



VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
MELBOURNE AUSTRALIA

*From “Ghettoization” to a Field of Its Own: A
Comprehensive Review of Street Harassment
Research*


This is the Accepted version of the following publication

Fileborn, Bianca and O'Neill, Tully (2021) From “Ghettoization” to a Field of Its Own: A Comprehensive Review of Street Harassment Research. Trauma, Violence, and Abuse. p. 152483802110216. ISSN 1524-8380

The publisher’s official version can be found at
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/15248380211021608>
Note that access to this version may require subscription.

Downloaded from VU Research Repository <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/44357/>

From “Ghettoization” to a Field of Its Own: A Comprehensive Review of Street Harassment Research

TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE
1-14
© The Author(s) 2021
Article reuse guidelines:
sagepub.com/journals-permissions
DOI: 10.1177/15248380211021608
journals.sagepub.com/home/tva


Bianca Fileborn¹  and Tully O'Neill¹

Abstract

Street harassment represents one of the most pervasive forms of sexual violence. While it is commonly understood as a gender-based harm, it also intersects with racist, homophobic, transphobic, ableist, and other forms of abuse. Although it is rarely responded to through government policy, research illustrates that street harassment can have profoundly negative impacts of those who experience it. This article provides a comprehensive review of the current “state of the field” of street harassment research. We undertook two extensive searches of the EBSCO Discovery database in 2015 and 2020, followed by the use of reference snowballing and a Google Scholar search in order to triangulate results. Studies included in the sample were published in English, peer-reviewed and centrally focused on street harassment. Dissertations and nongovernmental organization reports were also included due to the small number of studies in this field. One hundred eighty-two sources were included in the final sample. Findings show that publications on this topic have increased substantially across the two reviews. We provide a thematic overview of key research findings to date and argue throughout that current research suffers from conceptual and typological slippage and does not consistently take into account the need for an intersectional analysis. We close with suggestions for future directions in research and practice, given the emergent nature of the field.

Keywords

street harassment, public intrusion, intersectionality, sexual violence, policy

Street harassment represents one of the most prevalent forms of sexual violence, though it also manifests as racist, homophobic, transphobic, and other forms of abuse. Despite its apparent commonality, street harassment has frequently been positioned as a “trivial” or harmless occurrence (Bowman, 1993; Laniya, 2005; Tuerkheimer, 1997; Vera-Gray, 2016a). Subsequently, it has received minimal attention in both research and policy, though it was addressed in early feminist work on “everyday” manifestations of men’s violence and intrusion (Fileborn, 2021b; Vera-Gray, 2016b). Given this general silence, it is heartening to see a resurgence of research on this issue, particularly over the past 5 years. Arguably, this renewed interest has been driven by the work of international activist groups such as *Hollaback!*, the *Everyday Sexism Project*, and *Catcalls of NYC*, who have drawn attention to the prevalence and impacts of street harassment, particularly in the lives of cisgender women (Fileborn, 2021b). In contrast to the widespread trivialization of street harassment, the body of research that has been conducted to date—in conjunction with the thousands of stories collated by activists (Hollaback!, n.d.)—demonstrates that it is a profoundly harmful experience that relates to stereotypically “more serious” iterations of sexual (and other) violence in intricate ways. In this article, we aim to provide a critical review of the current state of research-based knowledge on street

harassment. While considerable ground has been made in advancing our understanding of this issue, our review draws attention to substantive gaps in knowledge—with implications for both future research trajectories and policy development—and highlights theoretical and conceptual challenges that require further reflection by researchers in the field.

Method

In undertaking this critical review of literature, the authors conducted an extensive search of international databases using EBSCO Discovery, following the approach utilized by Fileborn (2016b) and also reflecting the approach taken in conducting a scoping review (Arksey & O’Malley, 2005). As Arksey and O’Malley (2005, p. 20) explain, this approach provides a “technique to ‘map’ relevant literature in the field of

¹ School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

Corresponding Author:

Bianca Fileborn, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne, John Medley Building, Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia.
Email: biancaf@unimelb.edu.au

interest” and is particularly appropriate when undertaking a broad review of a field that draws together studies that have utilized different methodological approaches. The search was repeated, with the first search conducted in 2015 and the second in 2020. The studies identified in this review were located by searching the key term “street harassment” in the following databases: Web of Science, Sociological Abstracts, Criminal Justice Abstracts, Worldwide Political Science Abstracts, SAGE Journals, Scopus, and PsychINFO. A secondary search was conducted using Google Scholar to identify studies not published in the aforementioned databases. Studies included in this review were peer-reviewed, written in English, and were centrally focused on street harassment. Articles that made passing mention of street harassment with no substantive focus or discussion on the topic were excluded from the sample, as were duplicate items. A small number of reports and dissertations were included in the review due to limited academic research into street harassment. In the 2015 search, 5,247 results were returned through the database and a further 1,670 results through Google Scholar, with a final sample of 53 relevant articles.

Another review was conducted in February 2020 to identify new contributions to the field. The second review of literature utilized the same search term, databases, and inclusion/exclusion criteria as the first and revealed a significant emergence of new literature: A total of 20,551 results were returned through the database search and approximately 212,000 from Google Scholar, with 122 new studies meeting the inclusion criteria. Following the search of these databases, a snowball sampling technique was utilized in the second search, drawing on the reference lists of relevant articles, with a further 32 articles included in the final sample. Following this, 27 sources were excluded due to inaccessibility. An overview of the total 182 sources included in the 2015 and 2020 reviews are provided in the Online Supplementary File. The review revealed a majority of qualitative studies ($n = 118$), with significantly fewer quantitative ($n = 31$) and mixed methods ($n = 33$) research examining street harassment. The expansion of publishing on this topic is itself a notable finding, demonstrating how street harassment has become a burgeoning research area and further supports the need for an updated literature review that builds on Logan’s (2015) contribution and acknowledges the rapid growth of knowledge production.

There are some limitations with our approach that should be noted. The terminology used to describe street harassment varies across studies, with terms such as “men’s intrusions,” “public intrusions,” “street remarks,” “public incivilities,” and “eve teasing” also used across the literature (Vera-Gray, 2016b). Public harassment against LGBTQ+ people and racist harassment may be labeled as hate crime rather than harassment. Likewise, street harassment is a diffuse category and can refer to forms of sexual harassment and violence that take place on public transport and in quasi-public spaces such as nightclubs. Given the slippage and ambiguity around what constitutes street harassment (something we address further below),

this creates a considerable challenge in identifying all potentially relevant literature. This was mitigated by the use of a triangulated search strategy, with the snowballing component in particular assisting to identify relevant studies that did not explicitly use the term street harassment. The authors undertook an initial reading of all studies included in the sample and, from this, developed thematic categories that reflected the key focus of the research to date. We move on now to explore the dominant themes and findings from the review.

Findings

What Is Street Harassment—Typologies

Street harassment constitutes a broad array of behavior, and in the research to date, there is considerable slippage and ambiguity in terms of what actions “count.” The most common approach positions street harassment as a form of sexual harassment that is overwhelming perpetrated by male strangers against women in public space. This typically includes actions such as catcalling, kissing noises, horn honking, staring or leering, following someone, unwanted conversation (e.g., repeated requests for a date or phone number), sexualized gestures, frottage, unwanted touching, indecent exposure, and public masturbation (Brundson, 2018; Campos et al., 2017; Macmillan et al., 2000). However, other studies have included actions such as physical abuse and violence, sexual assault, and rape (Armstrong, 2016; Campos et al., 2017; Fileborn, 2013; Gardner, 1995; Logan, 2015; Stop Street Harassment, 2014). The boundaries around what “counts” as street harassment are thus blurred and varied.

Difficulties in establishing any kind of firm typology of harassment are further complicated by the fact that what is lived or experienced as harassment can be highly context-dependent and subjective (di Gennaro & Ritschel, 2019; Fairchild, 2010; Farmer & Jordan, 2017; Fileborn, 2013, 2017b; Heben, 1994–1995; McCarty et al., 2014; Vera-Gray, 2016b). Interpretations of what counts as harassment are themselves made through the discursive lens of myths and stereotypes that exclude all but the most extreme iterations of sexual violence and harassment (Hlavka, 2014; Kelly, 1988). Moreover, many forms of public harassment are not overtly sexualized and may appear ambiguous, if not “friendly” in nature, when viewed as isolated incidents (e.g., commands to “smile” or apparent greetings such as “hello”—see Bailey, 2016, 2017; di Gennaro & Ritschel, 2019; Vera-Gray, 2016a, 2016b; Vera-Gray & Fileborn, 2018).

Additionally, typologies of street harassment must take into account how harassment is shaped through an intersectional lens. While street harassment is most commonly framed as sexualized in nature, it can manifest in ways that are racist, homophobic, transphobic, ableist, Islamophobic, and so forth (Chmielewski, 2017; Datzman & Gardner, 2000; Fogg-Davis, 2006; Heben, 1994–1995; Mason-Bish & Zempi, 2019; Stop Street Harassment, 2014; Vizvary, 2020). For Black women, it is often not possible to disentangle racist and sexist harassment

(Buchanan & Ormerod, 2002). Same sex attracted people can likewise encounter harassment that is simultaneously sexualized and homophobic in nature (Fileborn, 2021a). Men may be targeted with homophobic abuse or on the basis of some perceived “failure” in their performance of masculinity (see, for e.g., Gimlin, 2010; Namaste, 1996). As such, the precise forms of street harassment can shift across different groups as well as being filtered through the lens of personal experience, context, discursive norms, and structures of power.

Conceptualizing Street Harassment

Intrusion. Perhaps unsurprisingly given the difficulty in pinning down street harassment as a category of behavior, the approaches taken to conceptualizing street harassment have been subject to considerable debate in the literature (Davis, 1994; Kissling, 1991; Laniya, 2005; Logan, 2015; Vera-Gray, 2016a, 2016b). Such debates have important implications for how street harassment is understood, what and whose experiences are included, and how the issue should best be responded to. Indeed, until relatively recently we lacked a language to express street harassment and its attendant harms, making it difficult for individuals to articulate their experiences in a way that is recognized and intelligible to others (Davis, 1994; Heben, 1994–1995; Kissling, 1991; Laniya, 2005; Tuerekheimer, 1997). Difficulty in developing conceptualizations of street harassment that adequately reflect and capture its nature is undoubtedly compounded by the aforementioned varied perspectives on precisely which actions fall under the banner of street harassment or other commonly used terminology such as “stranger harassment” (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Wesselmann & Kelly, 2010), “sexual harassment” (Thompson, 1994), and “public harassment” (Gardner, 1995). Davis (1994, p. 155), for example, advocates for the use of street harassment as it captures both “the location—the street—and the behavior—harassment”. However, UK-based scholar Fiona Vera-Gray (2016a, 2016b) argues that we need to reposition street harassment as “men’s stranger intrusions,” as this discursive shift refocuses our attention to the actions of perpetrators, rather than whether something is interpreted or lived as “harassment” per se. Additionally, harassment occurs across many public, semi-public, private, and digital spaces—it is by no means limited to the literal street (Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017; Vera-Gray, 2016a, 2016b). Intrusion broadens the scope of analysis and encompasses experiences that are not labeled by the recipient as necessarily harmful or harassing. Such an approach radically shifts the possibilities of what is captured in research on this topic, especially given that participants may not share experiences deemed too “minor” to constitute harassment (see, for e.g., Farmer & Jordan, 2017; Vera-Gray, 2016b). However, not all forms of street harassment are exclusively perpetrated by men, so the concept of men’s stranger intrusions also eclipses some forms of harassment. Baptist and Coburn (2019) utilize the term “stranger intrusion,” and this can provide a more inclusive conceptualization, particularly when racist, homophobic, transphobic, and

“whorephobic” or anti-sex worker harassment are taken into account (see, e.g., Armstrong, 2016).

Nonetheless, there remains a substantial tension here, as the vast majority of public harassment is indeed perpetrated by men, and it is lived and experienced in gendered ways (Tuerekheimer, 1997; Vera-Gray, 2016b). For example, the fact that many women and gender diverse people are socialized to be fearful of unknown men and the potential for sexual violence in public spaces may amplify the harms of street harassment. Further, virtually *all* harassment is implicated in the (re)production of gendered (and other) power relations, something which is lost in the gender neutral stranger intrusion (see Laniya, 2005; Tuerekheimer, 1997; Vera-Gray, 2016b, for a similar critique of street harassment). While this includes the (re)production of men’s power, we also refer here to the (re)production of power within and across different iterations of gender. This tension is not easily resolved. We suggest that the approach taken to conceptualizing street harassment must be selected with an acute awareness of *whose* experiences of harassment we are addressing and an appreciation of what is obscured or rendered unspeakable through this choice (Vera-Gray, 2016b).

Continuum of sexual violence. Street harassment has commonly been conceptualized as a form of sexual violence drawing on Kelly’s (1987) continuum model. Dominant discursive and legal approaches to sexual violence typically order it according to apparent “seriousness” and exclude forms of violence that do not adhere to limited norms of “real” rape (see also Hlavka, 2014; Larkin, 1991; Stanko, 1985). In contrast, the continuum recognizes all forms of sexual violence as interconnected. Street harassment is thus underpinned by the same gendered power structures and logics that (re)produce other, more “serious” iterations of sexual violence—though the continuum does not order different forms of sexual violence according to a hierarchy of harm (Fileborn, 2013). Further, the continuum model understands experiences of sexual violence as lived alongside one another and operating in a cumulative way (Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017; Kelly, 1987; Vera-Gray, 2016; Vera-Gray & Fileborn, 2018). Thus, rather than focusing on discrete incidents, the continuum model accounts for the relational and evolving meanings assigned to encounters of sexual violence across the life course. In addition to constituting sexual (and other) violence in and of itself, this approach suggests that encountering street harassment can remind women of their vulnerability to, or the possibility of, stereotypically more serious forms of sexual violence (such as rape) occurring (Davis, 1994; Donnelly & Calogero, 2018; Fileborn, 2013; Kissling & Kramarae, 1991). However, as flagged earlier, not all forms of public intrusion are sexual in nature, something that is missed in framing street harassment as sexual violence.

Sexual terrorism, gender, and intersectionality. Building on the notion that street harassment can constitute a form of sexual violence, scholars have worked to develop understandings of the *function* street harassment fulfills. Crouch (2009, p. 137)

conceptualizes street (and other) harassment as serving a very particular purpose. Namely, “to keep women in their place.” She goes on to explain:

Sexual harassment is a means of maintaining women’s status as subordinate in society; it is also a means of keeping women in certain physical spaces and out others, or, at least, of controlling women’s behaviour in those spaces. (p. 137)

In this respect, street harassment is deeply implicated in the (re)production of gendered power relations and their spatial manifestation (see also Bowman, 1993; Chafai, 2017; Davis, 1994; Fileborn, 2021a; Kissling & Kramarae, 1991; Larkin, 1991; Lowe & Hayes, 2019; Namaste, 1996; Vera-Gray & Kelly, 2020). Street harassment can be understood as both the result of broader systems of gender inequality and actively reproducing these power relations. Scholars such as Elizabeth Kissling (1991) and Deidre Davis subsequently position street harassment as a form of “sexual terrorism,” as it forms one aspect of “men’s systematic control and domination of women through actual and implied violence” (Davis, 1994, p. 140). Relatedly, numerous scholars have argued that street harassment therefore provides men with an avenue for “doing” or performing hegemonic masculinity, providing “the currency used by men to improve their ranking on the masculine scale” (Baptist & Coburn, 2019, p. 116). Further, these acts have been interpreted as reducing women to a series of body parts or objects rather than fully formed human beings with rich lives (Chmielewski, 2017; Davis, 1994; Kissling, 1991; Mason-Bish & Zempi, 2019; Tuerekheimer, 1997). In so doing, street harassment works to “define a woman by her body’s value as giver-of-pleasure to the male subject” (Tuerekheimer, 1997, p. 184), negating women’s subjectivity—she becomes purely a “being-for-others” (Vera-Gray & Fileborn, 2018, pp. 89, 90).

However, it is vital that street harassment be viewed through the lens of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991; Logan, 2015; Mason-Bish & Zempi, 2019; Vera-Gray & Fileborn, 2018). Our discussion so far, and that which follows, clearly lays out the ways in which public harassment is informed by systems of power relating to gender, race, class, sexuality (or heteronormativity), (dis)ability, and so forth. Moreover, these systems of power “interlock” or intersect within one another in particular ways, producing different lived experiences of harassment. Street harassment can be understood as both a product of, and actively reproducing and co-constituting, these complex and fluid relations of power. Baptist and Coburn (2019, p. 116), for example, argue that street harassment must be viewed through the lens of both patriarchy and colonization “to understand how street harassment is perpetuated in attempts to uphold patriarchy and the normative standards rooted in Whiteness.” Scholars such as Bowman (1993, p. 534) and Davis (1994) have argued that the experience of African American women must similarly be understood in relation to the “long history of disrespect, degradation, and inhumane sexual mistreatment to which Black women have been subjected over the years,” with this history compounding the harms of harassment

(see also Buchanan & Ormerod, 2002; Chmielewski, 2017; Fogg-Davis, 2006; Heben, 1994–1995). Armstrong (2016) notes that participants in her study were targeted “not just as a woman but as a woman who sells sex” (p. 291). Harassment of street-based sex workers must also be understood as a manifestation of whorephobia, anti-sex work ideology, and the stigmatization of sex work—a conceptualization that has rarely been articulated in existing street harassment literature. Our intention here is not to provide an exhaustive overview of how each interlocking system of power manifests through street harassment but rather to highlight the necessity of undertaking such an analysis in any work aiming to make sense of this phenomenon.

Civil inattention. Others, such as Gardner (1995), Bailey (2016, 2017), Kissling and Kramarae (1991), and Gimlin (2010), draw on Goffman to suggest that street harassment can, at least in part, be understood as breaching the rules of “civil inattention.” In urban settings, the norm of civil inattention typically dictates that we do not speak to or interact with strangers. However, Goffman argued that certain categories of (what he terms) “low status” people—particularly children and women—are positioned as “open persons,” who may be treated in ways that would usually breach the norms of civil inattention. Under this reading, certain manifestations of street harassment can be conceptualized as harmful not because of their explicit content—indeed, these comments are often mundane and seemingly inoffensive (Bailey, 2016, 2017; Millan, 2016). Rather, as Bailey (2016, 2017) highlights, street remarks draw on the language that is typically used in addressing a romantic partner as opposed to a stranger (see also Millan, 2016). As a result of this breach of the “rules of civil interaction,” we can understand such comments as “an attempt to conjure and impose a fleeting moment of heterosexual intimacy,” while their nonreciprocal nature reflects and perpetuates a manifestation of unequal power with women (re)positioned as “open,” “low status” individuals in public space (Bailey, 2016, p. 599; see also di Genaro & Ritschel, 2019; Kissling & Kramarae, 1991; Lahsaeizadeh & Yousefinejad, 2012; Lowe & Hayes, 2019; Millan, 2016). However, the otherwise conventional and accepted language used (e.g., “hey, baby,” “how are you today?”), “along with the relative difficulty of articulating the implicit social conventions that they breach, may veil their harm and indirectly contribute to the perpetuation of male domination of women in public spaces (Bailey, 2016, p. 607). A failure to respond “correctly” to these seemingly civil remarks often can escalate to decidedly uncivil speech (e.g., “bitch”—see Bowman, 1993, p. 525), unveiling “the thinly concealed violence underlying” many incidents of public harassment (Bowman, 1993, p. 526).

Prevalence and Frequency

Research to date indicates that street harassment is both a prevalent and frequent occurrence in the lives of women and LGBTQ+ communities, though there is some variation across

studies (see Joseph, 2016, for a recent international overview). Moreover, there is consistent evidence that public harassment is first encountered in late childhood and early adolescence (Johnson & Bennett, 2015; Meza-de-Luna & Garcia-Falconi, 2015; Vera-Gray, 2016a). Eighty-seven percent of young women in an Australian study reported having experienced either physical or verbal harassment (Johnson & Bennett, 2015). In Mumbai, Bharucha and Khatri (2018, p. 105) reported that “almost all women had experienced some tangible threats to their safety at some point,” including verbal harassment (77.2%, $n = 175$), stalking (30%, $n = 68$), and groping (29%, $n = 65$). In contrast, Gekoski et al.’s (2016) review of harassment on public transport documented prevalence rates ranging from 15% (UK) to 98% of foreign women in Egypt (and 83% of Egyptian women).

In regard to frequency, women in Dhillon and Bakaya’s (2014) qualitative study in Delhi, India, reported being harassed between 50% and 100% of the times they accessed public space. Some 80% of women in Donnelly and Calogero’s (2018) UK-based study reported experiencing catcalls, whistles, or stares *at least* once per month, while 35% encountered unwanted touching at least once per month, with these findings largely reflecting those of Fairchild and Rudman’s (2008) U.S.-based study. Numerous studies consistently illustrate that iterations of public intrusion such as staring, whistling, and verbal comments are also the most commonly encountered (Ahmad et al., 2020; B. Ahmed et al., 2019; Betts et al., 2019; Campos et al., 2017; Donnelly & Calogero, 2018; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Johnson & Bennett, 2015; Lenton et al., 1999; Neupane & Chesney-Lind, 2014; Stop Street Harassment, 2014). Local sociocultural norms can also shape the frequency of harassment, with factors such as marital status in Nepal and nontraditional styles of dress in Pakistan linked to increased harassment (Ahmad et al., 2020; Lahsaeizadeh & Yousefinejad, 2012; Neupane & Chesney-Lind, 2014).

A notable gap in the extant research is the lack of an intersectional analysis in relation to prevalence and frequency of harassment. A small number of studies provide some insights. Stop Street Harassment’s (2014) survey of 2,000 individuals found that Black and Hispanic participants encountered higher rates of and more frequent harassment than White participants (see also Nielsen, 2000). Members of the LGBTQ+ communities routinely encounter high levels of harassment, and this can be heightened for those expressing same sex or queer affection in public or who are otherwise visibly nonconforming in their gender or sexuality (Chmielwski, 2017; Stop Street Harassment, 2014; Ussher et al., 2020). Alcalde (2020) reflects on how social class is likely to shape the nature and extent of harassment encountered by women in Lima, Peru, particularly due to lower socioeconomic status women’s reliance on public transportation. For Muslim women in the UK, public harassment may be heightened during periods of political tension and Islamophobia, particularly for women who wear the niqab (Mason-Bish & Zempi, 2019).

Questions of prevalence and frequency are also compounded by the definitional or typological difficulties in

relation to what counts as street harassment. Studies draw on different definitions of what falls under the banner of street harassment, while participants may not have a shared understanding of “what counts,” subsequently self-excluding or underreporting experiences (Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017; Lennox & Jurdi-Hage, 2017; Vera-Gray, 2016a, 2016b). The tendency toward quantitative work that categorizes different types of harassment as discrete incidents (e.g., staring, following, verbal comments) creates a siloed picture of harassment that may obscure the lived experiences of victims. This incident-based approach tells us little, for example, about how different forms of harassment may overlap or co-occur, how they are encountered as a lived process, and does not capture participants’ experiences in a way that reflects their full complexity. Forms of harassment that do not neatly fit into these predetermined categories may also be missed. Additionally, the everyday mundane nature of public harassment means that encounters may be quickly forgotten or blur into one-another, making the retrospective recall of incidents a distorted means of measurement (Larkin, 1991). Likewise, there is considerable variation in terms of whether participants are asked about recent or lifetime experiences of harassment. As a result, it is difficult to make comparisons or generalizations across different studies (Lennox & Jurdi-Hage, 2017; Vera-Gray, 2016a), and the multifaceted and contextual nature of harassment makes such comparison problematic if not undesirable (Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017). Despite these methodological challenges, it is nonetheless abundantly clear that street harassment in various forms is an incredibly common experience in the lives of women and marginalized communities. Moreover, these encounters result in direct harm, as we move on to show.

Impacts and Harms

Research across Western democracies such as the United States, the UK, Canada, and Australia demonstrates that street harassment bears substantial harms to people who experience it (see, for e.g., Bastomski & Smith, 2017; Betts et al., 2019; Kern, 2005; Lenton et al., 1999). Studies from these contexts have illustrated that encountering street harassment increases women’s fear, anger, violation, and repulsion, alongside other negative emotional and affective states (Bastomski & Smith, 2017; Betts et al., 2019; Lenton et al., 1999; Nielsen, 1999, 2002). In particular, the fear generated through street harassment is often a fear of further forms of sexual and gender-based violence occurring (Donnelly & Calogero, 2018).

Street harassment can profoundly impact on women’s use of public spaces leading to the avoidance of public space and modification of behavior through “safety work” in order to enhance their sense of safety (Bastomski & Smith, 2017; Johnson & Bennett, 2015; Lenton et al., 1999; Vera-Gray, 2018; Vera-Gray & Kelly, 2020). Vera-Gray’s (2016a) work highlights how intrusion fundamentally shapes women’s embodiment or how they “live in” their own bodies, with harassment foreclosing women’s capacity to act in and on the world. Collectively, these impacts “seem to accumulate over time . . . so

that you feel like you are carrying more and more weight” (S. Ahmed, 2017, p. 23). The harms of street harassment must be understood as cumulative and synergistic in nature—they add up to more than the sum of their individual parts—and as lived alongside other experiences of harassment and violence (Fileborn, 2017b; Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017; Larkin, 1991). In some instances, these harms or impacts may indeed be fleeting and quickly forgotten. Yet, they can persist for days, months, or years (Lenton et al., 1999). Additionally, the severity of the impacts of street harassment are subjectively experienced and can be dependent on context (Fairchild, 2010; Fileborn, 2019, p. 230).

The impacts of street harassment can also vary across cultural contexts. For instance, Ahmad et al.’s (2020) study of women in Islamabad, Pakistan, found that a majority of participants only accessed public spaces while accompanied by male family members (p. 13). Public intrusion in East Asian countries is also implicated in women and girls withdrawing from education (B. Ahmed et al., 2019). Research conducted in East Asian countries such as Pakistan and India indicate that the cultural gendered norms combined with the patriarchal structure of society plays a role in how women are impacted by and respond to street harassment (Adur & Jha, 2018; Ahmad et al., 2020; B. Ahmed et al., 2019; Bharucha & Khatri, 2018; Jabeen et al., 2017). Alcalde’s (2020) research with returned migrants in Lima, Peru, found that these women experienced increased fear and decreased autonomy upon their return to Lima after living abroad. Further, for participants who returned as adults with children, their fears and anxieties were both heightened and shifted toward the safety of their girl children. This highlights the contextual, temporal, and relational nature of the impacts and harms of harassment.

Intersectional research shows that the impacts and harms of harassment differ according to survivors’ positionality in relation to gender, race, class, sexuality, and disability (Crenshaw, 1991). Utilizing an intersectional lens, it is apparent that people who encounter street harassment are likely to experience it differently on the basis of the privilege that they occupy (Fileborn, 2019). Alcalde (2020) further demonstrates that migration can impact women’s experiences of street harassment, particularly by shaping the autonomy that survivors have over their bodies. Mason-Bish and Zempi (2019) note that Muslim women who wear the veil have heightened the risk of experiencing street harassment in the UK due to their hypervisibility in public space. Indeed, some women are placed in situations where they must navigate their safety in public space by choosing whether or not to wear or remove their veil which, in turn, can impact how they are perceived in their communities, adding “layers of complexity to their harm” (Mason-Bish & Zempi, 2019, p. 554).

Disclosure and Reporting

Research shows that there are barriers to reporting and disclosure of street harassment to the police and criminal justice system. Although there are jurisdictions where some forms of

street harassment are legislated against or covered under hate crime provisions (Mason-Bish & Duggan, 2020), many people who experience street harassment are reluctant to report to police as is the case for other forms of gender-based violence (Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017; Mullany & Trickett, 2018). In one Australian study, 16.1% of participants indicated that they had ever reported street harassment to the police (Fileborn, 2019). Participants from this project indicated that they perceived reporting to the police as being futile, due to the trivial nature of what happened, being unsure as to whether the incident was illegal, believing there was nothing that could be done, and that the emotional and time-based costs of reporting outweighed the harm of the incident. Dhillon and Bakaya (2014) demonstrate that survivors in Delhi, India, considered police to be insensitive and apathetic and legal avenues arduous and complicated to navigate. The perceived insignificance and normalization of street harassment means that those who do report to police have been met with victim-blaming, inaction, or inconsistency which, in turn, diminished the confidence survivors had in police (Boutros, 2018; Dhillon & Bakaya, 2014; Sheley, 2020). Indeed, Mason (2005, p. 592) comments that “most harassment is probably considered to be too minor to be reported (or recorded).” This suggests that sociocultural understandings of the impacts and harms of street harassment influence whether street harassment is both reported to and recorded by police. However, the vast majority of participants (95.5%) in the aforementioned study by Fileborn (2019) had disclosed an experience of harassment at least once, typically to a friend or partner. Whether any particular incident was disclosed was shaped by a range of factors, including the perceived severity, and as a form of consciousness-raising or political action.

Bystander Intervention

Bystander intervention into street harassment represented a major gap in research to date, with only three studies explicitly tackling this issue. Australian-based research by Fileborn (2017a) found that bystander intervention was rare, with participants indicating they had experienced considerably more street harassment than bystander intervention (see also Vizvary, 2020). Similarly, 23% of men and 20% of women in Stop Street Harassment’s (2014) study said they had proactively responded to street harassment that they witnessed as a bystander. For those who had experienced bystander intervention in Fileborn’s (2017a) study, the outcomes of the intervention were mixed. While bystander intervention could be successful in defusing or ending the harassment, in other cases, it could either escalate the harassment or result in the harassment being displaced onto the bystander. That said, bystander intervention held both practical and symbolic importance, with intervention increasing participants’ sense of safety, reducing the perceived harm of an incident, and providing a sense of justice by holding the perpetrator to account (see also Vizvary, 2020). Chaudoir and Quinn’s (2010) U.S.-based research with female college students indicates that bystanders can also be negatively

impacted by witnessing sexist harassment such as catcalling, with the young women in this study experiencing higher levels of anger and fear toward men. This is one of the only identified studies to demonstrate the impacts of street harassment beyond the individual victim, an area that requires further exploration in future research.

Perpetration

Of the literature reviewed, few studies conducted had specifically examined perpetration of street harassment. Rather, perpetration was often discussed within the context of victimization and prevalence studies. McCarty et al. (2014) conducted an online survey demonstrating that people perceived that severity of the impacts of harassment varied depending on whether the perpetrator was a stranger or known to the survivor. Participants viewed harassment perpetrated by a stranger as more severe than harassment perpetrated by someone known to them such as a colleague (McCarty et al., 2014). While the literature suggests that street harassment is most commonly perpetrated by men (Stop Street Harassment, 2014), sex workers in Armstrong's (2016) research also recounted incidents of harassment perpetrated by women. Armstrong (2016, p. 291) argues this can be understood as a performative act that allowed these women perpetrators to "safely locate themselves within the category of 'good' women and be reassured that they were not like 'those' women." Thus, while perhaps less common, street harassment can be understood as reproducing gendered power relations *between* women (see also Mason-Bish & Zempi, 2019). Moreover, Meza-DeLuna and Garcia-Falconi (2015) found that adolescents in Queretaro, Mexico, commonly experienced and perpetrated street harassment. Both young men and young women were perpetrators of nonphysical harassment, but young men were more likely to engage in physical forms of harassment such as groping. The young men and women surveyed in this research typically perpetrated harassment against other young people in a similar age range to themselves. These studies highlight some of the underexplored complexities surrounding the perpetration of street harassment.

Although research tended to assert a notion that street harassment is perpetrated by a broad array of men, and is not defined by age, class, race, and so forth, many findings suggested that perceptions of who perpetrates are heavily shaped by these factors. Participants in Alcalde's (2020) study, for example, often suggested that it was poorer men of color in Lima who disproportionately (if not exclusively) perpetrated street harassment. Similarly, participants in Dhillon and Bakaya's (2014) study attributed harassment to men who had moved to Delhi from conservative rural areas. Rather than reflecting the "reality" of perpetration, these claims must be understood through systems of power and processes of othering (Fileborn, 2016a). As Alcalde (2020, p. 37) puts it, "warnings about sexual harassment not only lead middle-class women to believe that their homes are safe, and the streets are dangerous, but they also reinforce the existing hierarchies of race and

class." Heben (1994–1995, p. 198) similarly draws our attention to the racist stereotype of the "black male rapist," arguing that "white women will probably be more likely to experience comments from men of color as harassing" on account of this. In other words, the identification of certain groups of men as perpetrators might tell us more about processes of the "othering" of marginalized men rather than reflecting some reality of perpetration (see also Gimlin, 2010; Lieber, 2018; Logan, 2015). That said, given that research on perpetrators is lacking overall, further work is required to establish any trends in perpetration and how perpetration may be differentially shaped through adherence to masculinities, class, age, and so forth. Our point here is not that particular groups of men may be more or less likely to perpetrate harassment but rather that perpetration may be "done" differently, and for different reasons, across diverse groups of men.

Few studies have directly engaged with perpetrators or examined how they perceive and engage in street harassment. Interestingly, Zietz and Das (2018) note that young men living in Mumbai, India, perceived eve-teasing (an East Asian term for street harassment) through a lens of misogyny and entitlement, with their harassment of girls being based on perceptions of their propriety. One participant in their focus group study justified harassment of girls who had "loose morals" (Zietz & Das, 2018, p. 1234). The analysis contended that men and boys in Mumbai justified their perpetration by placing blame on the women and girls being harassed (Zietz & Das, 2018). Henry's (2017) interview study with "self-professed harassers" similarly noted that men in Egypt justified their harassment by blaming their victims. Henry (2017) presented five central motivations that led perpetrators to engage in street harassment: normalization, sexual objectification, women's position in society, to punish women, and because the perpetrators believed that they were oppressed. Wesselman and Kelly's (2010) study with college men in the United States also dealt with motivations in perpetrating harassment, finding that young men were more likely to harass when in a peer group context where anonymity and group bonding were central reasons leading them to harass (see also Logan, 2015; Quinn, 2002). Furthermore, these participants were similarly motivated by misogynistic attitudes and the ability to have power and dominance over women (Wesselman & Kelly, 2010). Together, these studies suggest that in some contexts, the perpetration of street harassment is sanctioned by broader attitudes toward gender, sex, and sexuality. Indeed, the views expressed by the perpetrators in these studies signal a relationship between sexism and misogyny as an overarching influence of street harassment.

A final theme that arose in research about perpetration was concerned with theorizing harassment tactics. It is worth noting that this type of research was often framed from the perspective of survivors, as few studies have directly engaged with perpetrators of harassment. Hutson and Krueger's (2019) study is one example that sought to understand the mechanisms of street harassment, while also noting the affordances that physical spaces provide perpetrators. They argue that the "harassers

toolbox” is a range of commonplace practices that perpetrators utilize, often using location and mobility to their advantage to engage in harassing behaviors (Hutson & Krueger, 2019, p. 773). This further demonstrates that particular public sites such as public transport are common “hunting grounds” for perpetration and that harassing behaviors are an effort to exert power and control over women (see also Gardner, 1995).

Resistance and Responses to Street Harassment

Legal. Proposed responses to street harassment have largely centered on the possibility of criminal and civil legal remedies. This emphasis on developing legal responses can, at least in part, be attributed to the historic and contemporary failure of legal systems to adequately capture and respond to harms experienced by women (and other marginalized groups) and the efforts of feminist jurisprudence to redress this (see, for e.g., Bowman, 1993; Brundson, 2018; Chafai, 2017; Davis, 1994; Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017; Laniya, 2005; Tuerekheimer, 1997). It is also likely a response to the continued failure of jurisdictions internationally to develop legal or policy responses to public intrusion and harassment (Bowman, 1993; Brundson, 2018; Fileborn, 2017b; Joseph, 2016), although this situation is ever evolving. While a detailed analysis of the specific legal remedies proposed is beyond the scope of this review, the most common approaches include the development of legal definitions of street harassment (or particular iterations thereof, such as catcalling), consideration of how street harassment may be addressed (or not) under existing legislation, and the development of new legal frameworks (Ancheta, 2018; Arndt, 2018; Bowman, 1993; Brundson, 2018; Chhun, 2011; Heben, 1994–1995; Laniya, 2005; Olney, 2015; Sweeney, 2016). In contrast, grassroots activist organizations such as *Hollaback!* and *Stop Street Harassment*—particularly from the United States, where the vast majority of this legal scholarship stems from—have taken a stance that firmly opposes the criminalization of street harassment (Fileborn, 2021b). There is a clear disjuncture between the approaches advocated for by scholars and activist groups, with activists tending to focus on prevention and educational efforts (Fileborn, 2021b) and academic scholarship focused on the development of legislative frameworks. While legal scholarship has been preoccupied with the question of whether we can regulate street harassment using criminal and civil legislation, there has been only limited critical and intersectional discussion as to whether we *should* adopt this approach.

Of more central concern to our discussion is the impact of legislation where it has been introduced. The current literature base is scant. Alcalde (2020) speculates that the impact of anti-harassment legislation in Peru has been largely symbolic to date, with little evidence that the legislation has contributed to the prevention of harassment or increased the safety of women and girls. Kirollos (2016) similarly suggests that Egyptian legislation tackling sexual harassment is poorly enforced. Activists interviewed in Boutros’s (2018) work differed in their views of police, with some believing the police had no

legitimacy to respond to public sexual violence (particularly as police were documented as perpetrating some of this violence), while others believed there was an onus on police to improve their responses to sexual violence. Anti-feminist backlash in Portugal resulted in proposed legislation addressing street harassment being passed in a watered-down format (Simões & Silbeirinha, 2019), though the impact of the legislative amendments that were introduced is unclear.

Several studies have considered how victims would like street harassment to be responded to. The research points to a diversity of desired responses and needs, including transformative change addressing the root causes of harassment, public education and awareness raising, bystander intervention, changes to environmental design, and criminal justice responses (Dhillon & Bakaya, 2014; Fileborn & Vera-Gray, 2017; Mullany & Trickett, 2018; Stop Street Harassment, 2014; Vizvary, 2020). On this last point, participants in Fileborn and Vera-Gray’s (2017) work were more ambivalent. While they often valued the symbolic function of legislation, concern was expressed regarding the challenges in responding to harassment using a criminal justice response, the perceived triviality of individual incidents, and the potential to contribute toward the overpolicing of marginalized groups (see also Mullany & Trickett, 2018; Nielsen, 2000). Nielsen’s (2000, p. 1070) leading work on “legal consciousness” and the regulation of offensive public speech found that participants did not support the legal regulation of such speech, “except in its most extreme forms.” Collectively, these findings indicate that the role of the criminal justice responses to street harassment is heavily contested at best, while there is limited to no evidence on the effectiveness or impacts of such responses where they have been introduced.

Overall, very little scholarship to date has considered how street harassment might be prevented or redressed outside of the criminal justice system, how survivors might best be supported, or how to effectively engage in prevention work with perpetrators. Feminist self-defense has been presented as one potential avenue of prevention, as well as a means of transforming women’s sense of self and capacity to act on the world (Vera-Gray & Kelly, 2020). Boutros (2017, p. 543, 2018) documents the work of activist groups in Egypt, who formed anti-harassment groups which functioned as “patrol-type ‘intervention teams’ composed of volunteers that operated in the streets” to either support women who had been harassed or assaulted or to confront perpetrators (see Joseph, 2016, for other international examples). The intervention teams were developed by activist groups in the wake of “crisis levels” of sexual violence in public, and inaction by the state, while activists felt that more traditional means of generating change were ineffective in this case (Boutros, 2017, p. 553). Boutros (2017) argues that the use and success (or otherwise) of these intervention teams was shaped by the *places* in which they were used. This suggests that in developing responses to street harassment, we must be mindful of the cultural, social, political, spatial/geographical, and temporal specificities that influence both the type of response and support required, as well as successful

implementation. As such, future research and intervention initiatives should consider the need to examine responses at the local level.

Recommendations from the therapeutic and practitioner-focused guidelines developed by Baptist and Coburn (2019) include that practitioners should undertake the processes of self-reflection and education to firstly examine and challenge their own views on public harassment. Practitioners also have an active role to play in supporting survivors and guiding them toward online communities of support (such as *Hollaback!*; see also Farmer & Jordan, 2017), to intervene as bystanders, and to engage in political advocacy around street harassment. Additionally, practitioners may work with perpetrators and have an opportunity to engage in “therapeutic conversations with perpetrators to deconstruct the power and control associated with perpetuating stranger intrusion and to increase accountability and awareness” (Baptist & Coburn, 2019, p. 124). However, as Threadcraft (2014, 2015) rightly reminds us, developing responses to street harassment must also be informed by an intersectional lens that takes into account (in Threadcraft’s case) systemic and institutional racism and sexism that has denied Black communities’ access to power and resources and shaped and delimited subject formation. In other words, responses to street harassment must be intimately entwined with broader social and transformative justice efforts that extend beyond supporting individual victims and/or perpetrators.

Where prevention and other policy and practice-based initiatives have been introduced, they have only seldomly been subject to evaluation (Fileborn, 2021b). Darnell and Cook’s (2009) evaluation of a screening of the anti-street harassment documentary *War Zone* found that it did not shift men’s attitudes in terms of how acceptable they felt street harassment was, nor did it increase their empathy toward women who had been harassed. Lieber’s (2018) interrogation of Parisian policy on violence against women in public spaces suggests that efforts to improve women’s safety focused exclusively on the mobility of women who reflected norms of “respectable” femininity, contributed toward gentrification, and reinforced the racist othering of men of color. These examples illustrate how responses to street harassment can have unintended and problematic outcomes, reinforcing the need for careful monitoring and evaluation, which has been sorely lacking to date.

Digital responses and online justice: “Shouting back” against harassment. Some of the most substantial responses to street harassment have occurred through (or as a result of) digital activism and advocacy on social media. A significant subset of the literature found in this review is concerned with the ways that survivors of street harassment document and “shout back” about their experiences. Given the inconsistent formal responses of law and policy as a response to street harassment, digital responses have developed as a significant avenue for disclosure and informal justice (Fileborn, 2014, 2017b; Wångren, 2016). May and Carter (2015) discuss the origins

of the global movement *Hollaback!*, which began in 2005 as a blog based in New York City that sought to challenge street harassment by allowing survivors to contribute their stories to the blog and by naming places in the city where perpetration was commonly experienced. Research has also examined the potential for these digital practices to meet the justice needs of street harassment survivors by providing avenues to seek their own outcomes (Fileborn, 2014, 2017b).

Digital platforms can therefore represent sites of disclosure and informal reporting that seek to resist and challenge street harassment. Research studies show that these digital platforms are not unique to English-speaking or Global North contexts. There are several platforms where survivors of street harassment can record and map incidences of street harassment online (Fileborn, 2014, 2017b, 2020; Grove, 2015; Pechaud, 2014; Simões & Silveirinha, 2019). In Egypt, *HarassMap* and *WenDo* are the examples of reporting options facilitated through social media and volunteers, providing “street-level action-oriented initiatives” to survivors of street harassment (Abdelmonem & Galán, 2017, p. 155). Similarly, *Hollaback!* has grown into a global initiative and continues to challenge street harassment by providing survivors with opportunities to report and map their experiences (Fileborn, 2014, 2017b, 2020; May & Carter, 2015; Wångren, 2016). Social media platforms like Instagram provide space for grassroots digital activism to proliferate. Digital reporting mechanisms constitute a substantial response to street harassment in many countries and provide a space for survivors to resist harassment in contexts where formal avenues to justice fail to hear their experiences (Fileborn, 2014, 2017b).

Discussion

This critical review set out to provide a global overview of the current state of knowledge on street harassment. While our review highlights the rapid development of research and scholarship on this topic over the past 5 years, it has also drawn attention to some notable gaps and avenues for future research. Likewise, we have reiterated some central tensions and debates in relation to typologies and conceptualizations of public harassment that require close attention in future work. We acknowledge here that our review was intentionally broad in scope. While this was necessary in order to establish the “state of the field,” it inevitably means that there has been a privileging of breadth of literature over the depth of findings in the field to date. Our discussion below outlines areas for future research, and we also encourage scholars to undertake more targeted reviews of the literature in future in order to further unpack the key debates, findings, and limitations of subfields within street harassment research.

Throughout this review, we have advocated for the importance of an intersectional approach to understanding and researching street harassment. With some notable exceptions discussed throughout, this remains an underdeveloped aspect of scholarship. For example, the bulk of research is overwhelmingly focused on the experiences of cisgender women and

reproduces a binary view of gender (see also Baptist & Coburn, 2019). To some extent, this likely stems from the conceptualization of street harassment as a form of sexual and gender-based violence and the subsequent concentration of research within this field. While this conceptualization is a useful and important one—much street harassment occurs as a form of gender-based sexual violence—it nonetheless presents a limited or partial framework for understanding street harassment that excludes many experiences. Black and critical race scholars have developed detailed analysis of how race operates in relation to street harassment, yet these insights appear to only occasionally inform empirical work. Other categories of analysis such as (dis)ability and religion have received even less attention. There is heavy weighting toward the Global North in existing research, although our review illustrates that this is slowly changing with more recent studies addressing street harassment across East Asia, Latin America, and Egypt. Nonetheless, we echo the call of researchers such as Bharucha and Khatri (2018) regarding the need for further research in the Global South. Additionally, not all of these studies explicitly consider how contextual factors shape lived experiences of public harassment, instead tending toward empirical description and quantification. Collectively, our review points toward a clear need for future research to adopt intersectional modes of research design and analysis (see also Logan, 2015). Such research is undoubtedly required to inform tailored and culturally appropriate prevention efforts and interventions—we cannot assume that experiences of street harassment are the same across different social and cultural locations.

The majority of research examining street harassment was qualitative, examining various ways of conceptualizing street harassment and analyzing participants' experiences through qualitative methodologies. Quantitative and mixed methods studies, although less common, documented the prevalence, frequency, nature, and harms of public harassment. Although qualitative research was more common, it is worth noting that there was a dearth in literature that examines how victims of street harassment understand and make sense of their experiences. This is not to dismiss the importance of other research methods that have provided vital insights into this phenomenon and assist with building the case for taking street harassment seriously as a pervasive and frequent harm. However, given the conceptual and definitional slippages identified in this review, there are clearly also limits to the insights that quantitative work, or work that fails to critically interrogate what street harassment "is" and how it is lived by participants, can provide. In order to develop rich insights into the full range of public intrusion, qualitative work that provides scope for participants to articulate their experiences in detail and to probe for details that might be missed or excluded is needed to compliment and add nuance to existing findings. Moving forward, we also recommend that researchers undertaking quantitative work develop clear definitions of what is meant by street harassment in the context of their study. This may help to overcome some of the challenges identified in this review with regard to comparison across studies and the slippages in terminology.

However, challenges are likely to remain given the often subjective and context-dependent nature of harassment.

That said, there is still much work to be done in terms of documenting the nature, extent, and harms of different iterations of street harassment. For instance, something that has not commonly been included in typologies of street harassment includes harassment perpetrated by the state (e.g., police). The inclusion of state-perpetrated harassment may better capture the experiences of people who have experienced homelessness, who were found to commonly encounter harassment from both "authorities and non-authorities" in one study (Vizvary, 2020, p. 27). As DeKeseredy (2020) argues, state and corporate violence should also be positioned on the continuum of woman abuse, and we suggest it is important to consider what might be gained (and lost) in taking this conceptual approach to understanding street harassment. The absence of state-perpetrated public harassment may also stem from the exclusion of marginalized groups from current research—such as those experiencing homelessness, people of color, Indigenous communities, and sex workers—and lack of intersectional analysis. Another key gap here relates to how technology-facilitated violence and public harassment intersect or interact with one another (see Vera-Gray, 2016b). Technology-facilitated violence and harassment is itself a burgeoning field of research, and there may be much to gain in bringing these areas together. For example, to what extent can online violence and harassment itself be considered a manifestation of public harassment? How is digital technology featuring in encounters of "real life" public harassment, for example, through practices such as "air-dropping" pornography via smart phones? How are victims of harassment drawing on digital platforms to disclose and to seek justice and support in response to their experiences? How is the problem represented through these practices, and what role have they played in agitating for broader social, political and structural change? Again, while some studies have begun to provide insights, this area of scholarship remains in its infancy.

Beyond capturing the nature and extent of harassment, there are a range of other questions that require urgent attention. Firstly, we continue to know very little about perpetrators of street harassment, with this gap remaining largely unchanged since Logan's (2015) review or since Thompson (1994) made similar observations over two decades ago. There were some exceptions to this, including Meza De Luna and García-Falconi's (2015) study which found that teenage girls were as likely to perpetrate street harassment. However, it is a significant limitation that analysis of perpetration is often subsumed within research examining the prevalence of street harassment. Thus, questions remain in terms of who harasses, in what contexts, and for what reasons. Likewise, we know little about pathways into and out of perpetrating harassment. Why, for instance, do perpetrators begin engaging in this behavior, and why do they stop? What are the social and institutional structures that prop up their behavior, and how might we begin to unravel these structural drivers? Given the conceptual and typological slippage around street harassment, there are further

questions regarding whose actions are captured or framed as “problematic,” as well as likely implications in terms of how we best prevent and intervene into different iterations of this phenomenon.

Almost no research has examined attitudes of members of the general public toward street harassment. Some exceptions to this were Fairchild (2015), and Spaccatini et al (2019), who found that participants were more likely to assign blame to a woman who appeared “sexy,” though overall levels of victim-blame were low. Spaccatini et al. (2019) also document important contextual variables that influence perceptions of harassment, with participants rating harassment occurring on the street as more serious than that at a party. Simões and Silbeirinha’s (2019) analysis of online commentary in Portugal similarly found evidence of victim-blaming, the dismissal of street harassment as a problem requiring redress, and the framing of harassment as an issue of individual deviant men, rather than being systemic in nature. Community attitudes toward street harassment have follow on implications for the likelihood that victims of street harassment will be believed and supported, whether community members are able to intervene as bystanders, and for whether the issue is understood and taken seriously (Fileborn, 2017a, 2019). Ascertaining attitudes and knowledge levels can also help to direct public education and awareness-raising activities. As such, this is a significant gap in the literature that demands pressing research attention.

A final avenue for future research relates to the development and evaluation of policy and practice responses to street harassment. While, as Fileborn’s (2021b) work illustrates, street harassment has only rarely been addressed through formal government policy and practice responses, this situation is changing particularly in relation to the development of legislation regulating harassment. As noted, there has been no work identified to date that systematically evaluates the impact of legislative responses where they have been introduced, with the exception of Mullany and Trickett (2018). Rather, the literature reviewed continues to focus on the development of legislative frameworks for street harassment. Moreover, the small body of work examining victims’ preferred responses to street harassment suggests that they desire a diverse range of responses, and this is at odds with the strong emphasis on legislation in scholarship. Thus, there is further research needed to identify and develop victim-centered responses to public harassment and to consider how any responses might change across the diverse contexts of harassment highlighted throughout this review.

Conclusion

In this article, we set out to provide a comprehensive and critical review of the current state of the field of research on street harassment. Our findings have illustrated that, while the field is rapidly growing, much work remains in terms of developing our conceptual understandings of street harassment and in building on the empirical research undertaken to date. As the thematic synthesis of findings presented here illustrates, street harassment is a common and harmful issue impacting on

women and minority communities across the globe. Our hope is that this contribution continues to drive forward research on this important, yet underexplored, issue.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research

- Policy and practice responses require ongoing and systematic evaluation in order to monitor their impact and effectiveness.
- Policy and practice responses should reflect the identified needs of people who have experienced street harassment and should be informed by an intersectional approach.
- Further research is needed that focuses on perpetrators, community attitudes, state-perpetrated harassment, and the relationship(s) between technology-facilitated and public harassment, and as well as in contexts outside of the Global North.

Critical Findings

- Street harassment is a common and harmful occurrence for women and marginalized communities globally
- There is considerable slippage in the conceptual framing and definitions of street harassment used in research to date, making comparison across studies and research contexts challenging
- While research on this topic is expanding rapidly, much of this research lacks an intersectional understanding of street harassment


Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This project was supported by funding from the Australian Research Council (DE190100404).

ORCID iD

Bianca Fileborn  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2650-3592>

Supplemental Material

The supplemental material for this article is available online.

References

- Abdelmonem, A., & Galán, S. (2017). Action-oriented responses to sexual harassment in Egypt: The cases of HarassMap and WenDo. *Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies*, 13(1), 154–167.
- Adur, S. M., & Jha, S. (2018). (Re)centering street harassment—An appraisal of safe cities global initiative in Delhi, India. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(1), 114–124.
- Ahmad, N. M., Ahmad, M. M., & Masood, R. (2020). Socio-psychological implications of public harassment for women in the

- capital city of Islamabad. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*. Online first. 1–24.
- Ahmed, B., Yousaf, F. N., & Asif, U. R. (2019). Combating street harassment: A challenge for Pakistan. *Women & Criminal Justice, 0*(0), 1–11.
- Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.
- Alcalde, C. M. (2020). Gender, autonomy and return migration: Negotiating street harassment in Lima, Peru. *Global Networks, 20*(1), 25–41.
- Ancheta, A. C. P. (2018). No place for harassment: Constructing street harassment as gender-based sexual violence and providing remedies therefor. *Ateneo Law Journal, 63*, 539–648.
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8*(1), 19–32.
- Armstrong, L. (2016). "Who's the slut, who's the whore?" Street harassment in the workplace among female sex workers in New Zealand. *Feminist Criminology, 11*(3), 285–303.
- Arndt, S. (2018). Street harassment: The need for criminal remedies. *Hastings Women's Law Journal, 29*(1), 81–100.
- Bailey, B. (2016). Street remarks to women in five countries and four languages: Impositions of engagement and intimacy. *Sociolinguistic Studies, 10*(4), 589–609.
- Bailey, B. (2017). Greetings and compliments or street harassment? Competing evaluations of street remarks in a recorded collection. *Discourse & Society, 28*(4), 353–373.
- Baptist, J., & Coburn, K. (2019). Harassment in public spaces: The intrusion on personal space. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 31*(2–3), 114–128.
- Bastomski, S., & Smith, P. (2017). Gender, fear, and public places: How negative encounters with strangers harm women. *Sex Roles, 76*(1–2), 73–88.
- Betts, L., Harding, R., Peart, S., Sjolín Knight, C., Wright, D., & Newbold, K. (2019). Adolescents' experiences of street harassment: Creating a typology and assessing the emotional impact. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 11*(1), 38–46.
- Bharucha, J., & Khatri, R. (2018). The sexual street harassment battle: Perceptions of women in urban India. *The Journal of Adult Protection, 20*(2), 101–109.
- Boutros, M. (2017). Place and tactical innovation in social movements: The emergence of Egypt's anti-harassment groups. *Theoretical Sociology, 46*, 543–575.
- Boutros, M. (2018). A multidimensional view of legal cynicism: Perceptions of the police among anti-harassment teams in Egypt. *Law & Society Review, 52*(2), 368–400.
- Bowman, C. G. (1993). Street harassment and the informal ghettoization of women. *Harvard Law Review, 106*(3), 517–580.
- Brundson, D. (2018). Legal solutions to street sexual harassment in the #MeToo era. *Atlantis Journal, 39*(2), 40–56.
- Buchanan, N. T., & Ormerod, A. J. (2002). Racialized sexual harassment in the lives of African American Women. *Women & Therapy, 25*(3–4), 107–124.
- Campos, P. A., Falb, K. L., Hernandez, S., Diaz-Olvarrieta, & Gupta, J. (2017). Experiences of street harassment and associations with perceptions of social cohesion among women in Mexico City. *Salud Publica de Mexico, 59*(1), 102–105.
- Chafai, H. (2017). Contextualising street sexual harassment in Morocco: A discriminatory sociocultural representation of women. *The Journal of North African Studies, 22*(5), 821–840.
- Chaudoir, S. R., & Quinn, D. M. (2010). Bystander sexism in the intergroup context: The impact of cat-calls on women's reactions towards men. *Sex Roles, 62*, 623–634.
- Chhun, B. (2011). Catcalls: Protected speech or fighting words? *Thomas Jefferson Law Review, 33*, 273–295.
- Chmielewski, J. F. (2017). A listening guide analysis of lesbian and bisexual young women of color's experiences of sexual objectification. *Sex Roles, 77*, 533–549.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299.
- Crouch, M. (2009). Sexual harassment in public places. *Social Philosophy Today, 25*, 137–148.
- Darnell, D. A., & Cook, S. L. (2009). Investigating the utility of the film *War Zone* in the prevention of street harassment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33*(3), 266–274.
- Datzman, J., & Gardner, C. B. (2000). "In my mind, we are all humans": Notes on the public management of black-white interracial romantic relationships. *Marriage & Family Review, 30*(1–2), 5–24.
- Davis, D. (1994). The harm that has no name: Street harassment, embodiment, and African American women. *UCLA Women's Law Journal, 4*, 133–178.
- DeKeseredy, W. (2020). *Woman abuse in rural places*. Routledge.
- Dhillon, M., & Bakaya, S. (2014). Street harassment: A qualitative study of the experiences of young women in Delhi. *SAGE Open, July–September*, 1–11.
- di Grennaro, K., & Ritschel, C. (2019). Blurred lines: The relationship between catcalls and compliments. *Women's Studies International Forum, 75*, 1–9.
- Donnelly, L. C., & Calogero, R. M. (2018). The role of stranger harassment experiences in college women's perceived possibility of gender crimes happening to them. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 48*(3), 165–173.
- Fairchild, K. (2010). Context effects on women's perceptions of stranger harassment. *Sexuality & Culture, 14*(3), 191–216.
- Fairchild, K. (2015). "But look at what she was wearing!" Victim blaming and street harassment. In S. Tarrant (Ed.), *Gender, sex, and politics: In the streets between the sheets in the 21st Century* (pp. 22–32). Routledge.
- Fairchild, K., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Everyday stranger harassment and women's objectification. *Social Justice Research, 21*, 338–357.
- Farmer, O., & Smock Jordan, S. (2017). Experiences of women coping with catcalling experiences in New York City: A pilot study. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 29*(4), 205–225.
- Fileborn, B. (2013). *Conceptual understandings and prevalence of sexual harassment and street harassment. ACSSA resource sheet*. Australian Institute of Family Studies.
- Fileborn, B. (2014). Online activism and street harassment: Digital justice or shouting into the ether? *Griffith Journal of Law and Human Dignity, 2*(1), 32–51.

- Fileborn, B. (2016a). *Reclaiming the night-time economy: Unwanted sexual attention in pubs and clubs*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fileborn, B. (2016b). Sexual assault and justice for older women: A critical review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 18*(5), 496–507.
- Fileborn, B. (2017a). Bystander intervention from the victims' perspective: Experiences, impacts and justice needs of street harassment victims. *Journal of Gender Based Violence, 1*(2), 187–204.
- Fileborn, B. (2017b). Justice 2.0: Street harassment victims' use of social media and online activism as sites of informal justice. *British Journal of Criminology, 57*(6), 1482–1501.
- Fileborn, B. (2019). Naming the unspeakable harm of street harassment: A survey-based examination of disclosure practices. *Violence Against Women, 25*(2), 223–248.
- Fileborn, B. (2020). Online activism and street harassment: Critical cartographies, counter-mapping and spatial justice. *Onati Socio-Legal Series*. Online first.
- Fileborn, B. (2021a). Embodied geographies: Navigating street harassment. In J. Berry, T. Moore, N. Kalms, & G. Bawden (Eds.) *Contentious cities: Design and the gendered production of space* (pp. 37–48). Routledge.
- Fileborn, B. (2021b). Mapping activist responses and policy advocacy for street harassment: Current practice and future directions. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*. Online first.
- Fileborn, B., & Vera-Gray, F. (2017). "I want to be able to walk the street without fear": Transforming justice for street harassment. *Feminist Legal Studies, 25*, 203–227.
- Fogg-Davis, H. G. (2006). Theorizing black lesbians within black feminism: A critique of same-race street harassment. *Politics & Gender, 2*(1), 57–76.
- Gardner, C. (1995). *Passing by: Gender and public harassment*. University of California Press.
- Gekoski, A., Gray, J. M., Adler, J. R., & Horvath, M. A. H. (2016). The prevalence and nature of sexual harassment and assault against women and girls of public transport: An international review. *Journal of Criminological Research, Policy and Practice, 3*(1), 3–16.
- Gimlin, D. (2010). Uncivil attention and the public runner. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 27*(3), 269–284.
- Grove, N. S. (2015). The cartographic ambiguities of HarassMap: Crowdmapping security and sexual violence in Egypt. *Security Dialogue, 46*(4), 345–364.
- Heben, T. (1994–1995). A radical reshaping of the law: Interpreting and remedying street harassment. *Review of Law and Women's Studies, 4*, 183–219.
- Henry, H. M. (2017). Sexual harassment in the Egyptian streets: Feminist theory revisited. *Sexuality and Culture, 21*(1), 270–286.
- Hlavka, H. R. (2014). Normalizing sexual violence: Young women account for harassment and abuse. *Gender & Society, 28*(3), 337–358.
- Hollaback! (n.d.). *Take action (webpage)*. Retrieved December 4, 2021, from <https://www.ihollaback.org/take-action/>
- Hutson, A. C. F., & Krueger, J. C. (2019). The harasser's toolbox: Investigating the role of mobility in street harassment. *Violence Against Women, 25*(7), 767–791.
- Jabeen, T., Sunbal, M., & Taj, N. (2017). Relationship between women mobility and sexual harassment: Empirical study of metropolitan city of Lahore. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology, 9*(4), 90–102.
- Johnson, M., & Bennett, E. (2015). *Everyday sexism: Australian women's experiences of street harassment*. The Australia Institute.
- Joseph, J. (2016). Gender-based street harassment: An international perspective. In K. Jaishankar (Ed.), *Interpersonal criminology: Revisiting interpersonal crimes and victimization* (pp. 3–16). CRC Press.
- Kelly, L. (1987). Continuum of sexual violence. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control* (pp. 46–60). Macmillan Press.
- Kelly, L. (1988). *Surviving sexual violence*. Polity Press.
- Kern, L. (2005). In place and at home in the city: Connecting privilege, safety and belonging for women in Toronto. *Gender, Place and Culture, 12*(3), 357–377.
- Kirollos, M. (2016). "The daughters of Egypt are a red line": The impact of sexual harassment on Egypt's legal culture. *Sur-International Journal on Human Rights, 13*(24), 137–153.
- Kissling, E. A. (1991). Street harassment: The language of sexual terrorism. *Discourse & Society, 2*(4), 451–460.
- Kissling, E. A., & Kramarae, C. (1991). Stranger compliments: The interpretation of street remarks. *Women's Studies in Communication, 14*(1), 75–93.
- Lahsaeizadeh, A., & Yousefinejad, E. (2012). Social aspects of women's experiences of sexual harassment in public places in Iran. *Sexuality & Culture, 16*, 17–37.
- Laniya, O. O. (2005). Street smut: Gender, media, and the legal power dynamics of street harassment, or "hey sexy" and other verbal ejaculations. *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law, 14*(1), 91–130.
- Larkin, J. (1991). Sexual harassment: From the personal to the political. *Atlantis, 17*(1), 106–115.
- Lennox, R., & Jurdi-Hage, R. (2017). Beyond the empirical and the discursive: The methodological implications of critical realism for street harassment research. *Women's Studies International Forum, 60*, 28–38.
- Lenton, R., Smith, M. D., Fox, J., & Morra, N. (1999). Sexual harassment in public places: Experiences of Canadian women. *CRSA/RCSA, 36*(4), 517–540.
- Lieber, M. (2018). From "territories" to city centers: The ambivalent management of women's safety and gentrification. *French Politics, 16*, 64–79.
- Logan, L. (2015). Street harassment: Current and promising avenues for researchers and activists. *Sociological Compass, 9*(3), 196–211.
- Lowe, P., & Hayes, G. (2019). Anti-abortion clinic activism, civil inattention and the problem of gendered harassment. *Sociology, 53*(2), 330–346.
- Macmillan, R., Nierobisz, A., & Welsh, S. (2000). Experiencing the streets: Harassment and perceptions of safety among women. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 37*(3), 306–322.
- Mason, G. (2005). Being hated: Stranger or familiar? *Social and Legal Studies, 14*(4), 585–605.
- Mason-Bish, H., & Duggan, M. (2020). 'Some men deeply hate women, and express that hatred freely': Examining victims' experiences and perceptions of gendered hate crime. *International Review of Victimology, 26*(1), 112–134.

- Mason-Bish, H., & Zempi, I. (2019). Misogyny, racism, and Islamophobia: Street harassment at the intersections. *Feminist Criminology, 14*(5), 540–559.
- May, E., & Carter, S. (2015). Hollaback! You have the power to end street harassment. In S. Tarrant (Ed.), *Gender, sex, and politics: In the streets and between the sheets in the 21st century* (pp. 11–21). Routledge.
- McCarty, M. K., Iannone, N. E., & Kelly, J. R. (2014). Stranger danger: The role of perpetrator and context in moderating reactions to sexual harassment. *Sexuality & Culture, 18*, 739–758.
- Meza-de-Luna, M. E., & García-Falconi, S. (2015). Adolescent street harassment in Querétaro, Mexico. *Affilia—Journal of Women and Social Work, 30*(2), 158–169.
- Millan, E. A. (2016). “¡Quién fuera noche para caerle encima!” *Pirópos* in Chile: Sexual harassment or flirtation? *Sociolinguistic Studies, 10*(4), 509–527.
- Mullany, L., & Trickett, L. (2018). *Misogyny hate crime evaluation report*. Nottingham Women’s Centre.
- Namaste, K. (1996). Genderbashing: Sexuality, gender, and the regulation of public space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 14*(2), 221–240.
- Neupane, G., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2014). Violence against women on public transport in Nepal: Sexual harassment and the spatial expression of male privilege. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 38*(1), 23–38.
- Nielsen, L. B. (1999). *License to harass: Law, hierarchy and offensive public speech*. Princeton University Press.
- Nielsen, L. B. (2000). Situating legal consciousness: Experiences and attitudes of ordinary citizens about law and street harassment. *Law & Society Review, 34*(4), 1055–1090.
- Nielsen, L. B. (2002). Subtle, pervasive, harmful: Racist and sexist remarks in public as hate speech. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(2), 265–280.
- Olney, M. (2015). Toward a socially responsible application of the criminal law to the problem of street harassment. *William & Mary Journal of Race, Gender, and Social Justice, 22*, 129–164.
- Peuchaud, S. (2014). Social media activism and Egyptians’ use of social media to combat sexual violence: An HiAP case study. *Health Promotion International, 29*(suppl 1), 113–120.
- Quinn, B. A. (2002). Sexual harassment and masculinity: The power and meaning of “girl watching.” *Gender and Society, 16*(3), 386–402.
- Sheley, E. (2018). A broken windows theory of sexual assault enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 108*(3), 455–510.
- Simões, R. B., & Silveirinha, M. J. (2019). Framing street harassment: Legal developments and popular misogyny in social media. *Feminist Media Studies*. Online first.
- Spaccatini, F., Pacilli, M. G., Giovanelli, I., Roccato, M., & Penone, G. (2019). Sexualized victims of stranger harassment and victim blaming: The moderating role of right-wing authoritarianism. *Sexuality & Culture, 23*, 811–825.
- Stanko, E. A. (1985). *Intimate intrusions: Women’s experience of male violence*. Routledge.
- Stop Street Harassment (2014). *Unsafe and harassed in public spaces: A national street harassment report*. Stop Street Harassment.
- Sweeny, J. A. (2016). Trapped in public: The regulation of street harassment and cyber-harassment under the captive audience doctrine. *Nevada Law Journal, 17*, 651–666.
- Thompson, D. M. (1994). “The woman in the street:” Reclaiming the public space from sexual harassment. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism, 6*, 313–348.
- Threadcraft, S. (2014). Intimate injustice, political obligation, and the dark ghetto. *Signs, 39*(3), 735–760.
- Threadcraft, S. (2015). “Movement” justice and the capabilities approach: Resources, social environments and social attitudes in black urban space. *Philosophy and Social Criticism, 41*(1), 55–60.
- Tuerkheimer, D. (1997). Street harassment as sexual subordination: The phenomenology of gender-specific harm. *Wisconsin Women’s Law Journal, 12*, 167–206.
- Ussher, J. M., Hawkey, A., Perz, J., Liamputtong, P., Marjadi, B., Schmied, V., Dune, T., Sekar, J.A., Ryan, S., Charter, R., Thepsourinthone, J., Noack-Lundberg, K., & Brook, E. (2020). *Crossing the line: Lived experience of sexual violence among trans women of colour from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds in Australia*. (Research report, 14/2020). Australia’s National Research Organisation for Women’s Safety.
- Vera-Gray, F. (2016a). *Men’s intrusion, women’s embodiment: A critical analysis of street harassment*. Routledge.
- Vera-Gray, F. (2016b). Men’s stranger intrusions: Rethinking street harassment. *Women’s Studies International Forum, 58*, 9–17.
- Vera-Gray, F. (2018). *The right amount of panic: How women trade freedom for safety*. Policy Press.
- Vera-Gray, F., & Fileborn, B. (2018). Recognition and the harms of “cheer up.” *The Philosophical Journal of Conflict and Violence, 2*(1), 78–96.
- Vera-Gray, F., & Kelly, L. (2020). Contested gendered space: Public sexual harassment and women’s safety work. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*. Online first.
- Vizvary, M. (2020). *The state of street harassment in DC: A report on the first year of implementing the Street Harassment Prevention Act*. Office of Human Rights, District of Columbia.
- Wångren, L. (2016). Our stories matter: Storytelling and social justice in the Hollaback! movement. *Gender and Education, 28*(3), 401–415.
- Wesselmann, E. D., & Kelly, J. R. (2010). Cat-calls and culpability: Investigating the frequency and functions of stranger harassment. *Sex Roles, 63*(7–8), 451–462.
- Zietz, S., & Das, M. (2018). “Nobody teases good girls”: A qualitative study on perceptions of sexual harassment among young men in a slum of Mumbai. *Global Public Health, 13*(9), 1229–1240.

Author Biographies

Bianca Fileborn is a senior lecturer in criminology and Australian Research Council Discovery Early Career Researcher Award Fellow in the School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne. Her current work focuses on developing victim-centered justice responses to street harassment.

Tully O’Neill is a teaching specialist in criminology in the School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Melbourne. Her current work focuses on digital spaces and justice alternatives for victim-survivors of sexual violence.