

Marshall University

**Marshall Digital Scholar**

---

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

---

1999

## Effects of perceived verbal aggressiveness and proxemic violations on attributions of source blameworthiness for sexual harassment

Evelyn René Davis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://mds.marshall.edu/etd>



Part of the [Experimental Analysis of Behavior Commons](#), and the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Davis, Evelyn René, "Effects of perceived verbal aggressiveness and proxemic violations on attributions of source blameworthiness for sexual harassment" (1999). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. 1595. <https://mds.marshall.edu/etd/1595>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact [zhangj@marshall.edu](mailto:zhangj@marshall.edu), [beachgr@marshall.edu](mailto:beachgr@marshall.edu).

EFFECTS OF PERCEIVED VERBAL AGGRESSIVENESS  
AND PROXEMIC VIOLATIONS  
ON ATTRIBUTIONS OF SOURCE BLAMEWORTHINESS  
FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Thesis submitted to  
The Graduate School of  
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts  
Communication Studies

by

Evelyn René Davis

Marshall University

Huntington, West Virginia

May 3, 1999

This thesis was accepted on April 23 1999  
Month Day Year

as meeting the research requirements for the master's degree.

Committee Chairperson Camilla C. Brammer  
Dr. Camilla Brammer

Committee Member Bertram W. Gross  
Dr. Bertram Gross

Committee Member Edward Woods  
Dr. Edward Woods

Committee Member Toshi Kikuchi  
Dr. Toshi Kikuchi

Department of Communication Studies

Leonard Deutch  
Dean of the Graduate School

## Acknowledgments

*I would like to express my gratitude to the following individuals for their direction, support, and encouragement throughout my master's career. Each person played a significant part in helping me accomplish the goal of completing this thesis.*

**Dr. Cam Brammer** – Your guidance as my committee chairperson, advisor and friend, helped me go beyond my own expectations. Throughout my time at Marshall, I have never doubted your care for me. For all of your suggestions, help in editing, and honesty, I thank you. (It was fun being the first child!) The impact that you have had on my life will stay with me always!

**Dr. Toshi Kikuchi** – You have been my mentor and my coach throughout this entire project. In my eyes, you epitomize what a teacher should be. When I just could not understand something, you remained patient with me, and you continued to explain what I needed to know. Thank you for *always* being there for me. I know that this thesis would not have become what it is without your input. You have enriched my life by being a true example of benevolence.

**Dr. Bert Gross** – I am most appreciative of your integrity. You have showed me that I must always seek the true meaning of things. Your sense of humor and infectious laugh always brought a smile to my face. Thank you for admonishing me and encouraging me to give my best.

**Dr. Edward Woods** – You are the reason that I enrolled at Marshall University's Department of Communication Studies. Thank you for speaking so highly of the program, and thank you for taking the time to talk with me. From the moment I entered the door, you have taken time to listen and provide thoughtful feedback! Thank you for replenishing my supply of motivation and courage. Your kind words encouraged me to believe that I could indeed accomplish my objectives.

**"Kat", Barb, Jennifer, Kim, Teresa, Libby, Julie, Caroline, Amy, Chris, Matt** – my fellow TAs! You have been my support system, my shoulders to cry on, and my companions to laugh with! Thank you for all the jokes, all the parties, all the secrets, and all the memories. God has His reasons for everything, and I am so grateful that He put you all in my life.

**CMM 103 students** - You have helped me reach way beyond my own capabilities and wishes. You have taught me much more than I ever thought possible...and this is a good thing! I appreciate each of you as the individuals you are. You helped to make every day exciting and challenging. Thank you for being kind, forgiving, and supportive! A special thanks to **Benita Plata, Julia Jackson, LeRon Burge, Leslie Crider, and Susie Robertson** for helping me out with the experiment!

**Eric and Julie** – I appreciate all your help at ITV with the production and editing of the videos.

**Barbara Marshall** – It has meant so much to me to have you as a friend for the past two years! You are a helpful, organized, truthful lady, and I have needed you. I am grateful for all your visits to the office and for regularly checking on everybody. You helped me stay focused and determined. Thanks, Barb!

**Wally Dempsey** – Thank you for playing your part so well! I appreciate your help and your professionalism with this project.

**Kathleen Curtis-Dempsey** – Wow! You have been such an inspiration to me. You are an independent, intelligent young woman. You are the kind of person that people need as a friend, and I am so grateful that you chose to be my friend. I admire your unselfishness, your dedication to your students, your sense of humor and your love for your family. Our trips to Delaware for the Russian exhibit, our shopping excursions, the tennis lessons, and the hours spent studying all helped make my life a whole lot better! Thanks, Kat. I never thought that I would leave graduate school with a friend-for-life, but that is exactly what I have found in you.

**Ruth and Rodney Davis** – In the *middle* of your busy lives, (the grandchildren, the new house), you always took the time to ask me about my studies. Thank you for your unconditional love. Thank you for appreciating the beauty of life. You have taught me that through struggle and suffering I can find joy and contentment. I would chose no other two to be my parents.

**Janet, Van, Ivy and Eli** – Thank you for living life to its fullest. You have added blessings to our family forever.

**Amelia Davis** – It was your idea! This thesis was really conceived out of your suggestions. You have the best ideas and suggestions. Whenever I have needed an opinion or some advice, I knew that I could trust your contributions. Thank you for being the kind of sister whom I could go to for anything. You have set an incredible example for me to follow, professionally, educationally, personally, and spiritually.

**Lesia Courts** – You are the one person who has endured the most with me. Thank you for always wanting to read my papers! You have been a friend who is interested in *my* life, what I believe and what I think. That has meant so much to me. I owe you big time! Your competitive nature is an inspiration to me. You always show a desire to be the very best at whatever you decide to accomplish, and that is contagious. Thank you for your generosity, for putting up with my stress, and for always praying for me when I asked you. You are a true friend.

*Evie Davis*

**Table of Contents**

CHAPTER	PAGE
Approval Page .....	i
Acknowledgments .....	ii - v
Table of Contents .....	vi
Index of Tables .....	vii
I. Introduction .....	1 - 19
II. Methods .....	20 - 25
III. Results .....	26 - 32
IV. Discussion .....	33 - 37
Appendices .....	38 - 45
References .....	46 - 53



Index of Tables

TABLE	TITLE	PAGE
1	Blameworthiness: Item to Item Correlation Matrix .....	27
2	Blameworthiness by Verbal Aggressiveness and Proximity: Means and Standard Deviations .....	28
3	Blameworthiness by Gender and Verbal Aggressiveness: Means and Standard Deviations .....	31
4	Blameworthiness by Gender and Proximity: Means and Standard Deviations .....	32

## Chapter I

### Introduction

#### *Overview*

As society moves into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, sexual harassment remains a major problem in organizations (Buttny, 1993; Cockburn, 1991; Kreps, 1993; Langelan, 1993; Simons & Weissman, 1990; Taylor & Daly, 1995; Wolfson, 1997). The Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII, made it illegal to discriminate against employees regarding race, color, religion, national origin, and sex, but at that point in time, the phrase "sexual harassment" had no meaning. Although women were aware of their daily struggles with gender discrimination in the workplace, no one had coined the phrase, and this pervasive problem was not yet an established part of the legal system.

In the 1970s, the issue of sexual harassment in the workplace came to the attention of the public and the government via media and the feminist movement. During the early part of this decade, feminists defined sexual harassment as "an expression of power and a form of sex discrimination" (Bingham, 1994, p. 3). Studies focused on sexual harassment as being rooted in male dominance and privilege in the workplace. According to Bingham (1994), this definition continued to evolve throughout the decade to include such diversities as race, ethnicity, class, and sexual orientation among women.

During the 1980s, the literature on sexual harassment increased, and scholars across disciplines attempted to define sexual harassment in a more concrete, objective manner (Madden, 1987; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982; Terpestra & Cook, 1985; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). Other researchers explored the effects on victims, and the number of incidents that took place (Fitzgerald, Shullman, Bailey, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, & Weitzman, 1988; Powell, 1986). Still, this problem was relatively new to the public in general, and to the legal system. For example, Kreps (1993) noted, "It was not until 1986 with the Supreme Court's decision in *Meritor Savings Bank v Vinson* that workers were granted legal protection against sexual harassment as a form of sexual discrimination" (p. 149).

In the early 1990s, the subject of sexual harassment "burst into the homes of millions of people who watched the much publicized Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill hearings" (Jaschik-Herman & Fisk, 1995, p. 440). After the hearings, there was a reported 50% increase in sexual harassment charges filed from the year before (Abramson, 1992). Certainly, this could be due to an increase in the violations of sexual harassment, but it is possible that as women and men became more aware of what characterized and defined sexual harassing behavior, more reports followed.

Throughout the past three decades, the public has come to more fully understand the problem of sexual harassment. Organizations have increasingly sought communication training to help eliminate the problem, to educate their

employees, and learn how to better manage sexual harassment situations among personnel (Bingham, 1991).

### *Rationale*

Despite the growing awareness, how a source's behaviors are interpreted and evaluated by a receiver in sexual harassment situations remains unclear. Understanding a receiver's perceptual process is an important step in studying sexual harassment because a receiver's response or reaction to a source's behaviors is heavily dependent on how those behaviors are interpreted and evaluated in a given context by the receiver (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Teven, Martin, & Neupauer, 1998). For example, if a manager enters his assistant's office, and proceeds to tell her a sexually-explicit joke, she could interpret his behavior positively, evaluating the communication as an attempt to lighten the mood in the office, or as an expression of how comfortable he is with their relationship. Accordingly, her response to the message might be to laugh, or to share an equally humorous joke with him. However, if she interprets his message negatively, perceiving the message to be a personal insult against her, or perhaps a hostile attempt at intimidation, then her response might be to ask him to refrain from such humor, or perhaps to report the incident to his superior. As researchers explore receiver's perceptions, better insights will be obtained as to what responses and reactions will result, and even how attitudes about the relationships are influenced.

Secondly, although research on this topic is increasing, investigations have only recently begun to explore this phenomenon in the field of communication (Bingham, 1991; Kreps, 1993). There is a void in the literature regarding receivers' perceptions of sources' communicative behaviors, and as suggested previously, the implications of such research are critical enough to merit more extensive research.

It is important to note here that in sexual harassment situations, a receiver's perceptions are largely influenced by a source's verbal messages, (in particular, messages which are designed to hurt, intimidate or insult the receiver), and a source's use of distance/space. When individuals use verbally aggressive messages in their communications with others, they are helping to create a hostile environment. The literature suggests that verbal aggressiveness is designed to hurt the receiver (Infante & Wigley III, 1986). In sexual harassment situations, this intent to hurt can be demonstrated by insults (Bingham, 1994), and even threats (Greenberg, 1976). This is true of interpersonal relationships, family interactions, and school or work environments (Bingham, 1994; Infante & Wigley III, 1986; Kreps, 1993; Teven, Martin, & Neupauer, 1998).

Not only do sources' verbally aggressive messages influence receivers' perceptions, but the use of proxemic violations do as well. Research indicates that people often use proximity, or distance, to communicate intentions (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Leathers, 1997; Littlejohn, 1999; Manusov, 1990). And in situations where a receiver's normal expectations of distance are violated, receivers can

interpret this behavior as being intentional. Thus, a perceiver's resulting perceptions are influenced by this emotionally arousing, nonverbal behavior.

Finally, the utility of this area of research is evident when one considers the importance of communication training with regard to the appropriate responses to sexual harassment. As more communication researchers attempt to clarify and understand receivers' varying perceptions regarding sexually harassing behaviors, a better grasp of contributing factors, which perpetuate this problem, will develop. Thus, more effective communication training can be offered to organizations.

Sexual harassment has been studied in relation to power, gender, compliance-gaining techniques, relationship and status variables, and nonverbal communication behaviors, (Andrews, 1987; Harvey, 1987; Heider, 1958; Horgan & Reeder, 1986; Shaver, 1985), and most research has focused on sources' perceptions of receivers' blameworthiness (Edmonds & Cahoon, 1986; Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Johnson & Workman, 1994; Mathes & Kempher, 1976; Mazelan, 1980; Richards, Rollerson & Phillips, 1991; Workman & Johnson, 1991). However, for the reasons previously mentioned, this investigation is concerned with receivers' perceptions of source blameworthiness.

Attributions of intent, then responsibility, and ultimately blameworthiness play crucial roles in people's everyday social interactions (Shaver, 1985) because of everyday differences and conflicts. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that the labor force will reach 139 million people by the year 2000 (Hudson Institute, 1987). It follows, that as more people enter the workplace, so enters more

diversity among the workers. And often, because of the lack of communication training combined with such diversity of employees, businesses will see greater numbers of conflicts arising among personnel. When conflicts ensue, people often ask who caused the conflict, and who should be blamed.

Shaver (1985) contends that blameworthiness is a key element to consider when assessing causality, and after establishing intent and responsibility. In sexual harassment situations, a perceiver's negative evaluations and interpretations of a source's behavior, lead to perceptions of intent and responsibility. These perceptions, in turn, lead to attributions of blame. Ultimately, the amount of blameworthiness that a perceiver attributes to the source, will affect his or her response/reaction to the encounter, and his or her attitude about the relationship.

This study seeks to explore and ultimately test the relationship between receivers' attributions of sources' blameworthiness, and two variables: (1) verbally aggressive messages, and (2) proxemic violations. In order to examine this aspect adequately, this report first delineates the theoretical framework involved in conceptualizing attributions of sources' blameworthiness. Second, perceptions of verbally aggressive messages and proxemic violations are discussed, and an explanation of the expected relationships among these variables and attributions of blameworthiness is suggested. Finally, the research design, how data was gathered, the analyses, and the results are explained. To begin this investigation, attribution theory is discussed.

### *Attribution Theory*

According to Heider (1958), the human mind seeks sufficient reasons or explanations for the behavior of others. People do this to make possible a more or less stable, predictable, and controllable world. Bradac, Hosman, and Tardy (1978) studied the consequences on attribution of linguistic intensity and levels of intimacy in reciprocating messages of self-disclosure. Sillars (1980) explored the order and distribution of communicative acts in discussions.

More recent research includes Reardon's (1991) essay. In it she stated that "attribution theory suggests that people seek reasons or justifications for the actions of others and their own actions in order to understand certain consequence" (p. 18). Other relevant research includes Johnson and Workman's (1994) study. These researchers noted that attribution theory provides a basis for investigating how victims of sexual harassment are perceived. Johnson and Workman (1994) suggested that "people are information processors who search for facts to explain what is happening or has happened" (p. 384).

This study, however, is interested in testing the relationship between sources' communicative behaviors and receivers' perceptions of the sources' blameworthiness for those behaviors. Attribution theory serves as an appropriate framework to study this phenomenon.

Frandsen and Clement (1984) note that attribution theorists seek to clarify how diverse types of data are used by sources. Further, one of the most effective and useful delineations of these data, suggested by Jones and Nisbett (1972),



describe three types of data, (historical, effect, and cause), that sources and receivers use in their attribution processes.

Concerning attribution theory, one of the most important distinctions to be made is whether the perceiver views the cause of the behavior to be explained as internal/personal or external/impersonal to the actor. Applied to an incident of sexual harassment, this means whether the actor himself/herself is perceived as the cause of the harassment, (*internal*), or just as part of an uncontrollable situation, (*external*) (Rotter, 1966). The "uncontrollable situation" that Rotter (1966) refers to here, concerns the situational data used by perceivers in their external attributions, and these situational aspects are referred to by Jones and Nisbett (1972) as historical data.

First, historical data concern the expansive, yet momentary context of an action (Frandsen & Clement, 1984). For example, receivers and/or sources can have background information about themselves, the other person involved in the scenario, or even outsiders indirectly involved, and they can also obtain important data during the specific interaction taking place. Second, historical data affect attributions. For instance, if a male supervisor is known to behave in a certain condescending manner when female subordinates are in his office, this existing information will affect the way people perceive him. On the other hand, if no prior information is known about the supervisor, the newly-hired female might have to rely on her immediate perceptions of the situation or act in order to establish attributions.

It is important to note that in situations where no historical data is available, for instance, a new employee having no prior information about the culture of a company, attributions are often based only on effect and cause data. Since this investigation is concerned specifically with situations where no historical data is available, further discussions will center on effect and cause data.

The second type, effect data, can be illustrated by the following scenario. In a sexual harassment situation, where the source uses verbally-aggressive messages and proxemic violations, the receiver might ultimately interpret the actions negatively, thus a negative outcome or effect ensues. The effect data is the act itself and the negative outcome (Frandsen & Clement, 1984). It is important to note, however, that some outcomes can be interpreted positively and produce positive effects (Burgoon & Hale, 1988).

Third, there are cause data. This type consists of environmental or external indicators, such as money, respect, consent or endorsement, and they weigh the "difficulty of tasks" (Frandsen & Clement, 1984, p. 356). Cause data help answer the questions, "What motivated this person to act, and what was his/her objective?"

Intentionality is one key factor to consider when interpreting cause data. Forsterling (1988) explained that according to Heider (1958), "information ... about the presence of local causality is examined in order to decide between intentional (personal causality) and non-intentional (impersonal causality) causes" (p. 122). Cause data consist of intentional or internal indicators, which refer to

plans or efforts. "Jones and Davis reasoned that human actions are often explained by the attribution of stable, relatively invariant dispositions to the actor. In their theory, the knowledge and ability of the actor were held to determine the attribution of intention" (cited in Jaspars, Fincham, & Hewstone, 1983, p. 37).

Jones and Davis (1965) further developed Heider's (1958) perspective by suggesting that there are two requirements of intentionality: knowing that the action will indeed result in an effect, and being able to actually produce the effect. Reardon (1991) noted that the concept of intention becomes important to Heider's theory when he distinguishes between personal/internal and impersonal/external causality. "Personal attributions are formulated only when the individual observed appears to have performed a purposive action" (p. 168). Intent, purposive motivations, can be directly linked to a source's responsibility.

In fact, the literature suggests that in order to reach attributions of responsibility, intent must first be established. For example, as seen in Heider's (1958) work, his emphasis became less about the factors that might produce "overattribution" to personal causality than on the practical process involved in differentiating between varying degrees of personal responsibility.

Responsibility is the second key factor to consider when interpreting cause data. Mongeau, Hale, and Alles (1994) explained that Heider also developed several conceptions of responsibility that vary in complexity. These ideas range from association, commission, and foreseeable, to intentional and justifiable. "Heider's (1958) simplest notion, association, involves those situations where a

person is considered responsible because he or she was associated with a negative outcome although he or she was not considered the event's causal agent" (p. 327).

To further illustrate, if a manager is told by her supervisor to deliver a notice of termination to a certain employee, it is possible for the employee to hold the manager responsible for this devastating news, simply because she is associated closely with the supervisor. The employee might, in fact, know that the notice was entirely the supervisor's decision, but he might attribute responsibility to the manager for not adequately defending him to the supervisor. In this example, the manager was considered responsible because she was associated with the negative outcome, even though she was not the cause of the event.

Mongeau, Hale, and Alles (1994) go on to discuss the variance between association and commission. "Association differs from commission because at the latter level, the actor's behavior caused a negative outcome for another person, though the actor neither intended nor foresaw the outcome resulting from the behavior" (p. 327). For example, if the same manager had gone to the supervisor to complain about the way in which this employee was behaving during lunch break, and the supervisor, based on the manager's complaint, decided that instead of just warning the employee, he would terminate his position with the company. In this case, commission is seen in the fact that the manager caused the negative outcome for the employee, but never thought that a simple complaint would result in the employee being fired.

Heider's third level, foreseeable, involves those cases "where the actor did not intend to produce the negative outcome, but should have been able to foresee the outcome resulting from the behavior" (Mongeau, Hale, & Alles, 1994, p. 327). Now, consider that the employee had received a prior warning from the supervisor for his inappropriate behavior. The manager stops by her supervisor's office to complain about this employee, forgetting that the supervisor had previous grievances with regard to the worker. The employee is subsequently fired, and holds the manager responsible for causing the termination. The manager did not intend for the employee to be terminated, but should have foreseen this occurrence.

"As the name suggests, the fourth level, intentional, involves those cases where the actor intended to produce the negative outcome for another person" (Mongeau, Hale, & Alles, 1994, p. 327). This level is easily illustrated by considering that the manager wanted to get the employee, so she purposely complained to her supervisor, thus causing the employee to be terminated.

Finally, the most complex construct of responsibility, justifiability, "represents those cases where an actor intends to produce the negative outcome for another person. The actor's responsibility for the action, however, is attenuated by the circumstances surrounding the behavior" (Mongeau, Hale, & Alles, 1994, p. 327). For example, the manager purposely complained to her supervisor about the employee, in order to get him fired. She knew of the employee's prior warnings, and she also knew that unless this particular employee was terminated,

the employees' morale in her department would continue to suffer. She also knew that managers in other departments were anticipating a quick solution to this problem because her employee's actions had negatively affected personnel in other departments. In this example, the manager caused the termination to take place when it did, due to her complaint. She intended to have the employee fired, but because of her knowledge of the detrimental affects that this employee had had on others, and her knowledge of his prior verbal and written warnings, she is held less responsible for the outcome because her actions were justified.

In these five levels, the differences in responsibility are evident, and the inherent connection between responsibility and intent is obvious. However, not only are the elements of intentionality and responsibility central to interpreting cause data and, in general, attribution research, but attributions of blameworthiness are as well. For example, Shaver (1985) reasoned that these classifications of responsibility represent a continuum of blameworthiness, and a source's intent in producing the negative outcome is the element that distinguishes these classifications. Here, the literature suggests that in order for attributions of blameworthiness to occur, intent and responsibility must first be established.

Before the discussion of blameworthiness develops, some consideration must be given to the communicative actions or behaviors that a person commits, in order to evaluate his/her supposed intent and responsibility. As discussed previously, the two behaviors that this investigation is interested in studying are

verbally aggressive messages, and proxemic violations. First, a review of verbal aggressiveness will be explained.

### *Verbally Aggressive Messages*

Verbally aggressive messages are defined in the literature as being insulting, inappropriate statements which are designed to attack a person's self-concept and/or make that person feel threatened (Greenberg, 1976; Ifert & Bearden, 1998; Infante & Wigley III, 1986; Teven, Martin, & Neupauer, 1998). As Infante and Wigley III (1986) noted, there are many kinds of verbally aggressive messages, and these messages often include insults, maledictions, and profanity.

A commonality exists among all of these destructive types of verbally aggressive messages, and that is the common thread of hostility (Infante & Wigley III, 1986; Teven, Martin, & Neupauer, 1998). The literature suggests that even if one views verbal aggressiveness as a personality trait, rather than a message trait, the element of hostility still exists inherent in the personality (Infante & Wigley III, 1986).

Verbally aggressive messages are defined in this report as insulting comments, coercive, discriminatory, inappropriate to a business or professional relationship (Gutek, 1985), and/or hostile statements. In addition, verbally aggressive statements are often, by nature, hostile, threatening, offensive messages aimed at intimidating the receiver. Interestingly, this is an important point, when

one considers the definitions of sexual harassment. There is a significant similarity between these types of statements and sexually harassing remarks. For example, according to EEOC Guidelines (1990), sexual harassment is defined as quid pro quo advances or requests ("this for that"), and the creation of a hostile work environment. Please note the following explanation of hostile work environment:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute "hostile work environment" sexual harassment when such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating and intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment" (EEOC Guidelines, 1990).

Also, Gutek (1985) reported results from a study on the nature of sexual harassment that revealed connections between verbal aggressiveness and sexual harassment. Concerning the question, what is sexual harassment, Gutek reported that 70.3 percent of males and 85.5 percent of females surveyed indicated that verbally aggressive insulting comments characterize this behavior.

The literature not only suggests that verbally aggressive messages and sexually harassing statements are similar in nature, but it also suggests that comparable to sexual harassment, verbally aggressive messages are also intended to produce negative effects. "The intention of a verbally aggressive message is to hurt the other person" (Teven, Martin, & Neupauer, 1998) and threaten or intimidate them. Infante and Wigley III (1986) state that the damage from the



negative effects of verbally aggressive messages are often more injurious and longer lasting than that of physical aggression.

Shaver (1985) claims that as the receiver's perception of the source's intent to produce negative outcomes increases, so do perceptions of that actor's responsibility, and thus, blameworthiness for producing the negative outcomes. According to Shaver's (1985) sequential model of the attribution of blame, once a source's intent and responsibility have been established by the receiver, then attributions of blame may begin.

Therefore, based upon the literature regarding attributions of blame and perceptions of verbal aggressiveness, it is expected that when messages are perceived by observers as being high in verbal aggressiveness rather than low in verbal aggressiveness, then attributions of source blameworthiness increase.

**Hypothesis 1** – Attributions of source blameworthiness are higher when messages are perceived as being high in verbal aggressiveness than low in verbal aggressiveness.

### *Proxemic Violations*

One physical, nonverbal form of sexual harassment includes unwanted proximity. This unwanted proximity is also referred to as a violation of proxemic expectations (Burgoon, 1982). Communication scholars often study nonverbal immediacy behaviors in relation to touch, gaze, direct body orientation, and forward lean (Anderson & Guerrero, 1998). However, in addition to these areas,

the study of proxemics is frequently reported in communication literature as a commonly used nonverbal behavior (Altman, 1975; Burgoon & Jones, 1976; Hickson and Stacks, 1985; Knapp, 1978; and LaFrance & Mayo, 1978).

Hall (1959) defined proxemics as the study of how man unconsciously structures microspace. Altman (1975) made distinctions among primary, secondary, and public territories. First, primary territories include such places as homes, offices, bedrooms – “even a patient’s bed in a hospital qualifies as a primary territory” (Burgoon, Buller, & Woodall, 1989, p. 96). In secondary territories, formal or unspoken association to a group frequently decides who has a right of entry to the territory. Public territories aren’t used exclusively by any certain group. Beaches and parks are some examples of public territories.

Hall (1968) offered his explanation of three basic types of space which included (1) fixed-feature space -stationary, motionless items (2) semifixed-feature space – items that can be moved, and (3) informal space – “interpersonal distance” between people. Hall (1968) also categorized informal space into four different types: intimate, personal, social, and public. As Leathers (1997) noted, “Hall (1968) identified and classified the distances people use to separate themselves from others in order to satisfy their various needs”(p. 92). These types of informal distance were Type 1 - intimate distance, (0-18 inches); Type 2 – personal distance, (1 ½ - 4 ft); Type 3, social distance, (4 – 12 feet); and Public Distance, (12 feet or more). Burgoon and Jones’ (1976) research also support this categorization.

Additionally, Burgoon, Buller, and Woodall (1989) suggest, "The essential roles that spatial perception play in growth, development, and protection of the organism argue for a primacy of proxemic messages that may be unequaled by other codes. They have the capacity to arrest the attention of the receiver" (p. 118). Burgoon and Hale (1988) note, "In the case of the [nonverbal expectancy] violations model, the arousal change is posited to cause an alertness or orienting response that diverts attention away from the ostensive purpose of the interaction and focuses it toward the source of the arousal – the initiator of the violation" (p. 62).

This notion is consistent with the idea that deviant behaviors make people more observant of specific details about the deviant person (Langer, 1978; Langer & Imber, 1980). In Burgoon and Hale's (1988) nonverbal expectancy violations model, social norms and known idiosyncracies of the other characterize nonverbal expectancies. Therefore, when no historical data, or known idiosyncracies of the other are available, cognitive and affective expectancies of the immediate action are based primarily on social norms. For instance, when a newly-hired female employee is approached by a male coworker, and she has no prior information about this person, she will define expected proximity based on societal norms. This would mean that for her, appropriate, normal and/or expected proximity would remain between social and personal space. If, however, the male coworker approached her within an intimate space, the social norm would be violated, thus a

proxemic violation would take place. Yet, what outcome or effect might this have on the female?

Littlejohn (1999) stated, "The common assumption is that when expectancies are met, the other person's behaviors are judged as positive, and when they are violated, the behaviors are judged as negative" (p. 144). Although Burgoon and Hale (1988) contend that the effects of nonverbal violations can be both negative and positive, when these proxemic violations are combined with perceived verbal aggressiveness, it can be assumed that the outcome will be perceived as negative.

Not only do proxemic messages cause immediate responses, but these responses are often negative when proxemic violations occur, and according to the literature, the sources of these violations often use proxemic violations to communicate intent. Therefore, based on expectancy violation research and attribution theories concerned with intent, responsibility and blame, it is expected that when proxemic violations are perceived to occur, rather than when no proxemic violation takes place, then attributions of source blameworthiness increase.

**Hypothesis 2** – Attributions of source blameworthiness are higher when proximity is perceived to be violated than when there is no proxemic violation.

## Chapter II

### Methods

#### *Pilot Study*

Fifty undergraduate students from a mid-sized south-eastern university were randomly selected to participate in the first part of the pilot study. These participants were asked to write three different messages, (one message per one 3 x 5 index card), that they considered to be verbally aggressive and sexually harassing. One hundred and sixteen messages were collected, and rated to determine high, medium, low, and neutral verbally aggressive messages was performed by graduate teaching assistants at the same university. After all messages were sorted and subsequently numbered, six messages from the high, medium, and low categories were randomly selected for the second part of the pilot study. (Messages grouped in the neutral category were set aside as unusable.)

One hundred and twenty-five undergraduate students from a mid-sized south-eastern university were randomly selected to participate in this investigation. The eighteen different messages were written on a questionnaire which instructed participants to rate each message on 7-point Likert-type scale according to the degree that they considered the message to be verbally aggressive (see Appendix A). Verbally aggressive messages were defined on the questionnaire and repeated

orally for the participants as insulting comments, coercive, discriminatory, inappropriate and/or hostile statements.

Next, frequency analyses were performed on the responses to select six messages for the main study: three messages rated high in verbal aggressiveness and three messages rated low in verbal aggressiveness. A paired sample t-test showed a significant mean difference between high ( $M = 5.06$ ;  $SD = 1.13$ ) and low ( $M = 3.16$ ;  $SD = 1.66$ ) verbally aggressive messages,  $t = 15.42$ ,  $p < .001$ .

### *Experimental Manipulation*

In order to operationalize the variables for this study, four different videotaped scenarios were created. Qualified individuals from the communications discipline reviewed the videotaped scenarios to ensure that they indeed showed the intended manipulations. Based on results obtained from the pilot study, each video portrayed a female employee who was approached by a male coworker who proceeded to direct three verbally aggressive messages at her. Participants were told that the female employee had recently been hired at a local company, she had only been working there for one week, therefore she did not know anyone. This established the fact that no prior historical data was available to the receiver (female employee) of these communication behaviors on which to base her attributions.

In the first video, the male employee entered the female's office, closed the door behind him, and after approaching the coworker, and sitting approximately

six inches away, (angled in the same body position as she), directed three messages towards her which had been previously rated in the pilot study as being high in verbal aggressiveness. The first manipulation was labelled High Verbal Aggressiveness/Proxemic Violation Condition (HVA/PV).

In this second video, the male employee entered the female's office, closed the door behind him, and after approaching the coworker, and standing approximately six feet away, (angled in the same body position as she), he directed three messages towards her which had been previously rated in the pilot study as being low in verbal aggressiveness. The second manipulation was labelled Low Verbal Aggressiveness/ No Proxemic Violation Condition (LVA/NPV).

In this third video, the male employee entered the female's office, closed the door behind him, and after approaching the coworker, and standing approximately six feet away, (angled in the same body position as she), he directed three messages towards her which had been previously rated in the pilot study as being high in verbal aggressiveness. The third manipulation was labelled High Verbal Aggressiveness/No Proxemic Violation Condition (HVA/NPV).

In the fourth video, the male employee entered the female's office, closed the door behind him, and after approaching the coworker, and sitting approximately six inches away, (angled in the same body position as she), directed three messages towards her which had been previously rated in the pilot study as

being low in verbal aggressiveness. The fourth manipulation was labelled Low Verbal Aggressiveness/ Proxemic Violation Condition (LVA/PV).

### *Participants*

A student-sample of eighty-four undergraduates (34 males, 50 females; mean age = 21.4) from a mid-sized south-eastern university participated in the study. Extra credit points were offered to students who participated in the experiment.

### *Procedure*

Participants were given an information sheet before the experiment began which described the study (see Appendix B). Participants were told that the study concerned how people perceive and interpret communication behaviors. Individuals who volunteered to participate were given a sign-up sheet so they could select a time most convenient for them. Each of the four videotaped scenarios was randomly selected to be shown at the different times offered to the volunteers. Participants, who reported to the experiment at their selected times, were given a folder containing a four-part survey questionnaire (Appendices C & D). The first part of the questionnaire was used to measure and assess subjects' perceptions of the independent variable of verbally aggressive messages. The second part of the questionnaire was used to measure and assess subjects' perceptions of the independent variable of proximity (Appendix E). The third part



of the questionnaire was used to measure and assess subjects' perceptions of the dependent variable of source blameworthiness (Appendix F). And the fourth part of the survey questionnaire was used to identify demographic information: gender, age, work experience, known sexual harassment encounters (self or others), and also the degree to which participants thought the videotaped scenario was realistic and/or true-to-life (Appendix G).

After participants received their survey questionnaire and were seated in the laboratory, they were asked to view one of the four, randomly selected videotaped scenarios. After all the participants viewed the video, they were asked to silently read the same set of three verbally aggressive messages that were shown in the video. After the participants read the first message, they were asked to rate five different statements, on a 7-point Likert-type scale, according to the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. These statements specified their perceptions of the message's (1) insult; (2) coerciveness; (3) discrimination; (4) inappropriateness; and (5) hostility. The same procedure was followed for the two subsequent messages.

Once the subjects all completed the first part of the questionnaire, they were asked to turn their attention toward the front of the room where two actors portrayed the distances first enacted in the video. After all participants observed this demonstration, they were asked to turn to the second part of the questionnaire which addressed distance. Participants read five statements regarding their perceptions of the inappropriateness, discomfort, unexpectedness, impropriety,

and abnormality of the distance between the two coworkers in the video.

Participants then rated these statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale, based on the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement.

Once all the participants completed the second part of the questionnaire, they were asked to re-view the video. After the videotaped scenario had been reviewed by all participants, they were asked to turn to the third part of the questionnaire and answer the corresponding five questions on a 7-point Likert-type scale according to the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. These statements regarded observers' perceptions of source's liability, accountability, blame, intentionality, and responsibility. After all the participants had completed the third part of the questionnaire, they were asked to complete the fourth part of the survey regarding gender, age, work experience, past experiences concerning sexual harassment (self and other), and also the degree to which they thought the video was realistic and/or true-to-life.

of the questionnaire was used to measure and assess subjects' perceptions of the dependent variable of source blameworthiness (Appendix F). And the fourth part of the survey questionnaire was used to identify demographic information: gender, age, work experience, known sexual harassment encounters (self or others), and also the degree to which participants thought the videotaped scenario was realistic and/or true-to-life (Appendix G).

After participants received their survey questionnaire and were seated in the laboratory, they were asked to view one of the four, randomly selected videotaped scenarios. After all the participants viewed the video, they were asked to silently read the same set of three verbally aggressive messages that were shown in the video. After the participants read the first message, they were asked to rate five different statements, on a 7-point Likert-type scale, according to the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. These statements specified their perceptions of the message's (1) insult; (2) coerciveness; (3) discrimination; (4) inappropriateness; and (5) hostility. The same procedure was followed for the two subsequent messages.

Once the subjects all completed the first part of the questionnaire, they were asked to turn their attention toward the front of the room where two actors portrayed the distances first enacted in the video. After all participants observed this demonstration, they were asked to turn to the second part of the questionnaire which addressed distance. Participants read five statements regarding their perceptions of the inappropriateness, discomfort, unexpectedness, impropriety,

and abnormality of the distance between the two coworkers in the video.

Participants then rated these statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale, based on the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement.

Once all the participants completed the second part of the questionnaire, they were asked to re-view the video. After the videotaped scenario had been reviewed by all participants, they were asked to turn to the third part of the questionnaire and answer the corresponding five questions on a 7-point Likert-type scale according to the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. These statements regarded observers' perceptions of source's liability, accountability, blame, intentionality, and responsibility. After all the participants had completed the third part of the questionnaire, they were asked to complete the fourth part of the survey regarding gender, age, work experience, past experiences concerning sexual harassment (self and other), and also the degree to which they thought the video was realistic and/or true-to-life.

## Chapter III

### Results

#### *Verbal Aggressiveness Manipulation Check*

A five-item, seven-point Likert type scale was used to assess participants' perceptions of verbal aggressiveness for each of the three messages (average Cronbach alpha = .73). The verbal aggressiveness score was computed for each of the three messages by computing the mean of the five scores for each message, and then an overall aggressiveness score was computed by taking the mean of the three means. An independent sample t-test indicated a significant mean difference between the high verbal aggressiveness condition ( $M = 6.32$ ;  $SD = .67$ ) and the low verbal aggressiveness condition ( $M = 5.33$ ;  $SD = .90$ ),  $t = 5.76$ ,  $p < .001$ .

#### *Proxemic Violation Manipulation Check*

A five-item, seven-point Likert type scale was used to assess participants' perceptions of proxemic violation (alpha = .83). The proximity score was obtained by computing the mean of the five scores. An independent sample t-test revealed a significant mean difference between the proxemic violation condition ( $M = 5.20$ ;  $SD = 1.20$ ) and the non-proxemic violation condition ( $M = 3.48$ ;  $SD = 1.26$ ),  $t = 6.41$ ,  $p < .001$ .

### *Dependent Measure*

Research in the literature review indicated blame to be a unidimensional item. Thus, blameworthiness was assessed using a five-item, seven-point Likert type scale. However, the reliability coefficient was .49, which indicated a relatively low internal consistency among the five items in the present study. An item-to-item correlation matrix was obtained to investigate the degree to which those items correlated to each other. (See Table 1 for correlation matrix.)

Table 1  
Blameworthiness: Item to Item Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4
1 Liability				
2 Accountability	.49**			
3 Blame	.27*	.45**		
4 Intentionality	.08	.10	.07	
5 Responsibility	.05	-.03	-.01	.04

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

The correlation matrix indicated that the first three items were significantly correlated. However, items four and five were not correlated with any other item. A factor analysis was performed to further investigate the relationship among these five items. Results indicated significant factor loadings on the primary

blameworthiness component only for the first three items. Only the first three items were used to compute blameworthiness score in further analyses (alpha = .66).

### *Hypotheses*

Both hypotheses were tested with a 2 (low / high verbal aggressiveness) by 2 (no proxemic violation / proxemic violation) factorial analysis of variance performed on blameworthiness. Means and standard deviations are summarized in Table 2. Univariate analyses of variance were then probed.

Table 2

Blameworthiness by Verbal Aggressiveness and Proximity:  
Means and Standard Deviations

VA	PR	Blameworthiness	
		Mean	Standard Deviation
High	Violation	6.55	.58
	No Violation	6.54	.72
	Total	6.54	.64
Low	Violation	5.60	1.53
	No Violation	6.05	.91
	Total	5.84	1.24
Total	Violation	6.11	1.21
	No Violation	6.29	.85
	Total	6.20	1.04

### *Hypothesis 1*

The first hypothesis proposed that when messages are perceived as high in verbal aggressiveness, source blameworthiness will be rated higher than when messages are perceived as low in verbal aggressiveness. Results revealed a significant main effect of verbal aggressiveness on perceptions of blameworthiness,  $F(1, 80) = 11.4, p < .01, \eta^2 = .12$ . Therefore, consistent with Hypothesis 1, the message source was seen as more blameworthy when verbal aggressiveness was high than when verbal aggressiveness was low.

### *Hypothesis 2*

The second hypothesis predicted that when proxemic norms are violated, source blameworthiness will be rated higher than when proxemic norms are not violated. Results showed no significant effect of proxemic violation on blameworthiness.

### *Post Hoc Analyses*

Existing research indicates that males and females differ in their perceptual processes when making attributions. Henry and Meltzoff (1998) stated, "The most powerful and consistent variable that has been found to influence perceptions of sexual harassment is sex of the person who makes that judgment" (p. 255). Researchers concerned with gender and attributions of blame for sexual harassment situations (Kenig & Ryan, 1986) found that women are less likely than men to attribute responsibility for harassment to the victim.



Finally, Johnson and Workman (1994) noted the Calhoun, Selby, and Waring (1976) study which examined the issue of sex of subject. Male subjects indicated assaults were attributed to the victims' traits to a greater extent than did females. "In addition, the victim's behavior was seen as a cause for the assault significantly more by males than by females" (Johnson & Workman, 1994, p. 384).

### *Gender Effects*

Based on the research, it can be concluded that in sexual harassment situations, it is possible for observers' gender to influence perceptions. Therefore, gender effect was tested with a 2 (low / high verbal aggressiveness) by 2 (no proxemic violation / proxemic violation) by 2 (male / female) factorial analysis of variance. Results indicated a significant gender and verbal aggressiveness interaction effect,  $F(1,76) = 7.26, p < .01, \eta^2 = .07$ ; and a significant gender and proximity interaction effect,  $F(1,76) = 5.52, p < .05, \eta^2 = .05$ .

The gender by verbal aggressiveness interaction effect was further investigated by probing cell differences. A one-way analysis of variance was performed on blameworthiness with gender by verbal aggressiveness (male / high verbal aggressiveness; male / low verbal aggressiveness; female / high verbal aggressiveness; and female / low verbal aggressiveness) as an independent variable. Means and standard deviations are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3  
Blameworthiness by Gender and Verbal Aggressiveness:  
Means and Standard Deviations

Gender	VA	Blameworthiness	
		Mean	Standard Deviation
1 Male	High	6.78 <sup>a</sup>	.44
2 Male	Low	5.45 <sup>ab</sup>	1.62
3 Female	High	6.38 <sup>a</sup>	.71
4 Female	Low	6.11	.80
	Total	6.20	1.04

Note: Means having the same superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$ .

A Scheffe test indicated a significant difference between male participants in the high verbal aggressiveness condition and male participants in the low verbal aggressiveness condition. No significant differences were found among female participants in the high or low verbal aggressiveness conditions, and no significant differences were found between male and female participants in either high or low verbal aggressiveness conditions.

The gender by proxemic violation interaction effect was further investigated by a Scheffe test performed on blameworthiness. However, no significant effect for cell differences was found. Means and standard deviations are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4  
Blameworthiness by Gender and Proximity:  
Means and Standard Deviations

Gender	PR	Blameworthiness	
		Mean	Standard Deviation
1	Male Violation	5.71	1.72
2	Male No Violation	6.48	.80
3	Female Violation	6.36	.63
4	Female No Violation	6.15	.87
	Total	6.20	1.04

## Chapter IV

### Discussion

#### *Summary*

The primary concern of this investigation was to test the relationship between observers' perceptions of sources' communicative behaviors, in particular, verbally aggressive messages and proxemic violations, and attributions of source blameworthiness. The results from this study further demonstrate that there is a positive relationship between verbally aggressive messages and blame.

Hypothesis One, which examined the relationship between individuals' perceptions of verbally aggressive messages and corresponding attributions of source blameworthiness, was supported. In this study, it was found that blame decreases as verbal aggressiveness decreases. Results indicated that a receiver's perception of source blameworthiness is partly a function of a source's verbal behavior. More specifically, evidence was found which indicated that the message itself is not what affects a receiver's perceptions of source blameworthiness. Source blameworthiness appears to be affected by the receiver's interpretation and evaluation of the message, and subsequently, how that message affects the perceiver's feelings and emotions.

One interesting finding in this investigation was the much smaller difference between high and low verbal aggressiveness scores as compared to that scored in the pilot study. Although three low verbally aggressive messages were

selected from the pilot study, these messages were perceived as being relatively high in the main study ( $M = 5.33$ ), as compared to the pilot study ( $M = 3.16$ ). A possible explanation for this difference is that the participants in the main study viewed the videotaped scenario, which might have depicted a more vivid illustration of these messages for the observers, whereas the participants in the pilot study only read the messages. No contextual indicators were given to the participants in the pilot study, which might have influenced their responses. In sexual harassment situations, this could mean that when messages are taken out of context, the evaluations and interpretations of those messages will be greatly affected. The implication for sexual harassment cases is that messages cannot be taken out of context without serious consequences.

However, although the difference between the two levels of verbally aggressive messages was minimized in the main study, statistically significant reductions in blame were still found. This is an important finding with regard to receivers' perceptions. For instance, even the slightest variation in how an individual feels about a message, how that message affects his or her emotions and psychological response, significantly affects attributions of the source. People can detect subtle differences in messages, they are affected by their interpretations of those messages, and finally they base their attributions of the source on their interpretations and feelings about those messages. Thus, attributions are based on the different cues available to the receiver.

One limitation of this study might be that each verbal message in the study was not only found to be verbally aggressive, but was also found to have sexual content. Perhaps as long as messages have sexual content, the source is evaluated as being more liable, more accountable, and more blameworthy. Therefore, no clear distinction can be drawn for verbally aggressive and sexually explicit messages. It would be important, and interesting, for researchers to focus future investigations on manipulating sexually explicit messages as compared to verbally aggressive messages with sexual content. For example, researchers could operationalize variables by using sexually explicit messages with the same content, but adding a politeness cue at the end of the message (i.e. "please", "if you don't mind") to test the impact that these cues have on the receivers.

Another question that needs to be addressed, possibly in future research, is to what extent does blame decrease, when messages are perceived as low or even neutral in sexual content? Due to the higher verbal aggressiveness ratings regarding the messages, this study did not answer or address that issue. Also, the issue of gender needs to be investigated in future research. Why did males attribute significantly less blame to the source in the low verbal aggressive / proxemic violation condition than the low verbal aggressive / no proxemic violation condition? One possible explanation lies in the design of the manipulation. The female receiver in the videotaped scenarios, was instructed prior to taping, not to react or respond, either by changes in her facial expressions or by verbal reactions. This lack of response to an initial encounter might be the

reason for the difference in participants' responses. Perhaps this suggests that male participants identified with the male source. While putting themselves in his place, they believed that even though the source's behavior was intentional and he, alone, was responsible for his behavior, without a direct confrontation or reaction from the receiver, less blame should be imputed to the source. In this case, the participants were equating blameworthiness with eventual physical consequence or punishment. Why should he be punished or suffer negative consequences if she did not acknowledge her discomfort or negative feelings associated with his behavior? In fact, during the debriefing of participants, this very issue was raised by more than three male participants in different conditions.

No evidence was found to support Hypothesis Two, and this could partly be a result of overwhelming nature of the verbally aggressive message. Results seemed to indicate such high scores for the verbal message, that participants perhaps having compared the verbal messages to the nonverbal behavior of proxemic violations, felt that in this type of situation proximity violations did not matter as much as the verbal aggressiveness. It was surprisingly found that in the low verbal aggressiveness and proxemic violation condition, participants rated the source significantly lower in blame than in the low verbal aggressiveness and no proxemic violation condition. Once again, one reasonable explanation for this could lie in the receiver's lack of response to the behavior. It is possible that observers felt that when the message was low in verbal aggressiveness and the source approached the receiver within her "interpersonal, intimate space" as

defined by Hall (1968), and she did not show any verbal or nonverbal signs of threat or discomfort, her lack of reaction/response was interpreted by the observers as an acceptance or positive evaluation of the behavior.

Although the literature suggests that intent, responsibility and blame are all connected and build on each other in the perceptual processes of the attribution of blame, intent and responsibility were not correlated with the other three elements of blameworthiness: liability, accountability, and blame. This finding deserves further attention from researchers.

The implications of this study suggest a need for more research in the area of source characteristics. In particular, researchers should focus on sexual harassment situations where the source is blamed even though the messages were perceived to be neutral or low in verbal aggressiveness. Also, more research should focus on investigating the reasons why male observers more so than female observers attribute lower scores of blameworthiness to sources of verbally aggressive messages.



Appendices

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Pilot Study Questionnaire .....	39
B	Informational Sheet .....	40
C	Low Verbal Aggressiveness Instrument .....	41
D	High Verbal Aggressiveness Instrument .....	42
E	Proxemic Violation Instrument .....	43
F	Blameworthiness Instrument .....	44
G	General Information .....	45

## Appendix A

### Pilot Study Questionnaire

Please rank the following statements on a scale from 1 to 7 by circling the appropriate number. (*1 being low in verbal aggressiveness, 4 being medium in verbal aggressiveness, and 7 being high in verbal aggressiveness*).

If a person, male or female, says to you...

- |     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1)  | You will lose your job if you don't have sex with me.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2)  | If you would wear those pants a little tighter, I might consider giving you a raise.                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3)  | Hey bitch, I'll make your life a living hell if you don't come in my office now and do what I want. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4)  | If you sleep with me, I'll give you a pay raise.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5)  | If you don't give me what I want, I will take it.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6)  | I'd like to take you home tonight and fuck you.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7)  | Hey baby, you're ass looks great.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8)  | You've got some really huge breasts.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9)  | I want your body.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10) | I hate your mind, but I love your body.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11) | Your ass looks really good.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12) | Can I just touch your ass.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13) | Nice body, have you been working out.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14) | You need to be with a real man/woman.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15) | Right here, right now.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16) | Wide load.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 17) | Hey sexy, nice outfit.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 18) | Has anyone ever told you that you have a nice body.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## Appendix B

### Marshall University Department of Communication Studies

#### Informational Sheet

This research project is designed to investigate communication processes and peoples' understanding of verbal and nonverbal communication. As a part of this research project, you will be asked to provide some information regarding how you perceive various communication behaviors in specific situations.

If you would like to obtain extra credit points for your participation in this study, a separate sign-up sheet is provided. The sign-up sheet will be given to the appropriate professor, and no names will be kept on file for this project.

Please understand that you may ask questions and may stop participating at any time without any penalties. Your answers will be confidential, and will only be used by the Department of Communication Studies of Marshall University for research purposes.

Thank you for your time and participation.

## Appendix C

### Low Verbal Aggressiveness Instrument

After you have read the scenario and watched the videotape, please rate each of the following three messages by circling a number from 1-7 that best describes the degree to which you agree / disagree with the statements listed under each message. (1 = Strongly Disagree; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Strongly Agree).

<b>"Nice body, have you been working out."</b>		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>		<b>Neutral</b>			<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
1)	This message insulted the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2)	The receiver of this message felt coerced.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3)	This message discriminated against the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4)	This message was inappropriate for the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5)	This message was hostile toward the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

---

<b>"Has anyone ever told you that you have a nice body."</b>		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>		<b>Neutral</b>			<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
6)	This message insulted the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7)	The receiver of this message felt coerced.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8)	This message discriminated against the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9)	This message was inappropriate for the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10)	This message was hostile toward the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

---

<b>"Hey sexy, nice outfit."</b>		<b>Strongly Disagree</b>		<b>Neutral</b>			<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
11)	This message insulted the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12)	The receiver of this message felt coerced.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13)	This message discriminated against the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14)	This message was inappropriate for the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15)	This message was hostile toward the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix D

### High Verbal Aggressiveness Instrument

After you have read the scenario and watched the videotape, please rate each of the following three messages by circling a number from 1-7 that best describes the degree to which you agree / disagree with the statements listed under each message. (1 = Strongly Disagree; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Strongly Agree).

"Hey bitch, I'll make your life a living hell if you don't come in my office now and do what I want."

	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
1) This message insulted the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2) The receiver of this message felt coerced.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3) This message discriminated against the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4) This message was inappropriate for the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5) This message was hostile toward the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

---

"You will lose your job if you don't have sex with me."

	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
6) This message insulted the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7) The receiver of this message felt coerced.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8) This message discriminated against the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9) This message was inappropriate for the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10) This message was hostile toward the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

---

"If you don't give me what I want, I will take it."

	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
11) This message insulted the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12) The receiver of this message felt coerced.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13) This message discriminated against the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14) This message was inappropriate for the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15) This message was hostile toward the receiver.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix E

### Proxemic Violation Instrument

After observing the distance between the two actors, please respond to the **videotaped** scenario. Rate the following statements from 1-7 according to the degree to which you agree / disagree. (1 = Strongly Disagree; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Strongly Agree).

	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
16) She thought/felt the distance between herself and the other person was appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17) She felt uncomfortable with the distance between herself and the other person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18) The amount of space between the two employees was expected by her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19) She thought that the amount of space between herself and the other employee was improper.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20) She felt/thought that the distance between herself and the other employee was not normal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix F

### **Blameworthiness Instrument**

After reviewing the video, please rate each of the following statements by circling a number from 1-7 that best describes the degree to which you agree / disagree. (1 = Strongly Disagree; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Strongly Agree).

	Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21) The male employee should be held liable by the female.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22) The female employee should hold the male accountable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23) The female employee should blame the male.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24) The male's communication behavior was intentional.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25) The male employee is responsible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Appendix G

### **General Information**

Please rate each of the following statements by circling a number from 1-7 that best describes the degree to which you agree / disagree. (1 = Strongly Disagree; 4 = Neutral; 7 = Strongly Agree).

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26) The video depicted possible real-life situations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 27) The videotaped scenario was realistic.            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Please provide the following demographic information.

- |   |            |              |
|---|------------|--------------|
| 28) What is your gender?  | Male _____ | Female _____ |
| 29) Age?  | _____      |              |
| 30) Have you had any work experience?   | Yes _____  | No _____     |
| 31) Have you ever known someone, yourself included, who has been the victim of sexual harassment? | Yes _____  | No _____     |



## References

Abramson, J. (1992, October). Reversal of fortune: Image of Anita Hill, brighter in hindsight, galvanizes campaigns. The Wall Street Journal, p1.

Altman, I. (1975). The environment and social behavior. Monterey, CA: Brooks & Cole.

Anderson, P. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (1998). An empirical comparison of three theories of nonverbal immediacy exchange. Human Communication Research, 24, p 1-35.

Andrews, P. H. (1987). Gender differences in persuasive communication and attributions of success and failure. Human Communication Research, 13, p372-385.

Bingham, S. (1991). Communication strategies for managing sexual harassment in organizations: Understanding message options and their effects. Journal of Applied Communication Research. 1 & 2, p 88-115.

Bingham, S. G. (1994). Conceptualizing sexual harassment as discursive practice. (Ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Bradac, J. J., Hosman, L. A., & Tardy, C. H. (1978). Reciprocal disclosures and language intensity: Attributional consequences. Communication Monographs, 45, p1-17.

Burgoon, J. K. (1982). Privacy and communication. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication yearbook, 6, (pp.206-249). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., & Woodall, W. G. (1989). Nonverbal communication: The unspoken dialogue. NY:NY Harper & Row, Publishers.

Burgoon, J. K., & Jones, S. B. (1976). Toward a theory of personal space expectations and their violations. Human Communication Research, 2, pp 131-146.

Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. Communication Monographs, 55, p 58-79.

Buttny, R. (1993). Social accountability in communication. London: SAGE Publications.

Calhoun, L., Selby, J., & Waring, L. (1976). Social perception of the victim's causal role in rape: An exploratory examination of four factors. Human Relations, 29, p517-526.

Cockburn, C. (1991). In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Edmonds, E., & Cahoon, D. (1986). Attitudes concerning crimes related to clothing worn by female victims. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 24, p444-446.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, (1990). Policy guidance on current issues of sexual harassment, (Notice M-915-050). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. Journal of Vocational Behavior 32, p152-175.

Forsterling, F. (1988). Attribution theory in clinical psychology. NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Frandsen, K. D., & Clement, D. A. (1984). The functions of human communication in informing: Communicating and processing information. In C. C. Arnold & J. W. Bowers (Eds.), Handbook of rhetorical and communication theory (p338-399). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Geen, R. G., & Donnerstein, E. I. (Eds.), (1983). Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews (Vol. 1). NY: Academic Press.

Greenberg, B. S. (1976). The effects of language intensity modification on perceived verbal aggressiveness. Communication Monographs, 43, p130-139.

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

Hall, E. T. (1959). The silent language. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1968). Proxemics. Current Anthropology, 9, p83.

Harvey, J. H. (1987). Attributions in close relationships: Research and theoretical development. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 5, p420-434.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. NY: Wiley Publications.

Henry, J., & Meltzoff, J. (1998). Perceptions of sexual harassment as a function of target's response type and observer's sex. Sex Roles, 39, p253-271.

Hickson, M. L. III, & Stacks, D. W. (1985). Nonverbal communication studies and applications. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Horgan, D., & Reeder, G. (1986). Sexual harassment: The eye of the beholder. Journal of the American Association of Occupational Health Nurses, 34, p83-86.

Hudson Institute, (1987). Workforce 2: Work and workers for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Department of Labor.

Ifert, D. E., & Bearden, L. (1998). The influence of argumentativeness and verbal aggression of responses to refused requests. Communication Reports, 11, p145-155.

Infante, D. A., & Wigley III, C. J. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. Communication Monographs, 53, p61-69.

Jaschik-Herman, M. L., & Fisk, A. (1995). Women's perceptions and labeling of sexual harassment in academia before and after the Hill-Thomas hearings. Sex Roles Journal, 33, p439-446.

Jaspars, J., Fincham, F. D., & Hewstone, M. (Eds.). (1983). Attribution theory and research: Conceptual, developmental and social dimensions. London: Academic Press.

Jensen, I., & Gutek, B. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38, p121-136.

Johnson, K.P., & Workman, J. E. (1994). Blaming the victim: Attributions concerning sexual harassment based on clothing, just-world belief, and sex of subject. Family & Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 22, p19-23.

Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In Leonard Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Academic Press.

Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1972). The actor and observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E. E. Jones, D. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins and B. Weiner (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

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, p535-549.

Knapp, M. L. (1978). Nonverbal communication in human interaction. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). NY, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kreps, G. L. (1993). Sexual harassment: Communication implications. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

LaFrance, M., & Mayo, D. (1978). Cultural aspects of nonverbal communication. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2, p71-89.

Langelan, M. J. (1993). Back off: How to confront and stop sexual harassment and harassers. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Langer, E. (1978). Rethinking the role of thought in social interaction. In J. H. Harvey, W. J. Ickes & R. F. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research. (Vol. 2, p35-58, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Langer, E. J., & Ember, L. (1980). Role of mindlessness in the perception of deviance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, p360-367.

Leathers, D. G. (1997). Successful nonverbal communication: Principles and applications. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Littlejohn, S. W. (1999). Theories of Human Communication (6<sup>th</sup> Edition). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Madden, T. R. (1987). Women versus women. NY: American Management Association.

Manusov, V. (1990). An application of attribution principles to nonverbal behavior in romantic dyads. Communication Monographs, 57, p104-117.

Mathes, E., & Kempher, S. (1976). Clothing as a nonverbal communicator of sexual attitudes and behavior. Home Economics Research Journal, 43, p495-498.

Mazelan, P. (1980). Stereotypes and perceptions of the victims of rape. Victimology: An International Journal, 5, p121-132.

Mongeau, P. A., Hale, J. I., and Alles, M. (1994). An experimental investigation of accounts and attributions following sexual infidelity.

Communication Monographs, 61, p326-344.

Powell, G. N. (1986). Effects of sex role identity and sex on definitions of sexual harassment, Sex Roles, 14, pp 9-19.

Reardon, K. K. (1991). Persuasion in practice. London: Sage Publications.

Richards, L., Rollerson, B., & Phillips, J. (1991). Perceptions of submissiveness: Implications for victimization. Journal of Psychology, 125, p407-411.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, (Whole No. 60).

Shaver, K. G. (1985). The attribution of blame: Causality, responsibility and blameworthiness. NY: Springer-Verlag.

Sillars, A. L. (1980). Attributions and communication in roommate conflicts. Communication Monographs, 47, p180-200.

Simons, G. F., & Weissman, G. D. (1990). Men and women: Partners at work. Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications, Inc.

Tangri, S. S., Burt, M. R., & Johnson, L. B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38, p33-54.

Taylor, P., & Daly, C. (1995). Gender dilemmas in social work: Issues affecting women in the profession. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Terpestra, D. E., & Cook, S. E. (1985). Complainant characteristics and reported behaviors and consequences associated with formal sexual harassment charges. Personnel Psychology, 38, p559-574.

Teven, J. J., Martin, M. M., & Neupauer, N. C. (1998). Sibling relationships: Verbally aggressive messages and their effect on relational satisfaction. Communication Reports, 11, p179-191.

U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981). Sexual harassment in every day life. NY: Pandora Press.

Wolfson, N. (1997). Hate speech, sex speech, free speech. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Workman, J., & Johnson, K. (1991). The role of cosmetics in attributions concerning sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 24, p759-769.