

University of San Diego

Digital USD

---

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

---

1991

## The Effect of Sexual Harassment on Female Naval Officers: A Phenomenological Study

Kathleen Anne Krohne EdD  
*University of San Diego*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

---

### Digital USD Citation

Krohne, Kathleen Anne EdD, "The Effect of Sexual Harassment on Female Naval Officers: A Phenomenological Study" (1991). *Dissertations*. 559.  
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/559>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact [digital@sandiego.edu](mailto:digital@sandiego.edu).

THE EFFECT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON FEMALE NAVAL OFFICERS:  
A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

by

Kathleen Anne Krohne

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1991

Dissertation Committee

Johanna Hunsaker, Ph.D., Director  
William Foster, Ed.D.  
Mary Scherr, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON FEMALE NAVAL OFFICERS:  
A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

KROHNE, KATHLEEN ANNE QUINN, Ed.D., University of San Diego,  
1991, 255 pp.

Director: Johanna Hunsaker, Ph.D.

Sexual harassment has grown to epidemic proportions since being documented as a workplace problem. Court cases are rising along with costs to organizations from litigation, turnover, absenteeism and stress-related medical claims. Courts are continually refining the legal definition of sexual harassment, resulting in a steady expansion of employers' liability. Perceptions of men and women regarding what constitutes sexual harassment differ markedly as do their responses to sexually oriented behaviors at work. Development of a formula for effectively preventing sexual harassment is, therefore, a complex and perplexing exercise.

Two of three women serving in the military report that they have been sexually harassed. Women account for over 10% of service personnel, but the nature of military jobs encourages men with "macho" images to gravitate toward its ranks, further aggravating the problem of overcoming sex-role stereotypes. Despite these obstacles, the military, unlike civilian organizations, can strongly enforce

sanctions against those who disobey stated policies. As an example, the Navy's policy of "zero tolerance" for drug abuse has resulted in a nearly drug-free Navy. Its policy of "zero tolerance" for sexual harassment has not been similarly effective.

Eight women officers give their perspective on the Navy's efforts to prevent the kind of sexual harassment they encountered. The consequences of the harassment they experienced are described in detail. This descriptive research employed a phenomenological methodology in concert with survey and archival data to reach a more complete understanding of the effect of the sexual harassment experience on mature, well-educated, female managers.

Results indicate that the institutional character of the Navy places it at a disadvantage in narrowing perceptual differences of its personnel. Creating change in an embedded culture which, by law, restricts job assignments for its women is a challenging prospect. Revising customs in an organization which reveres its heritage is even more daunting. Pending legislation which mandates equality of job assignments, re-socialization is the key to long-term change. The goal of this research has been to create an understanding of the need for that change. Without this additional insight, the actions of organizational leaders will not support their stated policy of "zero tolerance."

**Copyright © 1991**

**by**

**Kathleen Anne Krohne**

**All rights reserved**

For the love of my sons,  
Kris and Karl,  
who soon will be men working with women.

## PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am sincerely grateful for the support and motivation provided to me by my fellow students and the faculty at the University of San Diego. Without their faith, prodding, and unfailing good humor, it would have been impossible to persevere.

To those eight courageous women who endured reliving painful memories to provide me with the raw data that forms the basis of this research effort, I salute you. You were my inspiration and my strength in the darkest hours of my labors. I also wish to acknowledge the women of the Navy. They are the unsung heroines of this story. Not just those whose personal recollections appear on the pages to follow, but the dozens who offered their insight, their time, and their assistance in keeping me on the right track and ensuring that this work is a fair and honest representation of sexual harassment and its effects. To those Navy men who gave me their direct support in completing this research and to the many others who expressed the belief that this was indeed a worthy project, thank you. I am confident that your concern for the women with whom you work will be immeasurably rewarded.

For her patient and meticulous editing assistance, I wish to recognize Therese Dougherty. There is no question

that the final product owes much to her red pencil. And finally, to my dissertation committee chair, Johanna Hunsaker, and to the other members of my committee, William Foster and Mary Scherr, thank you for your invaluable assistance in making this work possible.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER	
I. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	3
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	9
Significance of the Study . . . . .	10
Definition of Key Terms . . . . .	13
Limitations . . . . .	17
Chapter Organization . . . . .	19
Summary . . . . .	20
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	23
Historical Overview . . . . .	23
Principal Themes of the Literature . . . . .	29
Sexual Harassment Definitions . . . . .	29
Types and Frequency of Occurrence . . . . .	30
Types . . . . .	30
Civilian industry and academia . . . . .	31
Federal government . . . . .	32
The military . . . . .	33
Victim Responses . . . . .	34
Personal and Professional Consequences . . . . .	37

CHAPTER	PAGE
Emotional and physical reactions . . .	37
Job related impacts . . . . .	38
Differing Attitudes and Perceptions . . .	39
Cost to the Organization . . . . .	41
Legal Issues . . . . .	43
Civil law . . . . .	43
Military law . . . . .	46
Theories of Causation . . . . .	50
Natural-Biological/Organizational/ Socio-Cultural Models . . . . .	50
Sex-Role Spillover Model . . . . .	54
Prevention . . . . .	56
Summary . . . . .	58
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	60
Introduction . . . . .	60
A Brief History of Phenomenology . . . . .	64
The Phenomenological Method . . . . .	74
A Definition . . . . .	74
The Interview . . . . .	76
Method and Application . . . . .	77
Supplementary Data Sources . . . . .	80
Survey Data . . . . .	80
Court-Martial Transcripts . . . . .	81
Miscellaneous Archival Data . . . . .	81
Validity of the Study . . . . .	82
Researcher's Preconceptions . . . . .	84

CHAPTER	PAGE
Triangulation . . . . .	88
Participant and Site Selection . . . . .	89
Intersubjectivity . . . . .	91
Summary . . . . .	92
IV. DATA PRESENTATION . . . . .	94
Introduction . . . . .	94
Case Descriptions . . . . .	95
Types of Harassment . . . . .	96
Location of Harassment . . . . .	97
Case Elements . . . . .	97
Profile of Victims . . . . .	100
Biographical Data . . . . .	100
Self-Portraits . . . . .	102
Characterizations by Others . . . . .	109
Profile of Perpetrators . . . . .	109
Biographical Data . . . . .	109
Self-Portraits . . . . .	110
Characterizations by Others . . . . .	111
V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	117
Principal Emergent Themes . . . . .	117
Methods of Reporting the Harassment . . . . .	119
Reasons for Reporting the Harassment . . . . .	124
Emotional and Physical Reactions . . . . .	133
Personal Impact of the Harassment . . . . .	135

CHAPTER	PAGE
Professional Impacts and Organizational Costs . . . . .	137
Need for Support and Guidance from Others . . . . .	140
Personal Theories of Causation . . . . .	142
Re-Victimization . . . . .	145
Prevention . . . . .	149
Composite Summary . . . . .	150
<b>VI. CONCLUSIONS AND LEADERSHIP IMPLICATIONS . . . . .</b>	<b>157</b>
Introduction . . . . .	157
Culture Formation . . . . .	158
Traditions, Rituals, and Ceremonies . . . . .	159
Symbolism, Stereotypes, and Metaphors . . . . .	170
Institutional Biases . . . . .	175
Organizational Change . . . . .	178
Awareness . . . . .	180
Accountability . . . . .	184
Leadership . . . . .	186
Conclusions . . . . .	189
Recommendations for Organizations . . . . .	191
Recommendations for Future Research . . . . .	196
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	198
REFERENCES . . . . .	201
APPENDICES . . . . .	216
<b>A. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY     COMMISSION GUIDELINES . . . . .</b>	<b>217</b>

APPENDIX	PAGE
B. RESEARCHER'S BIOGRAPHY . . . . .	220
C. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL . . . . .	223
D. 1988 DoD SURVEY OF SEX ROLES IN THE ACTIVE-DUTY MILITARY . . . . .	225
E. A MODEL PROGRAM . . . . .	246
F. GLOSSARY . . . . .	253

## CHAPTER I

### STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

#### Introduction

Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination that violates Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is generally defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other sexually oriented verbal or physical conduct which explicitly or implicitly affects an individual's employment; unreasonably interferes with an individual's work performance; or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment.

It is a widespread problem in business (Gutek, 1985; Terpstra & Baker, 1988), government (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1988), academia (Sandler, 1986), and the military (Martindale, 1990) with serious personal and organizational consequences (Mynatt & Allgeier, 1990; Terpstra & Baker, 1986b, 1988, 1989). As was evidenced by the widely watched October, 1991 hearings to confirm Judge Clarence Thomas to the U.S. Supreme Court, the topic of sexual harassment is of great concern to many Americans. It is also a topic of great confusion among many men and women.

The definition of sexual harassment has evolved slowly over the past decade and now encompasses much more than a demand for sex as a term or condition of working. Several levels of harassment have been identified, progressing from workplace displays of sexually oriented posters through sexual teasing, jokes, and remarks to physical touching and assault. Although initially recognized as a workplace problem in the late 1970s (Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979), sexual harassment was not often litigated due to the problem of proving to the court that a request for sexual favors had been accompanied by threats of reprisal for noncompliance.

In the eyes of the law, compliance with sexual conduct had to be an explicit condition of employment for an employee to successfully take legal action. In June 1986, the Supreme Court made a pivotal ruling in a sexual harassment case by determining that subjection to an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment constituted another form of illegal sex discrimination (Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson, 1986). This finding created a whole new area of liability for employers as the courts aligned themselves with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines which had been published 6 years earlier (see Appendix A for applicable sections).

These guidelines remain the most widely used direction for employers in policy development. However, it is important to note that both the EEOC guidelines and most court opinions acknowledge the significance of individual

interpretations regarding what actually constitutes sexual harassment. It is defined as unwelcome sexual behavior; what is unwelcome by one may not be unwelcome by another. Because it can be defined differently by different people, studies such as this take on added importance.

The occurrence of sexual harassment in the workplace has continued to increase for two main reasons: The rise in the number of women in the workforce, and the movement of women into occupations previously dominated by men (Deane, 1986). In recent years, sexual harassment has been a frequent subject of litigation as well as a popular subject for social science research. This research endeavor specifically addresses the impact of sexual harassment on women officers in the United States Navy. However, it is equally relevant to other military and civilian organizations, particularly those which are male-dominated and employ women in managerial positions.

#### **The Problem**

In 1990, the Defense Manpower Data Center completed a survey on the incidence of sexual harassment in the military. According to the results, 64% of the women surveyed had experienced some form of sexual harassment during the previous 12-month period (Martindale, 1990). A variety of behaviors were recounted including relatively mild forms of harassment such as sexually oriented verbal remarks, and more severe forms of harassment such as



requests for quid pro quo sexual favors. In the latter circumstance, sexual advances are directly linked to an employee's employment or advancement.

The survey conducted by the Defense Manpower Data Center took over 2 years to complete and summarized the responses of 20,400 men and women on active duty. Their replies to survey questions made it clear that the military's efforts in eradicating sexual harassment have simply not been effective. The military has instituted numerous recommended, and even mandated, training programs aimed at education and prevention. Despite this, the percentage of women reporting sexual harassment in the active duty military services was one of the highest in the nation, exceeding that recorded for the Federal Government by over 22%.

Department of Defense policy prohibiting sexual harassment statements have been issued since 1980. Each military service has followed suit with a policy statement of its own. Yet, as late as October 1990, the Department of Defense unveiled another new program aimed at eradication of sexual harassment. These fresh efforts are intended to more clearly specify unacceptable behaviors and to improve the education of military members on current policies as well as the consequences of noncompliance (Willis, 1990). Despite all these official attempts to resolve this issue, sexual harassment, both mild and severe, continues to be an occupational hazard for women in the military.

As movingly stated by Schneider and Schneider in their book Sound Off! American Military Women Speak Out (1988):

Servicemen and servicewomen work together, they socialize together, and sometimes they live in the same barracks or quarters. They have a lot in common and often enjoy each other's company. Not always. For some women the military is a disastrous experience, a place of harassment and unhappiness, which violates their ideals and principles, where they dread going to work, where no one effectively helps or understands. (p. 78)

Whereas men are fulfilling a cultural ideal as they proudly don their uniforms and march off to defend their nation, Schneider and Schneider (1988) point out that a woman often

must waste the energy that men can save for their jobs or for their pleasures in proving herself, in smashing stereotypes and overcoming prejudice, in coping with men's questions and problems about her sexual identity and her gender roles. She must fritter away time and vigor in dealing with the question, spoken, or unspoken: "Why won't you go to bed with me?" (p. 79)

The high level of reported harassment in the uniformed services is one indication that potential contributions of women to the military mission may have been stunted by a predominantly male environment where women are often viewed more as sex objects than as professional military members. Women who feel harassed are sufficient in number to cause a tremendous amount of disruption in the workplace. Poor morale, absenteeism, low productivity, and litigation are all disruptive and costly aspects of sexual harassment. As a result, a substantial number of tax dollars set aside for the nation's defense have instead been spent on the hidden costs of dealing with this issue.

Compared to the other military services, the Navy has been particularly affected by sexual harassment and its aftermath. Over the past several years, numerous media reports of harassment, both at the Naval Academy and at a Naval Training Center in Florida, have severely tarnished the Navy's public image (Kreisher, 1990; Moore, 1991; Stein, 1990). In calling for a Congressional investigation into the Florida incident, Senator Sam Nunn, D-Ga., was quoted as saying:

I am very concerned about the persistent problems the Navy appears to have with the treatment of its women sailors. That such behavior is not dealt with more seriously than documented in the Navy Inspector General's report suggests that there may be institutional problems in the Navy in its treatment of women. (Donovan, 1990b, p. 4)

The results of a Navy-wide study on the progress of women initially conducted in 1987 and updated in 1990 reported that most women in the naval service had been victims of sexual harassment and nearly all had observed some form of it ("Navy Study Group's Report," 1987; "An Update Report," 1990).

The military services as a whole and the Navy, in specific, have institutionalized nearly every recommendation currently suggested by the literature to prevent sexual harassment without substantially reducing its incidence. The Navy has straightforward policies and required training programs. It has established a grievance procedure which includes a direct hot line to the inspector general as an alternative to reporting the incident through the chain of

command. Training on prevention has been mandatory since 1988, but the Navy's mandated training programs have not been able to overcome years of socialization where men are taught to see women as sexual objects and women are taught to be understanding, compassionate, and yielding to the forceful, assertive, dominant male (Frye, 1983; Gray, 1982; Harragan, 1977; Romer, 1981; Schaef, 1981).

Although sexual harassment is statistically a much greater problem for enlisted women, female naval officers are not immune from harassment. In a survey conducted by the Navy in 1989, 26% of the 849 female naval officers surveyed reported they had been harassed in the previous one-year period (Culbertson, Rosenfeld, Booth-Kewley, & Magnusson, 1990). In a 1988 survey of female naval officers attending a professional seminar in San Diego, 54% (32 of 52) of the respondents had experienced some type of sexual harassment (Krohne, 1988).

As of October 1990, women officers made up 10.8% of the United States Navy officer corps and numbered slightly in excess of 8,000 ("An Update Report," 1990, p. I-6). These officers perform a myriad of duties ranging from the various administrative tasks of a general unrestricted line officer to warfare specialties such as pilot or surface warfare officer (ship driver). Women officers also serve as nurses, attorneys, chaplains, and dentists. They specialize in such fields as aerospace maintenance, civil engineering, and intelligence. They are in the front lines of every

occupation in the Navy except the submarine and special warfare communities or SEALs.

Upon her commissioning, each woman officer is welcomed to the Navy with a certificate stating that she, like her male counterparts, serves "at the pleasure of the President." This means that she cannot quit her job or go on strike if she is unhappy with the working environment. If she wishes to leave the Navy, she must resign her commission. Although resignation requests are normally honored, they take time and can be rejected.

Working conditions which become intolerable in a service environment must generally be endured or confronted. A female naval officer must learn to deal with a man who believes women do not belong in uniform and who may use sexual intimidation as a weapon to subjugate her. How does a well-educated, highly trained, professional female naval officer handle a superior who forces unwanted sexual attention on her? She cannot quit. The only remaining options are to (a) confront the harasser and hope that reprisals do not result; (b) report the behavior and hope that reprisals do not result; or (c) tolerate the conduct. The current study examines the effects of the sexual harassment experience on the private and professional lives of eight women officers who chose option two.

### **Purpose of the Study**

As Hunsaker and Hunsaker (1985) suggest, "the dangerous element of sexual competition can interfere with the female manager's effectiveness if she is cast as a sex object by male subordinates, peers, or superiors" (p. 7). Eight women naval officers have consented to tell their stories concerning the ways in which sexual harassment interfered with their effectiveness as managers. The emotional impact of the harassment and its effects on mature, knowledgeable, capable women is studied in detail.

The central focus of this study is an in-depth examination of the experiences of female naval officers who were sexually harassed during the 5-year period 1985-1990. Also addressed have been their experiences as they relate to the overall organizational consequences of sexual harassment, in both military and civilian environments. In the course of this report, the following research questions will be answered:

1. What prompted these eight women to report the sexual harassment rather than tolerate it or confront the harasser without taking further action?
2. What impact did the harassment experience have on the personal life of these eight victims?
3. What impact did the harassment experience have on the professional life of these eight victims?
4. What impact did the sexual harassment have on the organization's effectiveness? In military terminology,

organizational effectiveness would be described as the "good order and discipline" of the unit.

5. What are the implications for organizational leadership from this study?

A clear understanding of the repercussions of sexual harassment on organizational units and on dedicated, intelligent, and well-regarded commissioned officers gives the reader a reference point from which to gauge the larger impact on the military and its readiness posture. The harassment suffered by the eight women studied in this report is the tip of a very large iceberg posing a dangerous threat to the United States armed forces. An added purpose for conducting this study is to facilitate an understanding of the phenomenon of sexual harassment and its consequences. Understanding is a precursor to effective action and long-term change. In this sense, the results of this study should benefit leaders in industry and government, as well as the military, as they seek to promote creativity and productivity in an atmosphere which promotes human dignity and worth.

#### **Significance of the Study**

All organizational leaders, civilian and military, need to be concerned with minimizing the occurrence of sexual harassment. Why? Aside from the problem's moral dimensions, the financial costs of ignoring it can be staggering. Damage awards from litigation and expenses as

they relate to high turnover rates are particular concerns for civilian industry and government. Though damage award costs do not affect the armed forces, the hidden price of decreased efficiency, lowered morale, loss of trained workers, and a negative public image impact on civilians and military alike (Terpstra & Baker, 1986a, p. 17).

Additionally, the services have other concerns to confront. As discussed by Rogan (1981), "there is no other country in the world in which women play such a large part in the uniformed military" (p. 16). It would therefore seem obvious that the potential of women in the military must be fully tapped if this country is to have an efficient and capable defense force. The military, and the nation, cannot afford to ignore the plight of women who are being sexually harassed as they attempt to fulfill their responsibilities to worldwide military operations. The phenomenon of sexual harassment has the potential to severely damage the good order and discipline of any effective military endeavor and often reduces a victim's competence to carry out her military obligations to the best of her ability. This reduction in military capability cannot be tolerated in a nation which depends on an all volunteer force to carry its defense burden.

Meeting the challenges which face the country's modern military can be highly complex and extraordinarily expensive. In order to ensure that the taxpayer receives the highest possible return on his or her investment, it is



crucial that women in the military develop to their full potential. In the view of this researcher, this cannot begin to happen until the phenomenon of sexual harassment and its impact, both personal and professional, is fully comprehended.

A training program which teaches potential victims how to report an incident after it has occurred is not the solution. Nor is restating a long-standing policy of "zero tolerance" with the hope that potential perpetrators will modify their behavior. Policy statements cannot change deeply held beliefs and attitudes. For real change to occur, leaders and followers must narrow their perceptual differences and must acknowledge their cultural encumbrances. More importantly, they must achieve a comprehensive understanding of the sexual harassment phenomenon and its full impact on the individual as well as the overall organization. This research effort is aimed at facilitating that comprehensive understanding currently lacking in the literature.

The literature to date has failed to explore fully the problem of sexual harassment in a male-dominated, hierarchical organization like the military. Cognitive perceptions and stereotypes strongly influence gender-related behavior in the workplace, but little has been written on the cultural biases which promote sexual harassment in tradition-bound, order-driven societies. Recognizing unconscious prejudices is essential to achieving

substantive progress in overcoming sexual harassment. Strong cultures such as the Navy produce strong prejudices, many of which are so ingrained that they no longer exist in the conscious mind. This study exposes several of those prejudices as a way to open the door for a critical reexamination of cultural encumbrances which may promote sexual harassment.

Preventing harassment demands closing the gap which currently exists between men's and women's perceptions of sexual harassment and its consequences. This study recreates the experience as it existed in the minds of these eight victims. By accepting or, at least, understanding the realities of these women, old beliefs and values can be unfrozen and nudged away from their solidified positions. This thaw can facilitate change and the development of a new conceptual framework which more effectively addresses this perplexing social issue.

#### **Definition of Key Terms**

The following terms will be referred to and used throughout the course of this research:

1. **Sexual harassment** is defined by the Department of Defense as a form of sex discrimination that involves unwanted sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:  
(a) submission to or rejection of such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of a

person's job, pay, or career; (b) submission to or rejection of such conduct by a person is used as a basis for career or employment decisions affecting that person; or (c) such conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with an individual's performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment (Martindale, 1990). This definition is drawn from Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and coincides with published Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines (Appendix A).

2. **Chain of command** is defined as the succession of officers through which command is exercised (Naval Terms Dictionary, 1977).

3. **Good order and discipline** is a military term which refers to the expectation that military leaders will enforce a strong chain of command; maintain stability and control; and promote peace and tranquility. It is particularly incumbent upon officers to avoid behaviors which would interfere with a service member's ability to carry out his or her assigned duties. Failure to maintain a "constant and effective state of discipline" (Military Law, 1963, p. 22) would be prejudicial to good order and discipline.

4. **Seeking legal redress** is defined in this study as reporting the behavior of a superior to a higher authority in order to remedy a wrong which was committed.

5. **Admiral's Mast** is defined as a formal hearing conducted by an Admiral serving in a command position, normally held as a result of misconduct by a subordinate.

Article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (10 U.S. Code, Sections 801-940, 1988) extends authority to Commanding Officers to impose certain nonjudicial punishments, a procedure which is referred to as "mast" in the Navy. Authorized punishments for officers range from punitive letters of reprimand through forfeiture of pay and confinement to living quarters. Commanding Officers below the rank of Admiral may hold Captain's Masts to mete out punishment to subordinate officers and enlisted personnel within the unit; however, their punishment authority is limited. For this reason, an officer mast is often referred up the chain of command to an Admiral who may punish the individual more severely. Additionally, officer masts are relatively rare and tend to reflect poorly on the Navy, an added reason to refer action up the chain of command.

6. **General Court-Martial**, as opposed to a mast, is defined as a court of law presided over by a military judge who is a member of the bar of a State and/or Federal court (Manual for Courts Martial, Part I, 1984). Service members have the right to have at least five other military members senior in rank to the accused to act as a jury and determine guilt or innocence. Normally convened by an Admiral serving in a command position, punishments awarded at a General Court-Martial are made a permanent part of the accused's record and are almost always more severe than those meted out at mast. Confinement to hard labor in a military prison, fines, forfeitures, and dismissal from the service

are types of punishment which may be awarded to an officer (Manual for Courts Martial, Part V, 1984).

7. **Commanding Officer (CO)** is defined in the U.S. Navy Regulations (1990) as someone whose responsibility for his or her command is absolute and whose authority is commensurate with that responsibility. As stated in Article 0802:

The Commanding Officer and his or her subordinates shall exercise leadership through personal example, moral responsibility, and judicious attention to the welfare of persons under their control or supervision. Such leadership shall be exercised in order to achieve a positive, dominant influence on the performance of persons in the Department of the Navy.

8. **Executive Officer (XO)** is defined as that officer who is second in command to the Commanding Officer. He or she acts in the capacity of Commanding Officer in the event of that person's absence.

9. **Female naval officer** is defined as a woman holding a commission in the United States Navy or Naval Reserve.

10. **Obligations of those in authority** emanates from U.S. Navy Regulations (1990), Article 1102:

All Commanding Officers and others in authority in the naval service are required to show in themselves a good example of virtue, honor, patriotism, and subordination; to be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons who are placed under their command; to guard against and suppress all dissolute and immoral practices, and to correct, according of the laws and regulations of the Navy, all persons who are guilty of them; and to take all necessary and proper measures, under the laws, regulations, and customs of the naval service, to promote and safeguard the morale, the physical well-being, and the general welfare of the officers and enlisted persons under their command or charge.

11. **Rank structure** in the Navy is different from the other military services. Those officers who enter the Navy upon graduation from a university are normally commissioned in the rank of Ensign (also referred to as an O-1). Each successive rank is designated as follows: Lieutenant (junior grade) (O-2); Lieutenant (O-3); Lieutenant Commander (O-4); Commander (O-5); Captain (O-6); Rear Admiral (lower half) (O-7); Rear Admiral (upper half) (O-8); Vice Admiral (O-9); Admiral (O-10).

The above key terms and definitions relate to the Navy and its idiosyncracies. Brief definitions of occasionally used words which may be unfamiliar to the reader can be found in Appendix F. These additional definitions are primarily related to the phenomenological method described in Chapter Three and are provided to aid in understanding the methodological approach employed in this research effort.

### **Limitations**

Hypothetically, either sex can sexually harass a member of the opposite sex or a member of the same sex; however, this is not the norm. Women represent, by far, the greatest number of victims and men, by far, the greatest number of perpetrators (Gutek, 1985; Martindale, 1990). For these reasons, sexual harassment occurring within either of the following two realms are excluded from this study: (a) a

woman harassing a subordinate male or (b) either sex harassing members of the same sex.

In order to rigorously explore a psychological concept such as the sexual harassment experience, personal prejudices and opinions must be identified and set aside. This is addressed in greater detail in the methodology section where I have listed my preconceptions; however, it is appropriate here to note the source of my interest in this subject. By providing this information, I hope to expose any unconscious limitations which might impinge on the authenticity of this study.

I am a retired Navy Commander (O-5) who recently completed 21 years of naval service. As an Ensign (O-1) in 1969, I was sexually harassed by a Navy Captain (O-6) for whom I worked. The situation escalated until he appeared at my apartment door one night, drunk. As he hammered on the door, asking to be let in while I pretended to be elsewhere, I decided it was time to seek a transfer to a new duty station. Because I believed that such behavior was the price a woman paid to be working in a male-dominated environment, I never considered confrontation as an option. The next morning, I discussed the problem I was having with the assignment officer in Washington, D.C. who was able to arrange a transfer soon afterwards. Having neatly solved the problem, at least for myself, I went on to have a very successful and rewarding career in the military, including two tours as an Executive Officer and one as a Commanding

Officer (see Appendix B for a more detailed biography). I had many male mentors and supporters along the way who helped me tremendously and I never gave that first year's problems much thought. Nor did I reflect upon what might have happened to the officer who harassed me or whether he had subsequently harassed other subordinates. In fact, I never identified him as a sexual harasser at all until 1988.

In the process of completing an independent study in the doctoral program at the University of San Diego, I surveyed 52 women officers on a wide range of issues. A particular eye-opener was the response to the question regarding whether any of them had ever experienced sexual harassment. Over 61% of these officers said "yes." Many went on to detail unacceptable behaviors which ran the gamut from rape and sexual assault to demeaning and derogatory comments. In the course of several follow-on interviews, my interest and concern grew. I began to realize that sexual harassment was a widespread problem in the Navy which had potentially serious personal and professional after effects. I wanted to find out more and this is the result of that additional research.

### **Chapter Organization**

The remainder of this study is organized in the following manner: Chapter Two is a comprehensive review of the literature on the topic of sexual harassment in the workplace, both military and civilian. Chapter Three



describes the phenomenological interview method in detail and provides a rationale for using this qualitative approach to studying sexual harassment. Chapter Four describes the cases which make up this study and profiles the victims and the perpetrators. Chapter Five is an analysis of the interview data and a description of the major themes which emerged. Chapter Six discusses the ways in which an embedded culture impacts on sexual harassment in the Navy and recommends new approaches for organizations. Appendix E represents a further distillation of recommendations to organizations which are found in Chapter Six. This final chapter also delves into those linguistic and ideological changes which must be wrought on the path to the sort of equal opportunity in the workplace that produces synergy, not divisiveness; that fosters cooperation, not competition; and that is founded on human dignity, not degradation.

### **Summary**

As is apparent from the definitions and key terms found earlier in this chapter, the Navy has certain expectations of its Commanding Officers, Executive Officers, and others in authority. A call to virtue, honor, patriotism, and subordination to superiors in the chain of command has been made by great naval leaders since John Paul Jones. Some may feel that since the Navy has broken with tradition by recruiting women into what was once "this man's Navy," the exhortations of Jones and his successors no longer have

meaning. Virtue and honor, however, do not go out of style and patriotism and subordination are necessary in an organization which is expected to defend the nation and its constitution.

If those in authority were to "guard against and suppress all dissolute and immoral practices" as Navy regulations would have them do, there would be no need for a study such as this one. Unfortunately, that has not happened. In the words of Admiral Carlisle Trost, former Chief of Naval Operations, in March 1988:

Recent Navy and DoD studies indicate that various forms of sexual harassment (particularly verbal abuse) are far too prevalent. The studies found leadership frequently unaware of the extent of sexual harassment within their commands, training programs ineffective, and procedures for reporting instances of sexual harassment not understood and lacking the confidence of our people. (Trost, 1988)

It is time for a new approach to the issue. Attitudes must change. Beliefs must be altered. Traditions must be reexamined, upholding those which are still appropriate and discarding those which are not. The "lewd, lusty language of the military conqueror" (Harragan, 1977, p. 110) will have to give way to something less salty. A sexual joke will have to become as inappropriate as a racial slur. Demeaning and derogatory terms for women have to be eradicated, along with sexual innuendos and explicit requests for sexual encounters. It is time to reclaim the "refined manners, punctilious courtesy, and the nicest sense

of personal honor" (Jones, 1970, p. 542) demanded by John Paul Jones. Those in authority must lead the way.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Historical Overview

Sexual harassment is, in part, a cultural problem rooted in potent sex-typed social patterns. In Western society, stereotyping of women has an historical basis dating from early philosophy and from the Bible. In the Laws, Plato supported patriarchy as the basic unit of the state, believing that power was an innate drive of man (Kets de Vries, 1980) while Aristotle was more direct in his view of women as passive receivers of the male seed or life-force (Aristotle, 1953). Both Old and New Testaments represent women as wives and mothers who are valued primarily for their ability to reproduce. Women in the Bible were assigned submissive roles and expected to keep to their proper places. Paul reasoned in the New Testament that:

A man ought not to wear anything on his head in church, for he is the image of God and reflects man's glory. For man was not made for woman, but woman for man. That is why she ought to wear upon her head something to symbolize her subjection. (Corinthians 11:3)

Historically, sexual aggression of men toward women is well documented (Brownmiller, 1975), but the perception that men had inherent rights over women grew up out of the

traditional patriarchal social system defined by Max Weber (1958). He described patriarchy as an early form of social organization in which men assert power over women, children, and slaves. The patriarch possessed unrestrained authority, legitimized by custom. One of the effects of this system was that it gave men exclusive sexual access to "their" women, giving rise to a tradition of male domination that justified and, in some cases sanctified, sexual aggression toward all women (Sydie, 1987).

Feudalism followed patriarchy, emerging from the military needs of patrimonial rulers. During this period of the middle ages, a custom referred to as "droit du seigneur" or the right of the first night was popularized. As Brownmiller (1975) explains, it gave the manorial lord the prerogative to take the virginity of the brides of subordinate vassals and serfs unless the bridegroom was able to pay an adequate redemption fee. This provides a clear illustration of the common perception that women were viewed as mere chattel. Marriages were seen as an exchange of property in which the father of the bride was paid a dowry in trade for a wife (Genesis 34:12) whose primary function was to produce healthy children, preferably sons. The only rights of women were those granted by their husbands or fathers. It was customary for the woman to stay home and look after the house and children while her husband went off to war. Laws of primogeniture ensured inheritances passed

from father to son, which perpetuated male economic dominance and fostered an unequal distribution of power.

At the start of the industrial revolution, the domestic role of women was expanded somewhat when they began to produce goods for middlemen to sell. The opportunity for women to gain a measure of economic power was thwarted, however, by the fact that they were often not paid directly. Their earnings were normally transmitted either to husband or father, leaving women still under the direct control of men, both in the household and in the marketplace (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981). By the late nineteenth century, however, women were being hired as factory workers. Paid less than their male counterparts, they represented a cheap source of labor to the organization. Though sought after by organizations for the first time, women's entry into the workplace was looked upon with great disdain by society. Both men and women had been socialized to believe a woman's place was in the home. The prevailing public attitude was that women who did venture forth into the factories did not possess the "ladylike" qualities of domesticity and dependence and could not expect to command the respect of their co-workers. Backhouse and Cohen (1981) come right to the point: "It was assumed that there was a connection between the working woman who sold her labor and the prostitute who sold herself" (p. 58). Sexual harassment in the workplace had begun in earnest.

The industrial revolution gave way to the administrative revolution of the twentieth century. The growing mounds of clerical paperwork created the first white-collar employment opportunities for women. With the advent of the "scientific management" of Frederick W. Taylor in 1911, managerial techniques started to receive attention just as women began filling these subordinate roles. Taylor created the concept of the rational manager who tightly controlled the worker's output and methods of work (Kanter, 1977), a management style which led naturally into the bureaucratic structure popularized by Max Weber. Weber imagined an ideal type of bureaucracy as a solution to the problems inherent in a patriarchy. In his view, the ideal organization was without passion and "dehumanized," to the extent that it eliminated "love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational and emotional elements" from the workplace (Weber, 1958, p. 216). Weber's bureaucracy emphasized a formalized structure in which subordinated employees followed the directives of supervisors, who used rewards and sanctions to ensure compliance. By developing a hierarchy with a set of generalized rules to govern performance, Weber constructed an organization to take the place of the nearly unlimited powers exercised by the patriarch (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Management positions in these hierarchies were held almost exclusively by men while clerical work became the province of women. Office work for women "was acceptable to the extent that women emphasized

their femininity rather than their skills and saw it as clearly subordinate to the ultimate goal of marriage" (Kanter, 1977, p. 27). This widely-held view made women particularly susceptible to sexual overtures in the workplace since it was assumed that "getting a man" was their reason for being there.

The idea that women obtain a job for the primary purpose of finding a husband has long been a conviction of many in society. This perception is particularly strong whenever women enter male-dominated occupations such as the military. During both world wars and the Korean conflict, large numbers of women enlisted in the military services. Considered temporary stopgaps during a national emergency, they were never viewed as fully integrated members of the service. Society considered the military to be quite an unusual occupation for females. Any woman who chose to serve her country in this way ran the risk of being stereotyped as "either a lesbian or a slut" (Schneider & Schneider, 1988, p. 33). If a woman married or became pregnant, military regulations required that she resign immediately, ostensibly to devote herself to the higher calling of wife and mother. It was not until the mid-seventies and the advent of the All Volunteer Force that there was a "perceptible effort to bring women fully into the workforce" ("An Update Report," 1990, p. VI-1). The ensuing influx of women into the military's traditionally male bastions was considered by many to be a contributing



factor to the growing problem of sexual harassment (Holm, 1982).

Coincidentally, it was during this time that the phenomenon of sexual harassment began to be openly discussed in the civilian sphere of work. In her seminal work on sexual harassment, Farley (1978) gave the phenomenon a name. This was the first real attempt at defining an experience which, by then, had become all too familiar to working women. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act form the foundations for women's rights in the workplace. Farley noted that, prior to this legislation, women had no legal rights in instances of sexual harassment at work. She discussed sexual harassment in terms of its use to reinforce job segregation; women whose contributions are met with sexual innuendo, prejudice, disrespect, and contempt will eventually be forced out of nontraditional work environments.

A year later, MacKinnon (1979) offered the assessment that "sexual harassment, the experience, is becoming 'sexual harassment,' the legal claim" (p. 57). A significant number of women were becoming galvanized into action as they finally began to insist that organizational and political leaders get involved to help solve the problem. Focusing on the legal aspects of the issue, MacKinnon argued powerfully for a conceptual shift in viewing the problem of sexual harassment. In her view, physical differences between men

and women were less the issue than the cultural inequalities that bind the social realities of a community.

These two books constituted the early basis for the study of sexual harassment. By citing numerous legal cases, surveys, and articles, they made the point that the issue needed to be taken out of the closet. The stage was set for the many studies which would follow.

### Principal Themes of the Literature

#### Sexual Harassment Definitions

By 1987, many authors considered sexual harassment to have been clearly defined by both the courts and the EEOC (Chusmir & Durand, 1987; "Navy Study Group's Report," 1987). In the past year, however, new concerns have been raised. Due to a wide variance of subjective perceptions between perpetrator and victim, it now appears that an unambiguous definition has yet to be formulated (Riger, 1991; "An Update Report," 1990). The EEOC guidelines (Appendix A) are widely used in organizational policy statements forbidding harassing behaviors, but men and women continue to construct different definitions depending on the situational context, the actors involved, and the values of the perceiver. In the latest version of U.S. Navy Regulations (1990), a new set of guidelines was issued intended to further clarify the official Department of Defense definition found in Chapter One:

1. Sexual harassment will not be condoned or tolerated in the Department of the Navy. It is a form of

arbitrary discrimination which is unprofessional, unmilitary, and which adversely affects morale and discipline and ultimately the mission effectiveness of the command involved.

2. Personnel who use implicit or explicit sexual behavior to control, influence, or affect the career, promotion opportunities, duty assignments, or pay of any other person are engaging in sexual harassment. Naval personnel who make deliberate or repeated offensive verbal comments, gestures or physical contact of a sexual nature in the work environment are also engaging in sexual harassment. (U.S. Navy Regulations, Article 1166)

Although more direct in its language than the EEOC guidelines, such guidance fails to address hostile environment harassment. Leers, hoots, yells, whistles, or pornographic posters, magazines, and photographs are all common methods of harassment (Canape, 1991; Martindale, 1990; Personnel Policies Forum, 1987). These forms of harassment have been ignored by the new regulation despite their prevalence in the military working environment. In truth, an all-inclusive, unequivocal definition may never be possible. A common heuristic offered by the literature is that when someone's behavior is making an employee feel uncomfortable, it is potentially harassing and needs to be addressed (Aun, 1988; Gutek, 1985). In any event, a legal definition, no matter how precise, should not be the determining factor in an intervention decision.

#### Types and Frequency of Occurrence

Types. The most common forms of sexual harassment are chronicled as sexual teasing, jokes, remarks, and questions; sexual looks, gestures, and body language; and sexual

touching, cornering, and brushing against. The least frequently experienced types of harassment consist of actual or attempted rape or assault (Martindale, 1990; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988). Other forms of sexual harassment include uninvited pressure for sexual favors; leaning over and pinching, uninvited letters, phone calls, or materials of a sexual nature; uninvited, repeated pressure for dates; comments repeatedly emphasizing the sexuality of an individual; graphic commentaries; and indecent exposure (Personnel Policies Forum, 1987; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

Civilian industry and academia. In a self-selected survey conducted in the mid-seventies, readers of Redbook magazine overwhelmed the editors with their answers to questions concerning unwelcome sexual conduct in the workplace. Eighty-eight percent of the 9,000 women who responded said that they had encountered such behaviors (Safran, 1976). Gutek (1985) randomly polled 827 men and women in the Los Angeles vicinity in the early eighties and found that 53% had experienced sexual harassment. In 1986, increasing numbers of sexual harassment claims by small business employees led the Small Business Report to issue a warning to its readers (Goldblatt, 1986). That same year, Lafontaine and Tredeau (1986) summarized data on 160 women in traditional male occupations, disclosing that over 75% had been victims of harassment. The Cornell Hotel and

Restaurant Administrative Quarterly reported that 40% of female hotel workers contend with insulting sexual comments; 28% endure insulting sexual looks and gestures; and 28% must deal with sexual touching (Eller, 1990).

A variety of studies have been conducted on college campuses throughout the nation. Based on data collected between 1981 and 1984, Kenig and Ryan (1986) estimated that 15 to 35% of college females are exposed to sexual harassment. A recent press report quoting The Western Journal of Medicine declared that 55% of medical students felt they had been victims of harassment between 1988 and 1989 (Associated Press, 1991).

Federal government. As a result of Congressional urging, the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB) was directed to study the incidence and effect of sexual harassment within the federal service. This resulted in the largest scientific survey conducted to that point. In 1981, USMSPB randomly surveyed more than 17,000 federal employees and found that 42% of the women who responded reported having been harassed. A 1987 follow-up survey of 13,000 federal employees again recounted that 42% of the women respondents had been victimized. The later survey identified women who were more likely to be at risk as those who had a nontraditional job or were working in a predominantly male environment or had a male as an immediate supervisor. Other women at risk had attended college and

some graduate school or were single or divorced and between the ages of 20 to 44. The risk was highest if they had been with the federal government for fewer than 15 years (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1981, 1988). Significantly, the number of civilian women working for the Navy who reported sexual harassment in these two studies was 44% in the survey published in 1980, but rose to 47% in the 1987 survey (Aun, 1988). These two surveys remain the most widely quoted benchmarks for calculating the occurrence of sexual harassment in the workplace due to the very large sample sizes and the random sampling techniques employed.

The military. An early Navy survey of 90 enlisted women and 14 officers was conducted at commands throughout northern California (Reily, 1980). Of those surveyed, 90% had experienced some form of sexual harassment. Three years later, Coye (1983) surveyed a random sample of 322 Navy women, 84% of whom responded that they had been sexually harassed. Canny (1986) examined the experiences of over 14,000 enlisted men and women in the Air Force and determined that 27% of the female and 7% of the male respondents had been sexually harassed in the previous 4-week period.

No comprehensive, large scale random sample survey was conducted on military personnel until 1988. At that time, the Defense Manpower Data Center began polling 34,000 male and female service members on the nature and incidence of

sexual harassment in all branches of the service. Surveys were directed to 8,900 members in the Air Force and an additional 8,900 in the Army. The Navy polled 8,600 members and the Marines polled 7,700. The goal of this survey was to number the active duty men and women who may have received unwanted and uninvited sexual attention "from someone at work during the last 12 months" prior to the survey (Martindale, 1990, p. 10). The results showed that female personnel were nearly four times as likely to have been harassed as male personnel (64% for females versus 17% for males) (Martindale, 1990). Nearly all military surveys indicate that junior enlisted women are harassed at a much higher rate than senior military women (Coye, 1983; Martindale, 1990; Reily, 1980; "An Update Report," 1990).

#### Victim Responses

The majority of women who are sexually harassed do not report it (Martindale, 1990; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1981, 1988). For the most part, women who are objects of sexual pursuit try to ignore it and avoid the perpetrator. If that does not work, they may try to make a joke of the behavior, complain to peers or supervisors about it, or ask for a transfer. In the case of civilian workers, they may quit their jobs (Horn & Horn, 1982). Only rarely will a woman confront the harasser or take legal action (Crull, 1982; Gutek, 1985; McKinney, Olson, & Satterfield, 1988). Terpstra and Baker (1989) identified three dominant

responses to sexual harassment: ignoring the behavior and doing nothing; reporting it internally; and positive verbal confrontation. This last is defined as asking the perpetrator to stop by explaining why the behavior is bothersome. Although some women do confront their harasser, even positive confrontation is difficult for most women. Reasons for this range from not wanting to risk damaging the male ego (Farley, 1978) to embarrassment, intimidation, and fear of ridicule or of being made to feel that they are somehow responsible for enticing the behavior (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981). In some instances, a woman may even pretend to enjoy the attention in an effort not to harm a working relationship because, to a woman, it is the relationship that is important above all else (Gilligan, 1982; Josselson, 1987; MacKinnon, 1979). Women attempting to be "one of the boys" have been known to return vulgar language which has been directed at them, a response to sexual harassment that aims at "fighting fire with fire" as a means to fit into a male-dominated environment ("An Update Report," 1987, pp. 3-9). The importance that women attach to "fitting in" and maintaining good working relationships can be partially explained by research in adult development. An early separation of the male from his parents helps to forge an independent identity (Erikson, 1968; Gould, 1980; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, & McKee, 1978) while the female remains tethered to relationships, finding it difficult to



stop trying to respond to and please others (Gilligan, 1982; Sheehy, 1981).

Of the actions a woman can take in response to sexual harassment in the workplace, filing a formal grievance is the most disturbing and the least used. As documented in two extensive surveys by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981, 1988), less than 5% of the women reporting harassment took any formal action. Statistics such as these have led some recent researchers to surmise that gender biases cause women to remain silent. It is uncertain if this is due to male-dominated environments in which women perceive they have little power or due to the typically male-biased, adversarial approach to conflict resolution employed by most organizations (Riger, 1991; Stringer, Remick, Salisbury, & Ginorio, 1990). A woman wishing to maintain positive relations at work is unlikely to go through a complaint process pitting her against a supervisor or a co-worker.

The low number of formal complaints of harassment is often the result of women perceiving that the organization will not take their victimization seriously or will revictimize them in some way (MacKinnon, 1979; Popovich, 1988b; "An Update Report," 1990). Of the women responding to the 1988 Department of Defense survey, 19% reported negative consequences including less favorable work assignments, poor fitness reports (personnel evaluations), and denial of promotions (Martindale, 1990).

Personal and Professional  
Consequences

Emotional and physical reactions. Part of a victim's reluctance to use administrative procedures to combat sexual harassment may be due to the emotionally debilitating effects of the experience (Personnel Policies Forum, 1987). Depending on the severity of the harassment and how it is perceived by the victim, emotional consequences can vary over a wide range. Some victims may feel only mild embarrassment while others have expressed feelings of intimidation, degradation, powerlessness, self-blame, and guilt (Burley, 1990; Farley, 1978; Gutek, 1985; MacKinnon, 1979; Neville, 1990). In detailing types of emotional reactions, Jensen and Gutek (1982) indicated that 80% of those surveyed reacted with disgust, 68% were angry, and 20% felt depressed. Another study by Coles (1986) found that the effects of harassment can also include feeling ashamed, frightened, helpless, or alone. Common physical symptoms manifesting themselves as stress-related illnesses include headaches, dizziness, rapid heart rates, and upset stomachs (Crull, 1982; Personnel Policies Forum, 1987; Popovich, 1988a; Rubenstein, 1991).

In specifically discussing women in the military, Schneider and Schneider (1988) described sexual harassment as male behavior which "disconcerts women, shakes their self-confidence, and interferes with their ability to do their jobs" (p. 46). This is further supported by Stiehm

(1989) who commented that "the verbal aggression and insults in common areas, the catcalls from cars and dormitories, are often considered unimportant and uncontrollable by commanders; nevertheless, they are exhausting and corrosive for women" (p. 19). This supports the view that a hostile work environment can indeed be threatening even when there is no direct demand for sexual favors.

Job related impacts. Implicit in the EEOC definition of sexual harassment is the assumption that it prevents the realization of the victim's full potential (Personnel Policies Forum, 1987). In addition to the very real threat of organizational reprisal which faces a woman who rejects an advance, a victim starts to question her job performance. Jensen and Gutek (1982) revealed that there is a significant relationship between self-reported negative emotional states on the part of the victim and loss of job motivation, feelings of being distracted, and dread of work. In related research, Coles (1986) studied 88 cases and found that 20 victims had quit in fear or frustration. Almost half (40) said they had been fired when they did not submit to the sexual advance.

A considerable amount of time on the job can be lost when victims become psychologically or physically ill (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981). In one study of 17 sexual harassment victims, career well-being and economic status suffered to a much greater degree than either physical

well-being or private relationships. Each of the 17 victims studied progressed through stages of self-blame, depression, anger, and disillusionment (Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, & Stringer, 1986). Other consequences can occur when women go along with the sexual harassment due to intimidation, fear of reprisal, or an opportunistic desire for job benefits. The favoritism, or the perception of favoritism, which results can cause others' work productivity to be negatively affected. The problem of managing these issues in military organizations is exacerbated since each of these work-related results of sexual harassment has the potential to affect mission accomplishment (Reily, 1980; "An Update Report," 1990).

#### Differing Attitudes and Perceptions

Over the past 8 or 9 years, a considerable amount of evidence has accumulated regarding the perceptual differences of men and women, particularly on the topic of what constitutes sexual harassment (Colwill, 1982; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Linenberger, 1983; Morgenson, 1989; Pribble, 1986). Men still see it as a joking matter (Chusmir & Durand, 1987; Moskal, 1989). Women are no longer amused.

As Kanter (1977) suggests, human dignity "requires a sense of value (that one has worth according to a shared standard) and a sense of mastery or autonomy (that one is able to retain some control over life conditions)" (p. 251).

Sexual harassment has the potential to destroy both by implying that a woman's value rests solely with her body. This is exemplified by Nietzsche's comment that "Man shall be trained for war, and woman for the recreation of the warrior" (Nietzsche, 1927, p. 80). Over 100 years after that remark was penned, women in management must contend with a society that "is still sexist enough to imply that women can only sleep their way to the top" (Jensen, 1987, p. 110). These attitudes are slowly changing as more and more women enter the workforce, but the perceptual differences of men and women are still very far apart when it comes to sexual overtures at work (Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen, 1983; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Mazer & Percival, 1989).

Konrad and Gutek (1986) found that women in all professions tend to view more behaviors as sexual harassment than do men. In general, men are significantly less likely than women to perceive that a sexual overture is inappropriate work behavior. Women often feel that sexual teasing, looks, and gestures indicate they are being viewed as sex objects while men may feel they are being complimentary or just "joking around" (Abbey, 1982; Saal, Johnson, & Weber, 1989).

Terpstra and Baker (1986a) acknowledged the seriousness of sexual harassment in the workplace while emphasizing differences in perceptions between men and women. Even among women, there is no consensus on what actually constitutes the sexual harassment experience and how to

handle it. According to Terpstra and Baker, significant numbers of working women would choose to quit their jobs or report sexual harassment to external authorities before confronting an individual who would be unlikely to perceive the situation in the same way that they did. Mainiero (1989) reviewed the differences between how men and women view sexual innuendo. Men often think women are overreacting. Women fear the weakness that accompanies being made to feel like a nonperson.

Individuals with traditional attitudes regarding male and female sex roles tend to assign more responsibility to the victim in a sexual harassment case (Valentine-French & Radtke, 1989). This finding has particular significance for a military organization which appeals to traditionalists. Those who are sexually harassed by supervisors are more likely to foresee serious consequences resulting from the experience (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988). An additional research conclusion which bears on perceptions and attitudes is that the perceived severity of a sexual harassment experience is dependent upon how the receiver interprets the perpetrator's long-term intentions (Pryor, 1985).

#### Cost to the Organization

Sexual harassment is not only pervasive, it is expensive (Garvey, 1986). Terpstra and Baker (1986a) emphasized the high financial impact on organizations who

ignore sexual harassment rather than proactively work on prevention. They maintained that "given the rather consequential performance and turnover costs associated with sexual harassment, and the inescapable fact that such behavior is ethically and morally unacceptable, organizations should be convinced of the necessity to actively deal with the problem" (p. 30).

Two U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board studies (1981, 1988) attempted to quantify the cost to the government of this pervasive problem. From 1978 to 1980, sexual harassment cost taxpayers approximately \$180 million in sick leave, lost productivity, and turnover. In 1981, the federal government instituted a number of policies to stop sexual harassment. Despite these clearly written prohibitions, the 1988 analysis showed that government costs had risen to \$267 million for the two year period 1985 to 1987.

In 1988, Working Woman surveyed corporate directors of personnel, human resources, and equal opportunity officers. The replies indicated that the financial consequences of sexual harassment had become a major concern for the corporate world. More than a third of the 160 Fortune 500 companies responding had been sued by victims. A quarter had been sued repeatedly and each had spent an average of \$6.7 million a year in costs related to sexual harassment, not including court costs. In addition, the survey found that two-thirds of the complaints had been made against

immediate supervisors and upper management and that most cases of sexual harassment were found to be valid (Sandroff, 1989).

A case study reported by Breslin and Morris (1988) may have caught the attention of many executives due to their description of a \$2.5 million dollar lawsuit filed by an automobile plant employee. Court awards in sexual harassment cases have been steadily rising, troubling business executives even further. Although the military is not subject to law suits per se, the legal process used by the armed forces can be expensive, time-consuming and emotionally draining for all concerned. As yet, there has been no attempt to quantify the cost to the armed services and, by extension, to the taxpayer. Eleven percent of the female and 7% of the male respondents in the Department of Defense survey of 24,000 military personnel reported that they were reassigned from their work situation by means of temporary or permanent transfer to another base or work site (Martindale, 1990). Though the administrative costs associated with transferring these personnel may be measurable, the overall turnover, absenteeism, retraining, and lost productivity costs are incalculable.

### Legal Issues

Civil law. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, or national origin. Sexual harassment is seen by



the courts as a subset of sexual discrimination because it is unwelcome behavior driven by a person's gender. Until 1986, the Supreme Court had ruled favorably only on those cases involving tangible economic losses. These rulings essentially exempted the type of behaviors now known as "hostile environment" sexual harassment. The decision in Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson, 1986, however, effectively expanded an employer's liabilities to behaviors which unreasonably interfere with an employee's work performance or create an intimidating, offensive workplace environment. At the time, Clarence Thomas headed the EEOC and his forceful arguments helped clear the way for a judgment which brought the courts into alignment with the EEOC guidelines, issued 6 years earlier. Although the Supreme Court is not legally required to follow EEOC guidelines, they generally choose to do so (Baxter, 1987).

Beginning with MacKinnon's (1979) descriptions of cases brought before the courts and their outcomes, many subsequent authors have highlighted the legal aspects of this issue (Connell, 1987; Dworkin, Ginger, & Mallor, 1988; Garvey, 1986; Koral, 1986; Terpstra, 1989). The ruling in the Meritor case started an avalanche of articles on the meaning and impact of this landmark decision (Hipp, 1988; Koen, 1990; Monat & Gomez, 1986; Robinson, 1987; Sullivan, 1986; Tuttle, 1990; Vinciguerra, 1989). Meritor changed the face of the issue of sexual harassment. It permitted employees who were being subjected to sexual innuendo as

part of their daily work routines to seek redress via the courts even if they could not prove economic loss.

Focusing on the outcomes of litigation, Terpstra and Baker (1988) revealed that the number of complaints filed with the EEOC between 1981 and 1985 had risen 70%. Two factors were significant in a complainant being able to favorably settle a claim. Research by Coles (1986) pointed to a need for witnesses if a complainant were to successfully pursue legal remedies. Terpstra and Baker (1988) concurred with this finding and added that a documented prior notice to management from the complainant was also a significant factor in obtaining an advantageous settlement.

Two recent lower court decisions have further expanded the legal definition of sexual harassment. In Ellison v. Brady (1991), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit challenged the traditional male-biased "reasonable man's" perspective and declared that in cases where a woman has filed suit for sexual harassment, a "reasonable woman's" standard would be more appropriate (Bernstein, 1991). This is a clear sign that some courts are beginning to recognize that a man's perception of acceptable conduct is radically different from a woman's. The second ruling took place in a Florida District Court involving a female ship fitter who claimed that her working environment was intimidating and unreasonably interfered with her work performance (Robinson v. Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc., 1991). The judge in this

case deemed that pictures of women in various stages of undress and in sexually suggestive or submissive poses were inappropriate in the workplace, particularly when omnipresent and openly displayed. In the court's opinion, such pornographic posters created a hostile working environment and were "no less destructive to workplace equality than a sign declaring 'Men Only'" (Melton, 1991, p. 61).

Such decisions point up the futility of trying to establish a single all-encompassing definition of sexual harassment. "Hostile environment" claims need to be examined on a case-by-case basis, in a particular context. In most courts, an offensive working environment claim will be upheld only if the incidents are pervasive and severe enough to create psychological distress (Traeger, 1988).

Military law. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 extends protection to all employees in military departments. The U.S. Court of Appeals, Eighth and Ninth Circuits, have ruled that the uniformed military are not employees in the same sense as other members of the military departments. This ruling effectively denies military members legal redress for employment discrimination. To date, no court has granted a service person a remedy under Title VII (Griffin, 1987). Service members must therefore rely on the military system of jurisprudence to right any wrongs which may befall them.

Legal data on sexual harassment cases in the military are not centralized and are, therefore, difficult to track ("An Update Report," 1990). In some instances, complaints are handled locally through administrative actions such as counseling and verbal reprimands. In others, an informal investigation is convened and the case is brought to a nonjudicial punishment proceeding. Punishment is then determined by the Commanding Officer of the accused harasser. When the accused is an officer, a more formal investigation normally takes place and an Admiral's Mast may result. A final option is a court-martial proceeding.

A court-martial may result from the severity of the charges or the refusal of the accused to accept nonjudicial punishment. Every military member, not serving at sea, has a right to be tried by court-martial in lieu of nonjudicial punishment (mast). If trial by court-martial is requested, one of the following three proceedings may occur: a summary court-martial, a special court-martial, or a general court-martial. If the charges are referred to a special or general court-martial, the accused has the right to be represented by counsel.

The maximum punishment which can be imposed on an officer at a nonjudicial proceeding by a Commanding Officer below the rank of Admiral is restriction to a specified area with or without suspension from duty. An Admiral may impose additional punishments such as forfeiture of half of a month's pay for up to 2 months; restriction to a specific

area for not more than 60 consecutive days; and arrest in living quarters for 30 days. An Admiral also has the option of admonishing or reprimanding an officer in a punitive letter which then becomes a permanent part of the member's service record. This has a significant impact on the guilty party's opportunity for promotion. The higher level of punishment authority possessed by an Admiral is a primary reason for referring officer masts up the chain of command. (Manual for Courts-Martial, Part V, 1984).

If the accused is tried by general court-martial, a military judge presides over the trial. A service member has the right to have a jury of at least five other military members senior in rank to the accused. Guilt or innocence is determined by the military judge or the jury, if that option is chosen. Guilty verdicts normally demand more severe punishments than those meted out at mast. These punishments include dismissal from the service, fines, forfeitures, and confinement to a military prison (Manual for Courts Martial, Appendix 12, 1984).

In a sexual harassment case, the local Commanding Officer generally initiates and, to some extent, directs the administrative, investigative, and legal proceedings which are involved. A Commanding Officer has a great deal of latitude in deciding what action to take. As a result, command responses can, and do, include acquittals and dismissals ("An Update Report," 1990). Part of the difficulty in tracking sexual harassment cases is the

variety of procedures used and the fact that several different articles of the Uniform Code of Military Justice may be invoked to charge violators. The most common articles used to charge perpetrators in a sexual harassment case are Article 92 (general order), Article 93 (cruelty and maltreatment), Article 117 (provoking speeches or gestures), Article 128 (assault), Article 133 (conduct unbecoming an officer), and Article 134 (prejudicial to good order and discipline) (Uniform Code of Military Justice, 1988).

Sexual harassment cases are neither publicized widely nor available for public scrutiny. The information highlighted below was obtained from media reports as noted and is provided to give the reader an understanding of the extensive variety of punishments awarded:

A Commanding Officer was found guilty of sexually harassing subordinate female crewmembers and was punished at an Admiral's Mast. He received a punitive letter of reprimand and was fined one-half of his base pay for 2 months (Purcell, 1987).

A Navy Commander was tried by a general court-martial and found guilty of sexually harassing one woman officer and two enlisted women. His sentence included a \$3,600 fine and an official reprimand. The maximum punishment which could have been awarded was 4 years imprisonment and dismissal from the service (Dietrich, 1988).

A Commanding Officer was found guilty of sexual harassment of two female officers, two enlisted women, and a

female civilian government employee. He was censured at an Admiral's Mast and received a punitive letter of reprimand (Burlage, 1989).

A total of 24 rapes and assaults were reported at a naval training center over an 18-month period ending June, 1990. According to the Navy, 13 of the cases were "substantiated or resolved." Only one of the cases resulted in a court-martial. Six of the rapes were not prosecuted (Moore, 1990).

A Navy Lieutenant was tried by general court-martial and found guilty of raping a female officer. He was sentenced to 7 years in prison, forfeiture of \$1,800 per month during his confinement, and dismissal from the service at the conclusion of his sentence. The maximum punishment in this case was life imprisonment (Donovan, 1990a).

An Air Force Lieutenant General was relieved of duty for "inappropriate actions and relationships with members of the opposite sex, including subordinates." His punishment entailed being retired as a two-star rather than a three-star general (Bird, 1990, p. 20).

### Theories of Causation

Natural-Biological/Organizational/Socio-Cultural Models. Tangri, Burt, and Johnson (1982) hypothesized that sexual harassment is a result of one or more of the three models described below:

1. **The Natural-Biological Model** assumes that harassment is merely a function of the natural attraction between the sexes. As a result of their "naturally" stronger sex drive, men are biologically predisposed to be aggressive toward women. Several court cases tried in the late seventies and early eighties were dismissed on just such grounds. Under this model, women are expected to feel flattered by sexual attention, not harassed. If harassment occurs, it is suspected that the woman is at fault. She must not have set the proper moral tone since her less intense sexual drive makes her more capable of diffusing inappropriate behaviors (Gutek, 1985). Proponents of this model view women who cannot deal with innocent sexual byplay (joking, teasing, pinching) as overly sensitive or humorless. Since men's proclivity toward sexual harassment is genetically preordained, little can be done to prevent it from happening (Sydie, 1987).

The following quotation summarizes this model:

A man with an attractive woman may view every encounter, no matter how businesslike in purpose, as sexually charged. The obligation to make at least a perfunctory pass is reinforced by the predominant view of sexual attractiveness as a relatively impersonal matter of physical assets--one woman with good breasts and nice legs is more or less interchangeable with any other. (Feigen Fasteau, 1974, pp. 56-57)

On the other side of the issue:

There is little factual basis for the belief that males need sex more than do females. It is more likely that men do not exercise so much control over their sexual behavior. (Staples, 1973, p. 18)



2. **The Organizational Model** maintains that the structure of the organization encourages sexual harassment through vertical stratification and horizontal segregation. Power differentials between supervisors and subordinates and a high ratio of males versus females tend to increase the level of harassment. The occupational norms present in the organizational culture, job tasks and requirements, and the availability of grievance procedures also affect the level of predicted harassment. Assumptions inherent in this model are that newcomers to the organization, such as trainees, junior personnel, and token men or women, are more likely to be targets of harassment. It also predicts that harassment is more probable in organizations which are highly structured and stratified.

Kanter and Stein (1980) and Hemming (1985) suggest that greater integration of the workplace is an important part of solving the special problems of tokens. The power differential in structured, hierarchical organizations has been a popular theme in the sexual harassment literature (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981; Fain & Anderton, 1987; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; MacKinnon, 1979; Renick, 1980; Stringer et al., 1990). Researchers agree that sexual harassment occurs more often among co-workers than between supervisors and subordinates. However, it often involves an unequal relationship of some nature, which automatically introduces the element of coercion. Workplace norms, such as the prevalence of pornographic materials; job requirements, such

as overtime work and business trips; and a lack of grievance procedures or alternative jobs are all factors which might further encourage sexual harassment in accordance with the tenets of this model.

3. **The Socio-Cultural Model** is predicated on the belief that sexual harassment is a function of how men and women have been socialized. Consistent with this model, male dominance has developed and is maintained through historical, cultural, economic, and political traditions. Typically, society has praised and rewarded aggressiveness in men and passivity in women. Gender should be the best predictor of victim and perpetrator if this model were operative. In male-dominated environments, harassment would tend to increase and a single harasser would be apt to have multiple victims.

Literature has long popularized the view of woman as emotional, illogical, easily-influenced, indecisive, and dependent and of man as self-reliant, forceful, competitive, analytical, and strong (Bem & Bem, 1970; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1971). Such characterizations can sometimes result in self-fulfilling prophecies creating a climate ripe for sexual harassment. The language that society uses to describe men and women call up mental representations of their essences. Words are symbols of the culture in which we live. They determine the ways in which we think and arrive at meaningful concepts (Lakoff, 1987). Men who are socialized to visualize women

as bimbos, broads, bitches, or babes will find it difficult to treat them with respect.

Lockheed and Hall (1976) reported on the "widespread belief that women can work successfully as the equals or superiors of men only if they are modest, quiet, and inconspicuous" (p. 119). The authors reported that this belief may be partly to blame for the tendency of women in mixed sex groups not to emerge as leaders. Farley (1978) also advanced the idea that men's internalized beliefs in the submissiveness of women and in their adopted roles as protector of the female make it hard for them to accept an aggressive woman.

Gender-role socialization has been identified by several researchers as a primary cause of rape and sexual assault (Allgeier & Allgeier, 1988; Brownmiller, 1975; Burkhart & Stanton, 1988). This socialization process undoubtedly contributes to the assumption that a woman's attractiveness is a primary cause of sexual coercion (Romer, 1981). In this vein, media blitzes and pornographic material which urge both men and women to sexually manipulate one another are especially troublesome.

Sex-Role Spillover Model. Elements of the organizational and socio-cultural models and role theory can all be found in the sex-role spillover model initially put forth by Gutek and Morasch (1982) and further elaborated upon by Gutek and Cohen (1987). They found that women in

nontraditional jobs experience more social-sexual behaviors than women in traditional occupations where females predominate or in fully integrated environments where the numbers of men and women are essentially equal. Their studies concluded that the carryover of gender based roles into the work setting tended to promote sexual harassment. Women in nontraditional occupations ran the risk of being seen as role deviants. On the other hand, those in traditional occupations (i.e. waitress) tended to be viewed as sex objects. Little sex-role spillover was observed in integrated occupations. Evidence for the supposition that sex-role stereotypes transferred to the work setting promote sexual harassment is provided by Kanter (1977) as well as by Popovich and Licata (1987).

Gutek (1985) identified several causes for sex-role spillover into the work environment. These include the tendency of people to identify one another, first and foremost, on the basis of gender, and the tendency for men and women to adopt roles with which they are most comfortable. Kanter (1977) listed four stereotypical role traps into which women in the workplace can fall: mother, seductress, pet, or iron maiden. Although characterization as a pet or seductress carries the greatest risk of attracting sexual attention, none of the four roles fosters treatment as a professional equal.

### Prevention

Since the mid-1980s, approaches to discouraging sexual harassment have been proposed regularly in both scholarly journals and popular magazines. A consensus has developed that the best means of prevention is a three-pronged effort in the form of a well-publicized policy statement outlining behaviors which are considered unacceptable by company standards; an employee-centered educational program; and an effective means of reporting offenses when they do occur (Popovich, 1988b).

The majority of the literature in this area focused on the importance of having a strong policy against sexual harassment as a means of combatting it (Barrett, 1986; Champagne & McAfee, 1989; Finnegan, 1986; Frierson, 1989; Spann, 1990; Tuttle, 1990). The second most recommended remedy concerned the frequency and quality of training programs (Clarke, 1986; Deane, 1986; Flynn, 1991; Licata & Popovich, 1987; Segal, 1990). The third most popular solution recommended a clear and unambiguous grievance procedure (Bradshaw, 1987; Bryson, 1990; Caudill & Donaldson, 1986; Thornton, 1986; Woods & Flynn, 1989).

Several authors advised organizations to create several different ways of reporting harassment, some of which should permit circumvention of the hierarchical chain of command (Karnes & Tuerff, 1986; Webster, 1986). Having a specific person or position to act as the initial contact point makes it possible to begin an impartial investigation into the

circumstances prompting the employee's concern without jeopardizing confidentiality. As part of their grievance procedures, organizations have been urged to conduct prompt, thorough, sensitively-handled investigations and to consistently and even-handedly enforce the stated organizational policy (Garvey, 1986; Jossem, 1991).

Several potentially effective preventive measures received very little emphasis in the literature. The need for top management to personally express strong disapproval of harassment, the need for organizations to develop strong and effective sanctions to respond to harassment when it does occur, and the importance of informing employees of their legal right to raise the issue of harassment were all infrequently mentioned as solutions to the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace (McCalla, 1991).

The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1988) proposed several additional means of prevention over and above those already suggested. These included recommendations to conduct periodic, random, anonymous surveys as a way to determine the extent of sexual harassment in a particular organization. Follow-up interviews of personnel involved in the settlement of claims was also advised. One of the Navy's recent recommendations concerning the prevention of sexual harassment included development of a clearer definition. This would give much needed guidance to Commanding Officers who must implement the Navy policy of "zero tolerance." Other suggestions included extensive

publicity of the available grievance procedures and revised directives which emphasize sanctions for perpetrators. Training programs that modify behavior and instill a sense of mutual respect between men and women were viewed as essential to prevention. A common punitive charge under the Uniform Code of Military Justice would facilitate development of a centralized data base and subsequent trend analysis.

#### Summary

Sexual harassment is a highly charged emotional experience that occurs frequently in the workplace, particularly in male-dominated environments where its prevalence has been widely documented. Although sexual harassment causes untold financial and psychological turmoil, its prevention has defied the best efforts of both business and the legal system at policymaking, education, and enforcement. Viewed by many as an historical holdover from women's traditional place in society as an appendage to a father or a husband, sexual harassment was not defined until the late 1970s. It has not been fully defined yet. As a social issue, it must continually be addressed by organizations even as the courts proceed with developing and refining case law through the process of leveling penalties. Sexual harassment can be, and sometimes is, used as an effective weapon against women who threaten the status quo. Such stereotypical responses to women in the workplace

reduce an organization's flexibility in managing diversity  
while creating unnecessary barriers in overcoming prejudice.



## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

This research effort has sought a deeper, fuller, more meaningful understanding of the phenomenon of sexual harassment. In order to achieve this expanded understanding, a series of in-depth interviews were conducted with women officers who were found by the Navy to have been sexually harassed. A phenomenological approach was chosen in order to grasp the subjective meaning of each interview. Stripped to bare essentials during the data analysis stage, the phenomenological interview is then reconstructed into clustered units of meaning which reveal the basic elements of the experience under study.

During the past decade, surveys have been the preferred method of gathering data related to sexual harassment. For the most part, they have concentrated on reporting types and frequency of victim experiences. Although useful in delineating how widespread sexual harassment is, surveys fail to adequately explain the impact of the whole experience on the individual. In a technologically-oriented world, it is natural to look for concrete answers that can

move the decision maker quickly along to the next problem at hand. Unfortunately, a social issue as complex and uncertain as sexual harassment does not easily dissolve into one right answer. I have chosen, therefore, to engage this issue on the terms of those who have experienced it first hand. The goal in using this method is to begin a reflective conversation which will continue to define and appropriately respond to the phenomenon's full dimensions. Throughout this process, a conscious attempt has been made to avoid manipulating the results, an effort necessitating reflection upon and acknowledgement of all prior assumptions.

"Assumptions make messes researchable, often at the cost of great oversimplification, and in a way that is highly problematical" (Morgan, 1983, p. 377). Until the advent of quantum physics, scientists never questioned the assumption that the building blocks of the material world were fixed and immutable. It is now apparent that our "real world" is far less real than once taken for granted, yet our approach to research remains locked in the logical-positivist tradition. The demand for empirically-supported answers reduces doubt to no more than a technical consideration. The answers provided are then acted on with impunity because they have been proven as definitively "true" by a process of deductive reasoning.

Qualitative research methods recognize that reality is "experiential, not singular, convergent, or fragmentable"

(Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 59). To understand a social phenomenon, the researcher must understand individual perceptions and how meanings are derived. This approach to research is nonmanipulative, noncontrolling and open to whatever emerges, with no predetermined constraints on outcomes. From an holistic standpoint, the phenomenon is viewed as a complex system that is more than the sum of its parts (Patton, 1990, p. 40). The goal is not to come up with one right answer, but to add to the body of knowledge surrounding a phenomenon with many diverse aspects. For these reasons, qualitative methods have become increasingly important in the study of social behaviors such as racism and sexual harassment, both of which defy quantification as a means to understand their essences.

Qualitative research has become increasingly popular in the past several years. Background assumptions which prompt researchers to use quantitative methods as the sole determinants of truth and knowledge are increasingly being questioned. Challenging the idea that all scientific knowledge is completely neutral and totally objective opens the way to discovering that uncertainty is part of becoming more knowledgeable. Researchers are finding that the burden of proof can be shed "to lighten the load for the journey of experience" (Patton, 1990, p. 7). Quantitatively oriented researchers experience an "aha" when a statistical analysis reveals a significant relationship between two variables. Qualitatively-oriented researchers have a similar experience

when cogently analyzed, in-depth interviews reveal the essence of a social phenomenon in a way that cannot be duplicated through statistics and probabilities. A social issue which continues to confound men and women despite society's best efforts at solving it must be fully understood before an effective means of resolution can be tendered. Although cognitive understanding can be achieved through the use of many and varied quantitative approaches, visceral understanding will be lacking. This "heart knowledge" may be the best hope for real, intended change.

Intellectualizing the debate has kept these issues at arms' length while organizations seek to prevent sexual harassment through laws and other regulatory efforts. However, rules and regulations have not resolved the issue. Respect for others cannot be legislated, but must spring from a basic belief in human dignity and worth. If such convictions are not brought into adulthood from childhood experiences, new insights into the essence of social issues may help to unfreeze attitudes and opinions. By breaking through old belief systems, people and organizations can move from frozen positions to new ways of viewing the world which are more compatible with the nobility of the human race. Kurt Lewin (1981) argued that successful organizational change consists of three steps: unfreezing status quo beliefs and behaviors, moving to a new state of believing or behaving, and refreezing the change to make it permanent. In order to successfully navigate stage one, it

is necessary to find a way to achieve empathy. By getting inside the perceptual system of a sexual harassment victim, others begin to understand the essence of the experience. Empathy is the goal of qualitative research; to be able to respond emotionally based on deeply-felt sensations. Feelings are not always logical, nor do they always follow a predictable pattern. How, then, can they be understood using statistically-oriented methodologies?

"Qualitative inquiry cultivates the most useful of all human capacities--the capacity to learn from others" (from Halcolm's Evaluation Laws as quoted in Patton, 1990, p. 7). It is a way of understanding the world at large, not just a single individual's world. A qualitative approach offers the option of creating a new world for those who choose to accept alternative ways of knowing.

#### **A Brief History of Phenomenology**

Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger, Scheler, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and Schutz constitute a virtual who's who of western philosophy in the area of phenomenology. Yet the term itself remains shrouded in ambiguity and confusion. Volumes have been written on this philosophical approach to understanding the world. However, the research methodology which was developed from these beliefs will mean little without a basic understanding of the assumptions upon which it is based. A brief history will alert the reader to some

of phenomenology's more salient characteristics while providing an orienting timeline for its major proponents.

In his Philosophy of Mind (1817), Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) became the first philosopher to attach a technical meaning to the term "phenomenology."

Taking a systems approach to philosophical dilemmas, Hegel studied knowledge as it appears to consciousness.

Specifically, he made the point that:

No particular constitutes a self-sufficient independent unit, that any particular is what it is only because it stands in relationship to other units, each of which to some degree modifies its nature, just as these are themselves modified in the process. (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 136)

Hegel rejected the logic of deduction as unable to understand the concept of a whole that was greater than the sum of its parts and was the forerunner of holistic thinking. Drawing a distinction between understanding and reason, he offered ways in which to deal with emergent properties. Reason involves a dialectical thinking process, while understanding involves an earlier stage of thought aimed primarily at categorization. Although rarely acknowledged for his contributions to phenomenology, he nonetheless had a significant impact on those who would follow, particularly in France's phenomenological movement.

The phenomenological movement began with Edmund Husserl (1859-1938). A German mathematician by education, Husserl was also a philosopher and is now widely recognized as the father of phenomenology. He believed that lived experience

is created by essential structures of consciousness. These give order and form to what we think, feel, and perceive (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 41). He spoke of "essences" which are present in everyone's stream of consciousness. Often latent, these essences must be discovered, much as an archaeologist clears away layer upon layer of dirt before reaching that which has been hidden from view. Reflecting this view of discovering essences, Husserl called his philosophy "an archaeology of human experience, a search for the ultimate, constitutive foundations of experience" (Kockelmans, 1967, p. 241). He believed it was possible to locate objective essences in the heart of subjectivity (Spiegelberg, 1982, p. 688).

In his first major work entitled Logical Investigations (1900-1), Husserl focused on the importance of rigorous description as the vehicle for getting "to the things themselves," an oft quoted maxim of Husserl and his successor, Heidegger. This first work generated the greatest following. His successors became enamored with his ideas of investigating phenomena, especially the demand that the researcher look and listen carefully enough to gain an intuitive grasp of an experience. Only then should the analysis and painstaking description of what has been observed begin. Husserl's next major work, Ideas (1913), introduced a number of more radical concepts.

Based on Descartes' method of doubt, Husserl proposed the notion of a phenomenological "bracketing out" of the

world. As the first step in reaching a "pure datum," the researcher must suspend all nonapodictic beliefs. This is referred to as the "epoché" or the phenomenological reduction. The next step is an eidetic reduction which Husserl hoped would lead to the universal essences of the phenomenon under study. Eidetic reduction urges the use of "free imaginative variation" to reflect upon the phenomenon and to discard all aspects which are nonessential to its core. The third step is intended to discover how objects of cognition are "constituted" in the mind. The consciousness has an historical aspect derived of values and beliefs. These must be uncovered before the pure, presuppositionless phenomenon can be reached (Husserl, 1964).

Husserl's later ideas were much less acceptable to his followers. Indeed, he was roundly criticized for perhaps having gone too far in trying to create a philosophical science which could not be refuted. He may have been acknowledging these critics when he wrote 2 years before his death in 1936, "I attempt to guide, not to instruct, but merely to show and to describe what I see" (Speigelberg, 1982, p. 69).

An early disciple of Husserl's work was Martin Heidegger (1889-1976). He was drawn to the ideas in Logical Investigations and went on to collaborate with his fellow German on a number of projects. But Heidegger did not support the direction taken in Husserl's subsequent compositions, particularly with regard to his concept of



"pure consciousness" as an extension of the Cartesian separation of mind and matter (Kocklemans, 1967, p. 281). Believing there to be more to investigate than "pure consciousness," Heidegger was primarily interested in the unitary whole. Although often thought of as an existentialist, he emphatically rejected that title and took a firm stand against the philosophy of Sartre (Kocklemans, 1967, p. 271).

Heidegger proposed that understanding is the basic form of human existence. He complained that Husserl's emphasis on intentionality as the basic structure of consciousness belies the notion that to be human is to be interpretive (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 224). His major work was Being and Time (1927), which established him as a major philosopher in the hermeneutic tradition of phenomenology. Like Husserl, he wished to strip away the layers of consciousness to reveal that which is hidden beneath. He became, however, more of a proponent of Kierkegaard and Dilthey as he developed his idea of an "historical consciousness" which builds up over time and reflects an individual's way of being in the world (Kocklemans, 1967, p. 285).

Max Scheler (1874-1928) contributed to the German phenomenological tradition during this period, professing himself indebted to Husserl's original ideas. He nevertheless rejected what he considered to be the pro-Kantian stance which inspired Husserl toward a new form of transcendental phenomenology. Much more inclined to view

humankind in its earthier dimensions, Scheler sought a means to buttress and rebuild a set of Christian ethics and values which he saw as being lost to superficiality. In his view, phenomenology had the potential to create social change on a grand scale. An expression of his hope for the movement is found in the following passage:

It will be like the first step into a flowering garden of a man who had stayed for years in a dark prison. This prison is our human environment confined by an intellect turned toward the merely mechanical and whatever can be mechanized. (Speigelberg, 1982, p. 278)

Scheler's Formalism in Ethics (1913) stands as testimony to his view of phenomenology as a means of entering into intuitive relationships. However, Scheler rejected the precise set of mental operations which were proposed by the rationalistic Husserl (Speigelberg, 1982, pp. 283-284).

Until the 1930s, Germany was the stronghold of the phenomenological movement. Subsequently, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty began to develop their own strains of phenomenology and France became a main center of influence. In 1932, Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) received a grant to study phenomenology in Germany. Since Sartre saw the movement consisting primarily of Husserl and Heidegger, he studied both extensively. He was critical of Husserl on the basis of being "unable to escape solipsism any more than Kant," a charge that resulted from Husserl's later transcendental tendencies. As an existentialist, Sartre believed existence is at the root of all human essence. He

saw the subjective "free consciousness" in direct opposition to the objective "Being," which starkly contrasted with the position of Husserl. Despite their philosophical disagreements, Sartre remained an important intellectual stimulus for Husserl; both shared an affinity for Cartesianism. In subsequent years, Sartre showed an interest in Heidegger's Being and Time which he thought of greater importance than Husserl's later version of phenomenology (Kockelmans, 1967, p. 314). In fact, Sartre's well known treatise, Being and Nothing (1943) may owe its title to Heidegger's earlier work.

The other main philosopher in the French phenomenological movement during this period was, like Heidegger, an avowed anti-Cartesian who believed in a unitary whole. Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908-1961) attempted to bring phenomenology "down from the level of pure consciousness into the world of concrete life" (Speigelberg, 1982, p. 573). He opposed Husserl's teleology of consciousness which he described as "purposive structure." Merleau-Ponty portrayed conscious thought as first and second reflections; an immediate perception followed by a consideration of that perception (Speigelberg, 1982, pp. 752-754). This relationship between thought, defined as language using consciousness, and perception, which is the prelinguistic objectification of the world, is a major theme in his Phenomenology of Perception (1945) (Edie, 1975). Husserl was convinced that every phenomenon had a center to

which the philosopher-researcher must penetrate via the phenomenological and eidetic reductions. Merleau-Ponty considered description the key and spoke of a sphere of "separate essences" that could be arrived at through language. He stated that, "Thinking makes use of words; it exists in words, and by using words, we fix the phenomenal" (Kwant, 1963, pp. 159-160). Particularly interesting are Merleau-Ponty's insights concerning sexuality and his conviction that "sexuality is not an autonomous cycle" (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). This belief coincides with the socio-cultural view that men and women learn how to express their sexuality from their environment.

Alfred Schutz (1899-1959) was born in Vienna and lived there until 1939 when he emigrated to the United States. In 1932, he wrote Phenomenology of the Social World after becoming interested in Max Weber's efforts at developing a consistent methodological foundation for the social sciences. Like Husserl, Schutz wanted to examine the subjective realm in an objective manner. Weber sought to do this by making assumptions concerning what the subjective experiences of people might be if they were completely rational. Schutz rejected this idea as too mechanical, but did agree with Weber that human action has its basis in the world of common sense. He subsequently studied the multiple realities that determine how one comes to understand. Schutz thought understanding emanated from a concrete type of perception in which another's experience is grasped

through face-to-face encounters. Physical interactions (facial expressions and gestures) supplement the spoken word (Polkinghorne, 1983, pp. 207-209). Schutz used phenomenology to ground sociological questions, such as those which seek answers to the level of intersubjectivity in the social world (Schwartz & Jacobs, 1979).

Husserl lost many of his former advocates when his later writings appeared to violate his initial insistence on neutrality. His attempts to reach pure consciousness through a process of transcendental reduction was rejected by most subsequent philosophers. Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty were insistent that any analysis of human existence must be examined as a unitary whole. This disagreement marked the beginning of a progression to a type of hermeneutic phenomenology, a transition which continues to unfold today.

Paul Ricoeur (1913- ) is the most noted modern philosopher who has proposed a hermeneutic approach to studying the human sciences (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 233). Hermeneutics aims at correct understanding or interpretation of a phenomenon. This methodology emphasizes language and the meaning of each word in a given passage as it relates to the words surrounding it (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 218). "For Ricoeur hermeneutics and phenomenology are interdependent and in this sense have equal rights" (Speigelberg, 1982, p. 599), a view not unlike those of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty.

The author of The Idea of Dialogal Phenomenology, Stephan Strasser, gave a series of lectures on this topic at Duquesne University in 1968. His belief is that phenomenology must involve more than one's own reflections, but must learn from the experiences of others through dialogue. He objects to the idea of a monological thought process that utilizes reflection as its principal method. Strasser warns that the danger of solipsism looms ahead for those who submit to the methodological demands of Husserl (Strasser, 1969).

And so, the debate continues. As is evident from the foregoing, there is no shortage of ideas on how to approach the science of phenomenology, if it is indeed a science at all. My own thoughts are in accord with Merleau-Ponty's assessment of the chief gain to be derived from phenomenology. It presents us with an opportunity to unite extreme subjectivism and extreme objectivism (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. xix). This is where individual ideas and perceptions merge, creating meaning. Husserl's goal was to create a philosophical approach that would meet the rigors of a strict science. He envisioned "an all encompassing rational knowledge of all that is" (Kocklemans, 1967, p. 222). He failed in this impossible task. Despite the rejection of Husserl's transcendental approach to phenomenology, his philosophical movement spawned the qualitative methodologies which now facilitate the study of emotional-laden topics such as sexual harassment. These

subjects can now be studied in an expanded way which reaches beyond statistics and quantitative analyses.

Survey results and systematic, standardized quantitative findings are straightforward and easily comprehended, accounting for their popularity in seeking answers to difficult problems. In contrast, phenomenology seeks to provide new insights while creating doubt that there can be a single right answer to complicated social issues. Acknowledging that multiple realities exist among victims and perpetrators of sexual harassment demands a re-formulation of previous assumptions. As old beliefs are overturned, new dialogues and, ultimately, more creative solutions can be generated.

### **The Phenomenological Method**

#### **A Definition**

As can be observed from the foregoing brief history of the phenomenological movement, definitions vary with the definer. The following definition focuses on the approach employed in the conduct of this research. Phenomenology is, first and foremost, an entirely qualitative methodology which examines the meaning individuals attach to their experiences (Wagner, 1983). It enlarges and deepens our engagement with a phenomenon. It is an exciting voyage of discovery that "turns away from blind acceptance of crystallized beliefs and theories which, in turn, causes us to prejudge and preconceive what we see, hear and

experience" (Speigelberg, 1982, p. 680). Like all qualitative methods, the phenomenological method emphasizes the importance of process over ends in themselves by striving to make sense of an entire experience rather than to simply dissect its parts. As opposed to empirical methods which rely on quantification and deductive reasoning, phenomenology focuses on description and interpretation to inductively and holistically arrive at the essence of a context-specific human experience.

Because it views reality as socially constructed, this method recognizes many truths will emerge from a single phenomenon. The positivist seeks facts or causes of social phenomena apart from the subjective state of individuals. The phenomenologist is committed to achieving "verstehen" or an interpretive understanding of a phenomenon from the actor's particular perspective, comprehending that the important reality is what people perceive it to be (Taylor & Bognan, 1984, pp. 1-2).

The purely phenomenological approach to research concentrates on the structures of consciousness, those organizing principles which give form and meaning to the lifeworld. Alternatively, the purely hermeneutic approach concerns itself with the historical meaning of experience as it interprets the developmental and cumulative impact at both the individual and social levels (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 202). By incorporating both the descriptive and interpretive features of the phenomenological method, in the



tradition of Paul Ricoeur, a more complete understanding of opinions, attitudes, perceptions, and points of view may be achieved.

As contrasted to ethnography which studies an entire culture, phenomenology concentrates on the experiences of individuals in various social settings in order to gain knowledge about a set of circumstances with similar antecedents. Phenomenology is the method of choice when examining subjective experiences because of its ability to probe the language constructions used to recreate the experience. Description is used to reveal patterns and interpretation to identify linguistic expressions and nonlinguistic actions. From this combination, meaning emerges.

### The Interview

The primary means of gathering data in a phenomenological study is the interview. Not just a question and answer session, the phenomenological interview immerses both researcher and participant in the experience (Tesch, 1984). It is conducted face-to-face to permit notation of facial expressions, body movements, and intonations which later aid in delineating meaning. The researcher encourages the respondent to structure an account of the situation, introducing those ideas, values, and beliefs which the participant considers relevant. Open-ended questions "permit a free response from the subject

rather than one limited by stated alternatives or implied boundaries" (Guba & Lincoln, 1985, p. 177).

The interviews in this study were carried out in a quiet environment chosen by the participant. Two interviews of 1 to 2 hours each were conducted with seven of the participants. Due to time constraints, the eighth interview was conducted in one 2-hour session. All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed verbatim. Identical interview protocols (Appendix C) were used with each person studied to ensure the same issues were addressed in each case. A stream of consciousness approach limited interviewer questioning in order to minimize bias. This approach also encouraged the free association of participant thoughts and perceptions. Archival and survey data were used to supplement the research and further strengthen the results of the interviews.

#### Method and Application

Mohanty (1969, p. 3) divides thought into five processes: (a) the thinking subject; (b) the process of thinking the thought; (c) the thought itself; (d) the linguistic expression of the thought; and (e) the object of the thought. Husserl's method began with the linguistic expression and then moved backwards to the thinking process, ending with the thought. Although several road maps will lead the researcher in this general direction (Giorgi, 1983;

Hycner, 1982), Speigelberg's (1982) general outline, as described and applied below, was chosen for this study.

The method begins with the process of bracketing. **Bracketing** is a mathematical expression used by Husserl to describe the process of questioning what may have been previously taken for granted. Prior to analyzing the interview data, researcher biases and preconceptions were listed in order to set them aside or "bracket" them out. The seven steps listed by Speigelberg (1982, p. 682) follow from the bracketing process:

1. **Investigating a particular phenomenon** requires an initial critical and intuitive examination of the phenomenon under study.

**Application:** Audiotaped interviews were reviewed in order to acquire a sense of the whole experience. After the interview data was transcribed, the transcriptions were read through twice to provide a context for the beginning of theme development.

2. **Investigating general essences** forces the researcher to look for exemplifying particulars as stepping stones to reach the general essences. These essences are then lined up based on the order of their similarities.

**Application:** Units of general meaning were defined by crystallizing and condensing the interview data into unique, coherent expressions.

**3. Apprehending essential relationships among essences** by deriving those essences that embody the phenomenon and make it unique.

Application: After redundancies were eliminated, the units of meaning were examined and clustered together into general themes.

**4. Watching modes of appearing** gives attention to what Husserl referred to as "the ways of appearance of the intentional objects."

Application: Nonverbal facial expressions, gestures, and intonations were located throughout the transcription. Those units of meaning which received particular emphasis during the interview were appropriately annotated.

**5. Exploring the constitution of a phenomenon in consciousness** can be compared to watching a picture gradually take shape in the mind.

Application: Themes were clearly stated and sub-themes began to emerge from the clusters of general meaning. These were noted in conjunction with the numbers of women who reported the same behaviors, thoughts, or feelings.

**6. Suspending belief in the existence of the phenomenon** is accomplished by filtering out everyday experiences in order to achieve a critical detachment and to facilitate the intuiting process.

Application: After a period of reflecting on the preconceptions noted by the researcher in Chapter One, an additional review of the general themes and subthemes was

undertaken. Those which seemed to reflect the biases of the researcher were reexamined in context to prevent overt manipulation of the data.

7. **Interpreting the meaning of the phenomenon** is an area that concerned Heidegger, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, and Ricoeur more than it did Husserl and relates to making sense of the phenomenon in a larger framework.

**Application:** A composite summary was developed and individual differences were noted. Themes were then contextualized and interpreted in relation to the overall environment in which they occurred.

#### **Supplementary Data Sources**

In addition to the interview data, several supplementary sources were used to verify and cross-check information received during the interview process. These additional sources included survey data, court-martial transcripts, and archival data as outlined below.

#### **Survey Data**

As described in Chapter Two, the Department of Defense commissioned the largest survey ever undertaken involving active duty men and women (Martindale, 1990). Well over 20,000 responses were received and the results were published in September 1990. In order to compare those results with the responses of the participants in this study, each of the eight women interviewed was asked to

complete the survey as if she had received it one month after reporting the sexual harassment experience to authorities. A copy of the survey is included as Appendix D. The results were tabulated and compared to those reported by the Defense Manpower Data Center (Martindale, 1990).

#### Court-Martial Transcripts

In two of the studied cases, a general court-martial resulted from the harassment. In both instances, court-martial transcripts were made available to the researcher. After completion of the interview analyses, the transcripts were used to corroborate the data received in the interviews and to put themes in context. The transcripts are verbatim re-creations of the testimony given throughout the courtroom proceedings. They were particularly useful in contextualization since the remarks of both victim and perpetrator were recorded.

#### Miscellaneous Archival Data

Two participants had kept copies of the initial statements made to the Naval Investigative Service. In one instance, a participant had retained a copy of the statement that she and two other women officers (not participants) had written out and submitted to the Commanding Officer at the time of the harassment. This documentation was utilized to verify information received in the interview. In the four

cases where perpetrators were punished through a nonjudicial proceeding in lieu of a court-martial, no verbatim transcripts were available for scrutiny. Naval messages and media reports described some of the incidents and were obtained when practicable.

### Validity of the Study

Husserl's concept of a phenomenological study was highly rigorous. "The intuiting of essences is not a mystical or lyrical leap; it is a rational insight or cognition of a nonempirical structure of consciousness" (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 43). Although very different from the classical experimental research approach to science, phenomenology is a data-based methodology that attempts to discover the "rule structure which the matter in question prescribes to the knower" (Strasser, 1969, p. 5).

Despite the rigors of the phenomenological method, qualitative research strategies abandon a positivistic stance. They are, in fact, a reaction to the limitations of such an approach. Thus, they cannot be fairly judged by the evaluation criteria normally used in a quantitative study (Morgan, 1983, p. 396). Qualitative research strategies are not easily replicated, there are no statistical analyses to check for proper use and statistical accuracy, and the specific application may vary with the researcher. Nevertheless, by providing detailed descriptions of a phenomenon in a complex social world, a phenomenological

study picks up where quantitative methods leave off. There is no place for reflective dialogue in a quantitative study; it is results-oriented and often devolves into a tightly controlled technical activity. Bureaucratic organizations prefer quantitative data; it is more readily comprehended and can be used by political factions to "prove" or "disprove" a particular point of view. An inductive study such as this is time consuming and labor intensive, but is not bound by bureaucratic demands and limitations. Rather, it brings new insight to a phenomenon which has the potential to affect all social entities and organizations.

According to Tesch (1984), the validity of a phenomenological study can be judged using several criteria. These include the following six yardsticks: (a) whether or not the researcher examines presuppositions and biases and makes them known to the reader; (b) whether the researcher utilizes a sufficient number of participants to establish a pattern; (c) whether the researcher details data gathering and analysis with sufficient specificity to allow the reader to make a critical judgement on its accuracy; (d) whether the researcher adequately describes the participants; (e) whether the researcher incorporates sufficient raw data to give the reader a flavor of the participants' experience; and (f) whether the researcher triangulates data by verifying it with other sources. Marshall and Rossman (1989, pp. 148-149) list additional criteria including how participants' truthfulness is assessed and whether or not



negative findings are displayed and acknowledged. These concerns and others will be addressed throughout the study.

### Researcher's Preconceptions

The temptation to embark on a study such as this with preconceived notions and ideas and then set about proving them is the greatest threat to a qualitative study's validity. In the dialogue Theatus, Plato rightly pointed out that there is an important difference between what we believe to be true and what we know to be true. What we believe to be true may often turn out to be false. With this in mind, the following biases, beliefs, preconceptions, and attitudes of the researcher are listed. These were noted in journals before the first interview and as they occurred to the researcher throughout the process of data collection. Analysis of the data did not begin until this chapter was written and approved by the researcher's dissertation committee.

1. Though I am reporting only from the female perspective, I believe that sexual harassment is not only a male to female issue. Because I believe it is often a problem of unequal power relationships, I believe women can also be guilty of harassing men. Indeed, I am familiar with a case where that occurred. I do believe, however, that female harassment of males is an anomaly.

2. I believe the problem of sexual harassment is as serious and pervasive as the Department of Defense survey results reported it to be (see Chapter Two).

3. I believe that female naval officers are particularly vulnerable to sexual harassment due to their smaller numbers in a male-dominated culture which prizes war-fighting skills, skills which are still socially unacceptable for women to acquire.

4. I believe that female naval officers are not valued as highly as male naval officers and that this contributes to the sexual harassment phenomenon.

5. I believe that many female naval officers struggle between retaining their femininity and trying to fit into a male-dominated environment. This can result in inappropriate dress or behaviors which could be construed as a sexual come-on.

6. I believe most female naval officers who are sexually harassed do not knowingly invite it.

7. I believe most female naval officers are very sensitive to the maintenance of positive working relationships and do not like to confront co-workers or create hostility in the workplace.

8. I believe some female naval officers actively seek sexual attention because they are unsure of their professional capabilities or because it gives them a feeling of power over men.

9. I believe that the perceptions of male and female naval officers regarding what constitutes sexual harassment are significantly different. Females believe that many verbal comments fall in the category of sexual harassment, but males do not.

10. I believe that male naval officers do not view sexual harassment and sexual discrimination as seriously as they do racism or racial injustice.

11. I believe the majority of male naval officers do not see a compelling need for women in the Navy and that this attitude gives impetus to sexual harassment.

12. Despite the Navy's stated policy of "zero tolerance" for sexual harassment, I believe most male officers in leadership positions are reluctant to openly declare themselves against sexual harassment or to sanction those who violate the policy.

13. I believe many of the senior male officers and senior enlisted men in the Navy have been socially conditioned from childhood to think of women as sexual objects and believe that sexual teasing is a harmless pursuit which flatters most women.

14. I believe that many male naval officers have a strong need to dominate and acquire power and that this exacerbates the problem of sexual harassment.

15. I believe female naval officers are part of the problem to the extent that their own social conditioning has taught them that men should be deferred to, that women are

the weaker sex, that women are supposed to be flattered by the sexual attention of men and accept it as a compliment.

16. I believe most female naval officers do not wish to be ogled, addressed in a sexual way, or touched sexually by male co-workers.

17. I believe most female naval officers do not like sexually suggestive jokes or stories, but will rarely do anything to stop them because they do not want to be considered overly sensitive. For this reason, some may respond in kind as a way to become "one of the boys" and fit in. I believe such behaviors perpetuate the problem. I also believe that sexual jokes and innuendos are commonplace throughout the Navy.

18. I believe reporting sexual harassment is extremely difficult for female naval officers for the following reasons: (a) fear of reprisal, (b) fear that nothing will be done, (c) fear of becoming an outcast, (d) fear of appearing as incapable of handling their own problems, and (e) embarrassment.

19. I believe that female naval officers are emotionally affected by being treated as sexual objects and that such treatment often results in serious personal and professional consequences.

20. I believe female naval officers want to be treated with respect and as capable professionals.

21. I believe the military has a "macho" image that appeals to men who see themselves or would like to see

themselves as conquering heroes. This image conjures up what conquering males have historically done; pillage and rape.

22. I believe that many male naval officers feel threatened at the idea of being outperformed by a female officer to a much greater extent than they fear being outperformed by a male colleague. I believe such an outlook may give rise to sexual harassment.

23. I believe some male naval officers sexually harass women to satisfy ego needs.

24. I believe that alcohol is a major contributor to sexual harassment, particularly in the Navy.

25. I believe many male naval officers treat women officers as equals, serve ethically as their professional mentors, and genuinely are against sexual harassment, but are rarely proactive in combatting sexual harassment.

### Triangulation

As noted in Supplementary Data Sources above, a variety of documents were used to verify information obtained through the interview process. Court-martial transcripts, written statements for the record, Naval Investigative Service statements, naval messages, and press reports were all used to authenticate interview observations and comments. Moreover, interviews with female officers who had direct knowledge of one of the six cases investigated were conducted as an additional means of triangulating

transcribed data. As one more safeguard against researcher bias, a female Navy Captain (O-6) with over 25 years commissioned service was interviewed after confiding to me in private that she had been sexually harassed. Her harassment by a superior, to whom she reported while she was a Commanding Officer of a major naval command, affected her emotionally and physically. Her response to the harassment typifies the reaction of most women; she did not report it. Her comments helped to emphasize the hidden nature of this problem since many women feel, as she did, that the path to success is strewn with obstacles they must dodge rather than confront. The interview was audiotaped and transcribed. Though her remarks do not appear in the composite summary of core cases, they are used where appropriate to add weight to a point of view.

#### Participant and Site Selection

Eight women officers agreed to be interviewed for this study. They constitute a representative sample of the 8,000 women officers currently on active duty. Two of the officers interviewed have since left active service; the remaining six are still on active duty. One nurse corps officer, one judge advocate corps officer (an attorney), one aerospace maintenance officer, one aviator, and four general unrestricted line officers with a wide variety of backgrounds were interviewed. Commissioning sources for the eight women included the Naval Academy (two), NROTC (two),

Officer Indoctrination School (one), and Officer Candidate School (three). All interviewees were junior officers (Ensign through Lieutenant) except for one Commander.

The incidents took place between the years 1985-1990. Interviews were conducted over the 9-month period beginning February 9, 1991 and ending October 9, 1991. Two General Courts-Martial and four Admiral's Masts addressed the claims of the eight women interviewed and, in each instance, the sexual harassment charges were found to be legitimate. All perpetrators were found guilty and punished in some manner. Each of the women interviewed was between the ages of 21 and 38 at the time of the incidents described. All were college graduates.

The population was narrowed to female naval officers who had successfully pursued a legal solution to the sexual harassment they had experienced for the following reasons:

1. All sexual harassment charges were independently investigated by naval authorities and found to be substantiated.
2. All participants were mature, well-educated, professional managers over the age of 21. Adhering to these criteria enhances both validity and generalizability for a like population. Validity has also been strengthened by obtaining data on eight separate experiences which were similar in nature. This facilitated the emergence of patterns.

A ninth woman officer was also interviewed as a representative woman officer who did not report the harassment which she experienced. Her comments were particularly valuable in light of her seniority and experience in the Navy through 26 years of active duty and four tours as a Commanding Officer. She will not be described further in order to protect her anonymity. Her comments will be appropriately credited when used.

Site selection for the interviews was determined by the participants. Interviews were conducted in private homes, hotels, a library, an office conference room, and a university classroom at various sites in California, North Carolina, Virginia, Hawaii, and Florida.

#### Intersubjectivity

Intersubjectivity is very difficult to achieve in a phenomenological study since it is quite possible that two researchers studying identical populations will construct different answers to the same research questions. Ideally, reader insights gained from a clearly written, believable description and carefully thought out interpretation ensure validity. Kocklemans, however, offers five approaches which substantially improve the prospect of achieving intersubjectivity: (a) avoid forcing the phenomenon into a preconceived scheme; (b) make the phenomenon reasonable and human while trying for a more profound understanding than the participants in the study may have had; (c) get familiar



with the traditions and history of the phenomenon; (d) move back and forth from understanding the parts to understanding the whole; and (e) show meaning for the present after understanding the phenomenon's historical origin and development (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 236). This advice guided the researcher's efforts. It is left to the reader to determine how successful those efforts have been.

### Summary

Words rather than numbers are the core of the phenomenological method. Quantitatively oriented researchers argue that statistical analyses are more objective and less susceptible to the biases of the researcher. Yet, quantitative data can be as easily manipulated as qualitative data. As an example, information obtained from statistical surveys is heavily dependent on the questions and the manner in which they were asked. Since questions are dictated by the parameters that a particular researcher assigns to a topic under investigation, they often reflect the prejudices of the researcher. It would be wise to question the preconceptions of a researcher before routinely accepting the results of his or her "scientifically conducted random sample survey," but this is rarely done. In a phenomenological study, preconceptions are identified before the research data are analyzed. More importantly, the person who actually experienced the phenomenon in question is heard directly.

Surveys and other research instruments tend to mold information into pre-set patterns in order to more easily analyze the results. Phenomenological research is open to what may emerge from in-depth interviews which permit the subject to explore aspects of an experience that cannot be reached any other way. Though labor intensive, phenomenological research techniques are the best means of getting "to the things themselves" (Husserl, 1964).

"Postpositivism holds that we do not have access to indubitable truths" (Polkinghorne, 1983, p. 2). Because human beings have histories, their thought processes, behaviors, beliefs, values, and feelings will differ. What is to be gained from a study such as this one is an increase in understanding as evidence continues to build up that the phenomenon of sexual harassment does indeed possess essences which can be articulated. Though the apodictic standard may not apply to my conclusions, I believe that I can cogently defend what I have said before my community of naval officers.

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA PRESENTATION

#### Introduction

The information presented in this chapter has been derived from the following sources: (a) responses to the survey presented in Appendix D; (b) sworn testimony from two court-martial transcripts; (c) sworn statements made to naval authorities by victims, perpetrators, and witnesses; and (d) interview data from the eight women profiled. Sources have been noted in conjunction with presentation of the data.

For the purpose of clarity, each case has been briefly described, noting ranks of victims and perpetrators. With the exception of these brief descriptions, cases will not be further identified to guarantee the anonymity of the participants. Eight victims and nine perpetrators have been portrayed in six independent legal proceedings. In two of the cases described below, more than one woman officer preferred charges against the same perpetrator. To increase the verifiability of the information provided by victims, both women were interviewed. In another case, one victim was harassed in a single incident by four different male

officers. This accounts for the higher number of perpetrators.

#### Case Descriptions

**Case #1:** An Ensign (0-1) was harassed by a Lieutenant Commander (0-4) who was her direct supervisor. At the time, he was serving as one of the command's five Department Heads (a middle manager who normally reports directly to the Executive Officer of the unit). An Admiral's Mast resulted.

**Case #2:** An Ensign (0-1) was one of several individuals harassed by a Commander (0-5) who was her Executive Officer (the second in command in a unit). A General Court-Martial resulted.

**Case #3:** A Commander (0-5) was harassed by her Commanding Officer, her Executive Officer, and two subordinate Lieutenant Commanders. A General Court-Martial resulted.

**Case #4A and #4B:** A Lieutenant (0-3) and an Ensign (0-1) were two of five women who were harassed by their Commanding Officer. An Admiral's Mast resulted.

**Case #5:** A Lieutenant (junior grade) (0-2), was harassed by a Lieutenant Commander (0-4), a supervisor senior to her in the unit. An Admiral's Mast resulted.

**Case #6A and #6B:** A Lieutenant (0-3) and a Lieutenant (junior grade) (0-2) were harassed by an individual who was initially a Department Head in the unit, but who subsequently became the unit's Executive Officer. One was

harassed during the time that he was a Department Head, the other while he was the Executive Officer. Two other women officers were also harassed during this same period and gave sworn statements to that effect. An Admiral's Mast resulted.

An investigation was conducted in each of the six cases, and the charges which were filed by the eight women with whom I spoke were found by the Navy to be substantiated. Disciplinary actions ranged from punitive letters of reprimand to forfeiture of pay and a loss of seniority.

#### Types of Harassment

As characterized by the eight victims in their responses to questions contained in Appendix D, the harassing behaviors they endured included sexual whistles, calls, hoots, or yells (three reports); sexual teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions (six reports); pressure for dates (one report); letters, telephone calls or materials of a sexual nature (two reports); sexually suggestive looks, gestures, or body language (six reports); sexual touching, leaning over, cornering, pinching, or brushing against (seven reports); pressure for sexual favors (five reports); and attempted rape or sexual assault (three reports). Although Appendix D did not list exposure of genitals as a type of harassment, several of the women interviewed

indicated that indecent exposure by the perpetrator was part of the behavior that they experienced (three reports).

#### Location of Harassment

Events concerning four of the eight women profiled took place on shore duty in the continental United States. One of the events took place on board ship; and the location for three of the incidents was overseas. In two of the cases, the actions took place while the victims and perpetrators were on temporary duty, away from the main unit (analogous to a civilian business trip). Alcohol was a contributing factor in all but one of the eight incidents. However, in two cases, the primary harassment took place while the participants were sober and on duty in the working environment.

#### Case Elements

The following quotes are taken from the sworn testimony of the victims immediately subsequent to the incidents taking place:

I was just about to get ready for bed when I heard a knock at my door and loud voices. This was about 2300 or 2315 [11:00 or 11:15 p.m.]. I asked "who is it?" several times. I recognized the Commanding Officer's voice and Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_'s voice. They didn't go away so I finally opened the door. They barged in, and I realized that there were five people: the Commanding Officer [CO], the Executive Officer [XO], Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_, Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_, and Senior Chief \_\_\_\_\_. [The Senior Chief was the only enlisted man present and was tangential to this incident in the sense that he was more of an observer than a participant. He was not charged with sexual

harassment and will not be described further.] They had at least two bottles of wine with them. There were three empty bottles in my room when they all finally left. The XO especially looked very drunk and the CO, too, although not as much. They were all very loud and rowdy. I thought they would have a drink or two and leave. I wasn't very comfortable with the situation but thought I could handle it. Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_ began to talk about how I needed to "loosen up," relax, and have fun. There were many comments about the fact that my room had a queen-sized bed and how they'd be glad to help me warm it up. The CO said I should come up and see his bed--it was bigger, and he had a tub, too. I think it was about this time that Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_ fell down on the bed, pulling me down on top of him. Then someone landed on top of me. They had only been in the room a few minutes. I just laid still--it was a little bit hard to breathe or talk. Whoever was on top of me got up after a short while, and I rolled off Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_. I managed to sit up--the men were still talking, less loudly, and laughing. Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_ put his hand under my sweater, up my back. I told him to stop and pulled his hand away. I managed to get off the bed and stand in the corner by the window. All five men were between me and the door. Conversation was loud and covered many topics. The CO asked me if I had ever had an orgasm on a bidet. I was invited to spend several days in \_\_\_\_\_ with him. The Executive Officer commented "That will get you a 4.0 fitrep" [an excellent evaluation]. At some point, Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_ and Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_ tried to lift my sweater. I held my sweater down. Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_ unbuttoned his shirt to the waist and exposed his chest. I was becoming concerned at this point, but I had noticed that Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_ [a witness to the events] had come in the door and was standing in the small hallway to the room. I could tell he was appalled by the scene, and I felt that if things got any further out of hand, he would help me. At some point, the CO, followed by Lieutenant Commander \_\_\_\_\_, unzipped their pants and exposed themselves. I think it was one testicle. The CO called it "ball walking." I was becoming extremely worried at this point, and after a little more conversation, I began to try and get them out of my room. I think it was at this point that I was tossed on the bed again and not let up until someone took a picture.

In another incident:

I said I should be going, but the XO asked me to stay a while longer. He said I didn't need a haircut, but I

insisted. Then he asked how long the haircut would take, and I said one to one and a half hours. He asked me what I was doing after that, and I said I had rugby practice at 1830 [6:30 p.m.]. He asked me if I could take him back to the base after my haircut, and I said I would. Before I left to get my haircut, he said a few more things, this time sexually suggestive in nature:

- He said he wanted to put his lips on my lips.
- He said I scared him because he wanted me.
- He said he couldn't wait til I was CDO [Command Duty Officer, a duty which normally requires one to stay overnight on the base] again so he could look at me.

In other sworn testimony:

He knocked on the door, looked in to see if anyone was in there, then led me in. When we got in the room, I started to take the stethoscope off from around my neck, and while I was doing that, he was pulling my shirt out of my scrub pants, exposing my abdomen. At that point, I put my hand down, and blocked his hands.

In yet another case,

Before I could say or do anything his arms were around me and he was kissing me. I pushed him away and told him no. I said you're my boss. He said "No, I'm not, the Department Head is." I said "You are too." He kept putting his arms around me and said "Let me touch your breasts." I said "No" and again pushed his hands away.

Since sworn testimony was not available in all the cases, the following comments were taken from verbatim transcripts of the taped interviews which I conducted with each of the eight victims:

My boss called me in the next day to talk to me . . . and when we got done talking . . . he said "well, what did you think about my dick hanging out of my shorts yesterday?" And, um, somewhat amazed, okay, a lot amazed, he stood up and unzipped his pants and said "Okay, well let me show you again." He, uh, was standing in front of me and I was sitting down and he was standing in front of me and the first thing I thought was someone was going to open the door and it was going to look like we were engaging in some oral sex, so I said "what are you doing, what if somebody



opens the door?" and he said "Don't worry, the door's locked," as though that was, uh [laughs nervously], supposed to be comforting. So, then he sat next to me and continued to, uh, fondle himself.

Another victim comments that:

We were talking and then he approached me and tried to kiss me and I said "No, Captain, you can't do this." And he said "Oh come on, come on, come on . . ." and he forced a kiss on me and sort of threw me to the couch and got his hand down my pants . . . up the slit in my mess dress skirt. And I threw him off.

In another incident with the same Commanding Officer:

I went to the Captain to give my goodbyes and say "thank you very much" and then leave and he pulled me down on the couch and put his wet lips all over me and that was it, that was just like, that was the final straw.

The final incident took place on board an aircraft carrier and included the following elements:

So, he goes in and uses the head [bathroom], he's got the door closed, he comes out, he's got his pants down around his ankles, he's not wearing anything but his shirt. His pants are down around his ankles because I remember he was walking kind of, you know, his walking was restrained by his garments being around his ankles, and he had an erection, and he said something about "I know you've been wanting this all night."

### **Profile of Victims**

#### Biographical Data

The following information was gleaned from answers to the survey found in Appendix D. At the time of the incidents described in the case profiles, the victims' ages ranged from 24 to 38. Two of the victims were married at the time of the incidents. The remaining six had never been married. Two of the victims listed themselves as hispanic;

the remainder indicated that they were nonhispanic caucasians. When the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention took place, three of the victims were Ensigns (0-1); two were Lieutenants (junior grade) (0-2); two were Lieutenants (0-3); one was a Commander (0-5). All had been in the Navy for at least three years. At the time of the harassment, one victim was an aviator; one was a nurse corps officer; the remaining six were general line officers. Of those six, one has subsequently become an attorney; one is currently an aerospace maintenance officer; one has left the service; one is attending law school and has submitted her resignation; the remaining two are general line officers who plan to stay on active duty for the foreseeable future.

The following additional information was obtained from the interview process. All eight victims were college graduates who entered the Navy through various commissioning programs. One officer entered through officer indoctrination school in Newport, Rhode Island; three others completed officer candidate school in Newport, Rhode Island. These four women all attended civilian colleges or universities prior to entering the Navy. Of the remaining four, two attended universities in connection with the Navy's ROTC program and two were Naval Academy graduates. All eight were exposed to Navy leadership and management training, some more than others depending on their commissioning source.

Of the eight, two are now drilling reservists; one is a civilian who has not affiliated with the reserves. The remaining five are still on active duty; although one will be leaving the service in the next year. In answer to a survey question from Appendix D, five of the eight said the harassment incident caused them to have a less favorable opinion of the service. Two of those five have resigned since their commissioning; one additional resignation is pending. Of the eight victims, six grew up in military families.

#### Self-Portraits

A portrait of how the victims saw themselves emerged from the interview data. The following eight paragraphs contain representative quotations from each of the eight women interviewed.

**Case #1:** "I always thought that if anyone ever harassed me, I'd handle it on the spot, I'd, you know, I'd slap 'em, you know, whatever, and all of a sudden, when I was caught in that situation, you know, I didn't know what to do." "I felt real lousy about myself, that I'd let this man treat me like dirt and he's getting away with it, and, and, it's not right." "Being believed was the major factor in my being able to deal with the situation. It took me a long time to, uh . . . [pause] get my self-esteem back up." At her request, the victim was reassigned to another job but was given very little work. "I started to feel real useless

'cause I was doing nothing productive . . . little tiny projects that would take two hours and they'd be done and then I'd say 'Now what?' I finally went in there [to the Executive Officer] and said 'Sir, either give me a job or I'm going to phone-in muster everyday [call in from home]." Her response to the question concerning how she had changed by virtue of this experience reveals a growth process. "I gained a lot of confidence in myself, as a person. I stood up for something I believed in and I could have just swept it under the rug and pretended it didn't happen . . . which I tried to do in the beginning . . . I tried to erase it and pretend it didn't happen." "I was really intimidated, you know, and unsure of what to do, uh, scared . . . scared as hell, thinking I'm only an Ensign and he's a Lieutenant Commander."

Case #2: "When people do hit on me, I'm not real quick to catch on sometimes." "I was afraid to not do what the XO said because he's the XO." "You know how you can feel, you can sense, kind of, danger and I felt like 'this is not right,' but now I'm here so what do I do." "My first instinct is to punch him in the mouth, but that's probably not a good idea, so I won't do that, but I, I really didn't know what to do." "I think we all like to think 'Well, I can handle it, it's no big deal . . . it's under control. I took care of it. I, I'm a big girl . . . I can deal with my own problems.' And that's really how I thought and I had no intention of taking it any further." "It made it hard to

concentrate on anything and I've never been like that before and I've never been like that since." "I'm usually pretty relaxed."

**Case #3:** "I was trying to figure out what was going on and I was wondering how I was going to keep control of this situation and uh, thinking that, uh, that I just wanted them out of my room, but I couldn't figure out a way to get them out gracefully." "I was interested at that point in maintaining some sort of dignity and face in the situation, uh, even though my instinct was to just start yelling." "Was there a point where I could have put my foot down and said 'You guys are out of line . . . straighten up!' Can you tell that to a Captain who is your Commanding Officer?" "One of the things that was going through my mind that night was 'I still have to work with these people.' If I start yelling and screaming at them, uh, and, and shrieking and what have you, the things that I felt like doing, I couldn't see that I could continue any kind of working relationship." "I know I did the right thing filing charges. In retrospect, I wish I'd even pursued those more aggressively than I did. Uh, but as far as, I, I still tend to second guess myself a little bit as to, you know, was there, was there something else I could have done to have prevented it from happening altogether. As time goes by, I start to realize probably not. If I'd had the attitude then of zero tolerance for sexual harassment and the perfect willingness to be an absolute bitch about it, no matter who was

involved, then probably I could have prevented it from happening to me."

Case #4A: "And I threw him off and, uh, got out of the situation and I was going to scream, but . . . I was going to really scream because the Ensign [a new woman officer who had just checked into the command and was temporarily staying with the victim] was upstairs, but I didn't because I didn't want to embarrass him and I . . . it was such a paradoxical situation because I knew this was totally inappropriate. If it had happened in a back alley . . . if someone had kissed me who I didn't want to . . . I would have screamed my head off. And more than just pushing him off me, I would have let him know . . . I would have kicked him good. So I didn't scream because I didn't want to wake the Ensign . . . it's her first day here. She doesn't need to see this happening with her new Captain. So I finally get across the point that this is not what I would like to do and so, I said 'You must leave Captain . . . this is not right.'" In talking about how the incident was eventually reported, "I was rather nervous because . . . I mean, I hated to do it. And I didn't know if it was appropriate . . . and I hated jumping the chain of command." "I just felt bad, because he was a good guy and it was a good operational command. It was sad to see . . . he was so smart, I just couldn't believe that such a smart man would do such stupid things."

**Case #4B:** "I don't necessarily confront them right at the beginning and I think that this is just another example. I'm a tolerant person. I tend to think 'What did I do wrong?' first and sort that out. And, I think what happened was . . . it was just like a pressure cooker. This kept on for I'd say a year and one night I just totally lost it."

"Because I was raised in a military family, there were a lot of implicit rules. I grew up with the UCMJ [Uniformed Code of Military Justice] more than I did when I was in the real Navy. And, uh . . . anyway, one thing is you never say anything bad about your Captain. And he was my Commanding Officer. So, during all this time, I'd never mentioned a word to anybody, never discussed it, I tried to blame it all on myself, not on him, since the Captain can do no wrong."

"The biggest problem with me was not knowing that he was wrong and I was right in the beginning. Thinking that a Captain is always God and most of the time, they probably are, but there are some cases, like this one, when they are not." "I think I feared more for my professional growth. It was a goal for me to do something in the Navy and . . . I was afraid I was going to be held back from that." "Unlike some people, I had worked and put myself through school and, to me, it was a big deal to have a degree and to be actually doing something."

**Case #5:** "I had frozen. Because it was something that was unexpected and I was trying to figure out what was going on. That's why I didn't react." "It was just a real bad

time for me until I got into counseling." "A lot that came out in counseling was that I was also molested as a child. Um, and they said a lot of what I was going through with what \_\_\_\_ did relates back to what happened to me as a child." "It put me right back in the victim role and I wasn't reacting because in the past I would just block and get through it and that's probably why I froze when I did." "There was a lot of . . . well, am I making this up . . . is it really not that serious? Could there have been something that I could have done about it?" "If he's above you in the chain of command, you think twice about it."

Case #6A: "I know that I'm only one person, I can only fight so much, so I choose, and whether it's right or wrong, I don't know, but I have to just pick certain battles and some of them I will fight and some of them I will just let go, you know? A lot of time, the jokes, just say them and just leave me alone." On the subject of men who talk about women in suggestive terms, "I guess that's how I feel when they do that, 'So that means you're sizing me up too? You don't think I have brains enough to do my job and is that all you can think about? Isn't there something else redeeming about me instead of just how I look?'" "It was kind of hard to keep in mind that I didn't do anything wrong, you know? I did nothing, I was just a victim of something. I was reacting to them [the investigators] as if I was somehow guilty. I was able to at least quickly realize though that I did nothing wrong, I was just there."



He was the one who did the wrong." "I think I was able to recover faster than the other ones [two of the three other women officers involved in this case], because I was probably the most prepared and had the most information. For them, I think, they had to be overwhelmed."

Case #6B: "It's very difficult to talk about it. It's very difficult for a person who considers myself to be a strong, a person of strong character and, you know, I just don't let a lot of things bother me . . . to admit how much this bothered me. I mean it was very, very hard for me to go 'I've been victimized, oh, my God.' You just don't think of yourself . . . if you're a strong person who just does what you need to do . . . it's very hard to think of yourself in those terms." "I had never been harassed before and I'd never been in a situation where I didn't know what to do about it, so I just said 'I'm not doing anything. I'm just going to stay away from this guy. I'm going to hope that it's just me, you know, that I'm the reason he's doing it.'" "It just really got to the point where I had to deal with it because I couldn't live with myself if I didn't." "I'm goal oriented and get where I'm going, you know, accomplish this, go here, accomplish that and I've never had something that was so disruptive to my life as this." "I can't think of a single other thing I've done and made a decision at a crossroads to go here or here, that I've ever tortured myself over the way I've tortured myself over this thing. And that's another thing that's kind of weird about

it. That's not how I am, I'm very much 'make a decision and live with it and make it the right decision for you.' But I cannot deal with this one. I just can't do it."

#### Characterizations by Others

From testimony given at court-martial proceedings, two of the victims were characterized in the following manner: "an assertive, female pilot, normally willing to speak her mind." When asked specifically how the perpetrator felt about this victim, a witness testified that the perpetrator "had mentioned that she was a pretty good officer." In another court-martial case, the prosecutor asked a co-worker of the victim why he thought she did not immediately press charges after the harassment took place. He responded that "She was afraid that her career, which she was just starting, after having graduated from the Naval Academy, would be in danger, and she didn't want to take that chance."

### **Profile of Perpetrators**

#### Biographical Data

The following information on the nine perpetrators was taken from answers to the survey found in Appendix D, and from interview testimony. At the time of the incidents described in the case profiles, all of the perpetrators were officers on active duty with the United States Navy. Two were Commanding Officers in the rank of Captain (O-6), three

were Executive Officers in the rank of Commander (O-5), and the remaining four were Department Heads (middle managers) in the rank of Lieutenant Commander (O-4).

Eight of the nine were married at the time of the harassment. All were nonhispanic caucasian males. Seven of the nine were older than the victim; were senior in rank to the victim; and were in a supervisory position over the victim. The two individuals who were junior to the victim were accompanied, during the primary harassment incident, by their CO and XO to whom the victim also reported. In all but one of the cases profiled, the victim claimed to have known that the perpetrator(s) had sexually harassed other women. Seven of the perpetrators were aviators, one was a submariner, and one was a medical doctor.

Three of the perpetrators had well over 20 years of naval service. Two of the officers who were charged had close to 20 and the remaining four all had been on active duty for 10 years or more. The two Captains and two Commanders were senior officers whose rank permitted them to wear caps adorned with the coveted "scrambled eggs" (gold braid). Their status as senior officers meant they were accorded additional respect by those in uniform and were expected to shoulder additional responsibility.

### Self-Portraits

The following comments are taken from sworn testimony of the perpetrators:

I do not recall who mentioned the words "ball walk." One of the officers stated that his old squadron mates would have a wager on the amount of time it would take for someone at a party to notice that one of your testicles was out of your pants. I must state that the act of "ball walking" has only been done in a group of known acquaintances and never in a public place. I stood up, demonstrated "ball walking" for about 30 seconds, re-zipped my fly, and sat back down.  
(Captain, Commanding Officer)

To be honest, I probably made remarks with a sexual connotation. All remarks I made were in a "joking" manner and were not intended to be offensive.  
(Commander, Executive Officer)

I tried to lighten things up by talking about some of the crazy things we've done [pilots in general] like "ball walking." At that point I pulled my fly down and got up and pulled out my penis. I walked a step or two away toward my locker, turned around and said, "So what do you think of that." She then stated something about the door being locked (which it always is). I then put my penis back in my pants sensing that my attempts at a joke to lighten the situation had failed.  
(Lieutenant Commander, Department Head)

No other sworn testimony was available for perusal, however, the following comment by one of the perpetrators was made to the media at the conclusion of his court-martial:

Sometimes you win, sometimes you lose, sometimes it's a draw. I'll say this, though. I'll never go to a social event again where there are women officers or enlisted women present. I've learned that a smile and a touch can make them ring your bell.  
(Commander, Executive Officer)

#### Characterizations by Others

The quotations which follow were taken from testimony in the two court-martial cases and refer to characteristics of the perpetrators:

The attorney chosen by a perpetrator (Commander, Executive Officer) to defend him described him as, "a little

bit rough around the edges," and "something of a rascal." While "he may not be the type that will impress people in the Washington cocktail circuit, he's extremely effective in what he does which is leading, motivating and getting the job done."

The following quotation was taken from the guilty plea which was entered at a court-martial proceeding by one of the perpetrators:

I admit that my conduct was unbecoming an officer and a gentleman under the circumstances. I believe that my conduct seriously detracted from my standing as a commissioned officer, and was even more serious because I was the Commanding Officer. I admit that my conduct was unbecoming because it was more serious than slight and of a material and pronounced character. My conduct was also morally unfitting and unworthy.  
(Captain, Commanding Officer)

The quotations which follow describe the perpetrators as seen by the victims. Quotations appear in sequence as they were taken from each of the eight interviews.

An Ensign described her former boss, a Lieutenant Commander, Department Head by saying, "He was, uh, very highly respected, and highly thought of, number one Lieutenant Commander." He was a "real outgoing kind of guy and really into the troops, he got down and got into the shops." "He kind of made this job for me to get me groomed," but "obviously this man had no respect for me as an officer, as a subordinate, as a person."

A Lieutenant made the following comments about her former Executive Officer, "He was a crass kind of person, you could tell he was old world, kind of, and had no . . .

no social skills, basically, whatsoever." "He had a propensity to drink too much and kind of run his mouth a bit." "He had so much more power than . . . than an XO should have, because of the way he ran his shop. If he didn't like you . . . it was over . . . you were gone, your career was history." "He did a good job of being a manager. He was a good managing XO. He was not a good XO, because he wasn't a good naval officer, but he was a good manager." "He basically said 'You know, my lawyer said the only way I can win is to discredit you as a witness, so I'm going to watch every move you make.'" "And he really, honestly in his heart, thought he would beat this thing and I know it. And I knew he would stop at nothing to do it either." "He respected your professional performance as a general thing, but whenever he had to deal with you in a social setting, it didn't matter what . . . you know, he would go back to 'I'm a male and I'm supposed to dominate you and hit on you and whatever.'" "He was a, pardon the expression, a kind of 'kick ass and take names' sort of guy. He just went in like . . . he just, just leveled everything. I don't know how to describe it other than to say what he didn't like, he didn't like and it would go away. And who he didn't like, he didn't like and they would go away. I mean fired or whatever. So, he was very authoritarian, I guess is the right word."

A female Commander described her Commanding Officer, a Navy Captain, and her Executive Officer, a Navy Commander by

saying: "I recognized the Captain as someone who likes to have a good time . . . he was sort of your classic attack aviator and, uh, . . . an Academy graduate." "Certainly, the CO had no, you know, his career was strong and, and he had no inferiority complexes that I could detect." "I'd known Captain \_\_\_\_ for over a year and I considered Commander \_\_\_\_, while not the kind of person I would call a friend, at least I certainly didn't consider him to be a threat in any way." "It was very, very hard for me to understand why this had happened . . . why these people would do a thing like this."

A Lieutenant depicted her Commanding Officer, a Navy Captain, in the following manner: "He felt the wardroom [officers in the unit] weren't socializing enough, so he wanted to have an AOM [all officer's meeting] every Friday where we would get a little training and tell jokes and then go over to the bar and have drinks." "His general style as he walks about the command is very . . . uh, he wants to be friendly with everyone, in my opinion, too friendly." "This is a guy who's been in the Navy for many years and he knows his professional stuff very well and he's definitely an asset to the \_\_\_\_ community and he has very good insight and foresight on operational matters and knows his job very well, so I thought, well, he's had a second chance and I'm going to give him a third chance." "Operationally, I did respect him, yes. But I was embarrassed for a senior

officer in the United States Navy to be behaving so inappropriately."

Discussing the same Commanding Officer, a former Ensign, now a civilian reported: "He was the type who would go up to seamen and ask them what needed to be done and then go to the division officer in front of the division and say, 'Get this done' and basically, you're not doing your job." "No, I don't think he ever would have changed. I think it was his basic character and when I made the comment 'And you're a married man,' he said 'I've been married since 19 whatever and I've been doing this since 1960 whatever and my wife this,' and basically he was saying 'I know what I'm doing and I don't give a shit, I'm having a good time.'"

A Lieutenant (junior grade) characterized her senior Lieutenant Commander in these comments: "My first recollection of him was that he lambasted me because I told him he couldn't admit a patient to the unit. And he was like, 'I am the attending', I will admit who I want to and you will do what I tell you." "What people were telling me is that he had been harassing nurses for awhile. Everyone else apparently knew his reputation." "He was kind of an oddball among the doctors." "He wasn't among those people who were really trusted." From another nurse involved in the same case and interviewed by phone from her current duty station at an overseas hospital: "It was like all in one week that this physician was acting strange and, one day I was sitting at the nurse's station and he came by and he, um



. . . he, he was always saying some kind of comment, but this particular day he like pulled open my, um, pulled for my scrubs . . . and looked down my scrub tops."

A Lieutenant (junior grade) described her superior officer, a Commander, as follows: "He was good, he was down there with the maintenance people, he was very interested." I thought, "This is a great guy, he's down here seeing how we are and how things are going." "And during this time, he'd never done anything unprofessional, inappropriate, or anything else. He was very professional, very appropriate, but very interested in what we did." "He got drunk, he did drink a lot." "I mean he was a very big drinker and everyone knew it and nothing was ever done about that."

A Lieutenant spoke of the same individual in the following way: "I mean they didn't relieve him or anything, all I know is they talked to him and let him know that his behavior was inappropriate and I do think that they told him that he probably should stop drinking." "So we get in the plane, and we're sitting at the end of the runway and he's revving up the engines to get ready to take off and he says '\_\_\_\_, I may be a lot of things, but I'm certainly not a bad pilot.' Later in the same interview, "I think I always had a gut feeling that I couldn't quite trust him. In fact, professionally, I didn't trust him." "I kept a distance from him, knowing just to stay away from him because he doesn't know lines, he doesn't know boundaries, he doesn't understand that there's supposed to be boundaries."

## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### **Principal Emergent Themes**

Most major themes emerged as a consequence of the research questions addressed in Chapter One and the Interview Protocol found in Appendix C. Other themes arose naturally from the concerns of the participants. In several instances, subthemes developed when four or more victims spontaneously articulated nearly identical reactions, feelings, or impacts. The ways in which the harassment was reported will orient the reader to the myriad of avenues used by these women to seek legal redress. The initial section, Methods of Reporting the Harassment, will deal with these. The first three research questions sought to discover why the victim pursued legal redress and what personal and professional impacts occurred as a result of the sexual harassment. These represent three of the principal themes and will be analyzed under the headings: Reasons for Reporting the Harassment, Personal Impact of the Harassment, and Professional Impacts and Organizational Costs. The fourth research question addressed the effect of sexual harassment on good order and discipline in the

workplace, an issue which will be discussed in conjunction with other Professional Impacts and Organizational Costs.

Other major themes will also be considered. The immediate emotional and physical reactions caused by the harassment will be covered under Emotional and Physical Reactions. Each of the participants sought help and advice from others, a theme which will be discussed under the heading Need for Support and Guidance from Others. The personal views of those interviewed concerning underlying reasons for the harassment will be examined in Personal Theories of Causation. Victimization by others in the unit after the harassment was reported will be explored under Re-Victimization. Finally, possible ways to prevent sexual harassment from happening in the Navy of the future will be proposed in Prevention.

As the major themes took shape, subthemes surfaced from clusters of data naturally grouping together. Several of these subthemes were mentioned as concerns by all eight women, but received less overall attention than the major themes previously outlined. For this reason, they are listed as subthemes. In five cases, victims wondered what they might have done to cause the harassment. This self-blame created an initial unwillingness to report the harassment. For several of the officers, this hesitancy was overcome by their concerns for the safety of junior women in the unit if they failed to act. Six of the eight victims expressed the importance of having their charges believed by

co-workers, family, and friends. Many were convinced that an unsullied personal and professional record was needed to successfully prefer charges. Once the harassment was reported, victims felt they were being constantly watched. Along similar lines, some of the victims perceived that their experiences were being trivialized and ridiculed by those with whom they worked. Finally, most of the victims assumed that their experiences were isolated, exceptional incidents; not typical of the Navy as a whole. Each of these subthemes will be addressed as it relates to one of the major themes examined below.

#### Methods of Reporting the Harassment

In Case #1, the victim returned to the perpetrator the next day and confronted him by saying "Sir, I need to talk to you about what happened yesterday . . . if I have, if I have said anything or done anything that would lead you to believe that that behavior was okay, then I apologize." The perpetrator said "No, no, I'm the one that needs to apologize, I shouldn't have done that, I'm sorry." After this conversation, he returned to his usual, friendly manner, but she found she was no longer comfortable working around him. He had previously put his arm around her at work and she had not objected, but now she felt anxious. "It really bothered me, I didn't like . . . didn't like being around him." By arranging some training, she was able to stay out of the unit for about 3 weeks. During this time

she thought constantly about what she was going to do. "I just decided (pause) I couldn't . . . I couldn't work for this guy anymore, I couldn't handle seeing him, I was nervous, I wasn't able to concentrate on anything. So, I went to talk to the XO, and said 'Sir, I've got a problem that I need your help with. I don't know how to deal with this, and this is what happened,' and I related the whole story to him. And I said, 'I'm not out to hammer this guy and ruin his career and his . . . his family life. I just need a different job. I can't work for him anymore [pause], 'cause I'm not being productive.'" After telling the Executive Officer, she was asked to repeat her story to the Commanding Officer, who then called in the Naval Investigative Service to take statements and conduct a full investigation.

In Case #2, the victim documented what happened word for word in a letter and sent a copy of it to her parents, to her supervisor, and to her leading chief. On the advice of a co-worker, she sent it registered mail so that she would have verification of the date the events took place. She took no further action at that time, but tried to stay away from the XO as much as possible. On the nights she had to stay overnight on the base as the Command Duty Officer, the XO continued to bother her. Despite this, she felt she was handling the situation pretty well. As she was coming to these conclusions, she found out that several enlisted women were also being harassed. Soon afterwards, someone

else who was also concerned about the XO's behavior (she's not sure who) called the Inspector General's hotline. "The Admiral was called, and then the investigation started." Because of her letter, she was one of the primary witnesses against the XO. Initially, she resisted testifying because she felt very much caught in the middle, but eventually agreed to press charges.

In Case #3, the victim confronted the CO the next day and said, "I was deeply offended by what happened, I was frightened, and nothing like that had better ever happen again and I just considered the whole incident completely out of line." The CO indicated he was sorry the victim was offended and promised to have the others involved apologize to her. One of the four perpetrators did, in fact, apologize, but not at the direction of the CO. Meanwhile, in response to her inquiries, an enlisted woman in the unit told the victim that she, too, had been harassed during a previous deployment. The enlisted woman stated that the Commanding Officer had taken her head in his hands and placed it in his lap. This information, coupled with her husband's comment that she "couldn't let the matter rest," decided the victim in favor of reporting the incident. Soon afterwards, she contacted the Chief of Staff (second in command to the Admiral on his administrative staff) at the next level in the chain of command in order to begin the process of filing formal charges of sexual harassment.

The two women in Case #4 did not talk to one another regarding filing formal charges. One of them approached the XO and asked him to speak with the CO about the CO's inappropriate behavior. The XO decided against doing that, resulting in no further action being taken until 9 months later. By that time, the other woman officer in this case had reached a breaking point and reported the behavior to a Commander attached peripherally to the unit. This Commander took it upon himself to report it further up the chain of command. During this same time, a female Chief Petty Officer in the unit complained to a Master Chief Petty Officer at the next level in the enlisted chain of command about the CO's behavior. In addition, a third woman in the unit informally reported the harassment she had experienced to a friend on the Admiral's staff. All three reports surfaced at once, causing an investigation to be initiated.

In Case #5, the harassment victim called a friend immediately after the incident and told her what happened. The victim's friend also worked in the unit and was just getting ready to come on duty when the phone rang. When the victim's friend arrived at the unit, she called the duty officer, the chaplain, the supervisor, and the assistant head nurse and reported the incident. "They got the story and asked me if I wanted to press charges. I told them at the time that I thought it would be right . . . I don't think he has the right to do this stuff." Later that evening, the victim discovered that another nurse had been

similarly harassed and would also press charges. The Naval Investigative Service was contacted and a formal investigation commenced although no legal action was taken for over 3 months. Upon receiving the report, the Executive Officer chose not to take further action. Shortly after a change of command several months after the incident, the new Commanding Officer was made aware of the harassment at a briefing by the equal employment opportunity members of his staff, "Then the CO found out and within a week we were in Admiral's Mast . . . he moved on it. And we heard that \_\_\_\_\_ was offered the choice of a mast or a court-martial and he took the mast."

There were four women officers involved in Case #6. Initially, three of the women officers told the Commanding Officer about the behaviors being exhibited by the Executive Officer. No formal action was taken, nor was the next level in the chain of command informed about what had happened. Since the three women were given no feedback on the resolution of their complaint, they were not aware of this. A year later, the Executive Officer was awarded a Navy Commendation Medal and was selected to be a Commanding Officer of a command to which women were attached. At that time, the fourth woman, who had not yet come forward, realized that he had received no punishment and "something just went TILT." After several sleepless nights, she decided to press charges herself. She asked the other women if they would be willing to support her claim and they said



they would. Because she was no longer attached to the same unit, she contacted the attorney for the Admiral at the next level of the chain of command and asked how to proceed. A hotline call was suggested, but she declined and wrote a letter to the Admiral's staff concerning this officer's behavior. An investigation was begun and the previous charges from the other three women were resurrected as part of a complete investigation.

#### Reasons for Reporting the Harassment

As is apparent from the profiles of the victims in Chapter Four, there was a tremendous amount of ambivalence concerning the idea of preferring charges against the perpetrators. Most of the perpetrators were respected professionally; all of them were respected for their rank and position. However, the personal behavior of the perpetrators eventually broke down the professional respect that these women had for them. None of the women took these actions lightly. All discussed the situation with friends, family, or co-workers before deciding to go ahead.

In Case #1, "I called my Mom and said 'Mom, what do I do, I need some quick advice here.'" The victim also spoke with her roommate and her running partner before convincing herself that she had to take action. Then she started to wonder if "he was doin' this to these young girls who, you know, were they too scared to say anything, 'cause I knew how scared I was and I thought, well, being enlisted, you're

really much more intimidated to bring something up against the officers. So, yeah, after pacing the halls and shaking, and wringing my hands, and stuff, I finally went into the XO, and said 'Sir, we have to talk.'

Right after the main incident in Case #2, the victim went directly home and called her father, a former Marine Corps officer, to get some advice. He told her "You have to do something about it . . . you can't let that go." She also told her running partner who said, "Well, you've got to do something about it." She was still reluctant, however, because even though she knew that "eventually I was going to have to do something," she realized that "people didn't stand up to him (the XO) . . . didn't take action right away on something that he did, because they knew they were going to probably lose." The XO had stopped bothering her; her avoidance techniques seemed to be working. She stated that "I had no intention of taking it any further, knowing that I had the letters [the registered letter in which she documented the incident] . . . that if anything happened, he . . . you know, I'd have him or at least I thought I would. But then, when I heard about them [the enlisted women he was also harassing], it kind of made me realize . . . I can't let this go on because they can't do anything about it. If I'm in a bad position, you know, they're in a really, really much worse position." A hotline call made by someone else started the investigation, but this victim stated that she

probably would have initiated action shortly thereafter if no one else had.

In Case #3, "Initially I thought perhaps I could let the incident slide, but . . . my husband was really concerned for my safety and in retrospect, he was correct." She was unhappy with the CO's failure to apologize for his behavior and began to make up her mind that "I was going to have to do something." "You're really, you're vulnerable no matter what you do, and so, I, I was trying to think of all the things, all the ramifications of what I was about to do." When she talked with the Lieutenant Commander who had been a witness, but not one of the perpetrators, he offered to stand behind her "one hundred percent." This factor contributed significantly to her willingness to come forward since she knew her story would be corroborated. "Another thing that was a big driving force for me was I did not see how I could protect the enlisted women, once I found out that another incident had occurred."

The two victims in Case #4 had very different ways of handling the harassment experience. The victim who had previously discussed the CO's behavior with the XO had been told that "the Skipper [CO] treats you all like his daughters . . . don't worry about it." She responded by saying, "I just think it's inappropriate . . . and I guess I am upset . . . it's just not right . . . he shouldn't be doing this . . . we're not his daughters." However, she did not report the harassment she experienced until after the

formal investigation had begun. The following recounts a conversation she had with the Commanding Officer subsequent to her refusal of his advances on a Friday evening: "Monday morning rolls around and he comes in for his eight o'clock brief, listens to the brief and he comes in for coffee and then into my office where I'm sitting at my desk and I start to stand up when he says 'No, no, don't stand up.' And then he closes the door and I don't know what to expect since this is very unusual . . . he never did this. So, he says 'About Friday night . . . I just want you to know it will not hurt your performance . . . I think you're a good, hard worker and this won't hinder your advancement.' And I said 'Well, I would not expect it to, sir.' Then he said 'And I'm just curious, why wouldn't you let me stay?' And I said, number one sir, I'm Catholic, number two, you're married, number three, you're my Commanding Officer.' He said 'Well, why wouldn't you sleep with me?' I said 'Sir, I just told you three reasons.' And then he said 'Well, okay . . . well, this won't hurt you.' And then he starts to open the door and turns back to me and says, 'Well, you know I'm usually free on Saturday mornings and can get away from my wife . . . are you sure I can't come over on Saturday?' I said 'Absolutely not.' And, he said, 'Well, think about it.' And I think those words are pretty much verbatim since I do remember that conversation distinctly." Despite this sort of direct pressure and the fact that she knew other women in the unit were being pressured, this victim wanted

to give him another chance before she took further action. "And then, if something happens, three strikes and he's out." As she continued to notice inappropriate behaviors involving other more junior women officers, she made up her mind to speak to the Admiral during an upcoming inspection tour, but ended up not doing it. "I still hadn't brought up this delicate subject and I knew I had to. And, I was rather nervous because . . . I mean, I hated to do it. And, I didn't know if it was appropriate . . . and I hated jumping the chain of command. But I raised my hand . . . and then I asked this stupid question about operations. I guess I was stalling at that point." Once the investigation was initiated by others, however, she came forward and cooperated fully.

The other victim in Case #4 found it much more difficult to directly confront the Commanding Officer. She describes some of the consequences: "Then the things started coming like, uh, putting his hand on my behind or brushing my breasts, picking me up. One time I remember we were at a social and we were all in uniform and he picked me up and he had his hands on my behind. It was obviously intentional and I was trying to get down from his grasp, but it was a very awkward situation because, of course, other members from the wardroom [other officers in the unit] were in there. Things would happen at work . . . started happening at work. For example, I was in communications by this time, and he came back into my working spaces and he cornered me

into a corner. He was making some type of comment which had sexual innuendos and the radiomen were in the area and, of course, that was very embarrassing." After over a year of this type of behavior, this victim finally reached a breaking point as he tried to kiss her against her wishes. "I stood up and pushed him away and I made three points, one of which was 'You're the most disgraceful, disgusting thing I've ever seen, something about being disgraceful to the United States Navy, being unprofessional, and being a married man.' And at that point, I just said, 'You haven't heard the end of this.'" Until then, she had not discussed her feelings with anyone, but could no longer keep quiet. The next day, she spoke with a senior officer who "was a friend of mine and he obviously knew that something was wrong because I'd just kind of lost it, I was shaking, almost in tears, and he asked me if I wanted to talk." She proceeded to tell him the whole story, whereupon he told her it was his obligation to take it further. When he asked if she would cooperate in the event of an investigation, she replied "yes."

The victim in Case #5 felt she may have been willing to report the sexual harassment immediately because "My professional reputation was such that people believed me" and because she had a good support group initially with people saying, "You're doing the right thing. We believe in you. We believe you. Go for it." Her reason for reporting the behavior may have emanated in part from her experience

of being molested as a child: "I think I took action because I could; where as a child . . . I couldn't take action as a child. But, here, I had something that had happened to me and I could do something about it. So, I did." This victim also indicated that the process was made easier by another victim who offered to come forward and testify.

The two victims who were interviewed in Case #6 did not coordinate their actions any better than those described in Case #4. Sexual harassment by the Executive Officer had first been reported by three women officers in the unit soon after a party during which he fondled two officers against their wishes. Besides being outraged at being personally harassed, the victim who took the lead in reporting it was additionally concerned when she discovered she had not been the only victim. When she found out that at least two other women had been harassed, she thought, "This is . . . this is wrong. It's just totally wrong. He is the senior person here." She immediately consulted her uncle, who had previously worked with equal opportunity in the Navy, and asked his advice. He suggested getting all the victims to document what happened to them and then report it through the chain of command. After further consultations with the equal opportunity people in Washington, she followed that advice. She obtained written statements from the two other officers and informed her Department Head, who took the information to the Commanding Officer. None of the three officers received any feedback as to what actually occurred

after they reported the incident, but all assumed that appropriate disciplinary action had been taken.

The fourth victim in this case chose to remain silent for well over a year after she had been harassed. She feared she would not be believed, since the harassment took place as a one-on-one encounter and there were no witnesses. She also feared that her seniors in the chain of command would want to protect the perpetrator and would not take action. Despite several subsequent occasions in which the perpetrator harassed her, this victim continued to think she was the only one being bothered and felt her experiences were aberrations not worth mentioning. She left the unit 9 months later without reporting the incident and without confiding to others that she had been harassed. Her friend in the unit later told her about the Executive Officer's approaches to three other women officers. After learning that his behavior involving them had been reported, but that no action had been taken, this victim became extremely agitated. Her decision to come forward was precipitated by the knowledge that the perpetrator had not been punished for harassing the other women and that he was being sent to take command of a unit where women might again be his victims. As she describes the experience of hearing about this for the first time, "something just snapped. I had three or four nights when I couldn't sleep." She went on to say, "You just don't have a Commander in the Navy doing what this guy did to four different officers who work for him and say



'Well, you've done such a great job, we're going to put you in charge of your own command of women.' You just don't do it! And two weeks passed and I was . . . I was really freaking out, I was unable to concentrate on anything else and I finally called my friend and one of the other women in the unit and said 'I'm going to blow the lid off it, ladies, and I need to know if you're going to have a real problem with that.'"

It should be noted that only one of the eight women who filed harassment charges had no corroborating witnesses. In the instance where one woman was harassed by four men, a witness to the events offered to testify on her behalf. In all other cases but one, other women came forward and said they had been similarly harassed by the same man and would agree to publicly recount their experiences. In Case #1, there were no witnesses. It was a classic one-on-one encounter. In response to the question "What do you think would have happened if he hadn't admitted it?" the victim said "Life would be hell. I knew it had the potential to be really ugly and end up in a court-martial and a character slamming kind of thing. I really am fortunate that I didn't have to deal with that."

A primary reason for reporting the sexual harassment for four of the eight women was to protect other women from the perpetrator. This subtheme emerged in connection with the decisions of these women to seek legal redress. Seven of the eight women interviewed had solid evidence that other

women had been harassed by the same man who had harassed them. They stated that this was a contributing factor in their decision to take action.

#### Emotional and Physical Reactions

All eight victims reported some emotional trauma. Four of the eight indicated that physiological reactions accompanied the emotional reaction. The mildest emotional reaction was slight nervousness and a feeling of being upset. The victim experiencing the most severe emotional upset continues to require psychological counseling. Routinely reported reactions included anger, frustration, shock, nervousness, fear, anxiety, depression, an inability to concentrate and a generalized feeling of being upset. The following four comments are illustrative: "I was nervous, and I'd go hide in the closest office and shut the door and send someone out to find out when he left." "I was pretty much an emotional mess." "The slightest little thing and I would burst into tears for no reason." "I had a little bout of mental illness, I think. I mean I was very, very distraught about it." Sleepless nights were reported by four of the eight women. Three stated that they tended to hibernate at home and did not want to see or talk to anyone: "I kind of withdrew from society for awhile."

Headaches were common to four of the women interviewed. Two reported various other stress reactions including upset stomachs and a tendency to get sick more often than normal.

Three of the women noted continuing physical distress when forced to think or talk about the experience. As one stated, "I notice physiological symptoms every time I talk about this. It's so strange too, because I really . . . in my mind, I don't think it's affecting me at all any more, but then I notice when I start talking about it, I get really agitated and I, I shake a little bit and it gets hard to talk."

During the time of the harassment, one victim had what she described as irrational thoughts like, "Maybe if I gained a little weight, he wouldn't look at me like this or talk to me like this. So I started eating three Snickers™ bars a week." Relating other things she did "to look as unattractive as possible," she said she stopped wearing make-up, stopped fixing her hair, and bought new uniforms which were two sizes too big. Another woman gained weight because "I didn't want to be out and about and I just became very inactive and just kind of vegetated." All of the women interviewed have recovered physically. Those who gained weight were able to lose it, those who reported headaches ceased having them, but one woman did report the following irreversible physical impact, "I look like I've aged more than two years and that's the truth, I mean other people have told me that."

Four of the eight victims debated extensively with themselves before agreeing to talk about their experiences.

A representative recounting of the physiological impact of reliving the experience follows: "Every time I think about it, like the day after I talked to you, I got a headache and I broke out in a sweat and started getting really nervous because I hadn't been confronted with it in a long time."

The initial reaction of five of the eight women was to question themselves on what they could have done to prevent things from "getting out of hand." This subtheme highlights aspects of the natural-biological model of causation which hypothesizes that women bear the primary responsibility for preventing sexual harassment (Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982).

#### Personal Impact of the Harassment

In addition to the immediate emotional and physical reactions caused by the harassment experience as it was occurring, victims suffered long-term personal consequences which continue to the present. Six of the eight women interviewed share the sentiments of one of the victims who declared, "I'm a lot more conscientious. I'm very careful of what I say. I have to make sure it's not misconstrued in any way." Along these lines, a strong desire for privacy and a reluctance to become socially involved with co-workers emerged out of four of the interviews. One victim expressed it this way, "They're not going to know who I am because it's too dangerous. I'm going to be a 'one each' naval officer any time I'm in a professional setting and they're

not going to know anything about me." Five of the eight victims asserted that they now tend to doubt others' motivations and they are sometimes ill at ease with people they don't know well. The following comment typifies this feeling: "I think it really does make you not trust people as much or, at least, that's what it did to me, so I guess I'm edgy sometimes." Several of the women admit to having a problem with second guessing themselves. As one admitted, "I don't know if maybe I'm overreacting or I'm not and I'll never know that because I'll always in the back of my mind, think, you know . . . I'm cued on this now. I'm kind of poised, kind of hair trigger, you know what I mean?"

Four of the women made it clear that their level of tolerance for such behavior had been substantially reduced because "when you've been a victim of something like that, you do get very hard line." Five of the eight women's relationships with men are still being affected because they find it hard to trust them, "especially one-on-one with a male . . . particularly a male officer, particularly if the door is shut."

In response to the question, "What might you have gained from this experience?" six of the eight women responded that they had gained personal strength and self-confidence. As one victim said, "I think I gained a lot of respect for myself to know that I can stand up for myself in this Navy where a lot of us are afraid to stand up." One of the victims pointed out, however, that she felt the price

she paid for this new strength had been too high. Six victims stated that being believed was extremely important to them and two were impressed with the fact that the Navy's system of justice did prevail. Several of the women said they learned how to handle sexual harassment should it ever arise again. Each victim gained a sense of her responsibility to actively confront the issue in the future rather than keep quiet and hope for the best.

#### Professional Impacts and Organizational Costs

Those five women who now find it more difficult to socialize and relax with co-workers and supervisors at work are being affected professionally. The following scenarios are illustrative: "When I'm working with someone from out of town and they want to continue over dinner, I don't go alone. I don't do it." "If I would need to be around someone who chases skirts late at night, then I would ask someone else to stay here with me." "I don't like to socialize with my peers, so I'm really not as comfortable with them as I would be if I felt comfortable to socialize with them." "It's almost as if I tense up every time a male boss comes around." One of the victims verbalized it this way, "The one thing that a person needs in order to make it is not just your technical skills and your managerial skills . . . you also need your personal interactive skills. Take that piece of the puzzle or a portion of that third piece

away and you have a little bit less of a professional aptitude." Another victim was more direct: "I look at people and say 'Are they an honorable kind of person or are they not?' And if they're not, I contrive not to be alone with them. And so, it's really taken a toll on me as a naval officer." One victim summed it up: "If you get a little cog here who's not doing her job because someone is harassing her, then it screws up the mechanism, and until you understand that cost-benefit analysis, it's not going to work. And I think the Navy needs to understand that it's not a, it's not a 'nice to have' thing, it's a mission thing, and as long as they have women in crucial roles, they're going to have to have some mechanism for dealing with these problems because they're going to affect somebody's effectiveness."

Immediately following the harassment, direct professional impacts included absenteeism and reduced productivity. Seven of eight victims admitted to reduced productivity over a span of 2 to 8 months. This resulted from time spent trying to figure out what to do, time spent trying to avoid the perpetrator, and a markedly reduced ability to concentrate. All eight women described instances in which co-workers treated them less charitably after the harassment was reported. In addition, six of the eight victims stated that some command members regarded them as "whistleblowers." These unit personnel either refused to work with them or made it more difficult to complete

assignments. One victim reported that "I had to consult with him [a co-worker] regularly, or should have been consulting with him . . . but he simply refused to speak to me. He would not answer the phone, he would not give me the information, he would relay the information to a third party, just flatly . . . refused to deal with me in any way, shape, or form."

Unit productivity was affected in all six cases, but in four instances, victims stated the command was "torn apart" or "leveled" as a result of the harassment incident and that it did not recover for months or even years. The following observations are pertinent: "Our whole unit was affected. The morale just went straight to the bottom." "What went on destroyed the command. It did, completely." "The relationship between the professionals in the unit was strained. And that, I think, although I don't know how you would measure it, I think it does affect your productivity." "When people finally started expressing their feelings, I have never seen a command just come to a halt [as this one did]."

It is apparent from this commentary that the state of stability, control, and tranquility which the Navy aspires to when it seeks to maintain "good order and discipline" was negatively affected. The equilibrium of each of the six commands studied was deeply disturbed as a result of the sexual harassment which occurred. This organizational cost



cannot be quantified or graphed, but should nonetheless be of concern to naval leaders.

Need for Support and  
Guidance from Others

Without exception, all eight women sought advice or support from a co-worker, family, or friends. Four of the eight called one or both parents, one relied heavily on the support of her husband, one on the help of a roommate, and two others talked to friends or co-workers. Women's relationships often take precedence in their lives which can hinder independent action even when it is viewed internally as the right thing to do (Gilligan, 1982; Sheehy, 1981). Such a dependence on others also makes confrontation less likely when objectionable behaviors occur.

Support from others was an extremely important factor in the decision process that these eight women went through as they contemplated reporting the harassment. The following instance describes an encounter one victim had with a co-worker several weeks after she had been harassed, but before she reported it. Counseling her to report it, "He said, 'You deserve better than that and you can't tell me you can look at yourself in the mirror and you feel okay by letting this guy get away with this, can you?' And I said, 'No, I can't.' So he said 'You need to march into the XO and you need to say something.' And I said, 'You're

right.' So he kind of gave me a pep talk, like, I'm a human being, I don't deserve this kind of treatment."

Support from the chain of command was clearly evident in two cases. In one situation, the victim was supported by the Executive Officer, the Commanding Officer, and other women in the unit. The victim in this case believed the CO and XO handled it very well. She reported that they kept her, the command, and the next level up the chain of command informed throughout the entire process. Not only did they conduct an immediate investigation, but she perceived that they were also sensitive to her needs.

In another case, the victim felt she got immediate support from the chaplain, a family services counselor, the nurses and doctors in the unit as well as the director of the unit. After the initial support, however, the command lagged in its efforts to complete the investigation and bring the perpetrator to justice. Three months passed before the mast took place.

In one case involving two women officers, both victims were impressed with the performance of the Navy's Inspector General team and felt that they had done an effective job. The women were disappointed, however, that the Executive Officer had not also been removed from his position. By failing to take any action when the harassment was first reported to him, he became part of the problem. The following comment attests to this belief: "I think I could have gone to him with a videotape and he would have said

'Well, he's just your father figure . . . ." He continued to be part of the problem after assuming the duties of interim Commanding Officer. Shortly after the CO was removed from his post and sent home, the XO relieved him. He immediately held a training session on how to "appropriately report sexual harassment charges," during which he strongly intimated that the Commanding Officer's departure had been the fault of the women officers.

A subtheme from this area was the importance that being believed had for these women. Six of the eight women interviewed expressed the need to have family, friends, and co-workers view them as credible and truthful. The following statement is relevant: "I was real lucky in that I was . . . believed. If I hadn't had that support initially, I might not have gone through with it."

#### Personal Theories of Causation

The victim who reported the mildest emotional reaction to the harassment was the only one of eight to suggest that the harassment was a result of a man who "just liked to have a good time and had maybe a higher than normal sex drive." Her belief that this was the cause of the harassment aligns her with the Natural-Biological Model of causation (Tangri et al., 1982). Women who view sexual harassment in this light may see it as inevitable unless the woman takes appropriate action to prevent it. This may explain her comments that if "everyone in the wardroom had said 'no' and

not let him dare put his hands lower than their necks or whatever, then he would have gotten the word from every single female officer at the command." She had little tolerance for less assertive women and tended to place the responsibility for preventing harassment squarely on the woman's shoulders.

Two of the women respondents were specific in their rejection of this causative model. As one stated, "the idea that it's natural for men to behave this way or it's natural for people who are attracted to people to behave this way, well, it's not natural and we know it's not natural and I don't know why we have to continue to play this charade that it's natural to make sexually demeaning comments to someone. This is about somebody feeling like they want to impose an unpleasant situation on someone else."

Five women officers considered the desire to exert power over someone else as one of the primary causes of the harassment. The following comments support this point of view. "Now I understand what can happen with too much power when it's put in a person who can't handle it and I realize how devastating that can be . . . because he had complete control over me and in a military environment, even more so than a civilian environment . . . that . . . really destroys good order and discipline." Another woman theorized that "they were out to prove something . . . for some reason, whatever reason, I was a threat." From another's view, "People will use power and sex is power." Yet another woman

expressed it this way, "I felt very vulnerable around men to be in a position where they were more powerful than I was." And finally, "It still can be viewed as discrimination . . . the power play to keep the woman in her place."

In several instances, the socio-cultural theme made its appearance. "I think that it's just a pervasive feeling, especially in our society, about the purpose of women . . . not their role necessarily, but their purpose. On the one hand, we're told that we can have all these careers and have all these choices and everything else, and yet, every time we turn around we're told we have to be beautiful." Later in the same conversation, "It's how pretty she is . . . appearance plays a huge role . . . she's just supposed to sit there and be pretty. That somehow plays a role in sexual harassment." Another comment in this vein, "Women are socialized to be passive and that doesn't happen when men run into women who have overcome that socialization process. And, when women do not obey unquestioningly and men expect it, I think that's when violence erupts."

Alcohol was a causative factor in all but one of the eight incidents. According to the victims, seven of the nine perpetrators had been drinking or were drunk when the harassment took place. One of the perpetrators who was sober when he exposed himself in the office had partially exposed himself during a tailgate party the day before when "there were several kegs out in the parking lot and I'm sure that contributed." In the view of the victim, this may have

laid the groundwork for the subsequent exposure incident. In two cases, victims characterized the perpetrators as alcoholics.

Several causes were implied more than they were clearly stated. These included institutional biases, traditions, stereotypes, and perceptions. Each of these are pertinent to the understanding of sexual harassment in a strong culture such as the military and will be explored in depth in Chapter Six.

#### Re-Victimization

All eight victims reported some degree of re-victimization. Unit members either shunned them directly or contrived to obstruct their ability to complete assignments. Even in the case where the Commanding Officer and Executive Officer kept the command informed, many rumors still circulated. This caused some of the unit personnel to be a "little more resentful . . . because they didn't know the story." In this particular case, the victim received a phone call from the perpetrator's wife who said, "You flaming bitch, you brought this on yourself and I believe that you and my husband were maybe doing something on the side."

In another case, the victim stated that "a few of the officers who would normally come to my house stopped coming. I think they were resentful of the fact that the CO was relieved." This was the case in which the Executive Officer

succeeded to command after the Commanding Officer was relieved of his duties, a situation where both victims agreed that the Executive Officer "basically put us on trial." He said, "I want you to know you're welcome to speak to me anytime, it just needs to be with a witness."

In another instance, the victim felt as if she were being "stonewalled." As she stated, "I was indirectly being told to keep my mouth shut."

The following is descriptive of one of the uglier cases of re-victimization: "I was prepared for unpleasant . . . I wasn't prepared for as unpleasant as it was. Literally, it was horrible. I had never seen the kind of, the kind of side-taking and the twisted logic with how this is your fault. It's not his fault that he did all these things . . . it was your fault because you turned him in. And, it was amazing how many people we thought were our friends weren't anymore."

In the two courts-martial, both victims stated that the prosecutor had informed them that their credibility would be called into question and any and all previous conduct would be fair game for the defense. "The defense attorney told the government's attorney several times that we have some things about your client that you don't know about and the attorney would call me up and say 'You've got to tell me, if there's anything that they can dredge up on you.'" Later in the same interview, "That was the kind of thing you go through when you decide to file court-martial charges,

because they go for the jugular and they try and discredit you as a person . . . they're not supposed to call your integrity into question in that way, but I'm telling you that the reality of the situation is that it happens."

In the other court-martial, the perpetrator would call the victim and say "Hmmm, so, you got to work at this time and, at this time, you walked over the BEQ (Bachelor Enlisted Quarters) and, at this time, you went to the little mini mart and, at this time, you did this, and at this time, you went running. I'm watching you . . . I know where you are." He told her, "My lawyer said the only way I can win is to discredit you as a witness, so I'm going to watch every move you make." At one point, she was even being followed by a reporter from the National Enquirer, making her feel like "a witness in a Mafia case or something where you're going to get it one way or the other . . . no matter what you do, you're dead."

A subtheme that emerged from this section was the belief that a spotless record is needed to successfully bring a charge of sexual harassment. "I can just thank God I hadn't been a wild woman because I would have just been crucified during this thing" was a representative comment. The victims realized that they, too, had been put on trial through the act of bringing charges. Five of the eight victims stated that their charges would have gone nowhere had the investigators been able to discredit them as



witnesses. In the one instance described below, that is exactly what happened.

In the case involving four women officers, the charges of the two women interviewed for this study were substantiated. The other two women who complained were discredited because of the personal behavior patterns of the women who complained. The two women whose charges were believed told of being questioned by the investigators concerning the morals of the other two women bringing charges. "Things like 'Haven't you seen them be sleazy at parties?' and this kind of thing. And I said 'Well, I haven't seen them do anything I haven't seen male officers do.'"

A second subtheme was the feeling of all eight women that they were being constantly watched. "In the back of my mind, I felt the XO was scrutinizing everything that I did." The most common thread involving being watched was expressed this way, "I felt like everybody was staring at me and saying 'There she is . . . .'"

A third subtheme under re-victimization was the way in which the victims' experiences were trivialized by the perpetrator, by co-workers, and by others in the chain of command. Victims were most often characterized as being humorless and their experiences were belittled. Several comments illustrate this attitude: "He pulled up his pants and said something like I didn't have much of a sense of humor." Another victim commented that "None of the women

had any problem believing it [that the sexual harassment occurred], but the men, there was just, just a lot of denial, like it just didn't happen. Somehow, again, it all came back to me, I had just lost my sense of humor and couldn't take a joke . . . a hysterical female on the loose."

The last subtheme concerns the way the victim's perceptions and attitudes affected their actions. Seven of the eight women interviewed felt the sexual harassment they experienced constituted unique and isolated incidences. This attitude prevailed despite the fact that seven of the eight women were certain that their harassers had harassed other women. In part, their mistaken belief that they were the only ones being harassed was responsible for the victims' ambivalence regarding their perpetrator's actions. This made them reluctant to report the behavior.

### Prevention

The concept of preventing what happened to them from happening to someone else surfaced as each interview wound down. Many ideas were generated and each of the following recommendations were suggested by at least half of the participants. Sincere support is needed from the Navy's top leadership. Cases of sexual harassment must be publicized. Better training programs must be developed. The proper way to report sexual harassment and the right of personnel to report sexual harassment must be publicized and included in

training programs. Trainers must be sincere and capable. Sanctions for violating the policy of zero tolerance must be publicized and used. A better method of tracking cases must be developed so that trend data may be analyzed. These issues will be explored in greater detail in Chapter Six and Appendix E.

### Composite Summary

The methods of, and reasons for, reporting the harassment and the organization's reaction to it were many and varied. However, one detail stands out: All but one of the victims had corroborating witnesses who had seen or experienced the types of behaviors alleged by the victims. This supports the finding by several researchers that witnesses are almost always necessary to successfully prosecute a case of sexual harassment (Coles, 1986; Terpstra & Baker, 1988).

The various methods of reporting the harassment included one instance in which the Inspector General's hotline was contacted. However, the call was made by someone other than the victim, who spoke with no one officially until investigators arrived on the scene. Immediate action was taken by the Inspector General as soon as the hotline call was received, an indication that this may be an effective means of resolving a case of sexual harassment if the chain of command appears unresponsive.

Of the victims interviewed, four reported the harassment to superiors within the unit. In all four instances, an internal investigation was initiated. However, information was suppressed in three of the four cases and no action was taken until a higher authority was made aware of the harassment. In one of these three cases, a second officer, victimized by the same perpetrator, contacted the next level up the chain of command on her own, after she left the unit. In another case, a second victim was also a catalyst in a case when she reported the harassment to a senior officer outside the unit. This officer subsequently communicated with the next level of command on her behalf. In the third case, equal opportunity personnel were responsible for setting formal proceedings in motion as a result of a briefing they conducted for the new Commanding Officer on unresolved EEO issues. In the only one of these four cases which was quickly investigated and prosecuted, the unit Commanding Officer, upon being informed of the harassment, immediately contacted the Naval Investigative Service and the next level up the chain of command. Significantly, the perpetrator admitted to the conduct once confronted. It can be speculated that had he denied any wrongdoing, this case would have been exceedingly difficult to prosecute since the incident took place behind closed doors, without witnesses.

The two most common reasons given for reporting the behaviors were the urging of others to take appropriate

action (five reports) and the feeling that others needed to be protected from becoming future victims of the perpetrator (four reports). It is important to point out that these eight women were unique in having reported these incidents at all. Fewer than 5% of women who say they have been harassed ever take formal action. Their reasons include fear of retaliation, a perception that nothing will be done, and pressure from seniors not to embarrass the organization. Additionally, some victims are unaware that such behavior is against the policy of the organization. This last is an important reason to ensure policies are well publicized (Martindale, 1990; "An Update Report," 1990; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1981, 1987).

As mentioned in Chapter Three, an interview was conducted with a female Navy Captain (O-6) who confided that, while serving as the Commanding Officer of a major shore command, she had been sexually harassed by her superior in the chain of command. Since few women report harassment, her response typifies how this issue is routinely handled by women, particularly women managers. An excerpt from her interview follows:

And because he was my Admiral, and my boss, I couldn't very well say 'Admiral, don't do that' or 'Admiral, I'd appreciate it if you'd keep your hands off of me. I mean you don't want to say something like that to your boss. And I didn't want to make an issue of it, I didn't want to create any kind of negative rapport between us. And it wasn't just fitness reports [employment evaluations], although certainly that's important if you have any hopes of continuing to advance in your career, but just to maintain a good working relationship. I didn't want to get into a

contest with him. I mean, he was my boss. And so, I tolerated it.

Other quotes from women officers who did not report sexual harassment when it occurred are found in a study completed by this researcher in 1988. The following comments are representative: "I didn't report it because I didn't believe it would do any good and they [the perpetrators] would be believed before I would." "I felt he was in a position of control and I was not." "I didn't want to be thought of as difficult." "I felt it would cause more trouble than it would solve, the old 'another bitchy female' type of attitude" (Krohne, 1988).

A feeling of being on edge and nervousness were the two most common emotional reactions (eight reports) while headaches were mentioned more frequently than other physical reactions (four reports). The Captain who was interviewed reported similar symptoms as supported by her comment that "I was just in a constant state of fret with him. I had migraine headaches . . . ." Five of the eight women tended to look within to find answers to the harassment. Was it something they could have prevented? Did they bring it on by something they said or did?

From the standpoint of how they had changed personally, the victims most often stressed their increased caution when dealing with people (seven reports). Not only do they now weigh what others say and do carefully, but they also monitor their own behaviors for ambiguity or unintentional

double entendre. Likewise, in a professional sense, most of these women admit to having lost their ability to be spontaneous in the workplace (five reports). Because of this reaction, they perceive a negative effect on their interactive skills. An inevitable casualty of this change of attitude has been teamwork in the workplace. The female Captain who was interviewed related that she "got to the point where I dreaded to see the man or interact with the man and professionally, you need to do that . . . that's part of your job." Seven of the eight women interviewed noted a personal decline in productivity. Six of the eight stated that the productivity of co-workers was also affected. In these instances, command members took sides, debating the culpability of both victim and perpetrator.

Seeking advice and support from others was a common reaction to the harassment experience of all eight women. They also expressed the need for someone to believe that their stories were credible (six reports).

The most commonly cited causative factors involved in these harassment cases were alcohol abuse (seven reports) and abuse of power (five reports). A comment from the female Captain is pertinent, "I felt like he was trying to back me into a corner, to go along with it. In some ways, I think he was also trying to use his charisma and male prowess to conquer . . . I mean to have the feeling of conquering. And because of his position, he also knew he had a certain amount of power that went with that."

Seven of the eight women interviewed tended to view their own situations as unusual occurrences and considered them highly atypical of the Navy as a whole despite an awareness that others were also being harassed. This attitude, combined with the victims' respect for the rank of the perpetrators, contributed to their reluctance to report the harassment they experienced.

It was strongly implied by each of the victims that various cultural factors were at work in viewing the larger picture of sexual harassment in the Navy and in civilian organizations. Several of these factors include stereotypical characterizations of women, traditions which promote inequalities of treatment, and institutional biases which create an unwelcome environment for women in the workplace. These cultural issues and others will be explored in greater detail in Chapter Six.

Some degree of re-victimization was universal, both due to the antagonism of co-workers (eight reports) and the insensitivity of friends (six reports). Such treatment contributed to a feeling of being under a spotlight (eight reports). It was apparent to most of these victims that their reputations were very much at stake. They perceived that any past indiscretions would inevitably come back to haunt them (five reports).

Attitudes displayed by others were particularly hurtful factors in re-victimization. Many of these women were left with the perception that their co-workers or friends simply



did not understand the nature or severity of what they had endured. One of the victims described it this way:

Up until then [when the complaint was filed], my guess would be that there weren't a whole lot of people who would have attacked my character. But the minute that that complaint was made, I was free game. And people were making all sorts . . . people I didn't even know were talking about my character and the fact that I must be a lying dog and I must be somebody who had undisclosed motives and things like that. I was completely naive about how . . . people could judge me completely and finally without ever knowing me or the facts or anything else.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSIONS AND LEADERSHIP IMPLICATIONS

#### Introduction

The way in which an organization is structured, the strength of its socialization process, and the manner in which it stereotypes its members have all been documented as root causes of sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982). Seven of the eight women interviewed intimated that these aspects of the Navy's culture did, in fact, contribute to the sexual harassment they experienced. Also cited as important contributory factors by the women in this study were abuse of power and over-indulgence in alcohol. The federal law excluding women from combat (Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 6015) was viewed by five of the eight women as a catalyst for sexual harassment to the extent that it produces negative attitudes toward servicewomen.

This chapter will explore these issues as they relate to the women officers studied and to the culture which surrounded them at the time that the harassment occurred. The themes which were delineated in Chapter Five will be placed in context by investigating various components of the

Navy's culture. An examination of ways to change elements of an embedded organizational value system will follow.

### Culture Formation

The culture of an organization is its heart. Culture is what makes the organization unique, sets it apart, and distinguishes it from every other entity on the face of the earth. A strong culture creates strong bonds. This collection of enduring beliefs, values, customs, and practices glue the organization together. Transmitted from one generation to the next, a culture is worn like a second skin by those who accept its tenets and pledge their support to it. In this regard, it "results in the establishment of shared ways of addressing the world" (Foster, 1986).

The primary aspects of an organizational culture are its rituals, symbols, metaphors, ceremonies, traditions, stereotypes, beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions. All of these help to create institutional biases which reduce ambiguity, enhance commitment, and increase consistency of behavior. These positive components of a strong culture are counterbalanced by liabilities which include organizational inflexibility in responding to dynamic environments and ineffectiveness resulting from conflicting values (Robbins, 1991).

"At the core of every culture will be assumptions about the proper way for individuals to relate to each other in order to make the group safe and comfortable" (Schein, 1985,

p. 104). If these assumptions are not widely shared, turmoil results. The Navy is in the midst of a tumultuous tug of war between many of its men and women. Their assumptions concerning how individuals should relate to each other and to the organization differ significantly. As a result, many service members are not "safe and comfortable" with regard to the causes and consequences of sexual harassment. Some of the reasons are explored below.

#### Traditions, Rituals, and Ceremonies

All military organizations are replete with traditions, rituals and ceremonies. The Navy takes great pride in its heritage and may be the most ritualistic of the uniformed services. From the first day of training, both officer and enlisted personnel are intensively socialized into a new way of life. Navy indoctrination programs are geared toward breaking down old habits and replacing them with behaviors which are acceptable to the organization. To do this, training programs immerse each new member into unaccustomed ways of speaking, thinking, and behaving. An early task of a Navy recruit or officer candidate is to learn a new language. Walls suddenly become bulkheads, floors become decks, ceilings become overheads. Anything that moves and wears gold braid is normally addressed as "sir" or, more recently, the occasional "ma'am." "Sir" becomes such an ingrained response for newcomers and seasoned veterans alike that phone calls are nearly always answered with the name of

the person picking up the phone, followed by "May I help you, sir?" Even when the voice on the other end is obviously female, it is not uncommon for a woman officer to be addressed as "sir" throughout the telephone conversation.

One of the most important tasks of those new to the service is to memorize the chain of command. This series of positions and people extend from the trainee at the bottom up through his or her Commanding Officer and on through numerous levels, ending with the President of the United States. A military member's understanding of where he or she fits into the chain of command is an essential component of maintaining good order and discipline in an organization which prizes and rewards unblinking obedience to authority. Significantly, part of the commissioning and enlistment oaths require members to swear "to uphold the orders of those officers appointed over me" (Title 10, U.S. Code).

Learning how to wear a uniform properly, how to march, and even how to make a bed (the Navy way, of course) are the types of tasks that fill every new member's waking hours during that initial socialization process. This process gradually breaks through old frames of reference and replaces them with a new means of viewing the world. The goal of this intense training is to produce an officer or enlisted person who is totally committed to an altered way of life.

Those who successfully negotiate this socialization process will often be described by friends and family

members as different people in both appearance and outlook. Some may even view themselves as superior and above the norm because of the special knowledge acquired during these rites of passage. Undeniably, old attitudes have been unfrozen. Essentially, indoctrination training is a disconfirming process that moves the individual toward the intended change sought by the organization. Traditions such as saluting and standing up when the Commanding Officer enters the room; ceremonies such as the change of command when a new Commanding Officer takes charge of a unit; and rituals such as the uniform inspection are shared experiences which serve to lock in these changes. Frequent new assignments encourage military members to cling to these traditions, ceremonies and rituals as a source of stability. Recurrent uprootings also mean that military members tend to interact primarily among themselves, further strengthening bonds to the organization and its philosophy. If conflicts occur, they are muted as the rank and file submit to the ultimate authority of the hierarchical structure. It is a strict, tightly-woven environment which places inordinate power in the hands of its Commanding Officers. "The Captain's word is law" and "The Captain goes down with his ship" are two common sayings which mirror the dual tenets of authority and responsibility inherent in naval leadership principles. Just as Harry Truman believed that "the buck stops here," every Commanding Officer knows that he or she is the ultimate authority and must also carry the weight of the

ultimate responsibility. Since women officers fill few of the Navy's Commanding Officer billets, that ultimate authority and responsibility is generally carried by a man. Congressionally-mandated combat restrictions reduce women's opportunities to become warfare specialists and their access to command billets. To date, only one Navy woman has officially been awarded the right to "go down with the ship" in the capacity of a Commanding Officer.

The hierarchical structure described above contains inherent power imbalances. "Rank hath its privileges" is a frequently heard adage which reinforces this notion. Women and men in the service are intensively socialized to respect authority, a tradition regarded as the bedrock of military discipline. The impact of this socialization process is demonstrated by one of the women interviewed in this study:

In my case, for example, if it had not been the Captain telling these jokes, I feel confident . . . I mean I would have gone to a Lieutenant on the side and said "That joke was funny, but I think you should have told it one-on-one in a small group and not in a public forum." But, in my situation, it was an O-6, a Captain who I am supposed to respect and be loyal to and I think maybe bend the rules a little bit more for. Although that is not the policy, but in tradition, I think we let our Captains do or say whatever they want to in their own command. That's sort of the privilege of having a command. So I think in my situation, it would have been a little . . . the outcome would have been a little bit different if it had not been the Captain saying the jokes.

Several other women also spoke of the effect of structure and power relations on the willingness to report offending behaviors: "But being it was the Commanding Officer, I would have hesitated to gather a bunch of people together to come

in and complain to the Captain . . . like a mutiny," and "You respect authority and you respect rank and it's just something that's not questioned."

Women who join the Navy are expected to conform to the predominant ethos created by its various traditions, rituals, and ceremonies. In this male-dominated environment, many of these lead naturally to alcohol consumption. Men and women in the military deploy and spend a good deal of time away from home base. In this environment, events which tolerate and even encourage overindulgence in alcohol can also lead to sexual activity as inhibitions are lowered and discretion falters. Schneider and Schneider (1988) addressed the issue of alcohol abuse in the following passage, "Too many servicemembers seek release in liquor, and little beyond their own common sense salvages them, unless their addiction severely impairs their job performance" (p. 225).

One tradition which promotes alcohol consumption among officers is the "wetting down" party hosted by a newly promoted individual to "wet down his or her new stripes." No sooner has the promotion ceremony taken place than co-workers begin asking about the traditional party to follow. These occasions often result in overindulgence. One of the eight women interviewed had just such an experience. After her promotion to Lieutenant, she was congratulated and simultaneously asked by her co-workers if she would be buying the beer at the Officer's Club that



evening. She agreed and it was this event that marked the onset of the sexual harassment she experienced at the hands of her Executive Officer.

The practice of "greenlighting" is another tradition promoting alcohol use. It refers to the custom of co-workers arriving unannounced at a unit member's doorstep for an impromptu party. Often, the idea to "greenlight" someone germinates in a bar, as a means to continue the evening's entertainment. In one of the cases studied, this activity led directly to a court-martial after members of the unit got drunk and assaulted a woman officer who worked with them.

Although alcohol can, and often does, contribute to the problem of sexual harassment, the initial inclination to harass women in the workplace flows from traditions which characterize them as unwelcome additions to a particular profession (Gutek, 1985; "An Update Report," 1990). For centuries, sea-going men have talked about women at sea in pejorative terms. Traditionally, a woman on board a ship was considered bad luck (Beck, 1973; Brasch, 1976). Women's place was on shore; their role was to create a haven for the sailor upon his return from sea. Although women are now serving alongside men at sea, some naval leaders have been slow to adjust to those realities. The following comment from one of the women interviewed pertains:

My current CO just got orders to a deep draft [a heavy re-supply ship with a large displacement] that has women on it. And he's just really upset about it. The

first thing he said was "Well, I guess it'll be okay, as long as my Engineer and my XO aren't women." My CO even said that he didn't think women belonged on ships or in squadrons, period. He didn't say it in a malicious way, it's just a statement of fact in his mind. He likes all the women officers who have worked for him and thinks we're all good officers, but he doesn't make the connection between the fact that he's got women in the unit where he doesn't think they belong. It's kind of an interesting gap in logic.

Women now serve in nearly every area of the Navy except on submarines and in special warfare units, but the Congressionally-enacted combat restriction still legally limits their utilization. Each service varies in its interpretation of that restriction. Since 1972, the Navy has permitted women to serve in warfare specialties that allow them to fly airplanes. The first opportunity for women to drive ships did not occur until six years later. A 1978 amendment to Title 10 allowed women to serve on ships which were not filling a combatant role (Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 6015). The relatively recent opening of these warfare specialties to women led many to surmise that the lack of a warfare designator was the reason that women were not fully accepted as equal partners in the service. Once they became warfare specialists, it was reasoned, they would break down these barriers. The pilot interviewed for this study rejected that notion in the following story:

Once I was given a gift, as a joke, by a good friend, so it really was a joke. It was a pair of wings that had been clipped on the ends. Obviously, I was capable physically of doing the flying, but the legal restrictions were such that they essentially clipped my wings. And all the designators [specialties] have those same restrictions when it comes to full

utilization of women. We just can't get away from it at this point. Maybe someday, they'll change the law.

As she went on to point out, "If you're a woman, then it's unlikely that you'll be fully accepted, regardless of your designator, because of the legal restrictions." Many women conclude that legal restrictions which drive unequal assignments and underutilization of women also lead to a lack of acceptance. This lack of acceptance is then manifested in unequal treatment and a perception that women are second class citizens in the armed forces ("An Update Report," 1990). Although not all women are anxious to go to sea, fly airplanes, and serve in combat roles, many are ready, willing, and capable of taking on those responsibilities. "Navy women are succeeding in all environments at sea and ashore" ("An Update Report," Executive Summary, p. ES-3). In the words of one of the officers interviewed, "women who come in the military should be able, and should be allowed, to compete on an equal footing with the men. And that means being able to fly combatant aircraft and be on the front lines, and be shot at, as it were." A woman officer frustrated by this issue commented, "I found myself competing against men who resented my being there because I wasn't able to deploy, to go out on detachment, make WESTPAC [Western Pacific] cruises, that sort of thing."

Another tradition which affects attitudes and perceptions in the Navy is the common use of sexual

innuendo and sexually oriented commentary. In the course of completing this research, I had occasion to visit with a former colleague who was serving as a Commanding Officer of a large aircraft squadron. The squadron employed a significant number of women officers, both pilots and general unrestricted line officers. As we reminisced, he told me a joke, a funny joke, but a very sexist joke. I asked him where he had heard it. He explained it was a tradition in the squadron for the bull Ensign (the most senior Ensign in a unit) to start off each officer's meeting with a joke. I asked if they always depicted women in a sexual way. Becoming somewhat defensive, he said "Well, you know the Navy." And I replied, "Yes, but tell me, what would you have done if he'd told a racial joke." He instantly retorted, "I wouldn't have permitted it." I said, "Then why are sexist jokes acceptable?" Thinking I'd "lost my sense of humor," he pronounced me changed and somewhat more "hard line" than he'd remembered. To his credit, he did consider the probable impact of such jokes on his women officers. Before I departed several days later, he assured me that his consciousness had been raised. He would curtail sexist jokes and comments with the same fervor that he had previously accorded to preventing racial slurs. A pertinent point to make here is that women infrequently object publicly to a sexist story or remark. They may politely laugh along with the men at jokes they find personally offensive. They have also been known to return the banter

as a means to fit in with the prevailing culture and to be viewed as team players (Martindale, 1990; "Navy Study Group's Report", 1987).

The use of female nudity to "spice up" dull lectures or to otherwise get the attention of an audience is yet another tradition that is demeaning to professional women in the working environment. Two of the women interviewed described separate incidents in this arena. One of them mentioned a planning meeting which was begun by a male officer placing a picture of a nude woman on the table. The other respondent objected to calendars featuring nude women which were seen in office spaces and on bulletin boards. A similar occurrence also took place in the researcher's personal experience when slides of naked women were slipped into a projector to "wake up" the participants.

It is often difficult for men who have spent most of their working lives in all male environments to fully appreciate the impact on women of such open and seemingly acceptable displays of female nudity. Certainly, this difficulty contributed to the harassment experiences which were described in Robinson v. Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc. (1991). In response to complaints by a female ship fitter that pictures of nude women in the shipyard were offensive to her, a male co-worker told her that "people always had displayed pinups and other images of nude or partially nude women, like figureheads on boats, and that the posting of

such pictures was a 'natural thing' in a nautical workplace" (Robinson, 1991, p. 1516).

A single offensive picture would not qualify as pervasive sexual harassment in any organization, particularly if it is removed upon request. However, the district judge in this case found Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc. (JSI) liable because

a reasonable woman would find that the working environment at JSI was abusive. This conclusion reaches the totality of the circumstances, including the sexual remarks, the sexual jokes, the sexually-oriented pictures of women, and the non-sexual rejection of women by coworkers. (Robinson, 1991, p. 1524).

This ruling denotes the importance of context in determining when sexual harassment is present. Context depends, in part, upon traditions, rituals, and ceremonies which make up and create an organizational culture.

In some areas of the Navy, women are merely tolerated, not welcomed. The prevailing attitude as expressed by one of the women interviewed is "Come on, ladies, if you're going to be here with the guys, you're going to have to learn to roll with the punches." The implication is that a woman needs to think like a man, act like a man, and respond like a man in order to be regarded as an equal. Under these circumstances, a woman must often deny her sex in order to survive. This issue was explored in a survey of 35 female Air Force officers who were convinced that successful assimilation into the military meant deemphasizing their

femininity and maintaining an appearance of being strong willed at all times (Maze, 1988).

Symbolism, Stereotypes,  
and Metaphors

A particularly vivid example of symbolism is the Navy's Flight Demonstration Team, better known as the Blue Angels. It is expensive to maintain a squadron of aircraft, mechanics, and top notch pilots for the express purpose of public relations. However, these costs are minimal in terms of the political rewards. The Navy knows the importance of perpetuating the myth of invincibility and technical perfection in the skies if public support is to be elicited and maintained.

How is such a myth sustained? Perhaps it is the matching royal blue flight suits. They are impressive, with each pilot's name embroidered in gold over the right breast and with wings of gold emblazoned over the left. Or maybe it is the airplanes all lined up in perfect order on the flight line, each one gleaming in the sunlight. The gleam is so bright that spectators need to shade their eyes to see the canopies close in unison as each jet slowly taxis to the end of the runway for a formation takeoff. This is symbolism at its best. No expense is spared to create the illusion of man and machine coupled in a marriage of professional precision and competence. To date, no woman has been considered as a potential member of this

prestigious team. Women are the spectators, the ones who are expected to be won over by the symbolism of the men of steel and sex appeal.

A recent example of the media reinforcing such symbolism is the movie Top Gun, a story in which the hero strapped on his jet plane much as John Wayne strapped on a gun. Thus armed, each hero swaggered forth to do battle with evil. Women in both westerns and war movies anxiously await the hero's return, offering succor, support, and sex. Such symbolism helps fuel stereotypes which assign "proper" roles for men and women. It is a powerful aspect of a war-fighting culture.

Women who become a minority in this male-dominated environment and fill roles which have been traditionally performed by men are often stereotyped (Gutek, 1985; Kanter, 1977). By categorizing women in stereotypical ways, it is easy to perceive that they are more or less all alike. Women who are viewed first as females and secondly as co-workers suffer more discrimination than women who are seen primarily as workplace equals who are valued for their professional capabilities. Stereotyping is a major part of the sex-role spillover theory of causation advanced by Gutek and Morasch (1982). Categorizations of women in the workplace are common and frequently so internalized as to be unconscious. Part of the testimony in Robinson v. Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc. made reference to this issue. One woman who brought suit was denigrated by witnesses



because she did not meet their expectations of a stereotypical affectionate female. Another woman's behavior was frowned upon because she used crude language and did not act like a "lady" (Robinson, 1991. p. 1503). The following quote from one of the eight women interviewed in this study speaks to this problem as well: "Once they can't categorize you any longer, once they can't put you in a neat little slot where they can discount you, then you become a major threat . . . and then, there's the tendency to use power to 'get you back into the niche.'"

Some years back, General Unrestricted Line Officer was briefly abbreviated to GURL. This acronym was seized on by many to describe female naval officers as a group. The use of the term "GURL" was a way to identify women officers by their sex, rather than by professional function. Most women naval officers are either nurses or general unrestricted line officers. However, many other women specialize in particular areas such as engineering, intelligence, or law. These women do not identify with the general unrestricted line, yet they are often lumped together and categorized first as women. The aerospace maintenance officer in the group of women interviewed related a story concerning how she routinely receives information intended for general unrestricted line officers. She sees this as an indication that she's being automatically stereotyped.

Another means of categorization which can be useful in ordering the world into comprehensible parts is the use of

metaphors (Lakoff 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Meanings get attached to behaviors and experiences through the use of metaphors as major vehicles for describing relationships (Smith, 1982). A commonly accepted metaphor causes people to experience one thing in terms of another whether or not the one is representative of the other. The visualization process which results creates a cognitive re-mapping which may, in turn, impact on behavior. Several examples of metaphors as they relate to women officers are provided below.

"Head skirt" is a term sometimes used to refer to a senior woman, a metaphor which tends to set women as a group aside from men as a group. Potentially divisive, such references make it easy for men to view women's issues as somehow so unique and different that they may be no longer capable of understanding or dealing with "female" problems which arise. One of the eight women interviewed gave an example: "They had me doing things; like they wanted me to come in and brief the women before they went on Dets [detachments] that I didn't go on that there were no tampons or anything available on the ships, and they needed to bring them." Her other duties included counseling the men on venereal diseases and unprotected sex, issues which she viewed as personal as a man telling a woman that she might need to bring along some tampons. Emphasizing this point, she told a male co-worker, "'Tampon' is not a hard word to

say and if you think they need to hear this, then you need to say it to them."

In one of the two courts-martial studied, a charge was lodged against the perpetrator for calling one of his subordinate women officers "babe." It was a charge that was eventually thrown out and discounted because there had been no other harassment experienced by this particular woman. Taken alone, the charge did not seem terribly important. A discussion of this incident led one of the eight women interviewed to comment that the act itself was probably inconsequential, but that it raised an important issue:

I think the idea of calling a woman "babe" is sexually demeaning and I think if there were a list of names that would be inappropriate to call a woman subordinate, that would be one of them. And I don't care if it's me calling a woman that or whoever. Would it be appropriate for me to call a black subordinate "boy" just because that's what I'm used to calling black men?

A less ambiguous form of linguistic sexual harassment is described by one woman this way:

I guess what happens is . . . a lot of the men . . . it's a little thing to them, they think its no big deal, you know . . . like this one guy was an LPO [leading petty officer] and he used to just . . . whenever a woman would come into work looking good, he would just say "You lock like you just got fucked." And that was his way of saying "Gee, you look nice today."

Women who work expect to be recognized for their professional talents. Most do not wish to be viewed as sex objects or as women first and workers second. However, it is a dual edged sword, in the sense that a woman alone has no power base from which to operate. Many women band

together in organizations such as the Women Officers Professional Association because they know that there is political strength in numbers. A coalition of like-minded women can address inequities in the workplace; a woman alone cannot. Many other women refuse to participate in organizations like this because they fear the association with a "women's group" might set them aside from the mainstream culture. There is a strong tendency among these women to view problems such as sexual harassment in isolation, in the same manner as seven of the eight women officers interviewed.

Stereotypes, metaphors, and categorization schemes such as those described above reinforce the fears of some women who do not wish to be seen as one of the "girls," a patriarchal term which is a wholly inappropriate description of professional women (Myers, 1984). The language we use to describe one another is very powerful and conveys many images beyond what is communicated on the surface. As long as women are thought of and referred to in terms of their gender instead of their professional expertise, their worth to the organization is devalued.

### **Institutional Biases**

Once people have an internalized picture of reality, further experience tends to confirm that picture. Traditions, rituals, ceremonies, and symbolism are substituted for the real world in accordance with the

established picture. Sometimes this occurs "at the cost of gross perceptual distortion and elaborate rationalization to make it all hold together" (Harman, 1988). This is the negative side of institutional biases; they tend to blind us to other realities.

The following hypothesis regarding the cause of sexual harassment is based on a 1990 report prepared by the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Service (DACOWITS) and the 1990 Navy Women Study Group's interviews with 1,760 active duty men and women. Sexual harassment flourishes in an atmosphere where women are not accepted as full-fledged members of the established group; where the institutional character of the organization encourages a "warrior mentality"; and where women's value and worth to the organization is perceived to be in doubt ("An Update Report," 1990).

Title 10 of the U.S. Code, Section 6015, excludes women from serving in combat roles, a factor which leads to resentment on the part of Navy men and which may promote sexual harassment ("An Update Report," 1990). The perceived gender gap regarding fair and equal treatment of women creates doubt concerning their worth to the organization. These feelings were expressed, in one way or another, by seven of the eight women interviewed. "My being female was never really an issue for anything that I ever wanted to do until I joined the military. And all of sudden, there was this long list of things that I probably couldn't handle and

shouldn't try." Another woman said, "I think men resent women in the military, because the military is a macho environment." The perceived "macho" environment which draws men into the service is further reinforced by a purposely fostered competition between warfare communities and by peer pressure to conform. The following comment describes what was perceived as happening in a jet squadron:

It's a serious fraternity and they really push everybody toward the norm. And you'd better fit in, you'd better be one of the "bubbas" as they call them, you'd better play with the guys, because if you're not one of them, there must be something wrong with you.

The traditions of the Navy focus on its war-fighting capabilities. This produces images in the minds of many men of aggressively confronting the nation's enemies while ensuring protection of the nation's women and children. Those men who envision themselves in such stereotypical roles also tend to view women in a stereotypical fashion. The woman in uniform is seen as abnormal and therefore not worthy of being treated like a "lady." Sexual harassment is one means to discount or subjugate women. Likewise, reducing a woman to the status of sex object is a method used by some to cope with the uncertainty of a woman's purpose in the organization. The frustrations created by such institutional biases is well expressed by one of the officers interviewed:

You like to think that this is 1991 . . . and people are going to look at me not for the fact that I'm a woman, but for the fact that I'm a competent professional. And it's this kind of thing [sexual harassment] that sends you back to square one. It

tells you "No." To a lot of people you'll never be anything more than a sex object and it doesn't matter how accomplished you are, it doesn't matter how effective a leader you are, you're always going to be a sex object. And that's a tough thing to take.

### **Organizational Change**

As society changes from an industrial to a postindustrial paradigm, cultural values, organizational philosophies, and organizational practices also are being transformed. A recognition that resources are finite and must be used wisely is slowly causing the cultural values of achievement and independence to give way to self-actualization and interdependence. New organizational philosophies regard resources as belonging to society just as much as to the organization. Hierarchical organizations with strict chains of command are becoming more organic in structure, flatter, and more responsive to their environments. Competitive relations are becoming less important than collaborative relations as today's organizational members look for ways to link their separate objectives together. There is a greater emphasis on cooperative efforts toward renewal and progress. Organizations are shifting their practices to longer planning horizons which anticipate, rather than react to, crises. Participation is no longer just a manipulative subterfuge aimed at producing support for a previously chosen answer. It is a genuine search for innovation and a

means of confronting rather than avoiding conflict (Lippitt, 1982). As society changes emphasis, so must the military.

Changing an embedded culture with 200 years of tradition behind it is a multi-faceted endeavor which must begin with organizational awareness and acceptance of the need for change. The ability of an organization to learn new ways is a function of how well it is able to tune in and break through old methods of functioning. To move away from those socialization processes which no longer serve organizational needs, perceived realities must be examined and described, individual interpretations of reality must be revealed, and critical inquiry must be pursued (Foster, 1986). Transformational change requires breaking through the language, customs, behaviors and reactions which have become second nature and which lie mainly in the subconscious. This process can result in real progress if the organization forces itself to question paradoxes that simultaneously praise women for their abilities and debase them for their differences.

Meaningful change depends on understanding individual ways of viewing reality. Individual meanings must be probed to facilitate a double looped learning process. This occurs when underlying assumptions are exposed and altered so that they coincide with a desired end state (Argyris, 1982). As Argyris points out, one of the major obstacles to change is a disconnect between espoused theories and theories-in-use. Simply put, people or organizations often say one thing and



act out another without realizing the contradiction because of an unconscious set of underlying values. Sometimes referred to as governing variables, these unspoken beliefs must first be uncovered and then "unfrozen" in order for successful long-term change to occur (Lewin, 1991). A central purpose of this research effort has been to probe individual meanings and to expose underlying beliefs as a means of unfreezing old ways of conceptualizing the problem of sexual harassment in the Navy and in other male-dominated organizations.

The participants in this study recommended a broad range of solutions to the issue of sexual harassment. Three major themes from these discussions relate to how successful change can be implemented in the Navy. The following approaches to organizational change will be presented in turn: The need for publicity and education as a way to raise public awareness; enforcement and the importance of holding people accountable for their actions; and the significance of the sincere involvement of senior leadership in an organization, both in word and deed.

#### Awareness

"I think awareness is the key all around" (Captain, 0-6). This opinion was shared, to some extent, by all eight women interviewed. Several agreed with a Lieutenant's assessment that "I think it needs to be talked about more. I think it needs to become more open." Discussion on sexual

harassment in the Navy currently centers around the Navy's policy of "zero tolerance" and the information which is disseminated in rights and responsibilities training upon a service member's arrival at a new command. The policy of "zero tolerance" is perceived by all of the women officers as a good one. It is adequately publicized, but inadequately enforced. A suggestion was made to reinforce the policy at least annually. An effective means to do this might be a personal message from senior leaders in the chain of command reiterating the policy and their support for it. It was also recommended that the overall organizational policy be supplemented with specific examples of behaviors which will not be tolerated (Appendix E details an approach to achieving this awareness).

More publicity of actual cases is perceived as an excellent means of raising public awareness on this issue. Seven of the eight women interviewed agreed that, when an officer is found guilty at a mast or at a court-martial, it should be publicized in the same manner as when an enlisted man or woman is found guilty at similar proceedings. A notation in the Plan of the Day (a daily calendar of events which is published throughout the command) of the unit was proposed. As with enlisted personnel, no names need be used. Only the rank of the officer should appear along with the offense and the punishment which was awarded.

When the offense relates to sexual harassment, that information should be provided, with the specific Uniform

Code of Military Justice article which was violated. This will avoid a perception that officers are somehow "above the law." Currently, any offenses committed by officers are only whispered about. In the words of one respondent: "the troops should have been afforded the right to hear exactly what happened to their boss . . . so that they can put things in perspective a little bit." A Navy newsletter containing synopses of actual cases was advised to help increase awareness and bring attention to how easily it is to cross over into behaviors which are sexually harassing. The following comment summarizes the feelings of one respondent:

I wanted to see it publicized and I wanted to let people know that this is how things get out of hand. It starts off this way and it ends up as an assault and the line is so fine . . . and the only way to avoid [crossing] that line is not to get there in the first place.

Training is the other important determinant in promoting public awareness. Many service members do not fully understand the extent of the problem; seven of the eight women interviewed thought that experiences such as theirs were isolated incidents. When they were told that nearly two of three servicewomen surveyed by the Defense Data Manpower Center reported having been harassed, they were astonished (Martindale, 1990). Most service men and women have not been exposed to these statistics and offenses are rarely publicized. This may account for a perceived lack of sensitivity to the issue. As a discussion topic,

sexual harassment has the potential to be divisive between men who are afraid of being held liable for their actions and women who are trying desperately to fit into a male-dominated environment. Men often laugh about the idea of being trained in sexual harassment and may not take the training seriously. Women are on the defensive. This poses a significant challenge for the organization in planning its training program.

Each officer interviewed had a slightly different perspective on how sexual harassment training should be conducted. However, all agreed with one participant that "the Navy needs education, education, education, education for everybody." It was generally acknowledged that training would be best conducted by individuals who have received special instruction, and who have been specially selected for their abilities to promote understanding and defuse tensions. Training should include role playing and an analysis of case studies to supplement movies and the recital of policy statements. The current slide presentations that involve little more than reading from a script are inadequate. Training should include statistical information on the frequency and types of occurrences to raise awareness and to educate personnel on the need for change. As several women officers stated: "I certainly think the quality of it would be better if done by a cadre of folks who are well trained." "The success of the training has a lot to do with the sincerity of the trainers

and the full participation of those who are in it" (Captain, 0-6). Sincere involvement by the leaders in the unit, by the trainers, and by the participants was seen as essential to the success of the training.

A subtheme under the heading of awareness was the idea that sexism should be tied to racism in terms of policy statements, reporting requirements, and education. There was a perception among all eight women that racism is taken much more seriously than sexual harassment. As a result, the Navy has been much more successful at combatting racial discrimination. One of the respondents pointed out that:

The Navy educated people with a strong punitive enforcement mechanism and said "We will not tolerate racial epithets in the Navy. We won't tolerate it . . . period." And it was real clear, real fast that that was unacceptable behavior . . . I remember getting briefed about "By golly, anything where two people are involved and they're different colors, you have to call me in the middle of the night and let me know as the CO and you have to start drafting that message." There's nothing like that for sexual harassment. Nobody cares.

### Accountability

In the views of the eight women interviewed, enforcement and holding people accountable are keys to prevention. As suggested in Appendix E, sanctions are an essential part of any program to prevent sexual harassment. The women officers who were interviewed had strong feelings on the question of accountability:

The policy is all right, but it's not being enforced. If you are sexually harassing people, then you need to be reprimanded. I think a lot of times, they just call them into the office, tell them to knock it off and

walk away. (Lieutenant [0-3], Aerospace Maintenance Officer)

I think they're giving it lip service. I think they're talking a good game, but nobody wants to be the hatchet man and we don't have the same outrage from the civilian population that we did over resolving the race problem. (Lieutenant [0-3], Attorney)

In my opinion, I don't think there's a whole lot of belief in redress, particularly from the enlisted gals' standpoint. At least that's the kind of feedback I get from them. (Lieutenant [junior grade] [0-3], General Unrestricted Line Officer)

I think that if a guy, or the woman or whoever the person is who has the inclination to perpetrate this understands that the consequence is that you go to mast and you lose a lot of money or the consequence is you go to mast and you lose your career or whatever it is . . . there has to be a bottom line punishment. (Lieutenant [0-3], General Unrestricted Line Officer)

I think if the CO is letting something like that happen, he should be held accountable and that is not happening. That's where the Admirals need to make sure people are getting the message. (Lieutenant [0-3], General Unrestricted Line Officer)

When we protect service members who willingly abuse their authority and responsibilities in regard to sexual harassment, it sends a powerful message to others who may be so inclined. The following comment summarizes the feelings of the interviewed officers:

You can educate someone and then he looks around and says "Who's going to punish me for this? What's the consequence to me if I decide to disregard this?" It's like dealing with children . . . if you keep saying "I'm going to spank you, I'm going to spank you, I'm going to spank you" and you never do, they know they're not going to get spanked.

### Leadership

As stated by one of the women interviewed, "I just feel like the superior in the chain of command should be the one taking responsibility for their actions. It shouldn't be up to a subordinate to go to a superior to say 'Excuse me, but you're inappropriate.'" This feeling was echoed by four of eight respondents and accords with the Navy's policy of responsibility accruing to the senior person. A senior who harasses someone below him or her in the chain of command is doubly guilty because of the added sense of coercion. The general feeling of the women interviewed is that verbal harassment by a peer or a subordinate should be met with positive confrontation and a request to stop. A woman can, and should, confront a peer or a subordinate when his or her behavior is inappropriate. When the perpetrator is a senior, confrontation is not easy, nor should it be necessary.

As stated above, the policy of "zero tolerance" of sexual harassment is good. However, sincere action to enforce this policy is lacking. The following comments describe this problem:

For the senior leadership, they too need to recognize the situations that are wrong, because really I don't think that some of them have a clue as to what we're talking about here. More than that, they need to get the message loud and clear that the atmosphere that breeds sexual harassment starts at the top and the atmosphere that doesn't tolerate sexual harassment also starts at the top. (Commander [0-5], pilot)

The biggest problem, to me, is that the senior leadership does what the rules say, but without any

heart behind it. Like my CO would never think about discriminating against a woman, he would probably go overboard not to because he's afraid, but he doesn't believe that women are equal. And the command knows that. Even if he wouldn't say things in places where he can be overheard, you can tell by a person's attitude. And I think then the men feel justified in continuing with their attitudes and the women aren't sure what's going to happen to them. Somehow, you just have to change the top. I don't know how you can do it, but the leadership has to stop mouthing the rules and start believing them. (Lieutenant [0-3], Naval Academy graduate)

Senior personnel must accept the policy and enforce it . . . like they enforce all other policies. How to get officers to enforce the policy . . . I'm not sure how to do that. (Lieutenant [0-3], Naval Academy graduate)

I don't trust the hierarchy. They're putting instructions and words into place because they have to. Because that's the mood of society and Congress and that's what's right, so they put it in. But as far as . . . I, I don't know how many of those in the four star and three star and whatever positions in that hierarchy have not themselves harassed. And I'm not convinced of their sincerity. (Captain [0-6], Commanding Officer)

Despite the progress of Navy women in breaking into newly charted territory over the past several years, four of the eight women interviewed felt the attitude toward women in the service was getting worse instead of better. Such books as Weak Link: The Feminization of the Military advance this idea. The view of the author was that "women offer the services one single advantage over men: they are better behaved." To bolster his theory that women have weakened the armed forces, the author reported that "the fears of military women that the services are insincere in their support for integration are well-founded" (Mitchell, 1989, p. 7). This last comment, if true, may be indicative



of hard times ahead for women in the military. As the nation draws down the numbers of men and women in uniform, women may be especially targeted. If the environment becomes increasingly male-dominated, women's frustrations will increase as their political clout decreases. The long-term impact of this scenario can only be imagined.

As pointed out in Appendix E, attitudes start at the top. A good example of why women often do not pursue redress is the following description of the attitude displayed by the Commanding Officer of the one of the eight women interviewed:

The Commanding Officer who couldn't understand why I couldn't come to him [after the incident was later reported to higher authority] was at an EEO lecture and the man slept from the time the speaker started until it was over. And it was just 'Yes, I can tell this is an important issue for you.' He just slept through it . . . he was in the front of the room and they had the big chairs and he's just like this, going 'Snxx, Snxx, Snxx' kind of softly snoring to himself. He just couldn't understand why I thought he was part of the problem.

Environmental pressures dictate a leaner Navy that fully utilizes all the resources at its disposal. Women make up nearly 11% of Navy personnel, a percentage not likely to increase in the near future. Their concerns and needs must not be ignored or denigrated by those who would choose to banish women from the military or to reduce their numbers to an insignificant minority. Many of the noble traditions established by John Paul Jones over 200 years ago are still worthy of being upheld, but some customs have outlived their usefulness. Women in the Navy have changed its face just as

irrevocably as Blacks and Filipinos have in other times and for other reasons. All have value to the organization and are important resources in carrying out the organizational mission. Full utilization of a diverse workforce requires a modification of the old ways.

It is apparent from the foregoing that leaders must be deeply involved and supportive of any change effort if it is to be successful. To date, naval leaders have been searching for the one right answer which will rationally correct a problem often manifesting itself as non-rational. As Don Quixote pointed out in The Man of La Mancha, facts may be the enemy of truth. It is a fact that women bring different attributes to the working environment. Not better, not worse, but different. The truth is that women in the Navy are as capable as men at fulfilling their responsibilities. While on the job, Navy women want to be treated with respect as professionals, not as girlfriends, mothers, sisters, or wives. It is time to tune in and break through old assumptions, old beliefs, and old ways of behaving in order to achieve a social equality which is long overdue.

### Conclusions

This qualitative study has permitted the voices of sexual harassment victims to be heard. Their pain and anguish has been laid bare to the reader to facilitate a deeper understanding of the sexual harassment experience

and its consequences. A full comprehension of sexual harassment's many facets has not yet been achieved, but studies such as this one aid in that effort.

In general, the women interviewed for this study experienced more severe forms of harassment than the "typical" harassment victim, but that is not surprising considering that all eight women sought legal redress. At the time of the harassment, seven of the eight victims were junior officers, providing additional support for the belief that most harassment victims are young and relatively inexperienced. The personal and professional long-term impacts on women who have experienced sexual harassment and who have gone through a grievance process has not been fully addressed by other researchers. The findings of this study indicate that there are significant long-term consequences which include an increased desire for privacy and a reluctance to socialize with co-workers. Other long-term consequences included an increased awareness of the comments and actions of both self and others; a tendency to suspect the motivation of others; and a reduced ability to trust others. Each of these factors created obstacles in both personal and professional interactions.

Since each of these women were harassed by senior personnel to whom they reported, it is logical that they would view power differentials in the workplace as significant to the promotion of sexual harassment. This organizational approach to understanding sexual harassment

theorizes that the sex ratio of males to females and the occupational norms present in the organizational culture tend to promote harassment, a view shared by most of the women interviewed.

An element in all but one of the eight cases studied was alcohol abuse. This finding is significant when examining organizational practices which promote drinking. Many researchers have noted the higher incidents of sexual harassment in male dominated environments. When a workplace has traditionally been the province of men, customs often exclude or stereotype women. In many instances, sexual innuendo is so common that it is invisible to those who have become accustomed to its presence. The solution to such institutional biases involve awareness, accountability, and leadership. These themes and the problem of re-victimization have been formulated into specific recommendations as discussed below and in Appendix E.

#### Recommendations for Organizations

These general recommendations reflect the concerns of the eight women interviewed as expressed in Chapters Five and Six. Appendix E contains specific proposals for organizations with regard to policies, educational programs, and grievance procedures based on the recommendations found in Robinson v. Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc. (1991) and on suggestions provided by the women interviewed for this research effort. The following guidance represents advice

to management in organizations striving to reduce instances of sexual harassment at work.

1. Review and modify those traditions, rituals, and ceremonies which no longer serve the organization. In particular, discourage those customs which promote the abuse of alcohol.

2. Carefully monitor language in the workplace. Strive to replace metaphors that have sexist connotations. Eliminate sexist jokes. Be aware of symbolic and stereotyped language which may contribute to sexual discrimination.

3. Monitor personal behaviors to ensure that there is no disconnect between what is said and what is done. Increase sensitivity to behaviors which are sexually oriented.

4. Equate sexism with racism and ensure it receives the same level of attention and concern in the development of policies, training programs, and sanctions.

5. Avoid re-victimization by keeping organizational members, including the victim and the perpetrator, as informed as possible. Do not try to hide information. If it is inappropriate to comment on specifics, say so. Both victim and perpetrator have a right to privacy, but both also have a right to information concerning the status of an investigation and its outcome.

6. Track all incidents in one central location so that trend data can be developed and studied. Require that

all incidents be reported directly to the head of the organizational unit as soon as they occur. Develop trend data so specific organizational problems can be more readily identified.

In the Navy, it is recommended that the Commanding Officer be immediately informed and that a report be forwarded to the Inspector General for central tracking.

7. Provide training sessions which utilize role playing and include participant analysis of actual case studies to aid in conveying the importance of the subject and the need for change. Utilize facilitators who have received special training regarding sexual harassment and its consequences. Develop indoctrination programs which teach new members of the organization its policies and its sanctions for ignoring those policies. Teach potential victims how to confront a perpetrator, but emphasize their right to submit a formal complaint. Teach potential perpetrators to clear up uncertainty by asking if what was said or done was offensive. Ensure all students understand that behaviors which make co-workers uncomfortable are not appropriate.

8. Issue a clear and unambiguous policy statement which addresses specific behaviors that will not be tolerated by the organization. Leaders must sincerely support and act on the organization's sexual harassment policy. Leaders who espouse one theory and use another can

expect subordinates to react to their deeds more strongly than to their words.

9. Ensure sanctions are developed and applied appropriately so that personnel found guilty of violating policies are punished. If found guilty, publicize the results in a generic way which protects the privacy of both victim and perpetrator, but which also keeps organizational members informed.

10. Conduct a thorough, unbiased investigation which, if possible, uses an investigator from outside the organization. Recognize the importance that being believed has to the victim. The perpetrator, however, should have the right to face his accuser in the presence of neutral parties. Investigators should be accompanied by a trained counselor in order to address the emotional concerns of the victim and to offer follow-on assistance if required.

In the Navy, this role could be filled by a Family Services Center counselor.

11. Develop a grievance process that permits confidential reporting of incidents to a neutral source outside the normal hierarchical structure.

In the Navy, the Inspector General's hotline appears adequate, but needs to be publicized more widely.

Organizations can learn just as individuals do. The most promising targets of change and reform efforts may be broad social expectations and myths. However, these cannot be changed wholesale without first reflecting upon how they

developed and their meaning to the organization. In order to ensure that structural changes last, myths, rituals, ceremonies, norms, and beliefs need to be developed that view women in a different light. A way to facilitate this process is to assume that women are in the workplace for the same reasons as their male counterparts. Women want to receive credit for their abilities, not their femininity. Some need the money, some want to learn a new skill, and some wish to become self-actualized. All want to fit in and be viewed as competent and able workers. Being treated or thought of as sex objects first and co-workers second is debilitating to women both emotionally and professionally.

The ultimate impact of leadership in organizations, as in society at large, is in its ability to create real, intended change (Burns, 1978). Leading organizations to willingly accept diversity in the workforce is a sound policy, both ethically and economically. Many ideas for implementing change have been suggested by this research effort. Policies can be readily re-written, training programs can be strengthened, and grievance procedures can be overhauled. Changing attitudes and perceptions will be the greatest challenge. This change will occur only by recognizing that the strength of our nation, our armed forces, and our civilian organizations depends on diversity.

It is time to stand back and look at the forest, realizing that its beauty is made up of many differing species. A forest's shape and size can be dictated to some



extent, but once trees are planted, all must be cared for and nourished if they are to thrive. Even strong roots can wither and die if ignored in favor of tending to the preconceived ideal. This misguided effort to standardize all the trees in the forest results not only in less diversity, but in wasted resources. It is time to encourage the growth of trees which may be differently formed, but which capably provide shade and may contain more character than some of their more perfect neighbors. In order to realize the full extent of human capability as the nation approaches the 21st century, leaders and followers must find a way to shed biases through development of a sensitivity to and a desire to nourish all organizational participants, including minorities and women.

#### Recommendations for Future Research

Recent research indicates an association between gender, education, and corresponding perceptions of sexual harassment. Individuals with high levels of education were found to perceive sexual harassment as more unacceptable social behavior than did those with less education (Lloyd, 1984). A study comparing and contrasting attitudes, perceptions, and reactions of women managers and blue-collar workers with regard to the sexual harassment experience is needed to determine if their views differ significantly.

Junior women and trainees are the most likely targets of harassment (Martindale, 1990; "An Update Report," 1990;

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1981, 1988). They are also the least skilled at handling themselves in the working environment. It is likely, therefore, that the problem of sexual harassment for them is much more severe than what has been reported here. Since the present study describes harassment experiences perpetrated by college-educated (with one exception) males on college-educated females, it may represent the lower end of the impact scale. The documented evidence that enlisted women suffer much higher rates of sexual harassment than officers (Martindale, 1990) makes this another issue which deserves further study and attention.

In Ellison v. Brady (1991), the courts spoke of the need to focus on the perspective of the victim when evaluating the pervasiveness and severity of sexual harassment incidents. Specifically, the ruling stated that:

If we only examined whether a reasonable person [rather than a reasonable woman] would engage in allegedly harassing conduct, we would run the risk of reinforcing the prevailing level of discrimination. Harassers would continue to harass merely because a particular discriminatory practice was common, and victims of harassment would have no remedy.

Considered in this light, an analysis of the different perspectives of men and women is essential to developing a solution to this problem. Conduct found objectionable by many women is not similarly objectionable to many men. This underscores the importance of conveying to men a "reasonable woman's" understanding of what constitutes harassment. Men who must administer women in the workplace also must learn

the effect of such behaviors on women's psychological and physical well-being. Studies like this need to be replicated in order to provide sufficient data to develop a "reasonable woman" standard.

#### Concluding Remarks

The sexual harassment experiences described in this research effort were assessed as serious enough to warrant punitive action against the perpetrator. These are the kind of experiences which reasonable people, both men and women, should be concerned about preventing. Men who say and do things to women in the workplace that they would not say or do to their mothers or sisters may need to rethink their behavior patterns. This heuristic is helpful advice, but it is also important to note that reasonable women, like reasonable men, do not all think identically. Some are more sensitive than others. That sensitivity must be respected once it has been made known. In this sense, women will continue to bear the responsibility of positively confronting a co-worker whose behavior is offensive, assuming it is not physically threatening or otherwise coercive (i.e. senior to subordinate harassment). A woman who supposes that a male co-worker knows what she is thinking may be making an incorrect assumption. A written or verbal objection gives a co-worker the opportunity to learn appropriate behavioral limits in a constructive manner.

In the view of this researcher, all the officers interviewed in the course of this study met a "reasonable woman" standard. A comparison of their experiences to those described by previous researchers on the topic of sexual harassment showed many similarities. Despite their maturity and level of education, all were emotionally affected in varying degrees by the sexual harassment and the re-victimization which they experienced. None of these women reported the sexual harassment without first giving the matter a great deal of thought and consideration. The goal in reporting the harassment was not revenge; it was to ensure the behavior was not repeated with them or anyone else. These reasonable working women realize that changing attitudes, traditions, and sexual stereotypes will not occur quickly. They know that concrete actions, such as those proposed in Appendix E, represent the best immediate hope for organizational change. In the words of one of my respondents, "sometimes you have to change people [and organizations] from the outside in." If the policies, training programs, and grievance procedures that have been recommended by these reasonable women are implemented, the cultural changes which have been suggested as fundamental to long-term change may follow.

In concluding this look at sexual harassment and the relations of men and women in the workplace, let me point out that the good far outweighs the bad. Every one of the women officers interviewed recounted stories of men who had

respected their professional efforts. They identified men who helped them through the sexual harassment experience by buoying their spirits and advising them on what action to take. They also described men who treated them with the dignity and respect so lacking in their experiences of the harassment itself. Women in this country and in our armed forces have achieved much in cooperation with men as their mentors, friends, and associates. It is my fervent hope that this work will increase that level of cooperation on the way toward greater productivity and satisfaction for all men and women in the workplace.

## **REFERENCES**

## REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 830-838.
- Allgeier, A. R., & Allgeier, E. R. (1988). Sexual interactions (2nd ed.). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Argyris, C. (1982). How learning and reasoning processes affect organizational change. In P. S. Goodman and Associates (Ed.). Change in organizations (pp. 47-86). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Aristotle. (1953). Generation of animals. Trans. by A. L. Peck. London: Heinimour.
- Associated Press. (1991, August 25). Fifty-five percent of medical students complain of sexual harassment. The San Diego Union, p. A-29.
- Aun, L. (1988, July 11). Sexual harassment still widespread, report concludes. Federal Times, pp. 1, 18.
- Backhouse, C., & Cohen, L. (1981). Sexual harassment on the job: How to avoid the working woman's nightmare. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Barrett, C. (1986). First there were the sex jokes . . . . Distribution, 85(9), 79, 81.
- Baxter, R. H., Jr. (1987). Sexual harassment in the workplace. New York: Executive Enterprises Publications.
- Beck, H. (1973). Folklore and the sea. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Bem, S. L., & Bem, D. J. (1970). Beliefs, attitudes and the human affairs. Belmont, CA: Brooks & Cole.
- Bernstein, H. (1991, February 5). Ruling may curb harassment. Los Angeles Times, p. D3.
- Bird, J. (1990, November 19). Three-star relieved of command. Air Force Times, pp. 1, 20.

- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, D. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bradshaw, D. S. (1987). Sexual harassment: Confronting the troublesome issues. Personnel Administrator, 32(1), 51-53.
- Brasch, R. (1976). Strange customs: How did they begin? New York: David McKay Co.
- Breslin, C., & Morris, M. (1988, December). "Please leave me alone." Working Woman, 74-82.
- Broverman, I., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, F., & Rosenkrantz, P. (1972). Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-78.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against our will. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bryson, C. B. (1990). The internal sexual harassment investigation: Self-evaluation without self-incrimination. Employee Relations Law Journal, 15(4), 551-559.
- Burkhart, B. R., & Stanton, A. L. (1988). Sexual aggression in acquaintance relationships. In G. Russell (Ed.), Violence in intimate relationships (pp. 43-66). Great Neck, NY: PMA Publishing Co.
- Burlage, J. (1989, August 28). Skipper leaves Navy after harassment reprimand. Navy Times, p. 9.
- Burley, D. P. (1990, November-December). Corporate secrets: What so often gets dismissed as teasing can be torture--with long term residual effects. Executive Female, 13(1), 23.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Canape, C. (Ed.). (1991, January 28). Harassment claimed by women in survey. Working Smart, 17(2).
- Canny, W. (1986). Sexual harassment within the USAF enlisted force. Unpublished report, Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell AFB, AL.
- Caudill, D. W., & Donaldson, R. M. (1986). Is your climate ripe for sexual harassment? Management World, 15(6), 26-27.



- Champagne, P. J., & McAfee, R. B. (1989). Auditing sexual harassment. Personnel Journal, 68(6), 124-139.
- Chusmir, I. H., & Durand, D. E. (1987). What managers don't understand about sexual harassment. Management Solutions, 32(8), 27-33.
- Clarke, L. W. (1986). Women supervisors experience sexual harassment, too. Supervisory Management, 31(4), 35-36.
- Coles, F. S. (1986). Forced to quit: Sexual harassment complaints and agency response. Sex Roles, 14(1/2), 81-95.
- Colwill, N. (1982). The new partnership: Women and men in organizations. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Connell, M. E. (1987). How to investigate sexual harassment. Security Management, 31(12), 32-38.
- Coye, M. (1983, December). Sexual harassment and rape in the Navy. Unpublished master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.
- Crull, P. (1982). Stress effects of sexual harassment on the job: Implications for counseling. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52, 539-544.
- Culbertson, A., Rosenfeld, P., Booth-Kewley, S., & Magnusson, R. (1990). Assessment of sexual harassment in the Navy. NPRDC TN 91-. San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
- Deane, R. H. (1986). Sexual harassment--is your company protected? Business, 36(2), 42-25.
- Dietrich, R. (1988, May 27). Officer reprimanded, assessed \$3,600 for sexual harassment. San Diego Tribune, p. B-1.
- Donovan, E. P. (1990a, August 13). Officer receives 7 years for rape. Navy Times, p. 6.
- Donovan, E. P. (1990b, November 5). Harassment found to be serious in Orlando. Navy Times, p. 4.
- Dworkin, T. M., Ginger, L., & Mallor, J. P. (1988). Theories of recovery for sexual harassment: Going beyond Title VII. San Diego Law Review, 254(1), 125-159.

- Edie, J. M. (1975). The significance of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of language. In D. Ihde & R. M. Zaner (Eds.) Dialogues in phenomenology, pp. 247-268. New York: G. B. Putnam's Sons.
- Eller, M. E. (1990, February). Sexual harassment: Prevention, not protection. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 30(4), 84-89.
- Ellison v. Brady, 924 F. 2d 872 (9th Cir. 1991).
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity, youth, and crisis. New York: Norton.
- Fain, T. C., & Anderton, D. L. (1987). Sexual harassment: Organizational context and diffuse status. Sex Roles, 5/6, 291-311.
- Farley, L. (1978). Sexual shakedown: The sexual harassment of women on the job. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Feigen Fasteau, M. (1974). The male machine. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Finnegan, S. (1986). Constructive discharge under Title VII and the ADEA. University of Chicago Law Review, 53(2), 561-580.
- Flynn, K. (1991, March). Preventive medicine for sexual harassment. Personnel, 68(3), 17.
- Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Frierson, J. G. (1989). Reduce the costs of sexual harassment. Personnel Journal, 68(11), 79-85.
- Frye, M. (1983). The politics of reality: Essays in feminist theory. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.
- Garvey, M. S. (1986). Labor relations: The high cost of sexual harassment suits. Personnel Journal, 65(1), 75-78, 80.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Giorgi, A. (1974). The relations among level, type, and structure and their importance for social science theorizing: A dialogue with Schutz. In D. Polkinghorne (Ed.), Methodology for the human sciences, pp. 210-212. Albany: State University of New York.

- Goldblatt, M. L. (1986, February). Companies are liable for sexual harassment. Small Business Report, 11(2), 48.
- Gould, R. L. (1980). Transformations during early and middle adult years. In N. J. Smelser & E. H. Erikson (Eds.). Themes of work and love in adulthood (pp. 213-237). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gray, E. D. (1982). Patriarchy as a conceptual trap. Wellesley, MA: Roundtable Press.
- Griffin, M. C. (1987). Making the Army safe for diversity: A Title VII remedy for discrimination in the military. 96 Yale Law Journal 2082, 36-66.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B. A. (1985). Sex and the workplace: Impact of sexual harassment on women, men and organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B. A., & Cohen, A. G. (1987). Sex ratios, sex role spillover, and sex at work: A comparison of men's and women's experiences. Human Relations, 40(2), 97-115.
- Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.
- Gutek, B. A., Morasch, B., & Cohen, A. G. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behavior in a work setting. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22(1), 30-48.
- Harman, W. (1988). Global mind change. Sausalito, CA: Knowledge Systems, Inc.
- Harragan, B. L. (1977). Games mother never taught you. New York: Warner Books, Inc.
- Hemming, H. (1985). Women in a man's world: Sexual harassment. Human Relations, 38(1), 67-79.
- Hipp, E. C. (1988). Now you see it, now you don't: The "hostile work environment" after Meritor. American Business Law Journal, 26(2), 339-361.
- Holm, J. (1982). Women in the military: An unfinished revolution. Novato, CA: Presidio Press.
- Horn, P. D., & Horn, J. C. (1982). Sex in the office. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Hunsaker, J., & Hunsaker, P. (1986). Strategies and skills for managerial women. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Co.
- Husserl, E. (1964). The idea of phenomenology. Netherlands: The Hague.
- Hycner, R. H. (1982). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. Unpublished manuscript.
- Jensen, M. (1987). Women who want to be the boss: Business revelations and success strategies from America's top female executives. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Jensen, I. W., & Gutek, B. A. (1982). Attribution and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 121-136.
- Jones, J. P. (1970). Maxims of naval leadership. In A. A. Ageton & W. P. Mack (Eds.), The naval officer's guide (8th ed., pp. 541-547). Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.
- Josselson, R. (1987). Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jossem, J. H. (1991, July). Investigating sexual harassment complaints. Personnel, 68(7), 9-10.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Kanter, R. M., & Stein, B. A. (1980). A Tale of "O": On being different in an organization. New York: Harper & Row.
- Karnes, C. D., & Tuerff, T. W. (1986). Labor law: Employer liability for sexual harassment in the workplace. Corporation Law Review, 9(2), 176-185.
- Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. Sex Roles, 15(9/10), 535-549.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1980). Organizational paradoxes. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Kockelmans, J. J. (Ed.). (1967). Phenomenology. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

- Koen, C. M. (1990). Sexual harassment claims stem from a hostile work environment. Personnel Journal, 69(8), 88-89.
- Konrad, A. M., & Gutek, B. A. (1986). Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31(3), 422-438.
- Koral, A. M. (1988). Dealing with sexual harassment in the workplace. Employment Relations Today, 15(3), 223-232.
- Kreisher, O. (1990, October 26). Navy to review treatment of women. San Diego Tribune, p. A-3.
- Krohne, K. (1988). On being a woman military officer. Unpublished paper, University of San Diego, School of Education.
- Kwant, R. C. (1963). The phenomenological philosophy of Merleau-Ponty. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Lafontaine, E., & Tredeau, L. (1986, October). The frequency, sources, and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. Sex Roles, 433-442.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, fire, and dangerous things. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). Season's of a man's life. New York: Knopf.
- Lewin, K. (1991). Foundations of organizational change. In S. P. Robbins (Ed.), Organizational behavior (5th ed., pp. 631-657). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Licata, B. J., & Popovich, P. M. (1987). Preventing sexual harassment: A proactive approach. Training and Development Journal, 41(5), 34-38.
- Linenberger, P. (1983, April). What behavior constitutes sexual harassment? Labor Law Journal, 237-246.
- Lippitt, G. L. (1982). Organization renewal: A holistic approach to organization development (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Lloyd, E. H. (1984). An analysis of the relationship of men and women's educational attainment and gender to their perception of sexual harassment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 2991.
- Lockheed, M. E., & Hall, K. P. (1976). Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristic: Applications to leadership training strategies. Journal of Social Issues, 32(3), 111-125.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1979). Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sex discrimination. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mainiero, L. A. (1989). Office romance: Love, power, and sex in the workplace. New York: Rawson Associates.
- Manual for Courts-Martial. United States. Joint Committee of the Armed Forces. (1984). Executive Order 12473.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Martindale, M. (1990). Sexual harassment in the military: 1988. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Maze, R. (1988, May 16). Study finds women downplay femininity in careers. Navy Times, p. 16.
- Mazer, D. B., & Percival, E. F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university student. Sex Roles, 20(3-4), 135-137.
- McCalla, R. K. (1991). Stopping sexual harassment before it begins. Management Review, 80(4), 44-46.
- McKinney, K., Olson, C., & Satterfield, A. (1988). Graduate students' experiences with and responses to sexual harassment: A research note. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3(3), 319-325.
- Melton, H. W. (1991, February 4). A setback for pinups at work. As quoted in Law Section, Time, p. 61.
- Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson, 477 U.S. 57 (1986).
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Phenomenology of perception. Trans. by Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

- Military law (2nd ed.). (1963). Annapolis, MD: United States Naval Institute Press.
- Mitchell, B. (1989). Weak link: The feminization of the American military. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Gateway.
- Mohanty, J. N. (1969). Edmund Husserl's theory of meaning. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Monat, J. S., & Gomez, A. (1986). Sexual harassment: The impact of Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson on grievances and arbitration decisions. Arbitration Journal, 41(4), 24-29.
- Moore, M. (1990, October 22). Navy failed to prosecute in 6 rapes. Washington Post, pp. 1, 18.
- Moore, M. (1991, April 4). Sex harassment called pervasive in Navy. The Washington Post, p. A4.
- Morgan, G. (Ed.). (1983). Beyond method. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morgenson, G. (1989, May 10). Watch that leer, stifle that joke. Forbes, pp. 69-72.
- Moskal, B. S. (1989, July 3). Sexual harassment: 80's-style. Industry Week, pp. 22-27.
- Myers, M. F. (1984). Watch your language, boy. Medical Month, 2(1), 11.
- Mynatt, C. R., & Allgeier, E. R. (1990, February). Risk factors, self-attributions, and adjustment problems among victims of sexual coercion. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 130-153.
- Navy study group's report on progress of women in the Navy. (1987). Prepared by the 1987 Navy Women's Study Group, Washington, D.C.
- Neville, K. (1990). Corporate attractions. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books.
- Nietzsche, F. (1927). Thus spake Zarathustra. In The philosophy of Nietzsche. New York: Modern Library.
- Noel, J. V., & Beach, E.L. (1971). Naval terms dictionary (3rd ed.). Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Personnel Policies Forum (PPF). (1987, June). Sexual harassment: Employer policies and problems. PPF Survey #144. The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1983). Methodology for the human sciences. Albany: State University of New York.
- Popovich, P. M. (1988a). An examination of sexual harassment complaints in the Air Force for Fiscal Year 1987. Unpublished paper. Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.
- Popovich, P. M. (1988b). Sexual harassment in organizations. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 1(4), 273-282.
- Popovich, P. M., & Licata, B. J. (1987). A role model approach to sexual harassment. Journal of Management, 13(1), 149-161.
- Pribble, R. (1986). Sexual harassment: Much more than the obvious. Training, 23(5), 101-102.
- Pryor, J. B. (1985). The lay person's understanding of sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 13, 273-278.
- Purcell, R. (1987, October 5). Former CO punished for sexual harassment. Navy Times, p. 2.
- Reily, P. J. (1980). Sexual harassment in the Navy. Unpublished master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA.
- Renick, J. C. (1980, August). Sexual harassment at work: Why it happens, what to do about it. Personnel Journal, 658-662.
- Riger, S. (1991, May). Gender dilemmas in sexual harassment policies and procedures. American Psychologist, 46(5), 477-505.
- Robbins, S. P. (1991). Organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Robinson, S. W. (1987). Steering clear of employee lawsuits. Bottomline, 4(10), 25-27.
- Robinson v. Jacksonville Shipyards, Inc., 760 F. Supp. 1486 (M.D. Fla. 1991)
- Rogan, H. (1981). Mixed company. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.



- Romer, N. (1981). The sex-role cycle: Socialization from infancy to old age. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rubenstein, M. (1991, February). Devising a sexual harassment policy. Personnel Management (UK), 23(2), 34-37.
- Saal, F. E., Johnson, C, B., & Weber, N. (1989). Friendly or sexy? It may depend on whom you ask. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13(3), 263-276.
- Safran, C. (1976, November). What men do to women on the job: A shocking look at sexual harassment. Redbook, pp. 217-223.
- Salisbury, J., Ginorio, A. B., Remick, H., & Stringer, D. M. (1986). Counseling victims of sexual harassment. Special issue: Gender issues in psychotherapy. Psychotherapy, 23(2), 316-324.
- Sandler, B. R. (1986). The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Project on the Status of and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
- Sandroff, R. (1989, December). Sexual harassment in the Fortune 500. Working Woman, pp. 69-73.
- Schaef, A. W. (1981). Women's reality: An emerging female system in the white male society. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schneider, D., & Schneider, C. J. (1988). Sound off! American military women speak out. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Schwartz, H., & Jacobs, J. (1979). Qualitative sociology: A method to the madness. New York: The Free Press.
- Segal, J. A. (1990). Safe sex: A workplace oxymoron? HRMagazine, 35(6), 175-180.
- Sheehy, G. (1981). Pathfinders. Toronto: Bantam.
- Smith, K. K. (1982). Philosophical problems in thinking about organizational change. In P. S. Goodman and Associates. Change in organizations (pp. 316-374). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Spann, J. (1990). Dealing effectively with sexual harassment: Some practical lessons from one city's experience. Public Personnel Management, 19(1), 53-69.
- Spiegelberg, H. (1982). The phenomenological movement. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Staples, R. (1973). Male-female sexual variations: Functions of biology or culture? Journal of Sexual Response, 11-20.
- Stein, M. (1990, October 10). Four reports cite Annapolis bias against women. The San Diego Union, p. A-5.
- Stiehm, J. H. (1989). Arms and the enlisted woman. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Strasser, S. (1969). The idea of dialogal phenomenology. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Stringer, D. M., Remick, H., Salisbury, J., & Ginorio, A. B. (1990). The power and reasons behind sexual harassment: An employer's guide to solutions. Public Personnel Management, 19(1), 43-52.
- Sullivan, F. L. (1986). Sexual harassment: The Supreme Court's ruling. Personnel, 63(12), 37-44.
- Sydie, R. A. (1987). Natural women, cultured men. New York: New York University Press.
- Tangri, S., Burt, M. R., & Johnson, L. B. Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bognan, R. (1984). Qualitative research methods: The search for meanings (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Terpstra, D. E. (1989). Who gets sexually harassed? Personnel Administrator, 34(3), 84-88.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1986a). A framework for the study of sexual harassment. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 7(1), 17-34.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1986b, September). Organizational costs of sexual harassment. Journal of Employment Counseling, 112-119.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1988). Outcomes of sexual harassment charges. Academy of Management Journal, 31(1), 185-194.

- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1989). The identification and classification of reactions to sexual harassment. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10, 1-14.
- Tesch, R. (1984, April). Phenomenological studies: A critical analysis of their nature and procedures. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA.
- Thornton, B. T. (1986). Sexual harassment: Discouraging it in the work place. Personnel, 63(4), 18-25.
- Traeger, T. B. (1988). Legal considerations in drafting sexual harassment policies. In J. Van Tol (Ed.), Sexual harassment on campus: A legal compendium (pp. 181-190). Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Attorneys.
- Trost, C. A. H. (1988, March 29). Naval Message CNO 290134Z MAR88, NAVOP 034/88, Subj: Sexual Harassment.
- Tuttle, C. (1990). Sexual harassment is no joke. Management Review, 79(8), 44-48.
- Uniform code of military justice. (1988). 10 United States Code, Sections 801-940.
- An update report on the progress of women in the Navy. (1990). Prepared by the 1990 Navy Women's Study Group, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board., (1981). Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem? Office of Merit Systems Review and Studies.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board., (1988). Sexual harassment in the federal government: An update. Office of Merit Systems Review and Studies.
- U.S. Navy regulations. (1990). Department of the Navy. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- Valentine-French, S., & Radtke, L. H. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for an incident of sexual harassment in a university setting. Sex Roles, 21(7-8), 545-555.
- Vinciguerra, M. (1989). The aftermath of Meritor: A search for standards in the law of sexual harassment. Yale Law Journal, 98(8), 1717-1738.
- Wagner, H. R. (1983). Phenomenology of consciousness and sociology of the life-world. Alberta: University of Alberta Press.

- Weber, M. (1958). Bureaucracy. In H. H. Gerth and C. C. Mills, (Eds.), From Max Weber: Essays in sociology (pp. 196-244). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Webster, G. D. (1986). Dealing with sexual harassment. Association Management, 38(11), 100-104.
- Willis, G. (1990, November 5). DoD to stop mincing words on sexual harassment. Navy Times, p. 6.
- Woods, M. P., & Flynn, W. J., (1989). Heading off sexual harassment. Personnel, 66(11), 45-49.

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A**  
**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION GUIDELINES**

## EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION GUIDELINES

Part 1604---Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex  
1604.11 Sexual Harassment

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

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

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

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

(e) An employer may also be responsible for the acts of nonemployees, with respect to sexual harassment of

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

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

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



**APPENDIX B**  
**RESEARCHER'S BIOGRAPHY**

**RESEARCHER'S BIOGRAPHY****Kathleen Anne Quinn Krohne**

Kathleen Quinn graduated from The George Washington University in June 1968 with a Bachelor of Arts in speech. She was commissioned an Ensign in the U.S. Navy in December 1968 by her father, Captain Robert D. Quinn, U.S. Navy (Retired). After attending Defense Information School, she reported to her first tour of duty as a speech evaluator in Washington, D.C. During this assignment, she received a Certificate of Public Relations Achievement for her role as a faculty member at the Navy Public Speaking Seminar at the U.S. Naval Academy. In November 1969, Ensign Quinn reported for duty as Assistant Public Affairs Officer for the Chief of Naval Air Training.

In July 1971, Lieutenant (junior grade) Quinn was transferred to Air Anti-Submarine Squadron FORTY-ONE and assumed the duties of Public Affairs Officer. Subsequent assignments included Communications, Educational Services, and Personnel. She was promoted to Lieutenant during this period and married Commander Theodore K. Krohne in May 1973.

Lieutenant Krohne's next assignment was on the staff of Commander, Naval Air Forces, U.S. Pacific Fleet where she reported in June 1974. She was selected for Lieutenant Commander in 1977 and was notified shortly thereafter of her acceptance into the Navy's Scholarship Program. From July 1978 to December 1979, Lieutenant Commander Krohne completed her Master of Business Administration degree at Southern Illinois University, acquiring a subspeciality in financial management.

In January 1980, Lieutenant Commander Krohne reported for duty as the Executive Officer of the Navy Recruiting District, San Diego. During that tour, the District was named the best in the nation for two consecutive years and was awarded the Navy Unit Commendation. In 1982, the Chief of Naval Operations presented Lieutenant Commander Krohne with a Navy League award for inspirational leadership. She was selected for Commander soon afterward and, in July 1982, became the first American woman to attend the Royal Naval Staff College in Greenwich, England.

Commander Krohne's next assignment was Comptroller for Naval Air Station, North Island where she served from February 1983 to July 1985. During this tour, she was selected for command and received orders to report as Commanding Officer, Personnel Support Activity, Naval

Training Center, San Diego. After completing her command tour in 1987, Commander Krohne reported to her last duty station. She concluded her naval career as Executive Officer and Associate Professor of Naval Science at the Naval Reserve Officer's Training Unit at the University of San Diego and San Diego State University. Commander Krohne retired from the Navy in November 1989 and is currently instructing at the University of La Verne as she completes her doctoral degree.

Commander Krohne is authorized to wear the Meritorious Service Medal, Navy Commendation Medal with one star, and the Navy Recruiting, National Defense and Expert Pistol ribbons. Other honors include election to Beta Gamma Sigma Business Honor Fraternity in 1980, selection to Who's Who in San Diego in 1982, and nomination to Marquis Who's Who in the West in 1991. Commander Krohne and her husband have two sons, Kristopher (15) and Karl (12), who reside with them in Coronado, California.

**APPENDIX C**  
**INTERVIEW PROTOCOL**

## INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Please relate, in your own words, the harassment experience which caused you to seek legal advice and counsel.
2. Can you describe your feelings at the time? How have your feelings changed over time? What do you attribute to those changes?
3. Describe the environment in which you worked at the time of the incident(s).
4. Describe the working relationship you had with the individual against whom you brought charges.
5. Describe the process you went through in deciding to file an official complaint.
6. Describe the impact of the complaint on your personal life.
7. Describe the impact on your professional life.
8. Did your working environment improve, deteriorate, or stay the same after you filed your complaint? Please explain.
9. Describe any impact this experience may have had on your ability to carry out your official duties.
10. Describe any impact this experience may have had on your view of the military as a career.
11. Do you feel you have put this experience behind you? If so, how long did it take and how were you able to resolve it mentally?
12. What do you feel you lost or gained by virtue of this experience? Explain.
13. What impact did this experience have on you as an individual?

APPENDIX D  
1988 DoD SURVEY OF SEX ROLES IN THE  
ACTIVE-DUTY MILITARY

# 1989 DoD SURVEY OF SEX ROLES IN THE ACTIVE-DUTY MILITARY

## SPECIAL RESEARCH SAMPLE

### SURVEY PURPOSE

This survey is part of a worldwide scientific study of some gender-related features of the working environments of personnel in the four DoD Active-Duty Military Services. It is being conducted for the Office of the Secretary of Defense by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). The purpose of this survey is to ask you about YOUR observations, opinions and experiences with ALL KINDS of sexual talk and behavior that can occur at work. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT ALL PERSONS SENT A QUESTIONNAIRE RESPOND, SO ALL KINDS OF WORK SITUATIONS WILL BE REPRESENTED IN THE STUDY.

### PRIVACY NOTICE

**AUTHORITY:** DoDD 5124.2.

**PRINCIPAL PURPOSE OR PURPOSES:** Information collected in this survey is used to sample attitudes and/or discern perceptions of social problems observed by service members and to support additional manpower research activities. This information will assist in the formulation of policies which may be needed to improve the working environment.

**ROUTINE USES:** None.

**DISCLOSURE:** Voluntary. Failure to respond will not result in any penalty to the respondent. However, maximum participation is encouraged so that data will be complete and representative.

### ASSISTANCE

If you have any questions about the questionnaire:

WRITE to us at: Survey Desk  
Defense Manpower Data Center  
1600 Wilson Blvd., Suite 400  
Arlington, VA 22209-2593

OR CALL us at: (202) 696-6675 or -5856  
Autovon 226-6675 or -5856

# 1989 DoD SURVEY OF SEX ROLES IN THE ACTIVE-DUTY MILITARY

## SECTION I

1. Listed below are ALL KINDS of talk and behavior you may have heard, seen or participated in while on active duty.

WHICH THINGS HAPPEN FAIRLY FREQUENTLY IN  
YOUR CURRENT ACTIVE-DUTY MILITARY ENVIRONMENT?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. People making sexual remarks intended simply as compliments . . . . . 1
- b. Someone patting or rubbing someone on the shoulder, back or arm in an appreciative way . . . . . 2
- c. Unmarried people asking each other for dates . . . . . 3
- d. Co-workers engaging in casual sexual "small talk," such as "off-color" jokes, mild sexual teasing and the like . . . . . 4
- e. People of different ranks dating each other . . . . . 5
- f. Military people dating local civilians . . . . . 6
- g. Two or more men (or women) casually commenting to each other about the sexual attractiveness of a passing female (or male) . . . . . 7
- h. People making "put-down" remarks about homosexuals . . . . . 8
- i. People casually commenting about some aspect of their own sex lives (like "I'm an animal") . . . . . 9
- j. People commenting about the sexual attractiveness of someone in their unit . . . . . 10
- k. People just gossiping about others' sex lives or possible extramarital affairs . . . . . 11
- l. Someone dressing or behaving in a "sexy" way just to get a little attention . . . . . 12
- m. Co-workers casually exchanging stories of past sexual relationships, sexual exploits and the like . . . . . 13
- n. Seeing sexual words on walls, doors and buildings of the post, base or ship . . . . . 14
- o. People greeting each other with friendly sexual questions (like "How's your sex life?") . . . . . 15
- p. Someone pretending to "accidentally" bump into or otherwise touch someone they're sexually attracted to . . . . . 16
- q. Married people commenting about their sexual attraction to a co-worker who is not their spouse . . . . . 17
- r. People giving a "wolf whistle" to a passing member of the opposite sex . . . . . 18
- s. People "flirting" with their supervisors to get favorable treatment now or in the future . . . . . 19



2. For each kind of sexual talk and behavior that might occur AT WORK, please circle below the number that best reflects how often you YOURSELF have ACTUALLY heard or seen it within the last two years. (If you have served in very different kinds of work situations, try to answer based on your "overall" or "average" experience.)

KIND OF SEXUAL TALK AND BEHAVIOR	HOW OFTEN DID THIS KIND OF TALK/BEHAVIOR OCCUR AT WORK IN THE LAST TWO YEARS?						
	Never	Once	Several Times	About every other month	Once a Month	Every Few Days	Every Day
a. Casual sexual jokes, remarks, teasing or "playing around" in a group . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Sexual remarks intended as compliments . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Gossip about people's sexual behavior or extramarital affairs . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Conversations filled with sexual bragging, talk of others' sexual characteristics, stories of sexual "conquests" and the like . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Talk with a lot of foul language . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Sexual teasing or remarks addressed to one person alone . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g. "Wolf whistles," or sexual hoots, calls or yells to a particular individual . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h. Sexual touching, leaning over, cornering, pinching or brushing against . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i. Sexual gestures, looks or other suggestive body language directed to a particular person . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j. Request(s) for sexual favor(s) or pressure for such favors . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k. Someone pressuring someone for a date . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l. Negative sexual remarks about a group (like minorities, homosexuals) . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m. Someone receives a letter, phone call or other material of a gross sexual nature . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
n. Passing nude or sexy pictures around at work . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
o. Pressure for a sexual relationship or affair . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
p. Attempt(s) to get one or more people involved in other sexual activities like group sex or nude films . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
q. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
r. Other sexual talk or behavior not given above . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

If you have NEVER OBSERVED OR HEARD any sexual talk or behavior at work in the last two years, go to Section II on page 5.

If you HAVE OBSERVED OR HEARD such talk and behavior, continue with Q.3 below.

3. Some people feel that having to hear sexual TALK between others at work makes them feel sexually harassed in an indirect way. Others are not bothered by hearing such talk. How do YOU feel?

- Hearing Sexual Talk  
At Work: CIRCLE ONE NUMBER
- a. NEVER bothers or offends me and NEVER makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 1
  - b. Bothers or offends me only once in a while and never makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 2
  - c. Sometimes bothers or offends me but never makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 3
  - d. Frequently bothers or offends me but still doesn't make me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 4
  - e. Always bothers or offends me but still doesn't make me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 5
  - f. Sometimes makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 6
  - g. Frequently makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 7
  - h. ALWAYS makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 8

4. Some people feel that having to see sexual BEHAVIOR between others at work makes them feel sexually harassed in an indirect way. Others are not bothered by seeing such behavior. How do YOU feel?

- Seeing Sexual Behavior  
At Work: CIRCLE ONE NUMBER
- a. NEVER bothers or offends me and NEVER makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 1
  - b. Bothers or offends me only once in a while and never makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 2
  - c. Sometimes bothers or offends me but never makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 3
  - d. Frequently bothers or offends me but still doesn't make me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 4
  - e. Always bothers or offends me but still doesn't make me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 5
  - f. Sometimes makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 6
  - g. Frequently makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 7
  - h. ALWAYS makes me feel sexually harassed . . . . . 8

**READ THIS**

If you have NEVER BEEN BOTHERED OR OFFENDED by the sexual talk and behavior you have heard or observed at work in the last two years, go to Section II on page 5.  
If you HAVE EVER BEEN BOTHERED OR OFFENDED by this talk and behavior, pick the ONE INCIDENT you heard or saw that MOST bothered you, then answer the questions beginning on page 4 in terms of that particular experience.

5. The statements given below are possible reasons you found sexual talk or behavior bothersome or offensive. For each possible reason, please circle the number below the option which best reflects whether or not it played a role in your reaction.

<u>POSSIBLE REASONS WHY THE TALK/BEHAVIOR BOTHERED/OFFENDED YOU</u>	<u>Did This Reason Play a Role in Your Reaction?</u>				
	<u>Definitely</u>	<u>Probably</u>	<u>Not</u>	<u>Probably</u>	<u>Definitely</u>
	<u>Not</u>	<u>Not</u>	<u>Sure</u>		
a. The individuals involved were fraternizing . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
b. At least one of the individuals involved would gain an unfair advantage in promotions, duty assignments, etc. . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
c. The behaviors I saw were unprofessional . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
d. The behaviors I saw were inappropriate for people who are married but not to each other . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
e. One of the individuals involved was exploiting his/her power over the other(s) . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
f. Such open displays of sexuality are generally offensive to me . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
g. The individuals involved were insensitive to the feelings of others around them . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
h. The people involved were neglecting their duties . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
i. The behavior distracted me from my own work . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
j. My productivity (the quality or quantity of my work) decreased . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
k. The productivity of my work group decreased . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
l. The talk/behavior was cheap and degrading . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
m. The talk/behavior was contrary to military policy or against the law . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .
n. The people involved continued after being asked to stop . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . . .

6. In comparison to your normal job performance, was your productivity (that is, either how much work you did or how well you did it) affected by sexual talk or behavior between others at work?

	<u>CIRCLE ONE NUMBER</u>		
	<u>Decreased</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Increased</u>
My productivity . . . . .	1	2	3 . . . .

**GO TO NEXT SECTION.**

**SECTION II**

1. Listed below are all kinds of sexual TALK that can happen ON THE JOB. For each kind, this question asks if YOU think it is sexual harassment when: (a) any co-worker(s), or (b) any supervisor(s) say(s) it.

CIRCLE IN EACH COLUMN BELOW: Y for Yes; D for Depends; or N for No. You should make two circles for each type of talk.

<u>KIND OF SEXUAL TALK</u>	<u>IS THIS TALK SEXUAL HARASSMENT?</u>	
	<u>If Any Co-worker(s) Say(s) It?</u>	<u>If Any Supervisor(s) Say(s) It?</u>
a. Sexual remarks intended simply as compliments . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
b. Casual sexual jokes, remarks, teasing or "playing around" in a group . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
c. Requests for dates . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
d. Sexual questions asked as part of casual talk (like "How's your sex life?") . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
e. Gossip about someone's sexual behavior . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
f. Talk with details of someone's sexual behavior, sexual bragging or stories of "sexual conquests" . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
g. Sexual jokes, remarks and teasing directed to a person alone . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
h. Crude words referring to sexual body parts . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
i. Sexual questions asked of a person in private by someone with unclear motives . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
j. Talk with foul language, obscenities and lots of four-letter words . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
k. Request for a sexual favor (Example: A person asks another to perform a certain sex act.) . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
l. Sexual remarks, jokes and the like which make fun of or "put down" groups of people (like minority groups, wives or husbands, homosexuals) . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
m. One or more people discussing sexual exploits among the local (nonmilitary) people . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
n. Sexual talk of any kind made to maintain control of subordinates or to cut down people seen as threats . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .
o. Other type of sexual talk (Specify: _____) . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .	Y/D/N . . . . .

2. Listed below are some kinds of sexual BEHAVIOR that can happen ON THE JOB. For each action, this question asks if YOU think it is sexual harassment when: (a) any co-worker(s), or (b) any supervisor(s) do(es) it.

CIRCLE IN EACH COLUMN BELOW: Y for Yes; D for Depends; or N for No. You should make two circles for each type of behavior.

<u>KIND OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR</u>	<u>IS THIS BEHAVIOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT?</u>	
	<u>If Any Co-worker(s)</u>	<u>If Any Supervisor(s)</u>
	<u>Do(es) It?</u>	<u>Do(es) It?</u>
a. Putting up sexual cartoons, nude calendars or other sexual material in the work area . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
b. Two unmarried co-workers let it be known they are dating . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
c. Squeezing, touching, pinching, stroking, or brushing against someone in a sexual way (like someone patting someone's rear end as they pass by) . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
d. Passing sexy pictures, nude photos and the like around at work . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
e. Sending someone at work a note or letter with sexual words, nude photos, or other sexual material . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
f. Sexually suggestive looks, gestures or body language directed to a person . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
g. Whistling at or calling sexual remarks to someone from a window, while passing them in a car as they are out walking and so on . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
h. Someone dressing or behaving in a "sexy" way to get personal favors . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
i. Phone call with sexual remarks, sexual noises or "heavy breathing" . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
j. Someone at work tries to get someone into a sexual relationship in order to get ahead . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
k. Leaning over or cornering someone in a sexual way or with a sexual intent . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
l. A married person "puts the make" on one or more unmarried people . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .
m. Other type of sexual behavior (Specify: _____) . . . . .	Y/D/N	Y/D/N . . .

SECTION CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

3. Sometimes people have a hard time deciding whether or not certain kinds of sexual talk or behavior are sexual harassment. What makes it harder for YOU to decide?

WHEN IS IT HARDER TO CALL IT SEXUAL HARASSMENT?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. When the talk or behavior seems wanted . . . . . 1
- b. When the talk or behavior seems to be invited . . . . . 2
- c. When the speaker or doer is just trying to be "one of the group" or didn't think anyone would be offended . . . . . 3
- d. When the speaker or doer doesn't know any better or is just a "nerd" or "klutz" . . . . . 4
- e. When the speaker or doer is drunk . . . . . 5
- f. When the doer is just a "touchy, feely" kind of person . . . . . 6
- g. When the speaker or doer has some kind of mental problem . . . . . 7
- h. When the speaker or doer is just trying to be more assertive in order to get dates . . . . . 8
- i. When the speaker/doer and receiver currently have or may have had a personal relationship . . . . . 9
- j. When the speaker or doer has recently been divorced or had a bad personal experience . . . . . 10
- k. When the speaker or doer is of a different cultural background where certain talk or behavior is more accepted . . . . . 11
- l. When you personally like the speaker/doer . . . . . 12
- m. When the speaker/doer is physically very attractive . . . . . 13
- n. Almost never or never, because there is NO REASON for most sexual talk and behavior at work . . . . . 14
- o. Almost always or always, because almost any kind of sexual talk and behavior at work is okay . . . . . 15
- p. Other (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_ ) . . . . . 16

4. Sometimes things that are said or done ARE EASIER TO CALL sexual harassment. This is because there is something about the talk or behavior that is obviously just not acceptable. What makes it easier for YOU?

WHEN IS IT EASIER TO CALL IT SEXUAL HARASSMENT?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. When the talker or doer is "nasty" drunk . . . . . 1
- b. When the talker or doer is clearly trying to hassle a shy, very young or innocent person . . . . . 2
- c. When the talk or behavior is unwanted . . . . . 3
- d. When the talk or behavior is uninvited . . . . . 4
- e. When the receiver is clearly hurt or embarrassed . . . . . 5
- f. When the talker or doer is trying to be "macho" . . . . . 6
- g. When the talker or doer is a supervisor . . . . . 7
- h. When the talker or doer is married and the receiver(s) is (are) not . . . . . 8
- i. When the talker or doer is trying to get someone at work to "foul up" . . . . . 9
- j. When talker/doer is a racist and the receiver is of a different race . . . . . 10
- k. When the talker or doer just doesn't care about the feelings of others . . . . . 11
- l. When the talk or behavior creates fear or upset . . . . . 12
- m. When the talker or doer is using pressure . . . . . 13
- n. When the doer threatens to punish the receiver if the receiver doesn't comply or complains . . . . . 14
- o. When the talker or doer just thinks of the opposite sex as people to exploit . . . . . 15
- p. When the talker or doer is using, or playing on the sympathy of, someone . . . . . 16
- q. When the talker or doer has already been warned to stop but keeps on . . . . . 17
- r. When the speaker/doer is physically ugly or unattractive . . . . . 18
- s. When you personally don't like the speaker/doer . . . . . 19
- t. When the speaker/doer is trying to fraternize . . . . . 20
- u. When the receiver is alone . . . . . 21
- v. Almost always or always, because you don't like any kind of sexual talk/behavior at work . . . . . 22
- w. Other reason (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_ ) . . . . . 23

5. Here, we ask you whether you agree or disagree with each of five statements about how you or others think and behave at work.

Statement	How Much You Agree or Disagree				
	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Opinion</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
a. People who receive annoying sexual attention at work have usually asked for it. . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
b. I try to look at everybody's side before making a decision . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
c. Except when they are needed in time of war, women really shouldn't be in the military . . .	1	2	3	4	5
d. Problems of sexual harassment in the military are largely exaggerated. . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
e. If they could get away with it, most supervisors would pressure a subordinate for sexual favors . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5

6. Do you feel that overall discrimination against women in the active-duty military is a worse problem for them than sexual harassment?

	<u>CIRCLE ONE NUMBER</u>
a. Both are problems, but overall discrimination is worse . . . . .	1
b. Both are problems, but sexual harassment is worse . . . . .	2
c. Both are problems; it's hard to say which is worse . . . . .	3
d. Overall discrimination against women is a problem, but sexual harassment is not . . . . .	4
e. Sexual harassment is a problem for women, but overall discrimination is not . . . . .	5
f. Neither overall discrimination nor sexual harassment are problems for active-duty military women . . . . .	6

7. Please read the statements below and select the one which best represents the attitude toward sexual harassment of the commanding officer at your base/post:

	<u>CIRCLE ONE NUMBER</u>
The CO very ACTIVELY DISCOURAGES sexual harassment . . . . .	1
The CO has spoken out against it AND does seem to want it stopped . . . . .	2
The CO has NOT spoken out against it BUT seems to want it stopped . . . . .	3
The CO HAS spoken out against it BUT really seems not to care about it . . . . .	4
The CO seems uninformed about sexual harassment . . . . .	5
The CO may or may not have spoken out against sexual harassment but really seems to condone it . . . . .	6
The CO has NOT spoken out against it AND seems not to care about it . . . . .	7
The CO seems to actually encourage sexual harassment . . . . .	8
The CO's attitude is unknown/The CO is new/ The subject hasn't come up . . . . .	9

8. For each person or organization given below, please give your opinion about whether it or they make honest and reasonable efforts to stop sexual harassment in the active-duty military, regardless of what is said officially.

PERSON OR ORGANIZATION	MAKE REASONABLE EFFORTS?			
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u> <u>Opinion</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>
a. Senior leadership of my Service . . . . .	1	2	3	4
b. Senior leadership on my installation/ship . . . . .	1	2	3	4
c. My immediate supervisor/commanding officer . . . . .	1	2	3	4
d. Other unit commanders I've had . . . . .	1	2	3	4
e. My training instructor(s) . . . . .	1	2	3	4
f. Commanding officers at my other assignment stations . . . . .	1	2	3	4



**SECTION III**

Please Note: Sexual attention can be welcome or unwelcome. "UNINVITED AND UNWANTED TALK AND BEHAVIOR" is talk and behavior which you did NOT provoke, did NOT ask for, are NOT responsible for and do NOT participate in willingly or jokingly. Keep the examples of sexual attention given below in mind as you answer the rest of the survey.

1. Have YOU EVER RECEIVED any of the following kinds of UNINVITED and UNWANTED sexual attention from someone AT WORK while serving in the active-duty military? (CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY BELOW)

TYPE OF UNINVITED, UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault . . . . . 1
- b. Unwanted, uninvited pressure for sexual favors (Example: Someone tried to talk you into performing a certain sexual act with or for them, maybe promising a reward.) . . . . . 2
- c. Unwanted, uninvited touching, leaning over, cornering, pinching or brushing against of a deliberately sexual nature . . . . . 3
- d. Unwanted, uninvited sexually suggestive looks, gestures or body language (Example: Someone at work kept staring at your sexual body parts.) . . . . . 4
- e. Unwanted, uninvited letters, telephone calls, or materials of a sexual nature (Examples: Someone at work called you and said foul things; someone at work brought nude pictures for you to look at; someone sent you letters suggesting that you and the person have sex.) . . . . . 5
- f. Unwanted, uninvited pressure for dates (Example: A superior kept pressuring you to go out.) . . . . . 6
- g. Unwanted, uninvited sexual teasing, jokes, remarks or questions (Examples: Someone told you that you have a nice body; someone asked you how your sex life is; someone told crude jokes to embarrass you; someone jokingly made some comment about how you might perform in bed.) . . . . . 7
- h. Unwanted, uninvited whistles, calls, hoots or yells of a sexual nature (Example: One or more persons whistled at you or yelled some sexual things at you from a window or from a car driving past you.) . . . . . 8
- i. Unwanted, uninvited attempts to get your participation in any other kinds of sexually oriented activities (Examples: Someone tried to get you involved in group sex, or to pose for nude films, or to seduce someone for fun.) . . . . . 9
- j. Other unwanted, uninvited attention of a sexual nature (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_ ) . . . . . 10
- k. No, I have NEVER experienced any UNINVITED and UNWANTED sexual attention from someone at work while in the active-duty military . . . . . 11

2. Have you received any UNINVITED AND UNWANTED sexual attention DURING THE LAST 24 MONTHS from someone at work while on active-duty? (If you have served less than 2 years, answer for your entire service period.)

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

No . . . . . 1(GO TO  
SEC. IV,  
p. 17)

Yes . . . . . 2

3. Circle below how often you received each type of unwanted, uninvited sexual attention in the last two years.

FREQUENCY IN THE LAST 24 MONTHS

Type of Uninvited, Unwanted Sexual Attention	<u>FREQUENCY IN THE LAST 24 MONTHS</u>				
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Once a Month or Less</u>	<u>2-4 Times a Month</u>	<u>Once a Week or More</u>
a. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
b. Pressure for sexual favors . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
c. Sexual touching, leaning over, cornering, pinching or brushing against . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
d. Sexually suggestive looks, gestures or body language . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
e. Letters, telephone calls or materials of a sexual nature . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
f. Pressure for dates . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
g. Sexual teasing, jokes, remarks or questions . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
h. Sexual whistles, calls, hoots or yells . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
i. Attempts to get your participation in any other sexual activities . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5 . . .
j. Other sexual attention (Specify: _____ _____)	1	2	3	4	5 . . .

If UNINVITED AND UNWANTED sexual attention HAS happened to you while AT WORK in the active-duty military within the last 24 months, select the ONE EXPERIENCE that had the greatest effect on you and answer the rest of the questions in this section in terms of that experience.

4. Describe the experience you have in mind:

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. This was my only experience . . . . . 1
- b. This was my most recent experience . . . . . 2
- c. This experience is still continuing . . . . . 3
- d. This experience permanently damaged my career . . 4
- e. This experience caused me to lose friends . . . . . 5
- f. This experience caused me to transfer . . . . . 6
- g. This experience may cause me to leave the Service . 7
- h. This happened more than 12 months ago . . . . . 8
- i. This did not actually occur (only) at the work site . . 9

5. Did this experience take place at the duty station where you are now assigned, at some other assignment location, while you were on temporary duty elsewhere (TDY), or on recruit (basic) training?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- This experience took place here . . . . . 1
- This experience took place at another duty station . . . 2
- This experience took place on recruit (basic) training elsewhere . . . . . 3
- This experience took place while I was on TDY . . . . 4

6. During the experience you have in mind, which of the following UNINVITED, UNWANTED sexual attention happened to you?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault . . . . . 1
- b. Pressure for sexual favors . . . . . 2
- c. Sexual touching, leaning over, cornering, pinching or brushing against . . . . . 3
- d. Sexually suggestive looks, gestures, or body language . . . . . 4
- e. Letters, telephone calls, or materials of a sexual nature . . . . . 5
- f. Pressure for dates . . . . . 6
- g. Sexual teasing, jokes, remarks or questions . . . . . 7
- h. Whistles, calls, hoots or yells of a sexual nature . . . 8
- i. Attempts to get your participation in other sexually oriented activities . . . . . 9
- j. Other unwanted, uninvited sexual attention (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

\_\_\_\_\_ ) .10

7. How did you respond to this sexual attention and what effect did your reaction(s) have? FOR EACH REACTION BELOW, please CIRCLE WHETHER you did it, and, if you did, CHECK what happened as a result. (NOTE: Y=Yes; N=No.)

REACTION	Did You Do This?	Result of Reaction		
		Made Things Worse	Made No Difference	Made Things Better
a. I ignored the behavior or did nothing . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
b. I avoided the person(s) . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
c. I asked or told the person(s) to stop . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
d. I threatened to tell or told others . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
e. I reported the behavior to the unit commander or other official(s) . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
f. I made a joke of the behavior . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
g. I went along with the behavior . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
h. I transferred, disciplined or gave a poor fitness report to the person(s) . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
i. I got someone else to speak to the person(s) about the behavior . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
j. I threatened to harm the person(s) if the behavior continued . . . . .	N/Y	_____	_____	_____
k. I did something else (Specify: _____)	N/Y	_____	_____	_____

8. Over what period of time did you keep receiving this uninvited, unwanted sexual attention?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- It was a single event . . . . . 1 (GO TO Q.10)-->
- Less than one week . . . . . 2
- 1 to 4 weeks . . . . . 3
- 1 to 3 months . . . . . 4
- 4 to 6 months . . . . . 5
- More than 6 months . . . . . 6

(GO TO Q.9 below)

9. During this period of time, how frequently did the person(s) involved sexually bother you?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Once a month or less . . . . . 1
- 2 to 4 times a month . . . . . 2
- Every few days . . . . . 3
- Every day . . . . . 4
- It varied; sometimes a lot, sometimes not often . . . . . 5
- Every time the person(s) saw me . . . . . 6

10. As a result of your response to the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention, did any of the following changes happen in your work situation?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. My work assignments or conditions got worse . . . . . 1
- b. I was denied a promotion or good fitness report . . . . . 2
- c. I transferred to another location . . . . . 3
- d. I was reassigned/transferred to another location . . . . . 4
- e. I transferred to another work site at the same installation . . . . . 5
- f. My working conditions got better . . . . . 6
- g. I received a promotion or good fitness report . . . . . 7
- h. No changes occurred in my work situation . . . . . 8

11. Did you make or file a FORMAL (official) complaint to or through an appropriate official or office against the person(s) who victimized you?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- No . . . . . 1
- Yes . . . . . 2

12. How did the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention affect you? For each factor listed below, mark the response which best describes how you were affected.

FACTOR	Effect of Attention		
	Became Less Favorable	No Not Effect/Applic.	Became More Favorable
a. My feelings about the military . . . . .	1	2	3
b. My feelings about my unit . . . . .	1	2	3
c. My opinion of the opposite sex . . . . .	1	2	3
d. My opinion of members of my own sex . . . . .	1	2	3
e. My feelings about work . . . . .	1	2	3
f. My self-esteem . . . . .	1	2	3
g. My opinion of my superiors . . . . .	1	2	3
h. My emotional condition . . . . .	1	2	3
i. My physical condition . . . . .	1	2	3
j. My ability to work with others on the job . . . . .	1	2	3
k. The quality of my work . . . . .	1	2	3
l. The quantity of my work . . . . .	1	2	3
m. My relations with my spouse . . . . .	1	2	3
n. My relations with other family member(s) . . . . .	1	2	3
o. My time and attendance at work . . . . .	1	2	3
p. My overall fitness for service . . . . .	1	2	3
q. My readiness . . . . .	1	2	3
r. My attitude about doing a good job . . . . .	1	2	3
s. My sense of control over my job . . . . .	1	2	3

13. Who was/were the person(s) who sexually bothered you?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- a. Your immediate military supervisor . . . . . 1
- b. Your immediate civilian supervisor . . . . . 2
- c. Your unit commander . . . . . 3
- d. Other higher level military personnel . . . . . 4
- e. Your military co-worker(s) . . . . . 5
- f. Your civilian co-worker(s) . . . . . 6
- g. Your military subordinate(s) . . . . . 7
- h. Your civilian subordinate(s) . . . . . 8
- i. Other military person(s) . . . . . 9
- j. Other civilian person(s) . . . . . 10
- k. Other or unknown . . . . . 11

14. Was (were) the person(s) who sexually bothered you in your unit?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Yes, the person(s) was (were) in my unit . . . . . 1
- No, the person(s) was (were) NOT in my unit . . . . . 2
- Some were, some were not in my unit . . . . . 3
- No, but the person(s) and I had been in the same unit in the past . . . . . 4

15. Please describe the person(s) who sexually bothered you. (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER IN SECTIONS a-c. CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY IN SECTIONS d and e.)

a. Sex of Person(s)

CIRCLE ONE

- Male . . . . . 1
- Female . . . . . 2
- Two or more males . . . . . 3
- Two or more females . . . . . 4
- Both sexes . . . . . 5
- Unknown . . . . . 6

b. Age of Person(s)

CIRCLE ONE

- Older . . . . . 1
- Same age . . . . . 2
- Younger . . . . . 3
- Mixed . . . . . 4
- Unknown . . . . . 5

c. Race of Person(s)

CIRCLE ONE

- Same as yours . . . . . 1
- Different . . . . . 2
- Some same, some different . . . . . 3
- Unknown . . . . . 4

d. Marital Status of Person(s)

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- Married . . . . . 1
- Single . . . . . 2
- Divorced, separated, widowed . . . . . 3
- Unknown . . . . . 4

e. Military/Civilian Status of Person(s)

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY

- U.S. military . . . . . 1
- DoD/Service civilian employee . . . . . 2
- Civilian contractor . . . . . 3
- DoD/Service foreign-national employee . . . . . 4
- Local civilian resident . . . . . 5
- Local foreign-national resident . . . . . 6
- Unknown/other . . . . . 7

SECTION CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE

16. Why do you think this (these) person(s) directed the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention to you? (Note: The person(s) may have acted for more than one reason.) FOR EACH REASON BELOW, CIRCLE A NUMBER TO INDICATE WHETHER IT HELPS EXPLAIN THE BEHAVIOR.

POSSIBLE REASONS WHY THE PERSON(S) BEHAVED THIS WAY	WAS THIS A REASON FOR THE BEHAVIOR?				
	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Don't Know	Likely	Very Likely
a. The person(s) wanted to exert power over me . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
b. The person(s) wanted to "put me down" or insult me . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
c. The person(s) was (were) sexually interested in me . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
d. The person(s) misunderstood how I might react . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
e. The person(s) did not care how I might react . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
f. The person(s) wanted to win the approval of other members of the work group . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
g. The person(s) was (were) acting in a way that most men (or women) act . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
h. The person(s) does (did) not know any other way to act . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
i. The person(s) was (were) trying to make a joke or be humorous . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
j. The person(s) was (were) encouraged by something I said or did . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
k. I am the sort of person these kinds of things happen to . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
l. Other reasons (Specify: _____) . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5

17. How long had you been in the active-duty military when the incident or episode occurred or began?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Less than 6 months . . . . . 1
- 6 months but less than 1 year . . . . . 2
- 1 year but less than 2 years . . . . . 3
- 2 years but less than 5 years . . . . . 4
- 5 years or more . . . . . 5

18. Did you receive medical assistance or emotional counseling from a trained professional as a result of the sexual attention?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Yes, I received medical assistance . . . . . 1
- Yes, I received counseling from a trained professional . . . . . 2
- Yes, I received both medical assistance and emotional counseling . . . . . 3
- No, but emotional counseling might have been helpful . . . . . 4
- No, but medical assistance might have been helpful . . . . . 5
- No, but both medical assistance and emotional counseling might have helped . . . . . 6
- No, I did not need either medical assistance or emotional counseling . . . . . 7

19. If you used any annual leave or were ever out sick as a result of the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention, please indicate how many days you were absent.

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- None . . . . . 1
- One day . . . . . 2
- Two days . . . . . 3
- Three to five days . . . . . 4
- Six to ten days . . . . . 5
- More than 10 days . . . . . 6

20. In comparison to your normal job performance, was your productivity (that is, either how much work you did or how well you did it), affected by the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention? If so, please indicate the extent your productivity was affected. (In responding, do not count time lost due to use of sick or annual leave.)

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- My productivity was not affected . . . . . 1
- Don't know/Can't judge . . . . . 2
- My productivity was slightly reduced (10% or less) . . . . . 3
- My productivity was noticeably reduced (11% - 25%) . . . . . 4
- My productivity was markedly reduced (26% - 50%) . . . . . 5
- My productivity was dramatically reduced (more than 50%) . . . . . 6

21. At the time this unwanted, uninvited sexual attention occurred or began, what was your paygrade? (CIRCLE ONE PAYGRADE)

<u>ENLISTED</u>	<u>WARRANT</u>	<u>OFFICER</u>
E-1	W-1	O-1
E-2	W-2	O-2
E-3	W-3	O-3
E-4	W-4	O-4
E-5		O-5
E-6		O-6
E-7		O-7
E-8		O-8
E-9		O-9

22. At the time the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention occurred or began, what was your marital status?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Married for first time . . . . . 1
- Remarried . . . . . 2
- Legally separated . . . . . 3
- Informally separated . . . . . 4
- Widowed . . . . . 5
- Divorced . . . . . 6
- Single, Never Married . . . . . 7

23. Did the unwanted, uninvited sexual attention occur in CONUS (the Continental United States), overseas or at sea?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- CONUS . . . . . 1  
(Continental United States)
- Overseas . . . . . 2
- At sea . . . . . 3

**GO TO NEXT SECTION.**

**SECTION IV**

This section of the survey asks for information we need to help us with the statistical analyses of the survey.

**1. In what branch of the Armed Forces do you serve?**

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Army ..... 1
- Navy ..... 2
- Marine Corps ..... 3
- Air Force ..... 4

**2. What is your paygrade? (CIRCLE ONE PAYGRADE)**

<u>ENLISTED</u>	<u>WARRANT</u>	<u>OFFICER</u>
E-1	W-1	O-1
E-2	W-2	O-2
E-3	W-3	O-3
E-4	W-4	O-4
E-5		O-5
E-6		O-6
E-7		O-7
E-8		O-8
E-9		O-9

**3. If you are an officer, do you have prior active enlisted service?**

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Not an officer ..... 1
- Yes ..... 2
- No ..... 3

**4. Are you currently assigned to a ship as your permanent duty station?**

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Yes ..... 1
- No ..... 2

**5. To the nearest year and month, how long have you been on active duty? If you had a break in service, count current time and time in previous tour(s) ON ACTIVE DUTY ONLY.**

\_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_  
 YEARS                  MONTHS

**6. What is your present age, as of your last birthday?**

\_\_\_\_\_   
 YEARS OLD

**7. What is the highest level of education you have completed and received credit for?**

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Less than high school graduation ..... 1
- High school graduation only (include GED) ..... 2
- Vocational, trade or business school after high school ..... 3
- Certificate from military training program or school ..... 4
- Some college, but less than two years ..... 5
- Two-year college degree (Associate degree) ..... 6
- More than two years of college, but no bachelor's degree ..... 7
- Bachelor's degree (BA, BS, etc.) ..... 8
- Some graduate school ..... 9
- Master's degree (MA, MS, etc.) ..... 10
- Doctoral degree or other advanced professional degree (Ph.D., M.D., etc.) ..... 11



8. What is your marital status?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Married for the first time . . . . . 1
- Remarried . . . . . 2
- Legally separated . . . . . 3
- Informally separated . . . . . 4
- Widowed . . . . . 5
- Divorced . . . . . 6
- Single, Never Married . . . . . 7

9. If married, is your spouse currently serving on active duty in the Armed Forces?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Not married . . . . . 1
- Yes . . . . . 2
- No . . . . . 3

10. Are you:

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Female . . . . . 1
- Male . . . . . 2

11. Are you of Spanish/Hispanic origin or descent?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- No (not Spanish/Hispanic) . . . . . 1
- Yes, Mexican/Mexican-American/Chicano . . . . . 2
- Yes, Puerto Rican . . . . . 3
- Yes, Cuban . . . . . 4
- Yes, Central or South American . . . . . 5
- Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic . . . . . 6

12. Are you:

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- American Indian/Alaskan Native . . . . . 1
- Black/Negro/Afro-American . . . . . 2
- Oriental/Asian/Chinese/Japanese/  
Korean/Filipino/Pacific Islander . . . . . 3
- White/Caucasian . . . . . 4
- Other (Specify: \_\_\_\_\_) . . . . . 5

13. Are you now on recruit (basic) training?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Yes . . . . . 1
- No . . . . . 2

14. What is your MOS/rating/designator/AFSC? (ENTER CODE IN SPACE BELOW)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MOS/Rating/Designator/AFSC

15. Are you a supervisor who gives fitness reports to others?

CIRCLE ONE NUMBER

- Yes . . . . . 1
- No . . . . . 2

**NOW PLEASE GO TO  
THE LAST PAGE.**

**IF YOU HAVE ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR ACTIONS which your branch of the Service could take to reduce sexual harassment (other than those already being taken), please write them in the space below.**

---

---

---

---

**IF YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS FOR US, PLEASE WRITE THEM IN THE SPACE BELOW. IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE, PLEASE WRITE ON THE BACK OF THIS SHEET.**

---

---

---

---

**THIS COMPLETES THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Please use the enclosed, postage-paid envelope to return your completed questionnaire. If preprinted envelope is lost or unavailable, please return the form to:

**Survey Desk  
Defense Manpower Data Center  
1600 Wilson Blvd., Suite 400  
Arlington, VA 22209-2593**

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND PARTICIPATION  
IN THIS IMPORTANT SURVEY**

**APPENDIX E**  
**A MODEL PROGRAM**

## A MODEL PROGRAM

### Statement of Policy

An organizational policy on sexual harassment can reasonably begin with the guidelines contained in Appendix A, but it must also state that every member of the organization has the right to report behaviors which he or she believes to be sexual harassment; that the organization intends to take all claims seriously; and that it is illegal to retaliate against those who do report such behaviors. While it is appropriate to point out that an isolated slur or action is not normally sufficient to be labeled harassment, an effective policy needs to list specific conduct which is prohibited. The following example is not all inclusive. It does provide sufficient detail to ensure a better understanding of the types of behaviors which violate the organization's overall policy.

### Statement of Prohibited Conduct

The following conduct represents types of acts which violate the organization's policy against sexual harassment:

- A. Physical assaults of a sexual nature, such as:
  - (1) rape, sexual battery, molestation, or attempts to commit these assaults; or
  - (2) intentional physical conduct which is sexual in nature, such as touching, pinching, patting, grabbing, cornering, leaning over, brushing against another's body, or poking another's body.
- B. Unwanted sexual advances, propositions or other sexual comments, such as:
  - (1) sexually-oriented gestures, including exposure of genitals; uninvited, repeated pressure for dates; graphic commentaries; uninvited, repeated hoots, yells, whistles or sexually-oriented sounds; or comments about a person's sexuality or sexual experience directed at or made in the presence of any employee who indicates or has indicated that such conduct in his or her presence is unwelcome;

- (2) preferential treatment in exchange for submission to sexual conduct, including soliciting or attempting to solicit any employee to engage in sexual activity for compensation or reward; or
- (3) subjection or threats of subjection to unwelcome sexual attention or conduct or intentionally making performance of the job more difficult because of an employee's sex.

C. Sexual or discriminatory displays or publications, such as:

- (1) displaying pictures, posters, calendars, graffiti, objects, promotional material, reading material, or other materials that are sexually suggestive, sexually degrading, or pornographic; or bringing into the work environment or possessing any such material to read, display, or view at work;

NOTE: A picture will be presumed to be sexually suggestive if it depicts a person of either sex who is not fully clothed or in clothes that are not suited to or ordinarily accepted for the accomplishment of routine work in and around the workplace and who is posed for the obvious purpose of displaying or drawing attention to private portions of his or her body.

- (2) reading or otherwise publicizing in the work environment materials that are in any way sexually revealing, sexually suggestive, sexually degrading or pornographic; or
- (3) displaying signs or other material purporting to segregate an employee by sex in any areas of the workplace other than restrooms and similar semi-private lockers and changing rooms.

D. Retaliation for sexual harassment complaints, such as:

- (1) disciplining, changing work assignments of, providing inaccurate work information to, or refusing to cooperate or discuss work-related matters with any employee because that employee has complained about or resisted harassment, discrimination, or retaliation; or

- (2) intentionally pressuring an employee or escalating harassing verbal or physical conduct towards an employee because that employee has complained about or resisted harassment, discrimination, or retaliation; or
- (3) falsely denying, lying about, or otherwise covering up or attempting to cover up conduct such as that described in any item above.

### **Education and Training**

Education and training at every level of the work force is critical to the success of the stated organizational policy. Documents clearly presenting the policy and the statement of prohibited conduct must be conspicuously displayed throughout the workplace on bulletin boards and in all central gathering areas. The statements must be clearly legible and displayed continuously. Personal messages from organizational leaders should be prepared at least annually and should receive wide distribution. Educational posters using concise statements conveying the organization's opposition to workplace sexual harassment will help to further reinforce the policy statement and should be simple, eye-catching, and graffiti resistant.

### **Training Programs**

- A. Orientation programs shall, as a minimum, include the following:
  - (1) A copy of the organization's policy and prohibited conduct statements are to be provided to each new employee who will be requested to read and sign a receipt for the statements to ensure awareness of the standards of behavior expected; and
  - (2) New employees will participate in a day-long training session in which the policy is explained and questions are answered; where a role-playing exercise is conducted to show appropriate responses to prohibited conduct; and where case studies of actual cases are examined in detail.
- B. Employee annual training programs shall include the following:
  - (1) All supervisory personnel will participate in a half day-long seminar on sex discrimination. At least one-third of each session will be

devoted to education about workplace sexual harassment. This shall include examples of the types of remarks, behaviors, and pictures which will not be tolerated. Organizational leaders should introduce these training sessions by stressing the importance of the policy as a means to promote full utilization of all of the organization's resources. Leaders should make clear that those who choose to engage in such conduct will be made to bear full responsibility for their behavior; and

- (2) Supervisory personnel who have attended a management training seminar shall conduct training sessions twice annually to be attended by all employees. During this training, supervisors are to explain the kinds of acts that constitute sexual harassment, the organization's serious commitment to eliminating sexual harassment in the workplace, the penalties for engaging in sexual harassment, and the procedures for reporting incidents of sexual harassment; and
- (3) Investigative personnel shall be appointed and shall attend annual full day training seminars conducted by experienced sexual harassment educators to increase their knowledge concerning sexual harassment in the workplace and to train them in techniques for prevention and for investigation of complaints.

#### **Grievance Procedures**

The organization must provide its employees with convenient, confidential, and reliable mechanisms for reporting incidents of sexual harassment and retaliation. The names, responsibilities, work locations, and phone numbers of investigative personnel must be routinely and continuously posted. An employee should be able to report inappropriate conduct while remaining anonymous and inconspicuous to co-workers should she or he so desire. Anonymous complaints will be taken seriously and investigated. Anyone observing sexual harassment or retaliation has an obligation to report it. Only those who have an immediate need to know, including investigative personnel, the alleged target of harassment or retaliation, the alleged harasser or harassers, and any witnesses should find out the identity of the complainant. Those personnel contacted in the course of an investigation will be advised that all personnel involved in a charge are entitled to respect. All parties will be made aware that acts of

retaliation or reprisal against an individual who is an alleged target of harassment or retaliation, who has made a complaint, or who has provided evidence in connection with a complaint will be appropriately punished.

#### **Investigations and Tracking Procedures**

- A. Investigations shall follow the following guidelines:
- (1) Each investigator will have received thorough training with regard to sexual harassment and the procedures to be used in an investigation before embarking on said investigation; and
  - (2) All complaints will be investigated expeditiously by a trained investigator who will produce a written report, which, together with the investigation file, will be shown to the complainant upon request and within a reasonable time; and
  - (3) Immediately upon receiving a complaint, the investigator will bring all sexual harassment and retaliation complaints to the confidential attention of the head of the organization and equal opportunity personnel. The investigator and EEO will each maintain a file on the original charge and follow-up investigation; and
  - (4) A single counseling session will be conducted with the complainant by a trained counselor as part of the initial investigation and follow-up counseling will be made available upon request. In all cases, the name and telephone number of a trained counselor will be left with the complainant in order that immediate counseling may be obtained if needed.
- B. Tracking procedures shall include the following:
- (1) Monitoring the workplace environment is the primary responsibility of supervisors and trained investigators. These personnel shall immediately inform the head of the organization upon discovering sexual harassment or retaliation in the workplace; and
  - (2) Tracking will be conducted at a central location within the organization to permit trend analysis of types of behaviors



exhibited, frequency of behaviors, and disciplinary actions.

### **Sanctions**

Sanctions must be clearly defined and widely promulgated. They should be sufficiently punitive to deter repetition of offensive behavior; a primary goal of prevention measures. Depending on the severity of the behavior exhibited, the following sanctions will be considered: verbal warning, written warning, denial of promotion, and dismissal. The severity of the harassment may require legal remedy. Training and counseling may also be constructive, but should be employed in conjunction with punitive measures, not as a replacement for them.

### **Responsibilities of Leaders**

Leaders set the tone and determine the direction of the organization. The words they speak are important; their actions are even more so. Leaders who do not believe sexual harassment is a serious problem and who lack sensitivity to its impact cannot effectively administer a program of prevention. Awareness begins with a willingness to listen and ends with a willingness to act. Leaders must support, by both word and deed, the written policies issued by the organization. Sexual harassment is a form of discrimination which is emotionally damaging, costly, and morally wrong. It is worthy of a leader's sincere attention and concern.

**APPENDIX F**  
**GLOSSARY**

## GLOSSARY

**Apodictic (Husserl):** synonym for necessary, indubitable, and even infallible; applied not only to knowledge but also to objects known and to methods

**Cartesianism:** based on the ideas and methods of Descartes who believed in the separation of mind and matter. He thought of God as resembling the mind in that both God and the mind think, but have no physical being. Matter is the physical universe, of which the human body is a part.

**Constitution:** in the phenomenological sense, it is the act by which an object is built up in consciousness

**Eidetic reduction:** the act which leads from particulars to universal "pure" essences

**Empiricism:** relying or based solely on experiment and observation; in philosophy, the theory that sensory experience is the only source of knowledge

**Essence:** the whatness of things, as opposed to their thatness, i.e., their existence

**Ethnography:** the methodological approach to describing specific cultures

**Hermeneutics:** the methodological principles of interpretation and explanation

**Heuristic:** rule of thumb used to help discover or learn; a method in education in which the pupil is trained to find things out for himself

**Holistic (inquiry):** the world is studied as a continuous context within which individuals view themselves and their lives as real, true, and having meaning

**Intersubjectivity:** interrelating two consciousnesses; a plurality of subjectivities making up a community sharing a common world

**Intuiting:** the act of exploring a phenomenon; contemplation on a phenomenon in an effort to make sense of it

- Logical Positivism:** the philosophical belief that all statements which cannot be verified by sense perception, except for provable statements of mathematics or logic, are meaningless nonsense
- Macho:** a Spanish term which connotes male virility, gutsiness, self-reliance, the ability to take care of oneself against opposition, pride of person, a touch of swagger, and a compulsion to prove oneself, especially sexually
- Monological (phenomenology):** understanding the world through reflection as opposed to dialogue; dialogal phenomenology focuses on a world which arises in the interactions between individuals
- Phenomenology:** a research tradition rooted in the belief that what is known about reality derives from consciousness; a methodology which is used to better understand human experience
- Positivism:** a philosophy based solely on positive, observable, scientific facts and their relations to each other and to natural law; the belief that all knowledge is based on experience (see Logical Positivism)
- Quid pro quo:** one thing in return for another; something given or received for something else
- Reflection:** the act by which consciousness turns inward, reversing its usual forward orientation
- Solipsism:** the theory that the self can be aware of nothing but its own experiences; the theory that nothing exists or is real but the self
- Teleology (of consciousness) (Husserl):** the purposive structure of consciousness
- Transcendental reduction:** implies a reflective turn to transcendental subjectivity in which pure phenomena are constituted
- Triangulation:** a combination of multiple data sources aimed at achieving structural corroboration; occurs when pieces of evidence validate each other
- Unit of meaning:** those words, phrases, nonverbal or para-linguistic communications which express a unique and coherent meaning irrespective of the research question