

# **The prevalence of sexual harassment within a student sample of Stellenbosch University**

FRANCOIS RUDOLPH STEENKAMP

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts (Psychology) at Stellenbosch University.



Supervisor: Dr. Charl Nortje  
Co-supervisor: Prof. Amanda Gouws

March 2010

**DECLARATION**

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the owner of the copyright thereof (unless to the extent explicitly otherwise stated) and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

March 2010

Copyright © 2010 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

## ABSTRACT

Due to the extensive prevalence of sexual violence permeating the present day South African society, the social relevance of a study of the extent and nature of sexual harassment among university students, cannot be overestimated. This is particularly evident if one takes into account the growing number of research studies undertaken in South Africa and elsewhere on the African continent indicating the presence of this social evil on campuses of higher education. The purpose of this study was to determine the prevalence, effects, correlates and perceptions of different types of sexual harassment among a student sample at Stellenbosch University. The methodology applied in this study can be viewed as quantitative in nature as it entailed the use of a survey design. The researcher developed a new questionnaire to investigate the pervasiveness of students' experience of, reaction to, and beliefs about sexual harassment. This questionnaire consisted of sub-scales, of which some were newly developed by the researcher, and others, based on existing scales, were adapted for the purposes of this study. The design took the form of a questionnaire that covered the time period during which the students were enrolled at Stellenbosch University.

Both undergraduate and post-graduate students from the four campuses of Stellenbosch University (i.e., Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch and Tygerberg) were invited to participate in the study. The total sample consisted of 1679 students. The electronic questionnaire consisted of a total of 27 separate questions with some of the questions having various sub-sections. Data were obtained on the socio-demographic profile of students. The questionnaire explored student perceptions of which behavioural types constituted sexual harassment, the number of times a participant had been a victim of a particular type of sexual harassment, whether alcohol or drugs played a contributory role in the victimisation, whether the participant sought help from available support services following the victimisation, the location of the incidents of sexual harassment and whether the offender was known to the victim or not. Gender role attitudes of students, indicating the extent to which sexual harassment is tolerated by the student community, were also investigated.

The questionnaire furthermore explored issues of same-sex sexual harassment, the occurrence of group harassment and the possible effects, be it social, emotional or academic, that the victim might have suffered. The relationships between certain measurement scales were also investigated. With the utilisation of statistical packages, frequencies and statistical differences amongst various sub-groups were determined. Significant findings of the study included gender, racial and sexual orientation subgroup differences in terms of the perception of, rate of prevalence and tolerance of sexual harassment. Significant statistical differences between gender, racial and sexual orientation subgroups were also established for certain variables

related to the familiarity of the perpetrator, the locations of sexual harassment, help-resource utilisation following incidents of sexual harassment and the effects of sexual harassment.

## OPSOMMING

Vanweë die uitgebreide voorkomssyfer van seksuele geweld tans in die Suid-Afrikaanse samelewing, kan die sosiale relevantheid van 'n studie oor die omvang en aard van seksuele teistering nie oorbeklemtoon word nie. Hierdie veronderstelling word duidelik ondersteun deur die groeiende aantal studies in Suid-Afrika en elders in Afrika wat hierdie sosiale euwel op tersiêre kampusse ondersoek. Die doel van hierdie studie was om die voorkomssyfer, gevolge, korrelate en persepsies van verskillende tipes seksuele teistering by 'n studentesteeekproef van die Universiteit van Stellenbosch te bepaal. Die metodologie van hierdie studie kan beskryf word as kwantitatief van aard aangesien daar van 'n opnameontwerp gebruik gemaak is. Die navorser het 'n nuwe vraelys ontwikkel om die omvang van studente se ervaring van, reaksie op, en opvattinge oor seksuele teistering te ondersoek. Hierdie vraelys het bestaan uit subskale, waarvan sommige nuut geskep was deur die navorser en ander wat vanuit bestaande bronne aangepas is vir die doel van hierdie studie. Die ontwerp is in die vorm van 'n vraelys wat die tydspanne dek waarin die studente ingeskryf was by die Universiteit van Stellenbosch.

Beide voorgraadse en nagraadse studente van die vier kampusse van die Universiteit van Stellenbosch (i.e., Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch en Tygerberg) is genooi om deel te neem aan die navorsing. Die totale steekproef het uit 1679 studente bestaan. Die elektroniese vraelys het 27 aparte vrae gehad waarvan sommige verskeie onderafdelings bevat het. Data is verkry oor die sosio-demografiese profiel van studente. Die vraelys het studente se opvattinge bepaal oor watter gedragstipes seksuele teistering behels, asook die aantal kere wat 'n deelnemer 'n slagoffer van 'n spesifieke soort seksuele teistering was. Verdere vrae het ondersoek of alkohol en dwelms bygedra het tot die teistering, of die deelnemer bystand gesoek het by beskikbare ondersteuningshulpbronne na die teistering, die plekke waar die seksuele teistering voorgekom het, en of die oortreder bekend was aan die slagoffer of nie. Studente se houdings oor geslagsrolle, wat aanduidend was van die mate waarin seksuele teistering verdra word in die studentegemeenskap, is ook nagevors.

Die vraelys het verder kwessies verken soos selfde-geslag seksuele teistering, die voorkoms van groepsteistering en die moontlike nadelige gevolge daarvan vir die slagoffer, hetsy sosiaal, emosioneel of akademies. Die verbande tussen sekere metingskale is ook ondersoek. Met behulp van statistiese pakkette is die frekwensie en statistiese verskille tussen verskeie subgroepe op die kampus bepaal.

Beduidende bevindings van die studie sluit in: geslag-, ras- en seksuele oriëntasie-subgroepverskille in terme van die persepsie van, voorkomssyfer van en verdraagsaamheid teenoor seksuele teistering. Beduidende statistiese verskille tussen die geslag-, ras- en

seksuele oriëntasie-subgroepe is ook bevind met betrekking tot sekere veranderlikes wat verband hou met die bekendheid van die oortreder, die plekke van teistering, die benutting van ondersteuningshulpbronne na teistering en die gevolge van seksuele teistering.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to:

Dr. Charl Nortje, Department of Psychology, Stellenbosch University for his endless patience with me. Without his expert guidance and meticulous work this study would not have been possible.

Prof. Amanda Gouws, Department of Political Science, Stellenbosch University, for her professional approach to this study and its aims.

Prof. Martin Kidd, Centre for Statistical Consultation, Stellenbosch University, for his expertise in statistical analysis.

Marieanna le Roux, Department of Psychology, Stellenbosch University, for her expertise in statistical analysis and generous guidance, advice and assistance.

Magriet Treurnicht, Department of Information Technology, Stellenbosch University, for spending many hours assisting me with the software package used for the electronic creation and distribution of the questionnaire.

All second-year students I lectured on both the main and Tygerberg campuses of Stellenbosch University for their help in scrutinising the questionnaire and their encouragement to complete the research.

Carey Bremridge, clinical psychologist, for showing me that anything is possible.

All of the 1679 students who participated in the study. Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire and for sharing your experiences.

Stellenbosch University for approving the research and for allowing me to conduct the study without let or hindrance.

Helene van Niekerk and Erika Viljoen of the company 'Transliterate' for the professional editing of this document.

My mother, Marsha Steenkamp, for her endless sacrifices as a single parent. Without her support, love and encouragement I could not have achieved success.

My father, Francois T Steenkamp, for loving me in his way.

**DEDICATION**

I dedicate this study to all those who have been victims of sexual violence in whatever form both within South Africa and abroad.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | PAGE     |
|--|----------|
| <b>Declaration</b>                             | ii       |
| <b>Abstract</b>                                | iii      |
| <b>Opsomming</b>                               | v        |
| <b>Acknowledgement</b>                         | vii      |
| <b>List of Tables</b>                          | xiv      |
| <b>List of Figures</b>                         | xix      |
| <b>List of Addendums</b>                       | xx       |
| <br>   |          |
| <b>1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION</b>          | <b>1</b> |
| <br>   |          |
| <b>2. CONCEPT DESCRIPTIONS</b>                 | <b>5</b> |
| 2.1. SEXUAL HARASSMENT                         | 5        |
| 2.2. SEXUAL HARASSMENT: SPECTRUM OF BEHAVIOURS | 5        |
| 2.3. BLATANT AND SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT      | 6        |
| 2.4. RAPE                                      | 7        |
| 2.5. ATTEMPTED RAPE                            | 7        |
| 2.6. STALKING                                  | 7        |
| <br>   |          |
| <b>3. THEORETICAL MODELS</b>                   | <b>9</b> |
| 3.1. INTRODUCTION                              | 9        |
| 3.2. BIOLOGICAL MODELS AND THEORIES            | 9        |
| 3.2.1. The role of sex hormones                | 9        |
| 3.2.2. Evolutionary theory                     | 10       |
| 3.3. PSYCHOSOCIAL MODELS AND THEORIES          | 12       |
| 3.3.1. Socialisation theory                    | 12       |
| 3.3.2. Social learning theory                  | 13       |
| 3.3.3. Gender role theory                      | 14       |
| 3.3.4. Gender and criminal behaviour           | 15       |
| 3.3.5. Feminist theories                       | 16       |
| 3.3.6. Patriarchal society theory              | 17       |
| 3.3.7. Male dominance theory                   | 18       |
| 3.3.8. Cognitive theories                      | 21       |
| 3.3.8.1. Information processing theory         | 21       |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 3.3.8.2. Social-cognitive theory                                      | 22        |
| 3.4. CONCLUSION   | 23        |
| <b>4. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>   | <b>24</b> |
| 4.1. INTRODUCTION   | 24        |
| 4.2. DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPT DESCRIPTIONS                             | 24        |
| 4.3. TYPES OF RESEARCH ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT                           | 27        |
| 4.4. TYPES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT                                       | 28        |
| 4.5. EXTENT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES               | 30        |
| 4.6. PREVALENCE STUDIES AT AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES                       | 32        |
| 4.6.1. University of Cape Town  | 33        |
| 4.6.2. Stellenbosch University  | 34        |
| 4.6.3. University of Natal – Pietermaritzburg                         | 34        |
| 4.6.4. University of Transkei   | 35        |
| 4.6.5. University of the Witwatersrand                                | 35        |
| 4.6.6. University of Venda  | 36        |
| 4.6.7. University of Agriculture – South-West Nigeria                 | 36        |
| 4.7. UNIVERSITY RESIDENCES AS FOCAL POINTS FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT      | 36        |
| 4.8. RESPONSES TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT                                   | 38        |
| 4.9. EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT                                     | 39        |
| 4.10. RISK FACTORS FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT                              | 40        |
| 4.11. PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT                                | 41        |
| 4.12. PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT                               | 42        |
| 4.13. SEX DIFFERENCES REGARDING THE PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT | 43        |
| 4.14. SEX DIFFERENCES REGARDING THE VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT      | 44        |
| 4.15. FAMILIARITY OF PERPETRATORS                                     | 45        |
| 4.16. MEN AS TARGETS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT                             | 45        |
| 4.17. SAME-SEX SEXUAL HARASSMENT                                      | 46        |
| 4.18. DEFICIENCIES IN PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT          | 47        |
| 4.19. CONCLUSION  | 48        |
| <b>5. AIM OF STUDY</b>  | <b>49</b> |
| 5.1. GENERAL AIM  | 49        |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 5.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES   | 49        |
| <b>6. METHOD</b>   | <b>51</b> |
| 6.1. INTRODUCTION  | 51        |
| 6.2. DESIGN  | 51        |
| 6.3. PARTICIPANTS  | 51        |
| 6.4. MEASURES  | 53        |
| 6.4.1. Prevalence of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-BSHS)   | 55        |
| 6.4.2. Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS)  | 55        |
| 6.4.3. Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS)   | 55        |
| 6.4.4. Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS)  | 55        |
| 6.4.5. Blatant Sexual Harassment Help-resource Scale (B-HRS)   | 56        |
| 6.4.6. Subtle Sexual Harassment Help-resource Scale (S-HRS)  | 56        |
| 6.4.7. Effects of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale (B-ESHS)   | 56        |
| 6.4.8. Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS)  | 56        |
| 6.5. PROCEDURE   | 56        |
| 6.6. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS  | 57        |
| 6.7. DATA ANALYSIS   | 58        |
| 6.8. CONCLUSION  | 58        |
| <b>7. RESULTS</b>  | <b>59</b> |
| 7.1. INTRODUCTION  | 59        |
| 7.2. BLATANT SEXUAL HARASSMENT   | 59        |
| 7.2.1. Prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of<br>different types of blatant sexual harassment                 | 59        |
| 7.2.2. Prevalence of participants who had more than one experience of<br>different types of blatant sexual harassment                | 62        |
| 7.2.3. Comparison of groups regarding the prevalence of participants who<br>had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment | 65        |
| 7.3. SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 67        |
| 7.3.1. Perceptions of subtle sexual harassment   | 67        |
| 7.3.2. Tolerance of subtle sexual harassment   | 71        |
| 7.3.3. Prevalence of subtle sexual harassment  | 80        |
| 7.3.3.1. Total scores on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual<br>Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the comparison<br>of certain subgroups   | 80        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 7.3.3.2. The prevalence of different types of subtle sexual harassment and the comparison of certain subgroups | 82         |
| 7.4. GROUP HARASSMENT  | 90         |
| 7.4.1. Prevalence of participants' experiences of group harassment for the total sample                        | 91         |
| 7.4.2. Prevalence of participants' experiences of group harassment for the different subgroups                 | 91         |
| 7.5. FAMILIARITY OF PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 94         |
| 7.6. LOCATIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 97         |
| 7.7. HELP-RESOURCES UTILISED BY VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT   | 98         |
| 7.7.1. Help-resources utilised at least once by victims of blatant sexual harassment                           | 98         |
| 7.7.2. Help-resources utilised by victims of subtle sexual harassment  | 102        |
| 7.8. ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE BY VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 103        |
| 7.9. EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 104        |
| 7.9.1. Prevalence of the effects of blatant sexual harassment  | 105        |
| 7.9.2. The intensity of the effects of subtle sexual harassment  | 108        |
| 7.10. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION, TOLERANCE AND PREVALENCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT                | 111        |
| <b>8. DISCUSSION</b>   | <b>112</b> |
| 8.1. INTRODUCTION  | 112        |
| 8.2. PREVALENCE OF BLATANT SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND COMPARISON OF SUBGROUPS                                       | 112        |
| 8.3. PREVALENCE OF WHAT PARTICIPANTS PERCEIVE AS SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT                                      | 117        |
| 8.4. TOLERANCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT   | 119        |
| 8.5. PREVALENCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 121        |
| 8.6. GROUP HARASSMENT  | 122        |
| 8.7. FAMILIARITY OF PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 123        |
| 8.8. LOCATIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 124        |
| 8.9. HELP-RESOURCE USE FOLLOWING EXPERIENCES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 125        |
| 8.10. PSYCHOACTIVE SUBSTANCES USE AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT  | 128        |
| 8.11. EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT   | 130        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 8.11.1. Blatant sexual harassment  | 130        |
| 8.11.2. Subtle sexual harassment   | 130        |
| 8.12. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION, TOLERANCE AND<br>PREVALENCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT | 132        |
| 8.13. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE<br>RESEARCH                              | 132        |
| 8.13.1. Sample size  | 132        |
| 8.13.2. Length of questionnaire  | 133        |
| 8.13.3. Layout of questions within questionnaire   | 133        |
| 8.13.4. Absence of formal definitions for sexual harassment  | 134        |
| 8.13.5. Time periods   | 134        |
| 8.13.6. The scope of the research  | 134        |
| 8.13.7. Comparison with previous research on sexual harassment                                     | 135        |
| 8.13.8. Other factors impacting on the research  | 135        |
| 8.14. CONCLUSION   | 137        |
| <b>9. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS</b>   | <b>138</b> |
| 9.1. SUMMARY   | 138        |
| 9.2. RECOMMENDATIONS   | 140        |
| 9.3. CONCLUSION  | 142        |
| <b>REFERENCES</b>  | <b>143</b> |

## LIST OF TABLES

|                   |   |    |
|-------------------|---|----|
| <b>Table 6.1</b>  | Distribution of the Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Total Sample (N = 1679)  | 52 |
| <b>Table 7.1</b>  | Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Total Sample and for Each Gender Group                                | 60 |
| <b>Table 7.2</b>  | Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups   | 61 |
| <b>Table 7.3</b>  | Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Sexual Orientation Groups   | 62 |
| <b>Table 7.4</b>  | Prevalence of Participants who had More Than one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Total Sample and for Each Gender Group                               | 63 |
| <b>Table 7.5</b>  | Prevalence of Participants who had More Than one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups  | 64 |
| <b>Table 7.6</b>  | Prevalence of Participants who had More Than one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Sexual Orientation Groups  | 65 |
| <b>Table 7.7</b>  | Comparison of the Gender, Racial, and Sexual Orientation Groups Regarding the Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment | 66 |
| <b>Table 7.8</b>  | Prevalence of What Participants Perceived as Subtle Sexual Harassment for the Total Sample and for the Gender Groups, and the Comparison of Differences               | 68 |
| <b>Table 7.9</b>  | Prevalence of What Participants Perceived as Subtle Sexual Harassment for Each of the Racial Groups and the Comparison of Differences                                 | 69 |
| <b>Table 7.10</b> | Prevalence of What Participants Perceived as Subtle Sexual Harassment for each of the Sexual Orientation Groups and the Comparison of Differences                     | 70 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Table 7.11</b> Means and Standard Deviations for Different Subgroups for the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS), and the Comparison of Differences                       | 71 |
| <b>Table 7.12</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of Gender, Racial, and Sexual Orientation Groups                | 72 |
| <b>Table 7.13</b> Means and Standard Deviations of the Individual Items of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of the Gender Groups                     | 73 |
| <b>Table 7.14</b> Means and Standard Deviations of the Individual Items of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of the Racial Groups                     | 75 |
| <b>Table 7.15</b> Means and Standard Deviations of the Individual Items of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of the Sexual Orientation Groups         | 77 |
| <b>Table 7.16</b> Means and Standard Deviations for Different Subgroups for the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of Differences                          | 80 |
| <b>Table 7.17</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS) and the Comparison of Gender, Racial and Sexual Orientation Subgroups            | 81 |
| <b>Table 7.18</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the Comparison of Gender Groups   | 82 |
| <b>Table 7.19</b> Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Types and Same Sex Harassment for Scale Anchor Points for Gender Groups, on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS) | 83 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Table 7.20</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the Comparison of Racial Groups   | 84 |
| <b>Table 7.21</b> Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Types and Same Sex Harassment for the Scale Anchor Points for Racial Groups, on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS)         | 85 |
| <b>Table 7.22</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the Comparison of Sexual Orientation Groups   | 87 |
| <b>Table 7.23</b> Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Types and Same Sex Harassment for Scale Anchor Points for Sexual Orientation Groups, on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS) | 89 |
| <b>Table 7.24</b> Means and Standard Deviations for Different Subgroups for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and Comparison of Differences                                       | 90 |
| <b>Table 7.25</b> Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Total Sample  | 91 |
| <b>Table 7.26</b> Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Gender Groups   | 92 |
| <b>Table 7.27</b> Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups   | 93 |
| <b>Table 7.28</b> Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Sexual Orientation Groups   | 94 |
| <b>Table 7.29</b> Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment Where the Perpetrator was Known to the Victim, for the Total Sample and for Each Gender Group     | 95 |



|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Table 7.30</b> Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment Where the Perpetrator was Known to the Victim, for Each Racial Group  | 96  |
| <b>Table 7.31</b> Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment Where the Perpetrator was Known to the Victim, for Each of the Sexual Orientation Groups                              | 97  |
| <b>Table 7.32</b> Prevalence for the Total Sample, of the Locations Where Blatant Sexual Harassment was Experienced by Participants at Least Once   | 98  |
| <b>Table 7.33</b> Prevalence of the use of Help-Resources at Least Once by Victims of Blatant Sexual Harassment   | 99  |
| <b>Table 7.34</b> Prevalence of the use of Help-Resources at Least Once by Victims of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Gender Groups   | 100 |
| <b>Table 7.35</b> Prevalence of the use of Help-Resources at Least Once by Victims of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups   | 101 |
| <b>Table 7.36</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Subtle Sexual Harassment Help-Resource Scale (S-HRS)  | 102 |
| <b>Table 7.37</b> Prevalence of Victims who Indicated That Their use of Alcohol Probably Contributed to at Least one Incident of Blatant Sexual Harassment, and Comparison of the Gender Groups                                 | 103 |
| <b>Table 7.38</b> Prevalence of Victims who Indicated That Their use of Drugs Probably Contributed to at Least one Incident of Blatant Sexual Harassment, and Comparison of the Gender Groups                                   | 104 |
| <b>Table 7.39</b> Prevalence of Participants who Indicated That They Experienced Social, Emotional and Academic Effects at Least Once Following Incidents of Blatant Sexual Harassment, and the Comparison of the Gender Groups | 105 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>Table 7.40</b> Prevalence of Participants who Indicated That They Experienced Social, Emotional and Academic Effects at Least Once Following Incidents of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups and the Comparison of Differences | 107 |
| <b>Table 7.41</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS), and Comparison of the Gender Groups  | 109 |
| <b>Table 7.42</b> Means and Standard Deviations for the Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS) for the Racial Groups, and the Comparison of Differences  | 110 |
| <b>Table 7.43</b> Pearson Correlations Between the TSSHS, Pr-SSHS and Pe-SSHS for the Total Sample   | 111 |

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Figure 4.1** Sexual harassment: A spectrum of behavioural patterns

30

**LIST OF ADDENDUMS**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>APPENDIX 1</b> E-mail invitation document | 160 |
| <b>APPENDIX 2</b> Questionnaire              | 162 |

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Due to the extensive prevalence of sexual violence permeating present day South African society, the social relevance of a study of the extent and nature of sexual harassment among university students cannot be overestimated. This is particularly evident if one considers the growing number of research studies undertaken in South Africa, elsewhere on the African continent, and indeed the world, that indicate the presence of this social evil on campuses of higher education.

Research in many countries testifies to a range of sexual harassment practices found within academic settings. According to Sutherland (1991) the existence of sexual harassment undermines the educational process of any institution and it remains a university's responsibility to provide a safe environment in order that students might reach their full potential. Sexual harassment prevents this from happening. Being institutions of higher learning, universities are seen as bearing a special responsibility to be exemplary and to act as models for other institutions. The phenomenon of sexual harassment has wide and serious consequences for victims and the institutions in which it occurs (Gouws & Kritzinger, 1995). Crocker (1983) argues that a definition of sexual harassment, which includes a wide range of behaviour, has the following implications for the university and academic community:

- (i) university authorities need to take cognisance of the broad range of behaviour for which they have to take responsibility,
- (ii) students must be made aware of the variety of behaviours, which are seen as unacceptable,
- (iii) official recognition should be given to the fact that sexual harassment can vary from verbal comments to rape and that such practices have serious and detrimental implications not only for the victims but also for the university community. (p. 219)

Bennett (2002), defines "sexual harassment" as "the spectrum of different forms of sexual violence" (p. 3). According to her, the term is:

most usefully embedded into a specific context (such as "education" or the "work environment") to form an analytic and pragmatic focus and explore exactly what it is, within that context, that constitutes sexual harassment and exactly how to strategise against it. (p. 3)

The current study has as its focus a wide range of behaviour that could be viewed as harassing and/or abusive and has been grouped under the collective umbrella name of "sexual harassment". This includes behaviour that would otherwise have been labelled "sexual violence" (e.g., rape or

domestic violence etc.). The researcher believes that the umbrella term “sexual harassment” does include these forms of abuse and has decided, for the purposes of the current research study, to only utilise the term “sexual harassment”. Among the wide range of behaviours classified as “sexual harassment” the following are included. Firstly, “blatant” types of sexual harassment like stalking, attempted rape and rape. Secondly, “subtle” types of sexual harassment, for example, being “rated” (i.e., assigned a mark based on perceived physical attractiveness), repeated unwelcome requests for dates, flashing, unwanted touching etcetera. According to Lenhart (2004) sexual harassment and other forms of gender-based employment (and academic) discrimination are not new phenomena; historical accounts of discriminatory behaviour towards working women date back to colonial times and before. Wood argues that despite evidence of such longstanding discriminatory behaviour “these phenomena remained unidentified elements of the work and academic environments that were deeply embedded into the prevailing culture but at the same time obscured from view” (cited in Lenhart, 2004, p. 2). In the previous 50 years, as noted by Lenhart (2004) a number of complex specialised prevalence studies focusing on sexual harassment emerged from a broad spectrum of employment and academic settings. Although these studies varied greatly with regard to both methodology and behaviours that were studied, outcomes consistently documented that sexual harassment as a particular form of discrimination is “prevalent, underreported and associated with adverse outcomes for both individuals and institutions” (Stockdale, 1996, p. 10). The prevalence of sexual harassment of women particularly, has been well documented since the 1980s; so too has the serious psychological, academic, emotional and social consequences flowing from this victimisation been recorded since the 1990s (Lenhart, 2004).

The importance of studying the prevalence of sexual harassment cannot be overestimated, especially as it occurs on campuses of higher education, a context well known for its sexual undertones and ample opportunities for sexual harassment. The researcher believed that research of the prevalence of sexual harassment, such as the present one, must be considered important because of the contribution it makes to our theoretical academic understanding of the phenomenon of sexual harassment. The topic of sexual harassment is also of great social relevance, especially to a society such as in South Africa with its high levels of crime, and particularly crimes against women. This study hopes to add to the existing knowledge of sexual harassment and sexual violence in general within South Africa. Furthermore, the researcher is firmly of the view that the extent of research undertaken to investigate sexual harassment within South Africa, and also the African continent, remains lacking.

Prevalence studies of sexual harassment on campuses of higher education in South Africa have been few when one considers the number of higher education institutions in the country. As far as can be ascertained, research studies of this kind have, to date, been initiated at the following six

South African universities: University of Cape Town, Stellenbosch University, University of Kwazulu-Natal – Pietermaritzburg campus, the University of Transkei, University of the Witwatersrand and the University of Venda. The relatively small number of prevalence studies notwithstanding, it should be noted that most of South Africa's 23 universities and universities of technology, as well as other private higher education institutions have established policies and general awareness of the challenges posed by sexual harassment. Most notable among these are the policy documents of the following universities: Stellenbosch University, University of Cape Town, University of the Western Cape, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Walter Sisulu University of Technology, University of Fort Hare, Rhodes University, University of KwaZulu-Natal, University of Zululand, University of the Free State, North-West University, University of Johannesburg, University of the Witwatersrand, University of Pretoria and the University of Venda. A number of research studies have been undertaken at South African universities, which sought to study the effective implementation of sexual harassment policies. However, these studies are not applicable here because the present study has as its focus the prevalence of sexual harassment on university campuses and not issues pertaining to policy implementation. The researcher is aware of one prevalence study of sexual harassment in a higher education context that has been conducted in Nigeria. Again, numerous studies have been conducted in other African countries pertaining to sexual harassment policy implementation, but as previously stated, these studies fall beyond the scope of the present study.

The researcher is aware of two previous studies into the prevalence of sexual harassment at Stellenbosch University, one conducted on the main campus (i.e., in Stellenbosch) by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) and a study by Daniels (2002) conducted on the campus of the university's military academy (in Saldanha). In the time that has passed since the above research was conducted, it can be assumed that perceptions and beliefs regarding sexual harassment have altered and/or have evolved among the student population of Stellenbosch University. The researcher believed that Stellenbosch University provided the perfect testing ground for a study of this nature. This is especially true if one considers the sizeable and growingly diverse student population attending Stellenbosch University. Furthermore, given the presence of certain practices (i.e., hostel initiation rituals and other socially "damaging" practices) often described as forming part of the so-called "institutionalised culture" of this particular university, it is predictable that a study of this nature will yield important findings that might not have manifested elsewhere. Also of importance are general societal perceptions still held by many in South Africa (including students) pertaining to gender and sex roles (i.e., stereotypical, often patriarchal, sexist and/or chauvinistic beliefs) that might act as causative and/or aggravating factors in the perpetration of sexual harassment.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the choices of methodology available to the above studies limited them to smaller sample sizes due to the practical and logistical constraints present at the time. Also, neither of the two studies sampled participants from all four of the campuses of Stellenbosch University. In addition, the present research project had at its disposal advanced computer software via which survey research could be conducted with relative ease and with maximum reach of participants. This type of infrastructure was not available to the researchers conducting the two previous studies at Stellenbosch University. The researcher hopes that this research project will make a valuable contribution to the already existing data collected by his predecessors and that these additions will make for a more relevant understanding of sexual harassment at this particular university and elsewhere.

In this chapter an introduction and motivation for the present study was presented. In the next chapter brief descriptions of certain concepts, as well as a discussion of relevant theoretical models, will follow.



## CHAPTER TWO

### CONCEPT DESCRIPTIONS

#### 2.1. SEXUAL HARASSMENT

According to an official definition adopted by the European Commission (1991), sexual harassment can be defined as: “unwanted conduct of a sexual nature affecting the dignity of men and women at work. This can include unwelcome physical, verbal and non-verbal conduct” (p. 16).

#### 2.2. SEXUAL HARASSMENT: SPECTRUM OF BEHAVIOURS

Till (1980) in a study in the United States of America, collected data from a national sample of female university students. In his analysis of the responses he suggested five types of sexual harassment, namely: (a) gender harassment: generalised sexist remarks and behaviour, similar in appearance to racial harassment. Such behaviour is not necessarily designed to elicit sexual cooperation, but rather to convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women, (b) seductive behaviour: inappropriate and offensive but essentially sanction-free sexual advances (although such behaviour is unwanted or offensive, there is no penalty attached to the woman’s negative response), (c) sexual bribery: the solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behaviour by promise or reward, (d) sexual coercion: coercion of sexual activity by threat or punishment, and (e) sexual imposition or assault: sexual crimes and misdemeanours, including rape and sexual assault. Gelfand, Fitzgerald and Drasgow (1995) condensed these to three non-overlapping dimensions: sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention, and gender harassment. Other authors (Bennett, 2002; Berman Bradenburg, 1997; Finchilescu, 1997; Hobson & Guziewicz, 2002; Kastl & Kleiner, 2001) divide sexual harassment into *quid pro quo* and hostile working and learning environment. *Quid pro quo* means the exchange of one thing for another (e.g., a pass mark by a professor for a sexual favour from a student). Someone who has authority over the victim makes sexual advances, which could take the form of threats, demands, unwanted touches and overt sexual behaviour (Kastl & Kleiner, 2001). Hostile environment involves sexual conduct that affects a student’s ability to participate in or benefit from an educational environment, such as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature by an employee, another student, or by a third party (Hobson & Guziewicz, 2002). Sandler and Shoop (1997) define sexual harassment, occurring in the work and academic environments as follows:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when any one of the following is true: (1) submission to such conduct is either explicitly or implicitly made a term or condition of a person’s employment or academic achievement; (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions or academic decisions

affecting the person; (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with a person's work or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working, learning, or social environment. (p. 22)

The above definition was adopted by the United States Equal Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and was subsequently included in a guidebook on college/university administration in the United States of America (Sandler & Shoop, 1997). It is this definition that will be used as operational definition in the present research study.

### **2.3. BLATANT AND SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

The present researcher decided to distinguish operationally between so-called "blatant" and "subtle" types of sexual harassment in order to more meaningfully categorise the various types of sexual harassment that are outlined in the literature. For the purposes of this study, "blatant" forms of sexual harassment include the three "main" types of sexual harassment/violence, namely: (1) stalking, (2), attempted rape, and (3) rape. "Subtle" sexual harassment however, is a category that includes a variety of other types of sexual harassment, excluding the three "main" types typified as "blatant" sexual harassment. Among the many different types of behaviours classified as "subtle" sexual harassment, the following were included in the present study, namely: (1) being "rated"<sup>1</sup>, (2) "raids"<sup>2</sup>, (3) unwelcome requests, (4) unwanted/unwelcome touching, (5) electronic harassment<sup>3</sup>, (6) sexist remarks/comments, (7) flashing<sup>4</sup>, (8) streaking<sup>5</sup>, (9) "wolf-whistling"<sup>6</sup>, (10) same sex harassment, and (11) stares (leering). This operational distinction was made in order to encompass the broadest possible view of sexual harassment types within the study and to separate the three "main" behaviour types from the others. The researcher furthermore felt it important to separate these types in order to simplify the questionnaire, mindful of the fact that unnecessary complexity might impede participation. It should however be noted that the division into two groups (i.e., blatant and subtle), was an arbitrary decision on the part of the researcher. The distinction between the two does not indicate one type as having a higher degree of moral reprehensibility than the other, or that the effects of one type are necessarily more profound compared to the other.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Rating" is a practice whereby a mark (e.g., 8 out of 10) is assigned by (mostly male) students to (mostly female) students based on perceived physical attractiveness.

<sup>2</sup> "Raiding" of residences refers to students from one university residence (i.e., almost always male) that "raid" another university residence (almost always female) in order to "abduct" students for the purposes of a hazing ritual.

<sup>3</sup> "Electronic harassment" refers to harassing behaviour perpetrated via electronic means. This includes the sending of lewd or sexually related e-mails, sms's, faxes or video clips and making sexually inappropriate phone calls.

<sup>4</sup> "Flashing" refers to the exposure by a person of their private/genital areas in public.

<sup>5</sup> "Streaking" is a practice whereby (mostly male) residence dwellers run around the campus in the nude, especially in the vicinity of female residences.

<sup>6</sup> "Wolf-whistling" is a practice whereby (mostly male) students make wolf-like verbal noises in an attempt to communicate their sexual attraction/interest in (mostly female) students.

## 2.4. RAPE

Fisher, Cullen and Turner (2000), in a study entitled *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*, conducted among a national sample of 4,446 women attending colleges and universities in the United States of America, defined rape as follows: “Unwanted completed penetration by force or the threat of force. Penetration includes: penile-vaginal, mouth on your genitals, mouth on someone else’s genitals, penile-anal, digital-vaginal, digital-anal, object-vaginal, and object-anal” (p. 8).

However, the definition of rape in terms of South African criminal law, as contained in the *Sexual Offences and Related Matters Amendment Act, Act 32 of 2007* (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 2007) reads as follows: “Any person (“A”) who unlawfully and intentionally commits an act of sexual penetration with a complainant (“B”), without the consent of B, is guilty of the offence of rape”. It is this definition that will be used as operational definition for rape in the present research study.

## 2.5. ATTEMPTED RAPE

Fisher et al. (2000) defined attempted rape as follows: “Unwanted attempted penetration by force or the threat of force. Penetration includes: penile-vaginal, mouth on your genitals, mouth on someone else’s genitals, penile-anal, digital-vaginal, digital-anal, object-vaginal, and object-anal” (p. 8).

As far as can be ascertained, current South African criminal law does not explicitly state the definition of attempted rape. Current sex crime legislation in the form of the *Sexual Offences and Related Matters Amendment Act, Act 32 of 2007* (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 2007) appears to be silent on the matter. The researcher has however, formulated a definition of attempted rape, following adaptation of the official definition of rape, which yields a definition as follows: “Any person (“A”) who (attempts to) unlawfully and intentionally commit an act of sexual penetration with a complainant (“B”), without the consent of B, is guilty of the offence of (attempted) rape”. It is this definition that will be used as operational definition for attempted rape in the present research study.

## 2.6. STALKING

Various definitions for stalking are offered in the literature. Spitzberg and Cupach (2007) outlined the following legal definition of stalking, which is also contained in certain statutes of the United States of America:

Stalking can typically be identified as an: (a) intentional (b) pattern of repeated behaviours toward a person or persons (c) that are unwanted, and (d) result in fear, or that a reasonable person would view as fearful or threatening. Stalking is therefore not a single act or behaviour,

but a pattern of behaviour over time, requiring a minimum of two acts, but typically consisting of what may be a “campaign” of behaviour over an extended period of time. (p. 66)

Other researchers (Meloy & Gothard, 1995, p. 258) defined stalking thus: “the wilful, malicious, and repeated following and harassing of another person that threatens his or her safety”. A definition is also offered by Douglas and Dutton (2001, p. 520): “Classification of stalking generally requires repeated direct or indirect acts of following, communicating, besetting, watching, contacting, and threatening in such a way as to cause the victim fear, on reasonable grounds, for his or her safety”.

*The National Violence Against Women Questionnaire* conducted between 1995 and 1996 by Tjaden and Thoennes (2000), under the auspices of the United States Department of Justice, defined stalking as: “a course of conduct directed at a specific person that involves repeated visual or physical proximity, non-consensual communication, or verbal, written or implied threats, or a combination thereof, that would cause a reasonable person fear” (p. 1). It is this last definition that will be used as operational definition in the present research study.

A closely related phenomenon to stalking, and one that is much more prevalent, is the unwanted pursuit of intimacy. Cupach and Spitzberg (2004) refer to this set of activities as “obsessive relational intrusion”, which can be defined as “the repeated and unwanted pursuit of intimacy through violation of physical and/or symbolic privacy” (p. 2). The unwanted pursuit of intimacy is comparable to stalking, although it differs in two major ways. Firstly, not all stalkers are pursuing intimacy or a relationship, some stalkers are strangers to their victims and some stalkers only want to do harm to their target. Secondly, some instances of unwanted relationship pursuit do not cross the threshold of becoming fear inducing. Such pursuits are merely experienced as annoying, frustrating or otherwise undesirable. In addition, research has demonstrated that the majority of stalking cases emerges from previously acquainted relationships (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004).

In this chapter a description of certain concepts was provided, the next chapter will present an overview of theoretical models.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **THEORETICAL MODELS**

#### **3.1. INTRODUCTION**

This chapter will outline the biological model and a few psychosocial models used in the conceptualisation of the existence of sexual harassment from the perspective of victim and perpetrator. Firstly, the biological models consider the effects of biological influences on the body of primarily the male perpetrator of sexual harassment. Secondly, the psychosocial models outline the possible effects of gender roles on the origins of sexual harassment and examine the ways in which sexual harassment behaviour could be learnt by the perpetrator in terms of the social learning theory and the process of socialisation. Cognitive theories, in terms of (1) the information processing and (2) the attribution theory, present an explanation of the role of cognition on sexual harassment perceptions, experiences and effects suffered by victims of sexual harassment. Feminist theories explore the presence of patriarchy and male dominance within some cultures of the world that may act as a point of origin for sexual harassment.

#### **3.2. BIOLOGICAL MODELS AND THEORY**

##### **3.2.1. The role of sex hormones**

The biological model emphasises the biological differences between male and female anatomy and physiology in accounting for the occurrence of sexual harassment. Of special importance to this model is the difference in sex hormone levels and biological functioning between the genders. It is commonly accepted that the male androgen hormone testosterone is primarily responsible for sexual arousal in both human males and females. According to Baumeister (2001) research has consistently demonstrated that testosterone is the single hormone with the greatest effect on sexual behaviour in both human males and females. Also, stated this researcher, because male bodies and its receptors are much more sensitive to testosterone, male behaviour in general (i.e., not only sexual in nature), may be more influenced by the hormone testosterone than is generally the case for females (Baumeister, 2001). It is known that men have a significantly higher level of testosterone in their bodies at any given time than do women. This is due to the differences in bodily anatomy between human males and females: testes in males produce large amounts of testosterone, which are absent in the human female, and which appears to have evolved as the result of biological requirements and other evolutionary forces. It has been speculated that these higher levels of testosterone may account for the higher sex drive generally found among males of most animal species, including humans.

Testosterone itself is not only related to high sex drives but has also been linked to aggressive behaviour and loss of both impulse control and good judgement, or a loss of a combination of these

faculties. A number of studies (Dabbs, Carr, Frady, & Riad, 1995; Dabbs, Frady, Carr, & Besch, 1987; Dabbs, Jurkovic, & Frady, 1991) have illustrated the link between levels of testosterone and the inclination for violent and even criminal behaviour. The above studies have hinted at the link between levels of testosterone and particularly violent crimes such as rape and sexual assault. For example, it has been found that men convicted of violent crimes have higher levels of testosterone in their bodies (i.e., blood testosterone levels), than do average men in the general population with no convictions, and also, that men convicted of violent crimes have higher levels of testosterone compared to men convicted of non-violent crimes (Baxter, Barbaree, & Marshall, 1986). Inmates who had committed personal crimes (i.e., crimes committed against another person) of a sexual and violent nature have been found to have higher levels of blood testosterone than those who had committed non-violent crimes such as burglary, theft and drug-related crimes (Dabbs et al., 1995).

Notwithstanding these findings, the sexual arousal-aggression link pertaining to most instances of sexual violence remains unclear. The findings from a study by Dabbs et al. (1995) indicated differences between individuals with low and high levels of testosterone in both the frequency and pattern of their misbehaviour and criminal conduct. In light of these findings it is possible to speculate as to the role testosterone plays during sexually violent behaviour. It has been proposed that the male rapist rapes because of abnormal high levels of testosterone in their blood and the accompanying loss of impulse control and good judgement often associated with such elevated levels. Given these research findings supporting the causal link between elevated levels of androgen hormones (i.e., mostly testosterone) within the male body, and the resultant tendency to display aggressive behaviour, one is left to speculate as to the increased likelihood of sexually violent behaviour of some men.

### **3.2.2. Evolutionary theory**

Evolutionary theory considers the biological and evolutionary factors that may act as causes and/or catalysts in the perpetration of sexual violence. It is important for our understanding of the possible causes of sexual harassment that we explore the effect of evolution on the human species and to consider biological characteristics in humans that have been brought about by natural forces. Evolutionary theory accepts that human males have evolved a higher sex drive and greater pressure to more frequently seek out opportunities for copulation than human females (Darwin, 1859). It is known that males and females, especially mammals, seem to have evolved tendencies to emphasise different aspects when allocating their time and energy to tasks relating to reproduction (Buss & Schmidt, 1993; Ellis, 1989; Gould & Gould, 1997; Ridley, 1993). In mammalian species (e.g., humans) females emphasise care of offspring and males tend to emphasise securing as many sexual partners as possible (Gould & Gould, 1997). According to Ellis (1989) one can determine why such sex differences may have evolved if one notes that females

must commit a great deal of reproductive time and energy to gestating and rearing of offspring, something males are not generally required to do. She went on to say that:

If one assumes (a) that variation in reproduction is a crucial feature of all life (Darwin, 1859) and (b) that transmitting one's genes to future generations can best be accomplished primarily through reproduction (Dawkins, 1976) and (c) that each sex has a more or less equal amount of time and energy to commit to reproduction, one can deduce that the time and energy males do not devote to gestation can be diverted to other reproductive activities. (p. 14)

Moreover, given the speed with which males are able to father new offspring, there is none more beneficial reproductive activity males can pursue than copulating with as many female sexual partners as possible (Baumeister, 2001; Dawkins, 1976; Quinsey, 1984). Evolutionary theorists contend furthermore that males have a stronger tendency for evolving traits (behavioural and otherwise) that increase their chances of inseminating large numbers of females, rather than taking care of a few offspring (Dawkins, 1976). Therefore forceful tactics to achieve copulation (or rape in human terms) may have been naturally selected. Basically, evolutionary theorists consider aggressive copulation tactics like rape as an extreme response to natural selection pressures that require males to be more aggressive in their attempts to copulate by procuring sex partners for the purposes of gene transmission. However, because forced copulations reduce the ability of females to confine coitus (sex) primarily to males who will help care for the offspring that they produce, females should have evolved strong tendencies to avoid and/or resist attempts at forced copulation (Dawkins, 1976; Ellis, 1989). Females have thus evolved tendencies to resist copulating until a courting male exhibits evidence of having made long-term commitments to the female and any offspring she may bear (Dawkins, 1976).

According to Ellis, (1989) there is considerable evidence among humans that most females have an extreme aversion to being raped, especially when the offenders are strangers (Glazer-Schuster, 1979; Le Vine, 1977; Murphy, 1959). Studies have reported that women fear rape more than crimes like murder, assault and robbery, and that they report levels of fear relating to rape that are three times higher than that of men (Anonymous, 1981; Stanko, 1993). Reports from rape crisis centres have also found that fairly long-term and severe emotional traumas often accompany rape victimisation (Burgess & Holmstrom, 1977; McCahill, Meyer, & Fischman, 1979; Shainess, 1976). Another theory postulated by the evolutionary model to explain the perpetration of sexual violence, held that rape acts as a response from otherwise socially or biologically "inadequate males", who seek to more successfully transmit their genes to future generations (Ellis, 1989). Disparities in sexual capability among human males might compel males who are less assertive, less sexually attractive or lacking in desirable traits to seek out opportunities to inseminate females by whatever methods necessary in order to pass down their genes to the next generation (Ellis, 1989).

According to this theory, rape acts as the only mechanism for these men to achieve transmission of their genes when no other sexual outlet is available or accessible.

In summary, the evolutionary theory postulated sexual violence as being brought about for the following reasons: Firstly, as a result of natural selection males have a stronger sex drive than females and are more likely to focus their sex drives on seeking multiple sexual partners. Secondly, the theory stated that males who are generally regarded as less attractive sexual partners to females, might resort to using forced copulation (e.g., rape) as a last means of ensuring the transmission of their genes and thus achieving genetic survival into future generations.

### **3.3. PSYCHOSOCIAL MODELS AND THEORY**

#### **3.3.1. Socialisation theory**

In heterosexual relationships, according to Thomas and Kitzinger (1997) “it is assumed that men will take the lead in sexual encounters with women and have strong needs for (instant) gratification of their sex drive” (p. 158). There exists a tremendous amount of pressure in most cultures for men to pursue women for the purposes of establishing a romantic and/or sexual relationship. According to these researchers, the underlying assumption by society is that men are biologically “programmed” to pursue women in sometimes aggressive ways and that the role of the woman is to wait and communicate her availability and/or responsiveness (or not) to such acts of pursuing. Thomas and Kitzinger (1997) believe this is achieved by means of the woman sending out “signals” (verbal and non-verbal) for the man to interpret and then to respond accordingly. The problem of how the initiator (generally male) is to go about interpreting these “signals” is made more difficult by the prevailing expectation in society that a man is to “chase” and “hunt” the woman that is the object of his desire.

Limits to such hunting and chasing behaviour in especially the heterosexual context are not at all clearly outlined or defined and furthermore varies from the subjective perception of each person (i.e., both the male initiator and/or female being pursued). Another problem that remains regarding such expectations, lies in the fact that the man, or so it is assumed, understands and is able to correctly interpret the “signals” sent by the woman, and moreover to respond correctly according to the perceived meaning (decoding) of such signals. In reading these signals the man is expected to decide either to continue with the pursuit or to end the interaction altogether. Much of this “figuring-out” or “decoding” process remains the domain of intuition and individual subjective interpretation, both of which men are expected to naturally possess. In this regard it is worth noting that sexually harassing behaviour oftentimes originates from the erroneous interpretation of such “signals” by the man (or woman) as initiator of the contact, which often leads to the “pursuing” behaviour (e.g., acts aimed at initiating a romantic relationship etc.) to be deemed as unwelcome by the intended target.



This is especially true in the case of what is generally referred to as “stalking” and its related behaviours.

The mechanisms of how socialisation and societal expectations (especially gender role expectations) can influence the perpetration (or not) of sexual violence are clear from the above.

### **3.3.2. Social learning theory**

According to social learning theorists like Bandura (1973) and Mischel (1970), sexually harassing behaviour can be explained by means of the process of social learning. Research in socialisation has indicated that sex role definitions within a specific society are internalised and learned by its members. Mischel (1970) argued that according to the social learning theory, sex-typed behaviour (i.e., behaviour associated with a specific gender) is mostly acquired through “observational learning” or “identification” (explanation to follow). “Observational learning behaviour” Mischel (1970) contended, “may result from watching what others (models) do, or from attending to symbols such as words and pictures” (Mischel, 1970, p. 29). Mischel went on to say: “Undoubtedly, TV, movies, books, and other symbolic media play an important part in transmission of information about sex-typed (role) behaviour and the diverse consequences to which they may lead when displayed by males and females” (p. 45). So for example will diverse societal influences such as cultural traditions via imitation or modelling, sex-violence linkages (pornography depicting violent acts), rape myths<sup>7</sup> (beliefs that women secretly like/want to be raped, or that a healthy woman can successfully fend off a rapist if she wants to), and desensitisation effects (numbing from repeated exposure to instances of rape often depicted in the media), lead some to conclude that sexually harassing and/or violent behaviour is acceptable within society and can be viewed as behaviour worth imitating in order to achieve desired outcomes.

According to Ellis (1989) the explanation that the social learning theory provides for the origins of sexual harassment may be best considered a complex blend of Bandura’s theory of instrumental aggression and the feminist theory of rape. Feminist theory, (as will be seen in Section 3.5.) contended that acceptance of rape myths, sex-role stereotyping, sexual conservatism, and acceptance of sexual violence against women create an atmosphere which fosters the acceptance of rape and other forms of sexual violence (Burt, 1980; Koss & Burkhardt, 1989). In terms of the instrumental aggression theory, Bandura (1973, 1977) claimed that the strength of observational learning depends on the “functional determinants” (i.e., the rewards and punishments), received by

---

<sup>7</sup> Rape myths can be defined as false beliefs about rape, which seek to deny or make light of its effects on the victim, or in fact, blame the rape on the victim (Briere, Malamuth & Check, 1985). Beliefs surrounding circumstances, situations, and characteristics of individuals connected to rape are applied to all cases and situations uncritically. Rape myths exist for many historic reasons, which include inherited structural conditions, gender role expectations, and the fundamental exercise of power in a patriarchal society (Hamlin, 2001).

the model and the viewers' evaluation of the probability that they would attain the same reinforcement or punishment for performing a similar action. This evaluation process is known as "identification" (Mischel, 1970; Seto, Maric, & Barbaree, 2001). Bandura (1973, 1977) has argued that observational learning can be more effective than direct learning because the functional determinants (the factors that constitute a given situation) are unambiguous and therefore clear to the observer. The social learning theory, for example, suggests that pornography depicting violent acts can increase subsequent aggressive sexual behaviour because it portrays this behaviour as rewarding (Allen, Emmers, Gebhart, & Giery, 1995). Although the causal relationship between sexual violence and pornography remains controversial, a number of studies have linked violent pornography with rape depictions, violent sexual fantasies and other forms of sexual violence perpetration (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Malamuth, 1984).

### **3.3.3. Gender role theory**

A gender role is defined as a set of perceived behavioural norms associated particularly with men or women, in a given social system, based solely on the gender of the person and for no other reason or practical function. Gender is one form of the gender/sex system that according to Reiter (1975) can be explained as a set of arrangements by which a society transforms a biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed needs are satisfied. All societies, to a certain extent, have a gender/sex system, although the components and workings of this system vary markedly across different societies and cultures. It is generally recognised that the concrete behaviour of individuals is a consequence of both socially enforced rules and values, and individual disposition, whether genetic, unconscious or conscious. Such rules and values may change over time but there has been extensive debate as to exactly how, and how fast, such change occurs. This type of debate is rendered especially contentious when it involves the gender/sex system. This is because people have differing views about how much gender depends on biological sex and how much of the concept of gender is determined by social forces.

The process through which the individual learns and accepts roles is called socialisation. Socialisation, which can only occur within a social structure, works by encouraging wanted and discouraging unwanted behaviour in individuals that are part of that social structure. Sanctions that are imposed by the specific society and its agents (e.g., the family, school, religion, the media, government) make it clear to the child and (later) the adult which behavioural norms are expected of his or her gender. The examples set by one's parents, siblings, peers and teachers are typically followed in order to achieve success in life, as defined by the particular society. Once someone has accepted certain gender roles and gender differences as "expected" socialised behavioural norms, these behavioural traits become part of a person's perceived personality. According to Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) gender roles represent an important aspect of the socio-cultural system that

develops on the basis of sex and sex differences. Therefore, these researchers believe that gender role beliefs and attitudes refer to conceptions of “normatively appropriate behaviour associated with the biological fact of sex differences” (Gouws & Kritzinger, 1995, p. 26). Of special interest to the study of sexual harassment are the forces of socialisation that are enacted upon men and boys. As will be illustrated in a forthcoming section, patriarchal societies expect that men will be socialised to hold certain beliefs regarding their gender and the sexual roles and expectations that accompany it. For example, it is known that boys (and the men they later become) are heavily influenced by the gender role expectations of their society and the beliefs particular within that society. It is argued that these beliefs cannot otherwise but find expression in the everyday interaction between the genders. Such interactions inevitably provide the potential for sexual harassment and other forms of sexual violence, produced as it were, as by-products of such beliefs. This is particularly true in the event that gender expectations (i.e., what is expected of a specific gender in a given society) are incorrectly interpreted by any of the two genders.

As Taylor (2004) stated, “the social norms surrounding what is considered acceptable sexuality and sexual relations continue to influence understandings and attitudes towards sexual harassment” (p. 66). With regard to gender role attitudes and beliefs, Baron and Strauss (1987) stated, “norms associated with the expression of masculinity such as dominance and aggression, encourage men to sexually exploit women” (p. 12). Gender role beliefs and attitudes are also viewed by Powell (1986) as central in accounting for sexual harassment and as having a greater effect on perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment and what does not.

#### **3.3.4. Gender and criminal behaviour**

According to Cassel and Bernstein (2007) it is generally believed that males, being the traditional “warriors” in Western cultures, are inherently more aggressive than females. This gender difference is observable particularly during adolescence. During this time far more aggressive and violent acts and/or crimes are committed by adolescent boys than is the case with adolescent girls. This is not to say that girls cannot be aggressive, but female aggression generally tends to manifest in different, often less physically aggressive, ways (Cassel & Bernstein, 2007). It is evident that differences between the genders exist regarding the perpetration of criminal behaviour and violent acts. Bennet, Farrington, Rowell and Huesmann (2003) stated that “a child’s gender is one of the strongest and most frequently documented predictors of delinquent and violent behaviours” (p. 278). According to Bennet et al. (2003) studies of overall crime rates in the world have consistently shown higher rates of offending for men as opposed to women. These researchers went on to state that “the gender gap in crime has been so consistent over time and cultures that it is difficult to disregard the conclusion of researchers like Wilson and Herrnstein (1985) who are of the opinion that gender demands attention in the search for the origins of crime” (p. 278). The apparent

propensity for criminal and deviant behaviour among men as a general category, might also account for the generally higher rates of perpetration of acts of sexual violence by this group.

Feminist theories are concerned with sexual relations of domination and power. It is to these theories that we turn next.

### **3.3.5. Feminist theories**

Feminist theories are concerned with issues such as sex discrimination and gender inequality within society, its origins, practices and maintenance. This model emerged as a reaction against male dominance in patriarchal society and has its origins in the early works of influential feminist scholars (Brownmiller, 1975; Jagger, 1988; MacKinnon, 1989b; Smart, 1989; Walby, 1994). According to MacKinnon (1989b), a feminist theory of sexuality locates sexuality within a theory of gender inequality and sex discrimination. Gender inequality refers particularly to the social hierarchies within society which provide power to men to exercise over women. As summarised by Watkins (2000):

The feminist movement (and its theories) has created profound positive change in the lives of girls and boys, women and men, living in our society, in a political system of imperialist, white supremacist, capitalist patriarchy. It has changed how we see work, how we work, and how we love. (p. 14)

Yet, said this scholar, feminism has not created a sustained revolution (e.g., against patriarchy) and as such the gains made by the feminist movement are always at risk (Watkins, 2000). Sex discrimination refers to those sets of behaviours that men exhibit towards women which exposes the latter to the practical manifestations of such structural and other forms of inequality. For MacKinnon (1989b) a feminist theory on sexuality and gender inequality can be defined as follows:

A theory of sexuality becomes feminist to the extent that it treats sexuality as a social construct of male power: defined by men, forced on women, and constitutive in the meaning of gender. Such an approach centres feminism on the perspective of the subordination of women to men as it identifies sex - that is, the sexuality of dominance and submission – as crucial, as fundamental, as on some level definitive, in that process. Feminist theory becomes a project of analyzing that situation in order to face it for what it is, in order to change it. (p. 316)

Borrowing theoretical insights and hypotheses from rape research and literature, this model, according to Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), postulated that sexual harassment can best be understood within the context of the domination that men have over women within patriarchal society. The primary objective of sexually harassing behaviour is the domination and belittling of

women and not sexual gratification. These researchers went on to say that sexual harassment (including rape), is seen to function as a mechanism of social control employed by men in patriarchal societies (Gouws & Kritzinger, 1995). This model therefore considered the inequalities that exist among the genders in contemporary Western society and applies these to the study of sexual harassment.

### **3.3.6. Patriarchal society theory**

It is known that Western society, both in the past and in the present day, continues to be infused with notions of patriarchy. These notions have its origin in the biological, historical, socio-cultural, religious and economic heritage of the West, amongst others (Johnson, 2005). Patriarchal societies are of course not limited to the West, instead they are found throughout the globe in varying degrees of intensity and type. The word patriarchy is derived from two Greek words - *patēr* (father) and *archē* (rule). Patriarchy is described as a social structure (i.e., a society), whereby the actions and ideas of men and boys are dominant over those of women and girls. This circumstance of male dominance is reflected in many examples of inequalities throughout the particular society in which it occurs (Johnson, 2005). In the sphere of the family, the father or eldest male relative (e.g., uncle) is considered the patriarch or “head of the household”.

Patriarchal societies have customs or laws, or have had customs or laws, where wives and children, in a family, are owned by the father or other close male relative. In most cases the idea of patriarchy cannot be divorced from religion seeing as the two concepts are for the most part historically intertwined (Johnson, 2005). The teachings of most of the world’s religions espouse the doctrine of men being the head of the family unit and it is believed that this is so by divine appointment. A variation of this doctrine is found throughout the Judeo-Christian and Islamic worlds. The prevalence of such beliefs and the consequences it may hold have compelled most schools of feminism to challenge patriarchy as a social system (MacKinnon, 1989a). This system, many believe, is practiced unwittingly by the majority of the human population today. The system of patriarchy together with its inherent rewards (sexual, social, economic etc.) mostly benefits men as the perpetrators and sustainers thereof. Despite the undesirability of this system of inequality predicated on gender, patriarchy seems to persist and has survived to the present day. Some have sought to attribute its sustained practice over the last 5,500 years to the idea that male physical strength represents the primary way of attaining dominion over others and achieving life-outcomes (i.e., successful goal achievement). It is considered a biological fact that it is easier to achieve certain outcomes in life when a species, or members of a species, is endowed with superior physical strength (Johnson, 2005). Examples of outcomes that can be achieved in this way within the human context are the settling of disputes, competing with others over scarce resources, fighting enemies, certain advantages for procreation (e.g., procuring of a mate), and hunting for

food. It is therefore argued that because men generally are physically superior in strength to women, men are entitled to control, lead and/or be at the head of whatever social structure they are part of (Johnson, 2005). As noted by the feminist scholar Daly (1978) “males and males alone are the originators, planners, controllers and legitimators of patriarchy” (p. 29). As Pateman (1988), another feminist scholar wrote, “the patriarchal construction of the difference between masculinity and femininity is the political difference between freedom and subjection” (p. 207). As the current author has attempted to illustrate, the phenomenon of sexual harassment becomes less of a mystery when it is viewed in the context of patriarchy and observed within a society in which men believe themselves to be the superiors of women and in which women are often sexually and otherwise the victims of subjugation.

### **3.3.7. Male dominance theory**

Early feminist scholars identified the problem of sexual harassment as a means for men to subordinate women in the workplace and academic environment (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978). Some feminist scholars claim that this argument is particularly valid if one considers that the vast majority of sexual harassment, according to research, is perpetrated by men (Berkowitz, 1992; MacKinnon, 1989a; Watkins, 2000). In contemporary Western culture there remains, what some researchers call, “a sexist double standard” (Stockard & Johnson, 1979). Forming part of this standard, which in and of itself informs the perspective men and women have of each other is (1) the continued devaluation of women in everyday life and; (2) the continued entrenchment of beliefs surrounding male dominance and the pre-destination of women to positions of second-rate citizens. Stockard and Johnson (1979) comment in this regard as follows:

Sex segregation and the devaluation of women appear in everyday life. This involves social roles, individuals’ actions in social groups based on the expectations of the others in that group. When people are expected to play certain roles simply because they are male or female, these roles are called sex roles or gender roles. These sex roles are both different and differentially evaluated. (p. 202)

According to Stockard and Johnson (1979) issues of male dominance pervade our language, religion and media. This fact, these researchers said, influences the way in which men and women interact with each other on a day-to-day basis and informs their behaviour (i.e., towards the opposite sex). These researchers believe that in a male dominated society men have, as a group, greater power than women and men instinctively know this to be true. Men know this because of the subtle and sometimes not so subtle reinforcements within Western society of notions of male superiority. Male dominance, whether real or perceived, is evident in a wide variety of contexts in Western society (language, religion, family, government, legislation, culture, sport, education, the

media and the economy etc.), all of which continue to inform and perpetuate these beliefs (Stockard & Johnson, 1979).

Illustrating the complex, culturally-dependent and context-bound nature of human sexual interaction, Sanday (1981), in her groundbreaking study *The socio-cultural context of rape: A cross-cultural study* wherein she compared the social characteristics of 95 band and tribal societies, pointed out an inverse correlation between the status of women and the prevalence of rape (and other forms of sexual violence) within a particular society. She contended that “societies where rape is absent or rare are characterised by significant roles of authority and power for women as managers not only of their immediate families but also as personages of consequence in the greater society” (cited in Brown Travis, 2003, p. 22-23). According to Sanday (1981), rape prone societies on the other hand, are characterised by “interpersonal violence in general and by an emphasis on male dominance as part of the natural way of things and on beliefs that male dominance is important for the existence of an orderly society” (cited in Brown Travis, 2003, p. 23). Sanday also found that acts of rape are associated with cultures containing elements involving interpersonal violence, male dominance, sexual separation, and a so-called “ideology of toughness” (p. 24).

Also forming part of the beliefs regarding male dominance is the idea that women are seen as the objects of male lust and the vehicles of male sexual gratification. Nowhere are these beliefs better illustrated than in the Western world’s pornographic and commercial sex industries. Countless billions of Rands are made annually across the world from the exploitation of women and children in the commercial (legal or illegal) sex trade and sex trafficking. Billions of Rands are made annually in the production and sale of (mostly hetero-sexual) pornographic material. Adult Video News (1998), one of the major publications within the international pornographic industry, reported in 1997, following a questionnaire of retailers across the United States, that sales and rentals of adult videos doubled in the previous five year period with estimated annual revenue of some \$4, 2 billion US Dollars in 1997. This estimate did not include sales of other forms of pornography such as magazines, telephone sex services, CD-ROM’S, and internet services as well as those originating from the print media (erotic books, magazines, flyers, posters, postcards etc.), and other electronic media (cell phones, public and private television broadcasts etc.). In the year 2006 global pornography sales (i.e., pornography not acquired free of charge), totalled US\$96, 06 billion U.S. Dollars, with the United States earning US\$13, 30 billion of the global share (Ropelato, 2007).

In addition, figures for the year 2006 reveal that a new pornographic film, intended for the commercial market, is produced every 39 minutes somewhere in the United States of America. It is also interesting to note that online research mechanisms (internet companies and/or website

“trackers”<sup>8</sup>) have revealed that the age demographic of users of internet pornography has been dropping steadily since the year 2000. This trend has been observed in both the United States, Europe and most of Asia (Ropelato, 2007). No matter the format of the material, it remains arguable that each type of pornography contains a message that seeks to devalue and degrade women as human beings and to objectify female bodies as objects that exist only for the sexual pleasure and exploitation of men. Seto and his colleagues (Seto, et al., 2001) noted that many feminists have argued that the “sexualisation” of physical, sexual, and emotional harm enacted upon women, which is particularly evident in most forms of pornography, may lead to the social subordination of women and encourage sexual abuse of individuals.

Susan Brownmiller, a well-known feminist and author in this area, presented the feminist objection to pornography in 1979 by means of an organisation she co-founded, named *Women Against Pornography*. The summarised objection was based on the belief that 1. pornography represents hatred of women, and 2. that pornography’s intent is to humiliate, degrade and dehumanise the female body for the purposes of (mostly male) stimulation and pleasure (Brownmiller, 1975). It was argued by many (Brownmiller, 1975; Burt, 1980; Clark & Lewis, 1977; Steinem, 1980) that the availability of pornographic material may lead some men to believe that it is permissible to seek sexual gratification from any woman they find sexually desirable, regardless of the willingness of the particular woman concerned. These authors have consistently argued that aggressive pornography portrays women in a dehumanising and degrading fashion and that it “promotes a (cultural) climate in which acts of sexual hostility directed against women are not only tolerated but ideologically encouraged (Brownmiller, 1975, p. 44). This interpretation on the part of the (male) viewer is particularly likely to emerge when one considers the general availability, especially on the internet, of consensual and non-consensual violent and hardcore pornographic materials. This type of material usually displays women as being stripped of their individual worth, dignity and humanness and treated solely as an object of (mostly male) sexual desire.

It must be noted that other forms of pornography does exist (e.g., pornography intended for people who are bi- or homosexual). However, given that heterosexual men are the primary perpetrators of sexual harassment and violence (Berkowitz, 1992) and given that these behaviours are for the most part directed toward female victims (Brownmiller, 1975; Champion et al., 2004), it could be argued that the objectification of women in hetero-sexual pornography may present one explanation for the high levels of sexual violence perpetrated in contemporary society.

---

<sup>8</sup> “Trackers” are online web-based software which allows companies and other commercial entities to “track” (i.e., trace and/or record) the habits of internet users.



The following theoretical models will deal with issues pertaining to the victims of sexual harassment.

### **3.3.8. Cognitive theories**

#### **3.3.8.1. Information processing theory**

Cognitive theorists such as Ellis (1977) and Beck (1976) have proposed that distorted or irrational thinking patterns can lead to emotional problems and maladaptive behaviours (Nevid, Rathus & Green, 2008). Ellis (1977) believed that disturbing life events in themselves do not lead to anxiety, depression, or other psychologically disturbed behaviour. Ellis (1977) believed it is the irrational beliefs that people hold about these negative life events (and the appraisal thereof) that encourage negative emotions and maladaptive behaviour to develop (Ellis, 1977). In the case of an extremely negative event such as rape or other forms of sexual harassment for example, it is proposed by this theory that the life event itself is not the origin of the person's misery, but that the unhappiness actually originates from the thoughts and beliefs the person holds about the event. Ellis (1977) believed that the adoption of irrational beliefs leads people to "catastrophise" their disappointments leading to extreme distress and even states of depression and other negative and dysfunctional psychological phenomena (Nevid et al., 2008).

Beck (1976) theorised that depression and other abnormal psychological states may be the result of errors in thinking or what he called "cognitive disorders", for example thinking such as judging oneself entirely on the basis of perceived flaws or failures in life and the interpretation of such events in a (disproportional) negative manner (Beck, 1976). Beck likened this habit to viewing the world through "blue-coloured glasses" and stressed the fact that such distortions in thinking could be remedied via psychotherapy aimed at correcting faulty cognitions or thinking that emanate from negative life events and/or experiences (Beck & Young, 1985). According to Beck's theory of anxiety (Beck, Emery, & Greenberg, 1985) maladaptive thought patterns also play a central part in the development of anxiety disorders.

Lang (as cited in Resick, Monson & Rizvi, 2007) proposed an information processing theory of anxiety development that was later adapted by Foa, Steketee and Rothbaum (1989) to explain the development of negative psychological consequences following severely negative experiences including experiences leading to the development of post-traumatic stress disorder [PTSD]. Foa et al. (1989) suggested that PTSD originates due to the development of a fear network (structures) in a person's memory leading to escape and avoidance behaviours (as cited in Resick et al., 2007). This theory proposed that mental fear structures include three parts namely: (1) the actual stimuli or experience the person is exposed to, (2) the response from the person, and (3) the meaning elements the person attributes to the stimuli/experience. Any stimuli associated with the traumatic

experience may trigger the underlying fear structure or mental schemas present in the person and subsequently avoidant behaviour follows. Chemtob et al. (as cited in Resick et al., 2007) proposed that when the fear network is activated in individuals with PTSD by reminders of the trauma, the information in the network enters the person's consciousness (called "intrusive symptoms").

### **3.3.8.2. Social-cognitive theory**

Attribution theory proposed by Fritz Heider (1958), a social cognitive theorist, was an attempt to outline the method by which people come to explain (make attributions about) the behaviours of themselves and others. According to this theory, behaviour is attributed to either of two variables, namely: (1) internal disposition (e.g., personality traits, motives and attitudes), or to (2) situations (e.g., external pressures, social norms, peer pressure etc.). Heider (1958) suggested that people tend to overweigh internal dispositional causes over external causes; this cognitive habit was later called the "fundamental attribution error" (Ross, 1977). In terms of the application of this theory to sexual harassment, it is possible to theorise that the attributions (explanations) that victims generate following such negative experiences will in large part depend on the weighting given to either of the two factors above. The person's underlying disposition toward any of the two will furthermore determine the impact the particular event/experience has on that person and where the person will ultimately place blame and/or responsibility for such incidents.

As explained in a previous section, the social learning theory as devised by Mischel (1970) and Bandura (1973) provided an explanation for the origins of certain behavioural types on the part of the perpetrators of sexual harassment. Such behaviours are the result of processes of modelling and observing the behaviour of others in society. The social learning theory however, can also be applied to explain the factors that may predispose victims of sexual harassment to victimisation. As noted before, Mischel (1970) argued that in terms of the social learning theory, sex-typed behaviour (i.e., behaviour associated with a specific gender) is mostly acquired through social learning by means of so-called "observational learning" or "identification", (Bandura, 1973). Noting this, it becomes possible to assume that behavioural types that women ordinarily display in contemporary Western culture, may act as predisposing and/or causative factors for acts of sexual harassment. Research in socialisation has indicated that sex role definitions within a specific society are internalised and learned by its members, and this fact holds true for both victim and perpetrator of sexual harassment, because both are the products of the sustained process of viewing models within society which display certain types of behaviours as normative. Furthermore, the responses that victims display following experiences of sexual harassment may be intimately linked to the particular socialisation process persons undergo as part of living within our society. Also, it is interesting to note the observations by Bandura (1986) when he stated that in terms of behaviourist theory (behaviourism), which proposed that the environment acts upon and therefore transforms

the individual, a recently revised version of these theories now tends to give acknowledgement to the important impact the behaviour of the individual has on the environment. Bandura (1986) called this concept “reciprocal determinism” (Bandura, 1986). It could be argued that the process of social learning may lead both victim and perpetrator to act in certain ways, which will have a reciprocal impact on the environment, in turn creating the very context in which sexual harassment is then able to manifest.

### **3.4. CONCLUSION**

In this chapter the focus fell on the theoretical models that attempt to explain the role of the perpetrator, the prevalence of sexual harassment and the effects and responses of sexual harassment on the part of the victim. An overview was given of the biological and psychosocial models. In the next chapter we turn our attention to a review of the literature on sexual harassment.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 4.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves to outline the definition and concept description of sexual harassment. It will also look at the categories of sexual harassment, the types of sexual harassment, the extent of sexual harassment on university campuses, research on African university campuses, university residences as focal point for sexual harassment, responses to sexual harassment, effects of sexual harassment, risk factors for sexual harassment, factors influencing perceptions of sexual harassment, gender differences in sexual harassment, men as targets of sexual harassment, the phenomenon of same-sex sexual harassment.

#### 4.2. DEFINITION AND CONCEPT DESCRIPTIONS

According to many sources (Alliance Against Sexual Coercion, 1981; Kramarae & Treichler, 1985; Weeks, Boles, Garbin, & Blount, 1986; Wise & Stanley, 1987) the term “sexual harassment” was first coined in 1975 in Ithaca, New York, in the United States of America during a brainstorming session of a group called *Working Women United*. The group was formed under the leadership of the Human Affairs Program at Cornell University (Thomas & Kitzinger, 1997). The first use of the term “sexual harassment” was in a survey developed by this group in May 1975 (Benson & Thomas, 1982). Part of the group was the feminist scholar Catharine MacKinnon (1979) who played a pivotal role in publicising the term, in particular by means of an early manuscript of her book entitled *The Sexual Harassment of Working Women*, which was widely circulated among women’s groups and feminist organisations as early as 1975 and which proved very influential. MacKinnon’s work established both social and legal support for the recognition of sexual harassment as a serious social issue. According to Eyre (2000), another prominent feminist scholar, MacKinnon (1979) not only coined the term “sexual harassment” and named it publicly, but also “identified it legalistically as a form of discrimination against women” (p. 295). MacKinnon (1979) sought to establish that sexual harassment was not only a private personal event between victim and perpetrator but in fact amounted to sex discrimination and was therefore both an act against society in general, and likewise unlawful. She furthermore argued as follows:

Sexual harassment perpetuates the interlocked structure by which women have been kept sexually in thrall of men and at the bottom of the labour market. Two forces of American society converge: men’s control over women’s sexuality and capital’s control over employees’ work lives. (p. 29)

Eyre (2000) further stated, “for Mackinnon it was essential to recognise that sexual harassment was a group harm, a form of discrimination against women as women” (p. 295). MacKinnon’s arguments prevailed and in early 1980 the United States Equal Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued guidelines declaring that sexual harassment was a breach of Section 703(a)(1) of Title VII of the *United States Civil Rights Act of 1964*. According to Franke (cited in Snyman-Van Deventer & De Bruyn, 2001, p. 197), available statistics indicate that the number of sexual harassment cases filed with the EEOC on an annual basis more than doubled in the period between 1992 and 1998. According to Brama the number increased from 75 complaints in 1980 to 7 495 in 1991 (cited in Snyman-Van Deventer & De Bruyn, 2001, p.197). From 1985 to 1990 the number of complaints filed with the EEOC rose from 4 953 to 5 557. Since 1989 the figure increased by 112% each year (Snyman-Van Deventer & De Bruyn, 2001). In addition to this the Supreme Court of the United States of America, in 1986, confirmed in a ruling that sexual harassment was in fact legally actionable sexual discrimination (*Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson*, 477 U.S. 57, 1986). Furthermore, in 1992 the Supreme Court ruled that both pupils and students could seek monetary damages for sexual harassment perpetrated within any educational institution within the United States of America (*Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools*, 503 U.S. 60, 1992).

In South Africa, the numbers of reported cases of sexual harassment perpetration are also high. According to Nel (1993) and Dancaster (1991), 76% of all women are exposed to sexual harassment at some time during their careers or professional lives. In terms of South African case law, it is stated in *J v M Ltd* (1989 ILJ 755: 757H), a court judgement of 1989, that 63% of women in Johannesburg are exposed to sexual harassment at some point in their lives. According to Snyman-Van Deventer and De Bruyn (2001), South Africa has few court cases and very little legal literature that deal with sexual harassment. These researchers state that the reason for this is that few victims of sexual harassment in South Africa report such cases because they fear losing their jobs and/or being ridiculed. However, according to Snyman-Van Deventer and De Bruyn (2001) it is generally accepted by South African courts that sexual harassment is a form of discrimination, especially in terms of provisions prohibiting unfair discrimination found in the *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996* (as amended) (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 1996), and that sexual harassment constitutes an unfair labour practice in terms of the *Labour Relations Act, Act 66 of 1995* (as amended) (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 1995).

As is evident from the above, definitional issues pertaining to what exactly constitutes sexual harassment remain to this day. For example, Eyre (2000) contended that what exactly constitutes sexual harassment is not a given in all contexts. According to her, the writing of policies that seek to deal with the problem of sexual harassment cannot be removed from the political (and social)

realities in which such acts manifest. Therefore, posing serious problems for empirical research on sexual harassment, is the general absence of a shared definition of what it constitutes and consequently, how it should be operationalised for research purposes (Fitzgerald, 1990). Definitional problems relate to the so-called “subjective interpretation” (i.e., perception or interpretation unique to an individual) of behaviour as constituting sexual harassment. Whereas sexual harassment was initially thought to be limited to those situations where women are compelled to trade sexual favours for professional survival, *quid pro quo* (the exchange of one thing for another), it is now seen more broadly as “the inappropriate sexualisation of an otherwise nonsexual relationship and assertion by men of the primacy of a woman’s sexuality over her role as worker (i.e., professional colleague) or student” (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991, p. 23-24).

In addition to *quid pro quo* behaviours, a number of authors (Bennett, 2002; Berman Brandenburg, 1997; Finchilescu, 1997; Hobson & Guziewicz, 2002; Kastl & Kleiner, 2001) contended that sexual harassment could also lead to a hostile working and learning environment. Hostile environments according to Hobson and Guziewicz (2002) can be described as environments that involve sexual conduct affecting a student’s ability to participate in or benefit from an educational environment, such as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature by another student. Paludi (1990) contended that sexual harassment, like rape, incest, and battering, represents male expressions of power and dominance over women. However, MacKinnon (1979) believed that sexual harassment was essentially the subordination of women by men. Following from this approach, she contended that what was wrong with sexual harassment was the fact that “it participates in the systemic social deprivation of one sex because of sex” (cited in Eyre, 2000, p. 301). Notwithstanding these definitional difficulties, international guidelines for defining sexual harassment have been established. According to an official definition adopted by the European Commission (1991), sexual harassment in the workplace can be defined as: “unwanted conduct of a sexual nature affecting the dignity of men and women at work. This can include unwelcome physical, verbal and non-verbal conduct” (p. 32).

The South African government formally defined sexual harassment in legislation for the first time in 1995. This was done by means of the introduction of a *Code of Good Practice on the Handling of Sexual Harassment Cases in the Workplace*, as contained in the *Labour Relations Act, Act 66 of 1995* (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 1996). This code, in Section 5, defines sexual harassment as follows:

Sexual harassment is unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature that violates the rights of an employee and constitutes a barrier to equity in the workplace, taking into account all of the following factors:

- (i) whether the harassment is on the prohibited grounds of sex and/or gender and/or sexual orientation;
- (ii) whether the sexual conduct was unwelcome;
- (iii) the nature and extent of the sexual conduct; and
- (iv) the impact of the sexual conduct on the employee. (p.231)

In terms of which behavioural types constitute unwelcome conduct the code states on page 234:

- (i) The unwelcome conduct must be of a sexual nature, and includes physical, verbal or non-verbal conduct.
- (ii) Physical conduct of a sexual nature includes all unwelcome physical contact, ranging from touching to sexual assault and rape, as well as strip search by or in the presence of the opposite sex.
- (iii) Verbal conduct includes unwelcome innuendos, suggestions, hints, sexual advances, comments with sexual overtones, sex-related jokes or insults, graphic comments about a person's body made in their presence or to them, inappropriate enquiries about a person's sex life, whistling of a sexual nature and the sending by electronic means or otherwise of sexually explicit text.
- (iv) Non-verbal conduct includes unwelcome gestures, indecent exposures and the display or sending by electronic means or otherwise of sexually explicit pictures or objects.
- (v) Sexual harassment may include, but is not limited to, victimisation, *quid pro quo* harassment and sexual favouritism.
- (vi) A single incident of unwelcome sexual conduct may constitute sexual harassment.

#### **4.3. TYPES OF RESEARCH ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Research on sexual harassment fall broadly into two categories: (a) investigation of the dimensions of sexual harassment, and (b) investigation of factors influencing an individual's perception of sexual harassment (Tata, 1993). These factors include amongst others (1) the severity of the sexual harassment behaviour, (2) the context in which the behaviours occurs (i.e., the power differential between victim and perpetrator), and (3) the incidental attributes of the persons involved (e.g., physical attractiveness of the victim). According to Paludi (1997) it was generally accepted by the research community that several important characteristics should be considered when deciding whether or not sexual harassment had occurred. These included: (a) whether the behaviour is

unwanted and unwelcome; (b) whether the behaviour is sexual in nature and related to the gender of the targeted individual; and (c) the impact rather than the intent of the behaviour.

#### 4.4. TYPES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Till (1980) in a study in the United States of America, collected data from a national sample of female university students who reported, in an open-ended format, their experiences with sexual harassment. His analysis of the responses suggested five types of sexual harassment. Each type will now be discussed briefly. *Gender harassment*: Generalised sexist remarks and behaviour, similar in appearance to racial harassment. Such behaviour is not necessarily designed to elicit sexual co-operation, but rather to convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women. *Seductive behaviour*: Inappropriate and offensive but essentially sanction-free sexual advances. Although such behaviour is unwanted or offensive, there is no penalty attached to the woman's negative response. *Sexual bribery*: The solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behaviour by promise or reward. *Sexual coercion*: Coercion of sexual activity by threat or punishment. *Sexual assault*: Sexual crimes and misdemeanours, including rape and sexual assault (Fitzgerald, 1990). Gelfand et al. (1995) reduced Till's five categories into three conceptually distinct and non-overlapping dimensions, namely: sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention, and gender harassment. Sexual coercion is defined as the extortion of sexual co-operation in return for job-related benefits (Gelfand et al., 1995). Unwanted sexual attention is defined as unwelcome and reciprocated verbal and non-verbal behaviours that are considered offensive. Gender harassment includes a broad range of verbal and non-verbal behaviours that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about women (e.g., slurs, taunts, gestures, the display or distribution of obscene or pornographic materials, gender-based harassment, and so forth).

As noted before, the present researcher decided to distinguish between so-called "blatant" and "subtle" types of sexual harassment in order to more meaningfully categorise the various types of sexual harassment, which are outlined in the literature. This operational distinction was made in order to encompass the broadest possible view of sexual harassment types within the study and to separate the three "main" behaviour types from the others. The researcher furthermore felt it important to separate these types in order to simplify the questionnaire, mindful of the fact that unnecessary complexity might impede participation when conducting research of this nature.

One can turn to the field of human resource management for examples of behavioural patterns that may constitute different categories of sexual harassment in the workplace. The General Electric Corporation in 1998 published a document entitled *Sexual Harassment Manual* to enable employees to better understand the nature and definition of sexual harassment. It is important to note that although the corporation outlines sexually harassing behaviour types mostly found in the



work environment, these types of behaviours may also occur in non-traditional office environments like the academic environment (i.e., being a student), various public settings/contexts and even in private spheres such as the home. The corporation outlines the different patterns of behaviour (i.e., visual, verbal, written, touching, power, threats and force) that can be considered sexual harassment in the workplace as outlined in Figure 4.1.

| Visual   | Verbal                          | Written                          | Touching  | Power  | Threats             | Force             |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---------------------|-------------------|
| Ogling   | Requests for dates              | Love poems                       | Violating space   | Relationships                                      | <i>Quid pro quo</i> | Rape              |
| Staring  | Questioning about personal life | Love letters                     | Patting   | Using position of power to request dates, sex etc. | Demands             | Attempted rape    |
| Posters  | Dirty / sexual jokes            | Obscene poems, letters and cards | Grabbling   |  | Loss of job         |                   |
| Magazines  |                                 |                                  | Whistling   | Offensive E-mail                                   | Pinching            | Selection process |
| Flyers   | Caressing                       | Kissing                          |   |  |                     |                   |
| Online Pornography   |                                 |                                  |   |  |                     |                   |
| <p align="center"><b>Offensive conduct</b><br/>(May be illegal)</p> <p>Individual perceptions and reaction determine harassment<br/>Behaviour unwanted by recipients is harassment<br/>Behaviours may not be intended to harass, but this is often the result<br/>Illegal if the result is perceived as harassment</p> |                                 |                                  | <p align="center"><b>Demands</b><br/>(Illegal in all cases)</p> <p>Behaviours are intentional; goal is to intimidate, harass or hurt another person</p> |  |                     |                   |
| <p align="center">(Source: General Electric Corporation's Sexual Harassment Manual in Carrell et al., 1998, p. 64).</p>  |                                 |                                  |   |  |                     |                   |

Figure 4.1. Sexual harassment: A spectrum of behavioural patterns

#### 4.5. EXTENT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

University students are a particularly vulnerable group to be affected by sexual harassment, in part as a result of increases in both dating and sexual relationships during this time. Extensive research

literature (Abbey, Ross, McDuffie, & McAuslan, 1996; Finkelson & Oswalt, 1995; Fisher et al., 2000; Himelein, 1995; Koss, 1992, 1993, 1996; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Mills & Granoff, 1992; Synovitz & Byrne, 1998) originating from the United States of America, has documented the existence of coercive sexual behaviour in undergraduate university students since the early work of Kanin and his colleagues (e.g., Kirkpatrick & Kanin, 1957). These studies have revealed that a high rate of coercion exists within casual dating situations, and that the behaviour exists along a continuum, ranging from unwanted touching through to forced intercourse (Christopher, 1988; Koss et al., 1987). For example, when such harassment was defined as rape, studies have found rates of 13% for women (Finkelhor & Yllo, 1985), whereas when it was more broadly defined, rates as high as 54% have been reported in a university sample (Koss et al., 1987). Nasta et al. (2005) in a survey conducted at Brown University in the United States among 234 female students, found the following results among an undergraduate student sample: 6% for attempted rape and 3.8% for rape.

Research from education settings elsewhere in the world (So-Kum Tang, Critelli, & Porter, 1995) conducted at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, People's Republic of China, among 74 undergraduate female students, found a prevalence rate for attempted rape of 14.9% and 1.4% for rape for the total sample. In another study (Lehrer, Lehrer, Lehrer, & Oyarzún, 2007), conducted in the Republic of Chile among 455 female students attending various institutions of higher education, the following findings were reported: A total of 17% of the total sample reported having experienced some form of forced sexual intercourse (rape) in the previous 12 months. Concerning attempted rape, a prevalence rate of 11% was reported for this sample in the previous 12 months (Lehrer et al., 2007). Research regarding the prevalence of stalking as a form of sexual harassment on university campuses has reported interesting findings. A study by Fremouw, Westrup and Pennypacker (1997) among 318 female and 275 male university students found prevalence rates of 30% and 17% respectively for incidents of stalking which occurred during the participant's time as an enrolled student. Also, a study by Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) in a survey type study among 861 female students attending various tertiary institutions in the United States, found that 10.5% of female students reported that they had been stalked while being a student.

A review of 23 studies (Craig, 1990) noted that 30 to 78% of female university students had experienced unwanted sexual activity while on a date. Attention to sexual harassment of university students has also been prompted by the rising fear that university and college campuses are not ivory towers, but, instead, have become hot spots for criminal activity. Researchers have shown that university campuses and their students are by no means risk free from sexual harassment (Fisher, 1998). The results of an influential nationwide study of the prevalence of rape conducted among over 3,000 college/university women in the United States (Koss et al., 1987), indicated that

sexual assault rates seem to peak in young women between the ages of 16 and 24. The prevalence of harassment in this age group represents a two- to threefold increase in sexual assault rates compared to older women in the general population. Previous research suggested that young college women are at greater risk for rape and other forms of sexual assault than women in the general population (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993). Combining all types of objectively defined examples of sexual harassment, Barak, Fisher, and Houston (1992) maintain that students have at least a 40% chance of encountering some form of sexual harassment at university.

Sexual harassment is not unique to Western culture. Reports from many countries on the African continent testify to a range of sexual harassment practices in some academic settings. One such practice according to Twinamasiko (2008) is present on some university campuses in Uganda. The practice consists of a casual sexual relationship that exists between male lecturers and female students and is popularly referred to as “carpet grades” (indicating the place of the sexual transaction). This practice consists of students trading a range of sexual favours (oral, anal and/or vaginal sexual intercourse), in return for the reward of good grades and/or material assistance from lecturers and/or other academic staff (Twinamasiko, 2008). Furthermore, within many African countries, including Lesotho, Tanzania and South Africa, there exists a phenomenon that is popularly referred to as “sugar daddies”. This practice consists of older men with power and/or money sexually exploiting women, including learners and students, in return for academic and/or material assistance (Sugar daddies leave bitter taste, 2009). Research into the phenomenon of “sugar daddies” has described the practice of young women and girls exchanging sexual favours in return for the so-called “three Cs”, namely cell phones, cash and cars. It is said that poverty plays a big role in these transactions, but certain instances have been identified where the motive for the exchange was solely the acquisition of expensive items such as designer jeans or shoes (Sugar daddies leave bitter taste, 2009). The above-mentioned practices do not bode well for the future of South Africa’s youth, especially considering that so-called “transactional intergenerational sex”<sup>9</sup> described above, which can only lead to the spread of sexually transmitted diseases such as HIV/AIDS as well as further undermine the social fabric within society.

#### **4.6. PREVALENCE STUDIES AT AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES**

A number of studies of sexual harassment have been conducted on the campuses of African universities. Daniels (2002) provided an extensive outline of some of these. Among these institutions were: the University of Cape Town, Stellenbosch University, the University of Natal – Pietermaritzburg, the University of Transkei, University of the Witwatersrand, University of Venda and the University of Agriculture of South-West Nigeria.

#### 4.6.1. University of Cape Town

According to Daniels (2002) one of the first studies in South Africa investigating the prevalence of sexual harassment on a university campus was conducted at the University of Cape Town (UCT) in 1991. It was from this that other studies investigating sexual harassment at South African universities followed. A committee of Enquiry into Sexual Harassment was established by this university to determine the attitudes, traditions and accepted behaviour relating to sexual harassment and related behaviours, among the student body and the university at large. This committee particularly concerned itself with the situation in university residences. Specific focus was given to women's residences and the fears on the part of female students, their security and exposure to sexual harassment (Daniels, 2002).

The summary of the Report from this committee refers to seven major observations, namely:

1. A variety of forms of sexual harassment and sexual violence exists at UCT.
2. Experiences of sexual harassment and sexual violence are affected by race, class and gender.
3. The single greatest problem that needs to be addressed is community tolerance for sexually harassing behaviour.
4. An increasing number of female students and staff members feel alienated and unsafe on campus.
5. The current university disciplinary policy and procedures are inadequate and do not meet the needs of the university community.
6. The quality of education and life at the university is devalued by sexual harassment.
7. Issues regarding sexual harassment can be addressed successfully. (p. 22)

The study further noted that:

1. sexual violence was affected by race, class and gender and that 2. the greatest problem that needs to be addressed is the apparent community tolerance towards acts of sexual harassment and violence, 3. an increasing number of female students and staff members feel alienated and unsafe on campus, 4. that the quality of education and life at the university is devalued by sexual harassment. (p. 23)

---

<sup>9</sup> "Transactional intergenerational sex" refers to *quid pro quo* sexual intercourse among persons from different generations.

Following a workshop on sexual harassment at the University of Cape Town in July 1992, a statement was forwarded to the Committee of University Principles, which included the following remarks:

The workshop participants noted with concern the unacceptably high prevalence of sexual violence (including gang-rape, rape, sexual assault, battery) and harassment occurring at many universities. These were not exclusive to any university, and no university was exempt from the general problem. It was also noted that sexual violence and harassment transcended race, class, gender and language barriers. (p.24)

#### **4.6.2. Stellenbosch University**

In a questionnaire type study conducted at Stellenbosch University in 1992, Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) performed research aimed at, amongst others, measuring students' perceptions regarding a range of incidents that constitute sexual harassment. The sample consisted of 1500 randomly selected students. The researchers examined students' perceptions regarding so-called "institutionalised practices" including "raiding" residences, streaking and the grading of women according to their appearance. Attention was also directed towards the prevalence of experiences of subtle sexual harassment among students as well as the degree of tolerance students displayed towards different forms of sexual harassment. The present study sought to shed light on the comparable differences in the prevalence rates of sexual harassment as it existed in 1992, when the Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) study was conducted, and the phenomenon as it existed twelve years later in the year 2007. One other study investigating the prevalence of sexual harassment was conducted by Daniels (2002) on the campus of the Military Academy of Stellenbosch University located in the town of Saldanha. This study sought, amongst others, to replicate some of the research of Gouws and Kritzinger. This study also examined students' perceptions regarding experiences of sexual harassment as well as the degree of tolerance towards behaviours related to sexual harassment. The results of this study were generally in line with those found by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995).

#### **4.6.3. University of Natal<sup>10</sup> – Pietermaritzburg**

Braine, Bless and Fox (1995) conducted a study at the above-mentioned campus that focused on students' definitions, prevalence, perceptions and reactions to sexual harassment. Daniels (2002) noted that this study, in line with other studies at South African universities, found gender and cultural differences in the perception of which types of behaviour constitute sexual harassment. Braine et al. (1995) alluded to the lack of clarity that exists with students when judging what exactly

---

<sup>10</sup> The University of Natal was subsequently renamed the "University of KwaZulu-Natal" following a merger between the University of Natal and the University of Durban-Westville.

constitutes sexual harassment and stated that this has an effect on both the prevalence reported as well as the rate of reporting of such incidents. This study also highlighted the significant differences in perception between the genders when deciding on what behavioural types constitute sexual harassment.

#### **4.6.4. University of Transkei<sup>11</sup> (UNITRA)**

In 1997 Mayekiso and Bhana (1997) conducted a study at the above-mentioned institution aimed at investigating students' perceptions and experiences of sexual harassment. Data was obtained from a sample of 827 students. The study found that students needed more clarity on what constitutes sexual harassment. Again, as was the case in previous studies, differences between the genders were found pertaining to perceptions as well as experiences of sexual harassment. Mayekiso and Bhana (1997) modified and adapted a questionnaire by Braine et al. (1995) for use at UNITRA. Students were asked what their perceptions were on a range of examples of behavioural types that constitute sexual harassment. These researchers point out that in their analysis of the data, students at UNITRA displayed more tolerance and acceptance of behaviours that would otherwise have been considered as sexual harassment. These researchers also confirmed that their findings were consistent with those of Braine et al. (1995), who noted that Black African students tend to label and acknowledge the presence of sexually harassing behaviour far less often than is the case with students of other races. The researchers postulate that these findings might be the result of societal forces which endorse traditional sex-role orientations and which might lead to greater tolerance to sexual harassment in general. This phenomenon was also reported by Malovich and Stake (cited in Braine et al., 1995). It was noted that within societies where sexual harassment behaviours are considered more acceptable, women may feel affected by these behaviours, but they are conditioned to believe that men do not intend any harm by such actions. According to Mayekiso and Bhana (1997), women therefore do not seek redress or assistance in such instances because of this conditioning.

#### **4.6.5. University of the Witwatersrand (WITS)**

The above university conducted a survey on sexual and racial harassment in their Faculty of Health Sciences (1997) from September to October 1996. The sample consisted of a total of 1083 students who were surveyed regarding perceptions and experiences of sexual and racial harassment, as well as incidents of discrimination suffered during their undergraduate training. Almost 68% of participants reported being the victim of some form of sexual harassment and 52.

---

<sup>11</sup> The University of Transkei was subsequently renamed the "Walter Sisulu University of Technology" following its merger with the Border and Eastern Cape Technikons.

6% reported experiencing racial harassment. For all types of sexual harassment, proportionally more females compared to males reported having experienced incidents of sexual harassment.

#### **4.6.6. University of Venda**

Research was conducted by Dastile (2004) on the campus of the University of Venda. The research aims were to investigate, by means of face-to-face qualitative interviews among ten participants, the prevalence of sexual harassment and rape of female university students on this campus. This included the response from agents of social control (police, university officials etc.) to incidents of sexual harassment and the range of consequences following experiences of sexual harassment and rape. The researcher also sought to acquire the opinions of students about the possible preventative steps tertiary institutions could follow to combat incidents of sexual harassment and rape. The sample included two participants who were interviewed regarding experiences of sexual harassment and eight participants who were interviewed regarding experiences of rape. The study found extensive variation in both the type of incidents of sexual harassment and the type of perpetrator responsible for the harassment. It was also noted that sexual harassment was prevalent and under-reported on the campus. The reluctance of students to participate in the study was highlighted. Various recommendations were provided that may be adopted by tertiary institutions in order to combat the prevalence of sexual harassment.

#### **4.6.7. University of Agriculture in South-West Nigeria**

Ladebu and Shopeju (2004) conducted an investigation into the sexual harassment experiences, coping strategies and educational outcomes of undergraduate students from the University of Agriculture in South-West Nigeria. The researchers administered questionnaires to 290 undergraduate students. Sexual harassment perpetration was found to be prevalent and under-reported on the campus. It was reported that female students were the main targets of sexual harassment behaviour and that male students were typically identified as the perpetrators of the harassment. It was also reported that victims of sexual harassment had an overall lower academic performance rate compared to those who were not victimised. The researchers said this indicated, among other factors, a lack of coping mechanisms available to students following victimisation. Academic and university staff was also identified as initiators of harassing behaviours. Participants were also questioned to determine their perceptions regarding a range of sexual harassment behaviours. Participants in the above study were of the view that sexual harassment type behaviours which were accompanied by threats, did constitute more severe forms of sexual harassment.



#### **4.7. UNIVERSITY RESIDENCES AS FOCAL POINTS FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Research suggests that members of university residences are particularly at high-risk for involvement in acquaintance rape, due to the well-documented heavy drinking in this setting (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). Research findings on this topic have, however, been inconclusive (Copenhaver & Grauerholz, 1991; Kalof, 1993; Koss & Gaines, 1993). What is evident, though, is that high rates of alcohol consumption at social events may be used to justify unacceptable sexually aggressive behaviour (Nurius, Norris, Dimeff, & Graham, 1996). All-male, patriarchal peer groups that are often present in university residences can perpetuate and legitimate the sexual exploitation of women. This is mostly the result of elaborate (sometimes historically entrenched) institutionalised practices that are aimed at the sexual exploitation of female students, especially within the context of a university residence, but also elsewhere on campus (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2002). According to Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait and Alvi (2001) male students act within a larger patriarchal culture that supports sexual exploitation of women. This is particularly true within a student subculture that is focused on drinking in public places, high levels of sexual activity, and frequent socialising via the use of alcohol (often present within the university residence context). Research by Sanday (1990) has indicated that these residence groups create a climate conducive to the sexual objectification of women, tend to hold a very narrow conception of masculinity, perpetuate “hyper-erotic” peer group socialisation and generally operate in secrecy. Koss and Dinero (1989) have noted that certain rituals practised within these tight-knit male peer groups (e.g., residences/fraternities) may include the collective viewing of aggressive pornography, the attendance of strip clubs, getting drunk collectively, and the participation in collective sexually aggressive behaviours. The above factors render female students at increased risk for sexual harassment within the university residence setup.

Research furthermore suggested that membership of a university residence may act as a protective factor, minimising the experience of negative alcohol-related sanctions following an act of sexual harassment (Larimer, Lydum, Anderson, & Turner, 1999). Within certain college/university residences, especially in South Africa and the United States, there also exists what can only be called a “historic institutional culture” unique to a particular residence (especially male residences). It is this culture that breeds the type of unacceptable practices that sometimes answer to a definition of sexual harassment. In this regard, Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) have identified certain practices present on the campus of Stellenbosch University (and other universities in South Africa) that can be defined as sexual harassment. These practices include “hazing rituals” which are especially utilised in the case of junior students who are inducted into the residence at the beginning of the academic year and carries with it profound physical, emotional and psychological consequences for victims. Another example is “showering”, where female students from a nearby

residence are “abducted” or caught and then subjected to “washing”/showering while clothed and the practice of streaking and flashing, whereby male students run about campus in the nude (and especially in the vicinity of female residences) in full view of other students. This is done for the purpose of inducing shock and humiliation in those witnessing such displays (especially aimed at female students).

#### **4.8. RESPONSES TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Many studies have found that although women disapprove of sexual harassment, few women attempt to resolve issues attributed to victimisation by formal means, even when such formal means are clearly established and available (see: Gadlin, 1997; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Riger, 1991; Rowe, 1997; Rubin & Borgers, 1990; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1988, 1995). Instead, many women who experience sexual harassment choose not to file formal complaints. Common responses to sexual harassment include ignoring the behaviour or telling a friend or family member (Cammaert, 1985). Metha and Nigg (1983) found that only 20% of a particular university’s female students who reported that they had been sexually harassed, actually attempted to report it to a university official. However, studies indicate that students who are the targets of persistent unwanted sexual interest will eventually come to acknowledge and manage this pressure (Benson & Thomas, 1982; UCLA Questionnaire, 1985).

It is comforting to note that most victims of sexual harassment will eventually deal with the pressure that comes from having to endure incidents of sexual harassment. When victims fail to respond adequately to such pressure, a multitude of negative consequences may follow, as noted by Rabinowitz (1990) when she stated, “the preponderance of research on harassment is clear in indicating that most harassers are persistent, harassment rarely ends spontaneously, and often escalates in the absence of direct action” (p. 45). There are many reasons why victims of sexual harassment cannot or will not reveal their experiences. One such reason is the traditional view held by some that a victim of sexual harassment is a so-called “loser” or person otherwise negatively evaluated (Taylor, Wood, & Lichtman, 1983). Even in contemporary Western society a victim of sexual violence is viewed as either a precipitant or participant to the violence, unless there exists strong evidence of non-consent and/or resistance or, in the event that the victim is able to demonstrate serious bodily injury (Bularzik, 1978; Burt & Katz, 1985). Koss argued that “when people acknowledge their status as victims, some degree of devaluation and social stigma is inevitably incurred” (cited in Paludi, 1990, p.74).

From the literature it seems that many women who sustain harm do not automatically perceive themselves as victims. For example, Koss (1985) reported that only 75% of a group of college women, all of whom had had experiences that met the legal definition of rape, regarded themselves

as rape victims. According to Koss (1985) it was found that among a national sample in the United States of America, 30% of women that were raped by strangers and 62% of women raped by acquaintances did not view their experiences as any type of crime (Koss, Dinerto, Seibel, & Cox, 1988). The terms “acknowledged” and “unacknowledged” have been used to denote a raped women’s stance toward her victimisation (Koss, 1985). Burt and Estep (1981) have suggested that there are three stages to becoming a victim. In stage one a person sustains an injury. In stage two individuals perceive the injury as unfair and perceive themselves as victims. In stage three individuals seek redress from “social control agents” (the police, university officials etc.). Koss (1990) explained that one of the reasons a person would not want to label him- or herself a victim of sexual harassment is because this process involves losses (loss of control, value and self-esteem), and “it forces people to label themselves in negative ways or to categorise themselves with other stigmatised individuals” (Taylor et al, 1983, p. 75). Koss (1990) further explained that in order to avoid this negative labelling, victims may take steps to “de-victimise” themselves including trying to pass as non-victimised persons and to “engage in selective evaluations that allow them to limit the extent to which they see themselves as victims” (p. 75). Research has shown that the desire to avoid identification as a victim is very high. For example, Curtis (1976) completed a reverse records study and found that only 54% of known acquaintance rape victims (i.e., victims who reported their assault to the police), would admit to an interviewer that they had been raped.

#### **4.9. EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Sexual harassment may have very harmful and lasting consequences for victims, families, and communities. Victims of sexual harassment may display a range of potentially harmful effects following an incident of sexual harassment, as pointed out by Rabinowitz (1990): “Many women display a constellation of cognitive, behavioural, emotional, and physical symptoms following harassment that may persist long after the harassment ends and even change the course of their lives” (p. 38). Studies have pointed out that victims of sexual harassment may face both immediate and long-term psychological consequences (Ackard & Neumark-Sztainer, 2002). Immediate psychological consequences may include shock, denial, fear, confusion, anxiety, withdrawal, guilt, nervousness, distrust of others, symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder, emotional detachment, sleep disturbances, flashbacks and mental replay of the incident (Jewkes, Sen, & Garcia-Moreno, 2002). Chronic psychological consequences may include depression, attempted or completed suicide, alienation from others, post-traumatic stress disorder, eating disorder related behaviours such as fasting, vomiting, abusing diet pills and overeating. Potential long-term physical consequences of sexual harassment are chronic pelvic pain, pre-menstrual syndrome, gastrointestinal disorders, gynaecological and pregnancy complications, migraines and other frequent headaches, back pain, facial pain and disability, preventing the ability to work (Jewkes et

al., 2002). Social consequences of sexual harassment may include strained relationships with the victim's family, friends, and intimate partners, less emotional support and contact with them, and a lower likelihood of marriage or engaging in sexual relationships in general terms (Golding, Wilsnack, & Cooper, 2002).

#### **4.10. RISK FACTORS FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

There are numerous factors related to an increased risk of being sexually harassed, which will now be discussed. *Prior history of sexual violence*: Women who are raped before the age of 18 are twice as likely to be raped as adults, compared to those without a history of sexual abuse (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). *Gender*: Women are more likely to be victims of sexual harassment than men; 78% of the victims of rape and sexual assault in the United States are women and 22% are men (Champion et al., 2004). (Note that these findings may be influenced by the reluctance of some men to report sexual violence). *Age*: Sexual harassment starts very early in life. More than half of all rapes of women (54%) occur before age 18; 22% of these rapes occur before age 12. For men, 75% of all rapes occur before age 18, and 48% occur before age 12 (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). It has been noted that young women are at higher risk of being raped than older women (Acierno, Resnick, Kilpatrick, Saunders, & Best, 1999). *Drug or alcohol use*: Binge drinking and drug use are related to increased rates of harassment (Champion et al., 2004). *High-risk sexual behaviour*: As with drug and alcohol use, researchers are trying to understand the complex relationships between sexuality and sexual harassment — their causality, directionality, and other etiologic factors that increase vulnerability for victimisation are as yet not well understood (Champion et al., 2004). In addition to the above risk factors, a study by Fisher et al. (2000), also noted the following four factors as increasing the risk of sexual harassment: 1. frequently drinking enough to get drunk, 2. being unmarried, 3. having been a victim of sexual assault previously, and 4. living on a university/college campus as opposed to living in private off-campus accommodation. With regards to alcohol use by the victim, it is interesting to note the findings of studies (Abbey, 2002; Finney, 2004), that indicated that the effects of alcohol and group drinking increase the chances of a man interpreting female behaviours as possible sexual interest. A number of studies have noted that women who drink alcohol are at greater risk for sexual victimisation because men are likely to believe that a woman drinking alcohol is more sexually available and/or sexually promiscuous than would normally be the case and that men hold the belief that forcing sex on an intoxicated woman is more acceptable than a woman not drinking or drunk (Abbey, 2002; Finney; Gravitt & Krueger, 1998). A study by Reed, Amaro, Matsumoto and Kaysen (2009) reported that substance use is associated with increased reports of physical violence among male college/university students and an increased risk of sexual victimisation among female students. This study furthermore noted that substance abuse is prevalent among both victims and perpetrators (Reed et al., 2009).

#### 4.11. PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Research by Pryor and Day (1988) pointed out that ambiguous sexual harassment behaviour such as depicted in Till's (1980) first two categories, namely: (a) gender harassment, and (b) seductive behaviour, may be interpreted as sexual harassment by some persons but not by others because of complex influences on decision making amongst different individuals. Furthermore, Pryor and Day (1988) have suggested that the higher the level of ambiguity regarding the motives of the harasser, as experienced by the victim during the harassment, the more important is the role of contextual variables and factors such as the relative power of the harasser or reaction of the victim, as well as physical attractiveness of the victim. Also, most studies which examined gender differences consistently found that women seem to be less influenced by extraneous variables than men when rating more ambiguous harassing situations (Bursik, 1992; Pryor & Day, 1988; Tata, 1993). In this regard, Hendrix (2000) noted that courts in the United States of America have since 1988 moved from a position of "reasonable person", as a historic position, to one of "reasonable woman" when deciding on sexual harassment cases (*Ellison v Brady*, 54 FEP Cases 1347, 1991; *Robinson v Jacksonville Shipyards*, 54 FEP cases 83, 1988). Hendrix (2000) contended that, in making these decisions, the courts have illustrated their understanding of the fact that men and women differ in their perception of sexually harassing behaviour. Research in this regard has tended to support the view that there appears to be perceptual differences in views of what constitutes sexual harassment among the genders (Hendrix, 2000). The majority of these studies have found that women are generally more likely to view potentially harassing behaviours as inappropriate or sexually harassing than do men (Fitzgerald & Schullman, 1993; Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen, 1983; Harnett, Robinson, & Singh, 1989; Hendrix, Rueb, & Steel, 1998; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; Workman & Johnson, 1991). Also, male initiators are more likely to be seen as exhibiting inappropriate or sexually harassing behaviours than female initiators who exhibit identical behaviours (Gutek et al., 1983; Hendrix et al., 1998). According to Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) the most salient factors in judgements of whether a particular incident constitutes sexual harassment appear to be the severity or explicitness of the incident and the gender of the perceiver. These researchers also suggested that men consider gender harassment as trivial and seductive behaviour as acceptable forms of sexual approach (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991).

Attribution theory (Heider, 1958; Jones et al., 1972; Weiner, 1974; 1986) provides an additional explanation about the influence socialisation might have on the perceptions of sexual harassment held by the different genders. Attribution theory proposes that individuals attribute their behaviour, and the behaviours of others, to either internal or external causes. This theory suggests that the way men are socialised, primes them to more often initialise sexual activity than is the case for women (Hendrix, 2000). This has been called sex-role "spill over" and has been described by

Gutek and colleagues (Gutek & Morasch, 1982) as the transference of gender roles to the work and public place. Katz, Hannon, and Whitten (1996) suggested that men might be more likely to view the behaviours of other men as more sexually harassing due to this socialisation. Attribution theory research (e.g., Pryor, 1985) also suggested that the more role-discrepant the behaviour of an individual, the more the behaviour is perceived as sexually harassing. Therefore, the greater the power differential (real or perceived) between victim and harasser and the older and less physically attractive the harasser is, (e.g., in terms of the average student) the more likely it is that the behaviour would be seen as potential sexual harassment by the victim.

Furthermore, researchers (Gutek, 1985; Hendrix et al., 1998; Shea, 1993) have demonstrated that women tend to view both male and female initiators of sexually harassing behaviour as equally harassing. This contrasts with men who appear to view potentially harassing behaviour from women as less sexually harassing, even flattering, while at the same time finding identical behaviour from male initiators harassing (Hendrix, 2000). A national survey of rape on university/college campuses by Koss et al. (1987) revealed that one in twelve college men committed acts that met the legal definition of rape, and of those, 84% did not consider their actions to be morally reprehensible or illegal (Carr & VanDeusen, 2002). A large study of university/college male students found that 8.8% admitted to acts of rape and attempted rape (Ouimette & Riggs, 1998). This difference in perception between the genders might impact on the differential reporting of sexual harassment experiences between the genders.

#### **4.12. PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Carr and VanDeusen (2002) developed a conceptual framework for categorising risk factors that might lead to male sexual aggression (perpetration of sexual violence). These researchers identified four main factors, however only the first two are deemed relevant for the present study and will now be discussed, namely (1) male sex-role socialisation and (2) alcohol abuse.

##### **Male sex-role socialisation**

According to Koss (1990), when men are taught to display dominant and aggressive behaviour by the prevailing cultural norms and actors this may often lead to a sense of “hyper masculinity” within these men. This conception of masculinity can foster male peer support for sexually aggressive behaviour (often present in residences), the development of certain rape myths, and the emergence of adversarial sexual beliefs (as cited in Carr and VanDeusen, 2002). In a classic study of university/college date-rapists, Kanin (1985) found that a sample of date-rapists was significantly more sexually active, more prone to sexual frustration than control groups and that these men believed that rape could be justified under certain conditions. Kanin (1985) concluded that these date-rapists were the product of differential socialisation pertaining to issues of sexuality within,

what he called, a “hyper erotic” male culture which resulted, according to him, in such men having an exaggerated sex drive and a need to persistently seek out sexual encounters in order to satisfy these heightened impulses (Kanin, 1985). As has been noted before, the role that a largely patriarchal society plays in bestowing men with superior power in relation to women as well as general economic privilege for men, cannot be overestimated as a causative factor in sexual violence perpetration (Sanday, 1996). Sanday (1996) explained that a prevailing so-called “courtship patriarchy” creates an atmosphere wherein males feel that they are entitled to sex, the extensive use of pornography, the perpetuation of rape myths and the seeking out of sexual conquests of multiple women (Sanday, 1986). Lisak and Roth (1990) have noted that rapists believe many rape myths to be true, that they lack empathy for their victims, express more hostility and anger towards women in general, exhibit gender role rigidity, and have a higher tolerance for interpersonal violence.

### **Alcohol abuse**

According to research (Abbey et al., 1996; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987), there appears to be a strong correlation between alcohol abuse and university/college rape incidents. The relationship between alcohol and rape is multifaceted, and alcohol may be both a precipitant of and an excuse for sexually aggressive behaviour by men (Berkowitz, 1992; Larimer et al., 1999). Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) found that 55% of the men in their survey of rape on university/college campuses, who acknowledged that they have committed acts of rape on a date, were under the influence of alcohol. Also, Koss (1988) found that 74% of the men in her sample that admitted to rape, had used alcohol and drugs before (and during) the act of rape. A study by Koss and Gaines (1993) found that university/college students who reported having perpetrated the most serious acts of sexual aggression described their alcohol use as drinking until drunk.

### **4.13. SEX DIFFERENCES REGARDING THE PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Researchers of sexual harassment have been almost exclusively concerned with men's use of coercive strategies against women (Frieze, 2000). This focus reflects the reality that men are responsible for the vast majority of sexual harassment. The above gender differences in perpetration are in line with research studies elsewhere. According to Berkowitz (1992), current studies show that from 25% to 60% of male university students have engaged in some form of sexually coercive behaviour. He furthermore suggested that sexual harassment is the product of “normal” socialisation experiences for men in contemporary Western society. Despite increased efforts to teach university students about sexual harassment, Berkowitz (1992) has pointed out that most male university students who commit sexual harassment do not define their behaviour as such. Moreover, they feel they can justify their behaviour to themselves and others.

An important reason for the gender differences relating to perpetrators of sexual harassment may lie in the composition of current sex crime legislation. The criminal law definition of rape in South Africa at the time this study was conducted was restricted to the conception of the perpetrator as being a man and the victim as being a woman. Thus, from a legal point of view, sexual assault was until recently, by definition, an assault by a man on a woman. The Parliament of the Republic of South Africa only recently amended legislation relating to sexual offences. This was done in the form of the *Sexual Offences and Related Matters Amendment Act, Act 32 of 2007* (Department of Justice and Constitutional Development, 2007). This legislation was enacted to, amongst other aims, outline broader definitions of rape and other sexual offences. This Act extends the definition of a perpetrator(s) of rape to include both genders, for the first time allowing for the possibility of same-sex perpetration. The date of commencement of this act was 16<sup>th</sup> December 2007. The above act recalls and/or amends many of the offences formerly specified under South African common law and related criminal statutes pertaining to sexual offences.

#### **4.14. SEX DIFFERENCES REGARDING THE VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Historically, victims of sexual harassment were thought to be mostly women, with men as the primary perpetrators of the harassment. For example, a number of studies have reported that women are more likely to be victims of sexual harassment compared to men (Abbey, 1991; Koss et al., 1987). However, the majority of these studies either excluded men entirely, or included them only as perpetrators (Porter & Critelli, 1992). According to a study commissioned by the *American Association of University Women* [AAUW] conducted by Hill and Silva (2005), male and female students are nearly equally likely to be sexually harassed on campus. However, the type of harassment that female students are subjected to, differ from those of males. For example, female students, according to this survey, were more likely to be victims of physical harassment and gestures or looks, whereas men were more likely to be the victims of non-physical verbal harassment (e.g., to be called sexually derogatory names or to be called gay or other homophobic terms, etc.) (Hill & Silva, 2005). A study by Larimer et al. (1999) found that when a commonly utilised measurement instrument measuring unwanted sexual contact, for example the *Sexual Experiences Survey* (SES) developed by Koss and Oros (1982) was adapted to be gender neutral, men were found to be as likely as women to report being the recipients of several types of sexually harassing behaviours (Larimer et al., 1999). Women were however, more likely to report being the victims of incidents involving physical force (i.e., assault, attempted rape or rape), and they are more often given drugs and/or alcohol in an attempt by the perpetrator to gain sexual intercourse from them (Larimer et al., 1999). In addition to this, women tend to more often suffer depressive symptoms following harassment experiences than is generally the case with men (Larimer et al., 1999, p. 296). Women are also more likely to experience adverse social consequences following



incidents of sexual harassment, like social withdrawal and a decreased likelihood of establishing romantic relationships after an experience of sexual harassment (Golding et al., 2002; Struckman-Johnson, 1988). However, men may be less likely or willing to report similar symptoms, particularly psychological distress, indicating a bias towards underreporting by this gender rather than the actual intensity of negative experiences suffered (Banyard et al., 2007). It might also be that men report less, but different effects due to the gender differences in coping with stress and/or the expression of distress (Banyard et al., 2007). Furthermore, research has hinted at other differences pertaining to the effects suffered by male and female victims following incidents of sexual harassment. Struckman-Johnson (1988) reported that males who are the recipients of sexually harassing experiences from female perpetrators, appear unlikely to suffer negative emotional consequences. These researchers contended that this might be due to the greater degree of sex role socialisation of men and the fact that men might find such behaviour more congruent with their sense of self and their ideas pertaining to traditional masculinity (Struckman-Johnson, 1988). A study by Sorenson and Siegel (1992) found that female victims of sexual harassment more frequently reported effects such as fear or depression following incidents of harassment, while male victims more often reported alcoholism as a result of victimisation. Larimer et al. (1999) found that experiences of sexual harassment were linked with increased substance use for both genders, however men showed greater use of substances on average following such incidents. Also, female students were more likely to experience incidents of sexual harassment while under the influence of alcohol as alcohol represents one of the most important risk factors for victimisation of women (Koss et al., 1987).

#### **4.15. FAMILIARITY OF PERPETRATORS**

In a nationwide study on university/college campuses by Fisher et al. (2000) it was found that most victims in their sample knew the perpetrator of the sexual harassment. For both attempted rape and rape 9 out of 10 perpetrators were known to their victims. These researchers reported that in some cases the perpetrator (attempted rape and rape) was a boyfriend or ex-boyfriend (14.5%; 23.7%), classmate (43.5%; 35.5%), friend (24.2%; 34.2%) or acquaintance (9.7%; 2.6%) of the victim (Fisher et al., 2000). With regards to a friend and boyfriend as perpetrators of sexual harassment, Fisher et al. (2000) found that 12.8% of rapes, 35% of attempted rapes and 22.9% of so-called “threatened rapes” (i.e., where the victim verbally threatens to rape the victim) occurred while the victim was out on a date with the perpetrator.

#### **4.16. MEN AS TARGETS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

A sizeable body of research now seem to point to a comparable proportion of male students experiencing some form of sexual coercion on campus (Larimer et al., 1999; Russell & Oswald,

2002). In a recent study conducted at the Texas A & M University, significantly more men (62%) than women (46%) reported that they had engaged in heterosexual intercourse “when they did not want to” (Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988, p. 34). Such findings oppose the general belief that women are the only victims of such sexually coercive behaviour that may lead to sexual victimisation or rape (Felton, Gumm, & Pittenger, 2001). Larimer et al., for example, surveyed 296 male and female campus resident students at a large public education institution in the United States of America. These students, who were mostly in their first and second year, completed the Sexual Experiences Survey, developed by Koss and her colleagues (Koss & Oros, 1982), which had been modified to be sexually neutral concerning victim and perpetrator. The study noted that approximately 21% of the men and 28% of the women reported experiencing unwanted sexual contact.

In another study, Anderson and Aymami (1993) observed that both female and male participants reported that women used tactics to achieve sexual contact with men that are commonly defined as sexually coercive, abusive, or violent. Relevant to this study, 75% of women questioned, reported initiating sexual contact (kissing, fondling, or intercourse) with a man who was in a compromising position (i.e., being where he did not belong, breaking some rule or while drunk). A survey utilising a gender-neutralised version of the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982), found that 38.5% of men have reported some degree of unwanted sexual harassment (Hannon, Kuntz, Van Laar, Williams, & Hall, 1996). The types of sexual pressure that women have reportedly used include verbal inducement, offering of alcohol, physical force, and threats of force with or without a weapon (Anderson & Aymami, 1993; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1994). Despite reports of this nature, suggesting few gender differences in the prevalence of unwanted sexual contact, there continues to be relatively little attention focused on the phenomenon of male harassment. In part, this may be the result of prevailing societal beliefs that men cannot really be coerced into having sex against their will, or concerns that discussing male harassment may de-emphasise the focus on the prevention of the more prevalent and oftentimes more serious phenomenon of female harassment.

#### **4.17. SAME-SEX SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

The prevalence of same-sex sexual harassment is believed to be less than that of sexual harassment occurring between persons of the opposite sex. However, the literature on same-sex sexual harassment seems to contend otherwise. According to Faley and his colleagues (Faley, Knapp, Kustis, & Dubois, 1999) the sexual harassment literature now recognises that both opposite and same-sex sexual harassment fit into the greater definitional construction of sexual harassment. According to these researchers, survey research in particular has clearly established that women and men do not only harass each other, but they also harass members of their own gender (US Merit Systems Protection Board [USMSPB], 1981, 1988, 1995). It is especially important when

studying the prevalence of same-sex sexual harassment that one seeks out contexts in which the interaction between persons of the same sex, and therefore the risk of same-sex sexual harassment occurring, is high. A perfect example of just such a context can be found when focusing on an organisation predominantly made up of one gender, for example an organisation like the military. Numerous studies have been conducted in order to measure the prevalence of same-sex sexual harassment in the US military (USMSPB, 1981, 1988, 1995). A study by Waldo, Berdahl and Fitzgerald (1998) found that men experience sexual harassment from other men at least as often as from women.

Of particular interest was a study by Stockdale, Wood and Batra (1999) which noted that men in the military services were 33% more likely to experience same-sex sexual harassment than similarly situated women. This was likely due to the fact that more than 90% of the US military consisted of men (Waldo et al., 1998). The number of harassment complaints filed by men has nearly doubled over the previous ten years and a growing number of these complaints involve same-sex harassment (Faley et al., 2006). The prevalence rates of same-sex sexual harassment reported in the 1988, 1995, and 2002 surveys of sexual harassment for males in the US military increased from 40% in the 1988 survey to 51% in the 1995 and 2002 surveys (Defence Manpower Data Centre [DMDC], 1990, 1996, 2003). In contrast, same-sex sexual harassment of military women remained constant at about 2% across the three surveys (DMDC, 1990, 1996, 2003). Over the same time period, the prevalence of same-sex sexual harassment of military men increased from 44 to 48%, while the same-sex harassment of military women remained constant at about 2% (DMDC, 1990, 1996, 2003). From the above it is evident that the prevalence of same-sex sexual harassment is high and particularly so in contexts where persons of the same sex congregate. The notion that sexual harassment consisted only of harassing and violent acts between members of the opposite sex was clearly a too simplistic conceptualisation of what constituted sexual harassment. Such a notion may lead to the very denial of the serious effects that harassment has among persons of the same gender as well as the possible underplaying of the serious attention such acts ought to receive. It may also lead to the undermining of activities that seek to determine the approximate rates of prevalence thereof.

#### **4.18. DEFICIENCIES IN PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

Various research undertakings in South Africa and elsewhere in the world have investigated the phenomenon of sexual harassment among university students. However, in the majority of these studies the focus was mainly on the prevalence of sexual harassment, while little attention was paid to the potentially related factors such as students' perceptions of sexual harassment, the prevalence of group harassment and same-sex harassment, the relationship between offender and victim (i.e., whether the offender was known or unknown to the victim), the role alcohol and/or

drugs play in the perpetration of sexual harassment, as well as the location of the sexual harassment. Furthermore, only a limited number of studies have investigated the use of help-resources following experiences of sexual harassment, and the effects of sexual harassment, be it social, emotional or academic, that victims might have suffered. The importance of gender-role attitudes that are held by students and which might impact on the occurrence of sexual harassment has also not been studied.

#### **4.19. CONCLUSION**

In this chapter an overview was given of the definition and concept description of sexual harassment. The categories of sexual harassment were outlined as well as the types of sexual harassment, the extent of sexual harassment on university campuses, the responses to sexual harassment, the effects of sexual harassment, the risk factors for sexual harassment, factors influencing perceptions of sexual harassment, gender differences in sexual harassment, men as targets of sexual harassment, university residences as focal points for sexual harassment, same-sex sexual harassment, and lastly, an overview was given of previous research on sexual harassment.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### AIM OF STUDY

#### 5.1. GENERAL AIM

The purpose of the present research is to inform on the extent and nature of sexual harassment among a student sample at Stellenbosch University. The questionnaire covers the time period during which the students were enrolled at Stellenbosch University. Both undergraduate and post-graduate students from the eight Faculties on the main campus as well as the three other campuses of the university (Bellville, Saldanha and Tygerberg) were involved in the research study. Students were requested to only report on incidents that occurred either on or in close proximity of the four campuses of Stellenbosch University (i.e., incidents which occurred within the geographical areas of the towns of Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch and Tygerberg).

#### 5.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

- (i) To determine the prevalence of different types of blatant<sup>12</sup> sexual harassment (as measured by the Prevalence of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale [Pr-BSHS]), and to compare within subgroup differences for gender, race and sexual orientation.
- (ii) To determine the prevalence of participants' perceptions about what they regard as forms of subtle sexual harassment (as measured by the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale [Pe-SSHS]), and to compare within subgroup differences for gender, race and sexual orientation.
- (iii) To determine the tolerance of subtle sexual harassment (as measured by the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale [TSSHS]), and to compare within group differences for gender, race and sexual orientation.
- (iv) To determine the prevalence of different types of subtle sexual harassment (as measured by the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale [Pr-SSHS]), and to compare within subgroup differences for gender, race and sexual orientation.
- (v) To determine the prevalence of group sexual harassment.
- (vi) To determine the prevalence of the familiarity of the perpetrator to the victims of blatant sexual harassment.
- (vii) To determine the locations of the incidents of blatant and subtle sexual harassment.

---

<sup>12</sup> The division of sexual harassment into two groups (i.e., blatant and subtle), was an arbitrary decision on the part of the researcher. The distinction between the two does not indicate one type as having a higher degree of moral reprehensibility than the other, or that the effects of one type are necessarily more profound compared to the other.

- (viii) To determine the prevalence of help-resource use following experiences of blatant sexual harassment (as measured by the Blatant Sexual Harassment Help-Resource Scale [B-HRS]).
- (ix) To determine the prevalence of help-resource use following experiences of subtle sexual harassment (as measured by the Subtle Sexual Harassment Help-resource Scale [S-HRS]).
- (x) To investigate the relationship between the use of psychoactive substances and the incidents (occurrences) of blatant sexual harassment and to compare the gender groups in this respect.
- (xi) To determine the prevalence of the social, emotional and academic effects of blatant sexual harassment (as measured by the Effects of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale [B-ESHS]).
- (xii) To determine the prevalence of the social, emotional and academic effects of subtle sexual harassment (as measured by the Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scales [S-ESHS]).
- (xiii) To investigate the relationship between perception, tolerance and prevalence of subtle sexual harassment.

## CHAPTER SIX

### METHOD

#### 6.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter will deal with a description of the research design, the identification of participants, the measurement instruments used, the research procedure, the ethical considerations and finally the data analysis.

#### 6.2. DESIGN

A quantitative cross-sectional questionnaire (survey) design was used to inform on the prevalence of blatant and subtle sexual harassment among a student sample at Stellenbosch University. The methodology in this study can be viewed as quantitative in nature as it entailed the use of a questionnaire design, which Creswell (1994) described as follows: "A questionnaire design provides a quantitative or numeric description of some fraction of the population - the sample - through the data collection process of asking questions of people". (p. 234)

#### 6.3. PARTICIPANTS

All registered students (both undergraduate and postgraduate) on the four campuses of Stellenbosch University (Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch and Tygerberg) were targeted for participation in the study. The total number of participants potentially available to the study was 23 765 in the year 2007, registered students in this year on all four campuses, in all academic years. Students were invited to participate in the study via e-mails that contained a link to the questionnaires and this resulted in a total sample of 1679 students.

The demographic particulars appear in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1.

*Distribution of the Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Total Sample (N=1679):*

| Socio-demographic    |  |      |    |
|----------------------|--|------|----|
| variables            |  | f    | %  |
| Gender               | Male   | 677  | 40 |
|                      | Female   | 1002 | 60 |
| Race                 | Black  | 90   | 5  |
|                      | Coloured   | 189  | 11 |
|                      | White  | 1270 | 76 |
|                      | Other (Indian, Asian,<br>no answer etc.)         | 119  | 7  |
| Age                  | 18-20  | 665  | 40 |
|                      | 21-23  | 790  | 47 |
|                      | 24-26  | 133  | 8  |
|                      | 27-29  | 38   | 2  |
|                      | 30+  | 53   | 3  |
| Language             | Afrikaans  | 894  | 53 |
|                      | English  | 785  | 47 |
| Marital status       | Single   | 962  | 58 |
|                      | In relationship                                  | 662  | 40 |
|                      | Married  | 32   | 2  |
|                      | Divorced   | 1    |    |
| University residence | Yes  | 872  | 52 |
|                      | No   | 807  | 52 |
| Faculty              | Agri Sciences                                    | 96   | 5  |
|                      | Arts & Social Sciences                           | 251  | 14 |
|                      | Business School (Bellville)                      | 198  | 11 |
|                      | Economic & Management<br>Sciences (Stellenbosch) | 249  | 14 |
|                      | Education  | 148  | 8  |
|                      | Engineering                                      | 65   | 3  |



| Socio-demographic variables     |     |    |
|---------------------------------|-----|----|
|                                 | f   | %  |
| Law                             | 229 | 13 |
| Health Sciences<br>(Tygerberg)  | 186 | 11 |
| Military Sciences<br>(Saldanha) | 58  | 3  |
| Science                         | 176 | 10 |
| Theology                        | 20  | 1  |
| International Students          | 3   |    |

  

| Academic year      |             |
|--------------------|-------------|
| Mean score (years) | 2.69        |
| SD                 | 1.59        |
| Range              | .25 – 11.83 |

An e-mail containing a link to the questionnaires was sent to all 23 765 students with the help of the Department of Information Technology at the university. Further information pertaining to how participants were recruited will be explained in greater detail in Section 6.5. (“Procedure”).

#### 6.4. MEASURES

By replicating 20 items (questions) from a previous study of sexual harassment by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), as well as developing 17 new items, the researcher designed a new questionnaire instrument. The questionnaire was created to investigate the prevalence of sexual harassment (both blatant and subtle), and to measure students’ experience of, reaction to, tolerance for, and beliefs about sexual harassment. The questionnaire consists of a total of 27 separate items (questions) with some containing various subsections. Ten items in a check-list format was used to investigate student perceptions of which behavioural types constitute sexual harassment. Furthermore, 14 items were added which focused mainly on the investigation of the prevalence of sexual harassment (blatant and subtle types), the tolerance of subtle sexual harassment, the prevalence of group harassment (more than one offender), whether the perpetrator was of the same or opposite sex as the victim, whether the offender was known to the victim or not, whether or not alcohol or drugs played a contributory role to the sexual harassment, the location of the incidents of sexual harassment, how often victims made use of available help-resources following experiences of sexual harassment, as well as the possible effects, be it social, emotional or academic, that the victim might have suffered.

A demographic questionnaire page served as a cover page for the sexual harassment questionnaire and was aimed at recording socio-demographic details of students. This page consisted of 10 questions that sought to record details including the language preference of the participant, the Faculty in which the student was studying at the time of the measurement, the participant's sex, age, faith, race, year of study, as well as the course of study and his or her marital status. The students' sexual preferences were recorded towards the end of the questionnaire. All questions in the questionnaire were compulsory and therefore had to be answered in order for the participant to proceed to the next section. Because it was a questionnaire, each item provided discrete information regarding the prevalence of specific issues related to sexual harassment. These items were independently screened for face-validity by three psychologists and an interdisciplinary social scientist specialising in sexual harassment. The instrument was also refined in an independent pilot study (see discussion in Section 6.5. ("Procedure"). Various sub-scales can be identified within the larger 27-item questionnaire.

In the questionnaire a request was made to participants to report on incidents of sexual harassment that had occurred either on or in close proximity of any of the four campuses of Stellenbosch University (i.e., Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch and Tygerberg). In the case of the main campus in Stellenbosch, it is very difficult to delineate where the boundaries of the campus begin and end. It was for this reason that the researcher decided to allow participants to report on incidents experienced either on or in close proximity to any of the four campuses.

The researcher in collaboration with his supervisors took the decision not to devise set definitions for the various types of sexual harassment (i.e., both blatant and subtle sexual harassment). The decision was made because it was felt at that time that it would not be in the best interest of the study to firstly, prime participants as to the responses that the researcher was most probably seeking. Secondly, it was considered best not to limit the possible interpretations of which behavioural types constitute sexual harassment from the perspective of the participants (some of whom were victims of such incidents) by prompting them with the researcher's definitions, but instead to leave it to the self-definition of the participant and their judgement of what they thought constituted the various types of sexual harassment. The decision was further predicated on the assertion by some researchers (Pino & Johnson-Johns, 2009) that it is standard practice to allow victims the opportunity to define sexual offences such as rape and sexual harassment themselves, because of the social confusion (and subsequent absence of a shared definition of such acts) present among the general public (Pino & Johnson-Johns, 2009). This approach has been adopted by the United States Bureau of Justice Statistics when it conducts its annual *National Crime and Victimization Survey* among some 72,000 American households. This survey gathers information on a variety of crimes including sex crimes such as rape (U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2008).

This survey does not contain definitions for sex crimes (including rape) but instead relies on the victims of such crimes to define and report incidents from their perspective.

Different subscales within the survey questionnaire will now be described:

#### **6.4.1. Prevalence of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-BSHS)**

The researcher developed this instrument in order to measure the prevalence of blatant sexual harassment (stalking, attempted rape and rape) amongst the student sample. This was done by means of a question posed to participants wherein the number of times (incidents) a participant was the victim of any of the three types of blatant sexual harassment was reported. Participants had to fill in the number of times by placing a number in the box provided (e.g., 1, 5, 20 etc).

#### **6.4.2. Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS)**

This instrument was developed with the help of an existing instrument created by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) during their study of sexual harassment at Stellenbosch University in 1992. It consists of ten items where participants have to answer in the affirmative by checking the appropriate box. The purpose is to measure which behaviour types participants perceive as being examples of subtle sexual harassment. A Cronbach Alpha reliability (internal consistency) coefficient of 0.67 was established for the Pe-SSHS, based on the responses of the total sample (N = 1679).

#### **6.4.3. Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS)**

The development of the TSSHS was based on an existing instrument used by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), which in turn was taken from a study conducted by Lott, Reilly and Howard (1982). The researcher adapted the items (semantically) to better fit the requirements of the present study. The instrument consists of 13 items in the form of brief statements. The purpose of each statement is to provide a description of a possible sexually harassing scenario and to measure the degree of agreement or disagreement the participant has with the statement. It furthermore consists of five scale anchor points on an ordinal Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = "agree strongly", 2 = "agree moderately", 3 = "unsure", 4 = "disagree" to 5 = "disagree strongly". It is important to keep in mind that the lower the score on this scale, the higher the degree of tolerance for sexual harassment. Three of the items (items 1, 5 and 9) on this scale were reverse scored. A Cronbach Alpha reliability (internal consistency) coefficient of 0.67 was established for the TSSHS, based on the responses of the total sample (N = 1679).

#### **6.4.4. Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS)**

This instrument was an adaptation of an existing instrument used by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995). It consists of six items that provide a description of subtle sexual harassment and has six scale

anchor points on a Likert-type scale. The anchor points range from very often, often, sometimes, seldom to never. The purpose is to measure the prevalence of experiences of subtle sexual harassment. A Cronbach Alpha reliability (internal consistency) coefficient of 0.74 was established for the Pr-SSHS, based on the responses of the total sample (N = 1679).

#### **6.4.5. Blatant Sexual Harassment Help-resource Scale (B-HRS)**

This instrument was developed by adapting an existing instrument used by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995). It consists of 11 items, which list the possible help-resources that victims might have utilised following experiences of blatant sexual harassment. Participants were required to check the block next to any help-resource that was utilised following an experience of blatant sexual harassment.

#### **6.4.6. Subtle Sexual Harassment Help-resource Scale (S-HRS)**

This instrument was developed by adapting an existing instrument used by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995). It consists of 11 items, which list the possible help-resources that victims might have utilised following experiences of subtle sexual harassment. Participants had to indicate how often they utilised a specific help-resource. Five possible answers were provided ranging from “very often”, “often”, “moderately”, “seldom” to “never”.

#### **6.4.7. Effects of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale (B-ESHS)**

This instrument was adapted from an existing instrument used by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995). It consists of three items, which list the three possible effects (social, emotional and academic) a victim might have suffered following an experience of blatant sexual harassment. Participants were required to check the block next to the particular effect they suffered following an experience of any of the three types of blatant sexual harassment.

#### **6.4.8. Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS)**

This instrument was adapted from an existing instrument used by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995). Participants had to indicate how often they experienced any effects following incidents of subtle sexual harassment. The instrument has four scale anchor points on a Likert-type scale ranging from “very often”, “often”, “seldom” to “never”. The aim is to measure the prevalence of the effects participants experienced following subtle sexual harassment.

### **6.5. PROCEDURE**

Prior to the research being conducted, a draft version of the questionnaire was submitted to a trial group consisting of 20 randomly selected students willing to participate in the research. The 20 students were tasked with screening the questionnaire for, amongst other things, legibility, comprehension, language and grammatical errors. Following the return of the questionnaires from

this group, the researcher, together with his supervisors, edited and amended the questionnaire as required. The researcher thereafter applied for approval to conduct the research from the university's main ethical review committee. The academic registrar and other relevant officials of the university were also approached for official institutional consent. Following approval being granted, the researcher obtained the e-mail contact list of all students (both undergraduate and post-graduate) registered at the four campuses of the university (Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch and Tygerberg). This contact list was obtained from the Department of Information Technology of the university following permission granted by the registrar of the university. The contact list contained the e-mail addresses of a total of 23 765 registered students.

An e-mail containing a link to the questionnaire was sent to all students with the help of this department. The e-mail inviting students to participate in the study contained a brief description of the rationale underpinning the research, as well as the importance thereof. Assurances of anonymity and confidentiality were emphasised in the e-mail. The contact details of two university officials from the registrar's office as well as that of the researcher and both supervisors of the study were also provided to participants in the e-mail invitation. No personal identifying data other than information limited to the age, race, marital status, sex, faith, sexual preference, year of study and Faculty of study was recorded on the questionnaire in order to ensure anonymity. Students completed and submitted the questionnaire online by means of an exclusively dedicated Stellenbosch University questionnaire website. The questionnaire was submitted anonymously and all data received was stored and processed confidentially by an official of the Department of Information Technology of the university. Subsequent to the first e-mail invitation, the researcher allowed a period of one month to receive responses from participants. Thereafter permission was sought from the university registrar to allow two follow-up e-mail invitations to be sent to potential participants who had not yet completed the questionnaire. Approval was granted and two additional e-mail invitations were sent roughly three weeks apart.

All participants were informed via the e-mail invitations that, following publication of this research, participants will be provided with detailed feedback pertaining to the results of the study by means of an article in the student newspaper and other local printed media.

## **6.6. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Participation in this research study was completely voluntary and based on informed consent. Participants could withdraw from the study at any time by simply closing the window on their computer screen displaying the questionnaire. Psychological and/or other professional health services were made available to all participants upon completion of the questionnaire. This was done with the help of the Centre for Student Counselling and Development (CSCD) of the

university. The contact details of a professional health service provider (an all-hour psychological helpline telephone number) were placed on the last page of the questionnaire. This was done to ensure that participants would have access to professional help in the event that the act of completing the questionnaire aroused feelings of anxiety, flashbacks, and memories of reliving an event and/or other negative emotional states or consequences.

### **6.7. DATA ANALYSIS**

Statistical analyses were conducted using both the STATISTICA and SPSS for Windows statistical packages. The researcher compared a range of variables using chi-square and analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests. Pearson correlation analysis was performed on the data to ascertain the correlations between the TSSHS, Pr-SSHS and Pe-SSHS measurement instruments.

### **6.8. CONCLUSION**

The purpose of this chapter was to explain the research design employed in this study, the sampling strategy followed by the researcher in conducting the research, and the methodology in selecting the participants for participation in the study. An overview was given of the research procedure that was followed and an explanation of the research instruments employed by the researcher. Attention was also given to the ethical considerations that confronted the researcher as well as the methods used to analyse the data collected during the research.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### RESULTS

#### 7.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter details the findings of the survey that was conducted among the students on all four of the campuses (Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch and Tygerberg) of Stellenbosch University. This chapter will be divided according to the different objectives listed in Chapter 5.

#### 7.2. BLATANT SEXUAL HARASSMENT

This section details the results pertaining to the prevalence of blatant sexual harassment. The section is divided into three parts. Firstly, in Section 7.2.1, the prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment as measured by the Prevalence of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-BSHS), is presented. Secondly, in Section 7.2.2, the prevalence of participants who had more than one experience of blatant sexual harassment is presented. Thirdly, in Section 7.2.3, a comparison of the gender, racial and sexual orientation groups regarding participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment is presented.

##### **7.2.1. Prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of different types of blatant sexual harassment**

In order to measure the prevalence of participants who had different types of blatant sexual harassment, the Prevalence of Blatant Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-BSHS), was used.

The data in Table 7.1 reflects the prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of the various types of blatant sexual harassment for the total sample (N = 1679), and the two gender groups.

Table 7.1

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Total Sample and for Each Gender Group.*

| Blatant Sexual Harassment | Total<br>(N = 1679) |     | Male<br>(n = 677) |      | Female<br>(n = 1002) |      |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----|-------------------|------|----------------------|------|
|                           | f                   | %   | f                 | %    | f                    | %    |
| Stalking                  | 470                 | 28  | 127               | 18.8 | 343                  | 34.2 |
| Attempted rape            | 73                  | 4.3 | 6                 | .9   | 67                   | 6.7  |
| Rape                      | 32                  | 1.9 | 8                 | 1.2  | 24                   | 2.4  |
| Attempted rape/rape       | 105                 | 6.3 | 14                | 2.1  | 91                   | 9.1  |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had **at least one experience** of a specific type of blatant sexual harassment. Stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of stalking; attempted rape: no experience of rape, but at least one experience of attempted rape; rape: at least one experience of rape; attempted rape/rape: at least one experience of attempted rape and/or rape.

As can be seen from Table 7.1, stalking has the highest prevalence rate of all the types of blatant sexual harassment. The prevalence for attempted rape among females was also found to be higher than that of males; this was also the case with rape.

The data in Table 7.2 reflect the prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of the various types of blatant sexual harassment for the different racial groups.



Table 7.2

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups.*

| Blatant Sexual Harassment | Black<br>(n = 90) |      | Coloured<br>(n = 189) |      | White<br>(n = 1270) |      | Other<br>(n = 130) |      |
|---------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------------------|------|---------------------|------|--------------------|------|
|                           | f                 | %    | f                     | %    | f                   | %    | f                  | %    |
| Stalking                  | 28                | 31.1 | 57                    | 30.2 | 344                 | 27.1 | 41                 | 31.5 |
| Attempted rape            | 4                 | 4.4  | 11                    | 5.8  | 47                  | 3.7  | 11                 | 8.5  |
| Rape                      | 2                 | 2.2  | 5                     | 2.6  | 24                  | 1.9  | 1                  | .8   |
| Attempted rape<br>/rape   | 6                 | 6.7  | 16                    | 8.5  | 71                  | 5.6  | 12                 | 9.2  |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had **at least one experience** of a specific type of blatant sexual harassment. Stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of stalking; attempted rape: no experience of rape, but at least one experience of attempted rape; rape: at least one experience of rape; attempted rape/rape: at least one experience of attempted rape and/or rape; the category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant, or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

It is clear from the results reported in Table 7.2 that the prevalence rates for stalking appear to be approximately equally distributed between the different racial groups. The prevalence for attempted rape appears to be highest among the "Other" racial category. The prevalence rate of rape appears to be proportionally highest among Coloured participants.

The data in Table 7.3 reflect the prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of the various types of blatant sexual harassment for the different sexual orientation groups.

Table 7.3

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Sexual Orientation Groups.*

| Blatant sexual Harassment | Heterosex<br>(n = 1502) |      | Homosex<br>(n = 41) |      | Bisex<br>(n = 36) |      | Asex<br>(n = 20) |      | Unsure<br>(n = 17) |      | Unknown<br>(n = 38) |      |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|------|--------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|                           | f                       | %    | f                   | %    | f                 | %    | f                | %    | f                  | %    | f                   | %    |
| Stalking                  | 409                     | 27.2 | 12                  | 29.3 | 12                | 33.3 | 7                | 35.0 | 6                  | 35.3 | 13                  | 34.2 |
| Attempted rape            | 63                      | 4.2  | 3                   | 7.3  | 1                 | 2.8  | 2                | 10.0 | 0                  |      | 4                   | 10.5 |
| Rape                      | 25                      | 1.7  | 3                   | 7.3  | 3                 | 8.3  | 0                |      | 0                  |      | 0                   |      |
| Attempted rape /rape      | 88                      | 5.9  | 6                   | 14.6 | 4                 | 11.1 | 2                | 10.0 | 0                  |      | 4                   | 10.5 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had **at least one experience** of a specific type of blatant sexual harassment. Stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of stalking; attempted rape: no experience of rape, but at least one experience of attempted rape; rape: at least one experience of rape; attempted rape/rape: at least one experience of attempted rape and/or rape; the category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation; the category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

Investigation of Table 7.3 reflects that the prevalence rates for stalking appear to be approximately equally distributed among the various sexual orientation groups. Attempted rape appears to be highest among the “Unknown” sexual orientation group. Rape prevalence appears highest among the bisexual and homosexual participants.

### **7.2.2. Prevalence of participants who had more than one experience of different types of blatant sexual harassment**

The data in Table 7.4 reflect the prevalence of participants who had more than one experience of the various types of blatant sexual harassment for the total sample (N = 1679), and the two gender groups.

Table 7.4

*Prevalence of Participants who had More Than one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment<sup>a</sup> for the Total Sample and for Each Gender Group.*

| Blatant Sexual Harassment | Total<br>(N = 1679) |     | Male<br>(n = 677) |    | Female<br>(n = 1002) |     |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-----|-------------------|----|----------------------|-----|
|                           | f                   | %   | f                 | %  | f                    | %   |
| Attempted rape            | 25                  | 1.5 | 3                 | .4 | 22                   | 2.2 |
| Rape                      | 9                   | .5  | 3                 | .4 | 6                    | .6  |
| Attempted rape/rape       | 28                  | 1.7 | 4                 | .6 | 24                   | 2.4 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had **more than one experience** of a specific type of blatant sexual harassment. Attempted rape: participants who had no experience of rape, but two or more experiences of attempted rape; rape: two or more experiences of rape; attempted rape/rape: two or more experiences of rape and/or two or more experiences of attempted rape.

<sup>a</sup>Stalking as one type of blatant sexual harassment has been omitted from all tables pertaining to more than one experience of blatant sexual harassment due to a possible error in interpretation on the part of participants.

It is evident from Table 7.4 that the prevalence rate for more than one experience of attempted rape is substantially higher for females compared to that of males. The prevalence rate of more than one experience of rape among female participants is somewhat higher than that of male participants.

The data in Table 7.5 reflect the prevalence of participants who had more than one experience of the various types of blatant sexual harassment for the different racial groups.

Table 7.5

*Prevalence of Participants who had More Than one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment<sup>a</sup> for the Racial Groups.*

| Blatant Sexual Harassment | Black<br>(n = 90) |     | Coloured<br>(n = 189) |     | White<br>(n = 1270) |     | Other<br>(n = 130) |     |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|
|                           | f                 | %   | f                     | %   | f                   | %   | f                  | %   |
| Attempted rape            | 4                 | 4.4 | 5                     | 2.6 | 12                  | .9  | 4                  | 3.1 |
| Rape                      | 0                 |     | 0                     |     | 9                   | .7  | 0                  |     |
| Attempted rape<br>/rape   | 4                 | 4.4 | 5                     | 2.6 | 21                  | 1.6 | 4                  | 3.1 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had **more than one experience** of a specific type of blatant sexual harassment. Attempted rape: participants who had no experience of rape, but two or more experiences of attempted rape; rape: two or more experiences of rape; attempted rape/rape: two or more experiences of rape and/or two or more experiences of attempted rape. The category "Other" denotes other racial groups as specified by the participants, or cases where the participants chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

<sup>a</sup>Stalking as one type of blatant sexual harassment has been omitted from all tables pertaining to more than one experience of blatant sexual harassment due to a possible error in interpretation on the part of participants.

The data in Table 7.5 indicate a somewhat lower prevalence rate for more than one experience of attempted rape among White participants compared to the other racial groups. Surprisingly, White participants were the only ones to report incidents of more than one experience of rape.

The data in Table 7.6 reflect the prevalence of participants who had more than one experience of the various types of blatant sexual harassment for the sexual orientation groups.

Table 7.6

*Prevalence of Participants who had More Than one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment<sup>a</sup> for the Sexual Orientation Groups.*

| Blatant Sexual Harassment | Heterosex<br>(n = 1502) |     | Homosex<br>(n = 41) |     | Bisex<br>(n = 36) |      | Asex<br>(n = 20) |   | Unsure<br>(n = 17) |   | Unknown<br>(n = 38) |     |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|-------------------|------|------------------|---|--------------------|---|---------------------|-----|
|                           | f                       | %   | f                   | %   | f                 | %    | f                | % | f                  | % | f                   | %   |
| Attempted rape            | 18                      | 1.2 | 1                   | 2.4 | 4                 | 11.1 | 0                | 0 | 0                  | 0 | 2                   | 5.3 |
| Rape                      | 5                       | .3  | 1                   | 2.4 | 3                 | 8.3  | 0                | 0 | 0                  | 0 | 0                   | 0   |
| Attempted rape /rape      | 23                      | 1.5 | 2                   | 4.8 | 7                 | 19.4 | 0                | 0 | 0                  | 0 | 2                   | 5.3 |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who had **more than one experience** of a specific type of blatant sexual harassment. Attempted rape: participants who had no experience of rape, but two or more experiences of attempted rape; rape: two or more experiences of rape; attempted rape/rape: two or more experiences of rape and/or two or more experiences of attempted rape. The category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation; the category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

<sup>a</sup>Stalking as one type of blatant sexual harassment has been omitted from all tables pertaining to more than one experience of blatant sexual harassment due to a possible error in interpretation on the part of participants.

According to Table 7.6 bisexual participants reported a higher prevalence of more than one experience of attempted rape compared to the other sexual orientation groups. The prevalence of more than one experience of rape appears to be proportionally higher among bisexual participants.

### **7.2.3. Comparison of groups regarding the prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment**

Gender, sexual orientation and racial differences for participants who had at least one experience of a blatant sexual harassment type are presented in Table 7.7.

Table 7.7

*Comparison of the Gender, Racial, and Sexual Orientation Groups Regarding the Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment.*

| Blatant Sexual harassment | df | $\chi^2$ | p      |
|---------------------------|----|----------|--------|
| Gender                    |    |          |        |
| Stalking                  | 1  | 46.770   | .000** |
| Attempted rape            | 1  | 32.366   | .000** |
| Rape                      | 1  | 3.124    | .077   |
| Attempted rape/rape       | 1  | 33.582   | .000** |
| Race                      |    |          |        |
| Stalking                  | 3  | 2.464    | .482   |
| Attempted rape            | 3  | 7.431    | .059   |
| Rape                      | 3  | 1.552    | .670   |
| Attempted rape/rape       | 3  | 4.505    | .212   |
| Sexual orientation        |    |          |        |
| Stalking                  | 5  | 2.667    | .751   |
| Attempted rape            | 5  | 6.778    | .238   |
| Rape                      | 5  | 16.725   | .005** |
| Attempted rape/rape       | 5  | 9.447    | .093   |

*Note.* Stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of stalking; attempted rape: no experience of rape, but at least one experience of attempted rape; rape: at least one experience of rape; attempted rape/rape: at least one experience of attempted rape and/or rape.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

According to Table 7.7 significant gender differences were found for stalking, attempted rape, and attempted rape/rape. This was due to the higher prevalence rates for the female participants. No significant differences were found for the race subgroup, but a tendency toward significance was demonstrated for attempted rape. This could be due to the higher prevalence rate of attempted rape among the "Other" group. Only one significant difference was yielded for the sexual orientation subgroup, namely that of rape. This could be due to the high prevalence of rape among the homosexual and bisexual participants in comparison to the other sexual orientation groups.

### **7.3. SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

This section details the results pertaining to the prevalence of subtle sexual harassment. The section is divided into three parts. Firstly, in Section 7.3.1, participants' perceptions/beliefs of which behaviour types are perceived as subtle sexual harassment, as measured by the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS), are presented. Secondly, in Section 7.3.2, participants' tolerance regarding certain statements describing types of subtle sexual harassment, as measured by the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), is presented. Thirdly, in Section 7.3.3, the prevalence of subtle sexual harassment, as measured by the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), is presented.

#### **7.3.1. Perceptions of subtle sexual harassment**

In order to measure which behaviour types are perceived by participants as subtle sexual harassment, the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS), as adapted from Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), was used.

The data in Table 7.8 reflect the prevalence of participants' perceptions of subtle sexual harassment for the total sample (N = 1679), and the two gender groups.

Table 7.8

*Prevalence of What Participants Perceived as Subtle Sexual Harassment for the Total Sample and for the Gender Groups, and the Comparison of Differences.*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment | Total<br>(N = 1679) |    | Male<br>(n = 677) |    | Female<br>(n = 1002) |    | df | X <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------------|---------------------|----|-------------------|----|----------------------|----|----|----------------|
|                          | f                   | %  | f                 | %  | f                    | %  |    |                |
| Being "rated"            | 404                 | 24 | 91                | 13 | 313                  | 31 | 1  | 70.03**        |
| "Raids"                  | 228                 | 14 | 83                | 12 | 145                  | 14 | 1  | 1.68           |
| Unwelcome requests       | 712                 | 42 | 270               | 40 | 442                  | 44 | 1  | 2.96           |
| Sexist remarks           | 1036                | 62 | 345               | 51 | 691                  | 69 | 1  | 55.41**        |
| Wolf-whistling           | 601                 | 36 | 198               | 29 | 403                  | 40 | 1  | 21.17**        |
| Streaking                | 314                 | 19 | 97                | 14 | 217                  | 22 | 1  | 14.27**        |
| Flashing                 | 799                 | 48 | 272               | 40 | 527                  | 53 | 1  | 24.98**        |
| Unwanted touching        | 1604                | 96 | 631               | 93 | 973                  | 97 | 1  | 14.40**        |
| Stares (leering)         | 1163                | 69 | 383               | 57 | 780                  | 78 | 1  | 85.87**        |
| Rape <sup>a</sup>        | 1585                | 94 | 645               | 95 | 940                  | 97 | 1  | 1.63           |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who indicated agreement with an item.

<sup>a</sup>Rape was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was included in the original scale used in the sexual harassment survey of Gouws and Kritzinger (1995).

\* = p<.05. \*\* = p<.01.

According to Table 7.8 significant gender differences were found on *being "rated"*, *sexist remarks*, *wolf-whistling*, *streaking*, *flashing*, *unwanted touching* and *stares (leering)*. It is evident that a significantly greater proportion of females perceived these behaviours as forms of subtle sexual harassment, compared to their male counterparts.

Table 7.9 details the type of behaviours that were perceived by participants as subtle sexual harassment by different racial groups.



Table 7.9

*Prevalence of What Participants Perceived as Subtle Sexual Harassment for Each of the Racial Groups and the Comparison of Differences.*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment | Black<br>(n = 90) |    | Coloured<br>(n = 189) |    | White<br>(n = 1270) |    | Other<br>(n = 130) |    | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------------|-------------------|----|-----------------------|----|---------------------|----|--------------------|----|----|----------|
|                          | f                 | %  | f                     | %  | f                   | %  | f                  | %  |    |          |
| Being "rated"            | 20                | 22 | 45                    | 24 | 300                 | 24 | 34                 | 32 | 3  | 2.82     |
| "Raids"                  | 16                | 18 | 31                    | 16 | 52                  | 12 | 22                 | 21 | 3  | 13.88**  |
| Unwelcome requests       | 37                | 41 | 83                    | 44 | 527                 | 41 | 54                 | 51 | 3  | 3.74     |
| Sexist remarks           | 48                | 53 | 129                   | 68 | 775                 | 61 | 69                 | 66 | 3  | 6.82     |
| Wolf-whistling           | 37                | 41 | 70                    | 37 | 436                 | 34 | 47                 | 45 | 3  | 6.82     |
| Streaking                | 20                | 22 | 59                    | 31 | 203                 | 16 | 24                 | 23 | 3  | 29.36**  |
| Flashing                 | 31                | 34 | 100                   | 53 | 602                 | 47 | 55                 | 52 | 3  | 8.93**   |
| Unwanted touching        | 75                | 83 | 179                   | 95 | 1226                | 97 | 100                | 95 | 3  | 34.69**  |
| Stares (leering)         | 60                | 67 | 129                   | 68 | 881                 | 69 | 78                 | 74 | 3  | .70      |
| Rape <sup>a</sup>        | 77                | 86 | 173                   | 92 | 1215                | 96 | 97                 | 92 | 3  | 21.21**  |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who indicated agreement with a particular item. The category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

<sup>a</sup>Rape was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was included in the original scale used in the sexual harassment survey of Gouws and Kritzing (1995).

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

According to Table 7.9 significant racial differences were found on "raids", streaking, flashing, unwanted touching and rape. In the case of "raids" this could be due to the higher prevalence rates among the Black and the "Other" racial groups. In the case of streaking, this could be the result of the higher prevalence rate among Coloured participants. The significance for flashing could probably be explained by the higher prevalence rates among the Coloured and "Other" racial groups, and the lower rate for the Black participant group. The significant finding regarding unwanted touching could be attributed to the lower rate of prevalence among the Black participant group. Regarding rape, the finding might be attributed to the lower prevalence rate among the Black participants.

Table 7.10 details the type of behaviours that were perceived by participants as subtle sexual harassment by the different sexual orientation groups.

Table 7.10

*Prevalence of What Participants Perceived as Subtle Sexual Harassment for Each of the Sexual Orientation Groups and the Comparison of Differences.*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment | Heterosex<br>(n = 1502) |    | Homosex<br>(n = 41) |    | Bisex<br>(n = 36) |    | Asex<br>(n = 20) |     | Unsure<br>(n = 17) |     | Unknown<br>(n = 38) |    | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----|---------------------|----|-------------------|----|------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|---------------------|----|----|----------|
|                          | f                       | %  | f                   | %  | f                 | %  | f                | %   | f                  | %   | f                   | %  |    |          |
| Being "rated"            | 366                     | 24 | 9                   | 22 | 4                 | 11 | 6                | 30  | 5                  | 29  | 9                   | 24 | 5  | 4.13     |
| "Raids"                  | 204                     | 14 | 5                   | 12 | 1                 | 3  | 4                | 20  | 6                  | 35  | 6                   | 16 | 5  | 11.27*   |
| Unwelcome requests       | 635                     | 42 | 16                  | 39 | 14                | 39 | 11               | 55  | 10                 | 59  | 20                  | 53 | 5  | 5.13     |
| Sexist remarks           | 942                     | 63 | 26                  | 63 | 15                | 42 | 11               | 55  | 14                 | 82  | 18                  | 47 | 5  | 13.54*   |
| Wolf-whistling           | 549                     | 37 | 11                  | 27 | 12                | 33 | 7                | 35  | 5                  | 29  | 13                  | 34 | 5  | 2.18     |
| Streaking                | 279                     | 19 | 4                   | 10 | 5                 | 14 | 8                | 40  | 5                  | 29  | 7                   | 18 | 5  | 10.00    |
| Flashing                 | 711                     | 47 | 23                  | 56 | 17                | 47 | 11               | 55  | 12                 | 71  | 19                  | 50 | 5  | 5.28     |
| Unwanted touching        | 1440                    | 96 | 36                  | 88 | 34                | 94 | 20               | 100 | 17                 | 100 | 35                  | 92 | 5  | 9.19     |
| Stares (leering)         | 1059                    | 71 | 21                  | 51 | 20                | 56 | 12               | 60  | 10                 | 59  | 25                  | 66 | 5  | 12.44*   |
| Rape <sup>a</sup>        | 1424                    | 95 | 37                  | 90 | 33                | 92 | 19               | 95  | 17                 | 100 | 33                  | 87 | 5  | 7.54     |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who indicated agreement with a particular item. The category "Unsure" denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation; the category "Unknown" denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

<sup>a</sup>Rape was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was included in the original scale used in the sexual harassment survey of Gouws and Kritzing (1995).

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

According to Table 7.10 significant sexual orientation group differences were found on “raids”, sexist remarks and stares (leering). With regard to “raids”, this could be attributable to the very low prevalence rate among bisexual participants and the high rate of prevalence among the “Unsure” group. The significance for sexist remarks could probably be explained by the lower rates on prevalence among bisexual participants and high rates on prevalence among the “Unsure” group. Pertaining to stares (leering) this could be due to the high rate of prevalence among the heterosexual participant group.

In Table 7.11 the mean differences for the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS) for different subgroups are presented.

Table 7.11

*Means and Standard Deviations for Different Subgroups for the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS), and the Comparison of Differences.*

| Subgroups |           | n   | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F        |
|-----------|-----------|-----|-----------|------|--------|----------|
| Homosex   | Male      | 28  | 4.64      | 2.14 | 1,39   | .059     |
|           | Female    | 13  | 4.46      | 2.14 |        |          |
| Heterosex | Male      | 591 | 4.46      | 2.06 | 1,1500 | 84.368** |
|           | Female    | 911 | 5.45      | 2.00 |        |          |
| Female    | Heterosex | 911 | 5.45      | 2.00 | 1,922  | 3.126    |
|           | Homosex   | 13  | 4.46      | 2.36 |        |          |
| Male      | Heterosex | 591 | 4.46      | 2.06 | 1,617  | .189     |
|           | Homosex   | 28  | 4.64      | 2.64 |        |          |

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

Investigation of Table 7.11 reveals a statistically significant difference (on the 1% significance level), between heterosexual males and heterosexual females on the Perceptions of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS). The females perceived significantly more behaviours as types of subtle sexual harassment. No significant difference is evident for the other subgroups.

### 7.3.2. Tolerance of subtle sexual harassment

In order to ascertain participants' tolerance regarding certain types of subtle sexual harassment, the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), as adapted from Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), and Lott et al. (1982), was used. (It is important to keep in mind that a low score indicates higher tolerance).

In Table 7.12 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), for the total sample (N = 1679), and for the gender, racial and sexual orientation groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences of subgroups within these groups.

Table 7.12

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of Gender, Racial, and Sexual Orientation Groups.*

| Groups             | Subgroups            | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F        |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------|------|--------|----------|
| Total Sample       | (N = 1679)           | 38.0      | 5.0  |        |          |
| Score range 2 – 47 |                      |           |      |        |          |
| Gender             | Male (n = 677)       | 37.02     | 5.83 |        |          |
|                    | Female (n = 1002)    | 38.69     | 5.01 | 1,1675 | 13.939** |
| Race               | Black (n = 90)       | 38.74     | 5.68 |        |          |
|                    | Coloured (n = 189)   | 39.13     | 5.62 |        |          |
|                    | White (n = 1270)     | 37.70     | 5.23 |        |          |
|                    | Other (n = 130)      | 39.02     | 5.41 | 3,1673 | 6.271**  |
| Sexual Orientation | Heterosex (n = 1502) | 38.03     | 5.39 |        |          |
|                    | Homosex (n = 41)     | 38.76     | 5.99 |        |          |
|                    | Bisex (n = 36)       | 37.67     | 5.48 |        |          |
|                    | Asex (n = 20)        | 39.00     | 3.37 |        |          |
|                    | Unsure (n = 17)      | 37.89     | 5.75 |        |          |
|                    | Unknown (n = 38)     | 38.03     | 5.98 | 5,1652 | .907     |

*Note.* The category “Other” denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer). The category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation; the category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

According to Table 7.12 significant gender and racial differences were found. Females and Coloured participants as well as the asexual participants scored significantly higher on the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), indicating lower tolerance of subtle sexual harassment.

In Table 7.13 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the gender groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences between them.

Table 7.13

*Means and Standard Deviations of the Individual Items of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of the Gender Groups.*

| Items  | Gender          | $\bar{X}$ | SD  | df     | F        |
|--|-----------------|-----------|-----|--------|----------|
| 1. Most women often experience teasing by men as being of a sexual nature (i.e., with a sexual undertone). | Male (n = 677)  | 2.74      | .65 |        |          |
|  | Female (n=1002) | 2.96      | .63 | 1,1558 | 44.71**  |
| 2. An attractive woman must expect sexual advances from men and should learn to handle it.                 | Male            | 2.36      | .83 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 2.66      | .91 | 1,1604 | 45.01**  |
| 3. Most women often try to tempt the men with whom they have contact on campus.                            | Male            | 2.61      | .71 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 2.82      | .77 | 1,1520 | 27.18**  |
| 4. Most men are easily tempted by the sexual advances of the women with whom they have contact on campus.  | Male            | 1.98      | .63 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 2.19      | .70 | 1,1546 | 37.56**  |
| 5. A man should learn that a woman's "no" with regard to sexual advances really does mean no.              | Male            | 2.75      | .53 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 2.86      | .44 | 1,1655 | 21.59**  |
| 6. Unwanted sexual attention from men towards women contributes to keeping women in their place.           | Male            | 3.58      | .69 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 3.71      | .66 | 1,1570 | 13.00**  |
| 7. It is acceptable when women apply their sexuality in order to advance their careers or study            | Male            | 3.55      | .72 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 3.60      | .64 | 1,1581 | 1.90     |
| 8. An attractive man should expect sexual advances from women and should learn to handle it                | Male            | 2.31      | .82 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 2.79      | .89 | 1,1546 | 113.47** |
| 9. I believe that sexual harassment is a serious social problem on campus                                  | Male            | 1.43      | .82 |        |          |
|  | Female          | 1.77      | .76 | 1,1324 | 55.55**  |

| Items  | Gender | $\bar{X}$ | SD  | df     | F        |
|--|--------|-----------|-----|--------|----------|
| 10. It is acceptable for a man to make sexual advances towards a woman whom he finds attractive                  | Male   | 2.48      | .79 |        |          |
|  | Female | 2.91      | .75 | 1,1428 | 108.83** |
| 11. Innocent flirtation makes a work or academic day interesting and is therefore acceptable                     | Male   | 2.18      | .74 |        |          |
|  | Female | 2.40      | .78 | 1,1452 | 28.97**  |
| 12. Temptation of lecturers' sexual interest is often used by women to gain academic advantage                   | Male   | 2.61      | .79 |        |          |
|  | Female | 3.06      | .78 | 1,1235 | 94.25**  |
| 13. If a woman is sexually harassed, while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, it is probably her own fault | Male   | 2.94      | .99 |        |          |
|  | Female | 3.30      | .86 | 1,1577 | 57.22**  |

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

According to Table 7.13 significant gender differences were found with females scoring higher (indicating lower tolerance) on all items. The only non-significant difference was item 7.

In Table 7.14 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the racial groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences between the various groups.

Table 7.14

*Means and Standard Deviations of the Individual Items of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of the Racial Groups.*

| Items   | Race               | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F       |
|---|--------------------|-----------|------|--------|---------|
| 1. Most women often experience teasing by men as being of a sexual nature (i.e., with a sexual undertone) | Black (n = 90)     | 3.15      | .60  |        |         |
|   | Coloured (n = 189) | 2.97      | .60  |        |         |
|   | White (n = 1270)   | 2.85      | .64  |        |         |
|   | Unknown (n = 130)  | 2.86      | .68  | 3,1535 | 5.59**  |
| 2. An attractive woman must expect sexual advances from men and should learn to handle it                 | Black              | 2.66      | 1.08 |        |         |
|   | Coloured           | 2.66      | .92  |        |         |
|   | White              | 2.49      | .86  |        |         |
|   | Unknown            | 2.90      | .95  | 3,1578 | 8.55**  |
| 3. Most women often try to tempt the men with whom they have contact on campus                            | Black              | 2.67      | .91  |        |         |
|   | Coloured           | 2.88      | .81  |        |         |
|   | White              | 2.72      | .72  |        |         |
|   | Unknown            | 2.82      | .82  | 3,1496 | 2.97*   |
| 4. Most men are easily tempted by the sexual advances of the women with whom they have contact on campus  | Black              | 2.02      | .73  |        |         |
|   | Coloured           | 2.14      | .69  |        |         |
|   | White              | 2.10      | .67  |        |         |
|   | Unknown            | 2.13      | .71  | 3,1521 | .56     |
| 5. A man should learn that a woman's "no" with regard to sexual advances really does mean no              | Black              | 2.66      | .70  |        |         |
|   | Coloured           | 2.87      | .42  |        |         |
|   | White              | 2.82      | .46  |        |         |
|   | Unknown            | 2.78      | .53  | 3,1657 | 4.21**  |
| 6. Unwanted sexual attention from men towards women contributes to keeping women in their place           | Black              | 3.09      | .94  |        |         |
|   | Coloured           | 3.53      | .75  |        |         |
|   | White              | 3.72      | .61  |        |         |
|   | Unknown            | 3.72      | .67  | 3,1544 | 25.05** |
| 7. It is acceptable when women apply their sexuality in order to advance their careers or study           | Black              | 3.54      | .75  |        |         |
|   | Coloured           | 3.58      | .69  |        |         |
|   | White              | 3.59      | .66  |        |         |
|   | Unknown            | 3.53      | .69  | 3,1555 | .35     |

| Items  | Race     | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F      |
|--|----------|-----------|------|--------|--------|
| 8. An attractive man should expect sexual advances from women and should learn to handle it                      | Black    | 2.82      | 1.05 | 3,1519 | 7.24** |
|  | Coloured | 2.71      | .97  |        |        |
|  | White    | 2.54      | .86  |        |        |
|  | Unknown  | 2.86      | .90  |        |        |
| 9. I believe that sexual harassment is a serious social problem on campus  | Black    | 1.91      | .81  | 3,1322 | 5.55** |
|  | Coloured | 1.76      | .76  |        |        |
|  | White    | 1.59      | .78  |        |        |
|  | Unknown  | 1.73      | .93  |        |        |
| 10. It is acceptable for a man to make sexual advances towards a woman whom he finds attractive                  | Black    | 2.68      | .91  | 3,1404 | 1.41   |
|  | Coloured | 2.76      | .76  |        |        |
|  | White    | 2.73      | .78  |        |        |
|  | Unknown  | 2.90      | .78  |        |        |
| 11. Innocent flirtation makes a work or academic day interesting and is therefore acceptable                     | Black    | 2.74      | .89  | 3,1428 | 9.96** |
|  | Coloured | 2.37      | .76  |        |        |
|  | White    | 2.26      | .74  |        |        |
|  | Unknown  | 2.37      | .87  |        |        |
| 12. Temptation of lecturers' sexual interest is often used by women to gain academic advantage                   | Black    | 2.97      | .91  | 3,1212 | 1.39   |
|  | Coloured | 3.02      | .81  |        |        |
|  | White    | 2.88      | .79  |        |        |
|  | Unknown  | 2.86      | .96  |        |        |
| 13. If a woman is sexually harassed, while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, it is probably her own fault | Black    | 3.15      | .99  | 3,1551 | 3.87** |
|  | Coloured | 3.38      | .78  |        |        |
|  | White    | 3.13      | .94  |        |        |
|  | Unknown  | 3.19      | .96  |        |        |

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

ANOVA's used for analysis in Table 7.14 revealed significant differences between the racial groups with Black participants scoring higher (indicating lower tolerance) on item 9 and lower (indicating higher tolerance) on item 10. Coloured participants scored higher on items 3, 5, 13, probably contributing to the significant differences compared to the other two racial groups. The "Unknown" group scored higher on items 2, 6, 8. The non-significant items were items 4, 7, 10, 12.



In Table 7.15 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), for the sexual orientation groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences between the various groups.

Table 7.15

*Means and Standard Deviations of the Individual Items of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of the Sexual Orientation Groups.*

| Items   | Sexual Orientation   | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F    |
|---|----------------------|-----------|------|--------|------|
| 1. Most women often experience teasing by men as being of a sexual nature (i.e., with a sexual undertone) | Heterosex (n = 1502) | 2.87      | .64  | 5,1533 | 1.19 |
|   | Homosex (n = 41)     | 2.97      | .57  |        |      |
|   | Bisex (n = 36)       | 2.90      | .64  |        |      |
|   | Asex (n = 20)        | 3.10      | .80  |        |      |
|   | Unsure (n = 17)      | 3.06      | .45  |        |      |
| 2. An attractive woman must expect sexual advances from men and should learn to handle it                 | Unknown (n = 38)     | 3.00      | .71  | 5,1577 | 1.69 |
|   | Heterosex            | 2.54      | .88  |        |      |
|   | Homosex              | 2.72      | .83  |        |      |
|   | Bisex                | 2.53      | .94  |        |      |
|   | Asex                 | 3.06      | 1.12 |        |      |
| 3. Most women often try to tempt the men with whom they have contact on campus                            | Unsure               | 2.38      | .80  | 5,1494 | 1.94 |
|   | Unknown              | 2.46      | 1.03 |        |      |
|   | Heterosex            | 2.75      | .74  |        |      |
|   | Homosex              | 2.80      | .83  |        |      |
|   | Bisex                | 2.95      | .60  |        |      |
| 4. Most men are easily tempted by the sexual advances of the women with whom they have contact on campus  | Asex                 | 2.64      | .95  | 5,1518 | 1.87 |
|   | Unsure               | 2.50      | .81  |        |      |
|   | Unknown              | 2.46      | .81  |        |      |
|   | Heterosex            | 2.11      | .68  |        |      |
|   | Homosex              | 2.12      | .64  |        |      |
| with whom they have contact on campus   | Bisex                | 2.35      | .65  |        |      |
|   | Asex                 | 1.90      | .73  |        |      |
|   | Unsure               | 1.80      | .77  |        |      |
|   | Unknown              | 2.00      | .75  |        |      |

| Items   | Sexual Orientation | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F      |
|---|--------------------|-----------|------|--------|--------|
| 5. A man should learn that a woman's "no" with regard to sexual advances really does mean no    | Heterosex          | 2.82      | .48  | 5,1628 | 1.15   |
|   | Homosex            | 2.78      | .57  |        |        |
|   | Bisex              | 1.75      | .55  |        |        |
|   | Asex               | 2.95      | .22  |        |        |
|   | Unsure             | 2.76      | .43  |        |        |
|   | Unknown            | 2.67      | .69  |        |        |
| 6. Unwanted sexual attention from men towards women contributes to keeping women in their place | Heterosex          | 3.68      | .65  | 5,1544 | 1.51   |
|   | Homosex            | 3.45      | .77  |        |        |
|   | Bisex              | 3.72      | .62  |        |        |
|   | Asex               | 3.50      | .88  |        |        |
|   | Unsure             | 3.58      | .85  |        |        |
|   | Unknown            | 3.52      | .67  |        |        |
| 7. It is acceptable when women apply their sexuality in order to advance their careers or study | Heterosex          | 3.58      | .67  | 5,1555 | 1.05   |
|   | Homosex            | 3.68      | .52  |        |        |
|   | Bisex              | 3.46      | .81  |        |        |
|   | Asex               | 3.59      | .71  |        |        |
|   | Unsure             | 3.24      | .59  |        |        |
|   | Unknown            | 3.58      | .70  |        |        |
| 8. An attractive man should expect sexual advances from women and should learn to handle it     | Heterosex          | 2.60      | .88  | 5,1520 | 4.71** |
|   | Homosex            | 2.60      | .86  |        |        |
|   | Bisex              | 2.37      | .99  |        |        |
|   | Asex               | 3.45      | .78  |        |        |
|   | Unsure             | 2.19      | .98  |        |        |
|   | Unknown            | 2.42      | 1.01 |        |        |
| 9. I believe that sexual harassment is a serious social problem on campus                       | Heterosex          | 1.61      | .79  | 5,1299 | 3.15** |
|   | Homosex            | 1.65      | .73  |        |        |
|   | Bisex              | 1.76      | .68  |        |        |
|   | Asex               | 2.06      | .92  |        |        |
|   | Unsure             | 1.83      | .93  |        |        |
|   | Unknown            | 2.07      | .82  |        |        |

| Items  | Sexual Orientation | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F    |
|--|--------------------|-----------|------|--------|------|
| 10. It is acceptable for a man to make sexual advances towards a woman whom he finds attractive                  | Heterosex          | 2.75      | .79  | 5,1401 | 1.86 |
|  | Homosex            | 2.59      | .82  |        |      |
|  | Bisex              | 2.50      | .71  |        |      |
|  | Asex               | 3.12      | .83  |        |      |
|  | Unsure             | 2.60      | .73  |        |      |
| 11. Innocent flirtation makes a work or academic day interesting and is therefore acceptable                     | Heterosex          | 2.30      | .77  | 5,1428 | 1.76 |
|  | Homosex            | 2.24      | .60  |        |      |
|  | Bisex              | 2.14      | .63  |        |      |
|  | Asex               | 2.75      | .85  |        |      |
|  | Unsure             | 2.22      | .69  |        |      |
| 12. Temptation of lecturers' sexual interest is often used by women to gain academic advantage                   | Heterosex          | 2.91      | .80  | 5,1212 | .52  |
|  | Homosex            | 2.92      | .88  |        |      |
|  | Bisex              | 2.93      | .81  |        |      |
|  | Asex               | 2.82      | .98  |        |      |
|  | Unsure             | 2.86      | .37  |        |      |
| 13. If a woman is sexually harassed, while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, it is probably her own fault | Heterosex          | 3.17      | .92  | 5,1552 | 1.37 |
|  | Homosex            | 3.25      | .83  |        |      |
|  | Bisex              | 3.38      | .84  |        |      |
|  | Asex               | 3.20      | .95  |        |      |
|  | Unsure             | 3.07      | .85  |        |      |
|  | Unknown            | 2.84      | 1.08 |        |      |

*Note.* The category "Unsure" denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation. The category "Unknown" denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

Investigation of Table 7.15 yields no significant differences on all the items except items 8 and 9. On item 8 the asexual participant group scored significantly higher (i.e., lower tolerance) and on item 9 the higher scores (i.e., lower tolerance) of the asexual and "Unknown" groups probably contributed to the significant difference compared to the other sexual orientation groups.

In Table 7.16 the means and standard deviations of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS) for different subgroups are presented.

Table 7.16

*Means and Standard Deviations for Different Subgroups for the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), and the Comparison of Differences.*

| Subgroups |           | n   | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F        |
|-----------|-----------|-----|-----------|------|--------|----------|
| Homosex   | Male      | 28  | 37.83     | 6.37 |        |          |
|           | Female    | 13  | 40.77     | 4.65 | 1,39   | 2.215    |
| Heterosex | Male      | 590 | 37.05     | 5.84 |        |          |
|           | Female    | 911 | 38.66     | 4.99 | 1,1499 | 32.634** |
| Female    | Heterosex | 911 | 38.66     | 4.99 |        |          |
|           | Homosex   | 13  | 40.77     | 4.65 | 1,922  | 2.303    |
| Male      | Heterosex | 590 | 37.05     | 5.84 |        |          |
|           | Homosex   | 28  | 37.83     | 6.37 | 1,616  | .471     |

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

The results of Table 7.16 display a significant difference between heterosexual males and heterosexual females on the TSSHS, with the heterosexual males demonstrating significantly higher tolerance of subtle sexual harassment.

### 7.3.3. Prevalence of subtle sexual harassment

In order to measure the prevalence of subtle sexual harassment, the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), as adapted from Gouws and Kritzing (1995), was used.

#### 7.3.3.1. Total scores on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the comparison of certain subgroups

In Table 7.17 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), for the total sample (N = 1679), and for the gender, racial and sexual orientation groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences of subgroups within these groups.

Table 7.17

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS) and the Comparison of Gender, Racial and Sexual Orientation Subgroups.*

| Groups                  | Subgroups            | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df     | F        |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------|------|--------|----------|
| Total Sample (N = 1673) |                      | 5.44      | 4.0  |        |          |
| Range = 0 – 24          |                      |           |      |        |          |
| Gender                  | Male (n = 675)       | 4.29      | 3.84 |        |          |
|                         | Female (n = 998)     | 6.22      | 3.91 | 1,1671 | 99.271** |
| Race                    | Black (n = 89)       | 4.70      | 4.71 |        |          |
|                         | Coloured (n = 189)   | 6.39      | 4.40 |        |          |
|                         | White (n = 1265)     | 5.27      | 3.83 |        |          |
|                         | Other (n = 130)      | 6.14      | 4.19 | 3,1669 | 6.707**  |
| Sexual                  |                      |           |      |        |          |
| orientation             | Heterosex (n = 1498) | 5.37      | 3.94 |        |          |
|                         | Homosex (n = 41)     | 5.21      | 3.97 |        |          |
|                         | Bisex (n = 35)       | 6.94      | 4.63 |        |          |
|                         | Asex (n = 17)        | 6.41      | 5.22 |        |          |
|                         | Unsure (n = 20)      | 5.95      | 4.35 |        |          |
|                         | Unknown (n = 38)     | 5.78      | 3.23 | 5,1643 | 1.436    |

*Note.* The category “Other” denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer). The category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation; the category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation. Please note that the number of participants in some of the samples are less than the total sample (N = 1679) because participants submitted inconsistent responses (e.g., not answering all questions; changes in the number of experiences reported etc.) in different sections of the questionnaire.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

According to Table 7.17 significant gender and racial differences were found on the total scores of the Prevalence of Subtle Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), with the higher mean score of females contributing to the difference between the gender groups. Graphing indicated higher prevalence rates for the Coloured and the “Other” racial categories compared to the Black and White racial groups.

### 7.3.3.2. The prevalence of different types of subtle sexual harassment and the comparison of certain subgroups

In Table 7.18 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), for the gender groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences between the groups.

Table 7.18

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the Comparison of Gender Groups.*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment         | Male (n = 675) |      | Female (n = 998) |      | df     | F        |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------|------------------|------|--------|----------|
|                                  | $\bar{X}$      | SD   | $\bar{X}$        | SD   |        |          |
| Unwelcome requests               | .56            | .87  | 1.24             | 1.10 | 1,1634 | 176.00** |
| Unwelcome touching               | .59            | .84  | 1.05             | 1.03 | 1,1651 | 90.98**  |
| Sexist comments                  | 1.13           | 1.07 | 1.85             | 1.10 | 1,1649 | 171.79** |
| Being "rated"                    | 1.00           | 1.11 | 1.38             | 1.17 | 1,1644 | 43.81**  |
| Electronic harassment            | .59            | .98  | .57              | .95  | 1,1648 | .135     |
| Same sex harassment <sup>a</sup> | .52            | .90  | .20              | .52  | 1,1650 | 83.36**  |

<sup>a</sup>Although same sex harassment is not necessarily a type of subtle sexual harassment, it was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was an item in the original Pr-SSHS.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

According to Table 7.18 significant gender differences (see potential explanations in brackets) were found on the following items: *unwelcome requests* (females high, male low), *unwelcome touching* (females high, males low), *sexist comments* (females high, male low), *being "rated"* (females high, males low) and *same sex harassment* (males high, females low). The only non-significant item was *electronic harassment*.

In Table 7.19 the prevalence of different types of subtle sexual harassment is presented for three anchor points, reduced from the original 5-point Likert type scale to simplify the presentation of the data), for the gender groups.

Table 7.19

*Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Types and Same Sex Harassment for Scale Anchor Points for Gender Groups, on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS).*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment         | Anchor Points    | Male (n = 675) |      | Female (n = 998) |      |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|------|------------------|------|
|                                  |                  | f              | %    | f                | %    |
| Unwelcome requests               | Never/seldom     | 567            | 83.8 | 599              | 59.8 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 56             | 8.3  | 259              | 25.8 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 29             | 4.3  | 126              | 12.6 |
| Unwelcome touching               | Never/seldom     | 568            | 83.9 | 680              | 67.9 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 71             | 10.5 | 219              | 21.9 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 23             | 3.4  | 92               | 9.2  |
| Sexist comments                  | Never/seldom     | 433            | 64.0 | 378              | 37.7 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 148            | 21.9 | 331              | 33   |
|                                  | Often/very often | 78             | 11.5 | 283              | 28.2 |
| Being "rated"                    | Never/seldom     | 455            | 67.2 | 561              | 56.0 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 131            | 19.4 | 251              | 25   |
|                                  | Often/very often | 75             | 11.1 | 173              | 17.3 |
| Electronic harassment            | Never/seldom     | 565            | 83.5 | 838              | 83.6 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 54             | 8.0  | 91               | 9.1  |
|                                  | Often/very often | 44             | 6.5  | 58               | 5.8  |
| Same sex harassment <sup>a</sup> | Never/seldom     | 573            | 84.6 | 953              | 95.1 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 64             | 9.5  | 27               | 2.7  |
|                                  | Often/very often | 29             | 4.3  | 6                | .6   |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who selected a particular option on a 3-point Likert type scale.

<sup>a</sup>Although same sex harassment is not necessarily a type of subtle sexual harassment, it was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was an item in the original Pr-SSHS.

The frequency distributions across type (anchor points) and gender can be used to investigate and explain the significant findings of the previous Table (i.e., Table 7.18); for example: the low score for males (compared to females) on the item *unwelcome requests* can be explained by the relatively high frequency *never/seldom* and low frequency for *often/very often* for the male group.

In Table 7.20 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), for the racial groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences between the groups.

Table 7.20

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the Comparison of Racial Groups.*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment         | Black<br>(n = 89) |      | Coloured<br>(n = 189) |      | White<br>(n = 1265) |      | Other<br>(n = 130) |      | df     | F      |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|------|-----------------------|------|---------------------|------|--------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                                  | $\bar{X}$         | SD   | $\bar{X}$             | SD   | $\bar{X}$           | SD   | $\bar{X}$          | SD   |        |        |
| Unwelcome requests               | 1.05              | 1.36 | 1.28                  | 1.19 | .91                 | 1.00 | 1.04               | 1.18 | 3,1632 | 7.11** |
| Unwelcome touching               | .88               | 1.06 | .96                   | .97  | .84                 | .98  | .89                | 1.02 | 3,1649 | .86    |
| Sexist comments                  | 1.20              | 1.29 | 1.64                  | 1.13 | 1.55                | 1.12 | 1.93               | 1.26 | 3,1647 | 6.82** |
| Being "rated"                    | .95               | 1.23 | 1.40                  | 1.23 | 1.22                | 1.14 | 1.19               | 1.12 | 3,1642 | 3.05*  |
| Electronic harassment            | .66               | 1.07 | .79                   | 1.20 | .53                 | .90  | .64                | 1.02 | 3,1646 | 4.62** |
| Same sex harassment <sup>a</sup> | .31               | .85  | .44                   | .91  | .30                 | .67  | .40                | .77  | 3,1648 | 2.69*  |

*Note.* The category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

<sup>a</sup>Although same sex harassment is not necessarily a type of subtle sexual harassment, it was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was an item in the original Pr-SSHS.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

In Table 7.20 ANOVA's revealed significant racial differences (see potential explanations in brackets) on the following items of the Pr-SSHS: *unwelcome requests* (White low), *sexist comments* (Black low; "Other" high) *being "rated"* (Black low; Coloured high), *electronic harassment* (White low; Coloured high), and *same sex harassment* (White low; Coloured high). The only non-significant item was *unwelcome touching*.

Table 7.21 shows the percentages and frequencies of subtle sexual harassment items as reported by the different racial subgroups.



Table 7.21

*Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Types and Same Sex Harassment for Scale Anchor Points for Racial Groups, on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS).*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment         | Anchor Points    | Black (n = 89) |      | Coloured (n = 189) |      | White (n = 1265) |      | Other (n = 130) |      |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|------|--------------------|------|------------------|------|-----------------|------|
|                                  |                  | f              | %    | f                  | %    | f                | %    | f               | %    |
| Unwelcome requests               | Never/seldom     | 53             | 58.9 | 105                | 55.6 | 923              | 72.7 | 85              | 65.4 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 14             | 15.6 | 20                 | 26.5 | 226              | 17.8 | 25              | 19.2 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 15             | 16.7 | 29                 | 15.3 | 94               | 7.4  | 17              | 13.1 |
| Unwelcome touching               | Never/seldom     | 61             | 67.8 | 133                | 70.4 | 957              | 75.4 | 97              | 74.6 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 15             | 16.7 | 43                 | 22.8 | 209              | 16.5 | 23              | 17.7 |
|                                  | Often/Very often | 7              | 7.8  | 12                 | 6.3  | 86               | 6.8  | 10              | 7.7  |
| Sexist comments                  | Never/seldom     | 51             | 56.7 | 86                 | 45.5 | 621              | 48.9 | 53              | 40.8 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 16             | 17.8 | 56                 | 29.6 | 374              | 29.4 | 33              | 25.4 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 17             | 18.9 | 43                 | 22.8 | 258              | 20.3 | 43              | 33.1 |
| Being "rated"                    | Never/seldom     | 56             | 62.2 | 105                | 55.6 | 773              | 60.9 | 82              | 63.1 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 13             | 14.4 | 42                 | 22.2 | 302              | 23.8 | 25              | 19.2 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 11             | 12.2 | 39                 | 20.6 | 176              | 13.9 | 22              | 16.9 |
| Electronic harassment            | Never/seldom     | 70             | 77.8 | 142                | 75.1 | 1085             | 85.4 | 106             | 81.5 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 9              | 10.0 | 20                 | 10.6 | 106              | 8.3  | 10              | 7.7  |
|                                  | Often/very often | 7              | 7.8  | 23                 | 12.2 | 60               | 4.7  | 12              | 9.2  |
| Same sex harassment <sup>a</sup> | Never/seldom     | 76             | 84.4 | 165                | 87.3 | 1171             | 92.2 | 114             | 87.7 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 3              | 3.3  | 11                 | 5.8  | 64               | 5.0  | 13              | 10.0 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 4              | 4.4  | 9                  | 4.8  | 20               | 1.6  | 2               | 1.5  |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who selected a particular item on a 3-point Likert type scale. The category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

<sup>a</sup>Although same sex harassment is not necessarily a type of subtle sexual harassment, it was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was an item in the original Pr-SSHS.

The frequency distribution across type (anchor points) and race can be used to investigate and explain the significant findings of the previous Table (i.e., Table 7.20); for example: the high

score for Whites (compared to the other racial groups) on the item *unwelcome requests* can be explained by the relatively high frequency for *never/seldom* and low frequency for *often/very often* for the White group.

In Table 7.22 the descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), for the sexual orientation groups are presented, as well as the results of ANOVA's comparing the differences of subgroups within this group

Table 7.22

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and the Comparison of Sexual Orientation Groups.*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment         | Heterosex<br>(n = 1498) |      | Homosex<br>(n = 41) |      | Bisex<br>(n = 35) |      | Asex<br>(n = 17) |      | Unsure<br>(n = 20) |      | Unknown<br>(n = 38) |      | df     | F       |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|------|--------------------|------|---------------------|------|--------|---------|
|                                  | $\bar{X}$               | SD   | $\bar{X}$           | SD   | $\bar{X}$         | SD   | $\bar{X}$        | SD   | $\bar{X}$          | SD   | $\bar{X}$           | SD   |        |         |
| Unwelcome requests               | .96                     | 1.06 | .92                 | 1.07 | 1.26              | 1.36 | .94              | 1.03 | 1.11               | 1.10 | 1.0                 | 1.04 | 5,1606 | .611    |
| Unwelcome touching               | .86                     | .98  | .65                 | .77  | 1.20              | 1.11 | 1.0              | .93  | 1.0                | 1.12 | .92                 | 1.06 | 5,1623 | 1.383   |
| Sexist comments                  | 1.56                    | 1.14 | 1.46                | 1.12 | 1.73              | 1.26 | 1.94             | 1.19 | 1.35               | 1.31 | 1.68                | 1.07 | 5,1621 | .797    |
| “Rated”                          | 1.23                    | 1.15 | .82                 | .90  | 1.24              | 1.20 | 1.06             | 1.52 | 1.50               | 1.64 | 1.49                | 1.17 | 5,1616 | 1.630   |
| Electronic harassment            | .55                     | .94  | .79                 | 1.12 | 1.06              | 1.21 | .76              | 1.20 | .60                | .82  | .53                 | .94  | 5,1620 | 2.497*  |
| Same sex harassment <sup>a</sup> | .30                     | .67  | .69                 | 1.03 | .68               | 1.12 | .71              | 1.36 | .45                | 1.15 | .32                 | .58  | 5,1622 | 5.322** |

*Note.* The category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation. The category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

<sup>a</sup>Although same sex harassment is not necessarily a type of subtle sexual harassment, it was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was an item in the original Pr-SSHS.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

In Table 7.22 ANOVA's revealed significant sexual orientation differences (see potential explanations in brackets) on the following items of the Pr-SSHS: *electronic harassment* (bisexual group high) and *same sex harassment* (heterosexual group low; asexual group high).

In Table 7.23 percentages and frequencies of various types of subtle sexual harassment and same sex harassment, as perceived by the different sexual orientation groups are presented.

Table 7.23

*Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Types and Same Sex Harassment for Scale Anchor Points for Sexual Orientation Groups, on the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS).*

| Subtle Sexual Harassment         | Anchor Points    | Heterosex<br>(n = 1498) |      | Homosex<br>(n = 41) |      | Bisex<br>(n = 35) |      | Asex<br>(n = 20) |    | Unsure<br>(n = 17) |      | Unknown<br>(n = 38) |      |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------|---------------------|------|-------------------|------|------------------|----|--------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|                                  |                  | f                       | %    | f                   | %    | f                 | %    | f                | %  | f                  | %    | f                   | %    |
| Unwelcome requests               | Never/seldom     | 1045                    | 69.6 | 30                  | 73.2 | 19                | 52.8 | 14               | 70 | 13                 | 76.5 | 26                  | 68.4 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 285                     | 19.0 | 6                   | 14.6 | 9                 | 25.0 | 3                | 15 | 2                  | 11.8 | 7                   | 18.4 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 136                     | 9.1  | 4                   | 9.8  | 6                 | 16.7 | 2                | 10 | 2                  | 11.8 | 3                   | 7.9  |
| Unwelcome touching               | Never/seldom     | 1119                    | 74.5 | 33                  | 80.5 | 23                | 63.9 | 15               | 75 | 12                 | 70.6 | 27                  | 71.1 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 258                     | 17.2 | 7                   | 17.1 | 7                 | 19.4 | 3                | 15 | 4                  | 23.5 | 7                   | 18.4 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 103                     | 6.9  | 0                   | 0    | 5                 | 13.9 | 2                | 10 | 1                  | 5.9  | 3                   | 7.9  |
| Sexist comments                  | Never/seldom     | 729                     | 48.5 | 21                  | 51.2 | 16                | 44.4 | 10               | 50 | 6                  | 35.3 | 16                  | 42.1 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 430                     | 28.6 | 12                  | 29.3 | 7                 | 19.4 | 6                | 30 | 6                  | 35.3 | 13                  | 34.2 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 319                     | 21.2 | 8                   | 19.5 | 10                | 27.8 | 4                | 20 | 5                  | 29.4 | 9                   | 23.7 |
| Being "rated"                    | Never/seldom     | 910                     | 60.6 | 31                  | 75.6 | 21                | 58.3 | 11               | 55 | 13                 | 76.5 | 17                  | 44.7 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 345                     | 23.0 | 7                   | 17.1 | 7                 | 19.4 | 3                | 15 | 1                  | 5.9  | 14                  | 36.8 |
|                                  | Often/very often | 220                     | 14.6 | 2                   | 4.9  | 5                 | 13.9 | 6                | 30 | 3                  | 17.6 | 6                   | 15.8 |
| Electronic harassment            | Never/seldom     | 1269                    | 84.5 | 31                  | 75.6 | 23                | 63.9 | 16               | 80 | 14                 | 82.4 | 31                  | 81.6 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 126                     | 8.4  | 3                   | 7.3  | 8                 | 22.2 | 4                | 20 | 1                  | 5.9  | 2                   | 5.3  |
|                                  | Often/very often | 84                      | 5.6  | 5                   | 12.2 | 4                 | 11.1 | 0                | 0  | 2                  | 11.8 | 3                   | 7.9  |
| Same sex harassment <sup>a</sup> | Never/seldom     | 1380                    | 91.9 | 32                  | 78.0 | 29                | 80.6 | 17               | 85 | 13                 | 76.5 | 35                  | 92.1 |
|                                  | Sometimes        | 78                      | 5.2  | 4                   | 9.8  | 2                 | 5.6  | 1                | 5  | 1                  | 5.9  | 2                   | 5.3  |
|                                  | Often/very often | 23                      | 5.2  | 3                   | 7.3  | 3                 | 8.3  | 2                | 10 | 3                  | 17.6 | 0                   | 0    |

*Note.*  $f$  = The number of participants who selected a particular item on a 3-point Likert type scale. The category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation. The category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

<sup>a</sup>Although same sex harassment is not necessarily a type of subtle sexual harassment, it was included in this table for comparative reasons because it was an item in the original Pr-SSHS.

The frequency distributions across the type (anchor points) and sexual orientation can be used to investigate and explain the significant findings of the previous Table (i.e., Table 7.22); for example: the low score for bisexual participants (compared to the other sexual orientation groups) on the item *electronic harassment* can be explained by the relatively low frequency for *never/seldom* and high frequency for *sometimes* for the bisexual group.

In Table 7.24 the mean differences for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS) for different subgroups are presented.

Table 7.24

*Means and Standard Deviations for Different Subgroups for the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), and Comparison of Differences.*

| Subgroups |        | n   | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | Df     | F         |
|-----------|--------|-----|-----------|------|--------|-----------|
| Homosex   | Male   | 28  | 4.78      | 3.75 |        |           |
|           | Female | 13  | 6.15      | 4.41 | 1,39   | 1.055     |
| Heterosex | Male   | 589 | 4.10      | 3.67 |        |           |
|           | Female | 909 | 6.19      | 3.90 | 1,1496 | 107.181** |
| Female    | Hetero | 909 | 6.19      | 3.90 |        |           |
|           | Homo   | 13  | 6.15      | 4.41 | 1,920  | .002      |
| Male      | Hetero | 589 | 4.10      | 3.67 |        |           |
|           | Homo   | 28  | 4.78      | 3.75 | 1,615  | .911      |

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

Investigation of Table 7.24 demonstrates a significant difference between heterosexual males and heterosexual females on the Pr-SSHS, with the heterosexual females reporting a significantly higher prevalence of experienced subtle sexual harassment.

#### 7.4. GROUP HARASSMENT

This section details the results pertaining to the prevalence of group harassment. The section is divided into two parts. Firstly, in Section 7.4.1, the prevalence of participants' experience of group harassment for the total sample is presented. Secondly, in Section 7.4.2, the prevalence

of participants' experience of group harassment for the different subgroups is presented. In this section, results pertaining to "same sex" and "opposite sex" group harassment were omitted and are therefore not reported. This was due to the fact that a group could theoretically consist of a mixture of both genders. Furthermore, it appeared from the results that participants misunderstood the phrasing of the questions in this particular section of the questionnaire. From the results it would however seem that, in the majority of cases, the group perpetrators were men, and women were mostly the victims of male group harassment. Also, it is interesting to note that harassment by a group of females was reported by participants.

#### **7.4.1. Prevalence of participants' experiences of group harassment for the total sample**

Table 7.25 reveals the frequencies and percentages for the total sample (N = 1679), of group harassment, for at least one experience of blatant group sexual harassment.

Table 7.25

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Total Sample.*

| Type of Harassment               | f   | %   |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----|
| Group stalking                   | 123 | 7.3 |
| Attempted group rape             | 15  | .9  |
| Group rape                       | 13  | .8  |
| Attempted group rape/ group rape | 28  | 1.7 |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who had at least one experience of blatant group sexual harassment. Attempted group rape: participants who had no experience of group rape, but at least one experience of attempted group rape; group rape: at least one experience of group rape; attempted group rape/ group rape: at least one experience of attempted group rape and/or group rape.

As can be seen from Table 7.25, it appears that the rate of prevalence of group stalking is high within the total sample. The number of incidents of attempted group rape and group rape appears to be almost equal.

#### **7.4.2. Prevalence of participants' experiences of group harassment for the different subgroups**

In this section the findings for the different subgroups (i.e., gender, race and sexual orientation) will be presented.

In Table 7.26 the prevalence rates for group harassment for the two genders are presented.

Table 7.26

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Gender Groups.*

| Type of Harassment              | Male (n = 677) |     | Female (n = 1002) |     |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------------|-----|
|                                 | f              | %   | f                 | %   |
| Group stalking                  | 36             | 5.3 | 89                | 8.7 |
| Attempted group rape            | 2              | .3  | 13                | 1.3 |
| Group rape                      | 5              | .7  | 8                 | .8  |
| Attempted group rape/group rape | 7              | 1.0 | 21                | 2.1 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had at least one experience of blatant group sexual harassment. Group stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of group stalking; attempted group rape: no experience of group rape, but at least one experience of attempted group rape; group rape: at least one experience of group rape; attempted group rape/ group rape: at least one experience of attempted group rape and/or group rape.

From an investigation of Table 7.26, it is clear that, proportionally, females appear to be victims of group harassment more often than their male counterparts.

In Table 7.27 the prevalence of group sexual harassment for at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment is presented for the different racial groups.



Table 7.27

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups.*

| Type of Harassment              | Black<br>(n = 90) |     | Coloured<br>(n = 189) |     | White<br>(n = 1270) |     | Other<br>(n = 130) |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|
|                                 | f                 | %   | f                     | %   | f                   | %   | f                  | %   |
| Group stalking                  | 5                 | 5.5 | 5                     | 2.6 | 42                  | 3.3 | 6                  | 4.6 |
| Attempted group rape            | 1                 | 1.1 | 3                     | 1.6 | 9                   | .7  | 2                  | 1.5 |
| Group rape                      | 2                 | 2.2 | 2                     | 1.1 | 7                   | .6  | 0                  |     |
| Attempted group rape/group rape | 3                 | 3.3 | 5                     | 2.7 | 16                  | 1.3 | 2                  | 1.5 |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who had at least one experience of blatant group sexual harassment. Group stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of group stalking; attempted group rape: no experience of group rape, but at least one experience of attempted group rape; group rape: at least one experience of group rape; attempted group rape/ group rape: at least one experience of attempted group rape and/or group rape. The category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

From the data in Table 7.27 it is clear that in the case of group harassment, Blacks had the highest prevalence rates for group stalking, Coloureds the highest prevalence rates on attempted group rape and Blacks the highest prevalence rates on group rape.

In Table 7.28 the prevalence of blatant group sexual harassment for at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment for the different sexual orientation groups is presented.

Table 7.28

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Group Sexual Harassment for the Sexual Orientation Groups.*

| Type of Harassment              | Heterosex<br>(n = 1502) |     | Homosex<br>(n = 41) |   | Bisex<br>(n = 36) |     | Asex<br>(n = 20) |     | Unsure<br>(n = 17) |   | Unknown<br>(n = 38) |     |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-----|---------------------|---|-------------------|-----|------------------|-----|--------------------|---|---------------------|-----|
|                                 | f                       | %   | f                   | % | f                 | %   | f                | %   | f                  | % | f                   | %   |
| Group stalking                  | 50                      | 3.3 | 0                   |   | 2                 | 5.6 | 1                | 5.0 | 0                  |   | 3                   | 7.9 |
| Attempted group rape            | 14                      | .9  | 0                   |   | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 0                  |   | 1                   | 2.6 |
| Group rape                      | 10                      | .7  | 0                   |   | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 0                  |   | 0                   |     |
| Attempted group rape/group rape | 24                      | 1.6 | 0                   |   | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 0                  |   | 1                   | 2.6 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had at least one experience of blatant group sexual harassment. Group stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of group stalking; attempted group rape: no experience of group rape, but at least one experience of attempted group rape; group rape: at least one experience of group rape; attempted group rape/group rape: at least one experience of attempted group rape and/or group rape. The category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation. The category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

It is evident from Table 7.28 that the “Unknown” group had the highest prevalence rates on group stalking and attempted group rape and the heterosexual group the highest prevalence rates on group rape.

## 7.5. FAMILIARITY OF PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

This section details the results pertaining to the familiarity of the perpetrators of sexual harassment (i.e., whether the perpetrator was known to the victim or not). The results will be presented for the total sample as well as the different subgroups (gender, race and sexual orientation).

In Table 7.29 the prevalence of at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrator was known to the victim is presented for the total sample and for each of the gender groups.

Table 7.29

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment Where the Perpetrator was Known to the Victim, for the Total Sample and for Each Gender Group .*

| Type of Harassment  | Total sample |      | Male |       | Female |      |
|---------------------|--------------|------|------|-------|--------|------|
|                     | f            | %    | f    | %     | f      | %    |
| Stalking            | 360          | 76.6 | 98   | 77.2  | 262    | 76.4 |
| Attempted rape      | 54           | 74.0 | 6    | 100.0 | 47     | 70.1 |
| Rape                | 26           | 81.3 | 4    | 50.0  | 22     | 91.7 |
| Attempted rape/rape | 80           | 76.2 | 11   | 78.6  | 69     | 75.8 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrator was known to them; % = the percentage of the number of participants who experienced a specific type of sexual harassment. Stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of stalking where the perpetrator was known to them; attempted rape: no experience of rape, but at least one experience of attempted rape where the perpetrator was known to them; rape: at least one experience of rape where the perpetrator was known to them.

It is clear from Table 7.29 that male and female participants reported approximately equal prevalence rates for stalking incidents where the perpetrator was known to the victim. With regard to attempted rape, more male participants reported knowing the perpetrator, compared to females. In the case of rape, proportionally more women reported knowing the perpetrator than was the case with men.

In Table 7.30 the prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrator was known to the victim is presented for each of the different racial groups.

Table 7.30

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment Where the Perpetrator was Known to the Victim, for Each Racial Group.*

| Type of Harassment      | Black |       | Coloured |       | White |      | Other |      |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|-------|------|
|                         | f     | %     | f        | %     | f     | %    | f     | %    |
| Stalking                | 18    | 64.3  | 41       | 72.0  | 268   | 77.9 | 32    | 78.0 |
| Attempted rape          | 4     | 100.0 | 7        | 63.6  | 35    | 74.5 | 8     | 72.7 |
| Rape                    | 1     | 50.0  | 5        | 100.0 | 20    | 83.3 | 0     |      |
| Attempted rape<br>/rape | 5     | 83.3  | 12       | 75.0  | 55    | 77.5 | 8     | 66.7 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrator was known to them; % = the percentage of the number of participants who experienced a specific type of harassment. Stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of stalking where the perpetrator was known to them; attempted rape: no experience of rape, but at least one experience of attempted rape where the perpetrator was known to them; rape: at least one experience of rape where the perpetrator was known to them. The category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

It is clear from Table 7.30 that the number of participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrators were known to them, is high among all racial groups.

In Table 7.31 the prevalence of participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrator was known to the victim is presented for each of the different sexual orientation groups.

Table 7.31

*Prevalence of Participants who had at Least one Experience of Blatant Sexual Harassment Where the Perpetrator was Known to the Victim, for Each of the Sexual Orientation Groups.*

| Type of Harassment   | Heterosex |      | Homosex |       | Bisex |       | Asex |      | Unsure |      | Unknown |      |
|----------------------|-----------|------|---------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|--------|------|---------|------|
|                      | f         | %    | f       | %     | f     | %     | f    | %    | f      | %    | f       | %    |
| Stalking             | 320       | 78.2 | 9       | 75.0  | 9     | 75.0  | 5    | 71.4 | 4      | 66.7 | 9       | 69.2 |
| Attempted rape       | 46        | 73.0 | 3       | 100.0 | 1     | 100.0 | 1    | 50.0 | 0      |      | 3       | 75.0 |
| Rape                 | 20        | 80.0 | 2       | 66.7  | 3     | 100.0 | 0    |      | 0      |      | 0       |      |
| Attempted rape /rape | 66        | 75.0 | 5       | 83.3  | 4     | 100.0 | 1    | 50.0 | 0      |      | 3       | 75.0 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrator was known to them; % = the percentage of the number of participants who experienced a specific type of sexual harassment. Stalking: participants who experienced at least one incident of stalking where the perpetrator was known to them; attempted rape: no experience of rape, but at least one experience of attempted rape where the perpetrator was known to them; rape: at least one experience of rape where the perpetrator was known to them. The category “Unsure” denotes cases where the participant was unsure about his or her sexual orientation. The category “Unknown” denotes cases where the participant chose not to indicate his or her sexual orientation.

It is clear from Table 7.31 that proportionally less asexual, “Unsure” and “Unknown” participants had at least one experience of each of the different types of blatant sexual harassment where the perpetrators were known to them compared to the other sexual orientation groups.

## 7.6. LOCATIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

This section details the results pertaining to the locations of sexual harassment. The results will be presented for the total sample as well as for the different subgroups (gender, race and sexual orientation).

In Table 7.32 the prevalence rates for participants who had at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment, for the total group, for the various possible locations of incidents of sexual harassment are presented.

Table 7.32

*Prevalence for the Total Sample, of the Locations Where Blatant Sexual Harassment was Experienced by Participants at Least Once.*

| Location            | Stalking<br>(n = 786) |      | Attempted rape<br>(n = 102) |      | Rape<br>(n = 37) |      |
|---------------------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------|------|------------------|------|
|                     | f                     | %    | f                           | %    | f                | %    |
| Where you stay      | 200                   | 25.4 | 22                          | 21.6 | 12               | 32.4 |
| University building | 86                    | 10.9 | 7                           | 6.9  | 2                | 5.4  |
| Elsewhere on campus | 129                   | 16.4 | 17                          | 16.7 | 4                | 10.8 |
| Bar                 | 137                   | 17.4 | 16                          | 15.7 | 2                | 5.4  |
| Town                | 112                   | 14.2 | 17                          | 16.7 | 7                | 18.9 |
| Uncertain           | 26                    | 3.3  | 3                           | 2.9  | 1                | 2.7  |
| Other               | 96                    | 12.2 | 20                          | 19.6 | 9                | 24.3 |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who indicated that they had experienced a type of blatant sexual harassment at least once at a specific location; also note that a participant could have indicated more than one location for the experience of any of the types of blatant sexual harassment, and therefore *n* = the total number for all the locations.

Interpretation of the results in Table 7.32 reveals that the highest rates of prevalence for locations of the incidents of blatant sexual harassment appear to be where you stay, in a bar, elsewhere on campus, in town and the “Other” category (i.e., somewhere other than the listed options).

## **7.7. HELP-RESOURCES UTILISED BY VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

This section details the results pertaining to the help-resources utilised by victims following the experience of incidents of both blatant and subtle sexual harassment. The section is divided into two parts. Firstly, in Section 7.7.1. the help-resources utilised at least once by victims of blatant sexual harassment are presented. Secondly, in Section 7.7.2. the help-resources utilised by victims of subtle sexual harassment are presented.

### **7.7.1. Help-resources utilised at least once by victims of blatant sexual harassment**

This section details the results pertaining to the help-resources utilised by victims following the experience of incidents of blatant sexual harassment. The results will be presented for the total sample, as well as the different subgroups (gender, race and sexual orientation).

In Table 7.33 the prevalence for the total sample for help-resource use following one experience of blatant sexual harassment is presented.

Table 7.33

*Prevalence of the use of Help-Resources at Least Once by Victims of Blatant Sexual Harassment.*

| Resource                | Stalking<br>(n = 664) |      | Attempted rape<br>(n = 118) |      | Rape<br>(n = 77) |      |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------|------|------------------|------|
|                         | f                     | %    | f                           | %    | f                | %    |
| Friend                  | 353                   | 53.2 | 54                          | 45.8 | 23               | 29.9 |
| Parent                  | 99                    | 14.9 | 14                          | 11.9 | 10               | 13.0 |
| Sibling                 | 91                    | 13.7 | 12                          | 10.2 | 6                | 7.8  |
| Other family            | 26                    | 3.9  | 5                           | 4.2  | 3                | 3.9  |
| Student advisor         | 9                     | 1.4  | 2                           | 1.7  | 3                | 3.9  |
| <sup>a</sup> SRC member | 18                    | 2.7  | 6                           | 5.1  | 1                | 1.3  |
| Health worker           | 10                    | 1.5  | 6                           | 5.1  | 12               | 15.6 |
| Police                  | 13                    | 2.0  | 7                           | 6.3  | 6                | 7.8  |
| <sup>b</sup> USPS       | 11                    | 1.7  | 5                           | 4.2  | 1                | 1.3  |
| <sup>c</sup> CSCD       | 8                     | 1.2  | 2                           | 1.7  | 8                | 10.4 |
| Other                   | 26                    | 3.9  | 5                           | 4.2  | 4                | 5.2  |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who indicated that they had used a particular help-resource at least once; also note that a participant could have indicated the use of more than one help-resource for any of the types of blatant sexual harassment, and therefore n = the total number for all the help-resources.

<sup>a</sup>SRC = Student Representative Council; <sup>b</sup>USPS = University of Stellenbosch Protection Services; <sup>c</sup>CSCD = Centre for Student Counselling and Development.

The results in Table 7.33 reveal that talking to a friend was used moderately to often, and confiding in a parent and/or sibling was used seldom to moderately on average.

In Table 7.34 the prevalence of the use of resources of help by victims of blatant sexual harassment for the two gender groups is presented.

Table 7.34

*Prevalence of the Use of Help-Resources at Least Once by Victims of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Gender Groups.*

| Resource                | Stalking      |      |                   |      | Attempted rape |      |                  |      | Rape         |      |                 |      |
|-------------------------|---------------|------|-------------------|------|----------------|------|------------------|------|--------------|------|-----------------|------|
|                         | Male (n =129) |      | Female ( n = 527) |      | Male (n = 10)  |      | Female (n = 108) |      | Male (n = 7) |      | Female (n = 70) |      |
|                         | f             | %    | f                 | %    | f              | %    | f                | %    | f            | %    | f               | %    |
| Friend                  | 82            | 63.6 | 271               | 51.4 | 4              | 40.0 | 50               | 46.3 | 3            | 42.9 | 20              | 28.6 |
| Parent                  | 1             | .8   | 90                | 17.1 | 1              | 10.0 | 13               | 12.0 | 0            | 0    | 10              | 14.3 |
| Sibling                 | 14            | 10.9 | 77                | 14.6 | 0              | 0    | 12               | 11.1 | 0            | 0    | 6               | 8.6  |
| Other family            | 6             | 4.7  | 20                | 3.8  | 1              | 10.0 | 4                | 3.7  | 0            | 0    | 3               | 4.3  |
| Student advisor         | 2             | 1.6  | 7                 | 1.3  | 0              | 0    | 2                | 1.9  | 1            | 14.3 | 2               | 2.9  |
| <sup>a</sup> SRC member | 4             | 3.1  | 14                | 2.7  | 2              | 20.0 | 4                | 3.7  | 0            | 0    | 1               | 1.4  |
| Health worker           | 6             | 4.7  | 4                 | .8   | 0              | 0    | 6                | 5.6  | 1            | 14.3 | 11              | 15.7 |
| Police                  | 1             | .8   | 12                | 2.3  | 0              | 0    | 7                | 6.5  | 1            | 14.3 | 5               | 7.1  |
| <sup>b</sup> USPS       | 2             | 1.6  | 9                 | 1.7  | 1              | 10.0 | 4                | 3.7  | 0            | 0    | 1               | 1.4  |
| <sup>c</sup> CSCD       | 2             | 1.6  | 6                 | 1.1  | 0              | 0    | 2                | 1.9  | 0            | 0    | 8               | 11.4 |
| Other                   | 9             | 7.0  | 17                | 3.2  | 1              | 10.0 | 4                | 3.7  | 1            | 14.3 | 3               | 4.3  |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who indicated that they had used a particular help-resource at least once; also note that a participant could have indicated the use of more than one help-resource for any of the types of blatant sexual harassment, and therefore n = the total number for all the help-resources.

<sup>a</sup>SRC = Student Representative Council; <sup>b</sup>USPS = University of Stellenbosch Protection Services; <sup>c</sup>CSCD = Centre for Student Counselling and Development.

From the results reported in Table 7.34, it is clear that of all the types of help-resources utilised, a friend, a parent and a sibling are the most frequently utilised help-resources following incidents of blatant sexual harassment. It is interesting to note that male participants resorted to the use of a parent as a resource less frequently than did female participants.

Table 7.35 reflects the prevalence of help-resource use following one experience of blatant sexual harassment for the different racial groups.



Table 7.35

| Resource                   | Stalking          |      |                      |      |                    |      |                   |      | Attempted rape    |     |                      |     |                   |     |                   |     | Rape             |     |                      |     |                   |     |                  |     |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------|----------------------|------|--------------------|------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-------------------|-----|------------------|-----|
|                            | Black<br>(n = 36) |      | Coloured<br>(n = 96) |      | White<br>(n = 467) |      | Other<br>(n = 65) |      | Black<br>(n = 10) |     | Coloured<br>(n = 18) |     | White<br>(n = 74) |     | Other<br>(n = 17) |     | Black<br>(n = 3) |     | Coloured<br>(n = 10) |     | White<br>(n = 50) |     | Other<br>(n = 4) |     |
|                            | f                 | %    | f                    | %    | f                  | %    | f                 | %    | f                 | %   | f                    | %   | f                 | %   | f                 | %   | f                | %   | f                    | %   | f                 | %   | f                | %   |
| Friend                     | 15                | 16.7 | 48                   | 25.4 | 25.8               | 20.3 | 32                | 24.6 | 3                 | 3.3 | 7                    | 3.7 | 35                | 2.8 | 9                 | 6.9 | 1                | 1.1 | 4                    | 2.1 | 17                | 1.3 | 1                | .8  |
| Parent                     | 6                 | 6.7  | 11                   | 5.8  | 73                 | 5.7  | 9                 | 6.9  | 0                 |     | 5                    | 2.6 | 8                 | .6  | 1                 | .8  | 0                |     | 2                    | 1.1 | 6                 | .5  | 2                | 1.5 |
| Sibling                    | 5                 | 5.6  | 12                   | 6.3  | 66                 | 5.2  | 8                 | 6.2  | 2                 | 2.2 | 2                    | 1.1 | 8                 | .6  | 0                 |     | 1                | 1.1 | 1                    | 1.1 | 4                 | .3  | 0                |     |
| Other<br>family            | 2                 | 2.2  | 7                    | 3.7  | 15                 | 1.2  | 2                 | 1.5  | 2                 | 2.2 | 1                    | 1.1 | 2                 | .2  | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 1                    | 1.1 | 2                 | .2  | 0                |     |
| Student<br>Advisor         | 1                 | 1.1  | 1                    | .5   | 4                  | .3   | 3                 | 2.3  | 1                 | 1.1 | 0                    |     | 1                 | .1  | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 0                    |     | 3                 | .2  | 0                |     |
| <sup>a</sup> SRC<br>member | 2                 | 2.2  | 3                    | 1.6  | 11                 | .9   | 2                 | 1.5  | 1                 | 1.1 | 0                    | 3   | .2                | 2   | 1.5               |     | 0                |     | 0                    |     | 1                 | .1  | 0                |     |
| Health<br>worker           | 0                 |      | 3                    | 1.6  | 5                  | .4   | 2                 | 1.5  | 0                 |     | 1                    | .5  | 4                 | .3  | 1                 | .8  | 1                | 1.1 | 1                    | .5  | 9                 | .7  | 0                |     |
| Police                     | 1                 | 1.1  | 5                    | 2.6  | 7                  | .6   | 0                 |      | 0                 |     | 1                    | .5  | 6                 | .5  | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 0                    |     | 5                 | .4  | 1                | .8  |
| <sup>b</sup> USPS          | 1                 | 1.1  | 1                    | .5   | 7                  | .6   | 2                 | 1.5  | 0                 |     | 1                    | .5  | 4                 | .3  | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 0                    |     | 1                 | .1  | 0                |     |
| <sup>c</sup> CSCD          | 1                 | 1.1  | 1                    | .5   | 5                  | .4   | 1                 | .8   | 0                 |     | 0                    |     | 2                 | .2  | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 1                    | .5  | 7                 | .6  | 0                |     |
| Other                      | 2                 | 2.1  | 4                    | 2.1  | 16                 | 1.3  | 4                 | 3.1  | 1                 | 1.1 | 0                    |     | 4                 | .3  | 0                 |     | 0                |     | 0                    |     | 4                 | .3  | 0                |     |

*Prevalence of the use of Help-Resources at Least Once by Victims of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups.*

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who indicated that they had used a particular help-resource at least once; also note that a participant could have indicated the use of more than one help-resource for any of the types of blatant sexual harassment, and therefore *n* = the total number for all the help-resources. The category “Other” denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

<sup>a</sup>SRC = Student Representative Council; <sup>b</sup>USPS = University of Stellenbosch Protection Services; <sup>c</sup>CSCD = Centre for Student Counselling and Development.

Investigation of Table 7.35 reveals high rates of prevalence for the use of help-resources of a friend, a parent and a sibling by the victims of all four racial groups following incidents of blatant sexual harassment. Other types of help-resources are less frequently utilised.

### 7.7.2. Help-resources utilised by victims of subtle sexual harassment

This section details the results pertaining to the help-resources utilised by victims following the experience of incidents of subtle sexual harassment.

In Table 7.36 the means and standard deviations for the total sample for help-resource use for one experience of subtle sexual harassment are presented.

Table 7.36

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Subtle Sexual Harassment Help-Resource Scale (S-HRS).*

| Resource                | <i>n</i> | $\bar{X}$ | SD   |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|------|
| Friend                  | 210      | 3.50      | 1.38 |
| Parent                  | 70       | 2.20      | 1.41 |
| Sibling                 | 60       | 2.11      | 1.39 |
| Student advisor         | 10       | 1.18      | .61  |
| <sup>a</sup> SRC member | 13       | 1.26      | .84  |
| Health worker           | 20       | 1.41      | 1.03 |
| Police                  | 9        | 1.19      | .71  |
| <sup>b</sup> USPS       | 10       | 1.19      | .69  |
| Other                   | 23       | 1.54      | 1.12 |

*Note.* *n* = the total amount of participants who selected a particular resource at least once, each participant could select more than one resource and therefore could form part of the number reported for each of the different resources.

<sup>a</sup>SRC = Student Representative Council; <sup>b</sup>USPS = University of Stellenbosch Protection Services; <sup>c</sup>CSCD = Centre for Student Counselling and Development.

The results in Table 7.36 reveal that the means of friend, parent and siblings as types of help-resources, appear to be highest. This indicates that these three categories were used most frequently by victims, following experiences of subtle sexual harassment.

### 7.8. ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE BY VICTIMS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

This section details the results pertaining to the use of alcohol and/or drugs and the role these substances might have played in the prevalence of blatant and subtle sexual harassment.

In Table 7.37 the prevalence of at least one incident of blatant sexual harassment, where alcohol was used by victims, is presented, as well as the results of a comparison of the gender groups.

Table 7.37

*Prevalence of Victims who Indicated That Their use of Alcohol Probably Contributed to at Least one Incident of Blatant Sexual Harassment, and Comparison of the Gender Groups.*

| Type of Harassment | Groups | f  | %    | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------|--------|----|------|----|----------|
| Attempted rape     | Total  | 34 | 46.6 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 5  | 83.3 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 29 | 43.3 | 1  | 3.55     |
| Rape               | Total  | 15 | 46.9 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 4  | 50.0 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 11 | 45.8 | 1  | 0.042    |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who indicated that their use of alcohol probably contributed to at least one incident of blatant sexual harassment; % = the percentage of the number of participants who experienced a specific type of sexual harassment.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

It is evident from the results presented in Table 7.39, that the number of victims who reported that alcohol probably contributed to the experience of incidents of blatant sexual harassment was high among both genders. There were no significant differences yielded between the gender groups.

In Table 7.38 the prevalence of at least one experience of blatant sexual harassment, where drugs were used by the victims, is displayed, as well as the results of a comparison of the gender groups.

Table 7.38

*Prevalence of Victims who Indicated That Their use of Drugs Probably Contributed to at Least one Incident of Blatant Sexual Harassment, and Comparison of the Gender Groups.*

| Type of Harassment | Groups | f | %    | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------|--------|---|------|----|----------|
| Attempted rape     | Total  | 2 | 2.7  |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 1 | 16.7 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 1 | 1.5  | 1  | 0.768    |
| Rape               | Total  | 3 | 9.4  |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 2 | 25.0 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 1 | 4.2  | 1  | 3.065    |

*Note.* f = The number of participants who indicated that their use of drugs probably contributed to at least one incident of blatant sexual harassment; % = the percentage of the number of participants who experienced a specific type of sexual harassment.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$

It is clear from the results presented in Table 7.38, that the number of victims who reported that drug use probably contributed to the experience of incidents of blatant sexual harassment, was low among both genders. There were no significant differences yielded between the gender groups.

## 7.9. EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

This section details the results pertaining to the effects of blatant and subtle sexual harassment. Firstly, in Section 7.9.1, the prevalence of the effects of blatant sexual harassment (whether the participant suffered effects or not), was investigated. A comparison of the various groups was also performed. Secondly, in Section 7.9.2, the intensity of the effects of subtle sexual harassment as measured by the Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS) is presented.

### 7.9.1 Prevalence of the effects of blatant sexual harassment

In Table 7.39 the prevalence of the social, emotional and academic effects of blatant sexual harassment for the total sample and each gender group and the differences between them is presented.

Table 7.39

*Prevalence of Participants who Indicated That They Experienced Social, Emotional and Academic Effects at Least Once Following Incidents of Blatant Sexual Harassment, and the Comparison of the Gender Groups.*

| Type of Harassment | Groups | f   | %    | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------|--------|-----|------|----|----------|
| Social Effects     |        |     |      |    |          |
| Stalking           | Total  | 126 | 26.8 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 29  | 22.8 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 97  | 28.3 | 1  | 1.401    |
| Attempted rape     | Total  | 31  | 42.5 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 3   | 50.0 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 28  | 41.8 | 1  | 0.152    |
| Rape               | Total  | 19  | 59.4 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 4   | 50.0 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 15  | 62.5 | 1  | 0.389    |
| Emotional Effects  |        |     |      |    |          |
| Stalking           | Total  | 191 | 40.6 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 37  | 29.1 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 154 | 44.9 | 1  | 9.548**  |
| Attempted rape     | Total  | 56  | 76.7 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 4   | 66.7 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 52  | 77.6 | 1  | 0.369    |
| Rape               | Total  | 27  | 84.4 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 6   | 75.0 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 21  | 87.5 | 1  | 0.711    |

| Type of Harassment | Groups | f  | %    | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------|--------|----|------|----|----------|
| Academic Effects   |        |    |      |    |          |
| Stalking           | Total  | 73 | 15.5 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 21 | 16.5 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 52 | 15.2 | 1  | 0.134    |
| Attempted rape     | Total  | 28 | 38.4 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 2  | 33.3 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 26 | 38.8 | 1  | 0.07     |
| Rape               | Total  | 19 | 59.4 |    |          |
|                    | Male   | 5  | 62.5 |    |          |
|                    | Female | 14 | 58.3 | 1  | 0.043    |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who indicated that they experienced the effects at least once following blatant sexual harassment; % = the percentage of the number of participants who experienced a specific type of sexual harassment.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

Investigation of Table 7.39 reveals significant differences between the gender groups regarding the emotional effects of stalking. This significant difference can be attributed to the higher scores of female participants compared to males. No other significant differences were yielded between the gender groups pertaining to effects suffered following incidents of blatant sexual harassment.

In Table 7.40 the prevalence of the social, emotional and academic effects of blatant sexual harassment for each of the racial groups and the differences between them are presented.

Table 7.40

*Prevalence of Participants who Indicated That They Experienced Social, Emotional and Academic Effects at Least Once Following Incidents of Blatant Sexual Harassment for the Racial Groups and the Comparison of Differences.*

| Type of Harassment | Groups   | f   | %     | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------|----------|-----|-------|----|----------|
| Social Effects     |          |     |       |    |          |
| Stalking           | Black    | 8   | 28.6  | 3  | 2.125    |
|                    | Coloured | 20  | 35.9  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 89  | 25.9  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 11  | 26.8  |    |          |
| Attempted rape     | Black    | 4   | 100.0 | 3  | 8.424**  |
|                    | Coloured | 3   | 27.3  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 31  | 66.0  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 6   | 54.5  |    |          |
| Rape               | Black    | 0   | 0     | 3  | 4.587    |
|                    | Coloured | 4   | 80.0  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 15  | 62.5  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 1   | 100.0 |    |          |
| Emotional Effects  |          |     |       |    |          |
| Stalking           | Black    | 11  | 39.3  | 3  | 1.006    |
|                    | Coloured | 20  | 35.1  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 144 | 41.9  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 16  | 39.0  |    |          |
| Attempted rape     | Black    | 4   | 100.0 | 3  | 8.406**  |
|                    | Coloured | 10  | 90.9  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 48  | 100.0 |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 9   | 81.8  |    |          |
| Rape               | Black    | 1   | 50.0  | 3  | 3.429    |
|                    | Coloured | 5   | 100.0 |    |          |
|                    | White    | 21  | 87.5  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 1   | 100.0 |    |          |

| Type of Harassment |          | f  | %     | df | $\chi^2$ |
|--------------------|----------|----|-------|----|----------|
| Academic Effects   |          |    |       |    |          |
| Stalking           | Black    | 1  | 3.6   |    |          |
|                    | Coloured | 12 | 21.1  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 53 | 15.4  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 7  | 17.1  | 3  | 4.456    |
| Attempted rape     | Black    | 1  | 25.0  |    |          |
|                    | Coloured | 5  | 45.5  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 27 | 57.4  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 5  | 45.5  | 3  | 2.105    |
| Rape               | Black    | 0  | 0     |    |          |
|                    | Coloured | 4  | 80.0  |    |          |
|                    | White    | 15 | 62.5  |    |          |
|                    | Other    | 1  | 100.0 | 3  | 4.587    |

*Note.* *f* = The number of participants who indicated that they experienced the effects at least once following blatant sexual harassment; % = the percentage of the number of participants who experienced a specific type of sexual harassment. The category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

Investigation of Table 7.40 reveals significant differences between the racial groups regarding the social and emotional effects of attempted rape with the higher score by Black participants and relatively low score by Coloured participants probably contributing to the significant difference in terms of the social effects of attempted rape and the higher scores of Black and White participants probably contributing to the significant difference regarding the emotional effects of attempted rape.

### 7.9.2 The intensity of the effects of subtle sexual harassment

Table 7.41 reveals the means and standard deviations for the social, emotional and academic effects of subtle sexual harassment as measured by the Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS) for the two gender groups, as well as the results of a comparison of the gender groups.



Table 7.41

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS), and Comparison of the Gender Groups.*

| Effects           | Subgroups | n   | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df    | F        |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|------|-------|----------|
| Social effects    | Total     | 156 | 2.24      | 1.14 |       |          |
|                   | Male      | 39  | 1.77      | 1.06 |       |          |
|                   | Female    | 117 | 2.40      | 1.13 | 1,154 | 9.334**  |
| Emotional effects | Total     | 190 | 2.48      | 1.06 |       |          |
|                   | Male      | 45  | 1.98      | .98  |       |          |
|                   | Female    | 145 | 2.63      | 1.04 | 1,188 | 13.880** |
| Academic effects  | Total     | 160 | 1.82      | 1.05 |       |          |
|                   | Male      | 41  | 1.59      | .948 |       |          |
|                   | Female    | 119 | 1.90      | 1.07 | 1,158 | 2.746    |

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

It is noticeable from the results in Table 7.41, that significant differences between the gender groups are evident for the social and emotional effects. Females reported significantly higher intensity levels regarding the social, as well as the emotional effects of subtle sexual harassment. The scores of the two genders with regards to academic effects do not indicate significant differences.

In Table 7.42 the means and standard deviations for the social, emotional and academic effects of subtle sexual harassment for each of the different racial groups are presented as well as results of a comparison of the racial groups.

Table 7.42

*Means and Standard Deviations for the Effects of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (S-ESHS) for the Racial Groups, and Comparison of Differences.*

| Effects           | Subgroups | n   | $\bar{X}$ | SD    | df    | F     |
|-------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| Social effects    | Total     | 156 | 2.24      | 1.14  |       |       |
|                   | Black     | 12  | 2.67      | .985  |       |       |
|                   | Coloured  | 25  | 2.36      | 1.319 |       |       |
|                   | White     | 105 | 2.17      | 1.139 |       |       |
|                   | Other     | 14  | 2.21      | 1.05  | 3,152 | .765  |
| Emotional effects | Total     | 190 | 2.48      | 1.06  |       |       |
|                   | Black     | 12  | 2.42      | 1.084 |       |       |
|                   | Coloured  | 25  | 2.40      | 1.225 |       |       |
|                   | White     | 134 | 2.49      | 1.081 |       |       |
|                   | Other     | 19  | 2.58      | .769  | 3,186 | .115  |
| Academic effects  | Total     | 160 | 1.82      | 1.05  |       |       |
|                   | Black     | 9   | 1.33      | 1.00  |       |       |
|                   | Coloured  | 27  | 2.04      | 1.126 |       |       |
|                   | White     | 108 | 1.81      | 1.012 |       |       |
|                   | Other     | 16  | 1.81      | .750  | 3,156 | 1.034 |

*Note.* The category "Other" denotes other possible racial groups as specified by the participant or cases where the participant chose not to state his or her race (i.e., chose not to answer).

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

The results of Table 7.42 yielded no significant differences between the racial groups pertaining to the effects of subtle sexual harassment.

## 7.10 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION, TOLERANCE AND PREVALENCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Table 7.43 reveals the Pearson correlations between scores obtained on the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS) and the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS) for the total sample.

Table 7.43

*Pearson Correlations Between the TSSHS, Pr-SSHS and Pe-SSHS for the Total Sample (N = 1679).*

| Scales  | TSSHS   | Pr-SSHS | Pe-SSHS |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| TSSHS   | -       |         |         |
| Pr-SSHS | .030    | -       |         |
| Pe-SSHS | -.195** | .087**  | -       |

*Note.* TSSHS = Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale, Pr-SSHS = Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale, Pe-SSHS = Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale.

\* =  $p < .05$ . \*\* =  $p < .01$ .

The results of Table 7.43 reveal significant correlations ( $p < 0.01$ ) between the Pe-SSHS and the TSSHS, as well as between the Pe-SSHS and Pr-SSHS.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### DISCUSSION

#### 8.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the results of the present research study will be discussed. The discussion will be in sequential order to that of the objectives of the study. Following this, the limitations of the present study as well as recommendations for further study will be discussed. A summary of all recommendations will be provided in Chapter Nine.

#### 8.2 PREVALENCE OF BLATANT SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND COMPARISON OF SUBGROUPS

##### Stalking

A sizeable percentage of participants reported being victims of at least one experience of stalking (28%). It appears that stalking has the highest rate of prevalence of the three types of blatant sexual harassment (see Table 7.1). In addition, almost double the percentage of women (34.2%) reported being the victims of stalking (i.e., experiencing at least one experience), compared to the prevalence rate for men (18.8%). This finding corresponds with international research, which in the majority of studies, has consistently found differences in prevalence rates for stalking among the genders, with females reporting higher rates of prevalence than do males (e.g., Cupach & Spitzberg, 2003; Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000; McCreedy & Dennis, 1996; Spitzberg, Nicasastro, & Cousins, 1998; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999; Turell, 2000) or have found ratios of 2:1 (e.g., Elliot & Brantley, 1997; Fremouw et al., 1997; Harmon, Rosner, & Owens, 1998). Other more representative studies have revealed smaller differences between the genders in terms of prevalence (e.g., Hills & Taplin, 1998).

A study by Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) found a stalking prevalence rate of 10.5% among a female college student sample. Furthermore, the results of the present study are somewhat higher than those reported in a nationwide survey conducted by Fisher et al. (2000) in the United States of America. This study yielded prevalence rates for stalking of 13.1% for the total (female only) sample. It must be noted that in the Fisher et al. (2000) study, the term stalking was very narrowly defined and therefore did not leave participants with much doubt as to what was meant by the term. As explained before, this was not the case with the present study. The researcher in collaboration with his supervisors took the decision not to devise set definitions for the various types of sexual

harassment (i.e., both blatant and subtle sexual harassment). This decision was made because it was felt at that time that it would not be in the best interest of the study to firstly, prime participants as to the responses that the researcher was most probably seeking. Secondly, that it was considered best not to limit the possible interpretations of which behavioural types constitute sexual harassment from the perspective of the participants (some of whom were victims of such incidents) by prompting them with the researcher's definitions, but instead to leave it to the self-definition of the participant and their judgement of what they thought constituted the various types of sexual harassment. Please note, however, that a very limited definition of stalking was included in the questionnaire. Fisher et al. (2000) also restricted their measurements to incidents of stalking which occurred on a university campus. In the present study this was not the case. Participants could report any incident of stalking experienced during the time they were enrolled as students at Stellenbosch University. This would include experiences that had occurred off-campus, but limited to the geographical boundaries of the respective town in which the particular campus was located.

Two further reasons might explain the differences in stalking prevalence among the genders as reported in the present study. Firstly, previous studies (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000) have reported the existence of different schemata (i.e., ways of thinking about something) for males and females when defining what stalking is and the degree of threat it poses. This fact lead Cupach and Spitzberg (2004) to believe that even when males undergo the same kind of stalking experiences as females, these experiences may not be perceived as threatening. Furthermore, researchers (Gutek, 1985; Hendrix et al., 1998; Shea, 1993) have demonstrated that women tend to view both male and female initiators of sexually harassing behaviour as equally harassing. This contrasts with men who appear to view potentially harassing behaviour from women as less sexually harassing, even flattering, while at the same time finding identical behaviour from male initiators harassing (Hendrix, 2000). This fact might account for the differential reporting of stalking experiences among the genders.

Secondly, another explanation, not incompatible with the first, would be that males believe that Western culture and subsequently the official bodies (e.g., university management, police, etc.) existing within that culture, will not consider their stalking experiences to be serious (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2004). In addition to the above, it is important to take cognisance of the socio-historical context in which the present study

was conducted. To a great extent, the student population of Stellenbosch University is sexually and otherwise generally conservative in their views and outlook. This is the result of a culture and upbringing infused with Calvinist-Christian traditions and teachings, especially within the White and so-called “Coloured” Afrikaner communities. The presence of these beliefs might impact on the types of behaviour which are seen as inappropriate and threatening, as well as the degree to which these behaviours are judged as such.

It is impossible to draw definitive conclusions from the stalking prevalence rates obtained from the present study. For example, it is impossible to determine how the prevalence rate for stalking, found in this study, compares to other South African or African universities. Furthermore, a historical comparison of prevalence rates is not possible, so it remains uncertain whether the prevalence of this type of harassment has increased, decreased or remained stable. It is also not possible to determine whether stalking, as a type of blatant sexual harassment, is more readily labelled as such, or whether women as a group are more likely to report incidents of this type of sexual harassment than men. What is evident however, is that significantly higher percentages of women reported being the victim of stalking compared to men. When considering these findings, one prominent explanation could be offered for these differential prevalence rates. It is known that Western society pressurises men to perform the role of the “hunter” in sexual relationships, which means that the man is responsible for seeking out a female partner for the purposes of establishing a sexual/romantic relationship. This societal pressure may well be the reason why so many men appear to engage in the act of stalking women. A second explanation considers the fact that some men may be socially or emotionally immature or unskilled (real or perceived) and therefore may find it difficult or impossible to attract a female partner via the consensual socially acceptable mechanisms. A third possible explanation for the high levels of stalking prevalence reported in the present study, might relate to the definition of stalking provided. The researcher decided to include a short definition of stalking in the questionnaire, namely that stalking can be defined as “continuous unwelcome contacting”. This was done in order to provide some guidance to participants completing the questionnaire. Given the broad nature of this definition, it can be assumed that a great number of women experienced behaviours which fit this description. It could be speculated that a more precise definition might have reduced the number of participants who reported being the victim of stalking experiences.

Notwithstanding the above explanations, the present researcher remains largely unsure of the reasons for the high rates of prevalence of stalking evident from the data compared to those reported elsewhere. This fact is compounded by the lack of comparative data available from other studies in South Africa and the African continent. Further research pertaining to stalking and its prevalence, both in Stellenbosch and in South Africa, is therefore needed. The effects of using a more precise operational definition of stalking on prevalence reporting can also be investigated in future research.

### **Attempted rape and rape**

Participants in the present research study reported the following prevalence rates for attempted rape (4.3%) and rape (1.9%) (see Table 7.1). In the case of attempted rape it was found that women were more likely to have been the victims of attempted rape (6.7%) compared to men (0.9%). Concerning rape, prevalence rates for women of 2.4% were reported compared to men (1.2%). With regard to the racial groups, it is evident that “Coloured” participants reported a higher number of incidents compared to the other racial groups (see Table 7.2). Regarding sexual orientation groups, the asexual and “Unknown” groups reported a higher number of incidents than did the other four sexual orientation groups (see Table 7.3). In terms of participants who reported being victims of more than one experience of blatant sexual harassment, it is clear from the results that female participants reported higher prevalence rates compared to males (see Table 7.4), and that White and heterosexual participants reported higher numbers of such incidents compared to the other racial and sexual orientation groups (see Tables 7.5 and 7.6). It should be noted that White and heterosexual participants made up the majority of both the research sample and the student body of Stellenbosch University.

Results furthermore yielded statistically significant differences regarding the prevalence rates for at least one experience of stalking and attempted rape among the gender subgroups. This was due to the higher prevalence rates among female participants. This finding was expected, due to the fact that, as has been pointed out before, male perpetrators are generally responsible for most incidents of sexual harassment. No significant differences were reported among the racial groups; the sexual orientation groups, however, differed significantly in terms of rape prevalence rates with homosexual and bisexual participants reporting higher prevalence rates compared to the other sexual orientation groups (see Table 7.7). This finding might be attributable to the likelihood that male perpetrators were responsible for the incidents of rape perpetrated

against the homosexual and bisexual groups. This might be so, due to the fact that the other sexual orientation groups (i.e., heterosexual and asexual) do not ordinarily have a male sexual partner within the relationship who may act as a perpetrator of incidents of rape.

The results for attempted rape found in the present study, are lower than those reported by Fisher et al. (2000) which, in a nationwide study among female college/university students in the United States of America, indicated prevalence rates of 11.1% for attempted rape and 1.7% for rape. Nasta et al. (2005) in a study conducted at Brown University among a mixed gendered sample in the United States, found the following prevalence rates for attempted rape (6%) and for rape (3.8%). Research studies from elsewhere in the world conducted among college/university students present similar findings. A study by So-Kum Tang et al. (1995) found prevalence rates for attempted rape of 14.9% and for rape a 1.4% for the total female student sample. In another study (Lehrer et al., 2007) among female students attending institutions of higher education, the following was found: a total of 17% of the total sample reported having experienced some form of forced sexual intercourse (i.e., rape) in the previous 12 months. In the case of attempted rape a prevalence rate of 11% was reported for this sample in the previous 12 months. It is therefore evident that prevalence rates as high as 17% have been reported. However, the results from the present study yield a prevalence rate of 2.4% for rape among female participants. This prevalence rate seems to compare with rates from most other studies, and remains disturbingly high when compared to these studies performed among student populations. This is particularly so given that the rights of women have, in recent times, been articulated worldwide and especially in South Africa with its liberal and progressive constitution, bill of rights and affirmative action interventions amongst other female empowering initiatives. Notwithstanding these societal pressures however, Stellenbosch University, with its student demographic, representative of at least a subsection of South African society, yields a prevalence rate of 2.4% for rape of female students.

Another interpretation of this finding would be that the prevalence rate of 2.4% is relatively low, given South Africa's national crime statistics and especially crimes against women. This is particularly true for the crime of rape. It is generally known that South Africa has one of the highest prevalence rates of rape in the world (SA Depression and



Anxiety Group, 2008) and in light of this, a prevalence rate of 2.4% for rape, on the campus of Stellenbosch University, may seem relatively low in comparison.

Furthermore, the results of the present study produce questions that are difficult to answer. For example, the following questions could very well be asked: Have societal norms (as articulated by students being products of greater South African society themselves) become increasingly superficial? What role does the growing problem of alcohol and drug abuse (especially in the Western Cape Province), play in the perpetration of sexual harassment? Is the university failing in its duty to protect students? What more, if anything, can be done to ensure their safety? Are these results simply a symptom of a crime-ridden country at war with itself?

### **8.3. PREVALENCE OF WHAT PARTICIPANTS PERCEIVE AS SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

In order to determine students' perceptions and definition of sexual harassment, a list of incidents or behaviours was included in the questionnaire and respondents had to indicate whether they perceived such conduct as constituting sexual harassment. This list of incidents or behaviours formed part of the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS). According to Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), in order to contextualise sexually harassing behaviour on the Stellenbosch University campus, student practices that are institutionalised at this university were included in the list. These include "*raiding*" on residences, *streaking* and students *being "rated"* according to perceived physical attractiveness (Gouws & Kritzinger, 1995). From Table 7.8 it is clear that those activities that can be classified as "student pranks" (i.e., prevalent sexual behaviour by students of a less serious nature) are perceived by a relatively small percentage of students to constitute sexual harassment. These findings are in line with that of Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) as well as Daniels (2002), who when utilising the same basic list of behaviours, found similar perception prevalence rates. In all three studies "student pranks" were perceived by a smaller number of participants (relative to the other types of subtle sexual harassment) as constituting sexual harassment. In the present study, these behaviours included *being "rated"* (24%), *"raids"* (14%), *"streaking"* (19%). The prevalence for *wolf-whistling* was found to be especially high in the present study, with 40% of female respondents perceiving this behaviour type as subtle sexual harassment. In all three studies, a relatively higher percentage of students perceived incidents like *sexist remarks* and *unwelcome requests* as sexual harassment. In the

case of a more extreme offence such as *rape*, a very high percentage of students in all three studies perceived this behaviour as sexual harassment. These findings support other research findings (Gervasio & Ruckdeschel, 1992; Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991) which have noted that the more serious (i.e., in terms of perceived severity and explicitness) an incident, the greater the likelihood that such behaviour will be interpreted as sexual harassment. Of the 10 items on the list, 7 of them yielded statistically significant differences in perceptions between the genders (see Table 7.8). In the case of the heterosexual subgroup, women consistently employed more sensitive/strict criteria when judging whether a particular behavioural type constituted subtle sexual harassment compared to their heterosexual male counterparts. These findings are in line with those of Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) as well as Daniels (2002) both of which utilised a similar list of items. No significant differences were yielded for the other sexual orientation subgroups.

As previously noted by Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), it appears from the above results that a degree of ambiguity exists on the part of students as to their perceptions of behaviour such as *sexist remarks*, as well as *unwelcome requests*. In the case of such behaviours, noted Gouws and Kritzinger (1995), sexual expectations are not clearly spelled out. As is apparent from previous studies (Bursik, 1992; Pryor & Day, 1988; Tata, 1993), a wide range of variables exists that could potentially influence the perception of which behaviour types constitute sexual harassment, such as the status of the harasser and the explicitness of the behaviour, etcetera. However, as stated by Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991), gender differences in perceptions of sexually harassing behaviour are “the most robust of all variables that have been examined to date, having been reported in almost every investigation so far completed” (p. 282). As has been illustrated, a consistent difference was found between the genders’ perception of what constitutes sexual harassment (Fitzgerald & Schullman, 1993; Gutek et al., 1983; Harnett et al., 1989; Hendrix et al., 1998; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; Workman & Johnson, 1991). Notwithstanding this apparent gender difference, behaviours of a more serious nature (e.g., *rape*) yielded no significant differences, as both genders tended to perceive such behaviours as sexual harassment. According to Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) as well as Gervasio and Ruckdeschel (1992), the most salient factors in judgement of whether a particular incident constitutes harassment appear to be the severity or explicitness of the incident and the gender of the perceiver.

With regard to racial differences, 5 of the 10 items yielded statistically significant differences. These differences were the result of the following differences in perceptions: White participants perceived incidents of “*raids*” and *streaking* as subtle sexual harassment less often than did the other racial groups. *Unwanted touching, flashing* as well as *rape* was more often perceived by Black participants as constituting subtle sexual harassment compared to the other racial groups ( (see Table 7.9). Braine et al. (1995) as well as Daniels (2002) found that Black participants tended to acknowledge the existence of sexual harassment in general less often than did participants from other racial groups.

In terms of sexual orientation differences, 3 out of 10 items yielded statistically significant differences. These differences were brought about as a result of bisexual participants perceiving “*raids*” and, homosexual participants who perceived *stares (leering)* less often as forms of subtle sexual harassment (see Table 7.10). Heterosexual males and females differed significantly regarding their “general” (overall) sensitivity for behaviours perceived as subtle sexual harassment (see Table 7.11). However, contrary to what was expected, it appears from the results that no significant differences were reported among the following sexual orientation subgroups: (1) homosexual males and females, (2) heterosexual and homosexual females, and (3) heterosexual and homosexual males.

#### **8.4. TOLERANCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

It is evident from Table 7.12 that significant differences were found between the gender groups regarding the tolerance of subtle sexual harassment with the higher scores by female participants (indicating lower tolerance), that probably contributed to the significant differences between the two gender groups. Furthermore, the results of the present study indicated that male and female participants differed significantly on all items of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS). The only exception was item 7, which was found to bear no significant differences between the genders (see Table 7.13). The significant higher score of female participants on all items, except item 7, indicate that female participants have a lower tolerance of subtle sexual harassment compared to men.

The above findings correspond with those of Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) as well as the original Lott et al. (1982) study on which the items of this scale were based. In these previous two studies, scores suggested that men consider sexually related behaviour at university “more natural, more to be expected, and less problematic and serious than do

women” (Lott et al., p. 312). The findings of the two studies thus indicated that men are more accepting of such behaviours (higher tolerance) than women. The results of the present study confirmed these findings. The findings of the present study are also in agreement with those of Ford and Donis (1996) who found that younger women are less tolerant of sexual harassment than younger men. Ladebo and Shopeju (2004) also assumed that female students would be more likely to judge certain behaviours as sexual harassment than male students particularly in the university environment and the results of their research supported such an assumption.

The racial groups differed significantly regarding their tolerance of subtle sexual harassment (see Table 7.12). This significant difference can probably be attributed to the significantly lower score (indicating higher tolerance) of White participants who scored lower than the other racial groups. With regard to individual items the racial groups differed significantly on 9 of the 13 items (see Table 7.14). In most instances of significant difference between the races, Black and “Coloured” participants scored higher (indicating lower tolerance) compared to the other racial groups. The lower tolerance of White participants regarding subtle sexual harassment might possibly be explained by the fact that the White racial group has (generally) less exposure to such incidents (within general South African society) compared to other racial groups and therefore appear to be more sensitive to such incidents.

Regarding sexual orientation groups, no significant differences were yielded for overall tolerance (mean scores) among the groups (see Table 7.12). With regard to the individual items however, 2 of the 13 items (items 8 and 9) yielded a statistically significant difference between the groups (see Table 7.15). In terms of item 8, the significant difference could be attributed to the significantly higher score of the asexual sexual orientation group. And in the case of item 9, the significant difference could be the result of significantly higher scores from the asexual and “Unknown” sexual orientation groups. A comparison of the different sexual orientation subgroups (i.e., homosexual males and females, heterosexual males and females, heterosexual females and homosexual females, heterosexual males and homosexual males) yielded a statistically significant difference among heterosexual males and heterosexual females regarding the tolerance of subtle sexual harassment (see Table 7.16) with heterosexual females scoring higher (indicating less tolerance). This finding was expected given the higher rates of prevalence reported for subtle sexual harassment (see Section 8.5)

among this gender group, as well as the higher prevalence rates for what was perceived as forms of subtle sexual harassment reported by female participants (see Section 8.3). No other differences were found among the sexual orientation subgroups.

### **8.5. PREVALENCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

According to the results of the present study, significant differences were found on the total scores of the Prevalence for Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS), with females scoring significantly higher compared to men (see Tables 7.17 and 7.18). This indicates that females experienced incidents of subtle sexual harassment significantly more often than males. It must be noted however, that this rate of prevalence does not necessarily mean that female participants were subjected to a higher *number* of incidents of subtle sexual harassment, but rather that they reported having more often *experienced* such incidents, if and when they occurred, as forms of subtle sexual harassment. These findings are in line with those of Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) and Daniels (2002) who found that female participants reported having experienced significantly greater numbers of incidents of subtle sexual harassment compared to men. With regard to the racial groups, it appears from Table 7.17 that “Coloured” participants as well as the “Other” racial group scored higher on all items except two, compared to the White and Black participants, and it was these higher scores that contributed to the significant differences between the groups. This is not in line with the findings of Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) or Daniels (2002). However, this might be attributable to the fact that participants of other races were in the extreme minority in these studies. Table 7.20 reflects the differences of prevalence for subtle sexual harassment between the racial groups. It is clear from this Table that there is a significant difference in prevalence rates for all items between the groups with the exception of the item *unwelcome touching*. In terms of the sexual orientation groups, two of the six items yielded statistically significant differences. These differences could be attributed to the higher prevalence of *electronic harassment* among bisexual participants and the higher prevalence of incidents of *same sex harassment* among homosexual participants (see Table 7.22). A comparison of the different sexual orientation subgroups (i.e., homosexual males and females, heterosexual males and females, heterosexual females and homosexual females and heterosexual males and homosexual males) yielded a statistically significant difference between the heterosexual males and females (see Table 7.24). Heterosexual females reported higher prevalence rates for subtle sexual harassment compared to

heterosexual males. This finding was not unexpected. This is due to the lower degree of tolerance demonstrated by female participants in this study, as well as the higher prevalence rates of what was perceived as forms of subtle sexual harassment by this group. As has been argued before, males are also more likely to be the perpetrators of incidents of subtle sexual harassment, especially against female victims. The above findings can also be explained in terms of the socialisation and social learning theory which, as has been argued before, may lead men to believe that they are supposed to be the initiators of sexual relationships and that overt sexual behaviour is acceptable and less problematic than it might be for females in Western society.

### **8.6. GROUP HARASSMENT**

As can be seen from the results, both men (5.3%) and women (8.7%) had been the victims of stalking by a group of perpetrators (see Table 7.26). In the case of attempted rape by a group of perpetrators, 2 men or 0.3% of the total sample reported being victims compared to 13 women or 1.3% of the sample. In the case of rape by a group of perpetrators 5 men (0.7%) reported being the victim compared to 8 women (0.8%). These findings are very low compared to those of Fisher et al. (2000) who found that 48% of female students in their sample reported having been harassed (blatant harassment) by a group of male perpetrators and 6% of the female participants reported being harassed by a group of female perpetrators. Harassment by a single other woman was reported by 9% of participants. Fisher et al. (2000) also reported that 21% of male participants reported being the victim of group harassment (by other men) and 23% of male participants reported being harassed by a group consisting of both men and women (Fisher et al., 2000). From the results for the racial groups it is apparent that Black participants experienced group stalking and group rape more often than did the other racial groups (see Table 7.27). The "Coloured" participant group experienced more incidents of attempted group rape. In terms of the sexual orientation groups, the "Unknown" participants reported higher numbers of incidents of group stalking and attempted group rape and heterosexual participants higher prevalence rates for group rape compared to the other sexual orientation groups (see Table 7.28). The complete absence of available research in South Africa and insufficient international data, make comparison and interpretation of these results very difficult.

## 8.7. FAMILIARITY OF PERPETRATORS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

It has been reported that most victims of sexual harassment are familiar with the perpetrators of such acts (Fisher et al., 2000; Hill & Silva, 2005). Results from the present study support this assertion. For example, for incidents of stalking 76.6% of victims reported that they were familiar with the perpetrator of the sexual harassment. In the case of attempted rape 74% of victims and with rape 81.3% of victims knew the perpetrator (see Table 7.29). For both attempted rape and rape 9 out of 10 perpetrators in their study were known to their victims. The researchers reported that it was most often a boyfriend, ex-boyfriend, classmate, friend or acquaintance that was the perpetrator (Fisher et al., 2000). Furthermore, Gouws and Kritzinger (1995) reported that only 17% of the participants in their study reported not knowing the perpetrator of the victimisation and that in the majority of cases the perpetrator was reported as someone known to the victim, as an acquaintance (36%), a friend (26%) or a lover (18%).

It is evident from the results of the present study that more women reported knowing the perpetrator of the sexual harassment than was the case with men. In terms of the racial groups, Black and "Coloured" participants reported higher familiarity prevalence rates compared to the other racial groups (see Table 7.30). Also, among the sexual orientation groups, homo- and bisexual participants reported higher prevalence rates pertaining to the familiarity of perpetrators indicating that these groups knew the perpetrators of acts of sexual harassment more often than was the case with other sexual orientation groups (see Table 7.31). A possible explanation for this finding could be that familiarity with sexual partners is a more salient aspect of bi- and homosexual relationships. This is thought to be so because of the general need of such persons to be familiar with the sexual orientation status of a prospective partner prior to the establishment of such relationships. This need for knowing the sexual orientation of a partner is certainly more profound than it would be for heterosexual persons because heterosexuality is considered the normative (even default) sexual identity in Western culture. The researcher speculated that familiarity with a prospective partner is therefore an automatic by-product of such a process among these participants.

Possible significant statistical differences between the various subgroups were not investigated. This omission was discovered close to the deadline for submission of this study, but will be calculated for the purposes of future research. Such a calculation could however result in insignificant differences between the subgroups.

## 8.8. LOCATIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Results from the present study (see Table 7.32) indicate that locations where the participants resided (i.e., both on- and off-campus) yielded the highest prevalence rates of all locations of harassment perpetrated, with 25.4% of stalking, 21.6% of attempted rape and 32.4% of rape incidents having occurred there. The second most prevalent location for victimisation was harassment which occurred elsewhere on-campus and in university buildings. Prevalence rates for harassment in university buildings were as follows: stalking (10.9%), attempted rape (6.9%) and rape (5.4%). Prevalence rates for sexual harassment perpetrated elsewhere on-campus yielded prevalence rates for stalking of 16.4%, for attempted rape of 16.7% and rape of 10.8%. The third highest prevalence was a location somewhere in town and within the "Other" category, indicating locations elsewhere off-campus, for example a bar or nightclub (see Table 7.32). These findings are in accordance with those of other studies such as Fisher et al. (2000) who found that the majority of sexual victimisation occurred where the victim resided (e.g., living quarters). Fisher et al. (2000) reported a prevalence rate of 60% for rapes that occurred on-campus in the victim's place of residence. Fisher et al. (2000) also reported that on-campus living quarters (of a person other than the victim) were the site of the remainder of the rapes that were committed on campus (31%), and that 10.3% of all rapes on-campus had occurred in male residences (Fisher et al., 2000). (The latter finding could not be compared, as the questionnaire in the present research study did unfortunately not include an option where participants could report on the prevalence rates of harassment that occurred in residences other than their own). Fisher et al. (2000) also reported that in the case of other forms of sexual harassment (both blatant and subtle) such incidents took place in bars, dance clubs or nightclubs, a finding which is supported by the results of the present study.

It is easy to understand why prevalence rates for sexual harassment would be higher for incidents that occurred where the person resided or at the living quarters of someone else. It can be reasoned that these are the locations where students spend the majority of their free time and are also the locations where most sexually intimate activity is likely to take place. Also, it is interesting that relatively few incidents of blatant sexual harassment had occurred in a university building compared to other on-campus locations. This could be due to the presence of other students who might witness such acts being perpetrated and intervene or respond in some way. For purposes of the



present study, the category “Other” might include blatant sexual harassment that was perpetrated in university residences occupied by perpetrators of the opposite sex, as this was unfortunately not an option included in the questionnaire. Furthermore, it can be assumed that this category includes incidents that victims experienced off-campus. It must be remembered that participants were directed to report all incidents of sexual harassment they experienced since being enrolled as a student at this university, and this obviously would include incidents that occurred off-campus and those not experienced during the academic year. Furthermore, students had to report on incidents of blatant sexual harassment in this section (i.e., stalking, attempted rape and rape). The fact that relatively high percentages of such incidents were reported as having occurred on-campus leads the researcher to ask the question: Why have so few incidents of stalking, attempted rape and/or rape reported to on-campus authorities? During the eight years that the researcher has been a student of this university, only two incidents of rape have been publicly reported by the media as having occurred on-campus. Furthermore, a perusal of the official South African Police Service crime statistics for the past five years yields very low prevalence rates for attempted rape and rape on the campus of this university as well as incidents reported by students as having occurred elsewhere in the town of Stellenbosch (it is impossible to discern such statistics for the other three campuses as they are located within larger geographical areas). Why are so few of these incidents being reported to the university management, police or other agents of social control? Given the prevalence rates reported in the present study, one would hope that a sufficiently high number of formal complaints are made to on-campus structures for example the sexual harassment committee that was especially set up by the university management to deal with incidents of sexual harassment of both academic staff and students. The exact number of such cases reported to this committee (and other on-campus structures), ought to be publicised<sup>13</sup> to allow for the comparison with police and other available statistics and to enable further research analysis.

### **8.9. HELP-RESOURCE USE FOLLOWING EXPERIENCES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

From the results of the present study, it is evident that the help-resource most often utilised by victims of blatant sexual harassment is a friend (see Table 7.33). The second

---

<sup>13</sup> Currently all information (including number of reported cases) pertaining to reported cases of sexual harassment to the sexual harassment committee of Stellenbosch University is treated as confidential.

most common help-resource used is the parents of the victim, followed by siblings and other family members. Other forms of help seem to be less frequently utilised. Agents of social control (e.g., police and campus security) seem to be least utilised as forms of help-resources. These findings were also mirrored by the data reflected in the analysis of the racial subgroups (see Table 7.35). This finding also concurs with those of other studies (Gadlin, 1997; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Riger, 1991; Rowe, 1997; Rubin & Borgers, 1990; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1988, 1995), which have found that few women attempt to resolve sexual victimisation issues by formal means even when such means are well established and available. Cammaert (1985) found that many female victims choose not to file formal complaints and the most common responses to sexual harassment included telling a friend or family member of the experience. A study by Nasta et al. (2005) found that less than 22% of the female college/university students surveyed availed themselves of any available on-campus resources. The most commonly used help-resource in the above study, was the on-campus medical centre, which was visited by only 12% of study participants (Nasta et al., 2005). Interestingly, the above study also noted that awareness of available on-campus help-resources was high among women who experienced low levels of sexual harassment, but consistently lower among the group of women experiencing high levels thereof. The study also reported that women cited barriers such as concerns regarding confidentiality, fear, embarrassment, and guilt as reasons for not accessing help-resources following experiences of sexual victimisation (Nasta et al., 2005).

Close to a third of the students on the Stellenbosch University campus (being a residential university) live in university residences or other associated types of accommodation and many of these residents live far from their parents. This might account for the higher rate of utilisation of close friends as opposed to parents or other family members following experiences of blatant sexual harassment. The fact that formal agents of social control like the police and campus security might not be readily utilised by victims could be the result of a general mistrust in the efficacy of the South African Police Service (SAPS). This sense of mistrust could have “spilled-over” to the campus security services (Stellenbosch University Protection Services). Another possibility could be that victims of sexual harassment do not regard the arrest by the police and prosecution (successful or not) of a perpetrator, by the courts, as a form of “help”.

The relatively low levels of official help-resource utilisation (as compared to other forms of help-resource such as friends and family members) following experiences of both blatant and subtle sexual harassment, may also be attributable to the fact that research (Koss, 1985, 1990; Taylor et al., 1983) has reported a strong desire on the part of victims to not be labelled as victims. Koss (1990) argues that such labelling forces people to label themselves in a negative way and forces them to categorise themselves alongside other persons perceived as marginalized and/or stigmatised. Furthermore, it is to be expected that a person will more readily report an incident of blatant harassment to a friend or family member (being more familiar with such a person) than to official help-resources. However, the likelihood of incidents being reported to official help-resources, could be expected to increase depending on the severity of the experience.

Contrary to what was expected, health workers, campus psychological services and the student council seemed to be under-utilised as help-resources following experiences of sexual harassment. Reasons for low levels of utilisation of health workers and campus psychological services are unclear. Surely, a lack of faith in the efficiency and/or competency of on-campus healthcare workers cannot be the issue. However, it can be assumed that, because of the generally higher socio-economic bracket from whence most of the students hail, other private medical care might be the first port of call for victims as opposed to the university medical centre. Having said this, private medical care in South Africa is relatively expensive, which might put such services out of reach of some students. Also, there is a general mistrust of the public health sector. It must also be remembered that in many of the incidents reported, sufficient bodily injury might not have been sustained to warrant the seeking of formal medical care.

With regards to the campus psychological centre (Centre for Student Counselling and Development), the perceived limits to capacity of this centre might be a deterrent to prospective help-seekers, as this centre mainly provides short to medium term psychological intervention/counselling whereafter students (in the majority of cases) are referred to private practitioners if so required. In terms of help-resource use following incidents of subtle sexual harassment, it is evident that the resource most often utilised was a friend, followed by a parent, sibling and the "Other" category (see Table 7.36).

## 8.10. PSYCHOACTIVE SUBSTANCE USE AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT

From the literature it is clear that a striking relationship exists between sexual harassment and alcohol and/or drug use. Nasta et al. (2005) reported that 40% of the female college/university students surveyed reported an inability to resist unwanted sexual activity due to the simultaneous use of alcohol or drugs during such incidents. Rickert and Wiemann have noted that alcohol has clearly been identified as a contributing factor in date and acquaintance rape among young women (as cited in Nasta et al., 2005). In 1999 the Harvard School of Public Health conducted a study entitled the *College Alcohol Survey*, among full-time college/university students in the United States. In this study 2.3% of participants reported having had non-consensual sexual intercourse while intoxicated during the previous academic year. This amounts to some 110,000 college/university students who experience unwanted sexual intercourse as a result of their own excessive drinking (Nasta et al., 2005). Research by Koss and Dinero has furthermore illustrated that in the majority of cases of unwanted sexual activity, both victim and perpetrator were drinking at the time of the incident (as cited in Nasta et al., 2005). Results from the present study seem to support the above findings. It is clear from the results (see Table 7.37) that in the case of alcohol use, female participants reported that in 43.3% of cases their alcohol use probably contributed to the attempted rape. Regarding rape, female participants who had been raped reported that their use of alcohol probably contributed to the rape incident in 45.8% of cases. In the case of males 83.3% reported that their use of alcohol probably contributed to an incident of experiencing attempted rape and 50% to experiencing incidents of rape. With regard to attempted rape, 83.3% of male participants reported that alcohol probably contributed to the experience of an incident of blatant sexual harassment compared to 43.3% of female participants. Regarding rape, male and female participants reported very similar percentages, with males indicating that alcohol probably contributed to the experience of blatant sexual harassment in 50% of cases compared to 45.8% for females. Even though the difference in percentages appears large for attempted rape, statistical investigations did not yield significant differences between the gender groups. A possible explanation for this could be the relatively low frequencies on the part of male participants (see Table 7.37). It should be noted that low frequencies generally reduces the likelihood of statistical difference. Furthermore, in cases of low frequencies, such as the above, interpretation of the results needs to be performed with caution as such results do not offer conclusive evidence.

No statistically significant differences were found between the gender groups with regard to the use of drugs as very few respondents reported that their drug use probably contributed to incidents of blatant sexual harassment (see Table 7.38). These findings compare with those of Larmer et al. (1999) who found that experiences of sexual harassment were linked with increased substance use for both genders, with men showing a moderately higher level of substance use compared to women. Koss et al. (1987) found that female students were more likely to experience incidents of sexual harassment while under the influence of alcohol. These researchers claimed that alcohol use represents one of the most important risk factors for victimisation of women (Koss et al., 1987). Reed et al. (2009) have also noted that substance use by the victim increased vulnerability for sexual victimisation and that substance use is common among both victim and perpetrator.

In this regard a number of studies have noted that women who drink alcohol are at greater risk for sexual victimisation because men are likely to believe that a woman drinking alcohol is more sexually available and/or sexually promiscuous than would otherwise be the case and that men hold the belief that forcing sex on an intoxicated woman is more acceptable than a woman not drinking or drunk (Abbey, 2002; Finney, 2004; Gravitt & Krueger, 1998). Furthermore, the relationship between alcohol and rape and other forms of sexual harassment appears to be multifaceted, and alcohol may be both a precipitant of and an excuse for sexually aggressive behaviour by men (Berkowitz, 1992; Larimer et al., 1999). Also of importance is the fact that alcohol use is perceived by many students as an essential part of their social interaction and student life and that this habit increases social status. Men especially may also derive benefits from the use of alcohol and/or drugs because of the effect these substances may have on perception and behaviour. The decreased inhibition of thought and subsequent behaviour that these substances facilitate may be attractive to men seeking "courage" and a decrease in social awkwardness or inhibition. Behaviour that might not be performed under normal circumstances becomes possible to the person under the influence of a substance. It must also be remembered that alcohol especially forms an active part of the socialisation of both men and women in this particular culture and persons of this age group and in some cases even society at large may frown upon the abstinence from it. These results must be interpreted in the context of a university which has in the recent past, formally acknowledged that a problem with alcohol use exists

among students and acknowledged that the problem required urgent institutional attention.

## **8.11. EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

### **8.11.1. Blatant Subtle Harassment**

From the results of this study it is clear that between 15.2% (females experiencing academic effects after stalking) and 87.5% (females experiencing emotional effects after rape) of participants reported experiencing effects (i.e., social, emotional and/or academic) following blatant sexual harassment (see Table 7.39). A high percentage of both male and female participants reported suffering social, emotional and academic effects following incidents of attempted rape and rape. The percentages of participants who reported suffering effects following incidents of stalking, were lower compared to the other two types of harassment (see Table 7.39). From the results it is clear that male and female students did not differ significantly in terms of most of the effects suffered following incidents of blatant sexual harassment. A statistically significant difference was illustrated regarding the emotional effects following incidents of stalking between the two genders, with more women reporting more readily experiencing emotional effects after stalking (see Table 7.39). However, in terms of attempted rape and rape, no significant difference was recorded between the genders. Also, even if female participants experienced more emotional effects following incidents of stalking, this fact does not appear to impact on their social and academic functioning when compared to their male counterparts (see Table 7.39). In terms of racial groups, the percentage of participants who reported experiencing effects following incidents of stalking were relatively low (compared to the other forms of blatant sexual harassment) for all the racial groups, with between 3.6% and 41.9% of participants who reported that they experienced effects (i.e., social, emotional and/or academic) following such incidents (see Table 7.40). In terms of attempted rape and rape, between 27.3% (“Coloured” participants experiencing social effects after attempted rape) and 100% (Black, White and “Other” participants experiencing social, emotional and academic effects after rape and attempted rape).

### **8.11.2. Subtle Sexual Harassment**

Pertaining to subtle sexual harassment, significant differences were found between the genders regarding both social and emotional effects following incidents of such harassment (see Table 7.41). With female participants reporting higher rates of

prevalence for social and emotional effects following incidents of subtle sexual harassment. No significant differences were found between the racial groups regarding the effects of subtle sexual harassment (see Table 7.42). The finding that female students experience more social, emotional and academic effects following certain types of sexual harassment (in this case subtle sexual harassment) is supported in other studies. For example, Larimer et al. (1999) reported that women are more likely to experience depressive symptoms following incidents of harassment than is generally the case for men. Struckman-Johnson (1988) found that women were also more likely to experience adverse social consequences following incidents of sexual harassment, like social withdrawal and a decreased likelihood of establishing romantic relationships following experiences of sexual harassment.

Also, Banyard et al. (2007) found that men might be less likely to report symptoms, particularly psychological in nature, indicating a bias towards underreporting by this gender rather than the actual nature of the negative consequences that are suffered by them. Banyard et al. (2007) speculated that this decreased likelihood of men to report the effects they experience, might be due to the differences in coping mechanisms pertaining to emotional and other types of stress and/or differences in the way distress is expressed by men compared to women. In terms of the psychosocial theory of socialisation, it may be argued that men in Western society are socialised to exhibit less signs or displays of emotional and other types of distress, than women. This might lead to an underlying assumption in men to not report the effects suffered as a result of victimisation/harassment. Compared to this, women in our culture are generally socialised to be more exhibiting of their emotions and it is generally more socially acceptable for a woman to show signs of distress or upset than is the case for men. Women might therefore be more likely to report effects suffered as a result of sexual harassment.

The differences in terms of incidents of subtle sexual harassment experienced by the two genders, might be explained in terms of the social cognitive theory developed by Heider (1958), which posited that the impact that life events have on a person is closely related to his/her "attribution style". As has been explained in a previous section, the attributions (explanations) that victims generate following negative experiences will largely depend on the weighting given by them to either of two variables (i.e., internal disposition or external situations). Bearing this in mind, it is possible to speculate that

given the general positioning of women in a patriarchal context as well as the sex-role socialisation of females in Western society, as outlined by a number of feminist scholars (Brownmiller, 1975; Eyre, 2000; MacKinnon, 1979), women might have come to develop a sense of appropriating blame to themselves following sexual harassment experiences, instead of attributing such negative behaviour and its origin and consequent blame to external forces (e.g., the perpetrator).

### **8.12. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION, TOLERANCE AND PREVALENCE OF SUBTLE SEXUAL HARASSMENT**

It is clear from Table 7.43 that significant correlations ( $p < 0.01$ ) were found between the scores obtained on the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS) and the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (TSSHS), as well as between those on the Perception of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pe-SSHS) and the Prevalence of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale (Pr-SSHS). These significant correlations were expected and can be interpreted as follows: The higher the likelihood of a person perceiving behaviours as constituting incidents of subtle sexual harassment, the lower his/her tolerance levels for such incidents, and the more likely the person is to report such behaviours as subtle sexual harassment. The only unexpected finding was that a lower degree of tolerance among participants did not significantly correlate with the experience and/or reporting of incidents of subtle sexual harassment.

### **8.13. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

In the following section the limitations of the study as well as recommendations for future research will be discussed.

#### **8.13.1. Sample size**

The total sample of the present research study consisted of 1679 participants. This is by far the biggest sample of any study (i.e., prevalence or otherwise) into sexual harassment in Africa that the present researcher is aware of. The closest rival in this regard is the sample of 1083 that was obtained during the study of sexual harassment at the Faculty of Health Sciences at the University of the Witwatersrand in 1996. However, the total sample of this study dwarfs in comparison to those obtained by studies in the United States of America. Admittedly these studies were, in most cases, funded and conducted by well-funded educational institutions, non-governmental organisations or the U.S. government. Notwithstanding this, it must be noted that a larger sample would



have been preferable. Although a participation percentage of 7% (i.e., 1679 participants out of a possible 23 765 registered students), is in accordance with international standards regarding response rates for survey research, it is regrettable that such a large percentage of the student body available in 2007 chose not to participate in this study. The present researcher can only speculate as to the differences in prevalence rates that a larger sample could have yielded.

It must also be remembered that this particular sampling strategy has at least one important disadvantage which relates to the type of person recruited for participation. It is possible to argue that students who chose to participate in this study might differ in important respects from those who opted not to participate, and this possibility might impact on the type of data that the study yielded. Another important limitation in the present study, was the fact that no distinction was made between students on the basis of time spent enrolled as a student on the campus. It can be assumed that students who had spent a longer time (e.g., second year students up to postgraduate level), might have been more exposed to possible incidents of sexual harassment, compared to those who were enrolled as students for a shorter time period (e.g., first year students). There might be meaningful differences in prevalence rates between these groups, which were not investigated. A distinction of this nature is recommended for future research.

### **8.13.2. Length of questionnaire**

As has been noted previously, the questionnaire employed in the present research study contained 27 questions, with some containing various sub-sections. At the time the researcher had to make difficult decisions regarding which questions to include in the questionnaire and which to leave out. Some relevant and important questions were omitted from the questionnaire because it was believed that the document was too lengthy. The researcher feared that the length would impact negatively on participants' willingness to complete the questionnaire. It can be assumed that the length and degree of detail contained in the questions did have an effect on the number of participants that ultimately completed the questionnaire and that, had the questionnaire been less lengthy, more participants could possibly have been willing to participate in this study.

### **8.13.3. Layout of questions within questionnaire**

An issue that proved somewhat problematic was the fact that participants were questioned (either directly or by implication) on different types of sexual harassment

experiences via questions that were located throughout the questionnaire in a sometimes unsystematic fashion. No linking-system existed that would allow a participant to report on, for example, the prevalence of rape, and then allow the participant to conclude all questions pertaining to rape within that section before moving on to other sexual harassment types. This meant that many participants reported different rates of prevalence for the same type of harassment when answering questions throughout the questionnaire. The system rendered inconsistencies in the data that were generated and in the subsequent interpretation of the results.

#### **8.13.4. Absence of formal definitions of sexual harassment**

As has been noted in a previous chapter, the term sexual harassment (i.e., both blatant and subtle sexual harassment) was not defined, because it was argued that it would not be in the best interest of the study. As has been indicated previously, some studies (e.g., Fisher et al., 2000; Hill & Silva, 2005) have opted to provide narrow, clearly defined definitions for the types of sexual harassment they investigated. Other studies, such as the present one, as well as for example, Daniels (2002); Gouws and Kritzinger (1995); Pino and Johnson-Johns (2005) chose not to provide definitions. Both strategies have their advantages and disadvantages and it is therefore recommended that a comparative study of the two strategies be undertaken during future research.

#### **8.13.5. Time periods**

Participants in the present research study were requested to report on incidents of blatant and subtle sexual harassment that had occurred while they were enrolled students at this university. Participants were also requested to only report incidents of sexual harassment that had occurred on the particular campuses (or town where the campus was located) where they were studying at the time. Participants' responses recorded in the questionnaire did therefore not include incidents of sexual harassment that had taken place when the student was not enrolled, or incidents which took place during the academic year such as holidays and student breaks.

#### **8.13.6. The scope of the research**

The present study sought to investigate the prevalence of sexual harassment, by collecting data pertaining to the number of victims of incidents of sexual harassment. Little research attention was paid to issues relating to the perpetrator of sexual harassment. The study was not aimed at collecting data that would inform on the nature

of the sexual harassment perpetrator and the reasons for perpetration etcetera. This study could therefore be repeated to include the perspective of the perpetrator and to compare the dynamics present.

Furthermore, the present study was in essence a quantitative prevalence study. This type of study does not lend itself to research of a qualitative nature. A qualitative investigation of the experiences and/or perceptions of victims of the various types of sexual harassment, including attempted rape or rape was therefore not undertaken. In this regard it is important to remember that sections of the present study may be more specifically targeted for more in-depth investigations. This is especially important for variables such as responses to sexual harassment, effects of sexual harassment, risk factors for sexual harassment, perceptions of sexual harassment, sex differences regarding the perpetrators of sexual harassment, perpetrators of sexual harassment, familiarity of victim and perpetrator, men as targets of sexual harassment and same-sex sexual harassment. The dynamics of these variables ought to be studied in a qualitative manner.

#### **8.13.7. Comparison with previous research on sexual harassment**

The present study was conducted at Stellenbosch University, South Africa, and an attempt was made to compare the findings of the research with those of previous studies at this university and at universities elsewhere in South Africa, Africa and the world. It is recommended that studies replicating this study in its entirety or in part, be conducted at other South African universities, especially universities that also contain a large population of White Afrikaans and English speaking students, so that a comparison of the data could be made. This comparison would assist in answering questions arising from this research including such issues as whether or not the prevalence of subtle sexual harassment, the perceptions, effects and risk factors change over time and whether the results of the present study compare with that of other locations within South Africa, elsewhere in Africa and the world. Cases where the present research results differ from that of other studies should also be investigated more extensively.

#### **8.13.8. Other factors impacting on the research**

This study did not investigate variables relating to cognition, personality, age and/or emotional and cognitive maturity of the victim or perpetrator and the role that these variables might have played in mediating the effects of sexual harassment or whether

these variables might have acted as precipitants or causative factors for sexual harassment. Predictive variables (i.e., variables that may predict the experience, perception, responses and effects of sexual harassment), such as cognitive schemas (e.g., functional thinking, attitudes, beliefs), personality traits (e.g., stability of personality, hardiness, resilience) or variables related to age (e.g., level of intellectual maturity, life experience/exposure), socio-economic and socio-cultural variables (i.e., the economic and cultural environment of origin) and the effect these may have on the experiences and/or perceptions of incidents of sexual harassment have not been studied. Furthermore, the study did not for example account for the fact that certain participants were more advanced in age than others and the possible effect this might have had on the extent of exposure to incidents of sexual harassment and therefore the prevalence rate of such experiences. This should certainly be a focus for future research.

Variables such as the degree to which participants were informed about the concepts and/or definitions of sexual harassment, the help-resources (including agents of social control) and formal university structures available to them prior to the research being conducted were not studied. Also, the general level of awareness of students regarding the prevalence of sexual harassment on the campus and within the community at large was not investigated. Matters relating to the methods of coping with the effects of sexual harassment on an emotional (e.g., phases of processing feelings of trauma, denial, guilt, rejection etc), and on a spiritual/religious, social and cognitive level were also not studied.

Furthermore, in terms of the locations of sexual harassment, the researcher did not anticipate the possible confusion that might have resulted from the location where the participant resided. For example, a student who lives in private accommodation, who is raped in a university residence/hostel, would identify such a location as a “university building”. A student who resides in a university residence/hostel and is raped there might have identified this location as “where you stay” and might regard all other locations/buildings as “university buildings”. This lack of clarity was not anticipated and it is recommended that it be more clearly delineated for future research.

An important limitation was the fact that the researcher omitted to calculate the percentage of participants who utilised any help-resource following incidents of blatant and subtle sexual harassment. It would be possible to manually calculate such

percentages for the purposes of future publications, even if such calculations cannot be done via the statistical packages.

Another limitation of the study pertains to the very concise definition of stalking that was used in the questionnaire. This definition was included in order to provide a short description of this concept to participants. However, in retrospect it appears as if this description allowed for a too wide interpretation of the concept. Therefore, the use of a more precise operational definition of stalking on prevalence reporting is recommended for investigation in future research.

With regard to the tolerance of subtle sexual harassment, the researcher found the scale used, namely the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale, somewhat problematic. This was due to the fact that a low score on this scale indicated higher tolerance and vice versa. The researcher found that this fact made the interpretation of results cumbersome and it is therefore recommended that the name of this scale be changed to the "Intolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale" for the purposes of future research.

#### **8.14. CONCLUSION**

In this chapter the results of the study was discussed. This was done in the order of the objectives of the study. An outline of the limitations of the study as well as recommendation for future research were provided. In the next chapter a summary of the research study is compiled and recommendations for future research are presented.

## CHAPTER NINE

### SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

#### 9.1. SUMMARY

The purpose of the present research study was to inform on the extent and nature of sexual harassment among a student sample at Stellenbosch University. The motivation for the study was based on the shortage of research investigating sexual harassment prevalence rates at institutions of higher learning in South Africa and the African continent. The researcher is of the view that studies such as the present one advanced our understanding of sexual harassment as a phenomenon which plagues our society and impacts negatively on the lives of a great number of people. The main aims of the present study were to determine the prevalence of blatant and subtle sexual harassment. In addition to this, the researcher set out to determine the degree of tolerance of subtle sexual harassment among participants, the prevalence of subtle sexual harassment within the sample, as well as the prevalence of group sexual harassment, the prevalence of the familiarity of the perpetrator and the location of the sexual harassment incidents. The prevalence of help-resource use by victims following incidents of sexual harassment and the relationship between the use of psychoactive substances and the incidents (occurrences) of sexual harassment was also studied. Furthermore, the effects of sexual harassment on the victim, be it social, emotional and/or academic, was also ascertained. In addition to this, the relationship between the perception, tolerance and prevalence of sexual harassment among participants in the study, was investigated. Also, this study attempted to outline the different definitions of sexual harassment. An exposition of different behavioural types that reside under the umbrella name of sexual harassment, for example blatant types such as rape, attempted rape and stalking as well as a variety of subtle sexual harassment types were provided. Numerous theoretical perspectives were employed to explain the origins of sexual harassment and the effects of such harassment on victims. Attention was also paid to the factors that influence, sustain and foster the entrenchment and perpetration of sexual harassment in society. In the literature review an overview was given of the categories and types of sexual harassment. A review of the extent of sexual harassment on university campuses was provided as well as an analysis of prevalence studies conducted at African universities. In addition the focus fell on previous research on sexual harassment, university residences as focal points of sexual harassment, the

effects of sexual harassment, responses to sexual harassment, effects of sexual harassment, risk factors for sexual harassment, perceptions of sexual harassment, perpetrators of sexual harassment, sex differences regarding the perpetrators of sexual harassment, sex differences in victims of sexual harassment, familiarity of perpetrators men as targets of sexual harassment, the phenomenon of same-sex sexual harassment as well as the deficiencies in previous research on sexual harassment. The research design took the form of a questionnaire that covered the time period during which the students were enrolled at Stellenbosch University. Both undergraduate and post-graduate students from the four campuses of Stellenbosch University (i.e., Bellville, Saldanha, Stellenbosch and Tygerberg) were invited to participate in the study. The total sample consisted of 1679 students. The electronic questionnaire consisted of a total of 27 separate questions with some containing various sub-sections. The most important findings of the research were that a sizeable percentage of participants reported being the victim of at least one incident of stalking and that disturbingly high prevalence rates were reported for attempted rape and rape. It was also found that significant differences exist between the genders and racial groups regarding what behavioural types are perceived as constituting incidents of subtle sexual harassment. In terms of the degree of tolerance of subtle sexual harassment, significant differences were also found between the genders and the racial groups. Results of the study indicate that incidents of subtle sexual harassment were prevalent among the sample, that sexual harassment by a group of perpetrators occurs infrequently, and that victims were familiar with the perpetrators of sexual harassment in most of the cases. In terms of the location of sexual harassment, it was found that most incidents occurred on-campus and where the participants resided. The results furthermore indicate that help-resource use was relatively low among participants and that psychoactive substances contributed to the experience of a sizeable number of incidents of sexual harassment. Regarding the effects suffered following incidents of blatant and subtle sexual harassment, it was reported that a significant differences exist between the gender groups. Finally, significant correlations were demonstrated between the perception, tolerance and prevalence of subtle sexual harassment. In conclusion, the recommendations for future research as well as the limitations of the study were outlined.

## 9.2. RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section the recommendations proposed as well as limitations identified in Chapter Eight will be summarised point by point.

- 9.2.1. Sample size: A larger sample could have yielded differential results.
- 9.2.2. Length of questionnaire: The questionnaire might have been somewhat lengthy. Had it been shorter in length more students might have been willing to participate in the study.
- 9.2.3. Layout of the questionnaire: The questionnaire could have been organised in a more systematic fashion. Also, the introduction of a linking-system in order to link various sections of the questionnaire should be investigated.
- 9.2.4. Absence of formal definitions of sexual harassment: The present researcher opted not to include a formal definition for the various types of sexual harassment. Other studies have chosen to narrowly define such concepts. Both strategies have advantages and disadvantages. A comparative study of the two strategies is recommended for future research.
- 9.2.5. Time periods: The present study requested participants to only report incidents of sexual harassment that had occurred while they were enrolled students at Stellenbosch University, and only incidents that occurred on the campus (or town where the campus was located). This did not include other incidents of sexual harassment that might have occurred elsewhere and during other time periods. This could be investigated.
- 9.2.6. The scope of the research: The study focused on the prevalence of sexual harassment by collecting data pertaining to the number of victims of incidents of sexual harassment. The study was not aimed at collecting data that would inform on the nature of the sexual harassment perpetrator and/or the reasons for perpetration. Such an investigation is recommended for future research. Also, the present study was a quantitative study and therefore did not lend itself to qualitative investigations. A qualitative investigation of the experiences and/or perceptions of victims of the various types of sexual harassment were not undertaken. Certain sections of this study could be targeted for more in depth investigations.



- 9.2.7. Comparison with previous research on sexual harassment: The present study was conducted in Stellenbosch, South Africa. It is recommended that studies replicating this study in its entirety or in part, be conducted at other South African universities.
- 9.2.8. Other factors impacting on the research: This study did not investigate variables related to cognition, personality, age and/or emotional and cognitive maturity of the victim or perpetrator and the role that these variables might have played in mediating the effects of sexual harassment or whether these variables might have acted as precipitants or causative factors for sexual harassment. This could be investigated for future research.

Variables such as the degree to which participants were informed about the concepts and/or definitions of sexual harassment, the help-resources and formal university structures available to them prior to the research being conducted were not studied. This could be investigated in future research.

In terms of the locations of sexual harassment, the researcher did not anticipate the possible confusion that might result from the location where the participant resided. Clarity in this regard is recommended for future research.

The researcher omitted to calculate the percentages of participants who utilised any help-resource following incidents of sexual harassment. Such calculations would be recommended for future research.

The very concise definition of stalking provided in the questionnaire might have allowed for a too wide an interpretation of the concept. The use of a more precise operational definition (and/or a study comparing the effects of the two strategies) is recommended for future investigations.

The present researcher found the interpretation of high scores indicating low tolerance in the case of the Tolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale, somewhat problematic. It is recommended that the name of this scale be changed to the "Intolerance of Subtle Sexual Harassment Scale" in order to reduce confusion.

### **9.3. CONCLUSION**

In conclusion I would like to state that conducting this study was a personally enriching and rewarding experience. It is my sincere hope that this research will stimulate future research undertakings and that the findings and recommendations presented, will be purposefully applied to further our understanding of this challenging and complex phenomenon. In this regard, I also express the wish that this study will heighten overall sensitivity towards this important societal issue, and that the findings contained herein will be practicably applied for the benefit of South African society and beyond.

## REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. (1991). Acquaintance rape and alcohol consumption on college campuses: How are they linked? *Journal of American College Health, 29*, 165-169.
- Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 14*, 119-128.
- Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., McDuffie, D., & McAuslan, P. (1996). Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 147-169.
- Acierno, R., Resnick H., Kilpatrick, D. G., Saunders, B., & Best, C. L. (1999). Risk factors for rape, physical assault, and post-traumatic stress disorder in women: Examination of differential multivariate relationships. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 13*(6), 541-563.
- Ackard, D. M., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2002). Date violence and date rape among adolescents: Associations with disordered eating behaviours and psychological health. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 26*, 455-473.
- Adult Video News. (1998). *The 1998 annual entertainment guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Van Nuys Publishing.
- Allen, M., Emmers, T., Gebhart, L., & Giery, M. A., (1995). Exposure to pornography and acceptance of rape myths. *Journal of Communication, 45*(1), 5-26.
- Anderson, P. B., & Aymami, R. (1993). Reports of female initiation of sexual contact: Male and female differences. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 22*, 335-343.
- Anonymous, (1981). This is what you thought about fear of crime. *Glamour, 31*, 34-35.
- Backhouse, C., & Cohen, L. (1978). *The secret oppression: Sexual harassment of working women*. Toronto: Macmillan.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. New York, NY: General Learning Press.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Banyard, V. L., Ward, S., Cohn, E. S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. *Violence and Victims, 22*, 52-70.

- Barak, A., Fisher, W. A., & Houston, S. (1992). Individual difference correlates of the experience of sexual harassment among female university students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 17-37.
- Baron, L., & Strauss, M. A. (1987). Four theories of rape: A macro-sociological analysis. *Social Problems, 34*(5), 467-489.
- Baumeister, R. F. (Ed.). (2001). *Social psychology & human sexuality*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Baxter, D. J., Barbaree, H. E., & Marshall, W. L. (1986). Sexual responses to consenting and forced sex in a large sample of rapists and nonrapists. *Behavioural Research & Therapy, 24*, 513-520.
- Beck, A. T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. New York, NY: International University Press.
- Beck, A. T., Emery, G., & Greenberg, R. L. (1985). *Anxiety disorders and phobias: A cognitive perspective*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Beck, A. T., & Young, J. E. (1985). Depression. In D. H. Barlow (Ed.). *Clinical handbook of psychological disorders: A step by step treatment manual* (pp. 206-244). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bennett, J. (2002). *Sexual violence/sexual harassment: A Handbook of resources*. University of Cape Town: African Gender Institute.
- Bennet, S., Farrington, D. P., & Rowell Huesmann, L. (2003). Explaining gender differences in crime and violence: The importance of social cognitive skills. *Aggression & Violent Behaviour, 10*(3), 263-288.
- Benson, D. J., & Thomas, G. E. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confidence of authority relations, sexual interest and gender stratification. *Social Problems, 29*, 236-251.
- Berkowitz, A. (1992). College men as perpetrators of acquaintance rape and sexual assault: A review of recent research. *Journal of American College Health, 40*, 175-181.
- Berman Bradenburg, J. (1997). *Confronting sexual harassment: What schools and colleges can do*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Braine, J. D., Bless, C., & Fox, P. M. C. (1995). How do students perceive sexual harassment? An investigation on the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg campus. *South African Journal of Psychology, 25*(3), 140-148.

- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women and rape*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Brown Travis, C. (Ed.). (2003). *Evolution, gender, and rape*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bularzik, M. (1978). Sexual harassment at the workplace: Historical notes. *Radical American*, 12, 25-43.
- Burgess, A. W., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1977). Rape trauma syndrome. In D. Chappell, R. Geis & G. Geis (Eds.), *Forcible rape: The crime, the victim and the offender*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bursik, K. (1992). Perceptions of sexual harassment in an academic context. *Sex Roles*, 27, 410-412.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.
- Burt, M. R., & Estep, R. (1981). Who is a victim? Definitional problems in sexual victimization. *Victimology*, 6, 15-28.
- Burt, M. R., & Katz, B. L. (1985). Rape, robbery and burglary: Responses to actual and feared criminal victimization, with special focus on women and the elderly. *Victimology*, 10, 325-358.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmidt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204-232.
- Cammaert, L. P. (1985). How widespread is sexual harassment on campus? *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 8, 388-397.
- Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(6), 630-646.
- Cassel, E., & Bernstein, D. A. (2007). *Criminal behaviour*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Carrell, M. R., Elbert, N. F., Hatfield, R. D., Grobler, P. A., Marx, M., & Van der Schyf, S. (1998). *Human resource management in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Prentice Hall.
- Champion, H. L., Foley, K. L., DuRant, R. H., Hensberry, R., Altman, D., & Wolfson, M. (2004). Adolescent sexual victimization, use of alcohol and other substances, and other health risk behaviours. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 35, 321-328.
- Christopher, F. C. (1988). An initial investigation into a continuum of premarital sexual pressure. *Journal of Sex Research*, 25, 255-266.

- Clark, L., & Lewis, D. (1977). *Rape: The price of coercive sexuality*. Toronto: The Women's Press.
- Copenhaver, S., & Grauerholz, E. (1991). Sexual victimisation among sorority women: Exploring the link between sexual violence and institutional practices. *Sex Roles, 24*, 31-41.
- Craig, M. E. (1990). Coercive sexuality in dating relationships: A situational model. *Clinical Psychology Review, 10*, 395-423.
- Cresswell, J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Crocker, P. L. (1983). An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 219-224.
- Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2003). What mad pursuit?: Obsessive relational intrusion and stalking related phenomenon. *Aggression & Violent Behaviour, 8*(4), 345-375.
- Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2004). *The dark side of relational pursuit: From attraction to obsession to stalking*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Curtis, L. A. (1976). Present and future measures of victimization in forcible rape. In M. J. Walker, & S. L. Brodsky (Eds.), *Sexual assault* (pp. 61-68). Lexington, MA: Heath Publishing.
- Dabbs, J. M., Jr., Carr, T. S., Frady, R. L., & Riad, J. K. (1995). Testosterone, crime and misbehaviour among 692 male prison inmates. *Personality and Individual Differences, 18*(5), 627-633.
- Dabbs, J. M., Frady R. L., Carr, T. S., & Besch, N. F. (1987). Saliva testosterone and criminal violence in young adult prison inmates. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 49*, 174-182.
- Dabbs, J. M., Jr., Jurkovic, G. J., & Frady, R. L. (1991). Saliva testosterone and cortisol among late adolescent male offenders. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 19*, 469-478.
- Daly, M. (1978). *Gyn/Ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press
- Dancaster, L. (1991). Sexual harassment in the workplace: Should South Africa adopt the American approach? *Industrial Law Journal, 12*(3), 449-461.

- Daniels, P. I. (2002). *Perceptions of sexual harassment amongst university students: A case study of the South African Military Academy*. Unpublished master's thesis, Stellenbosch University.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *The origin of species by means of natural selection*. New York, NY: Mentor Publishing.
- Dastile, N. P. (2004). *Victimisation of female students at the University of Venda with specific reference to sexual harassment and rape*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Pretoria.
- Dawkins, R. (1976). *The selfish gene*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Defence Manpower Data Centre (DMDC). (1990). *Sexual harassment in the military*: DMDC Report No. 1990-026. Martindale, M. Arlington, VA.
- Defence Manpower Data Centre (DMDC). (1996). Department of Defence. *Sexual Harassment Questionnaire* DMDC Report No. 1996-014. Bastian, L.D., Lancaster, A.R., & Reyst, H.E. Arlington, VA.
- Defence Manpower Data Centre (DMDC). (2003). *Status of the Armed Forces Questionnaire Workplace and gender relations*. DMDC Report No. 2003-26, Lancaster, A.R., & Lipari, R.N. Arlington, VA.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Kelly, K. (1993). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Canadian university and college dating relationships. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 18, 137-159.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. & Swartz, M. D. (1998). *Woman abuse on campus: Results from the Canadian national survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (1995). *Labour Relations Act, Act 66 of 1995*. Pretoria. (Government Gazette, Vol. 378, No. 17678).
- Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (1996). *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996*. Pretoria. (Government Gazette, Vol. 458, No. 25346).
- Department of Justice and Constitutional Development (2007). *Sexual offences and Related Matters Amendment Act, Act 32 of 2007*. Pretoria. (Government Gazette, Vol. 865, No. 31330).
- Depression and Anxiety Group (2008). Retrieved November 1, 2009, from <http://www.sadag.co.za/index.php/PTSD/rape-and-post-traumatic-stress-disorder.html>

- Douglas, K. S., & Dutton, D. G. (2001). Assessing the link between stalking and domestic violence. *Aggression & Violent Behaviour, 6*, 519-546.
- Ellis, A. (1977). The basic clinical theory of rational-emotive therapy. In A. Ellis & R. Grieger (Eds.), *Handbook of rational emotive therapy*. (pp. 3-34). New York, NY: Springer.
- Ellis, L. (1989). *Theories of rape: Inquiries into the causes of sexual aggression*. New York, NY: Hemisphere Publishing.
- Elliot, L., & Brantley, C. (1997). *Sex on campus: The naked truth about the real sex lives of college students*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Ellison v Brady* (54 FEP Cases 1347, 1991, USCA, 9<sup>th</sup> Circ.)
- Eyre, L. (2000). The discursive framing of sexual harassment in a university community. *Gender & Education, 12*(3), 293-307.
- European Commission (1991). Recommendation of 27 November 1991 on the protection of the dignity of women and men at work, including the code of practice to combat sexual harassment, *Office Journal, 49*, 1-8.
- Faculty of Health Science (1997). *Report on students' perceptions of sexual and racial abuse in the Health Sciences Faculty*. University of the Witwatersrand.
- Faley, R. H., Knapp, D. E., Kustis, G. A., & Dubois, C. L. Z. (1999). Estimating the organizational cost of sexual harassment: The case of the US army. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 13*(4), 461-484.
- Felton, A. J., Gumm, A., & Pittenger, D. J. (2001). Recipients of unwanted sexual encounters among college students. *College Student Journal, 35*, 135-142.
- Finchilescu, G. (1997). Sexual harassment on a South African university campus: Reverberations from apartheid. *Sexuality & Culture, 1*, 191-211.
- Finkelhor, D., & Yllo, K. (1985). *License to rape: Sexual abuse of wives*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Finkelson, L. & Oswald, R. (1995). College date rape: Incidence and reporting. *Psychological Reports, 77*, 526-530.
- Finney, A. (2004). Alcohol and sexual violence: Key findings from research. *Home Office: Research, development and statistics directorate findings, 215*. ISSN 1473-8406.
- Fisher, S. (1998). Crime in the Ivory Tower: The level and sources of student victimisation. *Criminology, 36*, 671-710.



- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (Research Report No. NCJ 182369). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990). Sexual harassment: The definition and measurement of a construct. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory Power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 213-230). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. & Ormerod, A. J. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The influence of gender and context. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 281-294.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Schullman, S. L. (1993). Sexual harassment: A research analysis and agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 42, 5-27.
- Ford, C. A., & Donis, F. (1996). The relationship between age and gender in workers' attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Journal of Psychology*, 30(6), 627-633.
- Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools*, 503 U.S. 274 (1998).
- Fremouw, W. J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 42(2), 666-669.
- Frieze, I. H. (2000). Violence in close relationships: Development of a research area: Comment on Archer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 681-684.
- Gadlin, H. (1997). Mediating sexual harassment. In B. R. Sandler & R. J. Shoop (Eds.), *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students* (pp. 186-201). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 9, 251-266.
- Gervasio, A., & Ruckdeschel, K. (1992). College students' judgements of verbal sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 190-211.
- Glazer-Schuster, I. M. (1979). *New women of Lusaka*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Golding J. M., Wilsnack, S. C., & Cooper, M. L. (2002). Sexual assault history and social support: Six general population studies. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 15(3), 187-197.
- Gould, J. L., & Gould, C. G. (1997). *Sexual selection: Mate choice and courtship in nature*. New York, NY: Scientific American Library.

- Gouws, A., & Kritzinger, A. (1995). Sexual harassment of students: A case study of a South African university. *SA Sociological Review*, 7, 1-24.
- Gravitt, G. W., Jr., & Krueger, M. M. (1998). College students' perceptions of the relationship between sex and drinking. *Sexuality & Culture*, 1, 175-190.
- Gruber, J. E., & Bjorn, L. (1982). Blue-collar blues: The sexual harassment of women auto workers. *Work & Occupations*, 8, 271-298.
- Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace: Impact of sexual behaviour and harassment on women, men and organisations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38, 55-74.
- Gutek, B. A., Morasch, B., & Cohen, A. G. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behaviour in a work setting. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 22, 30-48.
- Hamlin, J. (2001). *List of rape myths*. Retrieved September 13, 2009, from <http://www.dumn.edu/cla/faculty/jhamlin/3925/myths.html>
- Hannon, R., Kuntz, T., Van Laar, S., Williams, J., & Hall, D. S. (1996). College students' judgement regarding sexual aggression during a date. *Sex Roles*, 35, 765-780.
- Harmon, R. B., Rosner, R., & Owens, H. (1998). Sex and violence in a forensic population of obsessional harassers. *Psychology, Public Policy & Law*, 4(1), 236-249.
- Harnett, J. J., Robinson, D., & Singh, B. (1989). Perceptions of males and females toward sexual harassment and acquiescence. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 4, 291-298.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Hendrix, W. H. (2000). Perceptions of sexual harassment by student-employee classification, marital status, and female racial classification. *Journal of Social Behaviour & Personality*, 15(4), 529-544.
- Hendrix, W. H., Rueb, J. D., & Steel, R. P. (1998). Sexual harassment and gender differences. *Journal of Social Behaviour & Personality*, 13, 235-252.
- Hill, C., & Silva, E. (2005). *Drawing the line: Sexual harassment on campus*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women.
- Hills, A., & Taplin, J. (1998). Anticipated responses to stalking: Effect of threat and target stalker relationship. *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law*, 5(1), 139-146.
- Himelein, M. J. (1995). Risk factors for sexual victimization in dating: A longitudinal study of college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19, 31-48.

- Hobson, C. J., & Guziewicz, J. (2002). Sexual harassment preventive/protective practices at US colleges and universities. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 21(2), 17-29.
- Jagger, A. M. (1988). *Feminist politics & human nature*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Little Field.
- Jewkes R., Sen, P., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2002). In E. Krug, L. L. Dahlberg, J. A. Mercy, A. B. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World report on violence and health* (pp. 213-239) Geneva: World Health Organization Report.
- Johnson, A. G. (2005). *The gender knot: Unravelling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Jones, E. E., Kannouse, D. E., Kelly, H. H., Nisbett, R. E., Valins, S., & Weiner, B. (Eds.) (1972). *Attribution: Perceiving the cause of behaviour*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- J v M Ltd.*, (1989 ILJ 755: 757H)
- Kalof, L. (1993). Rape-supportive attitudes and sexual victimization experiences of sorority and nonsorority women. *Sex Roles*, 29, 767-780.
- Kastl, M. A., & Kleiner, B. H. (2001). New developments concerning discrimination and harassment in universities. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 21(8), 156-164.
- Katz, R. C., Hannon, R., & Whitten, L. (1996). Effects of gender and situation on the perception of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 34, 35-42.
- Kirkpatrick, C., & Kanin, E. J. (1957). Male sex aggression on a university campus. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 52-58.
- Koss, M. P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristic. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9, 193-212.
- Koss, M. P. (1988). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in the national sample of students in higher education. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.). *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 241-256). New York, NY: Praeger.
- Koss, M. P. (1990). Changed lives: The psychological impact of sexual harassment. In Paludi, M. A. (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 73-92). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Koss, M. P. (1992). The underdetection of rape: Methodological choices influence incidence estimates. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 61-75.

- Koss, M. P. (1993). Detecting the scope of rape: A review of prevalence research methods. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*, 198-222.
- Koss, M. P. (1996). The measurement of rape victimization in crime questionnaires. *Criminal Justice & Behaviour, 23*(1), 55-69.
- Koss, M. P., & Burkhardt, B. R. (1989). A conceptual analysis of rape victimization: Long term effects and implications for treatment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13*, 27-40.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1989). Discriminant analysis of risk factors for sexual victimization among a national sample of college women. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 57*, 242-250.
- Koss, M. P., Dinero, T. E., Seibel, C. A., & Cox, S.L. (1988). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 1-24.
- Koss, M. P., & Gaines, J. A. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8*, 94-108.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimisation in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.
- Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual experiences questionnaire: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 50*, 455-457.
- Kramarae, C., & Treichler, P. A. (1985). *A feminist dictionary*. London: Pandora Publishing.
- Ladebo, O., & Shopeju, J. (2004). Sexual harassment: Perceptions and coping strategies among undergraduate students in Nigeria. *Acta Academica, 36*(3), 223-238.
- Larimer, M. E., Lydum, A. R., Anderson, B. K., & Turner, A.P. (1999). Male and female recipients of unwanted sexual contact in a college student sample: Prevalence rates, alcohol use, and depression symptoms. *Sex Roles, 40*, 295-308.
- Lehrer, J. A., Lehrer, V. L., Lehrer, E. L., & Oyarzún, P. (2007). Sexual violence in college students in Chile. *International Family Planning Perspectives, 33*(4), 168-175.

- Lenhart, S. A. (2004). *Clinical aspects of sexual harassment and gender discrimination: psychological consequences and treatment interventions*. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Le Vine, R. A. (1977). Gussi sex offences: Study in social control. In D. Chappell, R. Geis, & G. Geis (Eds.), *Forcible rape: The crime, the victim and the offender* (pp. 47-66). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1990). Motives and psychodynamics of self-reported, unincarcerated rapists. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 60, 268-280.
- Logan, T. K., Leukefeld, C. G., & Walker, R. (2000). Stalking as a variant of domestic violence: Implications for young adults. *Violence & Victims*, 15(1), 91-111.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case study. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8(2), 296-319.
- Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson*, 477 U.S. 57 (1986).
- Metha, A., & Nigg, J. (1983). Sexual harassment on campus: An institutional response. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, & Counsellors*, 46, 9-15.
- McCahill, T. W., Meyer L. C., & Fischman, A. M. (1979). *The aftermath of rape*. Lexington, MA: Heath Publishing.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sex discrimination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1989a). Sexuality, pornography, and method: Pleasure under patriarchy. *Ethics*, 99(2), 314-346.
- MacKinnon, C. A., (1989b). *Towards a feminist theory of the state*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Matchen, J., & DeSouza, E. R. (2000). The sexual harassment of faculty members by students. *Sex Roles*, 41, 295-306.
- Mayekiso, T.V., & Bhana, K. (1997). Sexual harassment: Perceptions and experiences of the University of Transkei. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 24(4), 230-235.
- McCreedy, K. R., & Dennis, B. G. (1996). Sex-related offences and fear of crime on campus, *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 12(1), 69-80.

- Meloy, J. R., & Gothard, S. (1995). A demographic and clinical comparison of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 152*, 258-263.
- Mischel, W. (1970). Sex typing and socialisation. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Carmichael's manual of child psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 3-72). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Mills, C. S., & Granoff, B. J. (1992). Date and acquaintance rape among a sample of college students. *Social Work, 37*, 504-509.
- Muehlenhard C., & Cook S. (1988). "Real men" don't say no: Do men have sex when they don't want to? *Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 58-72.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*(2), 186-196.
- Murphy, R. F. (1959). Social structure and sex antagonism. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, 15*, 84-98.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). A routine activity theory explanation for women's stalking victimizations. *Violence Against Women, 5*(1), 43-62.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2002). Sexual assault of college women: A feminist interpretation of a routine activities analysis. *Criminal Justice Review, 27*(1), 89-123.
- Nasta, A., Shah, B., Brahmanandam, S., Richman, K., Wittels, K., Allsworth, J. et al. (2005). Sexual victimization: Incidence, knowledge, and resource use among a population of college women. *Journal of Paediatric & Adolescent Gynaecology, 18*(2), 91-96.
- Nel, S. S. (1993). A comparative review of the law regarding sexual harassment in the workplace. *De Jure, 26*(2), 244-258.
- Nevid, J. S., Spencer, A. R., & Greene, B. (2008). *Abnormal psychology in a changing world*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Nurius, P. S., Norris, J., Dimeff, L. A., & Graham, T. L. (1996). Expectations regarding acquaintance sexual aggression among sorority and fraternity members. *Sex Roles, 35*, 427-444.
- Ouimette, P. C., & Riggs, D. (1998). Testing a mediational model of sexually aggressive behaviour in nonincarcerated perpetrators. *Violence Victims, 13*, 117-130.
- Paludi, M. A. (1990). *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Paludi, M. A. (1997). How to stop sexual harassment in our schools. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 152-174). Toronto: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pateman, C. (1988). *The sexual contract*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pino, N. W., & Johnson-Johns, A. M. (2009). College women and the occurrence of unwanted sexual advances in public drinking settings. *Social Science Journal, 46*(2), 252-267.
- Porter, J. F., & Critelli, J. W. (1992). Measurement of sexual aggression in college men: A methodological analysis. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21*, 525-542.
- Powell, G. N. (1986). Effects of sex-role identity and sex on definitions of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 14*, 81-95.
- Pryor, J. B. (1985). The layperson's understanding of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 13*, 273-286.
- Pryor, J. B., & Day, J. D. (1988). Interpretations of sexual harassment of university students. *Sex Roles, 18*, 405-417.
- Quinsey, V. L. (1984). Sexual aggression: Studies of offenders against women. In D. Weisstub (Ed.), *Law and mental Health*, (Vol. 1, pp. 84-121). New York, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Rabinowitz, V. C. (1990). Coping with sexual harassment. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 103-118). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Reed, E., Amaro, H., Matsumoto, A., & Kaysen, D. (2009). The relation between interpersonal violence and substance use among a sample of university students: Examination of the role of victim and perpetrator substance use. *Addictive Behaviours, 34*, 316-318.
- Reiter, R. R. (1975). *Towards an anthropology of women*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Resick, P. A., Monson, C. M., & Rizvi, S. L. (2007). Posttraumatic stress disorder. In D.H. Barlow (Ed.), *Clinical handbook of psychological disorders: A step by step treatment manual* (4<sup>th</sup>. ed., pp. 65-122). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ridley, M. (1993). *The red queen: Sex and the evolution of human nature*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Riger, S. (1991). Gender dilemmas in sexual harassment policies and procedures. *American Psychologist, 46*, 497-505.

- Robinson v Jacksonville Shipyards* (54 FEP Cases 83, 1988, DC Mfla)
- Ropelato, J. (2007). *Internet pornography statistics*. Retrieved September 2, 2009, from <http://internet-filter-review.toptenreviews.com/internet-pornography-statistics.html>
- Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 173-220). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Rowe, M. (1997). An effective, integrated complaint resolution system. In B. R. Sandler, & R. J. Schoop (Eds.), *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students* (pp. 22-49). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Rubin, L. J., & Borgers, S. B. (1990). Sexual harassment in universities during the 1980s. *Sex Roles, 23*, 397-410.
- Russell, B. L., & Oswald, D. L. (2002). Sexual coercion and victimization of college men: The role of love styles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 273-285.
- Sanday, P. R. (1981). The socio-cultural context of rape: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Social Issues, 37*(4), 5-27.
- Sanday, P. R. (1990). *Fraternity gang rape: Sex, brotherhood, and privilege on campus*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Sanday, P. R. (1996). *A woman scorned: Acquaintance rape on trial*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Sandler, B. R., & Shoop, R. J. (Eds.) (1997). *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Seto, M. C., Maric, A., & Barbaree, H. E. (2001). The role of pornography in the etiology of sexual aggression. *Aggression & Violent Behavior, 6*(1), 35-53.
- Shainess, N. (1976). Psychological significance of rape. *New York State Journal of Medicine, 76*, 2044-2048.
- Shea, M. (1993). The effects of selective evaluation on the perception of female cues in sexually coercive and noncoercive males. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 22*, 415-432.
- Sinclair, H. C., & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Initial courtship behaviour and stalking: How should we draw the line? *Violence & Victims, 15*(1), 23-40.
- Smart, C. (1989). *Feminism and the power of law*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Snyman-Van Deventer, E., & De Bruyn, J. (2001). Sexual harassment in South African and American law. *Acta Academica Supplementum, 1*, 196-221.



- So-Kum Tang, C., Critelli, J. W., & Porter, J. F. (1995). Sexual aggression and victimization in dating relationships among Chinese college students. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 24*(1), 47-53.
- Sorenson, S. B., & Siegel, J. M. (1992). Gender, ethnicity, and sexual assault: Findings from a Los Angeles study. *Journal of Social Issues, 48*, 93-114.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (2007). The state of the art of stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression & Violent Behaviour, 12*, 64-86.
- Spitzberg, B. H., Nicastro, A. M., & Cousins, A. V. (1998). Exploring the interactional phenomenon of stalking and obsessive relational intrusion. *Communication Reports, 11*, 34-37.
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Rhea, J. (1999). Obsessive relational intrusion and sexual coercion victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*(1), 3-20.
- Stanko, E. (1993). Ordinary fear: Women, violence and personal safety. In P. Bart, & E. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 155-165). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Steinem, G. (1980). Erotica and pornography: A clear and present difference. In L. Lederer (Ed.), *Take back the night: Women on pornography* (pp. 35-39). New York, NY: William Morrow & Co.
- Stockard, J., & Johnson, M. M. (1979). The social origins of male dominance. *Sex Roles, 5*, 199-218.
- Stockdale, M. S. (1996). *Sexual harassment in the workplace: Perspectives, frontiers and response strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stockdale, M. S., Wood, M., & Batra, L. (1999). *Same sex sexual harassment against men: Toward a broader theory of sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.
- Struckman-Johnson, C. J. (1988). Forced sex on dates: It happens to men, too. *Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 234-240.
- Struckman-Johnson, C. J., & Struckman-Johnson, D. L. (1994). Men pressured and forced into sexual experiences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 23*, 93-114.
- Sugar daddies leave bitter taste. (2009). Retrieved September 14, 2009, from [http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss\\_News&set\\_id=1&click\\_id=79&art\\_id=vn\\_20090326061632261C316763](http://www.iol.co.za/index.php?from=rss_News&set_id=1&click_id=79&art_id=vn_20090326061632261C316763)
- Sutherland, C. (1991). Sexual harassment: A darker side of campus life. *Agenda, 11*, 7-10.

- Schwartz, M. D., DeKeseredy, W. S., Tait, D., & Alvi, S. (2001). Male peer support and a feminist routine activities theory: Understanding sexual assault on the college campus. *Justice Quarterly*, *18*, 623-649.
- Synovitz, L. B., & Byrne, T. J. (1998). Antecedents of sexual victimization: Factors discriminating victims from nonvictims. *Journal of American College Health*, *46*(4), 151-158.
- Tata, J. (1993). The structure and phenomenon of sexual harassment: Impact of category of sexual harassing behaviour, gender, and hierarchical level. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *23*, 199-211.
- Taylor, C. S. (2004). *Surviving the legal system: A handbook for adult and child sexual assault survivors and their supporters*. Melbourne: Coulomb Communications.
- Taylor, S. E., Wood, J. V., & Lichtman, R. R. (1983). It could be worse. Selective evaluation as a response to victimization. *Journal of Social Issues*, *39*, 19-40.
- Thomas, A. M., & Kitzinger, C. (1997). *Sexual harassment: Contemporary feminist perspectives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Till, F. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students*. Washington, D.C. National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the national violence against women questionnaire*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice. Report No. NCJ 183781.
- Turell, S. C. (2000). Acquaintance/date rape. In A. Howard, & F. Kavenik (Eds.), *Handbook of American women's history* (2<sup>nd</sup>. ed., pp. 5-6). New York, NY: Sage Press.
- Twinamasiko, O. (2008). *Uganda: Sexual harassment at University: Is dress to blame?* Retrieved September 4, 2009, from <http://allafrica.com/stories/200806250122>.
- UCLA Sexual Harassment Questionnaire Committee (1985). A questionnaire of sexual harassment. *Administrative Report*: February, 1985.
- US Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2008). *National crime victimization survey*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- US Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB). (1981). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- US Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB). (1988). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: An update*. Washington, D.C. U.S.: Government Printing Office.
- US Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB). (1995). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Walby, S. (1994). *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Waldo, C. R., Berdahl, J. L., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1998). Are men sexually harassed? If so, by whom? *Law and Human Behaviour*, 22(1), 59-79.
- Watkins, G. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to centre*. London: Pluto Press.
- Weeks, E. L., Boles, J. M., Garbin, A. P., & Blount, J. (1986). The transformation of sexual harassment from a private trouble into a public issue. *Sociological Inquiry*, 56, 432-455.
- Weiner, B. (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Herrnstein, R. J. (1985). *Crime and human nature*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Wise, S., & Stanley, L. (1987). *Georgie Porgie. Sexual harassment in everyday life*. New York, NY: Pandora Publishing.
- Workman, J. E., Johnson, K. K. P. (1991). The role of cosmetics and attributions about sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 24, 759-769.

**APPENDIX 1 - E-mail invitation document****Seksuele Teisterings Vraelys / Sexual Harassment Questionnaire** Page 1 of 2Departement Sielkunde / Department of Psychology [[frs@sun.ac.za](mailto:frs@sun.ac.za)]

Sent: 21 October 2007 01:52 PM

To: [frs@sun.ac.za](mailto:frs@sun.ac.za)

---

(For English, please see below)

Departement Sielkunde  
Universiteit van Stellenbosch

Geagte student

Uitnodiging aan studente om deel te neem aan 'n ondersoek oor die voorkoms van Seksuele Teistering op kampus:

'n Studie word tans onderneem wat daarop gemik is om ondersoek in te stel na die voorkoms van seksuele teistering onder studente. Elke student sal uitgenooi word om deel te neem.

Die vraelys is totaal ANONIEM en VERTROULIK. Jou response sal nie aan jou, In e-posadres of 'n rekenaar gekoppel word nie. Dit is NIE nodig om jou naam, studentenommer of enige ander identifiseerbare data te verskaf NIE.

Deelname aan hierdie studie is geheel en al VRYWILLIG en deelnemers kan te eniger tyd aan die vraelys ontrek.

Die studie word uitgevoer onder die toesig van Dr. Charl Nortje (021-8083449) met Prof. Amanda Gouws (021-808 2116) as mede-supervisor.

Die navorser is Francois Steenkamp (083 697 2313) 'n M.A. (Sielkunde) student.

Klik asseblief op die onderstaande skakel om na die vraelys herlei te word.

Baie dankie dat jy die tyd neem om aan hierdie belangrike studie deel te neem.

Francois Steenkamp  
Departement Sielkunde

Goedkeuring vir hierdie projek is verleen deur die Etiekkomitee van Subkomitee A van die Navorsingskomitee van die Senaat, verwysingsnommer: 59/2007. Vir navrae in verband met hierdie goedkeuring, kontak die Koördineerder Navorsing (Geesteswetenskappe), Mev. Maryke Hunter-HOsselman by 021-8084623 in die Afdeling Navorsingsontwikkeling. Die studie word onderneem vir die doeleindes van 'n M.A. (Sielkunde) graad. Die doelwit van die studie is 'n ondersoek na die insidensie van seksuele teistering onder studente van die Universiteit van Stellenbosch. Die vraelys word geberg, onderhou en versprei met behulp van die Afdeling Informatietegnologie aan die Universiteit van Stellenbosch.

---

Department of Psychology  
Stellenbosch University

Dear student

Invitation to students to participate in a study into the incidence of Sexual Harassment on campus:

A study is currently being undertaken aimed at investigating the incidence of Sexual Harassment amongst students on campus. Every student will be invited to participate.

This questionnaire is completely ANONYMOUS and CONFIDENTIAL. Your responses will never be linked to you, your e-mail account or your PC. You do NOT need to provide your name, student number or any other identifiable data.

Participation in this study is completely VOLUNTARY and participants are able to withdraw from the study at any time.

The study is conducted under the supervision of Dr. Charl Nortje (021-808 3449) and Prof. Amanda Gouws (021-808 2116) as co-supervisor.

The researcher is Francois Steenkamp (083 697 2313) an M.A. (Psychology) student.

Please click on the link below to be relayed to the questionnaire.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this very important study.

Francois Steenkamp  
Department of Psychology

Approval to conduct this study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Subcommittee A of the Research Committee of the Senate, reference number: 59 / 2007. For enquiries regarding approval for this study, contact the Coordinator: Research (Social Sciences), Mrs. Maryke Hunter-Husselman at (021-808 4632) in the Division of Research Development. The study is conducted for the purposes of an MA (Psychology) degree. The aim of the study is to investigate the incidence of sexual harassment amongst students of Stellenbosch University. The questionnaire is hosted, maintained, and distributed with the assistance of the Division of Information Technology of Stellenbosch University.

---



APPENDIX 2 – Questionnaire

[Click here](#) to take the survey.

Language: English

\*Dui asseblief aan in watter taal jy die vraelys wil beantwoord.

*Please choose the language in which you would like to answer the questionnaire.*

Die vraelyste is identies. The questionnaires are identical.

- Afrikaans
- English

\*Dui asseblief jou Fakulteit aan:

- AgriWetenskappe
- Bestuurskool (Bellville)
- Ekonomiese en Bestuurswetenskappe (Stellenbosch)
- Gesondheids Wetenskappe (Tygerberg)
- Ingenieurswese
- Krygskunde (Saldanha)
- Lettere en Sosiale Wetenskappe
- Natuurwetenskappe
- Opvoedkunde
- Regsgeleerdheid
- Teologie
- Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:

\*Wat is jou ouderdomsgroep?

- 18-20
- 21-23
- 24-26
- 27-29
- 30 of ouer

\*Wat is jou geslag?

- Manlik
- Vroulik



\*Woon jy in universiteitsbehuising?

Nee

Ja Verskaf asseblief die naam van die behuising:

\*Wat is jou geloofsoortuiging?

Christen

Islam (Moslem)

Hindoe

Joods

Boeddhis

Nie gelowig

Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:

\*Tot watter tradisionele etniese groep behoort jy?

Swart

Kleurling

Wit

Indiër

Asiër

Ek verkies om dit nie te antwoord nie

Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:

•Indien jy 'n akademiese jaar as 12 maande beskou, hoeveel volle jare en maande studeer jy reeds aan die Universiteit van Stellenbosch?  
(bv., 1 jaar, 11 maande)

Jaar(e)

Maand(e)

•Dui asseblief jou studierigting aan:  
(bv., B.A. (Taal en Kultuur))

Wat is jou huwelikstatus?  
(Indien geskei, merk asseblief meer as een opsie).

Alleenloper

In 'n verhouding

Getroud

Geskei

Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:

NB! Alle vrae in hierdie vraelys verwys na die tyd sedert jy as student by die Universiteit van Stellenbosch ingeskryf het en slegs insidente wat binne die grense van enige van die vier (4) kampusse van die Universiteit van Stellenbosch (d.w.s., Stellenbosch, Tygerberg, Bellville & Saldanha), plaasgevind het.

Watter van die volgende sal jy as seksuele teistering beskou?  
(Dui asseblief aan deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk).

|  | Kies hier:               |
|--|--------------------------|
| Om beoordeel ('being rated') te word op grond van jou voorkoms (bv., toekenning van 'n punt uit tien deur ander) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Koshuisstrooptogte ('raids')   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Herhaalde onwelkome versoeke vir 'n afspraak ('date')  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Seksistiese opmerkings en grappe gemik op individue of groepe  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Wolwe-fluit  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Kaalnael ('Streaking')   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ontbloting ('Flashing')  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ongewenste aanraking/betasting   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Staar met seksuele bedoelinge ('leering')  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Verkragting  | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Ongeveer hoeveel KEER was jy die SLAGOFFER van die volgende tipes SEKSUELE TEISTERING?

(Dui asseblief aan deur die geskikte opsie(s) te merk).

|  | Baie gereeld          | Gereeld               | Soms                  | Selde                 | Nooit                 |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Herhaaldelike onwelkome versoeke tot 'n afspraak ('date')  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Onwelkome aanraking  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Seksistiese kommentaar en/of grappies ten koste van jou en/of jou geslag   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Om beoordeel ('being rated') te word op grond van jou voorkoms (bv., toekenning van 'n punt uit tien deur ander) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Elektroniese teistering (bv., ongewenste e-posse van 'n seksuele aard, pornografie ens.)                         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Selfde-geslag seksuele teistering (d.w.s., teistering deur 'n persoon van dieselfde geslag as jy)                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

\*Ongeveer hoeveel KEER was jy die slagoffer van die volgende tipes seksuele teistering?  
(Dui asseblief aan deur 'n getal in die geskikte blok(ke) te plaas, (bv., 0,1,4,6 ens.) As dit nie voorgekom het nie, plaas 'n nul in die blokkie.

|  | *Aantal<br>kere:     |
|--|----------------------|
| 'Stalking' (d.w.s, aanhoudende onwelkome kontak) | <input type="text"/> |
| Poging tot verkragting                           | <input type="text"/> |
| Verkragting                                      | <input type="text"/> |

Soms is daar, by DIESELFDE GELEENTHEID, MEER AS EEN oortreder betrokke by 'n insident van seksuele teistering, dit word genoem = groep-teistering. Ongeveer hoeveel KEER was jy die slagoffer van GROEP-TEISTERING?

(Dui asseblief aan deur 'n **getal** in die geskikte blok(ke) te plaas, (bv., 1,4,6 ens.) As dit nie voorgekom het nie, laat die blokkie oop.

|                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
|                        | Aantal<br>kere:      |
| 'Stalking'             | <input type="text"/> |
| Poging tot verkragting | <input type="text"/> |
| Verkragting            | <input type="text"/> |

Ongeveer hoeveel KEER was die oortreder(s) van dieselfde GESLAG as jy, en hoeveel keer was die persoon van die TEENOORGESTELDE geslag?

(Dui asseblief aan deur 'n **getal** in die geskikte blok(ke) te plaas, (bv., 1,4,6 ens.) As dit nie voorgekom het nie, laat die blokkie oop.

|                        |                      |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                        | Dieselfde            | Teenoorgestelde      |
| 'Stalking'             | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Poging tot verkragting | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Verkragting            | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

Let wel: Indien jy nulle by elk van die volgende drie (3) blokke invul, sal jy na die laaste afdeling van hierdie vraelys geneem word. Die res van die vrae sal wegval aangesien dit nie op jou van toepassing sal wees nie.

Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

Ongeveer hoeveel KEER was die oortreder BEKEND aan jou?

(Dui asseblief aan deur 'n getal in die geskikte blok(ke) te plaas, (bv., 1,4,6 ens.) As dit nie voorgekom het nie, laat die blokkie oop.

|                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
|                        | Aantal<br>kere       |
| 'Stalking'             | <input type="text"/> |
| Poging tot verkragting | <input type="text"/> |
| Verkragting            | <input type="text"/> |

Ongeveer hoeveel KEER was daar aanduidings dat die gebruik van substansies (ALKOHOL en/of DWELMS) waarskynlik bygedra het tot die insident(e) van seksuele teistering?

(Dui asseblief aan deur 'n getal in die geskikte blok(ke) te plaas, (bv., 1,4,6 ens.) As dit nie voorgekom het nie, laat die blokkie oop.

|                        |   |   |
|------------------------|---|---|
|                        | Substans<br>gebruik<br>deur<br>die<br>oortreder | Substans<br>gebruik<br>deur<br>die<br>slagoffer |
| 'Stalking'             | <input type="text"/>                            | <input type="text"/>                            |
| Poging tot verkragting | <input type="text"/>                            | <input type="text"/>                            |
| Verkragting            | <input type="text"/>                            | <input type="text"/>                            |

Indien jy die slagoffer was van 'stalking', poging tot verkragting of verkragting, het jy te eniger tyd om hulp aangeklop by enige op-kampus of buite-kampus hulpdienste na afloop van jou ervaring?

(Dui asseblief aan deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk. Merk 'n blok selfs al het jy slegs een keer met 'n persoon oor 'n insident gepraat.)

|  | Stalking                 | Poging tot verkragting   | Verkragting              |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Vriend   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ouer   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Broer / Suster                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ander familielid                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Studente-adviseur                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SR / 'HK' lid                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gesondheidswerker (d.w.s. dokter, sielkundige) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Religieuse werker (d.w.s. dominee, pastoor)    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Polisie  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| USBD   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SSVO   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ander  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



Indien jy die slagoffer van 'stalking', poging tot verkragting en/of verkragting was, waar het hierdie insident (e) plaasgevind?

(Dui asseblief aan deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk.)

|                             | Stalking                 | Poging tot verkragting   | Verkragting              |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Waar u woon                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In 'n universiteitsgebou    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elders op kampus            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In 'n kroeg of nagklub      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elders op die dorp / stad   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Onseker waar dit gebeur het | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ander                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Indien jy die slagoffer van enige vorm van seksuele teistering BUITEN (UITGESONDERD) 'stalking', poging tot verkragting en/of verkragting was, het jy te eniger tyd om hulp aangeklop by op-kampus of buite-kampus hulpdienste na afloop van jou ervaring?

(Dui asseblief aan deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk.)

|   | Baie gereeld             | Gereeld                  | Matiglik                 | Selde                    | Nooit                    |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Vriend  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ouer  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Broer / Suster                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Studente-adviseur                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SR / 'HK' lid                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gesondheidswerker (d.w.s., dokter, sielkundige) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Religieuse werker (d.w.s., dominee, pastoor)    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Polisie   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| USBD  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SSVO  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ander   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Indien jy die slagoffer van enige vorms van seksuele teistering BUITEN (UITGESONDERD) 'stalking', poging tot verkragting en/of verkragting was, waar het hierdie insident(e) plaasgevind en hoeveel keer?

(Dui asseblief aan deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk.)

|                             | Baie gereeld             | Gereeld                  | Matiglik                 | Selde                    | Nooit                    |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Waar jy woon                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In 'n universiteitsgebou    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elders op kampus            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In 'n kroeg of nagklub      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elders in die dorp/stad     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Onseker waar dit gebeur het | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Ander                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

In hoeveel van die gevalle was daar aanduidings dat die gebruik van substansies (ALKOHOL en/of DWELMS) waarskynlik bygedra tot die insident(e) van POGING TOT VERKRAGTING?  
(Dui asseblief aan deur 'n getal in die geskikte blok(ke) te plaas, (bv., 1,4,6 ens.) As dit nie voorgekom het nie, laat die blokkie oop.

|  |                      |                      |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|
|  | Alkohol              | Dwelms               |
| Substans gebruik deur die oortreder      | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Substans gebruik deur jou (as slagoffer) | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

In hoeveel van die gevalle was daar aanduidings dat die gebruik van substansies (ALKOHOL en/of DWELMS) waarskynlik bygedra het tot die insident(e) van VERKRAGTING?  
(Dui asseblief aan deur 'n getal in die geskikte blok(ke) te plaas, (bv., 1,4,6 ens.) As dit nie voorgekom het nie, laat die blokkie oop.

|                                   |                      |                      |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                                   | Alkohol              | Dwelms               |
| In die geval van die oortreder    | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| In die geval van jou as slagoffer | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

Het jy op enige stadium aan van die GEVOLGE, soos hieronder genoem, gely na afloop van die voorval(le) van 'stalking', poging tot verkragting of verkragting?  
(Dui asseblief die frekwensie aan deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk).

|   | Stalking                 | Poging tot verkragting   | Verkragting              |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Sosiale gevolge (bv., vermyding van sosiale situasies, sukkel om vriende te maak) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Emosionele gevolge (bv., woede, depressie, angs)                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Akademiegevolge (bv., onderprestasie, swak konsentrasie)                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Indien jy die slagoffer van enige vorm van seksuele teistering BUITEN (UITGESONDERD) 'stalking', poging tot verkragting of verkragting, het jy enige van die onderstaande gevolge ervaar?  
(Dui asseblief aan deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk.)

|                    | Baie gereeld             | Gereeld                  | Soms                     | Selde                    | Nooit                    |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Sosiale gevolge    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Emosionele gevolge | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Akademiegevolge    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



## Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

In die volgende afdeling word jou opinie oor 'n aantal stellings gevra. Dit sal vir ons voordelig wees as jy jou oorwegende seksuele oriëntasie kan aandui. Sodoende sal jou response beter verstaan kan word. (Indien jy bereid is, dui asseblief jou seksuele oriëntasie hieronder aan).

- Hetero-seksueel
- Homo-seksueel
- Bi-seksueel
- A-seksueel (d.w.s., geen seksuele gevoelens)
- Onseker
- Verkies om dit nie te antwoord nie
- Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:

\*Hieronder verskyn 'n aantal stellings met vyf (5) moontlike response.

(Dui asseblief die graad waartoe jy saamstem of verskil met elke stelling deur die geskikte blok(ke) te merk.)

|  | Stem sterk saam       | Stem saam             | Onseker               | Verskil               | Verskil sterk         |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Die meeste vrouens ervaar dikwels tergerey deur mans as van 'n seksuele aard (d.w.s., met 'n seksuele ondertoon).                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 'n Aantreklike vrou moet seksuele toenadering van mans te wagte wees en leer hoe om dit te hanteer.                                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Die meeste vroue probeer dikwels mans met wie hulle op kampus in aanraking kom, uit te lok ('tempt').                              | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Die meeste mans word maklik uitgelok ('tempted') deur die seksuele toenadering van vroue met wie hulle op kampus in aanraking kom. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 'n Man moet leer dat 'n vrou se 'nee' ten opsigte van seksuele toenadering werklik nee beteken.                                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ongewenste seksuele aandag van mans aan vroue help om vroue op hul plek te hou.  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Dit is aanvaarbaar wanneer vrouens hul seksualiteit inspan ten einde hul loopbaan te bevorder.                                     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 'n Aantreklike man moet seksuele toenaderings van vroue te wagte wees en moet leer hoe om dit te hanteer.                          | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Ek glo dat seksuele teistering 'n groot probleem op kampus is.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Dit is aanvaarbaar vir 'n man om seksuele toenadering te soek by 'n vrou wie hy aantreklik vind.                                   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Onskuldige flirtasie maak 'n werk- of studiedag interessant en is daarom aanvaarbaar.  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Die uitlok van dosente se seksuele belangstelling word dikwels deur vroue gebruik ten einde akademiese voordeel te verkry.         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Indien 'n vrou seksueel geteister word terwyl sy onder die invloed van alkohol en dwelms is, is dit waarskynlik haar eie skuld.    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

## Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

\*Please indicate your faculty:

- AgriSciences
- Arts & Social Sciences
- Business School (Bellville)
- Economic & Management Sciences (Stellenbosch)
- Education
- Engineering
- Law
- Health Sciences (Tygerberg)
- Military Sciences (Saldanha)
- Science
- Theology
- Other, please specify:

\*What is your age group?

- 18 - 20
- 21 - 23
- 24 - 26
- 26 - 29
- 30 or older

\*What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

Do you live in a university residence?

- No
- Yes (Please specify the name of the residence):

What is your religious preference?

- Christian
- Islam (Muslim)
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Buddhist
- Non-religious
- Other, please specify:

To which traditional ethnic group do you belong?

- Black
- Coloured
- White
- Indian
- Asian
- I choose not to answer
- Other, please specify:

\*If you regard an academic year as 12 months, how many full years and months have you been a student at Stellenbosch University?  
(E.g., 1 year, 11 months)

Year(s)

Month(s)

\*Please indicate your course of study:  
(E.g., B.A. (Languages and Culture))

Please indicate your marital status:  
(If divorced, please check more than one option.)

Single

In a relationship

Married

Divorced

Other, please specify:

Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

NB! All questions in this questionnaire refer to the time since you enrolled as a student at Stellenbosch University and only incidents that occurred within the borders of any of the four (4) campuses of Stellenbosch University (i.e., Stellenbosch, Tygerberg, Bellville & Saldanha).

Which of the following would you regard as sexual harassment?  
(Please indicate by checking the appropriate box(es).

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
|  | Click here:              |
| Being 'rated' (e.g., 'given' a mark out of ten by others) based on your appearance | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hostel/residence 'raids'   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Repeated unwelcome requests for dates  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sexist remarks and jokes aimed at individuals or groups                            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Wolf-whistling   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Streaking  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Flashing   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unwanted touching/fondling   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Stares with sexual intentions (leering)  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Rape   | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Approximately how many TIMES were you the VICTIM of the following types of SEXUAL HARASSMENT?  
(Please indicate by selecting the appropriate option(s).

|   | Very often            | Often                 | Sometimes             | Seldom                | Never                 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Repeated unwelcome requests for dates   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Unwelcome touching  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Sexist comments and jokes at the expense of yourself and/or your gender             | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Being 'rated' (e.g., 'given' a mark out of ten) based on your appearance            | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Electronic harassment (i.e., unwanted e-mails of a sexual nature, pornography etc.) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Same sex sexual harassment (i.e., harassment by a person of the same gender as you) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Please note: If you put zeros in each of the three (3) boxes below, you will be re-directed to the last section of this questionnaire. All of the other questions will be skipped as they will not apply to you.

\*Approximately how many TIMES were you the victim of the following types of sexual harassment?  
(Please indicate by placing a number in each of the boxes (e.g., 1,4,6 etc.) If nothing occurred place a zero in the block.

|  | *Amount<br>of<br>times: |
|--|-------------------------|
| Stalking (e.g., continuous unwelcome contacting) | <input type="text"/>    |
| Attempted rape                                   | <input type="text"/>    |
| Rape   | <input type="text"/>    |

## Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

Sometimes there is MORE THAN ONE offender involved at the SAME TIME during a specific incident of sexual harassment; this is called = group harassment. Approximately how many TIMES were you the victim of GROUP HARASSMENT?

(Please indicate by placing a number in each of the boxes (e.g., 1,4,6 etc.) If nothing occurred leave the block blank.

|                | Amount<br>of<br>times: |
|----------------|------------------------|
| Stalking       | <input type="text"/>   |
| Attempted rape | <input type="text"/>   |
| Rape           | <input type="text"/>   |

Approximately how many TIMES were the offender(s) of the SAME gender as you, and how many times of the OPPOSITE gender?

(Please indicate by placing a number in each of the boxes (e.g., 1,4,6 etc.) If nothing occurred leave the block blank.

|                | Same:                | Opposite:            |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Stalking       | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Attempted rape | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Rape           | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |



Approximately how many TIMES were the offender(s) KNOWN to you?  
 (Please indicate by placing a number in each of the boxes (e.g., 1,4,6 etc.) If nothing occurred leave the block blank.

|                |                        |
|----------------|------------------------|
|                | Amount<br>of<br>times: |
| Stalking       | <input type="text"/>   |
| Attempted rape | <input type="text"/>   |
| Rape           | <input type="text"/>   |

Approximately how many TIMES were there indications that the use of substances (ALCOHOL and/or DRUGS) probably contributed to the occurrence of sexual harassment related to stalking, attempted rape and/or rape?  
 (Please indicate by placing a number in each of the boxes (e.g., 1,4,6 etc.) If nothing occurred leave the block blank.

|                |   |                                       |
|----------------|---|---------------------------------------|
|                | Substance<br>use by<br>the<br>offender: | Substance<br>use by<br>the<br>victim: |
| Stalking       | <input type="text"/>                    | <input type="text"/>                  |
| Attempted rape | <input type="text"/>                    | <input type="text"/>                  |
| Rape           | <input type="text"/>                    | <input type="text"/>                  |

If you were the victim of stalking, attempted rape and/or rape, did you at any time seek help from any on or off-campus support services following your experience?  
 (Please indicate from whom you sought help by placing a check in the appropriate box(es). Check a box even if you only talked to a person once about an incident).

|  | Stalking                 | Attempted rape           | Rape                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Friend   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Parent   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Brother / Sister   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other family member  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student advisor  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SRC / HK member  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Health care professional<br>(doctor, psychologist, social<br>worker) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| USBD   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SSVO   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



## Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

If you were the victim of stalking, attempted rape and/or rape where did these incidents take place?

(Please indicate by placing a check in the appropriate box(es)).

|                             | Stalking                 | Attempted rape           | Rape                     |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Where you stay -            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In a university building    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elsewhere on campus         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| In a bar or night club      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Elsewhere in town / city    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Uncertain where it happened | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If you were the victim of any form of sexual harassment OTHER THAN stalking, attempted rape and/or rape did you at any time seek help from any on or off-campus support services following your experience?

(Please indicate by placing a check in the appropriate box(es). Put a check even if you only talked to a person once about an incident).

|  | Very often               | Often                    | Uncertain                | Seldom                   | Never                    |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Friend   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Parent   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Brother / Sister   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other family member  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Student advisor  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SRC / HK member  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Health care professional<br>(doctor, psychologist, social<br>worker) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Religious worker   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| USBD   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If you were the victim of any form of sexual harassment OTHER THAN stalking, attempted rape and/or rape where did these incidents take place and how many times?

(Please indicate by selecting the appropriate option(s)).

|                             | Very often            | Often                 | Uncertain             | Seldom                | Never                 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Where you stay              | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| In a university building    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Elsewhere on campus         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| In a bar or nightclub       | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Elsewhere in town / city    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Uncertain where it happened | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Universiteit van Stellenbosch / Stellenbosch University

How many times were there indications that the use of substances (ALCOHOL and/or DRUGS) probably contributed to the occurrence of the ATTEMPTED RAPE?

(Please indicate by placing a number in each of the boxes (e.g., 1,4,6 etc.) If nothing occurred leave the block blank.

|                               |                      |                      |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                               | Alcohol:             | Drugs:               |
| Substance use by the offender | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Substance use by you (victim) | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

How many times were there indications that the use of substances (ALCOHOL and/or DRUGS) probably contributed to the occurrence of the RAPE?

(Please indicate by placing a number in each of the boxes (e.g., 1,4,6 etc.) If nothing occurred leave the block blank.

|                               |                      |                      |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                               | Alcohol:             | Drugs:               |
| Substance use by the offender | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Substance use by you (victim) | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

Did you at any time suffer any of the effects indicated below following the stalking, attempted rape and/or rape? (Please indicate by checking the appropriate box(es).

|   | Stalking                 | Attempted rape           | Rape                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Social effects (E.g., avoiding social functions, difficulty making friends)                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Emotional effects (E.g., anger, depression, anxiety)  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Academic effects (E.g., reduced marks, reduced concentration, loss of interest in learning) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If you were the victim of any form of sexual harassment OTHER THAN stalking, attempted rape or rape did you ever suffer any of the effects indicated below?

(Please indicate by checking the appropriate box(es).

|                   | Very often               | Often                    | Seldom                   | Never                    |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Social effects    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Emotional effects | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Academic effects  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

In the next section your opinion on certain statements is requested. It would be beneficial for us to know your predominant sexual orientation in order to better understand your responses.

(If you are willing, please indicate your sexual orientation below):

- Hetero-sexual  
 Homo-sexual  
 Bi-sexual  
 A-sexual  
 Unsure  
 I choose not to answer  
 Other, please specify:

Below are a number of statements with five (5) possible responses given.

(Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements by selecting the appropriate option(s).)

|   | Agree<br>strongly     | Agree                 | Unsure                | Disagree              | Disagree<br>strongly  |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Most women often experience teasing by men as being of a sexual nature (i.e., with a sexual undertone).       | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| An attractive woman must expect sexual advances from men and should learn to handle it.                       | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Most women often try to tempt the men with whom they have contact on campus.                                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Most men are easily tempted by the sexual advances of the women with whom they have contact on campus.        | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| A man should learn that a woman's "no" with regard to sexual advances really does mean no.                    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Unwanted sexual attention from men towards women contributes to keeping women in their place.                 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| It is acceptable when women apply their sexuality in order to advance their careers or study.                 | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| An attractive man should expect sexual advances from women and should learn to handle it.                     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I believe that sexual harassment is a serious social problem on campus.                                       | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| It is acceptable for a man to make sexual advances towards a woman whom he finds attractive.                  | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Innocent flirtation makes a work or academic day interesting and is therefore acceptable.                     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Temptation of lecturers' sexual interest is often used by women to gain academic advantage.                   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| If a woman is sexually harassed, while under the influence of alcohol or drugs, it is probably her own fault. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Het jy enige kommentaar op hierdie vraelys of enige iets anders wat jy wil noem?

*Do you have any comments on the questionnaire or anything else you wish to mention?*

Indien u gespesialiseerde hulp benodig na die invul van hierdie vraelys, skakel gerus die Sentrum vir Studente Voorligting en Ontwikkeling Hulplyn by: 082 557 0880 of (021) 808 8858.

*If you require specialised help following the completion of this questionnaire, please contact the Centre for Student Counselling & Development Helpline at: 082 557 0880 or (021) 808 8858.*

Druk die 'Submit' / 'Next' knoppie onder aan hierdie bladsy om die vraelys in te stuur.  
*Press the 'Submit' / 'Next' button at the bottom of this page to submit the questionnaire.*

Dankie dat u die vraelys ingevul het!  
*Thank you for completing the questionnaire!*