

UNIVERSITY OF DERBY

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN HIGHER
EDUCATION:**

A FEMINIST POSTSTRUCTURALIST APPROACH

Helen Clarke

Doctor of Philosophy

2012

DL 8168128 3



Abstract

This study focuses upon the relatively unexplored area of sexual harassment in British universities. In sum, the thesis suggests that although MacKinnon's (2004) aim is to enable women to feel more powerful and less stigmatised, the contribution of feminist harassment discourses may, in part, generate in some women an understanding of powerlessness and vulnerability. In particular, it suggests seemingly prevailing discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education and considers if and how the women interviewed define themselves through these discourses. Thus, by exploring the power effects of and resistances to these suggested prevailing discourses, it is possible to infer the degree to which these discourses may have constituted the participants' subjectivities. Further, the thesis argues that feminist harassment discourses may have generated specific effects of power with regard to my participants. That is to say, many of my participants seem to understand sexual harassment as exploitative behaviours rooted in the unequal distribution of ascribed power in higher education. Feminism's understanding of power as a static and gendered appears to have generated for the participants, at least in part, the understanding that sex at work is used to humiliate and degrade women, maintaining and reproducing ascribed notions of power.

For this research, twenty-four unstructured interviews were carried out with women who had identified themselves as having experienced sexual harassment within higher education, either as a student or a member of staff, or who had witnessed events they had defined as sexual harassment. This was a passionately interested form of inquiry, recognising the partial nature of knowledge *and* identifying my political positionings (Gill 1995; Aranda 2006). The analysis is Foucauldian oriented, understanding power as fluid – rather than possessed – and as generating particular ways of being. In addition, although it notes that the participants did resist specific effects of power, this resistance always takes place from a new point of power and does not, therefore, carry us beyond power into a power free space. The prevailing discourses suggested from my data are: the 'grades for sex' discourse; the 'all boys together' discourse; the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse; the 'knickers in a twist' discourse; and the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse.

Supervisors: Dr. Kristin Aune and Dr. Gordon Riches

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr. Kristin Aune and Dr. Gordon Riches, for their continuous advice, guidance and support. I am grateful to my wife, my friends and my family and would particularly like to acknowledge the twenty-four women who were willing to be involved in this research.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
1 Chapter One: Introduction	5
2 Chapter Two: Literature Review	10
2.0 Introduction	10
2.1 Quantitative Research on Sexual Harassment	11
2.2 Qualitative Research on Sexual Harassment	19
2.3 Structural Mechanisms of Sexual Harassment in Higher Education	22
2.4 Competing Models of Student-Lecturer Relationships	26
2.4.1 Student-Lecturer Relationships as Exploitative	27
2.4.2 Student-Lecturer Relationships as Beneficial	28
2.5 Feminist Theories of Sexual Harassment	32
2.6 Women-Centred Definitions of Sexual Harassment	38
2.7 Legal Definitions of Sexual Harassment	54
2.8 Implementing Sexual Harassment Policies	62
2.9 What is Discourse?	65
2.10 Discourse and Power	66
2.11 Foucault and Resistance	69
2.12 The Discursive Construction of Subjectivity	72
2.13 Foucault and Liberal Feminism	74
2.14 Conclusion	79
3 Chapter Three: Epistemology, Methodology and Methods	80
3.0 Introduction	80
3.1 Epistemology	82
3.1.1 Critiquing Traditional Constructions of Knowledge	83
3.1.2 Standpoint Epistemology	85
3.1.3 Criticisms of Standpoint Epistemology	86
3.1.4 A Passionately Interested Form of Inquiry	88
3.1.5 My Principled Positions	90
3.1.6 Feminism and Foucault	93
3.2 Methodology	96
3.2.1 What is Foucauldian-Oriented Research?	96
3.2.2 Reflexivity as Care of the Self	98

3.3	Methods	103
3.3.1	Unstructured Interviews	104
3.3.2	Interview Sample and Access	107
3.3.3	Ethics	110
3.3.4	Anonymity and Informed Consent	110
3.3.5	Sharing my Position and its Effect on the Research	113
3.3.6	How can Foucauldian-Oriented Research be Analysed?	115
3.3.6.1	<i>Step One: Know Your Data</i>	117
3.3.6.2	<i>Step Two: Considering the Identification of Themes, Categories and Objects of Discourse</i>	118
3.3.6.3	<i>Step Three: Exploring Indications of Inter-Relationships between the Discourses</i>	119
3.3.6.4	<i>Step Four: Exploring the Deployment of Discursive Strategies</i>	120
3.3.6.5	<i>Step Five: Suggesting Absences and Silences</i>	121
3.3.6.6	<i>Step Six: Suggesting Instances of Resistance and Counter Resistance</i>	121
3.3.6.7	<i>Step Seven: Exploring the Effects of Discourse</i>	122
3.3.7	Conducting Reflexive Research	123
3.3.8	Using Field Notes	125
3.3.9	Researching Sensitive Issues	127
3.4	Conclusion	130
4	Chapter Four: Exploring the Effects of and Resistances to Suggested Prevailing Discourses Surrounding Sexual Harassment in Higher Education	132
4.0	Introduction	132
4.1	The 'Grades for Sex' Discourse	135
4.2	The 'All Boys Together' Discourse	152
4.3	The 'Trustworthy Lecturer' Discourse	177
4.4	The 'Knickers in a Twist' Discourse	192
4.5	The 'Sexual Harassment as Unwanted Sexual Behaviour' Discourse	204
4.6	Conclusion	223
5	Chapter Five: Conclusion	225
	References	232
	Appendix : Certificate of Informed Consent	262
	Appendix: Tabular Presentation of Previous Studies on Sexual Harassment	263

1. Chapter One: Introduction

In the last few decades, there has been a wealth of quantitative and qualitative research on sexual harassment in higher education. Mostly from a feminist perspective, this research tends to view power as static: men have power, women do not. Furthermore, as gendered power, this is often thought to be above and beyond organisational or formal power. For example, Grauerholz (1989) argues that a male student may seek to sexually harass a female lecturer on the basis of his gendered power. Other feminist researchers argue that the structural conditions of higher education may reproduce and maintain male power (e.g. Carter and Jeffs 1995; Ramazanoglu 1987). Although sexual harassment is not a 'new' social issue, liberal feminism often claims to have 'discovered' the exploitative behaviours. Thus, feminism often argues that sexual harassment is an abuse of power, deployed to humiliate and degrade women and is both a cause and a consequence of gender inequality and wide spread sexism (Gutek 1985; Stockdale 1993; Gutek 2001).

Conversely, Foucault argued that power is not something possessed. Rather, it is exercised over and through men and women and, as such, we are all caught in the subjectifying effects of power (Foucault 1980c). Power, therefore, operates through human beings, investing in us our sense of selves, constituting us as active and self-aware beings (Foucault 1980b). Thus, we are produced as subjects through the power effects of modern discourses. Here, discourse is defined as generating particular effects of power, producing in us our understanding of our sense of who we are and our relationships with others.

Discourse goes beyond the designation of objects: it produces the objects, shaping them and generates our understanding of them (Foucault 1991a). Although Foucault does identify the realm of the non-discursive, we can only speak of and understand the object once it enters discourse (Foucault 1991d). Thus, for Foucault, the role of power is not to repress discourse but to produce it. Contemporary discourses operating as 'truth' permeate our consciousnesses and produce certain power effects. In seeking to be our 'true' selves, we subject ourselves to increasing power and, thus, we are active in our own subjectification (Foucault 1980b). Power is exercised as a 'conduct of conduct': a productive set of relations which guide and shape our behaviours. Thus, it is power that makes us capable of resistance and gives us the ability to recast and re-understand previously held 'truths'. However, when we refuse a way of being, or resist an effect of power, we do so from a new discourse and therefore a new point of power. As such, resistance does not take us beyond power and carries with it its own problematics (Foucault 1998).

Bearing the above in mind, the aim of this research is to suggest seemingly prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and to consider if and how my participants define themselves through these discourses. That is to say, to explore the power effects of and resistances to these suggested discourses. By investigating how my participants understand their experiences, it is possible to infer the degree to which prevailing discourses have constituted their subjectivities.

To this end, I conducted twenty-four unstructured interviews with women who had identified themselves as having experienced sexual harassment in higher education, either as a student or a member of staff, or who had witnessed behaviours they had defined as sexual harassment. This research is based on a passionately interested form of inquiry: acknowledging the partial nature of knowledge and citing my own concerns and values. This forms 'new vocabulary' of values, enabling political intervention (Gill 1995). The analysis is Foucauldian: a genealogical approach exploring particular grids of intelligibility.

Having introduced the research in this chapter, Chapter Two of this thesis provides a review of the literature pertaining to the sexual harassment of female students by male lecturers in higher education. The review explores competing understandings of sexual harassment in higher education, including liberal feminist definitions, women centred definitions and legal definitions. In particular, it critiques liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment and their notions of power as static and gendered. It argues that further research is needed to explore the seemingly prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and the effects of and resistances to these discourses.

Chapter Three discusses my epistemology, methodology and methods. The epistemology section sets out my principled positions and argues that a passionately interested form of inquiry, one which enables scepticism and political interventions, is an appropriate construction of knowledge from feminist base. The methodology discusses the processes of reflexive practice and the practicalities of conducting ethical, genealogical research. In the methods

section, my interview sample and the procedures for conducting unstructured interviews are discussed. Overall, it is argued that restructuring the will to know as the desire for *not knowing* enables ethical, feminist research (e.g. Lather 2006; Davies 2002).

Chapter Four suggests prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and explores the power effects of, and resistances to, these discourses. In particular, it suggests that feminist discourses surrounding sexual harassment, especially those pertaining to liberal feminism, may generate specific effects of power with regard to my research participants. In fostering the notion of the powerful male and the powerless female, and highlighting the perceived unequal distribution of power within higher education, this chapter proposes that feminism, amongst other bodies of thought, may have generated, in part, a sense of vulnerability within my participants. The five discourses to be identified from my data are: the 'grades for sex' discourse; the 'all boys together' discourse; the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse; the 'knickers in a twist' discourse; and, finally, the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse. This final suggested discourse appears to feature the most within my participants narratives and with the most effect. It is noted that other discourses may also operate and this would require further data collection

Finally, chapter six, the conclusion, reiterates my suggestion that feminist harassment discourses may have generated specific effects of power with regard to my research participants. In particular, many of my participants seem to understand sexual harassment to be exploitative behaviour, often intended to

humiliate and degrade, located within the power differentials of higher education. With these points in mind, therefore, let us move to chapter two and the literature review.

2. Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter One, the aim of this research is to explore the seemingly prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and to consider if and how my participants define themselves through these discourses. To this end, this literature review explores the competing models of sexual harassment in higher education, including contradictory theories of power. This chapter utilises a Foucauldian analysis to critique liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment and provide the foundation for my own research. In particular, the literature review argues that liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment tend to view power as static: men have power; women do not (MacKinnon 1979; Wise and Stanley 1987). A Foucauldian perspective, on the other hand, views power as something exercised over and through both men and women and, as a result, we are all caught in the subjectifying effects of power (Foucault 1980c). The power effects of sexual harassment discourses constitute men and women into understanding themselves in particular ways. As such, the literature review argues that further research is needed to explore the relationships between seemingly prevailing discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education and the power effects of, and resistances to, these discourses. Therefore, within this research, discourse is defined as contingent and arbitrary, producing specific effects in our thinking and understanding of ourselves (Foucault 1991a).

Chapter Four will explore the above points further with reference to my own research data, but for now the literature review starts by considering existing quantitative and qualitative research on sexual harassment in higher education in order to provide a backdrop for my doctoral research. The literature review then explores structural understandings of sexual harassment in higher education and two competing models of student-lecturer sexual relationships. Liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment, including women-centred definitions, and legal definitions of sexual harassment, including the difficulties involved in implementing sexual harassment and equal opportunity policies, will be explored. Foucault's notion of power and resistance will be applied to the liberal feminist theories discussed above and the literature review will argue that prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education constitute men and women into thinking of themselves in particular ways. Firstly, therefore, let us consider the major quantitative studies on sexual harassment in higher education.

2.1 Quantitative Research into Sexual Harassment in Higher Education

Quantitative research into sexual harassment in higher education is predominately feminist based and, for the most part, the concepts of power tend to be gendered in focus: men wielding power over women. This section will explore the major studies of quantitative research into sexual harassment in higher education, starting with the United States where the bulk of the research has been published, and then considering quantitative research carried out in the United Kingdom. Where possible, these studies are presented in

chronological order, setting the research in its specific academic context. It should be noted that although this thesis focuses on (mostly feminist) research into sexual harassment in higher education, Appendix One details the major studies on sexual harassment in general from a variety of theoretical positionings. This section will highlight the contradictory nature of the knowledge proposed in these quantitative studies and will lead into the section on qualitative research.

In 1980, Till, on behalf of the US National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, argued that Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments could be invoked to prohibit the sexual harassment of students. One hundred and ninety-two responses from college campuses were received, detailing the following: thirty-eight allegations of generalised sexist remarks or behaviour; eighty-one allegations of inappropriate and offensive remarks; thirty-four allegations of solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behaviour by the promise of rewards; ninety-two allegations of coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment; and eighteen allegations of sexual assault. It was noted that many women did not perceive the same event in the same way and often defined sexual harassment and sexual assault using different terminology¹ (Till 1980).

Following a 1979 trial and subsequent acquittal of male students accused of sexually assaulting female peers, Lott et al. (1982) surveyed the university

¹ Victim-centred definitions are an important aspect of this research and will be discussed separately below.

population (students, faculty and staff) regarding their experiences of sexual assault, intimidation or insult. Thirteen per cent of the respondents reported knowing at least one person who had been assaulted on campus (although, of course, the anonymous nature of the survey means that we do not know if these reports are independent of each other). In twenty-five per cent of these cases, more than one assailant was involved. Male victims of assault made up three per cent of this total (Lott et al. 1982).

In the same year, research carried out by Benson and Thompson (1982) suggested that between twenty and thirty per cent of female students reported at least one incident of sexual harassment during their time at university and, a year later, Adams et al. (1983) found that thirteen per cent of women and three per cent of men had avoided taking specific lectures with a faculty member who was known, or rumoured, to have made sexual advances to students. In addition, three per cent of both men and women reported experiencing sexual propositions and two per cent had experienced sexual bribery. None of these respondents had reported their experiences (Adams et al. 1983). It is noted that these figures are substantially lower than those reported by Benson and Thompson (1982). Dziech and Weiner's (1984) research, however, suggests that thirty per cent of female students had been harassed by a male faculty member. In addition, they argue that 'harassment' represents a misuse of power and, given that faculty members maintain more structural power than students, it is not surprising that students are often victims of this sort of abuse (Dziech and Weiner 1984: 24, 34). However, the concept of power, and who is

considered more likely to hold it, is disputed.

As noted above, relationships of power, those who are structurally configured as holding power and those who are not, are contested within feminist research. Fitzgerald et al. (1988), for example, asked male faculty members from a prestigious university about social and sexual interactions among students and faculty. Many of the results are in line with the above research: thirty-seven per cent of the male faculty members admitted attempting to initiate personal relationships with female students, with forty per cent of this behaviour directed exclusively towards female students; twenty-five per cent of male faculty members stated that they had dated students or engaged in sexual relationships with them, and eleven per cent noted that they had attempted to 'stroke, caress or touch' female students. However, in addition to these results, six per cent of male faculty members stated that they themselves had been sexually harassed by their female students (Fitzgerald et al. 1988: 332). Here, Fitzgerald expands upon the concept of power from a more traditional model of lecturers holding formal institutional power over students to a model in which students may also hold power over their lecturers.

Grauerholz (1989) takes this argument further and states that although lecturers often are sexually harassed by their students, this is much more likely to involve male students harassing their female lecturers. Grauerholz states that most harassment research has focused on abuse directed towards subordinates when, in actuality, female lecturers are vulnerable to sexist comments, sexual harassment and sexual assault from their male students, regardless of the

lecturers' formal organisational power. This is termed 'contrapower harassment' and Grauerholz argues that dynamics of power are more likely to operate on the basis of gender than through organisational structures.² A male student attempting to assert his gendered dominance and authority may seek to sexually harass a female lecturer, thus challenging her organisational power. Grauerholz (1989) surveyed two hundred and eight female lecturers and nearly half (47.6%) reported sexual comments, jokes, sexual bribery or assault, and the majority of these (59.1%) had experienced two or more of these behaviours. These experiences included the following: eighteen per cent experiencing obscene phone calls believed to be from students; two per cent experiencing physical advances from students; and three per cent experiencing explicit sexual propositions. She notes that male students are far more likely than female students to engage in these behaviours. This, according to Grauerholz, is evidence that contrapower harassment - power formed on the basis of one's gender rather than one's organisational position - exists in higher education (Grauerholz 1989: 790, 793).

The above concept of sexual harassment on the basis of gendered rather than organisational power is also present in Roosmalen (1999). Here it is argued that sexual harassment is a 'hazard to women's health' and that gendered power relations exist in higher education. Although this research concentrates mostly on the experiences of female students, it also states that harassment can come from 'peers and subordinates who may resent women's presence in the workplace, classroom or field of study'. In this sense, Roosmalen argues

² Gendered power versus organisational power will be discussed further below.

that the power dynamics involved in the sexual harassment may be gendered in focus rather than organisational. In addition, the health hazards of sexual harassment may, it is argued, result in lost productivity, limited future opportunities, lost autonomy, headaches, neck and backache, stomach problems, anxiety, hypertension and even 'risks to life itself' (Roosmalen 1999: 37, 40). This focus on the effects of sexual harassment and its impact on the victims' studies is explored in much feminist research.

Brandenburg (1982) argues that students are particularly vulnerable to sexual harassment and that the impact upon them can be especially severe. Fear of academic reprisals (poor grades, failed modules or exams, bad references, denied recommendations, etc.) can discourage a student from reporting sexually harassing behaviours. Following this, in 1997, research by Rubin et al. explored academics' perceptions of sexual harassment and the likely impact this behaviour would have on female students. It considers the research of Fitzgerald (1988), discussed above, and asks whether professors had ever attempted to 'stroke, caress or touch' a student. This was found to be a somewhat problematic question: categories including 'stroking' or 'caressing' were seen by the respondents to be of an obviously sexual nature. However, 'touching' was considered to be a behaviour which easily falls into platonic or legitimate categories. For example, a lecturer may hug a student or touch his or her arm in a supportive manner. That said, Rubin et al. note that discussions of a personal or sexual nature should be kept out of supervisory or mentor-type relationships. A breach of trust in these relationships may be particularly harmful to the professional development of the student and, therefore, care

should be taken to maintain professional boundaries within supervision or lecturer-student relationships (Rubin et al. 1997: 766-767).

The study by Rubin et al. (1997) focuses on the effect of sexual harassment on academic standards. However, some research also explores the psychological and emotional impact of sexual harassment. For example, Huerta (2006) notes that female students who are sexually harassed often experience psychological distress, physical illness and disordered eating, leading to a disengagement from their studies and subsequent decline in academic performance (Huerta 2006: 624). Fisher et al. (2010) argue that violence and sexual harassment towards female students are often part of everyday university life and that many female students have to cope with being viewed as sexual objects, potentially negatively influencing their self-esteem and perceptions of academic ability (Fisher 2010: 2, 85, 107). Although the above quantitative research was conducted within the US, research has also been carried out within the UK.

Quantitative data on sexual harassment in UK universities are somewhat limited. However, a study in Durham University (1992 cited in Collier 1995) suggested that more than two thirds of women students had experienced unwanted sexual attention. Wilson's (2000) survey of two hundred and thirty-six students (one hundred and forty-three females and ninety-three males) at a Scottish university found that female students were much more likely to be sexually harassed by male students than by male lecturers. However, forty students (thirty women and ten men) reported being aware of sexual harassment between staff and students: almost one tenth of the sample

reported 'subtle pressure' for sexual activity from male members of staff and nearly eight per cent had received or witnessed explicit, unwanted sexual advances. In addition, forty-three per cent of the students had witnessed male staff stereotyping female students in a sexually derogative manner and seventy-seven per cent of students had seen male teaching staff making negative remarks or jokes about female students (Wilson 2000: 178-179).

In 2010, the National Union of Students (NUS) published a study of female students' experiences of physical and sexual violence. This online survey of two thousand and fifty-eight women found that female students often experienced a range of 'everyday' verbal and non-verbal harassment, stalking, and physical and sexual assault. For example, one in seven respondents reported serious physical or sexual assault during their time as a student and sixty-eight per cent of female students had experienced verbal or non-verbal harassment. Most of these incidents occurred outside university. However, sixteen per cent of these incidents had occurred within a learning environment and more than one in ten female students reported feeling uncomfortable as a result of sexual comments made within a learning environment. As in Wilson's (2000) study discussed above, the vast majority of perpetrators were male students studying at the same institution as the respondent; however, academic and non-teaching staff were included within the category of 'offenders known to the victim'. When asked how their experiences had affected their education, the most common response from the female students was that their attendance had suffered and that their grades had been negatively affected. The responses also included a harmful impact on mental and physical health, their sense of

confidence and difficulty within personal relationships (NUS 2010: 3, 5, 12, 19, 27-28).

It can be seen from the above that the majority of quantitative research on sexual harassment in higher education is feminist based with a gendered focus of power. It is argued that sexual harassment in higher education mostly involves men (often lecturers) wielding power over women (often students). In particular, Grauerholz (1989) and Roosmalen (1999) argue that power structured on the basis on one's gender, rather than one's organisational position, is behind much of the sexual harassment in higher education. The following section will broaden from a focus on quantitative research to research utilising qualitative data, again mostly from a feminist position, and continue this focus on relations of power.

2.2 Qualitative Data on Sexual Harassment in Higher Education

Having considered the mostly feminist quantitative research on sexual harassment in higher education and the argument that power is often structured on the basis of gender - men wielding power over women - this section will explore qualitative data on sexual harassment in higher education. As with the quantitative data which precede this section, the qualitative data mostly argue that power differentials are at the root of sexual harassment with men structurally positioned to hold more power over women. As a result, this section will be followed by a discussion on the structural mechanisms of sexual harassment in higher education.

Herbert (1997) discusses the case of Sophie, a student from New Zealand enrolled on a Master's degree at an English university. Her lecturer and personal tutor subjected Sophie to a range of personal and intimate questions and then, in a pre-arranged tutorial, proceeded to masturbate in front of her (Herbert 1997: 24). Carter and Jeffs (1992), in a discussion on sexual exploitation in higher education within the UK, suggest that it is in tutorials that students are the most vulnerable to sexual harassment; in this setting, students are often isolated and alone, which increases the power of the lecturer or tutor (Carter and Jeffs 1992: 236). In addition, they argue that those seeking to exploit students may take advantage of the pastoral role often given to course tutors. Carter and Jeffs' (1995) UK research suggests that some male lecturers may manufacture a level of dependence in vulnerable students; for example, those students on overseas placements who are feeling homesick and isolated from the support of family and friends. They also note that students on practice placements, separated from the support of their peers and working in unfamiliar environments, may also be vulnerable to exploitation (Carter and Jeffs 1995: 42).

In addition, Carter and Jeffs (1992) argue that sexual harassment not only affects the victims of the unwanted behaviour, but also has implications for other students and staff members within the institution; innocent and perfectly acceptable social contact between staff and students may come under suspicion and women students may well come to view all members of staff as a threat (Carter and Jeffs 1992: 237). For example, Bingham and Battey's (2005: 146) research suggests that some lecturers refrain from offering opposite-sex

students emotional support due to concerns that their communication may be construed as having sexual intent. Furthermore, McWilliam et al. (2002) argue that stories surrounding the 'lecherous professor' have been partly responsible for the introduction of the 'risk management' culture within academia; in particular, it is argued that the relationship of doctoral supervisor to doctoral candidate has suffered from the necessarily heightened vigilance, regulation and control (McWilliam et al. 2002: 122).

Lee (1998), discussing sexual harassment within PhD supervision in UK universities, suggests a productive relationship between supervisor and postgraduate student may be particularly difficult to maintain: the conditions for sexual harassment may flourish in one-to-one PhD supervisory relationships and students may have to negotiate complicated territory. Lee (1998) quotes one PhD student who had refused the sexual advances of her supervisor:

He cancelled our next meeting. Then he finally rang me and said: 'Given that the direction of your work has changed (which it hadn't), I don't think that I'm now the appropriate supervisor for your work. I've told the Head of Department. He's going to see if anyone else wants to do it'. Then he hung up (Lee 1998: 309).

Lee argues that in the context of PhD supervision, where having an expert in your field is seen as very important and highly desirable in securing funding, weighing up the expertise and personality of a supervisor can be a complicated and emotionally traumatic process (Lee 1998: 306). As with the quantitative section which precedes this, the qualitative data on sexual harassment in higher education, often feminist in focus, argue that power differentials are at the root of sexual harassment. For example, female students may be at risk of sexual

harassment from male lecturers, especially in situations where they may be more vulnerable. In addition, much of this work argues that sexual harassment in higher education not only affects the individual victims involved, but suspicion, anger and mistrust can also spread across the university. The next section, therefore, focuses on research which argues that the structural mechanisms of higher education play a considerable role in our understanding and experiences of sexual harassment.

2. 3 Structural Mechanisms of Sexual Harassment in Higher Education

In the preceding sections, I explored how quantitative and qualitative research, mostly feminist orientated, often position sexual harassment in higher education as an abuse of power perpetrated by individuals on the basis of gender. This section will consider theorists who argue that sexual harassment may not be due to individual lecturers or tutors but maintained by structural mechanisms. For example, Ramazanoglu (1987), discussing sex and violence in academic life, suggests that the institutional structures of higher education function to preserve the hierarchical order of white, male heterosexism and that sexual harassment is one means by which those who are not heterosexual males can be effectively subordinated (Ramazanoglu 1987: 65). This structural configuration of power linked to heterosexual masculinity is also seen in Kerfoot and Whitehead (2000), in their study of male managers in the contemporary work culture of further education in the UK. They argue that the restructuring of educational institutions combined with the new managerial ethos has created a dominant discourse of masculinity: increased demands for productivity,

accountability, aggressive competition and longer working hours have encouraged 'masculine' behaviours and validation through control and power over others (Kerfoot and Whitehead 2000: 188). Knights and Richards (2003) argue that masculine norms and practices have the effect of legitimatising the conquest of knowledge and the competition for scarce materials. They suggest that with the introduction of quality assurance procedures, together with the Research Assessment Exercise³ in UK universities, there may well be a reinforcement of masculine managerial methods of organising universities that limit alternative arrangements (Knights and Richards 2003: 230).

It is argued by some operating within this theoretical model that the masculinist managerial approach produces a 'no limits' requirement for loyalty to and compliance with an institution, thus discriminating against part-time workers and those employed on a sessional basis (Walsh 2002: 38). Jackson (2002: 30) argues that for many women in academia, the gatekeepers continue to be white, middle-class men who dominate the organisation and thus ensure that the male culture of the university continues to survive. Ramazanoglu (1987) suggests that women academics routinely endure experiences such as having 'their knee patted while discussing departmental affairs', 'the size and desirability of their bottom discussed in public by their colleagues' and being advised to 'seek therapy for the sexual problems after a stormy staff meeting' (Ramazanoglu 1987: 72). Ramazanoglu argues that these undermining tactics may be used against non-deferential women who are seen as a threat to men

³ Renamed the Research Excellence Framework.

and the male-dominated structure of the institution (Ramazanoglu 1987: 73). Likewise, Purkiss (1995), in a discussion on sexual harassment in academia, argues that the sexual harassment of female staff and students can function to deny women their professional status and right to cultural authority, and that male lecturers may use sexual harassment to drive women away from education. She states that 'the fact that harassment (of one sort or another) almost always involves driving the student away from class may not be an "unfortunate" side effect; it may be precisely the point' (Purkiss 1995: 206).

Carter and Jeffs (1995) argue that a camaraderie ethos of 'all boys together' may still exist within some structures of academia. They state that structural mechanisms often sanction the harassment and exploitation of women students, and staff occupying positions of authority may close rank when a student complains of unacceptable behaviour (Carter and Jeffs 1995: 34-35). Bagilhole argues that the structural mechanisms of many UK universities may well make what she perceives to be a male-dominated environment particularly difficult to challenge. Senior academic staff (predominantly men) in older universities often remain relatively autonomous and, therefore, difficult to manage (Bagilhole 2002: 23). For Conrad and Taylor (1994), it is when professionals have a significant amount of autonomy, and work relatively independently of each other, that it becomes easier to suppress a wide range of conflicts, including sexual harassment. They argue that the cherished principle of academic freedom is often used to prevent investigations into a particular professor or lecturer whose working habits give cause for concern (Conrad and Taylor 1994: 48). Furthermore, Francis (2001) notes that contemporary

debates about sexual harassment bring issues of freedom of expression to centre stage: there is often concern that sexual harassment policies may stifle free speech and open forums, thus damaging the production and transmission of knowledge (Francis 2001: 20).

Stamler and Stone (1998), in a discussion on faculty-student sexual involvement, argue that professional autonomy and academic freedom are often seen as essential principles for the production of independent knowledge. It is argued that despite modernisation processes in most UK universities, some conservative members of staff may still cling to the assumption that academic freedom is not one right but that it instead represents a 'charter of liberties entitling the professor to full autonomy, choosing what he or she shall do and when, and having a dominant voice in all university matters' (Stamler and Stone 1998: 23-24). Jackson (2002) takes this argument further and suggests that organisational influence is often in the hands of those who attract money and that these active researchers, whose work is to be included in the Research Assessment Exercise,⁴ are seen as particularly valuable assets. It is stated that this tends to apply to men, who, Jackson argues, still hold the vast majority of senior research and senior lecturer posts (Jackson 2002: 20). The overall argument here, therefore, is that a senior researcher with a wealth of publications and who is successful in obtaining grants, may potentially have any dubious actions ignored or may be more likely to have complaints against him dropped. Consequently, these researchers argue that higher education exists

⁴ Renamed the Research Excellence Framework.

as an institution organised by dominant interests and intersected with power dynamics that bias structural mechanisms in favour of the male sex (Carter and Jeffs 1992: 233).

This section has considered theorists who argue that sexual harassment may not be due to individual lecturers or tutors but maintained by the structural mechanisms of higher education. Structural understandings of power will be further critiqued in the section on liberal feminist theories. However, in building upon the notion that theories of sexual harassment in higher education are contradictory and contingent, the following sections discuss competing models of student-lecturer sexual relationships. The first model views such relationships as exploitative and discriminatory; the second model, however, positions student-lecturer sexual relationships as potentially beneficial to the student.

2.4 Competing Models of Student-Lecturer Sexual Relationships

As seen in the preceding sections, research on sexual harassment in higher education positions sexual harassment as an abuse of gendered power, often facilitated by the structural mechanisms of the university. However, arguments of sexual harassment in higher education are varied and contradictory (e.g. Dziech and Weiner 1984; Carter and Jeffs 1995; Stamler and Stone 1998). The next two sections explore competing models of student-lecturer sexual relationships. The first model argues that such relationships are exploitative, based on power differentials and involve the abuse of this power. The second

model, however, argues that student-lecturer sexual relationships can be beneficial for both the student and the lecturer. This model states that any attempt to ban such relationships is protectionist towards the women involved and may end in doing more harm than good. It is hoped that these competing and contradictory models will highlight the arbitrary and contingent nature of sexual harassment understandings and form the backdrop to liberal feminist theories on sexual harassment.

2.4 (1) Student-Lecturer Sexual Relationships as Exploitative

Dziech and Weiner (1984) discuss some of the myths that they suggest operate within the academy, and suggest that perhaps the most pervasive is that of the 'natural' attraction of undergraduates to the wisdom of their professors.

According to this understanding, female students add their lecturer's age to their superior knowledge, and thus presumably greater wisdom, and develop an 'adolescent idealism' which increases the extent of the lecturer's power (Zalk 1990: 145). For example, the study by Fitzgerald et al. (1988) reports some members of faculty who felt that they had been sexually objectified by female students and one respondent who wrote about the 'extreme pressure a male professor can feel as the object of sexual interest of attractive women students' (Fitzgerald et al. 1988: 337). Benson and Thompson (1982) discuss the similar perception that faculty-student sexual exchanges occur as a result of women attempting to use their sexuality to compensate for a lack of academic ability. The male respondents in this study stated that individual women profited from their sexual attributes because male lecturers would 'go out of their way to be

“extra friendly” and helpful to them’ (Benson and Thompson 1982: 239).

However, Cameron (1984) suggests that, unfortunately, many male lecturers consider having sex with female students to be a ‘fringe benefit’ of the job. She notes that it is not unusual for women to sleep with their lecturers and suggests that these involvements are seen as personal matters and ignored by university management. Cameron (1984) quotes one male lecturer commenting on his position as a ‘fantasy come true’: ‘I get older every year, but the girls are always eighteen’ (Cameron 1984: 258). Carter and Jeffs (1995) also comment on this belief that many male lecturers view sex with female students to be a ‘perk’ of the job (Carter and Jeffs 1995: 17).

In a similar vein, Kealey (2009), in an article on the ‘seven deadly sins’ of the academy published in the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, advised male lecturers to ‘enjoy’ the admiration of female students. Stating that these students are a ‘perk’ of the job, the recommendation is that male lecturers should ‘look but not touch’ and that female students should be ‘admired daily to spice up your sex, nightly, with the wife’ (Kealey 2009). Although many feminist theorists argue that student-lecturer relationships are formed on the basis of sexual exploitation (for example, see Carter and Jeffs 1992), there are other positions which comment positively on student-lecturer sex.

2.4 (2) Student-Lecturer Sexual Relationships as Beneficial to Both Student and Lecturer

As discussed above, many theorists argue that student-lecturer sexual

relationships are an abuse of power and, as such, exploitative. However, there are many theorists who argue the opposite and suggest a linkage between good teaching and eroticism. For example, Purkiss (1995) notes how male lecturer and female student relationships are often conceived of in terms of dominance and submission, gift and reception. Thus, this position suggests that the 'beautiful ideas' and oratorical skills of good teaching are linked with 'a great erotic scene' (Purkiss 1995: 199-200). Sikes (2005) believes that 'expressions of sexuality provide a major currency and resource in the everyday exchanges of school life...the seductive nature and erotic charge of good teaching [often] provokes a positive and exciting response' (cited in Kirkham 2005). Indeed, Sikes (2006) argues that newspaper and media reporting of pupil-teacher sexual relationships often structure these situations as being scandalous and exploitative. Although girls and women need to be protected from *some* male teachers and lecturers, many relationships are consensual and advantageous for both parties (Sikes 2006: 278). Likewise, Pryer (2001) equates education with sensual desire and longing; teaching and learning, she argues, are passionate acts but despite this there is a fear and distrust of the erotic among Western educators and curriculum theorists (Pryer 2001: 83).

Pryer states that:

Pedagogy ruptures the student's everyday understandings, permitting teacher/other knowledge to enter the student. The student merges with that knowledge, becoming, embodying, living out that knowledge in her everyday life (Pryer 2001: 81).

Gallop (1997), a feminist academic, states that a sexualised teaching environment can empower students, making them 'feel like adults, like

intellectuals' and share in the academic aura of knowledge (Gallop 1997: 18). She comments upon a student with whom she had a sexual relationship. She states: 'His real devotion to me was intellectual. He took every course he could with me during the rest of his time in college, began to read my scholarly articles, and generally tried to learn what I was trying to teach' (Gallop 1997: 45-46). Another student, states Gallop (1997), was 'enamoured of my work before she even met me' and that the relationship was 'charged with energy'. Gallop herself admits that she was 'tickled to see someone who wanted to work with me that much' (Gallop 1997: 54). Indeed, according to Gallop (1997), the attempt to ban student-lecturer sex has the effect of not recognising women as desiring subjects.

Women students should, Gallop (1997) argues, be given full freedom of choice to consent to sex with their lecturers. To deny women this choice is protectionist and a refusal to see women as sexual subjects capable of actually wanting sex (Gallop 1997: 36). This line of thinking can be seen in the work of Roiphe (1994), who argues that current feminist thought encourages women to position themselves as helpless victims of male power. She writes: 'Instead of learning that men have no right to do these terrible things to us, we should be learning to deal with individuals with strength and confidence' (Roiphe 1994: 101). Furthermore, Roiphe (1994) argues that unwanted sexual attention is necessary if reciprocal sexual attention is to be found: 'To find wanted sexual attention, you have to give and receive a certain amount of unwanted sexual attention' (Roiphe 1994: 87). She goes on to state:

I would even go so far as to say that people have the right to leer at whomever they want to leer at. By offering protection against the leer, the movement against sexual harassment is curtailing her personal power. This protection implies the need to be protected (Roiphe 1994: 102).

Roiphe argues, therefore, that feminist rhetoric takes everyday experiences and turns them into sexual harassment, and without access to this belief system women would not employ the status of victimhood (Roiphe 1994: 109).

As discussed, much research on sexual harassment in higher education, especially feminist research, often argues that sexual relationships between staff and students are an abuse of gendered power, often facilitated by the structural mechanisms of the university. However, we have seen that arguments regarding student-lecturer sexual relationships are varied and contradictory (e.g. Dziech and Weiner 1984; Carter and Jeffs 1995; Stamler and Stone 1998). These two sections, exploring two competing models of student-lecturer sexual relationships, serve to highlight the competing and contradictory nature of sexual harassment research and their implications for higher education; these two diverse and contradictory models emphasise the arbitrary and contingent nature of sexual harassment research and the difficulties in drawing firm conclusions from such approaches. Therefore, having explored some of the opposing research surrounding sexual harassment in higher education, the next section discusses liberal feminist theories: how liberal feminism defines 'sexual harassment'; how liberal feminism explains the power relationships within sexual harassment as gendered and structural; and, finally, how liberal feminism argues the importance of sexual harassment in the

reproduction and maintenance of gender roles.

2.5 Feminist Theories of Sexual Harassment

As the foregoing research shows, there are wide moral, ethical and philosophical differences in understanding sexual harassment. As a contested and constructed phenomenon, there is no single explanation or definition of sexual harassment and many competing theories (Skaine 1996). Liberal feminism, however, has positioned itself outside these contingent understandings and argues that it is not possible to understand organisations without first considering them as sites of gendered power. A key tenet of this belief is that sex at work is used to humiliate and degrade women and, as such, is exploitative and degrading (MacKinnon 1979: 67). This section, therefore, will focus on liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment: definitions of 'sexual harassment'; power relationships within sexual harassment; and the importance of sexual harassment in the reproduction and maintenance of gender roles.

Ollenburger and Moore (1992) argue that the liberal feminist tradition focuses upon freedom of choice, equal opportunities, and equal capacity for reason. Liberal feminism argues that freedom from oppression is best attained by challenging expected gender roles and promoting the equal capacity and capability of women. The underlying assumption is that if women are allowed equal access to compete, they will succeed (Ollenburger and Moore 1992: 17). Thus, liberal feminism argues that sexual harassment is a consequence of the gender inequality and sexism prevalent in society. Sexually harassing

behaviours are thus both the result and cause of societal belief in male dominance and male superiority (Gutek 1985). According to liberal feminist theories, sexual harassment, regardless of its form and content, constructs and reinforces male dominance in both private and public places, including the workplace and further/higher education. Women's inferior position in society is, thus, both a cause and a consequence of sexual harassment (Somers 1982; Tangri et al. 1982; Stockdale 1993; Barak et al. 1995; Gutek 2001).

The feminist focus on gender inequality in the workplace is often credited with bringing the sexual harassment of working women to light (Thomas and Kitzinger 1997). For example, Brewer and Berk (1982) argue that although sexual harassment is a 'new' social issue, it is not a new problem for working women; this problematic behaviour existed long before the term 'sexual harassment' was first coined. Before that, the behaviour had gone unnamed and undiscussed. Thus, it is argued that by labelling a set of unwelcome and uninvited behaviours as sexual harassment, feminists and union activists were instrumental in breaking 'the prevailing silence about this aspect of women's work experience' (Brewer and Berk 1982: 1-2; see also Gutek 2001). Thus, liberal feminism often credits itself as having 'discovered' sexual harassment and bringing the behaviour to the attention of the public.

Mackinnon first brought the term 'sexual harassment' into the public, academic and legal arena in 1979, enabling many feminists to argue that the development of the term allowed women to more easily challenge and protest against the 'unacceptability of their experiences' (Kitzinger and Thomas 1995: 32).

MacKinnon (1979), therefore, theorised unwanted male sexual conduct as behaviour in which men use power to gain sex, and argued that the sexual harassment of women in the workplace could be legally challenged as sex discrimination (MacKinnon 1979: 4). In 'quid pro quo' sexual harassment, a woman must comply sexually or risk losing her job (MacKinnon 1979: 32). The sexual harassment in 'condition of work' is not explicitly related to the requirement or demand for sexual relations but includes sexism, sex discrimination and other forms of unacceptable sexual behaviour. For example, MacKinnon (1979) states:

Unwanted sexual advances, made simply because she has a woman's body, can be a daily part of a woman's work life. She may be constantly felt or pinched, visually undressed and stared at, surreptitiously kissed, commented upon, manipulated into being found alone, and generally taken advantage of – but never promised or denied anything explicitly connected with her job (MacKinnon 1979: 40).

Within this theory, therefore, sexual harassment is based on the concept of men's greater social, cultural and structural power over women and involves men using this power to demand sex from women or to behave in a sexual manner towards women (MacKinnon 1979; LaFontaine and Tredeau 1986; Thomas and Kitzinger 1997). Still within liberal feminist theory, however, the concept of sexual harassment as behaviour in which men use power to gain sex has been critically assessed by feminists who wish to theorise its antithesis: that sexual harassment is behaviour in which men use sex to gain power.

Farley (1978), in her influential text on the sexual harassment of working women, argues that job segregation, unequal pay, few opportunities for

promotion and poor female solidarity are sustained by male sexual harassment. Women are, it is argued, an exploited underclass (Farley 1978: 208-211). Wise and Stanley (1987), analysing sexual harassment as an everyday feature in women's lives, state that although sexual harassment may sometimes involve 'sexual' behaviours, this is merely a means to an end. The actual intention behind sexual harassment is to increase the perpetrator's sense of power: to 'do power' over the woman (Wise and Stanley 1987: 64). Indeed, Quinn's (2002) research exploring the link between sexual harassment and 'doing masculinity' suggests that unwanted sexual attention operates as a targeted tactic of power: the men involved in the harassing behaviour seem to want everyone, the targeted woman and co-workers, clients and superiors, to *know* they are looking. Quinn argues that their gaze demonstrates their perceived right, as men, to sexually objectify women (Quinn 2002: 392). In this model, sexual harassment need not involve actions of a clearly sexual nature and includes any behaviour that is intrusive, unwanted and forced onto women by men. It is noted that 'the vast majority of these behaviours aren't sexual in any way other than one sex, male, does them to another sex, female' (Wise and Stanley 1987: 8). Although having a different focus from MacKinnon (1979), this approach still views male power as structurally configured: men have power; women do not.

In 1982, Gutek and Morasch stated that sexual harassment at work is often the result of 'sex-role spillover'. It is argued that this occurs when gender-based beliefs are carried over into the workplace, resulting in irrelevant or inappropriate shared expectations about the behaviour of men and women. For

example, sex-role spillover results in women being expected to be more nurturing, sympathetic or loyal than men. People combine the work role with the sex role to make expectations about the behaviours and those involved: cocktail waitresses 'are' sexy; nurses 'are' caring; executives 'are' competitive. In addition, sex ratios (the numerical amounts of women and men traditionally found within that occupation) influence the amount and type of sex-role spillover. The spillover has different consequences for women in female-dominated jobs or male-dominated jobs: women in non-traditional occupations are likely to be employed as women first, and as work-role occupants second. Therefore, they are likely to notice differential treatment from their male colleagues, including socio-sexual behaviours and sexual harassment. Traditionally-employed women, on the other hand, are likely to find that the job itself takes on elements of the sex role. In non-traditional jobs, as discussed above, women become 'women-with-jobs'. In traditional jobs, women become 'women', full stop. They are likely to be regarded as sex objects and often describe their job as containing elements of sexuality. Thus, Gutek and Morasch argue that sexual harassment is often not viewed as a problem at work because it is simply 'part of the job' (Gutek and Morasch 1982: 63-65).

Littler-Bishop et al. (1982) argue this point further. In their exploration of female flight attendants' perceptions of sexual harassment, Littler-Bishop et al. found that the women were most likely to experience sexual harassment from two sources: the pilots and the airplane cleaners. Pilots, however, were more likely to engage in more 'serious' forms of sexual harassment and, here, the harassment seemed to operate as an extension of status. Thus, the high status

pilots become culturally entitled to behave in a sexual manner towards the female flight attendants; the sexualised behaviours are just one element of their work expectation towards the women. Furthermore, it is argued that for their part, the women are less likely to respond negatively to the harassment, perhaps because of the potential gains made through associating with high status pilots or, conversely, the potential losses if they respond disapprovingly (Littler-Bishop et al. 1982).

In a study by Schneider and Phillips (1997) exploring the sexual harassment of female doctors by patients, they argue that female doctors are often treated as women first and foremost by some male patients and this leaves them vulnerable to sexual harassment. Although this harassment could be considered as contrapower harassment (see Grauerholz 1989 above), Schneider and Phillips (1997) believe that this approach may not explain, at a common sense level, how patients lying on an examination table, partly naked and in an unbecoming gown, can muster enough contrapower to sexually harass the female doctor. Instead, it is perhaps more likely that the carryover of gender-based expectations into the work role encourages the male patients to behave in a sexual manner towards the female doctor. Male patients conducting sexualised behaviour are often responding to the gender role rather than the professional role, the gender expectations thus taking precedence over the professional doctor-patient relationship (Schneider and Phillips 1997: 671, 675).

As discussed, liberal feminism defines 'sexual harassment' as an abuse of

power. Split as to whether sexual harassment is behaviour in which men use power to gain sex or behaviour in which men use sex to gain power, it is clear within liberal feminism that sexual harassment is exploitative behaviour intended to degrade and humiliate women. As Wise and Stanley (1987: 64) argue, sexual harassment is an intention for men to 'do power' over women. Credited with having 'discovered' and identified this abusive power, liberal feminism often views itself as having brought sexual harassment to the attention of the public. Furthermore, it is argued that sexual harassment is important for the maintenance and reproduction of gender roles. These concepts will be critiqued within the Foucault section below, but for now we will continue to expand the background of sexual harassment theories and move to discuss women-centred definitions of sexual harassment.

2.6 Women-centred Definitions of Sexual Harassment

As discussed above, sexual harassment within feminist research is mostly theorised as an abuse of power within exploitative relationships. This section discusses how certain sets of behaviours are often named and constructed by women as sexual harassment. This considers women-centred definitions of sexual harassment and how differences within the social category of 'woman' can impact upon women's experiences of sexual harassment in complex and contradictory ways. After exploring the intersectional nature of women's lives, this section goes on to consider how women identify and respond to experiences of sexual harassment, including the difficulties involved in telling their personal stories.

In their attempt to provide a framework for studying sexual harassment, Terpstra and Baker (1986) note that the search for a universal definition of sexual harassment is mired in confusion and recent research into this area serves only to highlight how little we know about it. They argue, therefore, that researchers of sexual harassment should work towards a more coherent and structured approach. The development of a 'general framework' for researching sexual harassment, including clearer definitions as to what constitutes the behaviour, will, they argue, enable clearer and more systematic research (Terpstra and Baker 1986: 17, 30). However, many feminists have argued against producing a systematic, monolithic or universal understanding of sexual harassment and how women experience it. Experiences of sexual harassment, and the subsequent impact on women's and men's subjectivities, operate differentially through specific social and cultural divisions.

As discussed in the theoretical commitments section, subjectivities are multiple, complex, fluid and contradictory. Women, like men, shift their subject positions to those that make the most sense to them at a particular time and place. Priorities in subject positions change and reveal shifts in perceptions of vulnerabilities and strengths (Sizoo 1997: 228). Female students of higher education, for example, negotiate multiple subject positions. Subjectivities engage in multiple role relationships, shifting through positions as and when required (Ramage 2004: 3). These multiple positions may include: daughter, mother, partner, friend, domestic worker, worker (full- and part-time), student, early academic, self-improver, mentor and many others (e.g. Devos 2004).

With these multiple positions in mind, Valentine (2007) discusses intersectionality within feminist research. She notes that many feminists have challenged the use of 'women' and 'gender' as unitary and homogeneous categories. Differences within the social category of 'woman', for example ethnicity, sexuality, class, and disability, intersect in fluid and complex ways. Identities are both 'done to' and 'unmade' through these intersections and, at the same, emerge within contested grounds to form an understanding of one's self (Valentine 2007: 14). Specific forms of intersectionality can create unique situations of disadvantage and marginalisation (Shields 2008: 307). Being aware of these complexities, therefore, assists the feminist researcher in her attempt to address how multiple forms of domination, especially those which are often forgotten such as age and ability, intersect to form experiences of oppression (Nash 2010).

For example, hooks (1981), in her classic study on the oppression of black women by both white and black men *and* white women, maintains the notion that struggles to end racism and sexism are inextricably linked: black women are often constructed as sexually depraved, immoral and 'loose, and the roots of this racism /sexism are firmly located within the slave trade'. For hooks, the women's rights movement has not succeeded in uniting black and white women and obtaining 'women's' rights in some areas has only succeeded in the further oppression of black women. Obtaining rights for women had little impact on the social status of black women with white imperialism continuing to deny them full citizenship. Hooks warns, therefore, against 'groups of women appropriating feminism to serve their own opportunistic ends' (hooks 1982: 52, 122, 189).

Being aware of these multiple forms of oppression, and the intersections of these experiences, we need to explore further the intersectionality within feminist theories on sexual harassment.

Welsh et al. (2006), in a discussion on understanding sexual harassment across ethnicities and citizenship, state that harassing behaviours, like rape and other forms of sexual violence, are embedded in interlocking systems of ethnicity, gender and citizenship. When women experience sexual harassment, their ethnicity and citizenship are never absent from the event and, as such, are an influencing and complicating component of women's understanding, reaction and labelling (Welsh et al. 2006: 95-96). Chen (1997) also notes how experiences of sexual harassment are interconnected in a complex system of gender and racial subordination. For example, stereotypes of the exotic, sexual prostitute of Asian-American women combined with an expectation that Asian-American women will be more likely to accept dominating male behaviours, often result in high levels of sexual harassment. In addition, the commonplace nature of gendered racism makes it more difficult for Asian-American women to speak out against harassment (Chen 1997: 55-58).

Discussing the intersectional nature of gender harassment and racial harassment, Buchanan and Ormerod (2002) argue that historical, social, cultural and sexual stereotypes of African-American women combine to produce 'racialised sexual harassment', distinct from either racial or sexual harassment alone. In particular, it is also noted that some white women also perpetrate acts of racialised sexual harassment. Therefore, universal safeguards – such as all-

women environments – may not offer protection for African-American women (Buchanan and Ormerod 2002: 111, 116). Luthar et al. (2009) expand upon this and argue that stereotypes of African-American women tend to be more negative than those of white women. The racist and gendered social and cultural stereotyping of African-American women leads to further marginalisation (Luthar 2009: 31). An example of how the intersections of racism and sexism operate in practice is the Anita Hill and Clarence Thomas hearings.

In 1991, Anita Hill claimed that during the period of time she worked for Clarence Thomas, a United States Supreme Court Judge, she was sexually harassed on numerous occasions. This involved, according to Hill, attempts to initiate sexual relations, vulgar sexual jokes and innuendo and comments about the size of her breasts (Hill 2001: 156-158). Black and Allen (2001: 35) argue that the Clarence Thomas hearings propelled sexual harassment into the public arena and have significantly influenced public perceptions of this issue. It is not the 'truth' of this case that has interested many feminists, but the media commentary surrounding the hearings. For example, Flax (1998), discussing the Clarence Thomas hearings within the context of gendered and racial dynamics, argues that Thomas positioned himself both as a 'bare-foot black boy' who had managed to triumph over adversity and as an 'honorary white man' capable of 'restraint, hard work, self-discipline and control' (Flax 1998: 15,17). Hill, on the other hand, was positioned as having, 'a propensity to fantasise' and having an 'exaggerated interest in men' (Flax 1998: 120). Hill (2001) states that she was portrayed as 'the silly prude who can't handle normal

adult conversation' (Hill 2001: 158). In addition, the media depicted these two opposing stereotypes – the 'exaggerated interest in men' and the 'silly prude who can't handle normal adult conversation' – as if they were a united representation (Phelps and Winternitz 1992: 395).

Phelps and Winternitz (1992), discussing the hearings, highlight that the case was part of a political, media-driven process: the White House was able to counteract the initial outpouring of feminist support for Hill with accusations of racism. Hill became the personification of everything feared from the 'modern woman': aggressive, rights-mongering and antagonistic. It is argued that many men thought the charges of sexual harassment were unimportant, even if they were true. While Thomas' standing in the black community increased, positioned as he was through the stereotyping of the sexually hyperactive black male, Hill was accused of attacking a fellow black person in a prominent and all-white arena (Phelps and Winternitz 1992: 392-397). Thus, the Clarence Thomas hearings highlighted the intersections of race and gender and the social and cultural stereotyping of African-American men and women. However, it is not only issues of ethnicity that intersect to form experiences of sexual harassment; class and sexuality, amongst many other social categories, are equally productive.

Myers (2004) discusses the complex intersections of class, ethnicity and sexuality in the reproduction and maintenance of approved femininity. For example, she argues that concepts of 'ladyhood', the enactment of respectable femininity, are underscored by class-biased, racialised, heterosexualised,

feminised elitism. It is argued that elite women, themselves oppressed within male-dominated societies, may contribute further to the oppression of women from minority categories, including those of ethnicity, economic status, sexuality, disability and the intersections of these categories. For Myers, the identification of class is an important component in the social and economic disadvantaging of women (Myers 2004: 37). Skeggs (1997), discussing formations of class and gender, notes it is white bourgeois women who have been given the classification of 'respectable femininity' and its historically associated heterosexuality. Black and white working-class women, on the other hand, are constructed through 'dangerous and perverse' sexualities and 'non respectability'. Thus, the heterosexual, middle-class woman is 'purified and unmixed with racial and class differences'. Heterosexuality is, therefore, operating as a category alongside femininity, designed to 'other' black and working-class women (Skeggs 1997: 18, 122). Classism, therefore, is defined as institutional and individual discrimination, stereotyping and prejudice against poor people. As with other forms of discrimination, the process of 'othering' identifies and isolates the economically disadvantaged (Lott 2002: 107).

Tester (2008), who notes that the bulk of sexual harassment research has been located within the workplace, explores the intersections of the class and ethnicity of women who have been sexually harassed by their landlords. Many of the landlords in her research preyed on economically vulnerable women and manufactured *quid quo pro* relationships. In some cases, landlords utilised stereotypes based on class and racialised gender to explain their actions against complaints of sexual harassment and to imply that the women

misunderstood their actions (Tester 2008: 359). The use of stereotypes and myths is considered by Aosved et al. (2006) in their analysis of rape myth acceptance and the intersections of class, ethnicity, sexuality, age and religious beliefs. It is argued that predominant cultural attitudes facilitate continued tolerance of aggression and sexual violence towards women. Rape myths encourage the shifting of blame for sexual assaults from the perpetrators to the victims and the research noted interrelations between greater rape myth acceptance and attitudes of sexism, classism, homophobia, ageism and intolerance of religion. Although it is noted that these belief systems are not perfectly correlated, and that there are other unexplained factors that contribute to rape myth acceptance, it is argued that wider and multiple intolerances of diversity may impact upon acceptance of rape myths and the perpetration of sexual violence (Aosved et al. 2006: 490).

Although there has been very little research exploring the intersections of gender and sexuality and women's experiences of sexual harassment in higher education, Konik and Cortina (2008) argue that oppressions based on gender and sexual orientation are intrinsically linked. It is suggested that sexualised harassment, gender harassment and heterosexist harassment all function to enforce traditional gender roles. In particular, sexual minorities within their research encountered substantially greater rates and frequencies of all forms of harassment, including sexualised and gendered hostility that does not explicitly invoke sexual orientation. Sexual harassment, therefore, serves to punish those who violate traditional gender norms, including the requirement of heteronormativity (Konik and Cortina 2008: 332). Epstein (1997) argues that sexual

harassment is a key factor in this 'institutionalisation of heterosexuality'.

Women who adopt deviant gender roles, and do not assume normative femininity within a heterosexual setting, often experience sexual/sexist harassment. Therefore, Epstein conceptualises sexual harassment as a pedagogy that schools women into heterosexuality and gender appropriate behaviour (Epstein 1997: 157-160).

This insight is in dialogue with Kitzinger (1995), in a discussion on anti-lesbian harassment, who argues that a 'climate of terror' surrounds lesbianism in a heterosexist society (Kitzinger 1995: 127). She states that 'harassment of lesbians ranges from murder, rape, torture and other forms of physical attack through to defamation, intimidation, ostracism and verbal abuse' (Kitzinger 1995: 125). It is argued that this constant fear of violence and abuse encourages gay women to be silent about their sexuality and not discuss their lesbianism. Given the involved risks of being an 'out' lesbian, this seems hardly surprising; however, it does have the effect, as Kitzinger notes, of creating our own invisibility⁵ (Kitzinger 1995: 127). Forms of violence, therefore, including the threat of violence, impact upon women's subjectivities in complex and varying ways.

For example, Kelly (1988), discussing women's experiences of sexual violence, argues that sexual harassment is not divorced from other forms of violence and that society has traditionally placed sexual violence within a hierarchy of perceived seriousness. More commonplace forms of violence are often

dismissed by society as a 'bit of a laugh' or an everyday event. However, Kelly argues that sexual violence should be conceived of as a continuum, ranging from the multiple forms of sexism women encounter every day to the murders of women and girls by men. These forms of violence, in no hierarchical order, include: the threat of violence, sexual harassment, pressurised sex, sexual assault, obscene/threatening phone calls and peeping, coercive sex, domestic violence, sexual abuse of girls, flashing, rape, and incest. The extent of the violence and the fear it can induce impacts upon women's feeling of safety and they may change their behaviours to avoid certain situations. Importantly, however, these categories should not be thought of as separate and isolated from each other. There is a great deal of overlap between these categories and how these forms of violence are experienced. It is often not possible to differentiate between forms of sexual violence on the basis of the enacted behaviours. Likewise, it is often difficult to distinguish between behaviours that are violent and behaviours that are sexual. Violent and sexual behaviours overlap and women can experience them in different ways. The intersectional nature of women's lives, women's multiple experiences of sexual violence, whether the abuser is known or a stranger, and many other circumstances all influence women's perceptions of violence and the subsequent impact on their subjectivities (Kelly 1988: 77-91).

In arguing for the importance of the continuum and multiple understandings of sexual violence, Kelly (1988) therefore states that the point at which sexual harassment becomes sexual assault is not clear. Within Kelly's research there

⁵ My positionality as an 'out' lesbian will be discussed in Chapter Three.

was a significant overlap in the definitions used by her female participants. The most notable distinction was that sexual harassment included a variety of behaviours combining visual, verbal and physical forms of abusive. Sexual assault, however, always involved physical contact. Visual forms of sexual harassment included leering, staring, and sexual gestures. Verbal forms included whistles, use of innuendo and gossip, sexual joking, propositioning and threatening remarks. Physical forms included unwanted physical closeness, touching, pinching, patting, deliberately brushing close and grabbing. Importantly, any incident of sexual harassment may contain elements of visual, verbal and physical behaviours (Kelly, 1988: 103). To promote Kelly's argument further, and to bring together the preceding discussion on intersectionality, the complex and intersectional nature of women's lives means that experiences and definitions of sexual harassment are multiple, diverse and contradictory. They can include elements of visual, verbal and physical behaviours, and it is often not clear where the boundaries lie between sexual harassment and sexual assault.

Complex subject positions, the intersections of gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality and other forms of marginalisation produce unique experiences of disadvantage, oppression and sexual violence. As discussed, workplaces and educational institutions are critical locations for the intersections of inequalities. These discriminatory systems produce complex patterns of inequalities with varying legitimacy and visibility (Acker 2006: 459). It is suggested, therefore, that what is needed is a move away from universal understandings, definitions and applications to women-centred definitions and preferred ways of coping.

Therefore, it is argued that when it comes to sexual harassment definitions, policies and complaints procedures, women cannot be treated as a monolithic category (Luthar 2009: 31).

For example, Kitzinger and Thomas (1995), in a discussion on the social construction and discursive nature of sexual harassment, note that many women refuse the label of 'sexual harassment' because it emphasises their status as victim. They suggest that for many women, the term 'victim' highlights the extent of their oppression too painfully, and implies female subordination.

They state: 'when women say, to themselves or to other people, "I am *not* being sexually harassed", one of the things they are saying is, "I am *not* a victim. I am *not* a subordinated person"' (Kitzinger and Thomas 1995: 38. Italics in original).

Discussing the confusion that many women feel over the definition of sexual harassment, Epstein (1997) argues that the term 'sexual harassment' is misleading: the definition of harassment as 'sexual' erases the experiences of women whose harassment was not overtly sexual in content. Women who experience sexist behaviours are, therefore, unlikely to view this behaviour as sexual harassment (Epstein 1997: 157). Lee (2001) also notes the difficulties women may face when trying to apply definitions to their experiences: it is argued that women may try to make sense of their experiences by using labels, such as 'working in a sexualised environment', 'everyday rudeness' and 'sexism'. Nevertheless, Lee argues, the existence of a range of terms, rather than just the one term of 'sexual harassment', may help women to recognise and perhaps challenge unwelcome experiences (Lee 2001: 30).

Discussing women students' non-reporting of sexual harassment in medical education and the subsequent labels attached to unwanted behaviours, Wear et al. (2007) found that most women paid little or no attention to sexual innuendo and explicit sexual banter. If the talk was generalised, rather than about specific people, this was often dismissed as reflecting the larger culture of the medical setting and something 'to be expected'. Women students often described themselves as 'strategizers' and 'reward driven' and learnt quickly that it was important not to be seen as being 'up tight' or prudish (Wear et al. 2007: 24). This is similar to the arguments made by Gutek and Morasch (1982) and Littler-Bishop (1982) discussed above: sexual banter becomes 'part of the job', something to be expected and endured, and career-focused women may be more reluctant to report unwanted experiences for fear of this harming their employment opportunities. In addition to this, however, Wear et al. (2007: 25) argue that some of the women seemed unsure about what 'counted' as sexual harassment and had differing concepts of sexually harassing behaviours in what they included and what they did not. Implicit within these discussions, therefore, are the questions: how do we decide what sexual harassment is 'about' and what impact do these decisions have on victims of sexual harassment?

Bell (1993), discussing incest from a Foucauldian perspective, argues that survivors' accounts of sexual violence have largely been ignored or reinterpreted. Survivor accounts of incest, for example, are subjugated knowledges, providing feminism with strong bases for critiquing ways of talking about incest (Bell 1993: 90). Indeed, feminist rhetoric has often privileged the

talking of sexual violence. For example, Herbert (1997) argues that feminism should concentrate on encouraging young girls and women to speak out against violent and harassing behaviour and states that there is much confusion, ignorance and misconception about sexual harassment (Herbert 1997: 26). She argues for the need to 'talk to young women and girls about male oppression, patriarchy and masculine myths of sexual prowess, uncontrollable sexual urges and other such tales' (Herbert 1997: 28). Herbert also states that we need to provide women 'with some skills in order to challenge and confront sexist incidents or situations' (Herbert 1997: 28). However, within Herbert's work, the act of talking is not problematised.

Holloway and Freshwater (2007: 707) argue that people often talk about personal experiences to understand them better, to store the memories and to 'move beyond' them. However, as Livesey (2002) argues, the process of telling one's story is not as simple as often suggested. The tellability of personal stories, the point to the story, is actually determined by the listener rather than the speaker: it is the listener who questions, who frames and controls the story. The speaker provides the information, which is limited, controlled and ultimately shaped by the listener. The nature of this process means that disclosure, like any conversation, is reciprocal and both participants co-construct the interaction. However, it is important to acknowledge the ability of the listener to control and influence the nature of the disclosure and the discourses of truth which are produced (Livesey 2002: 60). Speech and silence are not, therefore, opposing elements.

Clair (1997) notes that to speak may simultaneously act as a means of silencing issues. To have the ability to speak does not imply the potential to be heard, and, likewise, does not prevent others from speaking for us. Paradoxically, silence can often work in the form of a voice. To refuse to speak can be, on occasion, to refuse to locate oneself within a particular subject position (Clair, 1997). For example, Bell (1993) discusses how the telling of one's story is not an empowering act in and of itself and the 'telling' does not guarantee being 'heard': the person listening may be someone who wants to help or may be someone whom the listener has to 'please' in the telling of the story.

Furthermore, silence has often been required for the overarching story to maintain credibility and, in return, the strength of this position allows for additional stories to be heard. In this way, the ability to question and the ability to create discourses of truth is reciprocal (Bell 1993: 80; Livesey 2002: 59).

Bergman et al. (2002), in a discussion on the consequences of reporting unwanted experiences, note that the supposed benefits of challenging sexual harassment include a feeling of resolution and assistance in recovering from psychological damage. However, their research suggests that individuals who report sexual harassment generally fare no better than their non-reporting counterparts and, in certain cases, reporting unwanted sexual attention has had negative consequences for jobs, health and psychological well-being.

Therefore, Bergman et al. propose that the most 'reasonable' form of action in cases of sexual harassment may be to avoid reporting the unwanted experiences (Bergman et al. 2002: 14-15). Kaiser and Miller (2004), considering the potential for the confrontation of sexism, note that if women

believe that challenging discrimination will enact positive changes, even if this incurs some level of personal cost, they may be more likely to confront sexism. However, if women consider the interpersonal costs to be too high, such as being perceived as troublemakers or experiencing retaliation, then the most likely response may be one of silence. Therefore, it is argued that the decision to confront sexism may well be influenced by societal norms (Kaiser and Miller 2004: 169, 175). Consequently, and given the difficulties of labelling and reporting sexual harassment, Wear et al. (2007) argue that how women students label and respond to sexual harassment is less important; more important is the response of the institution: does it discuss with the students what is and is not acceptable language? Are its policies on sexual harassment clear and visible? It is argued that attentiveness to perceptions of sexual harassment, and where these perceptions may be in conflict, is a priority for educational establishments (Wear et al. 2007: 25-26).

By utilising women-centred definitions, we may be able to explore where other forms of oppression, such as racism, homophobia, lack of citizenship, disability and classism, intersect and interact with sexual harassment (Welsh et al. 2006: 95-96). This section, therefore, discusses how certain sets of behaviours may often be constructed and named by women as sexual harassment. Importantly, differences within the social category of 'woman' can impact on women's experiences of sexual harassment in complex and contradictory ways.

Although much feminist work prioritises the sharing of personal experiences, the telling of sexual harassment stories is often co-constructed between the speaker and the listener and is not the simple process it is often suggested to

be. Finally, Wear et al. (2007) discuss the importance of clear accessible policies on sexual harassment, especially within education institutions. Before moving on to discuss the processes of implementing such policies, let us first explore the legal definitions of sexual harassment and how such legislation is represented within policies and codes of conduct.

2.7 Legal Definitions of Sexual Harassment

In 1986, British courts ruled that sexual harassment was unlawful under the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 (*Porcelli v Strathclyde*;⁶ see also Thomas 2004). The Advisory Committee on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men (1988), which included representatives from Member State governments, recommended that there should be a code of conduct on sexual harassment in the workplace, covering the harassment of both women and men (cited in Beveridge 2007). Subsequently, in 1991, the European Commission produced a report detailing a code of practice designed to combat sexual harassment in the workplace. Entitled 'Protecting the Dignity of Women and Men at Work', the report stated that sexual harassment creates intimidating, hostile or humiliating work environments⁷ (see also European Commission 1991). In 2002, the Equal Treatment Directive of the European Parliament amended its definition of 'harassment relating to the sex of a person' to one which reflects the definition of other forms of harassment, such as ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, religion, belief and age discrimination.⁸ This stated that harassment is

⁶ [1986] SC 137 [1986]; ICR [1986] 564.

⁷ Commission Recommendation (EC) 92/131 of 27th November 1991 on the protection of the dignity of men and women at work [1991] OJ L49/1.

⁸ Directive of the European Parliament and Council (EC) 2002/73/EC; Article 2.

where an unwanted conduct relating to a sex of a person occurs with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person, and of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment.⁹

In addition to this first type of 'harassment relating to the sex of a person' outlawed by Directive 2002/73/EC, the revised Equal Treatment Directive created a new wrong of 'sexual harassment', bringing the 'soft' law of the above code of practice into legislation (Clarke 2006: 165). Sexual harassment is, therefore, defined separately as being

where any form of unwanted verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature occurs, with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person, in particular when creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment...a person's rejection of, or submission to, such conduct may not be used as a basis for a decision affecting that person.¹⁰

Stephens and Hallas (2006) note that these new definitions recognise that some people may harass on the basis of gender, not on a sexual basis; it is the form of harassment and its effect on the victim that becomes important – not the reason for it. In addition, the changes in definition do not require an individual bringing a claim of harassment to compare their treatment with anyone else, whereas under the previous legislation a claimant would have to show that a person of the opposite sex would be treated differently (Health and Safety at Work 2007). Thus, the two wrongs, 'general harassment related to sex' and 'sexual harassment', are positioned as two separate forms of discrimination.

Barnes (2007) notes that the Equal Treatment Directive has separated 'general

⁹ Directive of the European Parliament and Council (EC) 2002/73/EC; Article 2.

harassment related to sex' and 'sexual harassment' and assumed that the two wrongs would not overlap. Masselot (2004), for example, provides a theoretical scenario of sexual harassment (an employer requesting a sexual favour from a female office employee under the threat of dismissal) and an example of general harassment related to the sex of a person (an employer ordering his female employee to do 'domestic' duties whilst not requesting the same from male employees). In practice, however, it may be difficult to differentiate between sexual harassment and general harassment related to sex. The two behaviours are likely to overlap and have common characteristics and both of these scenarios are considered sex discrimination under the new Directive (Masselot 2004: 98).

In response to the revised Equal Treatment Directive discussed above, the UK government issued a consultation paper and draft legislation amending the Sex Discrimination Act. This stated that unwanted conduct must be 'on the grounds of her sex' rather than the Directive's focus on 'related to sex' (Department for Trade and Industry 2005). However, Rubenstein (2005) argues that the vast majority of harassment is 'related to the sex' of a person, allowing for a broader interpretation of sexual harassment. Indeed, by focusing on the grounds of a person's sex, the comparator is reintroduced: the question of whether conduct was based on the grounds of sex can only be answered by reference to the treatment of a person from the opposite sex (Rubenstein 2005: 21). Despite opposition from the Equal Opportunities Commission and the Trades Union Congress, the UK government maintained that there was no material difference

¹⁰ Directive of the European Parliament and Council (EC) 2002/73/EC; Article 2.

between 'related to' and 'on the grounds of' (Clarke 2006: 4). Thus, the government enacted the Employment Equality (Sex Discrimination) Regulations 2005, in which:

- 4A – (1). a person subjects a woman to harassment if –
(a) on the ground of her sex, he engages in unwanted conduct that has the purpose or effect –
- (i) of violating her dignity, or
 - (ii) of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for her.¹¹

However, Clarke (2006) states that the government's decision not to adopt the broader concept of harassment as 'related to sex' meant that some behaviours fell outside the category. This was amended in the Sex Discrimination (Amendment of Legislation) Regulations 2008,¹² which provide for harassment 'related to her sex or that of another person'. The change in legislation meant that a person was only required to show that the conduct was associated with the sex of the victim or any other person. This is now represented within the Equality Act 2010, providing a single legal framework for protection against discrimination and disadvantage.

The Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination, victimisation and harassment for individuals on the grounds of the protected characteristics (age, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, and sexual orientation).¹³ Talbot (2011)

¹¹ The Employment Equality [Sex Discrimination] Regulations 2005 s.5

¹² Sex Discrimination (Amendment of Legislation) Regulations 2008 s.3

¹³ Equality Act 2010 s.4

outlines these protections and states that direct discrimination is treating a person less favourably than others 'because of' a protected characteristic. 'Combined discrimination' is a new concept developed to address a person being subjected to direct discrimination because of a combination of two or more protected characteristics taken together. Importantly, people claiming under combined discrimination need not show that their claim would have been successful in respect of each of the protected characteristics taken separately. Victimization involves a person being treated badly because she/he is considering taking action under the Equality Act or if she/he is supporting someone else who is doing so. This is now a separate category and is no longer treated as a form of direct discrimination. The complainant need only show that she/he is being victimised and is not required to demonstrate that her/his treatment is less favourable when compared to others.

The Equality Act 2010 also includes three separate types of harassment: 1) sexual harassment; 2) harassment caused by treating a person less favourably because she/he has either submitted to, or rejected, sexual harassment; and 3) where a person is subject to unwanted conduct related to a protected characteristic which has the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, degrading, humiliating or hostile environment or violating the complainant's dignity. In addition to this, the Act introduces an offence in relation to employers who fail to reasonably prevent harassment of an employee by a third party during her/his employment on at least two occasions (Talbot 2011: 1-2). The Equality Act 2010, therefore, defines harassment accordingly:

(1) A person (A) harasses another (B) if—

(a) A engages in unwanted conduct related to a relevant protected characteristic, and

(b) the conduct has the purpose or effect of—

(i) violating B's dignity, or

(ii) creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for B.

(2) A also harasses B if –

(a) A engages in unwanted conduct of a sexual nature, and

(b) the conduct has the purpose or effect referred to in subsection (1)b.

(3) A also harasses B if –

(a) A or another person engages in unwanted conduct of a sexual nature or that is related to gender reassignment or sex,

(b) The conduct has the purpose or effect referred to in subsection (1) (b), and

(c) Because of B's rejection of or submission to the conduct, A treats B less favourably than A would treat B if B had not rejected or submitted to the conduct.

(4) In deciding whether or not the conduct has the effect referred to in subsection (1) (b), each of the following must be taken into account –

(a) the perception of B

(b) the other circumstances of the case

(c) whether it is reasonable for the conduct to have that effect.

(5) The relevant protected characteristics are –

Age;
Disability;
Gender reassignment;

Race;
Religion or belief;
Sex;
Sexual orientation.¹⁴

Expanding upon this, in its advice to providers of further and higher education, the Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) states that 'of a sexual nature' can include verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct, including unwanted sexual advances, inappropriate touching, sexual assault, sexual jokes, displaying pornographic material and sending emails of a sexual nature.

'Unwanted' conduct refers to behaviour which is 'unwelcome' or 'uninvited' and does not require the student to say that she/he objects to the conduct.

Furthermore, it is unlawful to treat a student or staff member less favourably because she/he submits to, or rejects, sexual harassment or harassment relating to sex or to victimise a student because she/he is making a complaint, or supporting someone making a complaint, under the Equality Act 2010. A claim of victimisation does not need to be linked to a protected characteristic and, having left an institution, former students and staff members are still protected from discrimination and harassment (Equality and Human Rights Commission 2010: 27).

In addition, the Equality Act 2010 brings together the three earlier duties (race, disability and gender) into one new public duty which covers all the protected characteristics. Those subject to the equality duty must eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation; advance equality of

¹⁴ Equality Act 2010 s.26

opportunity between different groups; and foster good relations between different groups (Government Equalities Office 2011). The aim of this public sector duty is to support 'good decision making' and to understand how decisions made by public bodies can impact upon people's lives. Furthermore, the equality duty requires a 'due regard' for the statutory equality aims. This is defined by the Government Equalities Office (2011: 4) as 'consciously thinking' about the three main aims of the duty and the Act more broadly in decision making.

However, Fredman (2011) argues that the 'due regard' standard is not as robust a strategy as the requirement to 'take all proportionate steps towards' the statutory goals. She compares the Equality Act 2010 policy of 'due regard' to the Child Poverty Act 2010, with its committed poverty targets embedded within the legislation, and to the Warm Homes and Energy Conservation Act 2000, which requires the Secretary of State to publish and implement strategies based on the setting of key targets. Next to these committed target duties, the 'due regard' standard of the Equality Act 2010 is described as a 'considerable disappointment' (Fredman 2011: 3).

As seen from the above legal definitions of harassment, the Equality Act 2010 and the equality duty (2011) promote an understanding of sexual harassment as involving a set of easily identifiable behaviours with clearly-defined purpose and/or effect. However, as earlier sections of this literature review have discussed, theories of sexual harassment, what does and does not constitute the behaviour, the reasons for the behaviour and its effects on the victim, are

complex and contradictory. Implementing this legislation into sexual harassment codes of conduct and equality policies is, as a result, fraught with difficulty and it is to this that we now turn.

2.8 Implementing Sexual Harassment Policies

The implementation of sexual harassment policies has had varying success within the UK. This section will consider the impact of legislation in the workplace more broadly and then focus on the execution of equal opportunity policies within higher education. For example, Fredman (2011) notes that anti-discrimination laws in the UK are conventionally enforced through individual complaints based on proof of breach. This complaints-led approach is both lengthy and costly, limited to compensation awarded to individuals, or groups of complainants, and is unlikely to correct the institutional structures which gave rise to the discrimination. Attention should, Fredman argues, be shifted towards more proactive attempts to achieve equality (Fredman 2011: 2).

Arguing that sexual harassment complaints are often mismanaged, Collinson and Collinson (1992) state that a complaints-led focus assumes that victims of harassment will be free, able and capable to disclose cases of discriminatory treatment. They believe that although formalised interventions – such as codes of practice and sexual harassment policies – are necessary, they are not sufficient if sexual harassment is to be eliminated: formalised practices cannot determine the actions of employees, employers, trade unionists, harassers and/or victims in any particular workplace (Collinson and Collinson 1992: 11,

16). Samuels (2004) takes this position further and argues that too much focus within sexual harassment policies is on the classification of sexual harassment as a form of workplace bullying and, therefore, offers working women little protection from sexually harassing behaviours. Instead, Samuels argues, sexual harassment policies need to recognise the 'power relations between men and women' and 'deconstruct the relationship between the sexes' (Samuels 2004: 448). Likewise, Thomas (2004) and Heward and Taylor (1992) argue that the impact of equal opportunities and sexual harassment policies has had a limited effect in most higher education institutions (Heward and Taylor 1992: 111; Thomas 2004: 149).

Thomas (2004), in a discussion on the impact of sexual harassment policies in UK universities, argues that policies must be backed by procedures that enable sexual harassment complaints to be dealt with appropriately and effectively. In addition, the policy needs to be conveyed to both staff and students to ensure familiarity with the policy and that it is taken seriously (Thomas 2004: 145).

Although the Government Equalities Office (2011) argues that staff members across the board, from senior managers to front-line staff, need to be involved in the implementation of the equality duty, some feminist researchers have argued that there is often an institutional reluctance to adopt a more 'proactive' stance in promoting harassment policy. For example, Thomas (2004) states that equal opportunity departments are often isolated from the everyday workings of universities and may experience resistance when trying to encourage individual faculties to take over responsibilities for implementing and monitoring equal opportunity policies (see also Bacchi 2001: 129). Such

research argues that although many universities are monitoring sexual harassment complaints, the reporting figures that are available are low and, in some universities, non-existent. It is suggested within this body of research that the low reporting rates almost certainly do not mean infrequent cases of sexual harassment but rather a problem with the complaints procedures (Heward and Taylor 1992; Thomas 2004).

Bagilhole (2002), discussing what she terms 'male hegemony' in academia, argues that resistance to sexual harassment policies may stem from the requirement not to 'open up a can of worms': although universities may have adequate policies, the arrangements for implementing them may be deliberately inefficient (Bagilhole 2002: 31). However, even when policies and procedures are appropriate, and universities have taken a particularly positive approach, some research suggests that equal opportunities officers often express dissatisfaction with the apparent under-reporting. For example, Thomas (2004: 149) quotes one respondent who said: 'the procedures are sound, but have we eliminated harassment/improper conduct? – I doubt it'. It is possible to suggest, therefore, that the implementation of sexual harassment policies in both workplaces and educational institutions has had only limited success in preventing behaviours identified as sexual harassment and improving equal opportunities.

So far, this literature review has discussed competing theories and definitions of sexual harassment in higher education, including women-centred definitions and legal definitions, and explored both quantitative and qualitative data on the

subject with emphasis on the role of power within sexual harassment. Liberal feminist perspectives in particular identify power differentials as being the root cause of sexual harassment. However, as noted above, a Foucauldian perspective would argue against power being a static thing wielded by one group of people over another. Instead, power is positioned as something exercised over and through both men and women (Foucault 1980c). The following section, therefore, focuses on Foucault's notion of discourse and power and suggests a Foucauldian critique of liberal feminist theories on sexual harassment.

2.9 What is Discourse?

Foucault's notion of discourse is specific: prevailing discourses generate particular effects of power and subsequent ways of our understanding ourselves. Discourse enables us to gain an identity, to understand ourselves and the world around us; as a result, to be without discourse is to become disconnected and detached from the social world. More than this, however, discourses produce effects in thinking and behaving: they do not reflect or mirror their objects but produce and shape them (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 61). Discourse, therefore, is not merely a set of words or a coherent body of sentences and its role goes beyond the designation of the object: it is through discourse that we understand the object, can speak about the object, and relate the object to other entities (Foucault 1991a: 49).

An object of discourse has no external quality that the discourse attempts to capture and portray or an unarticulated essence that simply needs to be exposed or expressed (Foucault 1991a: 61). Everything that we know, understand and feel about an object comes from the discourse that we use to identify it and differentiate it from other objects. This does not mean that objects only exist within discourse, for Foucault (1991a) identifies the realm of the non-discursive, but that we can only speak of and comprehend an object once it enters discourse. For example, the body is made up of non-discursive material but how we understand it is dependent on the particular discourses produced and practised in that specific time and society. Thus, discourse regulates, manipulates and shapes the body, and we cannot conceive of the body outside these practices (Foucault 1991d: 136). In this way, discourses are contingent and arbitrary, producing specific ways of thinking and understanding ourselves. Thus, what we understand to be "truth" is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it' (Foucault 1986: 74). For Foucault, therefore, discourse and power are inextricably linked.

2.10 Discourse and Power

In 'Body/Power', Foucault (1980b) distinguishes himself from theorists who regard power as only repressive. Instead, Foucault is clear that the function of power is not to repress knowledge but to produce it. If, indeed, power were merely repressive, it would be difficult to explain how such a negative force could maintain a hold over us (Foucault 1980b: 58-59). Sawicki (1991) explains

this further and notes that repressive power represents power in its most frustrated and extreme form. Therefore, instead of considering power as a possession which can be wielded over people, power should be thought of as something exercised: a relational model of power, focusing on the myriad relations at the microlevel of society. This enables an analysis of how power relations produce ways of being and ways of understanding the world (Sawicki 1991: 22). Power, therefore, operates through human beings, investing in us our understanding of humanness, and constituting us as active beings, conscious of our selves (Foucault 1980b: 59).

It is in the attempt to produce ourselves as autonomous beings, searching for and seeking to be our 'true' selves, that we produce knowledge about ourselves and, subsequently, subject ourselves to increasing power. In this way, we are active in our own subjectification (Foucault 1980b: 57). We are produced as self-aware subjects through the power effects of modern discourses. Foucault (1991d) notes that:

[P]ower is not exercised simply as an obligation or a prohibition on those who 'do not have it'; it invests them, is transmitted by them and through them; it exerts pressure upon them, just as they themselves, in their struggles against it, resist the grip it has on them (Foucault 1991d: 27).

Power, therefore, is not simply repressive: it is also productive of our selves. For that reason, we cannot exist independently or be outside power, and what we understand to be 'true' is always situated within these power relations (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: 121). The individual is, thus, an effect of power.

Contemporary discourses operating as 'truth' permeate our consciousnesses

and produce certain effects (Foucault 1980b: 98). For example, in *The History of Sexuality, Volume One*, Foucault (1998) outlines how the modern individual has been discursively constructed as a sexualised being. Our modern understandings of sex, the notion that we are essentially sexed beings, are produced through current prevailing discourses. Furthermore, rather than a repressive notion of sex, there has been a 'veritable discursive explosion' surrounding sex, sexual behaviours and sexuality (Foucault 1998: 17).

Foucault states that there is

[A]n institutional incitement to speak about it, and to do so more and more; a determination on the part of the agencies of power to hear it spoken about, and to cause it to speak through endless articulation and endless accumulated details (Foucault 1998: 18).

Mechanisms of power produce sex as something to be judged, talked about and administered, this regulation coming about through new regimes of public discourses. Power has not, therefore, repressed discourses on sex but has, conversely, developed an incitement to discourse; a multiplication of sexualities, perversions and ever-increasing ways of being (Foucault 1998: 35). In addition, Foucault cautions against viewing sex as a 'real' thing. He states:

[T]he notion of sex made is possible to group together, in an artificial unity, anatomical elements, biological functions, conducts, sensations, and pleasures, and it enabled one to make use of this fictitious unity as a causal principle, an omnipresent meaning, a secret to be discovered everywhere (Foucault 1998: 154).

Our knowledge of sex, as a contingent truth, is constructed through the

prevailing discourses surrounding sex and sexual behaviours. The power effects of these discourses produce particular ways of being and thinking (Foucault 1998: 48). As discussed, therefore, power is conceived of in terms of its positivity, not something exercised over the body but generated within it and existing in all social interactions; power is a circulating, productive force and its primary task is to create discourse and through it ways of understanding the world. Power and discourse are joined together, coming into play in multiple points and strategies. Indeed, Foucault states that discourses are not subservient to power or raised against it. There is not, on one side, a discourse of power and, on the other, an opposing discourse: different and contradictory discourses coexist, multiply and proliferate (Foucault 1998: 100). It is through power, therefore, that we are capable of resistance and it is to this that we now turn.

2.11 Foucault and Resistance

Knights and Vurdubakis (1994), in their discussion of Foucault and resistance, argue that criticisms of Foucault tend to be located within dualistic understandings of force and consent, power and powerlessness. However, for Foucault, power and resistance are symbiotic: power is productive of resistance and, importantly, resistance does not deny relations of power the ability to reconstruct, reorganise, adapt and multiply (Knights and Vurdubakis 1994: 174-179). Power, therefore, is a conductive relation, one which 'leads' others through a field of possibilities. Power guides the behaviour of others and 'acts upon their actions' (Foucault 2002: 340). Crucially, however, power can only

act on free individuals: the field of possibilities which individuals face must include a variety of possible reactions and modes of behaviour (Foucault 2002: 342). Sawicki (1991) explains this social field as containing innumerable unstable power relations: an open system containing the possibilities of domination as well as resistance (Sawicki 1991: 25).

In this sense, Foucault (2002: 341) considers power to be exercised as a 'conduct of conduct': a productive set of relations which guide and shape individual behaviours and responses. Thompson (2003), discussing Foucault's theory of resistance and self-formation, states that the individual whose behaviour is being shaped is conceived as an agent with the capacity to act in and through power structures, however minimal this may be in actuality. Therefore, it is freedom, rather than simply resistance, which is symbiotic in the exercise of power. This is crucial because resistance had previously been theorised with only negative connotations: the destruction of dominant forms of power relations. However, understanding freedom as co-constitutive of power allows the creation and development of new forms of being and possible alternatives to the previous structured arrangements (Thompson 2003: 122-123). Thus, it is power that makes us capable of resistance and of casting previous understandings as untrue. However, it is crucial not to romanticise or overstate resistance.

Importantly, when we refuse a way of being or resist an effect of power, we do so from a new discourse and, therefore, a new point of power. Foucault (1998) states that where there is power there is always resistance. This resistance,

however, is not in a position of exteriority to power. The points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network, producing a plurality of resistances but ones which can only exist within the field of power relations. As such, resistance does not take us beyond power (Foucault 1998: 96). Resistance is a conditional response, carrying with it its own set of problematics. As one example, Foucault discusses the gay rights movement and the campaign to have same-sex relationships morally and socially accepted. However, Foucault notes that the gay rights movements 'remain very much caught at the level of demands for the rights to their sexuality, the dimension of the sexological' (Foucault 1980d: 220). In their efforts to gain acceptance and equality, many gay rights campaigners identified themselves as being 'born like that' and essentially gay (Plummer 1995: 93). Thus, through efforts to resist one set of subjectifying discourses, the validation of gay sex as 'natural', 'normal' and self-affirming, homosexuality is produced as a fixed identity, bound to essentialist notions of sex and sexed subjects (Weeks 1985: 200-201). Knights and Vurdubakis (1994) comment on processes like these and state that

Another useful reminder of the possibilities for mutual re-appropriation and interdependence between practices of resistance and particular relations of power is how practices and discourses that are in opposition to each other at one level may be mutually supportive at another (Knights and Vurdubakis 1994: 180).

Relations of power, therefore, may compete, contradict and reinforce each other. Although specific power relations may appear stable for certain periods of time, we should not assume that such stability is anything more than contingent and precarious. Although we can resist specific locations of power, we are mistaken in thinking that this resistance frees us in any way (Knights and

Vurdubakis 1994: 178). These relations of power, and their specific contingent effects, produce our complex and contradictory subjectivities.

2.12 The Discursive Construction of Subjectivity

Subjectivities, that is, how we understand ourselves in relation to the outside world, are produced through discourse and, furthermore, subjectivities are not fixed or formed of an essential nature but are in a continual process of construction and renegotiation. The discourses we learn and are subjected to order our ways of thinking and provide meaning and context to our daily lives (Weedon 1997: 32). These processes are understood to be contradictory and in a constant state of reconstitution; the subject, therefore, is not an essential being and is always the site of conflicting struggles (Weedon 1997: 32).

Therefore, modern subjectivities, our sense of self and what it means to be human, are formed through our engagement in prevailing discourses. As Foucault states, individuals are an effect of power, which they simultaneously undergo and exercise. Thus, individuals are not inert beings, waiting for power to strike: they are the vehicles of power (Foucault 1980c: 98).

In particular, Foucault identifies the specific power effects of the Enlightenment. Through this particular epistemic tradition, the self is produced as a being capable of awareness, 'truth' and reason (Foucault 1986b: 92). Flax (1987) argues that the self produced through the specific power effects of the Enlightenment is a stable, coherent being capable of forming reasoned and privileged insights into its development. The self, therefore, has no fixed essence: it is fluid and varies over time and our temporary beings are located

within the discourses of their time. In particular, our gender relations, how we understand what it means to be 'men' or 'women', cannot be treated as a simple, natural fact: discourses, varied by culture, age, class and ethnicity, form particular ways of understanding masculinity and femininity (Flax 1987: 624, 628). Indeed, Butler (1999) argues that gender should be conceived of in terms of its 'performativity': the acts, gestures and communicated ways of being are discursively constructed and intended to produce the illusion of an intact and coherent gendered core. This is a 'fabricated' reality: a re-enactment and re-experiencing of a set of socially established and legitimated meanings through which the social audience, and the actors themselves, come to believe in the essential nature of the performance (Butler 1999: 173, 179). The argument here is that gender is an *effect* of discourse operating within a matrix of power; if gender can be presented as an inherent and united 'truth', certain gendered 'identities' appear as development failures, thus failing to conform to the limits and regulations of cultural norms (Butler 1999: 43, 24).

Thus, for Foucault, discourse is defined as contingent and arbitrary, producing specific effects in our understanding ourselves (Foucault 1991a). Rather than viewing power as something to be possessed, Foucault's notion of power is understood as something exercised over and through both men and women. Consequently, we are all caught in the subjectifying effects of power (Foucault 1980c). Although we have the ability to resist the effect of power, we always do so from a new discourse and, thus, a new point of power. Resistance is, therefore, always contingent and we can never get beyond the effects of power (Foucault 1998: 96). Our subjectivities, how we understand ourselves, are

produced through the specific power effects of prevailing discourses (Weedon 1997: 32). A Foucauldian focus would, therefore, consider the prevailing discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education and the power effects of, and resistances to, these discourses. Having discussed Foucault's concepts of subjectivity, discourse, power and resistance, we now apply these theoretical underpinnings to our earlier discussion: sexual harassment and liberal feminism.

2.13 Foucault and Liberal Feminism

As discussed earlier, the liberal feminist tradition, focusing on freedom of choice, equal ability and equal opportunities, argues that sexual harassment is both a cause and a consequence of gender inequality and widespread sexism (Gutek 1985; Stockdale 1993; Gutek 2001). Sexual harassment, often assumed to have existed in the workplace for many years, is thought to have been coined and defined by liberal feminists working within this area (Farley 1978; MacKinnon 1979). However, as discussed above, a Foucauldian notion of discourse and power would disagree with many of these claims. Therefore, this section will critique the tensions between liberal feminism, starting with notions of power and whether or not liberal feminism can claim to have 'discovered' sexual harassment. Finally, this section will critique the liberal feminist position that sex at work is exploitative and degrading, and will suggest that liberal feminist harassment knowledge contributes to the positioning of women within passive/weak modes of subjectivity (Brewis 2001).

Within liberal feminism's work on sexual harassment theories, there is often a tendency to view power as static: men have power, women do not. As we have seen, for example, MacKinnon (1979) defines sexual harassment as men using power over women to gain sex. Wise and Stanley (1987) argue that sexual harassment is behaviour in which men 'do power' over women. Many of these theories view power through a dualistic model of men wielding power over women. In higher education, sexual harassment is often believed to be behaviour which reinforces male power and marginalises women students and academics. Ramazanoglu (1987) highlights what she terms the 'undermining tactics' used against non-deferential women to preserve male hegemony. Carter and Jeffs (1995) argue that structural mechanisms often sanction the sexual harassment of women students and staff; furthermore, senior staff may 'close rank' to protect men accused of sexual harassment. Grauerholz (1989) goes further and states that sexual harassment is abusive behaviour perpetrated on the basis of gender rather than organisational, structural or institutional power. For liberal feminism, therefore, sexual harassment is an abuse of power. Thus, women are innocent victims and, as such, require protection through policies and legislation (Stephens and Hallas 2006).

However, Foucault (1980c) argues that power circulates. It is not possessed by some and wielded over others. He states: 'It is never localised here or there, never in anyone's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth' (Foucault 1980c: 98). Furthermore, power is exercised over and through both men and women. As such, we are all caught in the subjectifying effects of power (Foucault 1980c: 96). The above concepts of power from a liberal

feminist perspective do not sit well within Foucault's definition of power.

Foucauldian thought is unlikely to approve of a model of power relations in which one group of people possesses power and wields it over another group of people. For Foucault, the power effects of sexual harassment discourses, amongst many others, constitute both men and women into understanding themselves in particular ways and guiding their relationships with others (see, for example, Foucault 1980b). This discussion is expanded upon in Chapter Four.

In addition, liberal feminism has also put forward the suggestion that sexual harassment has been 'discovered'. For example, Brewer and Berk (1982) argue that although sexual harassment is a 'new' issue, newly defined and labelled, it existed in the workplace for many years previously. Cain (1993) argues that an allowance for the pre-discursive is necessary in feminist research: she states that it is possible to have a relationship which has not, as yet, been formulated in discourse. It is essential, Cain argues, to accept the possibility of an unthought relationship in order to successfully expose the relationships in which women are placed. This produces a more complete and accurate knowledge (Cain 1993: 74, 84). The liberal feminist argument is that women have for many years suffered behaviours only now labelled as sexual harassment. Labelling and identifying the conduct has enabled women finally to complain about behaviours that they had previously suffered in silence. Thus, liberal feminism argues that the consideration of gender dynamics within organisations allows for a more complete, less distorted picture of the realities of working women's lives (Brewer and Berk 1982; Stockdale 1993; Gutek 2001).

Foucauldian thought, however, would argue against the notion that power necessarily distorts what we know. As noted above, power does not have its origins in human agents but has specific conditions of existence at specific sites (Knights and Vurdubakis 1994: 184). There are not, therefore, any better understandings outside power or less distorted perceptions. Foucault argues that all discourses are contingent, producing particular ways of making sense of our lives and relationships. This he terms the 'grids of intelligibility': our concepts of what we understand to be 'true' are formed through particular plays of power at specific junctures. Thus, what we understand to be true is arbitrary, fragile and conditional (Foucault 1991a: 32). However, it has been argued by some that liberal feminism as a body of knowledge is less than aware of its fragility. For example, Grey (1995) states that:

What seems to be emerging (or to have emerged)...is a new grid of Intelligibility within which it is not possible to make sense of organizations without recourse to concepts of gender...that is to say, gender has always been an issue in organizations, but one which was occluded by the fact of male-domination of organizations and society more generally. Thus the new grid of intelligibility is seen as desirable...it provides a more accurate picture of organizations (Grey 1995: 49).

Liberal feminism, has, therefore, located gender as central to its analyses. By bringing gender into the equation, it is argued that we can have a more realistic portrayal of organisations and their internal operations. This understanding, however, is not critiqued and is, therefore, presented as truth (Grey 1995: 46). In suggesting the 'discovery' of sexual harassment and by claiming a less distorted, power-free understanding, liberal feminism is presenting itself as a privileged form of commentary (Brewis 1996: 5).

Furthermore, the focus of liberal feminism is often that sex at work is exploitative and discriminatory. Sexual harassment is positioned as demeaning and belittling to women (Brewis 1996: 142). Discussing sexual harassment within a Foucauldian framework, Brewis states that traditional harassment knowledge often functions within a heterosexist discourse: the *passive* woman becomes a helpless target of the *active* man. These understandings identify sexual harassment as exploitative, violating and degrading; it is the *sexual* nature of the harassment, and the corresponding emotional and physical effects, that is socially and culturally positioned as problematic (Brewis 2001: 48). Liberal feminism, therefore, contends that harassment is particularly distressing because it is experienced as sexual. Thus, sexual harassment can be experienced through physical behaviours (actual bodily contact) and verbal interactions. Furthermore, it is seen as a particular problem because it takes place at work. Sexually harassed women are viewed as sexual objects first and foremost. This prevents women from being seen as equally capable, a central demand of liberal feminism (Brewis 1996: 141-144).

Within the liberal feminist tradition, sexual harassment is argued to be both a cause and a consequence of gender inequality and widespread sexism (Gutek 1985; Stockdale 1993; Gutek 2001). In addition, sexual harassment as a concept is believed to have been coined and defined by liberal feminism (Farley 1978; MacKinnon 1979). This section had critiqued the tensions between liberal feminism, focusing particularly on notions of power and whether or not liberal feminism can claim to have 'discovered' sexual harassment. It has argued that by positioning sex at work as being exploitative and degrading,

liberal feminist harassment knowledge contributes to the positioning of women within passive/weak modes of subjectivity (Brewis 2001).

2.14 Conclusion

The aim of this research is to explore the seemingly prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and to consider if and how my participants define themselves through these discourses. This literature review has explored competing definitions of sexual harassment in higher education, including liberal feminist definitions, women-centred definitions and legal definitions, and has placed emphasis on opposing theories of power. In particular, the literature review critiqued liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment and their notions of power as static: men have power; women do not (MacKinnon 1979; Wise and Stanley 1987). To do this, a Foucauldian analysis was employed to evaluate liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment, forming the theoretical basis to Chapter Four (results and discussion). As such, the literature review has argued that further research is needed to explore the relationships between seemingly prevailing discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education and the power effects of, and resistances to, these discourses. The following chapter will explore my epistemology positioning, my methodology and the research methods employed within this study, with particular emphasis on the research techniques which may enable the exploration of the prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education, and how my participants may define themselves through these discourses.

3. Chapter Three: Epistemology, Methodology and Methods

3.0 Introduction

Chapter Two explored competing definitions of sexual harassment, including liberal feminist definitions, women-centred definitions and legal definitions, with particular emphasis placed on the role of power. It argued that liberal feminist perspectives on sexual harassment tend to theorise power as static. A Foucauldian approach, however, would understand power as fluid, rather than possessed, and as generating particular ways of being. In particular, Chapter Two argued that by positioning sex at work as being exploitative and degrading, liberal feminist harassment knowledge contributes to the positioning of women within passive/weak modes of subjectivity (Brewis 2001).

As discussed, the aim of this research is to consider the prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and to explore if, and how, my participants define themselves through these discourses. I used twenty-four unstructured interviews with women who had identified themselves as having experienced sexual harassment within higher education, either as a student or a member of staff, or who had witnessed events which they defined themselves as sexual harassment. By exploring how my participants understand their experiences, I suggest that it is possible to infer the degree to which prevailing discourses have constituted their subjectivities. Chapter Three, consequently, explores how these research aims were put into practice: the chapter sets out

my epistemology (theory of knowledge), methodology (theory and analysis of research procedures) and methods (techniques for gathering data) (Harding 1987a: 1).

Furthermore, this research attempts to avoid the hygienic lie. Oakley (1990) warns about the dangers of suggesting that 'objective' research can produce data which are more 'real' or 'true' and, in addition, she highlights the importance of ensuring that feminist investigations do not result in the objectification of the researched. For example, Lather (2006) argues that 'knowing' is always politically inscribed within power/knowledge networks. Through these effects of power, research participants become objects of knowledge which is to be drawn out and examined. As hooks (1990) describes, this is a familiar process within traditional forms of research:

No need to hear your voice when I can talk about you better than you can speak about yourself. No need to hear your voice. Only tell me about your pain. I want to know your story. And then I will tell it back to you in a new way. Tell it back to you in such a way that it has become mine, my own. Rewriting you, I write myself anew. I am still your author, authority. I am still the coloniser, the speaking subject, and you are now at the centre of my talk. Stop (hooks 1990: 152).

Consequently, in an attempt to avoid such oppressive research, the will to know is reconfigured as the desire for 'not knowing': an ethical approach to research which involves engaging with your participants and sharing personal constructions (Laible 2000: 691; Davies 2002: 155).

Chapter Three, therefore, firstly considers my epistemological position, working its way through critiquing traditional constructions of knowledge and standpoint epistemology and, subsequently, arguing for a passionately interested form of inquiry. On discussing my methodology, this chapter will then explore the focus of Foucauldian-oriented research and the theories behind reflexivity in the research process. Finally, the chapter will explore my research methods (unstructured interviews), my sample and access, and the steps taken to analyse my data. Overall, Chapter Three argues that an ethical focus to research is essential and, thus, an approach based on principled positions is best suited to considering the prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and if, and how, my participants define themselves through these discourses. Firstly, therefore, we discuss my epistemological position.

3.1 Epistemology

Epistemology is defined as the theory of knowledge; however, as Bernecker (2006) notes, this does not explain what knowledge is or why we should question its necessity. Traditionally, epistemologists have argued that knowledge is required to hold three core and equally necessary configurations: justification, truth and belief. Knowledge, as true belief, is derived from reason and requires evidence or supporting rationales (Bernecker 2006: 5). This section of Chapter Three will discuss how feminists have responded to the questions of epistemology and why it is important to question the value, source and structure of knowledge. Starting with traditional constructions of

knowledge, this section then explores standpoint epistemology and criticisms of such a position, and finally considers a passionately interested form of analysis. Such an approach argues that it is possible to remain sceptical about the nature of 'true' data whilst conducting research from a political foundation. Finally, this section explores some possible tensions between Foucault and feminism. In the first instance, therefore, we consider the critique of traditional epistemological constructions and why, as a feminist, it is important to explore new ways of knowing.

3.1.1 Critiquing Traditional Constructions of Knowledge

As discussed above, traditional constructions of knowledge require three core components: justification, truth and belief. Knowledge is, therefore, traditionally understood as true belief constructed from reason and supported by evidence (Bernecker 2005: 5). However, since the 'second wave' of the feminist movement, women have questioned the construction of knowledge; this involved deconstructing and rebuilding epistemological assumptions of what knowledge is, who can possess it and how it can be obtained (Hesse-Biber et al. 2004: 3, 11). For example, Harding (1987) argues that traditional epistemologies have systematically prohibited the legitimate positioning of women as 'knowers' or agents of knowledge and women's experiences, therefore, have been systematically excluded. Epistemological developments test the justification of knowledge against men's experiences and observations; what we define as 'true' belief is, therefore, taken from the masculine position

(Harding 1987a: 3). However, we are cautioned against rectifying this male domination by simply 'adding women' into the research equation.

For example, feminist empiricists have attempted to eliminate sexism from research by more strictly adhering to the existing principles of scientific methodologies and by adding more women to their research samples. However, masculinist research is not generated through 'bad science' alone and the marginalisation of women is created by much more than individual bias (Harding 1987b: 182). In addition, the normative identity of 'woman' excludes all differences and presents womankind as a homogeneous group. The move away from universalism, which attempted to speak for all women everywhere, towards an intersectional approach (as discussed in Chapter Two) was directed by the feminists who were left out of the grand, all-encompassing social theories: 'poor and working class women, women of colour, lesbians, differently-abled women, older women *and* women *within* these categories' (Lather 1991: 27). It is not enough, therefore, simply to 'add' women's issues into the established research process; as Smith (2004: 27) notes, this makes women's perspectives merely an 'addendum' to the traditional masculinist approach. Thus, a feminist epistemology must be able to confront traditional concepts of knowledge building and find new ways to generate knowledge about women's experiences and their social relations (Hesse-Biber et al. 2004: 3). It is often noted that a PhD can be likened to a journey: I started this process firmly located within standpoint feminism and it is to this that I now turn.

3.1.2 Standpoint Epistemology

Standpoint epistemology is based on the Hegelian concept that marginalised and oppressed people develop a dual perspective; the structural differences of the oppressed, their personal perspectives combined with the perspectives of their oppressors, are created in order to survive, and thus provide radical differences in experience and belief (Hesse-Biber et al. 2004: 15). Hartsock (1983), starting from a Marxist critique of class-domination, argues that this dual perspective of the oppressed group has the power to expose the 'real relations' of material life: the sexual division of labour constructs a hierarchical dualism; the world of women is irrevocably tied to necessity: giving birth, the rearing of children and household labour. Moreover, this dual perspective allows for a sense of life and connectedness. Conversely, the world of men provides only an abstract and partial vision of reality and thus their sense of self is experienced as disconnected and cut off from others. Hartsock insists, however, that we should not view either perspective as false: women are forced to exist within the masculine-structured relations and, as a result, women's self-definitions, their relationships with others and their communal activities become distorted by a phallogentric culture. An analysis of these dualistic worlds, beginning with the marginalised perspective of women, allows exploration to go beyond the partial and surface appearances to the deeper but concealed social relations (Hartsock 1983: 159-161).

Smith (2004), a key theorist of feminist standpoint epistemology, notes that this approach would not only benefit women but the sociological discipline as a

whole: the dual perspective, or what Smith refers to as the 'bifurcate structure', bringing together both the abstract and the concrete worlds, allows for a reorganisation of the relationship between the researcher and her knowledge, so that the research process can begin from the researcher's direct experience. This process aims not to duplicate our primary assumptions but to explore where these assumptions lead us and how implicit they are in the knowledge that follows (Smith 2004: 27, 33-35). It is claimed that far from reducing the epistemological level of research to that of opinion, these situated knowledges maximise objectivity by opening knowledge up to a 'logic of discovery' (Harding 1993: 56). Given that social values and interests can never be eliminated from the research process, standpoint theory allows for a reflexive investigation into these values and a consideration of how these interests have influenced the construction of our knowledge. Furthermore, starting from the position of the marginalised and the oppressed allows for an innovative and critical analysis of social relations that does not rely on dominant constructions of our society (Harding 1993: 65-70). Standpoint epistemology, therefore, argues that an analysis rooted within a dualistic perspective – a focus on both masculine and feminine understandings of the world – enables the exposure of 'real relations' within material life. There are, however, many criticisms of this approach.

3.1.3 Criticisms of Standpoint Epistemology

As noted above, the standpoint epistemological notion of producing data capable of reflecting the 'real relations' of life has come in for criticism. For example, Flax (1992) notes that standpoint theory claims to offer the promise of

'better' and less distorted knowledge. The assumption is that if we can correct the flawed knowledge existing within unequal power relations, we have the means of obtaining a more 'truthful' understanding. The idea that it is possible to produce 'innocent' knowledge for emancipatory purposes operates within the metanarrative of the Enlightenment and suggests a progressive and superior state of knowledge (Flax 1992: 457). Enlightenment traditions have led us to believe that knowledge can only exist where power relations are suspended (Foucault 1991d: 27). However, as Butler (1992: 6) notes, the possibility that knowledge can exist outside power networks is perhaps power's most dangerous deception. When we present knowledge and power outside their symbiotic state, we allow for the ruse that knowledge can achieve real, natural and universal truths about the world in which we live (Foucault 1980: 163). Such 'natural' and 'innocent' knowledge has created regulatory notions such as *being* gendered, primary sexual difference and the transmission of normative heterosexuality (Butler 1999: 43; Butler 2004: 14). Thus, the standpoint epistemological concept of reflecting the 'real relations' of life, and the idea of producing more 'truthful' knowledge, has been heavily criticised by some. Therefore, having started this process as a standpoint feminist, I became uneasy about the search for 'true' data and began to explore a postmodern epistemology.

For example, Lather (1991) believes that postmodernism offers feminism the tools to work within, and yet challenge, dominant discourses: to inhibit essentialism, avoid single-cause explanations and produce knowledge from which to act. Far from a dangerous slide into relativism, it is suggested that a

postmodern approach challenges hegemonic academic discourses, including those at play in our intended counter-hegemonic discourses (Lather 1991: 39, 115). Indeed, if the focus of postmodernism is to challenge the power/knowledge networks that restrain us within dominant power relations, then relativism belongs to another discourse: a foundational discourse of guaranteed certainty from a privileged standpoint (Lather 1991:116). This is because the concept of relativism only has meaning against its binary opposite: universalism. If we remove the desire to provide universal truth, relativistic fear is lost (Flax 1992: 453). Therefore, one response to the challenge of postmodernism/poststructuralism to feminist political action is to remain sceptical but, at the same time, recognise the possible benefits of attempting to reconcile the epistemological disputes between the two positions. That said, any theoretical compatibility must have the aim of furthering feminism's political goals (Aranda 2006: 136). The process of remaining sceptical about the nature of 'true' data *and* conducting research from a political base can be found within a passionately interested form of analysis, and it is to this that we now turn.

3.1.4 A Passionately Interested Form of Analysis

In the above section, Lather (1991) argues that the search for 'true' data with essentialist single-cause explanations should be avoided, whilst, at the same time, feminist researchers should find political bases from which to act. In a proposal for discourse analysis from a feminist perspective, Gill (1995) states that we do not have to dichotomise relativism and realism: it is possible to develop a poststructuralist form of analysis within a feminist, emancipatory

project. This would form a 'passionately interested inquiry', a way of articulating the partiality of knowledge and a deconstruction of universalism whilst, at the same time, making our concerns explicit, acknowledging our values and situating our interpretations. This forms a sound, ethical basis from which to act and involves 'reinventing a new vocabulary of value' with which we can make political interventions (Gill 1995: 165, 175-176).

A principled approach does not mean that truth does not exist, only that all truth is provisional: just because something is true for one person does not mean that it will be true for anyone else. This perspective, therefore, requires our 'truths' to be exposed and their constructions understood (Aranda 2006: 137). Aranda (2006) notes that any research which claims to produce a 'true' and authoritative account, which claims to speak the silences of the subordinated, can easily oppress or repress the people it is attempting to aid (Aranda 2006: 137). Feminists seek the emancipation of women; a cause which may not be best served by asserting the 'truth': political change is just as likely to be the result of empathy, anger or disgust (Gill 1995: 178). Indeed, Gill (1995) states that 'in the absence of ontological guarantees, then values, commitments and politics must be at the heart of all analyses' (Gill 1995: 177). A passionately interested form of inquiry, therefore, is based on acknowledging the partiality of knowledge and situating our own values and concerns. It is appropriate at this point, therefore, to discuss my own principled positions within a passionately interested form of inquiry.

3.1.5 *My Principled Positions*

As discussed above, feminist research should make clear our political involvements, acknowledge the partiality of knowledge, and seek to avoid providing authoritative accounts. This section highlights my own principled positions and attempts to situate my values and concerns. It is important to note that feminist research can provide the creation of a space in which women can get and give support through the sharing of our stories (Gustafson 2000: 717, 729). Indeed, Bell (1993) argues that survivors' accounts have formed the basis of feminist knowledge on sexual violence and that the silence of survivors is as important as their voices. It is vital, therefore, that we question how sexual violence has been spoken *about* and how some voices have been marginalised and silenced (Bell 1993: 80).

My interest in the subject of sexual harassment in higher education began when a close friend of mine was sexually harassed by two of the male lecturers at her university. At the time, Rebecca was suffering from various emotional problems and was particularly vulnerable; her experiences left her traumatised and shattered. As a mature student, I had worked hard to gain entry into higher education and, as a result, I had a rather idealised notion of the 'Ivory Towers'. I experienced confusion and disillusionment as I struggled to help Rebecca come to terms with her experience. Therefore, my research is based on both a personal need to come to terms with these issues and a more comprehensive

desire to explore the prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and how women may define themselves through these positions.

When I first started my PhD, the original objective was systematically to analyse the institutional structures and mechanisms that allow some male lecturers to sexually harass their female students. It was my intention to use these results to develop a framework capable of informing sexual harassment policies which would be more readily accessible to women. However, results from my pilot research suggested that this approach was misguided and far removed from the realities of women's lives; it did not consider women's multiple and often contradictory experiences and responses. It involved my placing myself in an authoritative position over women, interpreting their lives and making prescriptive decisions about what would be best. As noted above, traditional feminist research has always supported women in the sharing of their stories and in the creation of a discursive space in which to bring these stories to the public's attention.

However, as Bell (1993) notes, although 'speak outs' have enabled space for survivors' accounts, this does not necessarily mean that women's voices will be heard. Marginalised voices are often silenced through the effort to ensure credibility and uniformity (Bell 1993: 80). Glass (1998) warns feminist researchers against the dangers of falling victim to the generalising, monolithic theories often evident within the traditional research process. It is suggested, therefore, that the integration of feminist and postmodern methodologies can focus on supporting women who are attempting to speak the 'unspeakable'

whilst emphasising the local, the contextual and the marginalised voices (Glass 1998: 47, 53). This notion of researching the 'unspeakable' is of central importance.

In *Madness and Civilisation*, Foucault (2001) attempted to write the unspeakable silences of the men and women who were confined and oppressed through the discourses of psychiatry, reason and order. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982: 4-5) point out that this was not an attempt to write the individual stories of the men and women involved, but to produce an analysis of the specific mechanisms of power which operated within medical institutions. There are parallels here, I believe, with my own task: it is not my intention to interpret the experiences of the women involved or to discuss the potential (un)success of implementing sexual harassment policies. To do so would involve, once again, making the victims of sexual harassment the objects of analysis and contributing to their enforced silences by overlaying them with my own voice (see Young 1981: 48). It is noted that although power relationships within feminist research are not the same as the relationship between the analyst and the analysand, or between the accused and the court, the research dynamics are still problematic: the woman listening may be perceived as someone trying to help or as someone who has to be 'pleased' through the telling of the story (Bell 1993: 103). The methods section below discusses how I attempted to put these principles into power. In addition, there has been a significant debate about whether a feminist appropriation of Foucault's theories can ever provide an emancipatory role and it is to this discussion that I now turn.

3.1.6 *Feminism and Foucault*

Ramazanoglu (1993: 8) warns that many feminists fear the lack of consistency offered in Foucault's work and in poststructuralism and postmodernism more broadly; a Foucauldian approach is often feared as risking luring the emancipatory agenda into a pluralistic relativism which ignores gender, disempowers women and is insensitive to the political point of feminism. This section explores some of these concerns and asks whether it can be possible for a Foucauldian analysis and a feminist perspective to work together.

Soper (1993), discussing the value of Foucault's work for feminism, cautions against employing a wholesale Foucauldian emphasis on discourses: although such an anti-naturalist position does much to deconstruct the constraining and distorting effects of cultural stereotyping, feminists must be wary of dismissing a pre-discursive reality (Soper 1993: 33). Indeed, it is argued by some that a feminist position must be able to accept the possibility of experiences which have not been formulated in language. These intransitive relations are crucial to the exposure of feelings and emotions tied to behaviours which exist outside knowledge (Cain 1993: 74, 82). However, as argued in Chapter Two, this thesis takes the position that discourses produce effects in thinking and behaving, producing and shaping our understandings. Grids of intelligibility, the processes of understanding 'truths', are formed through specific and contingent plays of power (Foucault 1991a: 32). Within this model, although the pre-discursive does exist, we cannot know, experience or understand it unless through the medium of discourse (Foucault 1991a: 49).

A second criticism often directed towards Foucault's theoretical positioning is what has been identified by some feminists as his apparent gender blindness. For example, Soper (1993) states that in his account of power, Foucault ignores the specific relations at play in a sexually hierarchical society *and* the differential impact of the 'disciplinary' procedures on men and women (Soper 1993: 39). Hartsock (1990) argues that feminist theories must be able to highlight and expose the specific power dynamics used to subjugate women. Foucault's concept of power, she argues, is abstract rather than transformative and fails to acknowledge the importance of power differentials. Furthermore, Hartsock argues that his continued focus on power as operating within a network of multiple points leads him to avoid considering how gendered individuals experience and exercise power (Hartsock 1990: 158, 168).

Bell (1993) agrees that Foucault fails to consider the gendering of discourses. However, it is noted that this is not because Foucault 'leaves out' or ignores gender issues. He discusses at length, for example, the enrolment of women within the process of the deployment of sexuality. That said, Bell argues that Foucault does not necessarily consider how the deployment of sexuality has affected the relationship *between* men and women. Nevertheless, there are themes around which feminism and Foucault converge, especially those issues surrounding sexuality, power and knowledge. For example, both Foucault and feminism highlight the prevailing discourses and 'common sense' notions of sexuality, critiquing the concept that we are essentially sexed beings with innate sexual identities (Bell 1993: 23). Bell notes that Foucault's discussions on

power/knowledge networks can potentially assist feminism in their deconstructions of power and emphasis on local resistance. This is not to propose that feminism *needs* Foucault, but a suggestion that we utilise the parts of Foucault's work which can be usefully deployed within a feminist project (Bell 1993: 14, 27). This, therefore, was my task: to attempt to utilise Foucault's theories of discourse, subjectivities and relations of power, whilst, at the same time, staying committed to my principled positions.

The epistemology section of Chapter Three has critiqued traditional constructions of knowledge and the subsequent responses of feminists. In particular, we explored standpoint epistemology and criticisms of this theoretical positioning. It was suggested that an analysis based on a passionately interested form of inquiry, one which enables scepticism regarding the nature of 'true' data *and* the ability to conduct research from a political base, was an appropriate construction of knowledge from a feminist perspective. To this end, I discussed my own principled positions, my location within the research, and the reasons I became interested in the subject area. Finally, this section considered some of the tensions between feminism and Foucault and asked if the two could ever usefully work together. In the following methodology section, I will discuss the practicalities of working from such a position, including how Foucauldian-oriented research can be carried out from a feminist perspective.

3.2 Methodology

Having discussed my epistemological position, this section considers the theory surrounding my research procedures. The research methodology I utilised was Foucauldian oriented. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982: 104) note that throughout his career, Foucault continually revised and updated his theories. In *Nietzsche, Genealogy and History*, Foucault (1980) set out the beginnings of a methodology to explore his central themes of power, knowledge and the body. With this in mind, therefore, I discuss Foucauldian-oriented research and how, as a feminist, I can ethically operate within this methodological framework. In addition to Foucault's theory of genealogy, the theory of reflexivity as care of the self will be explored, as well as an analysis of love as the ability of not knowing (Davis 2002). Firstly, therefore, we discuss Foucauldian-oriented research.

3.2.1 What is Foucauldian-oriented Research?

In *Nietzsche, Genealogy and History*, Foucault (1980) sets out his argument that traditional interpretation has prioritised concealed meanings, hidden depth and fixed meaning of texts. A genealogical approach, however, starts from the premise that discourse is a series of dominations through a particular stage of forces; genealogy isolates these specific sites of power at the surface.

Discourse is always produced through forces which struggle and interact with each other and genealogy must outline the interaction of these forces to identify the complex grid of power in relation to discursive regularities (Foucault 1980: 148). It must, therefore, consider the 'games of truth': the rules by which a

subject can say certain things depending upon the questions of truth and falsity (Foucault 2000a: 460). However, it should be noted here that Foucault is not concerned with the actual veracity or falsehood of a discourse but the processes which cause the discourse to be understood as such: how, and why, we consider a discourse to be true or false (Foucault 1981: 54). Alvesson (2002) expands upon this point and argues that: 'the word "A" may or may not represent the thing "T", but why is the word "A" invoked in the first place, and what does it accomplish?' (Alvesson 2002: 67).

Discourse is regarded as a current episode in a series of dominations (Foucault 1980: 148). Crucially, we should understand change, not as a process of cause and effect, but as systems of transformation within vast fields of possibilities. Each new transformation informs, re-informs and contests other elements and the existence of these transformations renders new modifications possible (Foucault 1991a: 58-59). Not all discourses carry equal weight, and some are more open and penetrable than others. However, discourses do not hold constant positions and the primary texts continually change, multiply and take divergent forms within particular periods (Foucault 1981: 56-57).

In summary, it is the task of the genealogist to examine and discover those discourses that are recognised as valid, debatable and invalid, and the discourses that are retained or transformed (Foucault 1991b: 60). This process is intended to strip away the 'self-evidential' quality of a discourse and expel the myth of its unity and coherence, allowing for a differentiated analysis capable of highlighting deviation and differences. Alvesson (2002) refers to this process as

'defamiliarisation' and it is a refusal to regard discourses as natural or rational. However, there is also a cautionary note added here, as defamiliarisation requires the ability to think outside the pre-ordered discourses that structure our understanding of the world. This, clearly, is impossible but, nevertheless, the challenge is for each researcher to do her best and, as a result, a 'cautious interpretation' is recommended (Alvesson 2002: 73, 91).

Foucauldian-oriented research, therefore, involves exploring how discourses are produced through specific sites of power and considers the processes through which we understand discourses to be true or false. A Foucauldian researcher should problematise these prevailing ways of understanding the world and challenge the 'self-evidential' quality of research. The following section will argue how this process can be facilitated with a specific form of reflexivity.

3.2.2 Reflexivity as Care of the Self

Foucauldian-oriented research involves problematising prevailing ways of understanding the world. One possible way of assisting this approach is by employing reflexivity as care of the self. This section will critique Foucault's notion of self-mastery and suggests an analysis based on love (both towards oneself and others). In his account of antiquity, Foucault (2000d: 269) developed a concept of ethics as a way of thinking about one's self, of acting and behaving in what we believe to be an ethical manner; furthermore, an ethical approach centres upon enjoying the relationship we have with ourselves

(Foucault 2000f: 309). In other words, the care of others is irrevocably linked with caring for oneself. This is important because, as O'Grady (2004) notes, taking care of oneself provides a space for the generation and evaluation of knowledge.

It is argued that without the approach of taking care of oneself, reflexive knowledge about our individual beliefs, desires, values and principles cannot be conceived. Thus, taking care of oneself, or to use the Greek terminology, enjoying oneself, provides the possibility of exploring our preferred ways of being, standards and norms that we can choose to apply ethically to our daily living. As in Foucault's work, this does not involve a discovery of 'true' or inherent qualities but allows for the necessary space for a remaking of the self within our own preferred discursive practices (O'Grady 2004: 102). For me, it was vitally important that I was able to support women who wanted to give voice to their experiences; I did not want to oppress further or analyse my interviewees but I was aware of how easy it is to fall into this trap. I believe, therefore, that the ethos of caring for oneself, thus allowing the time and space to consider my relationship with myself, others and the world around me, provided me with the best opportunity to construct an ethical approach to my research. However, Foucault (2000b: 208) warns that no technique, practice or art of living can be learnt without training the self in what is referred to as the 'politics of self-mastery'.

Self-mastery is, according to Foucault (2000b), an ethically required objective involving a consultation with oneself, relying, benefiting and enjoying who we

are as individual beings (Foucault 2000b: 211). Furthermore, the process of taking care of oneself became linked to constant writing activity (Foucault 2000c: 232). For the ancient Greeks, an essential aid to this process were the hypomnemata; these personal and individual notebooks served as guides to conduct: one wrote down reflections, reasonings, quotations, extracts from books and things one may have heard or witnessed; these would be re-read frequently and meditated upon (Foucault 2000b: 209). The writings are not, therefore, confessional diaries, revealing intimate or hidden knowledge but a collection of what has already been said and thought (Valverde 2004: 79). In other words, it is a means of taking stock; not in a confessional sense but rather in an administrative view of one's own life (Foucault 1990: 61). These are processes of inspection and a re-measuring of the acts which were committed that day (Foucault 2000c: 237) but they do not lead to a guilty verdict or to possible decisions of self-castigation: the words are spoken as one might do after a piece of work has been finished, to see if it is up to the standards set for it (Foucault 1990: 62).

However, Foucault's notion of the mastery of the self has been criticised by some feminists. For example, McNay (1994: 97) argues that Foucault fails to evaluate the primacy of male dominance within the Greek understanding of self-mastery. These masculine discourses can be seen in *A History of Sexuality, Volume 2*, in which accounts of self-mastery are filled with metaphors of combative relations, battles for dominance, confrontations for supremacy, and ruling authorities (Foucault 1992: 64, 66-67). O'Grady (2004) also comments upon this and notes that a theory which bases itself on accounts of dominance

and subordination is unlikely to be useful to a feminist approach oriented towards respect and care for women. Nevertheless, it is suggested that Foucault's emphasis on the relationship we have with ourselves is a useful one and, as an alternative to concepts based on conquering and mastery, these reflexive processes can be applied through the development of a loving attitude towards the self and to others (O'Grady 2004: 103-104).

The concept of love, however, can form a complex approach that requires careful navigation. Davis (2002), in her salient analysis of love as the ability of not knowing, argues that the civilising-Christianising missions of colonisation asserted love within the supportive partnerships of knowledge and procedures forced upon the colonised Other. The rhetoric of 'saving' in the name of liberation and the desire to 'know' the Other is the 'failure of love' (Davis 2002: 147-148). A new commitment is needed, therefore, in which the *will-to-know* is reconstituted by the ability of *not knowing*: this involves having the capacity to engage profoundly with a person, seeking not to possess her 'truths' or to reduce her dignity by demarcating her as an object of research (Davis 2002: 155). Lather (2006) acknowledges this by arguing that 'knowing' is always politically inscribed within power/knowledge networks and what is needed, therefore, is a research practice that situates itself at the very limits of knowledge and embraces such limits (Lather 2006: 5). Davis (2002) states:

The proposal here is not that of giving up on knowing. To the contrary, what is at stake is the political objective to confront the postcolonial condition of love and knowledge simultaneously by cultivating a feminist ability of engaging with (not knowing) that which is constituted in parts by its own effacement and limits (Davis 2002: 157).

However, if love is the ability of 'not knowing', can we develop a reflexive methodology based on love? Laible (2000) argues that the desire to 'know' the Other can never be ethical and asks, therefore, if there can ever be an ethical or valid way to continue producing knowledge about other human beings. From the perspective of her Christian beliefs, a principled position which she exposes and defends, Laible develops the notion of 'a loving epistemology': a way of placing women's experiences and ethics of care at the centre of the research process (Laible 2000: 690). This involves the concept of 'travelling'. This does not involve travelling in the colonial sense of conquering, possessing and authoring in the name of love/reason, but of meeting people on their own ground, of opening yourself up, sharing constructions and being 'subjects to each other' (Laible 2000: 691).

These ideas are cautiously critiqued, however, by Capper (2000), who is concerned that these goals seem to reflect modernist ideals of research that is 'unbiased' or purely 'objective'. We are warned that just as no research can ever be pure or without power inequalities, similarly we can never be fully compassionate and loving at all times. Although we should always work towards the minimisation of any hurt or pain occurring as a result of our research, we can never eliminate the hurt completely (Capper 2000: 696).

Likewise, Fehn (2000) points out that given the limitations of using language in research, although we may have 'travelled' to our participants' worlds and attempted to become proficient in their language, we may not truly be able to 'hear' what our participants are saying (Fehn 2000: 706). This, I believe, is a

reminder of the ethical difficulties of 'knowing'. The practicalities of 'hearing' my participants are discussed at length in the next section.

The methodology section of this chapter has explored my methodology as Foucauldian-orientated research. This section has discussed the theory behind such a focus and how Foucauldian research may benefit from a reflexive approach based on care of the self. Finally, this section argued that a reflexivity based on self-mastery may not be appropriate for feminist-based research and suggested a form of reflexivity based on love. In the final section of this chapter, my research methods will be outlined and analysed, with particular attention paid to the process of unstructured interviews.

3.3 Methods

In this section, I outline my method of data collection, my interview sample and access, and the ethics of my research (including anonymity and informed consent). How I analysed the Foucauldian-oriented research is explored in depth and, finally, the difficulties of conducting reflexive research, using field notes, and researching sensitive issues. As discussed, my method of data collection involved unstructured interviews with women in higher education. Twenty-four unstructured interviews were conducted in total: twenty of these interviews were with women who had experienced behaviours they had defined themselves as sexual harassment from male lecturers during their time as a student; four interviews were conducted with female members of staff within

higher education who had witnessed what they defined as male lecturers sexually harassing female students, or who had experienced behaviours that they themselves defined as sexual harassment. It is suggested that my participants were able to offer contingent and partial opinions on the subject of sexual harassment in higher education and to propose the degree to which the prevailing discourses may have constituted their subjectivities. The first section, therefore, explores unstructured interviews and how these were carried out.

3.3.1 Unstructured Interviews

In an important text on gendered research, Oakley (1990) discusses how traditional research is structured around the masculine values of scientific rationality and objectivity. In addition, the relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee is seen as hierarchical, with the interviewee considered a receptacle of information that must be extracted by the interviewer (Oakley 1990: 40). It is argued that these types of conventional research have failed to represent women's experiences: either omitting their knowledge and life stories from the research completely, or distorting their experiences in sexist ways. Women's voices are silenced, as their knowledge and understanding is interpreted through male constructions (Wise and Stanley 1993: 2, 59).

Oakley refers to the process of women interviewing women as 'objectifying your own sister' and, agreeing with this, it was important that I found a method of conducting interviews within an ethical format. In addition, I wanted to avoid

positioning my research data as 'true' or 'real' information. This was an attempt to avoid the hygienic lie: the suggestion that detached and objective research can produce more valid results and that personal involvement is a 'dangerous bias' (Oakley 1990: 41, 58). It is argued that unstructured interviews attempt to rectify the problems associated with masculine-dominated research by offering non-categorised discussions and, as far as possible, unstructured interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee (Reinharz 1992: 19). With care, it is possible to be interviewee-guided and to focus less on getting one's questions answered and more on understanding the interview (Reinharz 1992: 19-24; Parr 1998: 92). Arksey and Knight (1999: 7) define the unstructured interview as flexible and this positions the interview process as being more like a two-way conversation. However, Livesey (2002) argues that these two-way conversations are an interactive process and that there is a reciprocal relationship between the one who speaks and the one who listens. Through this process, the listener can challenge the person telling the narrative in a number of ways, utilising the 'so what?' challenge to the speaker. In this sense, disclosure, like any conversation, is a shared event in which both participants have the ability to shape the nature of the interaction between them (Livesey 2002: 55, 60).

In the interviews, I took my lead from the interviewee and tried to let her steer the conversation, talking about issues that she felt were important to her. As in any conversation, if I was unclear about something I asked for further clarification and, on occasion, doubled-back to certain points. I went into each interview with only a general idea about the main themes and topics to be

explored and attempted to adopt a more passive and less directive role.

Unstructured interviews, however, do require careful consideration: because the interviews occur without pre-structured or standardised procedures, many methodological decisions have to be made immediately. This requires the researcher to be thoroughly knowledgeable about the subject area and to have an understanding of the conceptual issues of producing knowledge through conversation (Kvale 1996: 13).

I wholeheartedly agree that findings acquired from unstructured interviews have the ability to produce unexpected information and to avoid closed-off or inflexible discussions but I am sceptical about the possibility of producing hygienic, 'deeper' or 'true' knowledge. As Alvesson (2002) notes, the interview process involves co-constructions between the interviewer and the interviewee which shift, redefine and contradict themselves. These are complex interactions within specific and local situations; both the interviewer and the interviewee draw upon available discourses and the interview is the outcome of the discourses. Thus, the interviews were co-constructions between the interviewee and me. Although incapable of producing hygienic and 'true' knowledge, it is possible to explore the interview transcripts at the level of discourse: an indication of when and how specific socially prevailing discourses are operating (Alvesson 2002: 115-116).

It is argued above that unstructured interviews can help avoid the hygienic lie. That said, the reciprocal relationship between the one who speaks and the listener is noted, with the listener challenging and shaping the process (Livesey

2002). Interviews are, therefore, complex interactions within specific and local situations. Having discussed the process of the unstructured interviews, I now outline the interview sample and access.

3.3.2 Interview Sample and Access

My research consisted of twenty-four unstructured interviews with women who had identified as having experienced sexual harassment within higher education or who had witnessed events which they had defined as sexual harassment.

Although the focus of my study is female students' experiences of behaviours that they had identified as sexual harassment from male lecturers, my interview sample also included female members of staff who had approached me directly and asked to be part of my research. In the interviews with these female members of staff, the focus of the interview was on behaviours they had witnessed and identified as the sexual harassment of female students by male lecturers. In two of these interviews with staff members, however, personal information, including their own experiences of behaviours defined as sexual harassment, was discussed. Therefore, I conducted twenty interviews with female students (both undergraduate and postgraduate) and four interviews with female members of higher education staff (two lecturers, one administrative assistant and one manager from student services). Two of my interviewees identified themselves as lesbian; three of my interviewees were black or minority ethnic.

Fourteen of my interviewees were accessed through snowball sampling:

through my previous job as a mental health worker for undergraduate students, I had colleagues and friends in various UK universities. In discussions about my research, often over lunch or during nights out, a number of friends/colleagues reported that they knew of women who had experienced sexual harassment and, in turn, several of these women knew other possible contacts. In this sense, my sample was developed through a very informal process and had begun almost before I was aware of it. Using friendship networks can increase interviewees' trust in the research process: they can inquire about the project, ask questions about confidentiality and about the trustworthiness of the interviewer's credentials. These word-of-mouth assurances are particularly important when researching issues of a sensitive nature and when participants may be wary about revealing details of their personal lives to a stranger (Browne 2005: 50). However, these personal recommendations increased my feelings of responsibility towards my interviewees and, on one occasion, after interviewing a friend of a friend, I was concerned about the possibility of being asked to reveal confidential details. Fortunately, this did not occur.

The second group of my interviewees were self-selected in response to an article published online and an article published in the local newspaper of my home city (Oxford). The first article was published in a UK online feminist magazine. The article discussed recent comments Germaine Greer had made about sexual harassment and, at the end, was a brief note about my research and my email address. In particular, the article asked for female students who had experienced behaviours they had later identified as sexual harassment

from a male lecturer during their time at university. From this article, I received twelve emails from female students and this led to seven interviews being carried out. The second article was published in a local newspaper which has copies in the college lodges of Oxford as well as an online version. This article explained my research and advertised for female participants who had experienced behaviours they had identified as sexual harassment from a male lecturer as a student of higher education. I received eight emails from this article, three of these contacts leading to interviews. Although it is recognised that this sampling technique will not produce results capable of any generalisations, I suggest that its strength lies in the ability to explore key experiences in the dynamics of women's lives at the site of the individual (see MacLeod 1992).

In summary, my research consisted of twenty-four unstructured interviews with women who had identified as having experienced sexual harassment in higher education or who had witnessed events which they had defined as sexual harassment. Fourteen of these interviews were accessed through snowball sampling. The following ten were self-selected in response to articles in a UK online feminist magazine and in a local newspaper in a student city. It is recognised that this sample will not produce results capable of generalisation. Having outlined my sample and access, I now discuss the ethics of my result, anonymity and informed consent, and the effects of sharing my position on the research.

3.3.3 Ethics

As this research deals with sensitive and emotional topics, ethical issues are of particular concern and the guidelines produced by the British Sociological Association (2002) were closely adhered to. This included the following: behaving with professional integrity, recognising the boundaries of professional competence, not entering into relationships with my interviewees and attending to the power dynamics within the interview setting. With research involving complex issues, such as sexual violence, there is a particular responsibility on the part of the researcher to protect the physical, social and psychological well-being of her interviewees. This includes the principles of informed consent, anonymity, privacy and confidentiality (BSA 2002). As well as following these guidelines, as a feminist researcher I had an additional responsibility to the women I interviewed. Therefore, issues of anonymity and informed consent were of particular concern, as was the protection of my interviewees and myself from emotionally challenging subjects and dealing with issues of power within the interview setting.

3.3.4 Anonymity and Informed Consent

In their Statement of Ethical Practice, the BSA (2002) states that sociological research requires the informed consent of all research participants; this includes a clear and detailed understanding of what the research is about, who is involved in the research, why it is being undertaken and how the data are to be disseminated and used. In giving their informed consent, the research

participants are stating that they understand their rights to withdraw from the research at any time, their afforded levels of anonymity and confidentiality and their rights under copyright and data protection laws (BSA 2002). The issue of anonymity has caused me grave concern: although I have taken every possible action to break any connection between my interviewees, their universities, their courses/programmes of study and the people mentioned within their narratives, it was always possible that an individual reading my work would recognise the events and, therefore, the people involved.

I was particularly concerned about how to protect the anonymity of people who have not given their consent to being included in the research but, nevertheless, feature within the interview narratives (Etherington 2004: 82). Therefore, I have been additionally cautious about the material used and how issues of anonymity are dealt with. Interviewees were warned in advance that although I would make every effort to protect their identities, their anonymity could not be guaranteed with certainty. On several occasions I was unsure about whether or not I could adequately protect both my interviewee and the people included within the narratives and I did not include these data in the final analyses.

Informed consent is often treated as a singular event at the beginning of an interview. However, as Chih (2005: 287) notes, consent is a fluid process which has to be continually renegotiated; within a standard interview, topics vary widely from demographic data to issues of a much more sensitive nature and interviewees continually weigh up the relative risks and benefits of participating in the research. However, it is important to note that the 'sensitivity' of a topic is

relative to and dependent upon the experience of the interviewees and cultural and social norms. In addition, on those occasions when the interviewer and interviewee develop a strong rapport that encourages feelings of friendship, the interviewee may reveal more of her intimate feelings and experiences than initially expected (Cotterill 1992 as cited in Holland 2007: 202). As a result, during the interviews I provided the necessary space for consent to be renegotiated, thus allowing time for my interviewee to consider whether or not she wished to take the interview further and the potential implications of that decision. This involved both formal measures of actually pausing the interview to ask if my interviewee wished to carry on, and informal measures of taking time out to get refreshments.

There is, however, a note of caution here: I was aware that informed consent can obstruct the building of rapport between researchers and participants if the requested consent appears to be an unnecessary bureaucratic procedure. For example, some interviewees may feel the process to be too formalised, that there is too much paperwork to be completed, that they are overloaded with information, or that it increases the rather 'forbidding nature' of research (Crow et al. 2006: 90). The use of written forms which require the signatures of interviewees also increases the possibility of identification and the risk to confidentiality and anonymity (Burgess 1991: 200). My informed consent form, therefore, was brief and to the point, with consent renegotiated throughout the interview.¹⁵ All consent forms and transcripts were kept in a locked drawer.

¹⁵ A copy of my consent form can be found in Appendix Two.

3.3.5 Sharing my Position and its Effect on the Research

As discussed in the epistemology section of this chapter, Gill (1995: 176) argues that feminist researchers should make their values, commitments and politics explicit, thereby establishing ethical foundations from which to act. It is my belief that this overt positioning should occur at all stages of the research. Indeed, the researcher's self, including her opinions and the way she understands the world, cannot be separated from the research process and it is inevitable that her experiences and consciousness enter the research; as personhood can never be abandoned, who we are as a person should be used to its full advantage and allowed to become an integral part of the research. In this method of analysis, consciousness and experience are not hidden from view in a claim of objectivity, but are understood as having a direct influence on our interpretations and constructions (Wise and Stanley 1993: 60, 161). There are, however, problems with this approach and consequences that arise from self-disclosure.

Firstly, given that my research explores prevailing discourses of sexual harassment, it is important to remember that self-disclosure and the sharing of my position adds my own voice to the discourses surrounding these issues. Indeed, as Livesey (2002) notes, the relationship between the listener and the speaker is co-constructive: the listener questions, frames, shapes and controls the interaction and the speaker, in turn, displays the knowledge and the discourse of 'truth' (Livesey 2002: 60). Indeed, through this research, I have become part of the discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher

education. During the interview process, I found my position shifting between distance and disclosure as I attempted to find a middle ground on which I could honestly relate to my interviewee without influencing the direction of her narrative (Mauthner 1998: 50). Aware that disclosure may affect how comfortable an interviewee feels and what she will be able to say, I was careful in my statements and answers (Miller 1998: 62). The following extract from my interview with Sam illustrates this point:

Sam: Sometimes I think: 'Is he coming on to me?' And then I think that I'm in the wrong for thinking that. You know, like, don't flatter yourself! What do you think?

Helen: I think, well, it's obviously made you feel uncomfortable and you have the right to interpret it how you want... If someone has made you feel uncomfortable, whether they intended to or not, you should have the right to ask them to stop.

In her narrative, Sam is referring to a male lecturer and a series of events which she found difficult to define and interpret. When Sam asked for my opinion, I believed it to be unethical to attempt to 'shrug' the question off or to refuse to give an answer for fear of contaminating the data; Sam had found her experiences upsetting and unsettling. On the other hand, I had not witnessed the event and do not know what the lecturer's intentions had been. As a feminist, however, it is my firm belief that if a woman feels uncomfortable, no matter what the other person's intentions, she has the right to ask for that behaviour to end. This was an honest, but cautious, answer to Sam's question.

The above section has explored my ethics, informed consent and anonymity and the effects of sharing my position on the research. This research fully conformed to the requirements laid down by the British Sociological Association (2005). My interviewees were warned that although every effort would be taken to ensure anonymity, this could not be fully guaranteed. Informed consent was gained before each interview and renegotiated throughout. The issue of sharing my position on the research was complex: as Livesey (2002) notes, the relationship between listener and speaker is co-constructive and the extract from the interview with Sam highlights this point. Having discussed the processes of conducting my research, the following section explores the steps taken in the analysis of the data.

3.3.6 How can Foucauldian-oriented Research be Analysed?

The preceding sections have discussed the processes of conducting the research: the nature of unstructured interviews, my interview sample and access, the ethics involved in my research, including anonymity and informed consent, and the effect of sharing my position on the research. The following section explores the analysis of my research data and the processes I went through in breaking this analysis down into steps. Furthermore, it is noted that these steps are not in isolation from each other: they overlap, compete and contradict.

Kendall and Wickham (1999), summing up the practical applications of

Foucault, suggest that the genealogist focuses on viewing power as a strategy that maintains a relationship between the sayable and the visible, and instead of asking what it is, should concentrate on how it works. In other words, by utilising a genealogical approach, we can study discursive structures to reveal power/knowledge networks (Kendall and Wickham 1999: 58). My interview with Rachel goes some way to illustrating the focus of Foucauldian-oriented research. Rachel is a Hindu student in her thirties; she had contacted me after an experience with one of her male lecturers, which she labelled as sexual harassment. After the interview, I made the following notes in my field journal:

The lecturer [seemed to be] telling her that she needs to work harder. Or, rather, that he expected to see an improvement in her work in subsequent meetings. [Rachel] assumed that he'd criticised her work because she is a woman. (And is therefore sexual harassment.) Whereas, from the position of an outsider, it seems that he criticised her work because she was a student not performing at the required standard... In Rachel's narrative she talks about a typical lecturer/ student interaction. Yet she interprets this event as a result of her gender. Why? Why interpret an experience as a result of gender (and not as a result of something else?)... Rachel could have said that her lecturer treated her like that because he was just a horrible man. Or that he had a personal grudge against her. Or that he was being racist. Or that it was completely fair because she just wasn't working hard enough. She could have chosen any number of discourses to utilise. And yet she made sense of it in terms of her gender. Why?

Applying a Foucauldian-oriented analysis to Rachel's narrative does not mean that I doubt her experience. As discussed in the literature review, experiences are always constructed through contingent discourses (Scott 1992: 38; Townsley and Geist 2000: 197). The question to be asked is to what degree does Rachel define herself through these prevailing discourses? Therefore, having set out the focus on Foucauldian-oriented research, we need to develop a set of practical steps to analyse the research data.

Carabine (2001) has outlined a workable approach to Foucauldian-oriented research and states that it should include the following steps: i) a familiarity with the key data for the research topic and a knowledge of the background to the issue; ii) consideration of the themes, categories and objects of discourses apparent within the women's narratives; iii) exploring indications of inter-relationships between the discourses, and, in particular, the themes and categories which appear to inform, and then re-inform, each other; iv) exploring the deployment of discursive strategies and practices, thus considering how discourses are given their meaning and force, and the apparent processes by which objects are defined; v) suggesting the absences and silences, that is, what is not present or not spoken of that you might expect to be; vi) suggestions of resistance and counter-discourse; and vii) exploring the effects of the discourse: the contingent possibilities of 'speaking' of an issue which cohere to produce the object of which it speaks (Carabine 2001: 281). Each of these steps, and what they mean in practical terms when applied to my data, is discussed below.

3.3.6.1 Step One: Know your Data

Carabine (2001) notes that the first step in any genealogical analysis is to ensure a comprehensive knowledge of the research data (Carabine 2001: 282). As discussed in the literature review, discourses operate within the field in which they co-exist, multiply and contradict. These discourses offer competing ways of constructing and providing meaning to individual experiences (Weedon 1997: 35). It is the task of the researcher, therefore, to study and interpret the dimensions of this field (Foucault 1991b: 60). For me, this involved reading

and re-reading the interview transcripts to gain a 'sense' of the research data and to suggest occasions where the discourses of sexual harassment entered the field. Once I was familiar with the interview transcripts, I began to 'mind map'¹⁶ the sexual harassment discourses, plotting the points at which they appeared within the data. However, Cheek (2000) notes that the field is not 'out there' waiting to be described by the researcher: it is the researcher who defines the field for a particular study, constructing and delimiting the field of discourse in order to collect the research data. In turn, the discursive field constructs and positions the researcher (Cheek 2000: 126). This involved considering my principled positions and the impact these may have on my data.¹⁷ Each of these points was 'tagged' on the mind map next to the corresponding discourse. These tags then allowed me to track what decisions I made and at which point. From this, it can be seen that reflexivity is an essential part of this process and the practical considerations of a reflexive approach will be discussed later.

3.3.6.2 Step Two: Considering the Identification of Themes, Categories and Objects of Discourse

Step two involved exploring how sexual harassment was 'spoken of' within the women's transcripts. Discourses produce the object of which they speak, both in terms of what we understand to be true and in the sense that they produce outcomes or effects, so this step in the analysis involves considering the

¹⁶ Using MindGenius software.

¹⁷ For more information on my principled positions, please see section 3.1.5.

constituent parts of the discourses: what themes, categories and objects make up the discourses of sexual harassment within higher education? This was not, however, to discover uniform patterns or repetitions but to explore the variations, inconsistencies, instabilities and ambiguities of the categories (Foucault 1991c: 75). Once I had an impression of the sexual harassment discourses through the mind-map process as outlined in step one, I was able to consider the sexual harassment discourses within each narrative. This was done by selecting the parts within individual transcripts and then cutting and pasting these connected elements on to individual key cards. Given that my interviews were unstructured (see above), and that people do not talk in a linear manner, this often involved cutting and pasting the relevant data into coherent chunks: each line of the interview transcript was numbered, thus enabling me to cut out unrelated sections of data but allowing the tracking of specific discourses. Although cutting up the data in this way has negative implications for the hygienic flow of an interview, I had already decided to position my work as a mere construction of events, rather than a reliable and accurate representation of the facts (e.g. Cheek 2000). Cutting the data in this way also allowed me to suggest cross-references for the discourses as in step three below. It is also noted, however, that even with one chunk of data there were often multiple, competing and contradictory discourses at work.

3.3.6.3 Step Three: Exploring Indications of Inter-relations between the Discourses

This step explores how the discourses interact with each other within the discursive field. As discussed in the literature review, discourses do not exist in

isolation and only maintain meaning in relation to other discourses; there is a constant process, therefore, of modification, informing and re-informing as discourses interrelate with each other (Foucault 1991b: 54, 70). Step three, therefore, involved two parts: firstly, exploring the interrelations and correlations between the discourses within individual transcripts and, secondly, after all the individual transcripts had been analysed, considering how the discourses interrelate and cross-reference with discourses from other narratives. By then I had key cards for individual discursive structures and was further able to mind map the key discourses of sexual harassment in higher education. At this point, I was able to consider the following: what are the possible processes of cross-referencing within the discourses? How may these categories and themes interrelate? How may these discourses correlate with other discourses?

3.3.6.4 Step Four: Exploring the Deployment of Discursive Strategies and Practices

Foucault (1991c: 79) asks that we discover the procedures of discursive organisation and identify the support mechanisms that allow the discourse to operate. These are the processes by which the discourse is given meaning and force. For this section, I considered the following: who spoke about sexual harassment and what did they say about it? Which discourses were seen by my participants to carry authority? As with step three, this occurred in two parts: firstly analysing the individual transcripts and secondly analysing the transcripts as a group. The analyses from this second stage were later returned to, after steps five and six, so that I could begin to map the apparent discourses

operating within higher education at that particular time.

3.3.6.5 Step Five: Suggesting Absences and Silences

Alvesson (2002) notes that discursive constructions are often hidden: voids, silences and absences often occur within conversation. Therefore, the interpretation of 'subtle hints and undertones' must be allowed (Alvesson 2002: 101). For this step, I asked myself: what is not spoken of or present within the discourses that I might expect to be? Although the transcripts were analysed both individually and collectively, it was often only when I viewed the transcripts as a group that I could begin to suggest potential absences and silences within the texts.

3.3.6.6 Step Six: Suggesting Instances of Resistance and Counter-resistance

It is essential for a genealogical approach to regard discourse as a contested, uneven and contradictory process, with the individual as both the site and the subject of discursive battles. Given that power relations can only operate on free individuals, the discursive field must offer a variety of discourses and, as a result, provides the possibility for resistance and counter-resistance (Foucault 2002: 341-342). The sixth step, therefore, involved exploring apparent resistance to the prevailing discourses. Using both the mind map and the key cards, I was able to suggest instances of resistance at the micro-level and then search for similarities within other transcripts. This allowed me to 'map out' suggestions of resistance and counter-resistance.

3.3.6.7 Step Seven: Exploring the Effects of Discourse

The seventh step was the final phase of the analysis and explored the transcripts as a collective whole, exploring the historically specific ways of 'speaking' an issue which cohere to produce the object of which they speak. This stage maps and considers how discourses of sexual harassment in higher education may be constituted and explored the effect of these discourses (see Carabine 2001: 280). From step seven, and in conjunction with step four, I was able to suggest five prevailing discourses of sexual harassment which may operate within higher education at this particular time and to consider how these discourses may have informed my participants. The possible discourses are: i) the 'grades for sex' discourse; ii) the 'all boys together' discourse; iii) the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse; iv) the 'knickers in a twist' discourse; and, finally, v) the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse. It is noted, however, that there may be many more discourses, multiple, competing and contradictory, surrounding sexual harassment in higher education and further data collection would be useful in this area. These discursive strategies are discussed in Chapter Four.

The above steps set out the practical guidelines for analysing Foucauldian-oriented research. Steps one to seven outline how my research data may be analysed. It is important to note, however, that such a focus cannot produce 'true' data, or data capable of generalisations; merely my interpretations of a set of contingent responses. In addition, I was concerned that such an analysis

could have consequences beyond my own research. Alldred (1998) argues that researchers cannot completely control the meanings that are made from their research and that, in another context, our careful wordings, qualifiers and warrants may be lost and produce another meaning that we cannot predict. It is suggested, therefore, that although we cannot ensure our own preferred meanings, researchers should make every attempt to defend against meanings and labels that we believe to be oppressive (Alldred 1998: 163). Reflexivity, therefore, is essential to this theoretical positioning. Having discussed the theory behind my reflexive approach in the methodology section of this chapter, this section now discusses the practicalities of reflexive research and using field notes.

3.3.7 Conducting Reflexive Research

Gill's (1995: 165) notion of reflexivity stresses the responsibility of the researcher in making one's reasoning, assessment and analysis as transparent as possible; the researcher becomes accountable for all her interpretations. Thus, reflexivity is a necessary act that requires researchers to acknowledge their privileged position. As such, it is never a process of self-absorption but, rather, a practice concerned with power and accountability: 'Our knowledge claims and doubts, rather than certainty, are placed at the centre of our research practices' (Aranda 2006: 140). Gill (1995), however, adds a note of caution: this reflexivity must be a genuine challenge to the authority of the researcher. Forms of reflexivity exist which have less to do with accountability and responsibility and more with the strengthening of one's position and

protecting one's argument (Gill 1995: 180). In her analysis of reflexivity as a methodological tool, Pillow (2003) notes that reflexivity is often understood as making visible the practice and construction of knowledge within research in order to produce more accurate results: reflexivity is often used as a measure of legitimacy, supporting the idea that the researcher can 'get it right' and produce more 'truthful' knowledge (Pillow 2003: 178-179).

Even when the concern is to challenge one's decision-making processes, reflexivity can be hard to develop and maintain. Laible (2000) considers the implications of ethical positionings on research: during an early piece of research on the educational success of Mexican-American female students, Laible kept a reflective journal with the intention of becoming aware of any Eurocentric bias. However, during her research viva, Laible realised that despite her reflexive research journaling she had conducted her study using Euro-American, middle-class criteria to define the potential success and failure of these school girls (Laible 2000: 686). This, therefore, was my concern about utilising a reflexive approach. As discussed in my interview sample above, my participants came from varied backgrounds with complex subjectivities and I wanted to reflect the intersectional nature of their lives accurately as well as the complex positions in which they may have found themselves. However, individuals construct their understanding of the world through the prevailing discourses to which they are subjected and it seems likely to me that, however well-meaning, a reflexive approach would not allow me to step outside these discursive structures (Weedon 1997: 34). I am also concerned about the notion that if we search deep within ourselves, we can uncover the 'truth' about our

thoughts, our actions and our 'real' motives and produce more hygienic research.

In relation to Foucault's mastery of the self (as discussed above) and relating this to the possibility of reflexively challenging one's decision making, Valverde (2004), in a discussion on the status of experience and truth, argues that the truth about one's self does not lie deep within one's inner being waiting to be excavated and, equally, the meanings that we have attached to the world are not generated by our individual minds. Searching reflexively for these inner truths is misguided and misleading. A Foucauldian concept of reflexivity, however, would be based on a non-confessional form of self-disclosure, focusing upon the interactions between ourselves and the people around us and developing a critical attitude to one's self and the world (Valverde 2004: 71, 87). This is not, however, an excuse to avoid considering how my participants' experiences are directly related to the intersectionalities of their identities, and this occurred in part during the field note stage.

3.3.8 Using Field Notes

Conducting reflexive research requires the use of detailed field notes. As soon as possible after each interview, I made brief, annotated notes in my field journal. This was often whilst sitting on a park bench, in a public toilet or a bus shelter, as I considered it important to record my experiences as soon as possible. After several interviews, I had developed my own form of shorthand to help speed up this process. I would then go for a cup of tea to try and relax before going home and I would re-write my notes in full at the end of the day. I

followed the advice of Emerson et al. (1995: 26-28) in the writing of field notes: firstly, I recorded my initial impressions. These included emotional feelings and information about the setting and context. Secondly, I recorded key events or incidents, including things which may have surprised me or were contrary to previous experiences and feelings; impressions, verbal and non-verbal communications were all noted. Finally, I attempted to move beyond my own personal reactions to record any information that my participants gave about what is significant or important. This was particularly important when considering how my participants' experiences may be related to, and informed by, the intersectionalities of their identities. This process of using emotions to tease out unexplored facets of the research is discussed by Lee-Treweek (2000), who notes that our emotional responses may provide insights into dominant or minority ways of thinking and feeling. Allowing recognition of these emotions not only has the potential for highlighting important social conditions, but also allows for greater transparency: ignoring or repressing emotions is much more likely to distort the research data. There is also great insight to be gained between the participants' emotions and the feelings of the researcher: meeting and working with people from different backgrounds with different experiences and using different emotional rules and reactions can challenge our taken-for-granted perceptions if we remain open to these emotional dynamics (Lee-Treweek 2000: 114, 128). Having discussed the responsibility of the researcher in conducting reflexive research and maintaining detailed fields, the final section of this chapter explores the complexities of researching sensitive issues and the impact such research can have on the researcher and the participants.

3.3.9 Researching Sensitive Issues

Given that my research deals with sensitive issues, it was important to consider the impact the research could have on the researcher and the research participants. The focus of the research required particular care to be taken in the protection of my interviewees. Behaving in a sensitive and respectful manner, and in line with my feminist principles, I answered any personal questions that my interviewees asked, gave cautious opinions when asked for them, and reacted as somebody who cares rather than purely a data gatherer (Oakley 1990: 47). I stated at the outset that I was not qualified to offer advice or support, but I always ensured that I had details and information of available guidance, resources and self-help organisations which could be offered instead (Arksey and Knight 1999: 112-113). Given the emotional nature of the interviews, there were times when my interviewees became distressed. Parr (1998: 95) notes being surprised at how easily obviously painful events seemed to 'tumble out' with no prompting from her and this is something that I also experienced. I was constantly surprised at the information my interviewees chose to share with me, often very painful and traumatic narratives about past events and experiences. I tried hard to control my non-verbal communication, particularly my facial expressions: expressing support and understanding and, most importantly, not appearing judgemental (Parr 1998: 97).

On two occasions, my interviewees became very upset and I would have preferred to break the interview for a while to give them time to recover and consider if they wished to terminate the interview. However, on both of these

occasions, the women were adamant that they wanted to carry on and, indeed, that it was helpful to talk about such upsetting events. I was unsure about what to do and in the end continued with the interviews. It was always difficult to know how much emotion to express during an interview. I did not want to appear unemotional or unsympathetic but, at the same time, I did not want my interviewees to feel that I was too caught up in my own emotions or responses to their personal narratives (Goodrum and Keys 2007: 255). I always managed not to cry during an interview, but on several occasions I cried on the way home.

There was, however, an emotional danger that I had not considered and did not expect. After spending so much of my time studying sexual harassment and sexual violence against women, and conducting many emotionally traumatic interviews, I realised that I was starting to look at all men, particularly male lecturers, with suspicion. Moran-Ellis (1996) discusses a similar experience when she conducted research into child sexual abuse: she began to feel angry and frustrated about the overwhelming power imbalance in a male-dominated society and, at one point, even began to doubt leaving her children with her male partner. In many ways, these are feelings with which I can empathise. As a result of my research, I felt angry and suspicious about most men and began to isolate myself from my support network; the worst part came a year into my research, when I fell out with my best friend, Simon, who felt that I was accusing him (and all men) of being sexual predators.

Although it is common for negative responses to influence counsellors,

therapists and other trauma workers (see Rasmussen 2005), it has been noted that these feelings can also affect interviewers engaged in the research of sensitive issues. For example, in 1993, Etherington spent several months closely listening to and transcribing the narratives of 25 male survivors of sexual abuse. She notes that as a trained therapist, she was always able to intervene and help her clients move on from their emotional trauma; however, as a researcher she was not able to offer guidance or support and, unable to help these men work through their negative experiences, she was often left feeling powerless and isolated (Etherington 2000: 380). Importantly, Etherington notes that the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy requires all its practitioners to undergo regular counselling/supervision at least once a month for an hour and a half; however, as an academic researcher, supervision that focused on the researcher's emotional responses to the research data was not available (Etherington 2007: 86).

I am extremely fortunate to have two supportive supervisors, whom I know would have taken the time to go through these issues with me immediately. However, these negative feelings crept up, building into anger and suspicion without my even being aware of it. Etherington (2004: 210) suggests that keeping a detailed research journal can help in identifying these feelings; reviewing the journal as a whole can help identify patterns and changes over time and, therefore, highlight concerns that need action taken against them. As stated above, I had tried to keep an in-depth field journal but I occasionally felt too emotionally exhausted after an interview to record my responses. In hindsight, I realise that these were the times when I actually needed to make a

greater effort to write in the journal. Being personally connected to my doctorate (as discussed in the previous section) meant that I needed to develop cut-off points where I could create a level of distance from my research. As my doctorate progressed, I began to 'find my feet' within my research and regain a sense of emotional balance. As discussed, therefore, carrying out research into sensitive areas requires careful conduct and planning. The protection of my participants was essential and, in addition to this, the personal connection to my research meant that I needed to consider potential emotional dangers to myself.

3.4 Conclusion

The aim of this research is to consider the prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and to explore if, and how, my participants define themselves through these discourses. To this end, I conducted twenty-four unstructured interviews with women who had identified as having experienced sexual harassment within higher education, either as a student or a member of staff, or who had witnessed events which they defined as sexual harassment. Through the exploration of my participants' understanding of their experiences, I suggest it is possible to infer the degree to which prevailing discourses have constituted their subjectivities. Thus, Chapter Three has explored my epistemology, methodology and methods.

The research is based on a passionately interested form of inquiry: acknowledging the partial nature of knowledge and, at the same time, citing my

own concerns, values and interpretations. This forms a 'new vocabulary of values' which allows me to make political interventions (Gill 1995: 175-176). As Lather (2006) notes, searching out knowledge involves positioning your interviewees as objects of research. Therefore, in this research I attempted to reconfigure the will to know as the desire of *not knowing*: engaging with my interviewees, sharing personal constructions, answering questions openly and honestly and allowing myself to be vulnerable (Wise and Stanley 1993: 60; Laible 2000: 691; Davies 2002: 157). Although I did not always succeed, the effort made is an attempt to position the inquiry as ethical and feminist orientated. Therefore, let us next discuss the results of this research, starting with an analysis of the five possible prevailing discourses of sexual harassment which may operate in higher education.

4. Chapter Four: Exploring the Effects of, and Resistances to, Suggested Prevailing Discourses Surrounding Sexual Harassment in Higher Education

4.0 Introduction

As discussed in the literature review, there are competing understandings of sexual harassment in higher education, including contradictory theories of power. In particular, liberal feminist theories of sexual harassment often view power as static: men have power; women do not (MacKinnon 1979; Wise and Stanley 1987). In contrast, this chapter utilises a Foucauldian critique of power: something that is exercised over and through us, constituting men and women into particular ways of understanding themselves (Foucault 1980c). This chapter argues that my participants may understand themselves through the seemingly prevailing discourses on sexual harassment. Chapter Four, therefore, explores the power effects of, and resistances to, these suggested prevailing discourses. In particular, the chapter argues that feminist discourses on sexual harassment (amongst others) may have, in part, generated specific effects of power with regard to my research participants. That is to say, many of my interviewees appeared to understand the experiences they had identified as sexual harassment as an abuse of power.

Brewis (2001) argues that the power effects of feminist harassment discourses may contribute to the conditions of (re)producing harassment and perpetuate women's oppression. By exploring what is seen as the 'gendered dynamics' of sexual harassment within organisations, feminism hopes to provide the

possibility of a better, more egalitarian future for women. However, in shining a spotlight on the perceived power differentials between men and women, it is argued that feminist harassment discourses may actually foster the notion of the powerless female and the powerful male (Brewis 2001: 40, 47). It should also be noted that my suggested prevailing discourses have not been set out in any hierarchical order of perceived seriousness for the women involved; women's experiences of abusive behaviour cannot be categorised into levels of impact or degrees of seriousness. Rather, women's reactions to forms of violence, and their subsequent levels of impact, are complex matters. With the important exception of violence which results in death, degrees of impact are not conditional on the form of violence experienced. Thus, violence exists upon a continuum and women's reactions to sexual violence vary over time. In this sense, sexual harassment should not be thought of as divorced from other forms of sexual violence and is understood in my participants' narratives as complex and varied (Kelly 1988: 76).

As discussed in the methodology chapter, it is important to highlight that the suggestions within this chapter only involve *my* interpretation of my participants' narratives; by using a poststructuralist approach, the analysis does not make decisions about whether my participants' interpretations of their experiences are factual or inaccurate, only to propose discourses at work in these specific contexts and to suggest their potential impact upon how my participants may define themselves. This might suggest that other discourses are also at work but this would require further data gathering (see Strine 1992 and Scott 1992). The five prevailing discourses suggested as being at work within my

participants' narratives are, therefore, as follows: the 'grades for sex' discourse; the 'all boys together' discourse; the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse; the 'knickers in a twist' discourse; and, finally, the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse. It is important to note that discourses one to four do not acknowledge sexual harassment in higher education: the power effects of the discourses deny the harassment, understanding the behaviours as normal and expected interactions. In addition, the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse appears to feature most often and with the most impact in the way my participants seem to understand themselves and their experiences. Finally, it should also be noted that the suggested prevailing discourses produce complex forms of subjectivities and many of my participants appeared to subscribe to multiple and contradictory discourses, producing complex power effects. This chapter starts with an exploration of the 'grades for sex' discourse.

4.1 The 'Grades for Sex' Discourse

This section suggests that the power effects generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse may contribute to how my participants understand themselves and their experiences. By suggesting that sexual harassment is an abuse of power, stemming from power differentials, liberal feminism argues that sexual harassment is a gendered phenomenon and consists of men 'doing power' over women. For example, MacKinnon (1979) argues that many women are told by their boss that they must comply sexually or risk losing their job. This *quid pro quo* analysis, and the suspicion that comes with this way of thinking, is present in the narratives below and is, I suggest, exemplified in the following narrative from Sarah.

Sarah, a mature student and lone parent, experienced behaviours she defined as sexual harassment leading to pressurised sex over the course of several months from one of her male lecturers. In the early stages of what she describes to be an unwanted relationship, the lecturer would seek to flatter and praise Sarah in front of the other students:

So, then, the next interaction was when the essays got handed back, and he [the lecturer] personally came to hand them back to us when we were having lunch and sitting in a group. And he was handing them out to us on a silver platter, do you know what I mean? Like, 'I'm Mr Sleazy Slime!' [Laughs] Do you know what I mean? And, mine was an 'A-'. Amazing! And I'll never really know if it was an 'A-' which is really bad! In the way that, some people might say, 'Well, what the hell! You're getting an 'A'! But if you don't deserve it, then it's a shit degree, isn't it? And, erm, if I did deserve, then I'll never feel proud of it. You know what I mean? It's a degradation! A complete and total degradation! And, certainly the girls around me took it that I wouldn't have got that mark if

Carl [the lecturer] wasn't interested in me. And I didn't realise it at that point, but they were like really jealous, and everything, and didn't like me and stuff. And, erm, so there was a big hoo-ha among these people, and even she [another female student] developed the attitude of, well, 'I don't really like you'. And she was, like, 'I don't really like women who sleep with lecturers, because what if you do that with my husband?' Yeah, as if! Know what I mean? And, erm, the other girl was like, 'Oh, Sarah fucks lecturers for "A"s!' (Sarah).

Here, it could be suggested that the power effects generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse may have produced, for my participants, particular ways of understanding themselves and others. As Foucault (1991d) argues, our understanding of ourselves and our relationships with others is produced through the prevailing discourses and the power effects generated from them. Sarah's narrative suggests an understanding that students may attempt to trade sexual acts for higher grades and, in particular, generates the understanding that female students with perceived limited ability may attempt to compensate for poor academic skills.

Women and men who subscribe to the 'grades for sex' discourse may, therefore, understand themselves as victims of female students who trade sex for good grades. For example, in the narrative above, the girls stated angrily that Sarah's 'A' grade was due to her sexual relationship with the lecturer, rather than her own academic ability. By having their essays personally returned to them over lunch, presumably unusual behaviour for a lecturer, Sarah's 'A' grade was advertised to the other students and, I would suggest, validated any suspicions that Sarah and the lecturer were having a relationship. The likelihood of a link between the grade and the relationship is strengthened,

and the girls behaved as if the accusation were true. 'Truth', therefore, is an effect of the prevailing discourse (Foucault 1998). Consequently, Sarah's ability to successfully deny the accusation was limited. The final statement, 'Sarah fucks lecturers for "As"', is indicative of the power effects generated through the discourse. Indeed, Sarah herself also appears to question if she deserved the grade. She states that she would 'never feel proud' of the grade and that it was a 'complete and total degradation'. This is despite the fact that Sarah's grades from other lecturers were also, on average, around the 'B+' to 'A-' level.

Furthermore, implicit in the comment 'I don't really like women who sleep with lecturers, because what if you do that with my husband?' is the suggestion that a woman who sleeps with her lecturer is likely to be promiscuous in general (female undergraduate students as promiscuous will be considered in the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse). One power effect of the 'grades for sex' discourse, as echoed in MacKinnon's (1979) *quid pro quo* analysis, would appear to be the understanding of women as often unskilled and incapable, having acquired their qualifications through unfair, sexual means. The extract below suggests the potential consequences of the 'grades for sex' discourse for Sarah's understanding of herself and others:

I thought 'how can I cope with this?' Because, every time I go in I'm harassed by the girls, or, you know, having panic attacks as I walk up. And in the library, giggles and sniggers, and everyone just looks and stares... And was really grim going back for exams, and waiting outside the exam room with those girls there. Part of the whole giggle and bitch me up, and put your head down when I walk by, because I'm not to be spoken to. And stuff like that. So, you know? Horrible, petty, childish stuff, but, it gets to you. And in the context of the thing with Carl, it was just terrible. And it was awful sitting there in his lectures, listening to his snide comments towards me and all the girls giggling and looking at me.

Like: 'See where fucking her lecturer gets her now!' (Sarah).

From the above narratives, it would appear that the power effects generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse, which may have fostered the understanding that Sarah did not deserve her awarded grade, resulted in jealousy and bullying from the other students. By treating Sarah so harshly, the girls seem to be punishing Sarah for what they believed to be an unfair advantage and, at the same time, sending a clear message to other female students that having such a perceived advantage would not be tolerated. In the competitive world of higher education, and later on in the job market, it would seem understandable if jealousy were to arise from any apparent, unfair advantage that particular students may have had.

Sarah also refers to 'the whole giggle and bitch me up' approach from the other female students. Prevailing discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education seem to be spoken about in 'libraries', 'outside the exam room' and in 'lectures'. Indeed, Sarah's narrative suggests that the male lecturer may also have subscribed to the 'grades for sex' discourse: rather than seeking to conceal his behaviour, he appears to have displayed his relationship with a student in front of others, perhaps indicating that he believed his actions to be normal, justified and, indeed, often welcomed by his female students.

It is suggested that sexual harassment in higher education becomes, not something simply to be 'condemned or tolerated but managed' (Foucault 1998: 24). The management and governing of an individual, of leading somebody

through a field of possibilities, is what turns a human being into a subject and, as discussed in the literature review, an essential element of this power is freedom (Foucault 2002). In an extreme example, Dean (1999) refers to a woman under torture: through a range of techniques, the woman is invited to take responsibility for her situation and the pain she is causing herself. Thus she is urged to exercise her freedom by admitting guilt, signing a confession or denouncing others (Dean 1999: 15). I suggest, therefore, that through the girls' unpleasant behaviour towards Sarah, possibly operating through understandings generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse, she was being managed towards accepting her own guilt (that she did not deserve the 'A' grade) and that the bullying was a consequence of her behaviour. The final line in the second narrative, 'See where fucking her lecturer gets her now', sums up the governmental process within the 'grades for sex' discourse. This, therefore, may represent a historically-speaking way of understanding sexual harassment in higher education.

The above points notwithstanding, and as discussed in the literature review, where there is power there is always resistance. However, it is crucial not to overstate or romanticise resistance. For, when we resist, we always do so from another point of power. As such, resistance does not carry us beyond power and carries with it its own set of problematics (Foucault 1998). In the narrative below from Sarah, there appears to be an understanding of resistance, with its particular consequences:

I was in so much stress, and I just thought, 'You know what? I just can't face sitting out the rest of my degree'. So, I thought, 'Maybe I can go and do my third year somewhere else? These girls aren't going to go away, and this situation is not going to get any better. And I just can't take any more! I really, really just can't take anymore'. And I did think, 'What if I end up in a psychiatric unit and my daughter ends up in care?'... You know, I was just trying to sort myself out, so that it could be the least painful possible. [Pause] So, I thought about withdrawing, which was an option if I do feel so bad after Christmas that I just can't... then, then, I will have to do something. Leave, or do something, because you just can't think straight when you're so messed up. And, so, I went to see Carl, to tell him that I was completely not OK, and that I'd had enough. And I asked him to call the girls off me! [Laughs] I know that sounds really pathetic, but it had reached that point (Sarah).

Sarah appears to have resisted the 'grades for sex' discourse by going to her lecturer and asking him to stop the abuse. Although, for Sarah, this appeared to be the only way of dealing with the situation, it carried with it its own effects of power. For example, Sarah may now understand herself as having been unable to deal with the girls on her own and thus potentially weak and/or vulnerable. She may also feel indebted to the lecturer for his assistance.

In Sarah's narrative, her self, her female peers and her male lecturer appear to have understood themselves and others through, in part, the 'grades for sex' discourse. In the following narrative from Laura, an undergraduate arts student, it is a male lecturer who may have understood himself and his students through the 'grades for sex' discourse:

He would pick on women in class. Everything was sexual. Like, one time I was really cold and I was rubbing my arms to try and warm up. In front of everyone, he said that I was rubbing my breasts. That was the sort of thing he would do. I had an evening seminar with him one day but when I got there it turned out that nobody else had turned up. That was often the case with lectures and seminars at night. People just wouldn't bother

turning up. He started talking to me, getting closer and closer, moving his chair toward me. He was all charming, buttering me up, telling me how well I was doing in my degree. It didn't feel right, it felt uncomfortable and I was thinking: 'Look I actually don't need all this praise from you'. But I still didn't say anything. I was just thinking: 'I am on my own with him and there is no one else around'. Then he was like: 'Look, I know you really want a good degree and I could make it really easy for you'. He could ensure that I got top marks for things. There was this horrible pause and then he said: 'You're a smart girl. You know what I'm suggesting'. And all of a sudden it hit me: he thought that I'd agree to sleep with him to get a better grade. You know: bloody hell! As if he could honestly believe that I would have sex with someone just to get a good grade. And yet he clearly did think that. He was obviously expecting me to go along with that. I mean, he clearly felt safe by making those kind of suggestions to me. I was obviously looking astonished because then he was like: 'Oh come on, I know what you girls are like. I've been teaching young female students for years'. I dunno if he meant that he thought I would just go along with it for a good grade or if he thought that I slept around in general. Either way, I just couldn't believe in what I was hearing (Laura).

In Laura's narrative, her lecturer, apparently subscribing to the 'grades for sex' discourse, made the assumption that she might be willing to trade sex for a good grade. As with Sarah's narratives, the 'grades for sex' discourse generates specific understandings to which we are subject as if they were true because we believe that they are true (see Brewis 2001: 38). For example, despite stating that Laura is 'a smart girl', there is the implication that she could not achieve a high-quality degree without his assistance and by trading grades for a sexual relationship. Although on the one hand her lecturer appears to have recognised Laura's intelligence, he also suggested that with his help she could do better: the male lecturer, perhaps understanding himself and his students through the 'grades for sex' discourse, appears to have felt confident in making his proposition and even goes so far as stating: 'Oh come on, I know what you girls are like'.

It is argued here that ways of understanding sexual harassment in higher education may be generated, in part, through prevailing liberal feminist discourses, thus producing particular effects. For example, feminist harassment discourses may compel us to think of ourselves and behave in ways which may actually foster sexual harassment (Brewis 2001: 39). As discussed in the literature review, feminism tends to view power as static, and sex at work is considered to be exploitative and degrading. There is an understanding that men have greater social and cultural power, which enables them to behave in a sexual manner towards women or to demand sex (LaFontaine and Tredeau 1986). For example, MacKinnon's (1979) analysis of sexual harassment in the workplace states that male employers used their power and positions of status to demand sex. However, Wise and Stanley (1987) argue that sexual harassment is intended as a means to 'do power' over the woman and that the 'sexual' element of the harassment is merely a means to an end. This is important because, as Foucault (1998) argues, we think of ourselves and our relationships with others through the various prevailing discourses; because we think of these discourses as being 'true', we respond to them in kind.

However, operating through the 'grades for sex' discourse, the male lecturer appears to understand his suggestion of sex in return for a good grade as part of his 'normal' and 'expected' interactions with his female students. Thus, approaching this from a Foucauldian analysis, it is possible to argue that the male lecturer's understanding of what is appropriate and normal may have been constituted through the power effects of the 'grades for sex' discourse. That is to say, he may understand himself, and his relationships with his students,

through the operations of this harassment discourse. In the following narrative, Lindsey discusses behaviours she identified as sexual harassment during a personal tutorial with a male lecturer:

Anyway, he went into his office and straightaway he locked the door. That was it then. I knew that something was wrong and I moved to the door. He stepped in front of me and put his hand over my mouth. Not hard but like he was saying don't make any noise. It was in his eyes. I could see what he wanted. What he thought he was going to get. I moved back and just said: 'If you don't open that door, I am going to scream'. He looked at me, like he was trying to make out if I was going to fight, and then he shrugged and opened the door. I didn't look back or look at him again. I just got out of there. I couldn't stop shaking. I knew how close things had come (Lindsey).

Here, Lindsey describes an incident obviously experienced as alarming. It is possible to suggest, however, that the male lecturer may have understood himself and his students through the power effects generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse. With this understanding, the lecturer may have believed that Lindsey would acquiesce to his suggestions or even welcome them. Following this experience, and recalled in the next part of the narrative, Lindsey appears to believe that her next assessment was not worth its awarded grade but does not know if her lecturer awarded her the mark in the hope of encouraging sexual relations or if the grade was awarded retrospectively in an effort to encourage Lindsey not to report the accusation of sexual harassment:

Anyway, two weeks later the grades were released for our essays, and I had the essay that I had done for his module and it had got an 'A-'. I couldn't believe it. I'm no smart arse and there is no way that I deserved that mark. No way at all. All my other grades had come in at 'C's and 'B's and I knew that this piece of work wasn't any different. I don't know if this was marked before what went on in his office or if he changed the

mark later but I'm certain that I didn't deserve it. Either he marked me up because he was trying to flatter me, or maybe he thought it would get me to sleep with him, or he changed the grade to try and make sure that I didn't complain about him. That he was trying to buy me off. The thing is, I know that I didn't deserve it so it doesn't make me feel good. It actually makes me feel a lot worse. I don't want to be given marks for work that doesn't deserve it. Do you know what I mean? It just devalues everything else but it also makes me feel kind of cheap. Like he thinks that would make a difference to things. To me. That I could be that shallow (Lindsey).

Both of these situations are potentially informed in part by the 'grades for sex' discourse: the lecturer may have believed that women can be influenced into sexual relations for a better grade and/or that women can be encouraged not to report accusations of sexual harassment if awarded a better grade in return for silence. Importantly, however, I suggest that Lindsey's response to the situation also highlights how the 'grades for sex' discourse can impact upon an individual's subjectivity. Lindsey would appear to be subject to the discourse in two ways: as subject to the lecturer by his actions and, also, as subject to an identity – or self-knowledge – formed through the power effects generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse (Foucault 2002: 331). Lindsey, like Sarah, experiences this by feeling cheap and devalued. When Lindsey states 'It actually makes me feel a lot worse' and 'It just devalues everything else but it also makes me feel kind of cheap', I would suggest that Lindsey is expressing how her own subjectivity may be tied up within the 'grades for sex' discourse. Furthermore, an additional power effect of the 'grades for sex' discourse may be the understanding of women who have been sexually attacked as having 'asked for it':

I know now, at that that point, at that point I should have said something. Alarm bells were ringing in my head and it didn't feel right. Now I think, was it my fault? Did I give him the wrong impression by agreeing to go back to his office from the classroom? I mean, why would he want to move from a classroom that we were scheduled to be in to his empty office? But, anyway, I didn't say anything and we ended up going back to his office. As we walked along the corridor I was thinking, shit, there is no-one else about. I'm on my own here. But the more rational part of my head was saying, come on, this bloke is your lecturer and you are at university. You're being ridiculous. I guess if there is one thing that I've learnt it is to trust my instincts more... I did want to report it but what the hell was I going to do? How do you report getting a good grade? I mean it sounds a bit odd, doesn't it? And who would believe what had gone on in his office? And would people think that I had led him on in the first place? It all looks too bloody suspicious for me. And, well, you start to realise how this place works. Who has all the power in it and that nobody was going to do anything about it. The whole place stinks (Lindsey).

Lindsey's question of 'was it my fault?' may be influenced through the power effects of the 'grades for sex' discourse. By understanding Lindsey as willing to exchange sex for higher grades, and therefore going back to the lecturer's office at night on her own, Lindsey may be considered to have been 'asking for it'. Rape-supportive belief systems, producing particular understandings of ourselves and others, may require the victim to explain, for example, how she found herself in a risk-defined situation and why she did not scream or fight back (see Koss 1991; Best 1992). By asking how she found herself in such a situation, Lindsey appears to question her own reactions and comes to the conclusion that nobody would have believed her version of events. In addition, after considering both rape-supportive belief systems and the 'grades for sex' discourse, Lindsey seems to understand herself within a hierarchical power network, considering herself as having very little power within what she perceives to be a male-dominated system (see the 'all boys together' discourse). In a frightening situation, Lindsey warned the male lecturer that she

would scream if he did not unlock the door. In the second narrative, however, the combination of the 'grades for sex' discourse and rape-supportive belief discourses seems to coalesce into power effects through which Lindsey felt unable to challenge the situation. This resulted in Lindsey feeling unable to report the experiences she defined as sexual harassment formally.

Such rape myths as a power effect of the 'grades for sex' discourse appear to operate within Leah's narrative. In the following narrative, Leah discusses how she was sexually attacked by a male lecturer when visiting his house to collect journal articles (the levels of trust with which lecturers are often invested will be discussed as a separate discourse later). Leah began by explaining that she had at first trusted her lecturer, had enjoyed his company and had not felt threatened; however, after being in his house for a while, his attitude towards her became hostile and then aggressive:

I knew he was going to rape me. That he was going to do whatever he wanted, and I just thought, well, I thought that I couldn't stop him, he was too strong, I couldn't stop him so I might as well get it over with. Get it over with as soon as possible... The next thing that I knew, he was pulling me over, down, down onto the floor. I was wearing a skirt and he pulled it up around me and I could feel his hands on my legs and then between my legs. Dirty, grubby hands that were groping me and I felt like I wanted to be sick. I couldn't breathe, he was holding me down and I couldn't breathe. I couldn't believe it was happening. Almost as if I would wake up and find out it had all been a dream. I was sure that something would happen to stop him. But nothing was going to stop him. Not at that point. So he rapes me, there and then, on his living-room floor and I wanted to scream in his face and tear out his eyes... He asked me if I was going to tell anyone but I couldn't say anything, I was just hitting him to try and make him let me go. He said he could understand if I did want to tell anyone but that it would be the end of him. He said that if I kept quiet, he could see to it that I passed my degree with first-class honours. That he knew how much my degree meant to me but that if I promised not to say anything, that he could make sure that I got a first. I nearly laughed. After everything he had done. That he thought he could

buy me off. Bribe me or something (Leah).

Here, the male lecturer seems to have understood himself and Leah through the power effects generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse (see also the 'all boys together' discourse). He suggested to Leah that she not report the sexual violence in return for a first-class honours award. Despite refusing the 'grades for sex' discourse, the power effects generated through it do appear to impact upon Leah's decision:

Sean [Leah's boyfriend] wanted me to go to the police but I couldn't. Oh, I know all the things you are supposed to do. I know. And if it was anybody else, I would tell them they had to report it. I wasn't scared of what Paul [the lecturer] had said. I wasn't worried about being marked down and I certainly didn't care about, about getting good marks from him. By then I just didn't care about anything. But I couldn't report it. First of all, I just wanted a shower. Nothing else mattered. Nothing Sean said or nothing he said I should do. I just wanted a shower and to wash away where he had been and what he had done to me. And then once I had had a shower, I felt that I couldn't go to the police because I had washed away all the evidence. And I thought that the police might not believe me. I mean, you know, would they believe why I went to his house? Would they just think that actually I had consented and then made up the story about rape? Even worse, would they think that I was trying to bribe him to get a good degree (Leah)?

This, I suggest, is significant because it continues to highlight how, even if the suggested prevailing discourses, such as the 'grades for sex' discourse, are not believed by an individual, the power effects can still influence a person's understanding of herself. Leah asks 'would they believe why I went to his house?' and 'would they think that I was trying to bribe him to get a good degree?' As a result, the power effects generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse, especially given that she *had* been offered a first-class honours degree in return for not reporting the rape, appear to have resulted in Leah

feeling less empowered to report the attack formally. Power and knowledge, therefore, are joined together through discourse. Discourse transmits and produces power whilst, at the same time, undermining power and providing the necessary elements to weaken it (Foucault 1998: 101). Thus, power in a governmental model creates an open domain of structured possibilities, fashioning alternative ways of being and new options (Thompson 2003: 123). The following narrative discusses the importance of gaining a good degree and the influence that lecturers may have in achieving those grades. Bridget, a university graduate, discusses a female friend who had engaged in a sexual relationship with a male lecturer on their course. Bridget believes that her friend achieved a first-class honours degree as a direct result of this sexual relationship. It is possible, therefore, that the power generated through the 'grades for sex' discourse may foster in women, who may already consider themselves academically incapable, the possibility of using sex as a medium of exchange for higher grades:

But, you know, when you are at university and you are working for your degree, then you need to pass. That's it. That's everything. And you will do whatever it takes in order to pass. I'm not saying necessarily sleep around to pass but, you know, you don't piss off your lecturers because they are the ones that are marking your work and, I guess, it's quite easy to look at them with awe. You know, they have all the information you need to pass and they are giving it to you. That puts them in a really powerful position. They have real power. So you can see why it happens, can't you?...I was surprised that she [Bridget's friend] got a first-class honours [pause]. I don't want to belittle her achievement. But it wasn't as if she was clever or anything. There were people who were way more clever than her, you know? Maybe she was just dedicated and worked hard. And I don't want to take away any of her achievement. But to end up with a first-class honours? I was like, 'Damn, girl! You go girl!' (Bridget).

It is important to remember, of course, that Bridget appears to understand herself through the 'grades for sex' discourse and it is entirely possible that Bridget's friend completely deserved her first-class honours degree. However, given the power effects of the discourse, some women may engage in sex for grades. Bridget outlines the help that may actually be offered:

Well, you see, we had to do these essays set by him and there was core reading that you had to do. You know the thing, they only had a few copies of the books in the library and everybody had to scabble around for those few copies. In addition, he had his own set of the books in his office that he would lend out to some people... I don't think that he ever did the work for her but, well, he would either give her books that she couldn't get in the library, or tell her where to go to get the books, the journal articles to get the essay exactly the way it's supposed to be. You know, 'read this from here, include this person here, discuss this here, use this book for this'. And then he would go through drafts. Whereas, I'm not being funny but you couldn't get anybody to look at drafts for love nor money most of the time. By the time you handed your essay in, you know, that was it, that was what you got. But with his favourites, well, it was a whole other ball game (Bridget).

Bridget's narrative demonstrates how effects of power, through discourse, produce individuals and create new ways of being: thus, subjects are entirely composed by operations of power (Dews 1984: 82). Diverse power relations operating at the site of the individual have practical implications for how subjects may work with, or against, those dynamics of power at the everyday level (Sawicki 1991: 22-23). It is possible that Bridget's friend, aware of the importance of achieving a good degree, and understanding herself and the situation through the 'grades for sex' discourse, may well have traded sex in return for assistance with her work to be sure of receiving good grades and a high classification; as Bridget states, individuals may 'do whatever it takes in order to pass'. These multiple effects of power are suggested in comments

made by Michelle.

Michelle, a final-year undergraduate student, is in the process of writing a book in partnership with a senior male academic. During the early stages of negotiating the contract, the academic made it clear to Michelle that he would like to have a sexual relationship with her. In the following narrative, Michelle discusses how, despite turning him down, she was aware of the power effects generated through the discourse and the perceived requirement to work within these prevailing discourses.

I'm part of that 'let's do something different!' You know, to incorporate a sexual relationship into our working relationship! [Laughs] It's like, 'Hmm, no, can we please not!' [Laughs] And it brings all sorts of questions into mind about us, about, you know, what women have to do in order to keep something safe, a career, or their family life, or whatever... I'm aware that flirting, for me, is sometimes a subtle thing and sometimes it's not. Sometimes it's something that, as a child, growing up [pause] I'm aware that flirting gets you things. And although I try very hard not to do it, I'm aware that I can do it if I need to. And I'm not proud of that. It's just the way that it works (Michelle).

As discussed above, it is entirely possible that the male lecturer, understanding himself and his students through the 'grades for sex' discourse, may have considered his proposal to be an acceptable and perhaps desired consequence of working together. It is suggested, therefore, that an additional power effect for some women may well be an understanding that if male lecturers are so easy to influence, trading sex for grades is a viable option. As Michelle says, 'I'm aware that flirting gets you things' and some women may not stop at flirting. As noted above, through the positive circulation of power, discourse can create and, at the same time, disrupt power relations

This section argues that the 'grades for sex' discourse may have generated specific effects of power with regard to my research participants and how they define themselves. Furthermore, it suggests that fellow students and lecturers may also subscribe to the discourse, constituting particular ways of understanding themselves and others. Through the positioning of sexual harassment as an abuse of power, stemming from unequal relations of power between men and women, liberal feminism in particular argues that harassment is an abuse of power, exploitative and degrading. In particular, MacKinnon's (1979) quid pro quo analysis, in which women are forced to have sex with their boss in order to keep their jobs, is echoed throughout the 'grades for the sex' discourse. Here, women students may be forced to trade sex for higher grades. An additional power effect, however, may be the assumption by women students that if male lecturers are so easy to manipulate, why not take of advantage of them to secure a good grade. By denying harassment, and thus understanding student-lecturer sex as an exchange mechanism for higher grades, many of my participants felt unable to report the behaviours they had identified as sexual harassment. Finally, although my participants do find ways of resisting this discourse, it is always from another discourse and does not, therefore, carry the students beyond power. The following discourse, that of the 'all boys together' also denies the harassment.

4.2 The 'All Boys Together' Discourse

The second sexual harassment discourse that has been suggested from my data is that of 'all boys together'. As discussed in the literature, much of the research on sexual harassment in higher education, especially that coming from a liberal feminist perspective, argues that universities are structurally configured to reproduce male power. Furthermore, feminism often argues that sexual harassment is perpetrated on the basis of gender and intended to reinforce male dominance. For example, Purkiss (1995: 206) states that the sexual harassment and sexual objectification of women is a means of refusing to acknowledge women's intellectual status, and Dougherty (2001: 388) suggests that in some organisations sexual harassment can function to develop group cohesion and male camaraderie. Furthermore, Ramazanoglu (1987) argues that sexual harassment in higher education is one means of preserving the hierarchical order of white, male heterosexism. As a result, this section proposes that the power effects generated through the 'all boys together' discourse may encourage men and women to view higher education as a male-dominated institution, and that certain behaviours are normal and to be expected. Subsequently, in this discourse, as with the preceding discourse, there is a denial of sexual harassment and an understanding that sex at work with students is an acceptable and appropriate form of behaviour. The following narrative from Kate begins to illustrate how the 'all boys together' discourse may operate.

Kate works in a disability support department which offers specialist support to

students with a variety of needs. Here she talks about behaviour defined as sexual harassment and witnessed by her staff when supporting students in class:

I had placed a note-taker with one student. I can't quite remember what the lesson was. I think it was physics or something like that. The note-taker was very experienced in her job: both at taking notes and with dealing with students. And, apparently, the guy taking the lecture was using completely sexual language. You know, real sexual innuendo: 'Can you feel it getting hotter? Can you feel the friction?' and all this sort of thing. And then it was like, 'Can you feel it like this?' and 'Is it getting good for you?' And it was loaded and totally inappropriate. And the thing for me is that it's really horrible for the students. You know, the lecturer clearly loved having that kind of power, and really being quite horrible to the women. The student involved didn't come back and make any complaints about it. And if the student doesn't complain, then we can't do anything. And, the same support worker, unfortunately, experienced something on another course. Complementary Therapy – or one of those sorts of courses - where there is literally lots of hands-on stuff. A minefield. And, the man, again it was a man, he would make inappropriate remarks about her figure or her clothing. You know, 'Oh, that's a nice pair of jeans! Your legs look nice in those!' Again, a male lecturer making inappropriate remarks. And, erm, and actually physically touching students on their behinds (Kate).

In this narrative, Kate believed that the male lecturers were using 'loaded and totally inappropriate' language and that they 'clearly loved having that kind of power'. By using sexual innuendo, physically touching their female students and making inappropriate comments about their appearance, it is suggested that the male lecturers may have understood themselves and their relationships with their students through the 'all boys together' discourse: the behaviours defined as sexual harassment by Kate may evidence the lecturers' understanding that the behaviours are appropriate, and reflect their 'right' to behave in a sexual manner at work. In behaving this way towards their female students, therefore, the male lecturers may understand themselves and their

role through the power effects generated by the 'all boys together' discourse. For example, Littler-Bishop et al. (1982) discuss scenarios in which men with perceived authority may understand themselves as culturally entitled to behave in a sexual manner towards women. I suggest, therefore, that male lecturers who understand themselves through the 'all boys together' discourse would not consider themselves to be sexual harassers; indeed, the behaviour becomes their right as male lecturers with cultural and professional authority.

For the female students, the 'all boys together' discourse may have the effect of reinforcing any perceived feeling of vulnerability. Kate states:

I said, 'Well, what do the students do?' And she said, 'Well, they just don't do anything!' So, what the dynamic is, the students must just not feel able to challenge that. Or say anything. And, I'm not saying that it was because it was a student with a disability anyway, but maybe, you know, a young student who was having difficulties on the course, in terms of understanding and what she needed, would maybe feel less empowered to challenge that (Kate).

It is important to remember that I am only working from Kate's analysis of the situation: because the female students did not complain or report their lecturer's behaviour it is possible that they did not find the situation unpleasant or threatening. Brewis (2001) argues that prevailing forms of feminist discourses may have fostered an understanding of sexual harassment as gendered: men are understood to be powerful and women are understood to be powerless. Thus, the 'active' man becomes the initiator of sex and the woman becomes the target of sexual attention. In this sense, the woman is understood to be the recipient of the man's more powerful advances, thus returning to the

heterosexist privileging of sex and the sexual 'requirements' of men (Brewis 2001: 40, 52). Although liberal feminism aims to promote equal opportunities and a sense of empowerment in women (e.g. Ollenburger and Moore 1992), students who believe themselves to be in a vulnerable position, in part, through the 'all boys together' discourse may feel less empowered and, therefore, less able to challenge prevailing discourses through formal means. However, by denying the existence of sexual harassment, through the promotion of these types of activity as 'normal', 'to be expected' and 'just the way things work', the 'all boys together' discourse makes unwanted behaviours difficult to challenge and potentially perpetuates these behaviours. However, as noted with the 'grades for sex' discourse, women do have the capacity to resist prevailing ways of thinking. For example, Kate states that:

[A]s an employee of the university, I've been aware of, obviously, I think there's a dominance of male lecturers here [laughs]. Or am I imagining that? [Laughs] I don't know! And, erm, one particular lecturer. I mean, erm, I like to think that I'm a likeable, easy-going sort of person. I like a laugh and a joke with people. And after a while, I realised that, that, this person is [pause]. And it's not just me, it's happened to other female colleagues. But that, what passes for the, 'Oh, hello, and how are you?' sort of thing, and, 'Yes, I'm fine!'. You know, they're a little bit too much. The eye contact becomes a little bit too much. And then it gets to the stage of, 'You're looking very well!', and I sort of laugh and go, 'Oh, thank you very much!' You know, trying to keep it light. You know, 'Oh, I'm OK, all things considered!' Laugh it off. And then the next time, 'You're looking VERY nice!', and actually taking a step back and going like that [mimes looking someone up and down]. And I'm thinking, 'This is really uncomfortable!' And, actually to the fact that you think, 'The next time I see you, I'm going – If I see you coming, you know, coming down through the canteen, or whatever, I'm actually going to take the long way round. Because I don't want to meet you' (Kate).

The first form of resistance is the employment of humour: by keeping the interaction as free from conflict as possible, Kate appears to be attempting to

defuse the situation and prevent additional loss of control. Grosz (1994) argues that practices of femininity can, in some circumstances, operate as sedition towards patriarchal codes. In this narrative, Kate used patriarchal representations of femininity – humour, putting oneself down and responding to harassment as an apparent compliment – to retain control of the situation. However, it is noted that there is a fine line between subverting patriarchal codes and compliance (Grosz 1994: 144). Although these forms of resistance are often employed as means of self-protection, particularly in situations when women feel unsafe, threatened or fear retaliation, it may give the impression that sexual harassment is an acceptable or even enjoyable form of behaviour (see Pringle 1989: 58). Therefore, and as seen within the ‘grades for sex’ discourse, resistance does not occur in a power-free space and, when we resist, we do so from a new discourse. Thus resistance carries with it its own problematics (Foucault 1998).

It is suggested, therefore, that one of the possible power effects generated through the ‘all boys together’ discourse is for men and women to subscribe through the discourse to understanding themselves as working within hierarchical and segregated relationships, thereby impacting upon personal feelings of independence and empowerment. For example, the following narrative from Claire, a science graduate, states that:

He would talk down to me and lament my ineptitude at his subject whilst praising up the other student when our essays were actually fairly similar. On one occasion my male supervision partner had used my essay to inform and structure his own!...Anyway, during one supervision, we had got bogged down in a discussion about hormones and their effect on human behaviour, when he said to my male supervision partner: ‘You

know how women get when it's that time of the month. You only have to say hello the wrong way and they burst into tears'. He didn't even laugh or smile - I knew it wasn't a joke. I then said that actually I didn't suffer from that sort of hormonal change, to which he replied sarcastically, 'Oh well maybe you're one of those women who don't have hormones'. Then he added, "But seriously, I think you were probably exposed to too much testosterone in the womb' (Claire).

Claire's narrative suggests that she understands herself and the lecturer's behaviour through the 'all boys together' discourse. For example, when the lecturer discussed Claire's hormones and women's reproductive cycles, by bringing the male student into the strategy, Claire felt that the male lecturer was signifying his authoritative position. It is suggested that the power generated through this discourse may shift the socially understood dynamics of power so that being male and female (with male as the alleged dominant category) becomes understood as more important than being lecturer and student. This is echoed within some feminist harassment discourses. For example, Quinn (2002: 394) argues that hegemonic masculinity, as a performance, requires a demonstration of strength, dominance and marked heterosexuality. In this sense, the performance of masculinity – through sexual harassment – protects masculine identity and signifies dominance to other men.

Other feminists have argued that power structured on the basis of one's gender, rather than one's organisational or formal position, may be behind much sexual harassment in the workplace and in educational institutions. For example, Grauerholz (1989) argues that male students may seek to sexually harass their female lecturers to assert their gendered dominance and authority. Grauerholz terms this 'contrapower' harassment and states that although most harassment

research has focused on behaviour targeted at subordinates, positions of ascribed power understood through one's gender may be equally as important as formal or organisational power. Therefore, in Claire's narrative, she seems to understand herself as holding less ascribed power than her male colleague.

For example, a power effect of this discourse fosters an understanding that Claire, as a woman - especially a deficient woman lacking the required feminine hormones - occupies a subject position which is alleged to be lower than that of the male student. In the next narrative from Claire, I suggest that these understandings of power are reinforced:

Well, about mid-way through the year, he organised a supervision at late notice, emailing my supervision partner and I at about 10.30 pm scheduling the supervision for 9.00 am the next morning. My supervision partner didn't check his email between those times and he didn't turn up. I felt so uncomfortable alone with him. He locked the door to 'avoid interruptions' [rolls eyes] and I spent an hour trying to hide my panic as he told me my essay had been wonderful and a real delight to read - his spoken words didn't really match the ones written in red ink all over it - according to him the essay had been okay. I'd actually written it with a hangover! At the end of the supervision he noted we still had fifteen minutes left if I wanted to discuss anything with him. I said no again but he asked if I'd like to just have a chat. I said no and deliberately stood up making my way to the door. He suddenly darted ahead of me to the door and put his hand on the lock. He stood there for a moment barring my way for no obvious reason, staring me out. I managed to hold my icy gaze and eventually he unlocked the door and showed me out like chivalry wasn't dead (Claire).

As suggested by Lindsey's narrative in the previous discourse, by locking the door, the lecturer may have been displaying his understanding of his authority. I suggest that the lecturer may have understood his perception of 'masculinity' through the 'all boys together' discourse through an expression of strength in

two ways: firstly, the lecturer was signalling to Claire that he could, if he wanted to, close down power relations to those of force. The relations of power shift from acting upon actions to acting upon bodies: if the door is locked, Claire cannot make the choice to leave the room without a fight unless *he chooses* to unlock the door. Secondly, the lecturer was demonstrating his authority over the office, the organisation of its space and his control over the environment as a physical and tactical block of power (see Foucault 2002: 338; see also Quinn 2002). It is also suggested that Claire's apparent feeling of vulnerability may have increased through her perceived notion of ascribed power and understanding herself as holding less ascribed power. After a lack of support from her Director of Studies, and appearing to understand herself and her lecturers through the 'all boys together' discourse, Claire decided that it would be prudent to avoid making a formal complaint against her male lecturer:

Regretfully, I didn't report him. I did talk to my Director of Studies about having a problem with my supervisor but made out it was a clash of personalities. I think she thought there might be more to it but I didn't think anyone higher up would believe me. She suggested waiting until after my next supervision to make a decision. By that time there was little point in changing. I thought no one would believe me because half the female students, the flirty ones, I spoke to really liked him and the other half who were creeped out by him [the lecturer] would clam up after I mentioned reporting it. There were women who he had harassed far more seriously than me but they refused to consider reporting him and actually stopped talking to me after the suggestion...I think that was the reason I didn't report him: I knew there were implications. I knew the bullying would get worse, and that no-one would believe me, so I kept thinking I just have to get through those couple of hours...The day after that supervision, I was still shaken up by his behaviour but my boyfriend came to visit so I felt a bit more secure (Claire).

Believing that the situation might actually deteriorate, Claire remained silent about her experiences. Indeed, as discussed in the literature review, the

negative consequences that may be attached to formally reporting or challenging sexual harassment are often such that the most reasonable course of action may be perceived to be remaining silent about unwanted experiences (Bergman et al. 2002: 15; Kaiser and Millet 2004: 170). Claire also resisted by relying on the support and sense of security gained through the visit of her boyfriend. As with other forms of resistance, this has its own effects of power: by relying on her boyfriend, Claire may well have felt less capable of dealing with the situation on her own. The effects of power generated through the 'all boys together' discourse are also suggested to be present within Jenny's narrative below.

Jenny, a young social sciences student, discusses how being sexually harassed by two male lecturers had the effect of reminding her of women's precarious position within an 'old boys' club':

[A]t the time it made me feel like I was a stupid little girl. Maybe that was the point. It led me to feel that the whole department was one big 'old boys' club'. I sort of thought, you know, one event – one event of a lecturer overstepping the mark – well, one event I could cope with. But it was kind of a shock to see how they conduct themselves. Kind of 'jocks in the sports club', 'high five' and 'let's see if I can get anywhere here'. It's shocking because I came into education thinking that I could talk with people about books – good books – and intellectual things. Not to be treated as a silly little woman whose only place is to look pretty, or nod in the right places, or laugh at their rubbish jokes (Jenny).

Understanding herself and her situation through the 'all boys together' discourse, and experiencing the university department as an 'old boys' club', Jenny believes that her male lecturers did not award her any intellectual status but, instead, viewed her as an attractive, flattering object. Strine (1992) argues

that during their undergraduate years, students attempt to position themselves as emerging academics. This is reflected in Jenny's comment that she had entered university to talk about 'intellectual things' but that experiencing behaviours defined as sexual harassment had made her feel like 'a stupid little girl'. Again, this is echoed within many feminist discourses. For example, Purkiss (1995) argues that making female students feel like stupid little girls may be precisely the point: by separating a female student from her 'threateningly improper place' of intellectuality and forcing her into the 'proper sphere' of femininity, a male lecturer may succeed in his attempt to cut off any access to the possibility of her gaining cultural or professional status (Purkiss 1995: 206). Ramazanoglu (1987: 73) argues that sexual harassment may be used against non-deferential women who may be seen as a threat to the male-dominated structures of higher education. It is suggested, therefore, that the 'all boys together' discourse may produce specific effects of power, thus generating a possible understanding of higher education as a male-dominated environment.

Celia is an administrator in an academic department and in the following narrative she discusses how, in her opinion, her line manager feels insecure about her position as departmental head:

There's too much competition and it creates an atmosphere of mistrust and fear. I think she's insecure about her position here...And I think, deep down, she knows that the men would just love the opportunity to get her job, and, to be honest, that's a fair enough point. They are a bit like hyenas! Waiting to spot any signs of weakness and then picking over the remains! It's all very political. The women tend to get stuck in and help each other out. But, for the men, it's more about political gain.

Personal gain. They'll only help you out if you've got influence in the department or the university. You know, if they can get some prestige from it in some way. And they are much happier about saying 'no' to jobs that get put on people. You know, they are much more assertive and they look after themselves in a way that they, women, don't seem to do. So they'll say, 'Well, I'll only take on that responsibility if I get a pay rise', and stuff like that. I think in that sense, it's much more easier for them to move up the career ladder (Celia).

Celia talks about competition and an atmosphere of mistrust and fear; the idea of other colleagues '[w]aiting to spot any signs of weakness and then picking over the remains!' is possibly reflected in what Kerfoot and Whitehead (2000: 1999) refer to as the management ethos of productivity, accountability and aggressive competition. However, I would suggest that what is particularly interesting in Celia's narrative is her discussion on what she perceives to be the gendered dynamics of the department. Celia states that the 'women tend to get stuck in and help each other out. But, for the men, it's more about political gain. Personal gain'. Celia then went on to state that the men will 'only help you out if you've got influence in the department or the university. You know, if they can get some prestige from it in some way'. Thus, I suggest that the men and women within the department may understand themselves through the 'all boys together' discourse and operating through a belief that this is true may create a network of colleagues, often male, who help each other in return for assistance at a later date, which is familiar within traditional understandings of 'old boys' networks' (e.g. Stamler and Stone 1998: 33).

Given that Knights and Richards (2003: 215) note, in a discussion on sex discrimination in UK academia, that the majority of women in higher education

earn less than men, are segregated into lower roles and face greater difficulty in gaining promotion or entering non-traditional fields, it could be argued that understanding oneself and one's colleagues through an 'all boys together' discourse may be enormously beneficial for the men involved. Indeed, Jones (1998: 146) argues that occupational status, education and income come together to form traditional understandings of social class and, together with ethnicity, class and gender form interlocking systems of oppression. It is to this that I now turn.

Social class largely refers to a location within a stratified society. However, class identities are discursively negotiated and individuals may hold competing or contrasting senses of class. Lorna, a student of sociology, identified herself as 'a black, working-class woman'.¹⁸ As discussed in the literature review, intersections of class, ethnicity and sexuality may inform our understandings of 'approved' femininity (Myers 2004: 37). Skeggs (1997: 18) argues that 'respectable' femininity is historically understood as white, bourgeois women. It is possible to suggest, therefore, that already 'primed' through the wider social, Lorna understands her interactions with her male lecturer as based on class and gender. For example, she experienced behaviours she identified as sexual harassment from a male lecturer who was supervising her dissertation. This harassment occurred during the one-to-one tutorial sessions:

I had this man as my supervisor for my dissertation. And when I got to know him, on a one-to-one basis, I thought: 'God, this person is arrogant and really unprofessional'. He swore at me on two separate occasions.

¹⁸ Lorna was my only interviewee to have identified herself as belonging to a particular social class.

On the second occasion, I'd brought somebody with me as backup, you know, to show I wasn't being paranoid or hyper-sensitive... I think it was to do with my gender, because he seemed to talk a lot about gender issues. And statistics, like, how many mothers are out of work, and how many single mothers, and how many women take up council houses. And, you know, fair enough if it was relevant, if that what's we was supposed to be studying, but it wasn't, you know? It was just random stuff. And he seemed to talk a lot about class issues. And I just felt like, 'I'm a mature student. I'm here to learn. Not to listen to random abuse. You know, here to learn. That's what we're here for. Not to sit there like some kind of "nodding dog" syndrome' (Lorna).

In this extract, Lorna discusses how she understands her male lecturer to have treated her in an unprofessional manner with 'random abuse'. In addition to the focus on gender, there is also the introduction of 'class issues'. Sexual harassment, and other forms of sexual violence, is experienced in interlocking systems of domination: ethnicity, gender and social class all unite to structure our understandings of victims and victimhood. For example, the criminal justice system responds less seriously to the rape of black women by black or white men than the rape of white women. In this sense, race and social class are never absent from experiences of sexual harassment (Welsh et al. 2006: 89). Lorna states twice that she is at university to learn but, as in Jenny's narrative above, the lecturer's potential understanding of himself and others through the 'all boys together' discourse may have fostered an unwillingness or inability to view Lorna as a potentially emerging academic. By focusing on the stereotypes of unemployed, single mothers in council houses, it is suggested that the male lecturer may have been unable to consider Lorna in her position as a student, or emerging academic, and had understood her through the more generalised role of 'woman'.

Thus, the 'all boys together' discourse may produce specific effects of power, generating particular understandings through which staff and students define themselves and others and develop their understanding of 'how things work'.

Discussing the sexual relationships between male lecturers and students,

Bridget states that:

It was just something that was accepted. I can't explain. We all knew. It wasn't a case of us finding out, with the gossip and the whisper, whisper behind their backs, guess who's shagging who? And who doesn't know? It wasn't like that at all. It was an open thing that was just accepted (Bridget).

The fact that lecturer-student relationships were 'just accepted' is, I suggest, an example of how power effects generated through the 'all boys together' discourse produce particular understandings. Thus, what we know of ourselves and others is generated through these discourses, compelling us to act out these understandings as if they represented the 'truth' (Brewis 2001: 43). In Bridget's narrative, I suggest that things may have been 'just accepted' because it was difficult to imagine things being any different: lecturer-student relations have become the *status quo*. Therefore, the power effects of the prevailing discourses may produce an understanding of student-lecturer sex as something which is 'normal' and 'to be expected'. If this is the case, by denying the possibility of harassment within the department, the behaviours may be dismissed as operating within the 'natural' order of things. This can have the effect of people simply accepting that certain male lecturers are 'just like that' and that nothing can, or perhaps should, be done about it. Bridget explains

further:

In the management and in the students, nobody thought anything about it. That's just the way it was. There were these men, these lecturers, and they had groups of students that they liked, and groups of students that they didn't know their names, and groups of students that they didn't like. And the ones that they liked did well, the ones that they didn't know did average, and the ones that they didn't like didn't do well. And because that was just the way that it worked, most of us didn't think to question it. It just went on, end of story... Every year a different set of girls and every year he would definitely sleep with at least one of them. And the other staff: well the male lecturers were either all doing the same thing or it was just considered normal anyway. It was normal. Normal. That's what you had to understand. Nobody could complain about it or even feel pissed off about it because it was normal. It was how it was. How things worked. It was something that he had been doing for years. Him and other members of staff. Other lecturers. Going out for drinks and sleeping with your students (Bridget).

Bridget suggests that because of their very 'naturalness' nobody thought to question lecturer-student relationships and the consequences these relationships may have for individual students: 'Nobody could complain about it or even feel pissed off about it because it was normal'. Thus, the effects of power produced through the 'all boys together' discourse have generated this sense of normality. For example, in Leah's narrative, she discusses the response of the male lecturer who raped her:

He said that if I reported it, even if they sacked him, that the other lecturers wouldn't let it go. That they would protect him. That they would see to it that I never got more than a third-class grade for any of my work. That even he if I got him sacked, that he could still destroy my chances of getting a good degree (Leah).

In Bridget's narrative, the power effects generated through the 'all boys together' discourse by their very naturalness work to deny the existence of

sexual harassment. I suggest that staff who understand themselves, their roles and their students through the 'all boys together' discourse may not view their behaviour as something that would require protection. Instead, the perceived male right to have sex at work with female students is produced through specific effects of power and defines how the lecturers and students understand themselves and their behaviours. Thus, the power effects of the 'all boys together' discourse produce lecturer-student relationships as 'normal' social exchanges and the implication that such behaviours are sanctioned by management adds additional authority to the discourse. By understanding the relationships as 'just accepted' by students, staff and management, the power effects produce behaviour which is regarded as natural and inevitable. The perceived support the 'all boys together' discourse may receive is also present in Nicola's narrative below.

Nicola is a female lecturer in a red brick university. She identifies herself as gay and had experienced what she defines as anti-lesbian harassment from her academic colleagues (discussed in the 'knickers in a twist' discourse).

However, she also discussed how the sexual harassment of female students is a familiar occurrence:

I know that Steven has had at least two complaints put in about his behaviour because the students have been to see me to ask for advice, and I know that they made complaints. Although, I think one was only an informal complaint. She never made it formal. But management know, and if management know, how is he still getting away with it? I know for a fact that he's got another student on the go now, because I've seen them together. They were out at the front of the university, kissing! I mean, he must be pretty sure of his behaviour, that he can get away with it, if he's carrying on in public. And I know that you can say that most

sexual harassment doesn't get reported, well, if I know of at least two cases that have been reported, how much else is he getting up to? I just think it's outrageous. And outrageous that management are sitting back and just letting him get away with it... The whole place is just seething with testosterone. Everything is warped by this male-dominated attitude. I see students being sexually harassed, and I know how they've reacted to me, but I still can't believe that management are letting them get away with it (Nicola).

In the above narrative from Nicola, the belief that the 'whole place is just seething with testosterone' and that '[e]verything is warped by this male-dominated attitude' seems to result in a feeling that the behaviours defined as sexual harassment cannot be challenged. Even though she is apparently still witnessing the sexual harassment of students, she feels that the management is sanctioning the behaviour and that nothing can be done to stop it. Thus, from Nicola's perspective at least, it is possible to suggest that the power effects generated through the 'all boys together' discourse, including the denial of harassment, have removed the ability to complain about and challenge the behaviour. This apparent lack of trust in management processes is also evident in Janine's narrative below:

I was studying a new subject at a new university. I had never met him but I guess it's fair to say that his reputation, is, well, goes ahead of him [laughs]. My new group of friends were like, 'Oh you want to be careful with him because he's a leech'. You know, I am French, and although my English is very good, now at least, I still struggle sometimes and so this was a word that I was unfamiliar with [laughs]. But it was known that this Philip [the lecturer] had sexually harassed some of his students, his female students, and there had even been some complaints gone in about him although nothing was ever done about it (Janine).

Here I suggest that the 'all boys together' discourse generates specific effects of power, resulting in the girls wanting to set up their own protective network,

warning new students of the lecturer and what they perceive to be a threat. Although Janine and her friends signify that they are unhappy about their male lecturer behaving like a 'leech', and, therefore, the behaviour is not something that is just accepted by them, the apparent lack of management support for complaints of sexual harassment seems to have resulted in a distrust of the formal academic systems. Fear and distrust of the system and a belief that management will sanction members of staff who are found to be guilty of sexual harassment, can, it appears, result in female students forming their own supportive networks. However, this carries with it its own consequences. For example, if staff and students do not have any faith in sexual harassment complaint procedures, they may not report their unwanted experiences which, in turn, results in low reporting rates for behaviours defined as sexual harassment. Given that resources to improve sexual harassment and equal opportunity policies are often contingent upon reporting rates, this may be one reason why staff and student awareness of sexual harassment and their university's policy on it may be insubstantial. Thomas (2004: 155) agrees that the lack of implementation of sexual harassment policies, and the subsequent limitations to policy effectiveness, may impact upon prevailing understandings of certain behaviours.

However, in addition to this, feminist discourses often take a more conspiratorial approach to understanding sexual harassment in higher education. For example, Carter and Jeffs (1995) discuss how lecturer-student relationships frequently seem to result in academic staff providing a united front and a show of collegiate loyalty. They suggest that far from creating staff divisions,

accusations of sexual harassment often result in 'either [a] rally round to support the colleague or to treat such behaviour by a colleague with indifference' and that '[s]taff will go to great lengths to protect colleagues' from accusations of sexual harassment (Carter and Jeffs 1995: 17, 34). Thomas (2004) also states that some members of university management may be deliberately producing unwieldy complaints procedures: fears that more user-friendly policies and procedures may result in considerable numbers of complaints may result in management reluctance to offer a more proactive implementation of sexual harassment and equal opportunities policies (Thomas 2004: 155-157; see also Bagilhole 2002). However, a Foucauldian approach would argue against this line of thinking, suggesting that these policies and procedures are, in fact, deemed to be sufficient, their authors potentially understanding themselves and their colleagues through the 'all boys together' discourse. The perceptions of unmanageable complaint procedures are evident in Caroline's narrative below.

Caroline, a mature student, experienced behaviours she defined as sexual harassment, stalking and threatening behaviour from a male student on her course. However, although these events were reported several times to her male lecturers, programme leaders and eventually to the Head of the Department, Caroline feels that she was offered little support and protection. Thus, although the original perpetrator of the harassment was a student, Caroline feels that she experienced secondary victimisation caused by the response (or lack of response) from her male lecturers. For example, in the following narrative Caroline discusses a meeting with the Head of Department, before which she was asked to take along a diary to discuss the times and

dates of the harassment:

If this was a job, or a place outside of university, he would have had one warning and then they would have done something about it. And I tried to explain that to Nigel [the Head of Department]. And that's when I said, look, this is happening more and more, Nigel... He [Nigel] was a complete twat and I just didn't get anywhere with him. And I couldn't get into my handbag and then I couldn't get the notes that I'd made and I just got so upset. Crying so much. And I couldn't get into my bag and in the end I just threw the notes over to him and almost ran from the room. I just couldn't get through to him, Helen. It was all just: Peter [the male student] has got rights; Peter has got to be protected; he has got to be allowed to just come into the university whenever he wants to. And I'm too nice, I am, and I was all, yeah, yeah. You know? A lot of these lecturers do that, you know? They use this status, this power to get their own way. It's down to management and management making sure that their staff have respect for their students. This comes down from the top. It dissolves down into the team... I've tried to push Peter out of my mind, you know, not to think about him. But I've heard that he's coming back and that has really worried me. You know, what will happen? And I worry that the staff will think I've been silly and they will look at what's happened, you know, the stuff that is here in the diary, and they will think I've been silly for letting it go on for so long. That I should have stopped it long ago. Done something about it sooner. The diary sets it all out in black and white and it makes me look silly. You know, these are only minor incidents (Caroline).

In the above narrative, and despite the fact that Caroline had already tried several times to report the male student for sexual harassment and threatening behaviour, the complaints procedure felt unwieldy and unmanageable.

Although Caroline stated that the harassment 'is happening more and more' and despite taking in a diary of recorded incidents, she felt that her complaints and fears were not being listened to. Of course, the need for due process demands that the student in Caroline's narrative is also protected during any investigation. However, Caroline's understanding is that that the management had not considered the situation to be potentially dangerous. In this instance, the staff, understanding themselves, their students and their colleagues through

the 'all boys together' discourse, may have understood the alleged behaviours to be a private matter and, therefore, not a concern for management. Here, the power effects of the discourse may produce the understanding that sexual harassment is a private affair, even if it operates within a public area. There seem to have been two contradictory effects of power here: firstly, Caroline worried about looking silly after producing her diary; that she had, in effect, made a 'fuss' about nothing (see also the 'knickers in a twist' discourse). Secondly, and at the same time, Caroline also worried that she had let the behaviour continue for too long and that the responsibility seemed to have been placed on her to deal with it.

Thus, as a private matter, the target of the alleged harassment appears to be understood as responsible for proving the behaviour. Thus, Caroline appears to have felt responsible for ensuring her own safety and for preventing the male student's behaviour. The behaviours defined as sexual harassment appear to have been understood as separate from their social setting, fostering the belief that any blame might lie with Caroline. In addition, by requiring Caroline to record unwanted events in a diary or personal account, the behaviour may be encouraged to be regarded as 'personal' and 'individual' and focus attention on the private sphere instead of the public realm. This reinforces the idea that it is the target of the harassment who is responsible for stopping the behaviour (Clair 1993a: 131, 139).

As discussed in the literature review, it is important to note that women's subjectivities are often formed through multiple and contradictory discourses

held at the same time. Foucault (1980c: 98) argues that individuals, our sense of selves, are produced through our engagement with prevailing discourses. We are, therefore, an effect of power, in a state of constant renegotiation and it is likely that we hold multiple and contradictory positions. This sense of subscribing to multiple and opposing prevailing discourses is also, I suggest, seen in the following narrative from Gillian, a geology student and Women's Officer for the Students' Union:

I'm on a course with mainly all blokes, there are just four women, and all the lecturers and technicians are men. That's a big difference! Everybody has to rough it with everybody else. Sometimes, I seem to spend all of my time being wet, cold and thoroughly miserable! I think we all do. And a way of coping with that is to just get along together. You know, there isn't any room for people who just don't buckle down and get on with each other. You know, you gotta know how to handle it. I think it helps because I've got three brothers at home, so I learnt how to stick up to men! You know, you've just got to give it them back. If I didn't stick up for myself as a kid, I'd have got ground down. But, you know, you never went running round, telling tales, because the boys would never respect you. You had to stand up for yourself. Take the piss out of them back. And a geology course is just like that. The same rules apply. It's the same principles. And if you can't take that kind of stuff, then you shouldn't be on the course... Like I said, if you can't take that kind of thing, then you shouldn't be on the course. Though I can understand that some women wouldn't be able to, you know, cope. And then they wouldn't get the opportunity to study geology, or any of them type of subjects. I think it's just up to individual women. You gotta be strong, you know (Gillian)?

Gillian appears to understand herself, her colleagues and her fellow female students through the 'all boys together' discourse: the specific power effects generated through this discourse may have produced an understanding of needing to 'buckle down' and of not 'telling tales'. An additional effect of power may be the understanding that women who feel unable to cope with the

masculinist environment should not have the opportunity to study traditionally male-only subjects. Here, Gillian appears to denounce notions of victimhood and opts instead for a stronger notion of self:

You see, I'm the Women's Representative at the Students' Union, and we're always trying to get women at the university involved. Because, like, we are always being told that we've got to have equal representatives on the council and the like, and we're desperately trying to recruit women for the posts. To fill posts on the council. But nothing – we don't have any response. No reaction at all. And, I mean, if women were really bothered about equal rights, and all that, then they'd be working with the rest of us to make things better. You know? Generally, erm, all you get is, 'Well I'm too busy to go out!', or, 'I've got no money'. [Laughs] Well, none of us have got any money! That's what it means to be a student! The male sabs are all right with me, 'cause they know I'm trying to make a difference, but, honestly, you should hear them talking about the women students. That we're supposed to be promoting equality and diversity, but we don't get anything back at all. From the women, I mean. And you just start thinking that this is just about paper exercises (Gillian).

In this narrative, Gillian's fellow sabbaticals appear to hold negative views about the female student body. Apparently operating within a masculinist environment, Gillian agrees that most of the female students are uninterested in women's rights and securing a more equal environment. This sense of women needing a more proactive approach is seen within so-called power feminism: for example, Herbert (1997: 28) argues that feminism should encourage women to speak out against sexual harassment and provide women with the skills necessary to challenge and confront these unwanted situations. Roiphe demands that women should learn to deal with sexually harassing behaviours with 'strength and confidence' and that we should be able to put the harasser 'in his place... [and] not be pushed to the verge of a nervous breakdown' (Roiphe 1994: 101). In this sense, it can be argued that Gillian is resisting what she

feels to be the prevailing forms of femininity and is, instead, seeking to understand herself as strong, capable and different from the majority of the female body. However, as noted previously, all resistance carries consequences. For Gillian, it is possible to suggest that by understanding herself as strong and assertive she lives by the requirement that she must continually behave this way. Not only does this involve presenting herself in a constantly assertive manner to her fellow students and sabbatical officers, Gillian also appears to feel that she must criticise other female students who do not behave this way. In the first narrative, Gillian implies that she has learnt to 'stick up' for herself and that the behaviour does not bother her. However, this suggested coping mechanism is contradicted in a later extract from Gillian. As part of her geology course, Gillian had attended a week-long field trip; preparing for a day's excursion, she had packed a small rucksack and, whilst waiting for the coach, she experienced an upsetting incident:

I'd gone to the loo, and when I came back the guys had found the tampons and were chucking them about and over people's heads and things. And throwing them behind me to the guys behind me. And the tech guys were just laughing, which made me feel even more embarrassed, 'cause they'd obviously seen and were just standing around watching. It was horrible. I was really embarrassed. Well, Laura, my mate, she was like, Martin, don't be such a tosser! [Laughs] 'Just because you've never had a girlfriend, and probably don't even know what they are!' That was quite funny, because all the guys laughed at him, and left me alone after that. But, well, it was quite horrible [pause]. I was embarrassed, and I was just glad Laura was there really. I think, to make it worse, it was my first extended field trip, and I was feeling quite homesick, so I felt pretty miserable anyway. In some ways, it was just like the icing on the cake (Gillian).

In this narrative, the unpleasant and bullying behaviour from the men left Gillian feeling embarrassed and miserable. However, she chose not to report the

incident or to define the behaviour as sexual harassment; given the apparent prevailing nature of the 'all boys together' discourse and Gillian's desire to study geology, it seems understandable if Gillian understood herself through these power effects. However, as discussed, the consequences of understanding herself as tough and assertive may impact upon her experiences of being a geology student.

The second suggested discourse appears to generate specific effects of power which may encourage women and men to understand higher education as a male dominated institution and, as a result, that certain behaviours are 'normal' and 'to be expected'. Subsequently, as with the 'grades for sex' discourse, there is a denial of sexual harassment and an understanding that sex at work with female students is both acceptable and appropriate. This way of thinking reflects much of sexual harassment research, especially from a feminist perspective, which argues the organisations are gendered at their core, structurally configured to maintain and reproduce male power. My participants, who had experienced behaviours they defined as sexual harassment, appeared to feel vulnerable and powerless, in part, I suggest, as a result of these perceived male structures. It is suggested, therefore, that the 'all boys together' discourse may produce specific effects of power, generating particular understandings through which student and students define themselves and others, developing notions of 'how things work'. Let us now consider the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse.

4.3 The 'Trustworthy Lecturer' Discourse

For the most part, feminist theories argue against the notion of sexual violence as exceptional behaviour perpetrated by deviant, pathological men, and instead conceptualise women as vulnerable to violence from any man at any time. This is not, of course, to suggest that all individual men are potential rapists but to argue that a patriarchal society and culture constructs violence against women as fundamental to male power and that it is ordinary men (not pathological or deviant) who engage in violence as a form of social control (see, for example, Millett 1971; Brownmiller 1986; Edwards 1987). The third discourse to be suggested from my data would appear to have generated the understanding that male lecturers are in a different sphere to that of 'ordinary' men who, as in the feminist discourses above, may be regarded as a potential threat to safety. In this discourse, it is the ordinary man who may be regarded with suspicion and, conversely, the male lecturer who is discursively understood as being trustworthy and safe.

This is seen within much feminist research. For example, Dziech and Weiner (1984) provide a psychological breakdown of the different types of harasser, including the confidant, the intellectual seducer, the opportunist and the power broker. These profiles imply that there is something psychologically different about the lecherous professor compared with his 'ordinary' colleagues.

Crucially, it is stated that 'few [students] are prepared for the deception that occurs when the professor closes the office door and sheds the *professorial for the male role*' (Dziech and Weiner 1984: 121; italics added for emphasis).

In this third discourse, therefore, I suggest that feminist (amongst other) understandings of sexual harassment appear to have conceptualised an understanding of lecturers as trustworthy. The specific effects of power may have produced the understanding that the harassing behaviours are detached from the subject position of 'male lecturer'. For example, as discussed in the literature review, feminist understandings of sexual harassment in higher education argue that male lecturers who sexually harass their female students are treated as an aberration separate from their occupation (Purkiss 1995; Eyre 2000; Bacchi 2001). Indeed, the discourse of 'the lecherous professor' may have the power effects of isolating the 'lechery' from the 'profession': the lecherous man, by the very nature of his behaviour, cannot be considered a professional and his abnormal, deviant behaviour exonerates the rest of his colleagues (Purkiss 1995: 198-193). For example, in the following narratives, Leah, who was raped by a male lecturer, discusses the processes which encouraged her to feel safe in visiting the lecturer's house:

I called into his office and he said that he had made a mistake and he had left the journals at his home. But he said that he didn't live very far away, just a ten minute walk, and why didn't I go with him. He would find out the articles and I could read them before tomorrow's lecture and they would be very useful to me. You know, now, now, I think, could there have been a louder warning signal? You know? Alarm bells should have been ringing at that point. But I didn't think. I didn't think anything of it. I should have. I should have, I know that now. But I didn't. You know, you are not encouraged to question your lecturer. You know, you are meant to trust your lecturer. Nobody ever tells you that your lecturer can be a threat to you. I wouldn't go back to a normal guy's house, someone that I had met in a bar or someone that I didn't know very well. But aren't lecturers supposed to be different? Who can you trust if you can't trust your lecturer (Leah)?

In Leah's narrative, it is the 'ordinary' man who may be perceived as a potential threat and the male lecturer who is understood to be trustworthy and safe: the 'male lecturer' has been imbued with qualities of reliance and dependability, whereas the 'ordinary' man may not always be immediately trusted and may be perceived as a potential threat to Leah's safety. Of particular importance, I suggest, is the statement that 'I wouldn't go back to a normal guy's house'. Therefore, for Leah, it would seem that the subject position of 'lecturer', and the trustworthiness that appears to be understood as synonymous with the position, overrode her normal personal safety measures. Aware that 'ordinary' men may well be a threat, Leah asks: 'aren't lecturers supposed to be different?' A similar set of processes also occurs in Jenny's narrative when she discusses how her male lecturer asked her out for a drink:

Then one Saturday he actually asked if I'd like to go for a drink with him. He turned it into a way that he'd got a totally open social calendar. That he was looking for friends because he was bored and got nothing to do. He implied that he really wanted friends – like that was the reason. And I actually felt quite sorry for him. Because he said he wanted to be friends. Then [pause] after the next week or so, we went out for a drink. He was quite all right – as much as there wasn't any [pause]. Well, he was a bit weird and a bit disjointed [pause] in so much as, why was we both there? You know? As far as I was concerned, I actually looked up to him, as an intelligent person, with the kind of credentials I like people to have. And that was what I was interested in – totally nothing else. And then, at the end of the evening, he asked if I'd like to go back to his house. And I just thought that was [pause]. Well, even with my female friends, like, if my female friends asked me to go back to their house, well, I just wouldn't. I wouldn't go back to their house. I like to be in my own territory. So, I just said 'no' and I went off and thought 'that was a nice evening, and I'll probably see him again as and when'. But since then, well, he hasn't wanted to be with me at all. Won't even talk to me. He just blanks me – even in lectures... He was my lecturer – and not some bloke down the pub, you know? The whole point was that he was intellectual and sensitive. Well, no, intellectual [pause]. I'd assumed that because he was intellectual, that he'd be sensitive as well. It didn't. It didn't. It just meant academically clever. Well, if I'd met him in any other walk of life,

well, there'd be nothing to look up to. Therefore nothing to find intriguing (Jenny).

In this narrative, Jenny makes the link between 'lecturer' as a subject position and a perceived set of admirable qualities: 'He was my lecturer – and not some bloke down the pub, you know? The whole point was that he was intellectual and sensitive... I'd assumed that because he was intellectual, that he'd be sensitive as well'. Here, the perceived qualities of a lecturer (wisdom, intelligence, maturity and sophistication) are linked with those of sensitivity, emotionality and trustworthiness. Indeed, I would suggest that this way of thinking is most obvious when Jenny states that: 'I actually looked up to him, as an intelligent person, with the kind of credentials I like people to have'.

Here Jenny appears to assume that as an intellectual person, the lecturer in question would hold those additional personal attributes that she associates with intelligence, particularly that of sensitivity. The power effects generated through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, therefore, produce an understanding of male lecturers as different from 'ordinary' men or, indeed, as Jenny states, 'not some bloke down the pub'. I suggest that it is also possible that, for some female students, the position of male lecturer has additional perceived qualities. Bridget explains further:

The women [lecturers] were much more, well, they didn't need their groupies or their hangers-on. It's like, well, like they didn't need that feeling of being worshipped. They were just what they were and if you didn't like that, well, then, tough! Most of the men, though, seemed different. It seemed that they needed that ego trip. Most of the men had their own set of groupies, women and girls that followed them around and hung on their every word. And all of them were just followed around by their groupies! And the thing is, when you are in an environment like that, well, the men, these men, they know a lot more information than

you. They're supposed to. That's the whole point! But it's like, they have the information that you need to get yourself a good degree. And that can foster that sense of 'Oh my God, you're so brilliant!' That's what gives these men that power. Outside of that environment, outside of the university, these women, these girls, they would never look twice at these men. And, to be honest, nobody thought it was odd (Bridget).

In this narrative, Bridget states that many of the female students responded to the male lecturers in a way that she feels they would not do outside a university context: 'Outside of that environment, outside of the university, these women, these girls, they would never look twice at these men'. Moreover, Bridget highlights the effects of power which may operate within the classroom: the perceived intelligence of the lecturers, corresponding with the fact that the lecturers have the information necessary to ensure a good degree, means that female students may respond to male lecturers with adulation.

This is seen within other research on sexual harassment. For example, Zalk (1990) discusses this when she notes that the superior knowledge of a lecturer can easily be equated with greater wisdom. In addition, the levels of power that a lecturer holds over students, in terms of their degree, references for job applications and such like, means that it is easy for students, especially those who are vulnerable or adolescent, to view their lecturers with an exaggerated idealism (Zalk 1990: 145). Barton (2000) quotes the President of the Student Union of Lincoln and Humberside, who suggests that male lecturers may be seen as a 'glamorised' figure by female undergraduates and that their male peers, by comparison, may seem immature and inexperienced. As discussed in the literature review, it is sometimes argued that good teaching is invested with power, passion and sexual energy and that the teacher-student relationship

may be 'intensely personal and personally intense' (Gallop 1997: 55). Teaching may also have an 'erotic charge' with the 'seduction' of ideas experienced if lessons are exciting and there has been a 'flush of success' (Sikes 2006: 270). This understanding of lecturers regarded with 'exaggerated idealism' may be seen in Bridget's narrative below.

In Bridget's narrative, the male lecturers may have understood themselves through the power effects generated through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse. Bridget states: 'It seemed that they [the male lecturers] needed that ego trip. Most of the men had their own set of groupies, women and girls that followed them around and hung on their every word' and that 'nobody thought it was odd'. It is suggested, therefore, that the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse may have generated the power effects of connecting the position of lecturer as a subject role and the assumed characteristics which that subject role will entail. Furthermore, as with the preceding discourses, these effects of power deny the possibility of harassment. For example, there is the argument that any threat to student safety is external to the university, rather than from within its walls.

Leah expands further:

I remember coming to the open day here, when I was looking for a university, and the university was making this big deal about how safe everyone is here. About how all the paths to the halls of residence have excellent lighting and alarm points and stuff. You know, how they will protect you from outside threats. They never said that the threat would or could come from your own lecturers. So I never thought. I know now, looking back, that I should have thought. But I didn't... I never reported it. I thought I should. [Pause] I couldn't face it all: all the questions, all the accusations. But I was worried that I would seem arrogant. Or ignorant. [Laughs slightly.] That I should have seen it coming and protected myself. Not gone to his house for certain. That was stupid. Was that stupid? I go over and over it in my mind, jumping from things to things,

and I think, if I go to the police, well, I'm just going to seem like a stupid, ignorant girl who got what was coming to her. And because of all that I wouldn't be believed (Leah).

The 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, therefore, may reinforce an understanding that the university 'will protect you from outside threats'. Carter and Jeffs (1992) agree, commenting on how, in a market-driven society, universities and colleges are anxious to present themselves as safe places to work and study. However, they also argue that, unable or unwilling to confront the sexual exploitation from their *own staff*, universities have no alternative but to suppress any hint of danger within the classroom and to present any possible threat as existing outside their walls (Carter and Jeffs 1992: 239). By highlighting the exterior lighting and alarm points to prospective students, Leah's university does seem to be supporting the notion that the campus is a safe and secure environment: if there is a threat to personal safety, the university implies that this will originate from beyond its boundaries. However, unlike the suggestions from Carter and Jeffs (1995) as discussed above, it is unlikely, I suggest, that the universities are trying to displace the perceived threats from male lecturers to external dangers. As with the preceding discourses, the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse denies the possibility of harassment, producing the understanding that lecturers *do not* sexually harass their students and that any students claiming otherwise have misunderstood the situation (see the 'knickers in a twist' discourse). There would be no need, therefore, to displace perceived threats from male lecturers to external dangers.

One power effect which does seem to be generated through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, however, is the requirement for students to be able to distinguish safe men from unsafe men. Consequently, students may be judged or blamed if they *are* harassed or attacked: despite the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse generating the understanding that male lecturers are safe, sensitive and dependable individuals. A power effect of this discourse, therefore, may be to blame female students if they have not successfully distinguished between safe and unsafe men (see, for example, Koss 1991; Best et al. 1992). This is often witnessed in studies which attempt to find causal explanations for crime and victims of crime: victims are frequently seen, for example, to 'incite, provoke or create a situation conducive to the committing of the crime' (Wolhunter 2009: 14). This concept of victim-proneness allows for the notion of culpability: the requirement that the victim, in most situations, accepts some level of individual responsibility for the crime (Mawby and Walklate 1994: 12).

For example, the acceptance of responsibility and the corresponding belief that one's behaviour enabled the violence to occur is often present within rape-prevention strategies and anti-rape education programmes. Forms of training may include risk-avoidance strategies, assertiveness training, refusal strategies and 'just say no' techniques; very few programmes are aimed at changing men's behaviour (Carmody 2005: 467). Risk-defined behaviour may include unsuitable clothing, walking alone late at night, misleading signals or, in Leah's case, visiting a lecturer at his home. Consequently, even though Leah understood herself and her male lecturer through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, she appears to blame herself for not recognising the potential threat

of the situation and worries that the police would also have found fault with her actions: 'I should have seen it coming and protected myself. Not gone to his house for certain' (Leah).

Lees (1996: 189) argues that theories of culpability and victim-proneness go some way to explaining the apparent widespread condoning of male violence within the legal system and the high attrition rate in rape and sexual assault cases. Women are expected to sort out the 'so-called safe' from the 'so-called unsafe' men and to be able to do this 'simply because we are women' (Stanko 1996: 56). Therefore, the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse may generate specific effects of power: firstly, the discourse produces male lecturers as trustworthy individuals; secondly, the rape-supportive beliefs generate an understanding which may blame female students for finding themselves in risk-defined situations. Leonie, who was also raped by a male lecturer, expands upon what I suggest is the first power effect which can engender a feeling of trust:

Well, he [the lecturer] portrays himself as all shy and bumbling and no confidence. A haphazard lecturer who can't deal with the real world. Well, maybe that last part is true but the rest isn't. Far from having no confidence, his ego is enormous. Towering. And all that acting of a bumbling incompetent just draws you in. Makes you like him. A real snake in the grass. I think that's how he gets his power. And I think that he would like to believe it himself. You know the stereotype of the towering genius? The sort of lecturer who sits in the library writing research papers of immense worth but can't cope in the real world? I think that's how he would like to be. So he pretends to be all bumbling and inept but the sort of ineptitude that is down to towering intellect. Not just because he can't be bothered. When he doesn't answer his student email or doesn't turn up for programme committee meetings. 'Cause he's too brilliant for anything like that. When actually he's just lazy and he thinks that he's just above the need to deal with mere mortals. A real snake in the grass...[H]e pretends that he thinks he's no good and has no confidence but all the time his confidence is massive. Enormous. And he surrounds himself with people who back up his self-esteem and

tell him he is brilliant. But it is all an act. That's why I think he is a real snake (Leonie).

In this narrative, Leonie explains how and why she trusted her male lecturer. Understanding him as intelligent, wise and sensitive, combined with additional social and cultural stereotypes, Leonie states: 'You know the stereotype of the towering genius?' and that 'he pretends to be all bumbling and inept but the sort of ineptitude that is down to towering intellect'. Benschop and Brouns (2003: 200) argue that social and cultural stereotypes may inform our understandings of what it means to be a male lecturer in higher education. For example, the 'bumbling' and 'haphazard' lecturer who 'sits in the library writing research papers of immense worth but can't cope in the real world' (Leonie). Consequently, having formed an understanding of the man as within the subject position of 'lecturer', the power effects generated through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse may produce an understanding of him as 'trustworthy'. A power effect of this discourse, therefore, is the isolation of the behaviours connected with sexual harassment and the subject role of the professional lecturer. Understanding the position of 'male lecturer' to be one of intelligence, maturity and sensitivity may mean that if female students do experience behaviours they define as sexual harassment, the incidents are perhaps more likely to be seen as a betrayal of trust.

Carla is a student of history and described herself as being very excited at the prospect of going to university. In this narrative, Carla's enthusiasm for studying and the understanding of herself and her lecturers through the

'trustworthy lecturer' discourse appears to have increased her feelings of disappointment at the occurrence of behaviours defined as sexual harassment:

I'd worked really hard to get into university, and I wanted to be here so bad. So, I was terrified but, um, really excited too. I guess that made me a little naïve. [Pause] I thought all lecturers were like gods, or something, you know? [Laughs] I really looked up to them, never stopped to think for a minute that some of them might be dodgy. I thought, like, university was about thoughts and ideas and working together to solve problems. That's why I wanted to come here in the first place. Well, not necessarily *here* [pause] but to university, you know? I suppose that sounds stupid? But, um [pause]. Anyway, it was a big shock when I realised things aren't like that at all...It's all really sexual. One of the lecturers goes on about sex all the time, it's in the set books that we've got to study, but you get the feeling that he'd find some reason to talk about sex if you was studying the Bible. It's disgusting, but it's like he likes embarrassing us: he talks about it in this really gross way, like a dirty old man, you can see him looking at you, sizing you up (Carla).

In this narrative, Carla appears to have understood herself and her male lecturers through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse and, in her excitement of going to university, took the ivory towers perspective of higher education: 'I thought, like, university was about thoughts and ideas and working together to solve problems'. Rabinowitz (1990: 103) agrees and states that universities are often structured as environments of the highest morals, grand aspirations and great intellectual thinking; when women are sexually harassed in higher education, this discursive positioning often results in an intense feeling of betrayal. Carla states that 'it was a big shock when I realised things aren't like that at all...It's all really sexual'. The extract below, from Charlotte, is perhaps the most complex narrative within this discourse and I suggest sums up the potential power effects generated through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse.

Charlotte is studying French at a large red brick university. At the beginning of the interview, Charlotte described herself as having 'very low self-esteem' and often 'feeling unhappy'. This sense of low self-esteem is apparent throughout the narrative:

In my first year I became friends with a male lecturer, well supposedly still a friend. I dunno, he wasn't much older than us, a new guy still doing his PhD, and he used to come down to the bar with us, especially in the evenings after the lectures. Nobody thought there was anything wrong with that, well, you know, he was a nice guy, or seemed to be, and I ended up in a very close friendship group with him and another girl. To cut a long story short one evening we were messing about play fighting, he pinned me down, all happy and fine, and then he threatened to penis slap me. I struggled and said not to, but still he did. After he stopped, I screamed at him and told him to leave my room. He thought I was overreacting. I felt totally powerless to do anything about it, I felt like I was overreacting, so I did nothing and even kept him as a friend. A few months later whilst we were both very drunk we ended up in bed together. I suddenly remembered I wasn't supposed to be having sex with him! I told him we had to stop and it was time for him to go home. He tried to have sex with me, without a condom, but I managed to push him put of my bed and screamed at him until he left. The next morning he sheepishly came into my room and said 'I could have raped you last night if you hadn't chucked me out of your bed'.

What did you say?

I didn't know what to say. I think I felt let down, but also angry. I mean, he made me feel powerless, but he did stop and even sort of apologised. I mean, he knew he was in the wrong. We both didn't really know what to do so we just sort of carried on like normal. But despite all of this I continued to have a very close friendship with him and continued to occasionally have sex with him - I don't think it's necessarily wrong to sleep with your lecturer. And if he hadn't been such a dick it would've been fine, I think. But not when he tried to force sex onto me. And I don't really know why I continued to have sex with him. I think it was just because I didn't really know what else to do. I mean, we were friends, but I had low self-esteem and I didn't think I deserved any better so I never thought to question it. I had such low self-esteem that anyone being interested in me seemed to be a good thing. And especially that he was a lecturer, you know? [Pause] You know, I guess there's some status in that. Maybe I would have done something about it earlier if he hadn't been my lecturer (Charlotte).

In this narrative, Charlotte describes a sexual relationship with her male lecturer. Despite the behaviour identified at times as sexual harassment and attempted forced sex, Charlotte refers to the lecturer several times as a friend and, at one point, states that she 'continued to have a very close friendship with him and continued to occasionally have sex with him'. A contributory factor in continuing this relationship seems to have been Charlotte's understanding of herself as vulnerable. She states, 'I had low self-esteem and I didn't think I deserved any better so I never thought to question it'. In feminist research on sexual harassment, the vulnerability of female students appears to be a frequent feature; for example: anxious and unsure students dealing with the unfamiliar environment of university; international students coping with isolation from family and friends; part-time students with less access to mutual support; and students who are ill or experiencing problems at home or on their course (Carter and Jeffs 1992: 242; Carter and Jeffs 1995: 40; Stanko 1996: 55; Herbert 1997: 24). As discussed in the 'all boys together' discourse, the conceptualisation of universities as male-dominated institutions may also increase a female student's sense of vulnerability. However, an additional power effect of the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse is, I suggest, the self-esteem that may come from these men's attentions. Here, it could be suggested that Charlotte, through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, had internalised the idea of the male lecturer as superior.

Thus, it is possible to suggest that Charlotte's low self-esteem may have been raised during the initial stages of the relationship. Wilson (2000) agrees, noting

that many sexual relationships between female students and male lecturers start when the lecturer tells the student how 'special' she is (Wilson 2000: 182). In Charlotte's narrative, having identified that the relationship was unhealthy for her, she states that she would have 'done something about it earlier' had the man not been her lecturer; she also confirms her understanding that there is a particular level of status from engaging in a sexual relationship with him. In this narrative, therefore, it would appear that the power effects generated through the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, including the status of the subject role, were at least partly responsible for Charlotte feeling unable or unwilling to finish what she perceived to be an abusive relationship. In addition, Charlotte's narrative is confused and, at times, contradictory. She states: 'We both didn't really know what to do so we just sort of carried on like normal'; this highlights the often multiple and contradictory nature of subjectivities: subjects may subscribe to numerous, conflicting discourses forming particular ways of understanding the self through conflicting struggles (Weedon 1997: 28). Charlotte also describes her resistance to this understanding:

After my second year at university, I went away on my own for five weeks with a rucksack and travelled from Ljubljana to Budapest via Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia and Romania. I came back a lot more confident and with a much greater feeling of self worth. After that I finally found a boyfriend who wanted an independent, sexually free, liberated, feminist, driven, hairy arm-pitted, slightly round-tummied, intelligent women as a partner, and not as a pet. Two years on I am thinking of going away on my own again for a confidence top-up. I just wanted to show him [the male lecturer] that I could do it (Charlotte)!

In this narrative, Charlotte expresses herself as feeling happier and more empowered. However, she also describes understanding herself through feminist discourses and having 'finally found' a boyfriend who would approve of

these understandings. It could be suggested that this resistance has tied Charlotte into a set of self-understandings which still purport to tell the 'truth' about Charlotte and her situation.

For the most part, feminist theories have argued against the notion of sexual violence as perpetrated by those who are deviant and pathological, and, instead, have argued that violence against women is committed by those who are 'ordinary'. I suggest that the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse positions 'lecherous' professors as psychologically different from their 'normal' colleagues. My research participants appear to identify 'ordinary' men as being a potential threat, but may consider male lecturers to be safe and trustworthy. This understanding of safety may have influenced the safety measures that my participants may normally employ. It is possible that this isolates potential lechery from the profession and understands male lecturers as somehow more trustworthy than ordinary men. This understanding is present within feminist discourse. Dziech and Weiner (1984), for example, suggest that there is something psychologically different about the lecherous professor from his 'ordinary colleagues'. A power effect of this discourse, I suggest, is the belief that women should be able to distinguish safe men from unsafe men. As a result, if they are sexually harassed or attacked, rape supportive beliefs become evident. As with the preceding discourses, the 'trustworthy' lecturer denies that possibility of harassment and any students claiming otherwise is understood to be overly sensitive or emotion. It is to this that I now turn.

4.4 *The 'Knickers in a Twist' Discourse*

In 1982, *The Sun* newspaper ran an article which insisted that 'serious minded' feminists and trade unionists were 'getting their knickers in a twist' about sexual relations at work. The article stated that 'groping... makes the day more pleasant' and that attempts to curtail such behaviour had originated from the humourless misinterpretations of normal workplace interactions (cited in Wise and Stanley 1987: 34). The term 'knickers in a twist' has developed into a cultural marker for someone likely to become overwrought about trivial matters. It is my suggestion, therefore, that this discourse denies sexual harassment in the academy by proposing that the only people who complain about it or attempt to raise awareness of its existence are people who are overreacting or overly sensitive.

The power effects generated through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may impact upon women's and men's understanding of themselves and their peers. In particular, it is suggested that the power effects may produce an understanding of sexual harassment complainants as prudish, petty or without a sense of humour. By positioning the complainant as someone to be ridiculed, the object of the complaint may then dismiss the accusations of sexual harassment as 'normal' and sanctioned behaviour. This, I suggest, is emphasised in Nicola's narrative, which discusses how she tried to raise awareness of behaviours identified as sexual harassment during a staff meeting:

I did bring it [the sexual harassment complaints] up in a staff meeting once. Something about objecting to the male-dominated attitude of our department. Nothing too serious, I thought. Don't rock the boat too much. That was before I realised how ingrained it all was. I'd never try to do that now. Well, I was just completely shot down. I mean, it was really aggressive. I mean, I hadn't expected them all to support me. I knew there was going to be some opposition, but I'd expected it to be professional. But it was just like a free-for-all. I was completely attacked. I kept waiting for the Chair to put a stop to it. To support me. Or at the very least say their behaviour was out of order. But no, nothing. It was just like, 'Oh, just what I'd expect from a feminist!' I was almost waiting for them to say, 'Oh, just what I'd expect from a lesbian!' but at least they didn't go that far [laughs]. I should be grateful, I suppose! Anyway, the general gist was that it's all 'PC' policies now, going too far, making life unbearable for 'ordinary' people who just want to live out their lives without any fuss. I mean, honestly. I think it was the aggression that shocked me. The anger that was directed at me. Pure anger. And horrible, sarcastic comments. And personal comments. One guy said he couldn't help it if I was obsessed with sex and sexual harassment, seeing things that weren't there, and he didn't see why the department should suffer because I'd got *issues* [emphasised]. So, you can imagine that I've never tried to bring it up again. Mostly I just try to keep my head down. I wonder about looking for another job, but then I think, better the devil you know (Nicola).

I suggest that the power effects generated through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may produce an understanding which refers 'the problem' back to the complainant. In Nicola's narrative, the accusations of sexual harassment complaints were dismissed as misunderstandings and instead the source of the problem appears to be understood as be Nicola's feminist stance. It is suggested that the concept of 'PC policies', generated through the power effects of the 'knickers in a twist' discourse form an understanding of political correctness as arising from the 'loony left' and the 'terrorism of feminists and anti-racists' (Fairclough 2003: 20, 24). By understanding Nicola as displaying overly-sensitive and prudish behaviour *and* attempting to impose this way of

thinking upon others, the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may produce an understanding of Nicola as both an object of ridicule and a potential danger to other 'ordinary' people.

Furthermore, and as highlighted in the extract above, an additional power effect of the 'knickers in a twist' discourse appears to be the merging of feminism, lesbianism and political correctness. In Nicola's extract, she states that 'It was just like, "Oh, just what I'd expect from a feminist!" I was almost waiting for them to say, "Oh, just what I'd expect from a lesbian!"'. Geiger et al. (2006: 167) discuss this stereotypical connection between lesbianism and feminism and, indeed, Matthaei (1998: 86) notes the important roles that lesbianism and feminism have had in each other's social, cultural and political histories. For example, lesbianism is stereotypically understood as being a sexual issue rather than a personal or political choice made outside of sex (Bensimon 1997: 141). In addition, feminists are frequently constructed as strident, ageing spinsters putting high-paying careers before relationships and families (Faludi 1992: 125).

The power effects generated through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may, therefore, produce an understanding of feminists and lesbians as obsessed with political correctness in a way that is overreacting and overly sensitive. This, I suggest, is exemplified by Nicola's statement that '[o]ne guy said he couldn't help it if I was obsessed with sex and sexual harassment, seeing things that weren't there, and he didn't see why the department should suffer because I'd got *issues* [emphasised]'. Thus, feminists and lesbians are produced as an

object of ridicule and accusations of sexual harassment are not taken seriously.

Nicola explained further:

A few weeks later, I was going over to Peter's office, 'cause I had to drop off some paperwork, and, when I got there, I could hear him talking with Steven, another guy in the department. Anyway, I was just about to knock on the door, it was open, when I heard them mention my name. [Laughs] They say that eavesdropping never does anybody any good! Anyway, they were being really bitchy about me. They were saying that I'm passive-aggressive, whatever that means. And that I should stop wearing my girlfriend's clothes 'cause they make me look like an old housewife [laughs]. Well, for a start, I don't wear my partner's clothes, and, even if I did, what's it got to do with them? You know, it was like school playground humour! Oh, 'such and such looks really fat and has got really bad pimples!' You know? I mean, get a grip (Nicola)!

In this narrative, Nicola overheard two male colleagues making abusive comments about her and her sexuality. As discussed in the literature review, Kitzinger (1995: 125) outlines the forms of physical attack and verbal abuse which she states lesbians are likely to suffer in a heterosexist society. Furthermore, Bensimon (1997) argues that given that lesbianism is typically perceived to be a sexual issue and, as a result, a private and personal matter, women who are openly gay are often considered to be 'flaunting' their sexual lives in the public sphere. This public/private dichotomy undermines complaints about abuse and inequalities in the public sphere: the argument suggests that if a woman *chooses* to be open about a personal/private matter, she should *expect* a certain degree of ridicule or hostility (Bensimon 1997: 141, 149). It is possible, therefore, given the suggested levels of heterosexism and homophobia in the wider social, Nicola may already be prepared to understand herself as discriminated against. This way of understanding is, I suggest, present in Gillian's narrative below:

I mean I think, to an extent, the sexual harassment stuff has only come about by a certain amount of overreacting. It almost seems a case of telling women how they should feel, and that's why I think the sexual harassment policies are a bit, um, maybe a bit overreaching. I mean, don't get me wrong, there's times when women need to be made aware. Like, I can imagine that you get some right pervy lecturers hitting on the young girls. And I think women students, especially the young students, need to be aware of that. But I also think there are times when these ideas have gone too far. You know, it's even developed a reputation: lesbians who aren't 'getting any', and so they have to stop others from getting any as well. I mean, obviously I don't believe that, but I know there are lots of people who do. It's silly, I know, but that's the kind of reputation it's got. That they're all obsessed with sex, and saving women from things that aren't there in the first place. Or from things that women don't want to be saved from [laughs]. I don't really think that women are bothered about all that stuff. And if they are, it sometimes seems as if it's only because somebody's told them to be bothered (Gillian).

As suggested in the analysis of the previous discourses, my participants are likely to hold multiple and contradictory understandings of themselves.

Although Gillian states that she finds the 'knickers in a twist' discourse 'silly' and appears to support some level of sexual harassment awareness campaigning, she also emphasises the reputation that complainants of sexual harassment are often awarded: again there appears to be a link between feminism, lesbianism, obsession with sex and over-sensitivity. The understanding of lesbianism as a sexual issue and feminists as strident spinsters appears to lend strength to Gillian's statements that sexual harassment policies have 'even developed a reputation: lesbians who aren't "getting any", and so they have to stop others from getting any as well' and that 'they're all obsessed with sex, and saving women from things that aren't there in the first place'. Indeed, I suggest that the 'knickers in a twist' discourse and the levels of ridicule that may be produced through its specific power effects may be partly responsible for a reluctance to identify unwanted behaviours as sexual harassment. In Karen's narrative,

although one of her male lecturers engaged in behaviour which could potentially be identified as sexual harassment, the lack of support from other students, combined with the 'all boys together' discourse, denied the acknowledge of harassment, making the behaviour difficult for Karen, a postgraduate student, to challenge:

The thing is, it [the sexual harassment of female students] goes on all the time. A lot of the lecturers are at it. In my department at least two of the lecturers have serial affairs with their students. They're seen, you know? Out together with them. And you just think: 'blimey, they must be really confident that nothing is going to happen to them. That they won't get into any kind of trouble'. And I wonder how the hell they are getting away with it. But in a sense, it just makes it even more hard to challenge. That it's so much taken for granted, so much a part of the place, that everybody just assumes that it is normal. That it's just what happens. So we've got this lecturer, right, who is a bully. He bullies clever female students and lets the blokes get away with murder. For instance, if a bloke comes into the lecture late he pretends not to notice. But if a woman comes in late, he'll embarrass her in front of the class. He's always making really sexist comments and putting women down and, when he's talking to them, he looks at their breasts. Obviously, most of the women don't like it and, to be fair, a lot of the blokes get cross with it too. But as soon as I said that it was sexual harassment, everyone looked at me like I'd gone mad. One woman even asked if I was a lesbian. Because, obviously, only lesbian women get upset about sexual harassment, right? It's ridiculous because they all get cross about it, it's not as if they think his behaviour is OK, but when you suggest to them that it's sexual harassment, and that seeing female students is sexual harassment, they just stop listening to you. One of the mature students said that she's not a feminist because she's a married woman. Can you believe it? As if you can't possibly be both. People have complained that he is a bully, and one student I know has put in an official complaint, but nothing has been done about it. I can't help thinking that a complaint about sexual harassment would be taken more notice of but I can't even be sure of that. You feel like all the male lecturers are in it together and that they would just back each other up (Karen).

In this narrative, both male and female students protested against the male lecturer's perceived unacceptable behaviour towards female students.

However, as soon as Karen suggested that this behaviour may be sexual

harassment, she lost their support for a complaint and, indeed, also experienced some level of ridicule and abuse from the student body. However, I would suggest that the levels of hostility towards Karen, and the denial of harassment that may be produced through this discourse and the preceding discourses, may go some way towards explaining the low reporting rates of sexual harassment in higher education (see Heward and Taylor 1992; Francis 2001; Bagilhole 2002; Thomas 2004).

Karen states that her fellow students had all expressed anger at the male lecturer's behaviour but that 'as soon as I said that it was sexual harassment, everyone looked at me like I'd gone mad. One woman even asked if I was a lesbian'. Given the ridicule that the power effects produced through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse appear to generate, and the particular abuse aimed at lesbians (whether the individual actually identifies herself as a lesbian or her sexual identity is presumed because of her stance against sexual harassment), it does not seem surprising if some people choose not to report sexual harassment in order to protect themselves from hostile and deriding remarks. It could be suggested, therefore, that the 'knickers in a twist' discourse generates specific effects of power and produces particular ways of understanding oneself and one's relationships with others. Karen expands further:

I did think of complaining myself, of putting a claim of sexual harassment in myself. But firstly I think: 'would anyone believe me?' You know, it's so much a part of the way things seem to work around here that I don't know if anyone would believe me or take me seriously. And I know that my friends on the course wouldn't support me. That they would all think I was taking things too seriously and complaining about nothing. They all

keep saying: 'Look it's not sexual harassment. He's just a horrible bully'. But what else would you call making sexist comments and staring at our breasts? That's aside from the whole having relationships with students. In a way, I don't care what it's called providing it stops but claims of bullying aren't stopping it. But I also worry that putting in a complaint will affect my grades and what my other lecturers think of me. They are definitely all in it together and I don't want to get a name for myself as a troublemaker. And I don't want it to affect my grades. I feel a bit ashamed really, but knowing that nobody will support you definitely makes you think twice (Karen).

Firstly, Karen appears to have been worried that the behaviours identified as sexual harassment may be such a significant part of 'how things work' that nobody would take her complaint seriously. Secondly, Karen's fellow student, who stated 'Look it's not sexual harassment. He's just a horrible bully', may reflect the power effects produced through the discourse; by defining the lecturer's behaviour as horrible bullying instead of sexual harassment, the behaviour is normalised and, therefore, difficult to challenge. Thirdly, Karen's understanding of the 'all boys together' discourse also appears to be drawn upon: Karen worries that the lecturers are 'definitely all in it together and I don't want to get a name for myself as a troublemaker. And I don't want it to affect my grades'. As Karen states, 'knowing that nobody will support you definitely makes you think twice'. In this fourth discourse, therefore, I have argued that the power effects generated through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse combine feminism, lesbianism and political correctness to deny the presence of sexual harassment. Let us now add an additional effect of power: that of femaleness and irrationality.

As discussed in the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, Caroline had experienced behaviours identified as sexual harassment from a male student on her course and had attempted to report this several times to the programme leaders. In the narrative below, she explains further about how Nigel, the Head of Department, dealt with her complaints:

And I worry that the staff will think I've been silly and they will look at what's happened, you know, the stuff that is here in the diary, and they will think I've been silly for letting it go on for so long. That I should have stopped it long ago. Done something about it sooner. Nigel, he told me that I was getting very confused about some of these incidents. And you know, that I should question if I was being rational here. And that's when I spoke to Melissa [a friend] and she was like, Caroline, this isn't you! This isn't you! You don't get irrational or too emotional. You have a good handle on things. A good grip. But Nigel made me feel like I was being stupid and at that meeting, well, it got to the point that I said: 'Nigel, we could talk about this until the cows come home. You know, you've got your point of view and nothing I can say is going to change that' (Caroline).

In this narrative, the power effects generated through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse appear to combine over-sensitivity with perceived notions of 'femaleness'. Caroline states that 'Nigel, he told me that I was getting very confused... I should question if I was being rational'. Thus, it is argued that this approach combines femaleness with irrationality and confusion and, when additionally linked with over-sensitivity, the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may produce an understanding of sexual harassment complaints as behaviour which has been irrationally misinterpreted. Magley et al. (1999: 401) refer to this as the 'whiner hypothesis': the assumption that much of what is construed as sexual harassment is actually an overreaction to isolated or trivial experiences. Given that women have traditionally been positioned as emotional, disordered

and unreasoned (see, for example, Jordanova 1993: 377), it is, therefore, possible that through these traditional understandings of women, my participants may already have been 'primed' into thinking of themselves as overly emotional or too sensitive. If that is so, it may make it more likely for women to subscribe to an understanding of themselves and others through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse.

I suggest, therefore, that the power effects which may be produced through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse unite 'femaleness', irrationality and oversensitivity. For example, Grosz (1994) argues that patriarchal thought constructs women's bodies as frail, imperfect and unreliable. Cultural positioning, therefore, renders the mind as masculine and the body as feminine (Grosz 1994: 13-14). Kirsty, an undergraduate student and lone parent, discussed this process further after she had reported a male lecturer who had sexually harassed her:

He [the lecturer] looked at me or, rather, not at me but at my breasts. And the whole time it was like, look, I'm doing this because I can. It was like he was waiting for me to say something, to challenge him. And it was like: 'Yeah? What you going to do about it?' It was a challenge, definitely a challenge. And I told my friend and she was like, well, of course he was. He's a leech. A real perv. But the thing is I reported it to my personal tutor, someone that I always thought was OK, a decent bloke, and all I got was, well, you know, could I have been oversensitive? Imagined it? Because he's a nice guy and the students usually get on really well with him. It was definitely like, oh, you know, because I'm a woman I'm oversensitive to these things. Too emotional or something. He started saying in this really patronising voice that he knows I have a lot on as a single mother and that I must be really tired. 'You know what women are like!' The implication was like I was overtired and overemotional. Almost like: 'Is it your time of the month, love?' ... I think, well, you see, I'd reported it once and it hadn't got me anywhere. It was just dismissed. Or, well, worse really because it was implied that I'd imagined it. That I'd been too sensitive. And you start to think: is the whole place like this? The whole system? That's a really horrible thing to have to think. It makes you feel like you don't belong here and that

starts to make you feel vulnerable. If you report it once and you don't get anywhere, well, then you are not going to report it again. You start to feel sensitive and then perhaps you do get overemotional. It felt like the only way I could cope was just to push it to the back of my mind and try not to think about it. In some ways I feel bad about it because it feels like he has got away with it. But at the end of the day, what matters is my degree and I have to do what I can to ensure that I get it. I have to do it for myself and my kids. I can't teach them that when the going gets tough you just give up. So, yeah, I suppose I cope by just ignoring it and pretending that it isn't going on (Kirsty).

Here, Kirsty reported a well-liked lecturer for appearing to stare at her breasts in a challenging manner. I suggest that her personal tutor, understanding himself, his role and his students through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse, may have considered the potential problem actually to have been caused by Kirsty, as the complainant, thus dismissing the allegation of sexual harassment. The power effects produced through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may have encouraged the personal tutor to understand Kirsty as 'oversensitive' and 'too emotional' and thus he suggested that she may have 'imagined it'.

In this narrative, the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse also operates: as a 'decent bloke' and a 'nice guy', his professional and 'normal' behaviour cancels out the possibility of any lechery (see, for example, Purkiss 1995: 198-193).

Furthermore, there is the additional suggestion that Kirsty's hormonal responses may be influencing a more rational interpretation of the events. The power effects generated through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse, in conjunction with the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse, appear to deny the sexual harassment and refer the problem back to Kirsty. The power effects of the discourse appear to be such that having complained once and received such a negative response, Kirsty felt reluctant to complain again. She states: 'If you

report it once and you don't get anywhere, well, then you are not going to report it again. You start to feel sensitive and then perhaps you do get overemotional. It felt like the only way I could cope was just to push it to the back of my mind and try not to think about it'.

In sum, therefore, I suggest that the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may generate specific effects of power producing those who complain about sexual harassment as humourless or over-sensitive. These power effects potentially generate a link between femaleness and irrationality: thus, the 'problem' may shift from the male lecturer who has been accused, to the female student or member of staff who is doing the accusing. The complainant may be understood as an object of ridicule and, as result, the harassment is denied, sanctioning sexual behaviours in the workplace or educational institutional as 'normal' interactions between men and women. The following and final discourse explores the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour'.

4.5 The 'Sexual Harassment as Unwanted Sexual Behaviour' Discourse

The final discourse to be suggested is that of 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour'. My research data suggest that more of my participants defined themselves through this discourse, and with greater effect, than the previous ones. Unlike the previous discourses, in which the sexual harassment is denied, this final suggested prevailing discourse focuses on the sexual element of the harassment. This section argues, therefore, that by sexualising the nature of harassment, the discourse is comprised of two specific effects of power: the first produces an understanding of harassment as sexual in nature, thus enabling the construction of sexually harassed women as degraded and violated. As Brewis and Linstead (2000a: 93) note, this accords sexual harassment a punitive nature beyond the kind caused by other forms of sex discrimination. For example, it is often considered more reprehensible for a male lecturer to, say, touch a female student's bottom than to make a sexist comment about women being unsuitable for academic work.

The second effect of power generated through the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse produces an understanding of behaviours based on sexual attraction and desire. This enables allegations of sexual harassment to be understood by the accused as an unfortunate misinterpretation of what had been perceived, erroneously, as a reciprocated sexual interest. Watson (1994) refers to this discourse as 'sex gone wrong': those accused of sexual harassment understand their behaviour to be an 'error' which stemmed from a 'natural' source of sexual attention; the behaviour is

understood as occurring through the 'misreading the [of] signs' and a breakdown of communication (Watson 1994: 67, 70).

The effects of power generated through the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse produce the understanding of harassment within a set of sexualised actions, behaviours and responses. Brewis and Linstead (2000a) argue that although the material consequences of sexual harassment (losing one's job, being refused a promotion, etc.) are noted, the psychological consequences (anger, frustration, anxiety, depression, etc.) also feature broadly. The perceived sexual element of the harassment becomes understood as causing particular emotional and psychological distress (Brewis and Linstead 2000a: 93). These emotional consequences of sexual harassment by a male lecturer are highlighted in Kirsty's narrative below:

He [the lecturer] would look at me a lot, or rather at my breasts, and it would make me feel disgusted. Sort of dirty. Degraded. Hard to explain really but it kind of left me feeling sullied and unclean (Kirsty).

The words 'disgusted', 'degraded', 'dirty', 'sullied' and 'unclean' reflect the understanding of sexual harassment as an experience beyond sex discrimination or gender-based bullying. The implication is that to be sexually harassed, to have one's breasts stared at, for example, is to experience an infringement of one's identity and personal space; the inferred sexual nature of the behaviour locates the experience as intensely private and humiliating. Certain forms of the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse are also echoed throughout the feminist arena. However, although

MacKinnon's (1979) analysis of sexual harassment has had a fundamental role in the development of sexual harassment law, as discussed in my literature review, the results from my data suggest that the understanding of harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour has had negative implications for how many of my participants appear to define themselves; in particular, the perceived sexualisation of harassment, often experienced as degrading and punitive, appears to have had negative implications for how many of my participants understood themselves and others after experiencing behaviours they identified as sexual harassment. For example, when discussing how sexually harassing behaviour may affect women, MacKinnon (1979) states that

Sexual subjects are generally sensitive and considered private; women feel embarrassed, demeaned, and intimidated by these incidents. They feel afraid, despairing, utterly alone and complicit (MacKinnon 1979: 27).

Thus, it is the sexual nature of the harassment that MacKinnon focuses upon and the behaviour is positioned as that which demeans and embarrasses women. Furthermore, MacKinnon (1979) states that:

All the careful admissions that women may be oversensitive cannot overwhelm the fact that such comments make women feel violated for good reason. Nor are these remarks aberrations. They make graphic and public the degradation women commonly experience as men's sexual playthings (MacKinnon 1979: 43).

In a later publication, MacKinnon (2004: 672) argues that the development of sexual harassment law has enabled women to feel 'more valid and powerful, less stigmatized and scared, more like freedom fighters and less like prudes'. However, the results from my research would suggest that MacKinnon's (1979)

use of words such as 'demeaned', 'violated' and 'degradation' in her descriptions of sexual harassment are not helpful in the fight for less stigmatisation. As discussed in the literature review, and throughout this chapter, the discourses we use to conceptualise sexual harassment do not merely reflect our understanding of the experience, but produce it. Discourses, therefore, are contingent and produce specific effects of power and ways of understanding ourselves (Foucault 1991d: 36). It is suggested, therefore, that far from hoping MacKinnon's research would enable women to view themselves as powerful freedom fighters (MacKinnon 2004: 672), her focus on elements of violation and degradation is to present sexual harassment as having a peculiarly castigating and punishing nature. This discourse appears to be present in Leah's narrative as she describes the psychological cost of being sexually attacked:

In the days after the rape, I felt in shock. I felt violated. Like he had taken away who I am and left me with this degraded, used woman. I couldn't bear to look at myself in the mirror. I couldn't bear for Sean [Leah's boyfriend] to look at me. I felt like I was losing my identity. That I was unclean and that I couldn't wash away the traces of his grubby hands no matter how hard I tried. Sean kept on asking me to talk to him but he was so angry and I was so ashamed and felt so guilty. I don't know how I got through those first few weeks (Leah).

Leah describes the sexual attack as a violation. As in Kirsty's narrative, the adjectives 'degraded' and 'unclean' are used to describe the experience. The intrusion into one's identity is also present as is that of being ashamed and humiliated. For example, discussing historical portrayals of rape and sexual attack, Mahood and Littlewood (1997) note that any sexual activity which occurred outside of marriage was defined as immoral and, as a result, women

who experienced rape or forced sex were castigated as 'fallen'. What mattered, therefore, was not whether the incident was voluntary or forced, but the women's loss of innocence and/or reputation. Furthermore, the narratives and characters from these historical portrayals may still be deployed in the contemporary coverage of sexual attacks and sexual harassment.

For example, cases of sexual crimes on university campuses are often reported as involving 'the "voluptuous co-ed" [and] the lecherous professor'. The sexualisation of these attacks may serve to explain the source of the sexual violence as induced attraction and, subsequently, unmanageable sexual desire and to suggest that the women 'get what they deserve' (Mahood and Littlewood 1997: 174, 176, 182). It could be suggested, therefore, that to some degree my participants may have understood themselves and their experiences through the power effects generated by the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse and, therefore, the focus upon the sexualisation of the behaviour may possibly have increased feelings of degradation and responsibility. A sense of guilt and culpability is present in Jenny's narrative:

Now I just feel very, very objectified. And I know I shouldn't feel guilty for anything that went on, because so much of it was just coercion, but I do (Jenny).

Describing the experience of behaviours defined as sexual harassment and sexual coercion, Jenny refers to feeling objectified, of having one's personhood, feelings and opinions denied, and of feeling guilty despite logically recognising the coercion and emotional force. Therefore, I would suggest that MacKinnon's (1979) sexual harassment discourse, and other discourses which produce

understandings of harassment as consisting of sexualised behaviours, fosters the belief that harassment is not only discriminatory but that the sexual nature of the conduct is experienced as particularly degrading or as a punitive violation.

Brewis (2001) argues that the understandings generated through feminist discourses on sexual harassment foster the notion that to redefine harassment as discrimination alone – as one might in other forms of sex discrimination – is to ignore what is often argued to be the peculiarly odious nature of sexual harassment. However, Brewis argues that to understand sexual harassment in terms other than its economic or career-related consequences may actually (re)produce the structural and organisational conditions which enabled the harassment to function in the first place. In other words, to understand harassment as occurring between an active man and a passive woman, thus emphasising female passivity and helplessness in the face of male power, underscores the heterosexist privileging of sex and the subject positions of harasser and recipient (Brewis 2001: 40, 93). The perceived reinforcement of male power and female powerlessness appears to be present in the following narratives:

It's disgusting, but it's like he likes embarrassing us: he talks about it in this really gross way, like a dirty old man, you can see him looking at you, sizing you up (Carla).

Carla expresses disgust and embarrassment at the lecturer's actions and the sexualisation of the harassment. Furthermore, Carla believed that the behaviour was *intended* to embarrass, thus strengthening the socially constructed positions of the harasser and the harassed. In the narrative below,

Karen describes her experiences of being sexually harassed:

It's a horrible feeling. You do end up feeling really degraded and he knows that. That's why he does it. He does it to embarrass women and when he looks at your breasts, you end up feeling ashamed... I think it's because it's, you know, sexual that it feels so bad. You know what those eyes are looking at and what he's thinking and it makes you feel sort of dirty. If he'd graded your work down or laughed at you for being stupid, which he often does with a lot of the female students, it would be one thing different. If you're late for a class, he'll be really sarcastic when you come into the lecture theatre and he'll get everyone to laugh at you. And don't get me wrong, that feels awful. But when he's looking at you in that way, well, mentally undressing you, then it makes you feel so much more ashamed. Because it's private, you know, it's meant to be private. I only give my boyfriend permission to look at me that way and when this guy does it, it feels like it's really personal. Not just a sarcastic comment in front of the others (Karen).

For Karen, therefore, experiencing the behaviours as sexual appears to have resulted in a 'private' and 'personal' experience which leaves her feeling ashamed and degraded. It is argued, therefore, that the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse has specific effects of power which may produce the experience as being beyond the sex discrimination of laughing at female students, being sarcastic and the grading down of work. It is the sexual element of the harassment which appears to be considered to be particularly harmful. Indeed, Karen states: 'I think it's because it's, you know, sexual that it feels so bad'.

I suggest, therefore, following Brewis (2001), that effects of power generated through the 'unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse may reproduce positions of power and powerlessness. For example, Kirsty states:

That kind of mentally undressing, looking not at me but at my breasts, that's about him, you know, showing me that he has the power to do that. You know: 'look at me and where I'm looking and I'm doing this because I can'. It's about him showing me that he has the power to do that. To be a leech. It's revolting but it's all about power. And the trouble is, he does have the power to do that. We all know it. We all know what he's doing. We just can't do anything about it (Kirsty).

Kirsty describes what she considers to be the sexualisation of the harassment as an exhibition of power. Consequently, it is possible to suggest that the lecturer may have understood himself, his students and his behaviours through the 'sexual harassment as sexual behaviour' discourse. By looking at Kirsty in a sexual manner, the male lecturer may have understood his interactions with his students through heterosexist and naturalist concepts of men and women. The effects of power generated through this discourse may produce understandings of active masculinity and passive femininity (see Brewis 2001: 56).

To summarise this first power effect, therefore, Brewis and Linstead (2000a: 92) argue that the sexualisation of harassment may foster understandings of weak, helpless women when confronted with powerful men. Feminist harassment discourses argue that the ensuing emotional trauma is at least equal to the negative consequences of sex discrimination or gender-based bullying, seen, for example, in the argument that sex is used to humiliate and degrade women (MacKinnon 1979: 67; MacKinnon 2004: 679). The sexually punitive nature of the harassment feeds into discourses which may foster women's feelings of being violated, demeaned, sullied, and of feeling unclean.

The first suggested power effect of the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse has thus focused on harassment as sexually punitive: actions and behaviours which, by their sexual nature, may be experienced above and beyond any financial implications and career-based consequences. The second effect of power also sexualises harassment and understands the behaviour as operating from sexual desire and sexual attraction. Consequently, unwanted sexual behaviour is often dismissed as a misinterpretation of reciprocal sexual interest. Foucault argues that contemporary discourses operating as 'truth' permeate our consciousness, producing certain effects (Foucault 1980b: 98). I suggest, therefore, that the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse generates an understanding of behaviours which may be perceived as sexual harassment as 'sex gone wrong' (Watson 1994: 67). This, I suggest, is reflected in Sam's narrative below.

Sam is an undergraduate student studying sociology. Once a week, she travels by public transport from the university campus to her place of work and on one occasion was joined on the bus by one of her male lecturers:

Well, my lecturer was on the same bus as me and we both got off at the same stop. And he actually ran to catch me up and have a chat, and, like, he walked me all the way to work – even though it was right out of his direction. I don't know if he was just being nice, or just wanted a chat with me about not being in his lecture, but it made me feel uncomfortable. It was like, 'you're my lecturer; you're not my friend, even though we do have a bit of a laugh and a joke in the lectures'. It was just [pause], well, considering that we were outside the university, I just thought, 'what's going on? Why do you want to be with me? We're not at uni now!' You know? And also, people have told me that [pause], people say that, I don't know how to explain it. It's like, he always has to be personal, and have a laugh and a joke with people, but I don't know if it's sexual or not... [long pause]. But still, it makes me feel uncomfortable. Well, I'd

like to think that he was just being friendly, but I'm not sure... I mean, he's not your normal lecturer, and he's a bit hyper and a bit trendy, and you don't really know. On the one hand, it throws you off your guard, and on the other, it makes you more wary. Sometimes I think: 'Is he coming on to me?' And then I think that I'm in the wrong for thinking that. You know, like, don't flatter yourself (Sam)!

In Sam's narrative, even though the behaviour of the male lecturer has made her feel uncomfortable, she is unclear whether she can label the interaction as sexual harassment: the uncertainty about the lecturer's intentions and whether or not the behaviour was *intended* to be sexual has implications for Sam's interpretation of the event. She states: 'I don't know if it's sexual or not... But still, it makes me feel uncomfortable'. I would argue, therefore, that the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse, by focusing on the *sexual* element of the conduct, may in fact erase experiences of harassment which are not overtly sexual in content (see, for example, Epstein 1997: 158).

By producing an understanding of these behaviours as inherently sexual, men and women who subscribe to the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse may attribute accusations of sexual harassment to a misreading of signals or honest mistakes. In addition, those accused of sexual harassment may assert a lack of sexual attraction to the accuser and the 'problem' may shift to the over-sensitive and potentially overly-conceited woman (see the 'knickers in a twist' discourse). I would suggest that this discourse may be drawn upon when Sam states: 'Sometimes I think: "Is he coming on to me?" And then I think that I'm in the wrong for thinking that. You know, like, don't flatter yourself!' Thus, understanding themselves through this discourse, potential victims may feel the need to be certain of the sexual nature of their

experiences before making a claim of sexual harassment. This uncertainty may have resulted in Sam's decision not to report the incident formally: although she is clearly confident enough in her interpretation of the events to self-select for a study on sexual harassment, I would suggest that there is a difference between talking to somebody who has already identified herself as a feminist and, therefore, perhaps more likely to support her interpretations of the behaviour, to formally reporting the incident to senior members of her university.

In Laura's narrative, discussing how a male lecturer - apparently operating through the 'grades for sex' discourse - had suggested a sexual relationship in return for a good essay grade, the fear that she is not sexually attractive appears to have contributed to her decision not to report the behaviours identified as sexual harassment formally:

I didn't report it. I probably should have and, to be honest, I did feel a little bad for not reporting it. But I couldn't be sure that people would believe me. I mean, why me? You know? Why me? I mean, he didn't actually come right out with it and ask me to sleep with him. And I just thought, you know, what if people don't believe me or think I imagined it? I'm not exactly the most attractive student on campus and I can just imagine people thinking, oh yeah, as if he'd pick her. And, to be honest, why *would* he put everything on the line for me? It's like, yeah, right! Come on (Laura)!

In the above narrative, the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse appears to have contributed to Laura's reasons for not reporting her experiences: doubts about her own attractiveness appear to have led her to uncertainty about the nature of the harassment and, in addition to these doubts, she feared what other people would say: 'I couldn't be sure that people would

believe me... I'm not exactly the most attractive student on campus and I can just imagine people thinking, oh yeah, as if he'd pick her'. Thus, the power effects generated through the discourse produce an understanding of sexual harassment united with sexual interest, attractiveness and sexual drives. Sexual harassment becomes motivated by sex and not about power (Kitzinger and Thomas 1995: 45). However, as discussed in the literature review, feminists argue about the relationship between sex, ascribed power and sexual harassment. For example, MacKinnon (1979) argues that sexual harassment is behaviour in which men use power to gain sex, whereas Wise and Stanley (1987) argue that sexual harassment consists of behaviours which use sex to gain power. However, regardless of the reasons for the behaviour, most feminists argue that sexual harassment is an abuse of power and that sexualised behaviours are intended to humiliate and degrade (e.g. Farley 1978; Brewer and Berk 1982; Grauerholz 1989; MacKinnon 2004). The same power effect of sexualising the harassment also operates in the next narrative from Janine.

In previous narratives, Janine discussed how a male lecturer would appear to 'mentally undress' the female students in his class and, in particular, stare at their breasts when talking to them. I asked Janine if she had considered formally reporting the lecturer's behaviour:

Did I report him? [Laughs] What would we say? Philip [the lecturer] is looking at our breasts? As if the university would do anything. We know that there have been complaints made about him, about him actually touching female students and trying to get students to sleep with him. But nobody has ever done anything about it so as if the management here would do anything about him just looking at us. I mean, how would

we prove it? It would be his word against ours and he would just say that we imagined it. Or that we think too much of ourselves. You know, you get it in clubs when you go out at night. It's like, 'Did you just touch me?' to a guy who you *know* [emphasised] just did. And then you get, 'Oh, you should be so lucky, Love!' You know, it's the standard defence. If you complain about a man and his behaviour, you are just accused of having too big an opinion of yourself, like, as if any man would bother with you. Either that or you get the, 'Come on, you know you want it really!' It's the standard defence. It's one of the ways that guys get away with it as much as they do. I am certain that Philip knows all those little ways and would pull them out as quick as anything (Janine).

In this narrative, Janine explains what she understood to be the problematic process of reporting experiences identified as sexual harassment: firstly there is the difficulty in proving inappropriate behaviour when there is no physical evidence; secondly, the 'knickers in a twist' discourse may have generated the understanding that women often simply imagine the harassment. In addition to this, however, the power effects produced through the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse appear to produce in the accused an understanding that because he did not feel any sexual attraction towards the complainant it could not, therefore, have been sexual harassment. This defence may then be followed up by the suggestion that the women involved have an exaggerated image of their physical and sexual attractiveness. As Janine states, 'then you get, "Oh, you should be so lucky, Love!"'

Therefore, I argue that particularly demonstrative of the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse is Janine's explanation of what she referred to as the standard defence: the 'Come on, you know you want it really!' mechanism. Through this effect of power, men may understand themselves as needing actively to take the lead in sexual encounters; women, on the other

hand, may understand themselves as being 'naturally' inclined to passivity. The 'Come on, you know you want it really!' mechanism locates women as waiting to be pursued and projecting signals of availability. Further, the perceived passivity of women, the concept of them waiting to be pursued by men, may also be linked to the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse and the power effect of the requirement for women to be able to tell safe and unsafe men apart. The 'natural' and biological basis of sexual harassment is also present within Leonie's narrative below.

Leonie, a postgraduate student, had been offered work as a research assistant on a male academic's postdoctoral project. During a visit to his house to work on the research material, Leonie was raped. In Leonie's case, the lecturer appears to have understood himself, his students and his behaviours through the power effects generated through the 'sexual harassment and unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse. Here, the lecturer appears to have assumed that university women feel societal pressure to appear 'innocent' and chaste (see, for example, Benson and Thompson 1982) and that the response of her body proved that 'she wanted it really'. It is suggested that this enabled him to dismiss Leonie's accusation of rape:

Then he [the lecturer] came over. Right up to me. [Pause] I don't really know how it happened. It just happened. Just did. Next thing that I knew he is kissing me. Squashing his mouth against mine and pushing me up against the wall. I just froze. I don't know what I thought. I know I should have done something. Screamed or said no, or, or pushed him away. But I didn't. I couldn't breathe. Like all the air was being pushed out of me. I had little lines in front of my eyes. Little red lines. [Pause] It's funny what you remember, isn't it? And that was it. That's the story.

He pushed me onto the floor and I lay there and let him do it to me. After that, he left me. I went through to the kitchen and I said, 'You just raped me'. Or something like that. He looked at me, looked at me like I was dirt, and he said [pause]. He said that of course I wanted it. That my body was, was [pause]. That my body was, was, that I was excited. That I was wet. That that's how he knew I wanted it really. That university girls fake being innocent and pure, that we don't really want it, but that being wet proves that I wanted it really (Leonie).

In Leonie's narrative, the male lecturer may have been operating through a phallogentric understanding in which men are sexual predators, the natural seekers of sex, and women are their natural sexual objects (Watson 1994: 76). I suggest that the lecturer appears to dismiss Leonie's accusation of rape by understanding his actions through the active male / passive female dichotomy: men as the active sexual beings and women as expressing their femininity by their display of passiveness. Leonie quotes the lecturer as stating 'That university girls fake being innocent and pure, that we don't really want it, but that being wet proves that I wanted it really'. The discourses surrounding consent and pleasure are, perhaps, some of the most prevailing. In a legal setting, the accused must show that he reasonably believed that the woman (or man) consented to sex (with the exception of the evidential presumptions within section 75 and 76 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003). It is possible to suggest that the power effects generated through the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse may foster particular ways of understanding the behaviour: sexualising the rape means that even if Leonie *could* prove she did not consent to sexual activity, the lecturer's actions may well, in certain circumstances, at least in part, be understood on the bases of misreading her signals and a breakdown of communication. The sexual attack becomes

understood as 'sex gone wrong': 'bad' sex rooted in power rather than desire (Watson 1994: 67).

As Brewis and Linstead (2000a) note, the suggestion that 'bad sex' exists, as an abuse of power in the form of sexual harassment, implies that there can be a 'good' way to have sex. However, a Foucauldian understanding of sex tells us that good sex (as sex free from power) cannot exist: all that we know about sex, and the connection of disparate behaviours and feelings occurring within sexual activity, result from power/knowledge. Nevertheless, modern discourses have produced an understanding of sex through a false unity and importance; human subjects are advised that 'healthy' and self-governed sex lives are fundamental to happiness and we are, therefore, encouraged to seek out these 'good' forms of sex: that is to say, sex without power. Thus, Brewis and Linstead argue that the contemporary importance attached to sex and sexual behaviours, and the subsequent search for 'good' and power-free sex, is potentially the reason why sexual harassment may be considered beyond sex discrimination and bullying based on one's gender. In other words, it is the *sexual* elements of the harassment which are often considered emotionally and psychologically harmful and equalling those consequences which are of a financial and career-related nature (Brewis and Linstead 2000a: 95). Aside from what may be perceived as the sexually punitive effect of power generated through this discourse, it may contribute to heterosexist conceptions of 'real' sex, with particular emphasis on the active male initiator of sex and the depictions of women as victims (Brewis 2001: 56). This, I would suggest, is emphasised in Michelle's narrative below.

Michelle had turned down requests for a sexual relationship from a senior male academic several times. After informing the academic that she was getting engaged to her long-term boyfriend, she received a photograph as an email attachment of the academic's penis:

I think, I actually think, you know, sending a photograph of his penis, that was the point where I thought: 'Things have changed now'...anyway, erm, I think that I'd just told him that I was getting engaged and I think that was his way of trying to claw back some power. As if! You know, do you think that I'm going to see your phallus and not be able to resist? Dump Mark and go for you? [Laughs] I think that with him, well, I think that was his last ditch attempt. That he was going to bowl me over with his amazing dick [Laughs] (Michelle)!

It could be argued here that the male academic was operating under a belief that female colleagues would be rendered helpless in the face of sexual attention from male colleagues. Michelle believed that the photograph represented a 'last ditch attempt' to 'claw back some power'. As with some of my other participants, Michelle relied on her boyfriend for protection:

The main problem is that I have to get Mark to drop me off at the corner of street, when we meet up, because I'm not sure that I can trust him [the lecturer] [Laughs] (Michelle)!

As Brewis (2001) notes, feminist harassment discourses, arguing that sexual harassment is rooted in the abuse of power, may reinforce naturalist and heterosexist assumptions of what 'real' sex is and the passivity of women; thus women are constituted as in need of protection from harassment and other forms of sexual activity that they do not want and cannot control. This is a projection of female sexuality as peculiarly vulnerable and has the potential to

inform women's understandings of themselves as unable to fight back against unwanted sexual behaviour at work (Brewis 2001: 48). Certainly, Roiphe (1994), in a discussion on contemporary sexual politics, believes that today's young women are encouraged to fear sexual harassment and to view themselves as victims. She states:

Our female professors and high-ranking executives, our congresswomen and editors, are every bit as strong as their male counterparts. They have earned their positions of authority. To declare that their authority is vulnerable to a dirty joke from someone of inferior status just because that person happens to be a man is to undermine their position. Female authority is not (and should not be seen as) so fragile that it shatters at the first sign of male sexuality... Instead of learning that men have no right to do these terrible things to us, we should be learning to deal with individuals with strength and confidence (Roiphe 1994: 90-101).

Thus, for Roiphe, women have been encouraged to understand themselves as fragile and vulnerable and have forgotten how to deal with sexual harassment in an assertive manner. Although I would suggest that this stance is an improvement on MacKinnon's (1979: 43) understanding of sexual harassment as a degradation and violation, Roiphe's (1994) point of view presents a further 'truth' to our understanding of sexual harassment, producing another 'grid of intelligibility' (Foucault 1991a: 32).

The final discourse to be suggested from my data, 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour', generates specific understandings of harassment as sexual. This discourse appears to feature most often within my participants' narratives and with the most impact on how my participants understand themselves and their experiences. By sexualising the nature of the

harassment, I suggest that this discourse has two specific effects of power: firstly, producing the harassment as sexual may generate in my participants an understanding of themselves as degraded or violated. Secondly, sexualising the harassment may produce an understanding that sexual harassment stems from attraction and desire. In particular, allegations of harassment may be dismissed as a 'misreading of signs' and a 'breakdown of communication'. In particular, I suggest that liberal feminist discourses of sexual harassment as behaviours which may 'demean', 'violate' and 'degrade' women may have informed my participants' understandings of themselves and their experiences.

4.6 Conclusion

Results from my data suggest five prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education. It is important to note that this may suggest other discourses are at work but this would require further data gathering. This chapter, therefore, explores the power effects of and resistances to these suggested prevailing discourses. In particular, it suggests that feminist discourses on sexual harassment may have generated specific effects of power with regard to my research participants. In fostering the notion of the powerful male and the powerless female, and highlighting the perceived power differentials existing in higher education, this chapter suggests that feminism, amongst other bodies of thought, may have generated a sense of vulnerability within my participants. That is to say, many of my participants appear to understand themselves and their experiences through the notion of sexual harassment as an abuse of power.

Discourses one to four do not acknowledge sexual harassment in higher education: the power effects of the discourses deny the harassment, understanding the behaviours as 'normal' and 'acceptable' interactions between men and women in the workplace or educational institution. The 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse appears to feature most often within my participants' narratives and with the most effect. Although I suggest that my participants did resist the effects of power generated through the prevailing discourses, it is noted that such resistance always occurs from another point of power and carries with it its own set of problematics.

Furthermore, it can be seen that the suggested prevailing discourses have generated multiple and contradictory subjectivities, producing complex effects of power.

The 'grades for sex' discourse produces the understanding that female students with perceived limited academic ability may trade sex with their lecturers in return for better grades; the 'all boys together' together generates an understanding of higher education as being male dominated and structured to reinforce this male power - this may have the effect of female students understanding themselves as vulnerable and powerless; the 'trustworthy lecturer' isolates the possibility of lechery from the professional status of lecturer – thus the male lecturer may be awarded more trust than other 'ordinary' men may receive; the 'knickers in a twist' discourse generates an understanding in the academy that staff and students who make allegations of harassment are humourless and over-sensitive; and, finally, the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse may sexualise the nature of the harassment, producing an understanding that it is a violation and degradation, generating an understanding that it functions from a position of attraction and desire. It is suggested, therefore, my participants understand themselves through the power effects generated by these prevailing discourses on sexual harassment in higher education.

5. Chapter Five: Conclusion

The aim of this research was to suggest seemingly prevailing discourses of sexual harassment in higher education and to consider if and how my participants defined themselves through these discourses. It explored the power effects of, and resistances to, these suggested discourses and argued that, in particular, feminist discourses surrounding sexual harassment may, in part, have generated specific effects of power with regard to my research participants: that is to say, many of my participants appeared to understand their experiences as an abuse of power based on the power differentials between male lecturers and female students. This research used twenty-four unstructured interviews with women who had identified themselves as having experienced sexual harassment within higher education, either as a student or a member of staff, or who had witnessed behaviours which they had defined as sexual harassment. By exploring how my participants understood and defined their experiences, it was possible to infer the degree to which the suggested prevailing discourses may have constituted their subjectivities. The research was based on a passionately interested form of analysis, having acknowledged the partial nature of such knowledge and cited my own concerns, values and interpretations. Further, the research aimed to avoid the hygienic lie (Oakley 1990).

This thesis has argued that my research participants have defined themselves and their experiences through, in part, the prevailing discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education. Specifically, it argued that feminist

discourses on sexual harassment, and in particular those pertaining to liberal feminism, may have generated effects of power with regard to my research participants. MacKinnon's (1979) understanding that sex at work is used to humiliate and degrade women may have had significant implications for my participants' definitions of themselves and their relationships with others. It was also noted that my participants held multiple and often contradictory discourses, understanding themselves in varied and diverse ways. In addition, although my research participants had resisted these effects of power, it was vital to note that their resistance did not take them beyond power into any kind of power-free space. As Knights and Vurdubakis (1994) note, although we can resist specific instances of power, we are mistaken to think that this frees us in any way. The suggested prevailing discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education are, therefore, the 'grades for sex' discourse; the 'all boys together' discourse; the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse; the 'knickers in a twist' discourse; and, finally, the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse. It was suggested that this final discourse featured the most often, and with the most impact, in the way my participants defined themselves and their experiences.

The 'grades for sex' discourse was argued to generate the understanding that female students may be forced to exchange sexual favours with their male lecturers in return for higher grades. This is echoed through MacKinnon's (1979) *quid pro quo* analysis, in which women are forced to have sex with their boss in order to keep their job. Within feminism, sexual harassment is understood to be an abuse of power, resulting in exploitative and degrading

behaviours. However, an additional power effect of the 'grades for sex' discourse was also argued to be the understanding that if male lecturers really are so easy to manipulate, why not take advantage of them to secure a good grade?

The 'all boys together' discourse was argued to generate specific effects of power, producing an understanding of higher education as a male-dominated institution. As a result, male lecturers behaving in a sexual manner were understood to be engaging in 'normal' and 'to be expected' behaviours. Subsequently, and as with the 'grades for sex' discourse, the likelihood of sexual harassment was denied, with sex at work with female students becoming both acceptable and appropriate. It was suggested that those of my participants who understood themselves and their lecturers through the 'all boys together' discourse were likely to feel increased perceptions of vulnerability as a result.

The 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse was argued to generate an understanding that although 'ordinary' men may still be perceived as a potential threat, lecturers were somehow more trustworthy. For my research participants, this seemed to result, in part, in increased perceptions of safety when associating with male lecturers. An effect of power generated through this discourse was suggested to be the requirement that women are able to distinguish safe men from those who are unsafe and, as such, if they are attacked or harassed, they share some sense of blame. As with the preceding discourses, the 'trustworthy lecturer' discourse denies harassment and any students claiming otherwise are

understood through the 'knickers in a twist' discourse.

The 'knickers in a twist' discourse was argued to produce an understanding that those who complained about sexual harassment were humourless and/or overly sensitive. Therefore, the power effects generated through the discourse were suggested to link femaleness and irrationality. Thus, the 'problem' shifts from the accused to the accuser: the complainant is ridiculed and the possibility of harassment is denied. Workplace sexual behaviours are considered to be normal interactions between men and women.

The final discourse to have been suggested from my data, the 'sexual harassment as unwanted sexual behaviour' discourse, appeared to have the most impact upon how my participants understood themselves. It was argued that experiences of harassment were understood by my participants, in part, to be sexualised, generating feelings of violation and degradation. In addition, the power effects of the discourse generated an understanding that experiences defined as sexual harassment stemmed from misplaced desire and attraction. Subsequently, allegations of harassment were likely to be dismissed as 'misreading the signs' and a breakdown of communication. It was suggested that the liberal feminist discourses of sexual harassment, including an understanding of harassment as that which demeans, violates and degrades, may have informed my participants' understanding of themselves and their experiences.

Overall, therefore, this thesis has argued that feminist harassment discourses

present sexual harassment as something which, primarily, men are perpetrators of and women are the recipients. Not only does this understand harassment as heterosexist, it also reinforces notions of active men and passive women. This is seen, I have suggested, most notably when Grauerholz (1989) and others argue that dynamics of power within institutions are more likely to operate on the basis of gender than through organisational structures: for example, a male student, with less formal or institutional standing, may sexually harass a female lecturer, challenging her formal, organisational power through his *gendered* power. This understanding of 'contrapower' harassment fosters notions of the active male/passive female. By promoting power as static – men have power, women do not – and the understanding that sexual harassment consists of men 'doing power' over women, it is possible to suggest that women may come to understand themselves, in part, through notions of vulnerability and powerlessness.

Contending that sexual harassment is punitive – because of its sexual nature – may foster an understanding that it may produce psychological effects beyond any financial or material consequences. Finally, by crediting itself as having 'discovered' sexual harassment, liberal feminism has risked 'real-ising' the harassment: generating an understanding of sexual harassment as a 'real' issue; something which exists within gendered institutions, rather than something produced and shaped. As Grey (1995) has argued, liberal feminism, by locating gender as central to its analyses, has produced a new 'grid of intelligibility': a series of 'truths' regarding the gendered nature of power and its reproduction through organisations. Likewise, Brewis (1996) argues that by

claiming a less distorted, power-free understanding, liberal feminism has set itself up as a privileged form of commentary.

This research set out to explore the power effects of, and resistances to, suggested discourses surrounding sexual harassment in higher education. This might suggest that other discourses are at work but this would require further collection of data. In addition to this, future research may find it interesting to explore different types of institution (for example, elite universities, red brick universities, campus universities and post '92 universities) and the impact different managerial styles may have on women's definitions of themselves and their understandings of sexual harassment in higher education. For example, emphasis placed by elite universities on the production of research may result in active researchers understanding themselves through notions of ascribed power (e.g. Jackson 2002). It is possible that this may have an impact on women's and men's understandings of sexual harassment in higher education. In addition, new modes of managerialism seen particularly within post '92 universities (e.g. Kerfoot and Whitehead 2000) may develop an emphasis on accountability and clear, transparent decision making or, conversely, become 'paper exercises' or part of a 'tick box' culture. This may result in sexual harassment policies and procedures being in place but a lack of active support for women who define themselves as having experienced sexually harassing behaviours. Only two of my interviewees identified themselves as attending a specific type of institution, in both cases red brick universities. Although I believe the unstructured nature of my interviews to have been of significant benefit to this research, a couple of directed questions at the start of each

interview (for example on the type of institution that my interviewee attended) may have provided additional useful information.

There are competing understandings of sexual harassment in higher education and, in particular, feminist theories often argue that the behaviours are exploitative and degrading. This thesis, using a Foucauldian analysis, has argued that power is not something possessed but exercised through us and beyond us, constituting men and women into particular ways of understanding themselves. Thus, it has contended that feminist discourses on sexual harassment in higher education have, in part, generated specific effects of power with regard to my research participants. As a result, this thesis argues that many of my participants appeared to understand the experiences they defined as sexual harassment as being an abuse of power. It suggests, therefore, that although MacKinnon's (2004) stated aim was to enable women to more powerful and less stigmatised, the contributions of feminist harassment discourses may, in part, generate within some women an understanding of themselves as powerless and vulnerable.

References:

Cases

Porcelli v Strathclyde RC [1986] SC 137 [1986]; ICR [1986] 564.

Legislation

Commission Recommendation (EC) 92/131 of 27th November 1991 on the protection of the dignity of men and women at work [1991] OJ L49/1

Directive of the European Parliament and Council (EC) 2002/73/EC; Article 2.

Sex Discrimination Act 1975

Employment Equality (Sex Discrimination) Regulations 2005 s.5

Sex Discrimination (Amendment of Legislation) 2008 s.3

Equality Act 2010 s.26

Journal Articles and Books

Acker, J. (2006). Inequalities Regimes: Gender, Class and Race in Organisations. Gender & Society, 20(4), 441 – 464.

Adams, J. W.; Kottke, J. L. & Padgitt, J. S. (1983). Sexual Harassment of University Students. Journal of College Student Personal, 24, 484 – 490.

Alemany, M. C. (1998). Sexual Harassment at Work in Five Southern European Countries. European Commission (1998). Sexual Harassment in the European Union 155 – 228.

Allred, P. (1998). Ethnography and Discourse Analysis: Dilemmas in Representing the Voices of Children. In Edwards, R. & Ribbens, J. (Eds.). Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research pp 147 - 170. London: Sage Publications.

Allen, D. (2007). The reporting and underreporting of rape. Southern Economic Journal, 73, 623 – 641.

Alvesson, M. (2002). Postmodernism and Social Research. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Appen, H. & Kleiner, B. H. (2001). An Overview of the US Supreme Court Decisions in Sexual Harassment Cases. Managerial Law, 43(1/2), 17 – 23.

Aranda, K. (2006). Postmodern Feminist Perspectives and Nursing Research: A

Passionately Interested Form of Inquiry. Nursing Inquiry, 13 (2), 135 – 143.

Arksey, H. & Knight, P. (1999). Interviewing for Social Scientists. London: Sage Publications.

Bacchi, C. (2001). Managing Equity: Mainstreaming and 'Diversity' in Australian Universities. In Brooks, A. & MacKinnon, A. (Eds.). Gender and the Restructured University pp 119 – 135. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bacchi, C. (1998). Changing the Sexual Harassment Agenda. In Gatens, M. & MacKinnon, A. (Eds.). Gender and Institutions: Welfare, Work and Citizenship pp 75 - 89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bagilhole, B. (2002). Challenging Equal Opportunities: Changing and Adapting Male Hegemony in Academia. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 23(1), 19 – 33.

Barak, A.; Pitterman, Y. & Yitzhaki, R. (1995). An Empirical Test of the Role of Power Differential in Originating Sexual Harassment. Basic and Applied Psychology, 17(4), 479 – 517.

Bargh, J. A.; Raymond, P.; Pryor, J. B. & Strack, F. (1995). The Attractiveness of the Underlying: An Automatic Power-Sex Association and its Consequences for Sexual Harassment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(5), 768 -781.

Barker, M. (2004). The Power of the Laddish Predator. The Times Higher Educational Supplement. 10th December 2004.

Barling, J.; Dekker, I.; Loughlin, C.; Kelloway, E. K. & Johnson, D. (1996). Prediction and Replication of the Personal and Organisation Consequences of Sexual Harassment. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11(5), 4 – 25.

Barnes, L. (2007). Constitutional and Conceptual Complexities in UK Implementation of the EU Harassment Provisions. Industrial Law Journal, 36(4), 446-467.

Black, A. E. & Allen, J. L. (2001). Tracing the Legacy of Anita Hill: The Thomas/Hill Hearings and Media Coverage of Sexual Harassment. Gender Issues, Winter Edition, 34 – 52.

Barton, L. (2000). A Hard Lesson. Education Unlimited, The Guardian. 12th October 2000.

Bell, V. (1993). Interrogating Incest: Feminism, Foucault and the Law. London: Routledge.

Benschop, Y. & Brouns, M. (2003). Crumbling Ivory Towers: Academic Organising and its Gender Effects. Gender, Work and Organization, 10(3), 195 – 212.

Benson, D. & Thompson, G. (1982). Sexual Harassment on a University Campus: The Confluence of Authority Relations, Sexual Interest and Gender Stratification. Social Problems, 29 (3), 236 – 251.

Berdahl, J. & Aquino, K. (2009). Sexual Behaviour at Work: Fun or Folly? Journal of Applied Psychology, 94, 34 – 47.

Berdahl, J. & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace Harassment: Double Jeopardy for Minority Women. Journal of Applied Psychology, 91, 426 – 436.

Bergman, M. & Henning, J. (2008). Sex and Ethnicity as Moderators in the Sexual Harassment Phenomenon. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13, 152 – 167.

Bergman, M.E.; Langhout, R.D.; Palmieri, P.A.; Cortina, L.M. & Fitzgerald, L.F. (2002). The (Un)reasonableness of Reporting: Antecedents and Consequences of Reporting Sexual Harassment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(2), 230 – 242.

Bernecker, S (2006). Reading Epistemology: Selected Texts with Interactive Commentary. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Best, C. L.; Dansky, B. S. & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1992). Medical Students Attitudes About Female Rape Victims. Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 7 (2), 75 – 188.

Beveridge, F. (2007). Building Against the Past: The Impact of Mainstreaming Bingham, S. & Battey, K. (2005). Communication of Social Support to Sexual Harassment Victims: Professors' Responses to a Student's Narrative of Unwanted Sexual Attention. Communication Studies, 56(2), 131-155.

Bingham, S. G. (1994). Introduction: Framing Sexual Harassment – Defining a Discursive Focus of Study. In Bingham, S. G. (Ed.). Conceptualising Sexual Harassment as Discursive Activity pp 1 – 16. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Blackstone, A.; Uggen, C. & McLaughlin, H. (2009). Legal Consciousness and Responses to Sexual Harassment. Law and Society Review, 43, 631 – 668.

Bondestam, F. (2004). Signing Up for the Status Quo? Semiological Analysis of Sexual Harassment in Higher Education – A Swedish Example. Higher Education in Europe, XXIX (1), 134 – 145.

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black + Lesbian + Woman ≠ Black Lesbian Woman: The Methodological Challenges of Qualitative and Quantitative Intersectionality Research. Sex Roles, 59, 312 – 325.

Brandenburg, J. B. (1982). Sexual Harassment in the University: Guidelines for Establishing a Grievance Procedure. Signs, 8(2), 320 – 336.

Brewer, M. B. & Berk, R. A. (1982). Beyond Nine to Five: Introduction. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 1 – 4.

Brewis, J. (1996). Sex, Work and Sex at Work: A Foucauldian Analysis. Unpublished Thesis Submitted to the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology.

Brewis, J. & Linstead, S. (2000a). Sex, Work and Sex Work: Eroticizing Organization. London: Routledge.

Brewis, J. & Linstead, S. (2000b). 'The Worst Thing is the Screwing' (2): Context and Career in Sex Work. Gender, Work and Organization, 7(3), 168 – 180.

Brewis, J. (2001). Foucault, Politics and Organisations: (Re)-constructing Sexual Harassment. Gender, Work and Organisations, 8(1) 37 – 60.

Brogan, D.; Frank, E.; Elon, L.; Sivanesan, P. & O'Hanlan, K. (1999). Harassment of Lesbians as medical students and physicians. Journal of the American Medical Association, 282, 1290 – 1292.

Brown, J. M. (1998). Aspects of Discriminatory Treatment of Women Police Officers Serving in Forces in England and Wales. British Journal of Criminology, 38(20), 265 – 282.

Brown, K. R. (1997). An Evolutionary Perspective on Sexual Harassment: Seeking Roots in Biology Rather than Ideology. Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues, 8, 5 – 77.

Brown, K. R. (2006). Sex, Power and Dominance: The Evolutionary Psychology of Sexual Harassment. Managerial and Decision Economics, 27, 145 – 158.

Browne, K. (2005). Snowball Sampling: Using Social Networks to Research Non-Heterosexual Women. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 8(1), 47 – 60.

Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

BSA (2002). Statement of Ethical Practice. British Sociological Association. <http://www.britisoc.co.uk/equality/Statement+Ethical+Practice.htm> 15th December 2009.

Buchanan, N. & Fitzgerald, L. (2008). Effects of Racial and Sexual Harassment on Work and Psychological Well-Being of African-American Women. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13, 137 – 151.

Burgess, T. (1991). In the Field. An Introduction to Field Research. London: Routledge.

Burrell, G. & Hearn, J. (1989). The Sexuality of Organisation. In Hearn, J.; Sheppard, D.L.; Tancred-Sheriff, P. & Burrell, G. (Eds.). The Sexuality of Organisation pp 1 – 29. London: Sage Publications.

Butler, J. (1992). Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of Postmodernism. In Butler, J. (Ed.). Feminists Theorise the Political pp 3 - 21. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1999). Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004). Undoing Gender. Abington: Routledge.

Cahill, M. (2001). The Social Construction of Sexual Harassment Law: The Role of the National, Organizational and Individual Context. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Cain, M (1993). Foucault, Feminism, and Feeling: What Foucault Can and Cannot Contribute to Feminist Epistemology. In Ramazanoglu, C (Ed.). Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism pp 73 – 96. London: Routledge.

Cairns, K. V. (1997). 'Femininity' and Women's Silence in Response to Sexual Harassment and Coercion. In Thomas, A. M. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). Sexual Harassment: Contemporary Feminist Perspectives. pp 91 - 112. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Cameron, D. (1984). Sex With Your Tutor? It's His Fringe Benefit. In Rowe, M. (Ed.). Spare Rib Reader pp 257 – 258. London: Penguin.

Capper, C. A. (2000). Life Lessons and a Loving Epistemology: A Response to Julie Laible's Loving Epistemology. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 13(6), 693 – 698.

Carabine, C. (2001). Unmarried Motherhood 1830 – 1990: A Genealogical Analysis. In Wetherell, R; Taylor, S & Yates, S (Eds.). Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis pp 267 – 311. Milton Keynes: Open University.

Carmody, M. (2005). Ethical Erotics: Reconceptualising Anti-Rape Education. Sexualities, 8(4), 465 – 480.

Carter, J. & Jeffs, T. (1995). A Very Private Affair: Sexual Exploitation in Higher Education. Ticknall: Education Now Publishing Cooperative.

Carter, P. & Jeffs, T. (1992). The Hidden Curriculum: Sexuality in Professional

Education. In Carter, P.; Jeffs, T. & Smith, M. (Eds.). Changing Social Work and Welfare. (231 – 244). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Chamberlain, L.; Cowley, M.; Tope, D. & Hodson, R. (2008). Sexual harassment in organizational context. Work and Occupation, 35, 262 – 295.

Chan, D.; Chun, B. Chow, S. Cheung, S. (2008). Examining the Job Related, Psychological and Physical Outcomes of Workplace Harassment: a Meta-Analytical review. Psychology of Women's Quarterly, 32, 362 – 376.

Charlesworth, S. (2002). Risky Business: Managing Sexual Harassment at Work. Griffin Law Review, 11, 353 – 376.

Cheek, J. (2000). Postmodern and Poststructural Approached to Nursing Research. London: Sage Publications.

Chen, E. W. (1997). Sexual Harassment from the Perspective of Asian-American Women. In Ronai, R.; Barbara, A.; Feagin, J. & Jue, R. (Eds.). Everyday Sexism in the Third Millennium pp 4 – 62. London: Routledge.

Chih, H. S. (2005). Seeking Informed Consent: Reflections on Research Practice. Sociology, 39(2), 277 – 294.

Clair, R. (1993a). The Bureaucratisation, Commodification and Privatisation of Sexual Harassment Through Institutional Discourse: A Study of the Big Ten Universities. Management Communication Quarterly, 7, 123 – 157.

Clair, R. P. (1993b). The Use of Framing Devices to Sequester Organisational Narratives: Hegemony and Harassment. Communication Monographs, 60, 1 – 24.

Clair, R. P. (1996). Narrative Approaches to Raising Consciousness about Sexual Harassment. Journal of Applied Communication Research. 24 (4) 241 – 259.

Clair, R. P. (1997). Organising Silence: Silence as a Voice and Silence as Resistance. Western Journal of Communication, 61(3), 315 – 337.

Clarke, L. (2006). Harassment, Sexual Harassment, and the Employment Equality (Sex Discrimination) Regulations 2005. Industrial Law Journal, 35(2), 161-178.

Cleveland, J. L. (1999). Personal Autonomy and the Law: Sexual Harassment and the Dilemma of Regulating "Intimacy". Constellations, 6(4), 443 – 472.

Collier, R. (1995). Combating Sexual Harassment in the Workplace. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Collinson, M. & Collinson, D. (1992). Mismanaging Sexual Harassment:

Protecting and Blaming the Victim. Women in Management Review, 7(7), 11 – 16.

Collinson, M. & Collinson, D. (1996). 'It's Only Dick': The Sexual Harassment of Women Managers in Insurance Sales. Work, Employment & Society, 10(1), 29 – 56.

Collinsworth, L.; Fitzgerald, L. & Drasgow, F. (2009). In Harm's way: factors relating to Psychological Distress Following Sexual Harassment. Psychology of Women's Quarterly, 33, 474 – 490.

Conrad, C. & Taylor, B. (1994). The Context(s) of Sexual Harassment: Power, Silences and Academe. In Bingham, S. G. (Ed.). Conceptualising Sexual Harassment as Discursive Activity pp 45 - 58. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Cortina, L.; Lonsway, K. A.; Magley, V. J.; Freeman, L. V.; Collinsworth, L. L.; Hunter, M. & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). What's Gender Got Do with It? Incivility in the Federal Courts. Law and Social Inquiry, 27, 235 – 270.

Crocker, D. & Kalember, V. (1999). The Incidence and Impact of Women's Experiences of Sexual Harassment in Canadian Workplaces. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 36, 451 – 559.

Crocker, P. L. (1983). An Analysis of University Definitions of Sexual Harassment. Signs, 8(4), 696 – 707.

Croghan, R. & Miell, D. (1998). Strategies of Resistance: 'Bad' Mothers Dispute the Evidence. Feminism & Psychology, 8, 445 – 465.

Crossley, M. L. (2000). Deconstructing Autobiographical Accounts of Childhood Sexual Abuse: Some Critical Reflections. Feminism & Psychology, 10, 73 – 90.

Crow, G.; Wiles, R.; Heath, S. & Charles, V. (2006). Research Ethics and Data Quality: The Implications of Informed Consent. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 9(2), 83 – 95.

Davis, D. E. (2002). (Love Is) The Ability of Not Knowing: Feminist Experience of the Impossibility in Ethical Singularity. Hypatia, 17(2), 145 – 161.

De Haas, S. & Timmerman, G. (2010). Sexual Harassment in the Context of Double Male Dominance. European Journal of Work and Organization Psychology, 19, 717 – 734.

De Judicibus, M. & McCabe, M. P. (2001). Blaming the Target of Sexual Harassment : Impact of Gender Roles, Sexist Attitudes, and Work Role. Sex Roles, 44(7/8), 401 – 417.

Dean, M. (1999). Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society. London: Sage Publications.

Department for Trade and Industry (2005). Equality and Diversity: Updating the Sex Discrimination Act

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file13952.pdf> 14th October 2010

DeSouza, E. & Fansler, A. G. (2003). Contrapower Sexual Harassment : A Survey of Students and Faculty Members. Sex Roles, 48(11-12), 529 – 542.

Devos, A. (2004). The Project of Self, the Project of Others: Mentoring, Women and the Fashioning of the Academic Subject. Studies in Continuing Education, 26(1), 67 – 80.

Dews, P. (1984). Power and Subjectivity in Foucault. New Left Review, 144, 72 – 95.

Dougherty, D. S. & Smythe, M. J. (2004). Sense-making, Organisational Culture, and Sexual Harassment. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32(4), 293 – 317.

Dougherty, D. S. (2001). Sexual Harassment as [Dys]Functional Process: A Feminist Standpoint Analysis. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 29(4), 372 – 402.

Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P. (1982). Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Drieschner, K. & Lange, A. (1999). A Review of Cognitive Factors in the Etiology of Rape: Theories, Empirical Studies and Implications. Clinical Psychological Review, 19(1), 57 – 77.

Driscoll, D. M.; Kelly, J. R. & Henderson, W. L. (1998). Can Perceivers Identify Likelihood to Harass? Sex Roles, 38, 557 – 588.

Dziech, B. & Hawkins, M. (1998). Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: Reflections and New Perspectives. New York: Garland Publishing.

Dziech, W. & Weiner, L. (1984). The Lecherous Professor: Sexual Harassment on Campus. Boston: Beacon Press.

Eagly, A. H. & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender Stereotypes and Attitudes Towards Women and Men. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 111, 543 – 558.

Eagly, A. H. & Wood, W. (1982). Inferred Sex Differences in Status as a Determinant of Gender Stereotypes About Social Influence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(5), 915 – 928.

Eagly, A. H. (1983). Gender and Social Influence: A Social Psychological Analysis. American Psychologist, 38, 979 – 981.

Edwards, A. (1987). Male Violence in Feminist Theory: An Analysis of the Changing Conceptions of Sex/Gender Violence and Male Dominance. In Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (Eds.). Women, Violence and Social Control pp 13 - 29. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Edwards, A. (1987). Male Violence in Feminist Theory: An Analysis of the Changing Conceptions of Sex/Gender Violence and Male Dominance. In Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (Eds.). Women, Violence and Social Control pp 13 - 29. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Edwards, R. & Ribbens, J. (1998). Public Knowledge, Private Lives, Personal Experience. In Ribbens, J. & Edwards, R. (Eds.). Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research pp 1 – 21. London: Sage Publications.

Ellis, B.; Barak, A. & Pinto, A. (1991). Moderating Effect of Personal Cognitions on Experiences and Perceived Sexual Harassment of Women at the Workplace. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21, 1320 – 1337.

Emerson, R. M.; Rachel, I. F. & Shaw, L. L. (1995). Writing Ethnographic Field Notes. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Epstein, D. (1997). Keeping Them in Their Place: Hetero/Sexist Harassment, Gender and the Enforcement of Heterosexuality. In Thomas, A. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). Sexual Harassment: Contemporary Feminist Perspectives, pp 154 - 171. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (E.E.O.C.). (1990). Policy Guidance on Current Issues of Sexual Harassment. Retrieved on 4th September 2008. www.eeoc.gov/policy/docs/currentissue/html.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (E.E.O.C.). (2008). Sexual Harassment [Online]. Retrieved on 4th September 2008. <http://www.eeoc.gov/types/sexualharassment.html>.

Equal Opportunities Commission (2007). The Gender Equality Duty and Higher Education Institutions: Guidance for Public Authorities in England.

Equal Treatment (Amendment) Directive (2002/73/EC) (2002).

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2008). What Constitutes Sexual Harassment.

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010). What Equality Law Means for you as an Education Provider – Further and Higher Education. http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/uploaded_files/EqualityAct/fehe_nsg_2.doc c 14th October 2010

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2011). The Essential Guide to the

Public Sector Duty.

Estrada, A. & Berrgren, A. (2009). Sexual Harassment and its Impact on Women's Officers and Cadets in the Swedish Armed Forces. Military Psychology, 21, 162 – 185.

Etherington, K. (2000). Supervising Counsellors who Work with Survivors of Child Abuse. Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 13(4), 377 – 389.

Etherington, K. (2004). Becoming a Reflexive Researcher: Using Our Selves in Research. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Etherington, K. (2007). Working With Traumatic Stories: From Transcriber to Witness. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 10(2) 85 – 97.

European Commission (1991). Protecting the Dignity of Men and Women at Work: A Code of Practice on Measures to Combat Sexual Harassment. Equal Opportunities Review, 41, 39 – 42.

European Commission (1998). Sexual Harassment in the Workplace in the European Union. Retrieved on 4th September 2008.
<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/shworkpl.pdf>

Eyre, L. (2000). The Discursive Framing of Sexual Harassment in a University Community. Gender and Education, 12 (3) 293 – 307.

Fain, T. C. & Anderson, D. L. (1987). Sexual Harassment: Organisational Context and Diffuse Status. Sex Roles, 5/6, 291 – 311.

Fairclough, N. (2003). 'Political Correctness': The Politics of Culture and Language. 'Political Correctness': The Politics of Culture and Language. Discourse & Society, 14 (1), 17 – 28.

Faley, R.; Abel, R. & Sarat, A. (1980 – 1981). The Emergence of and Transformation of Disputes: Naming, Blaming, Claiming... Law and Society Review, 15, 631 – 654.

Farley, L. (1978). Sexual Shakedown: The Sexual Harassment of Women on the Job. New York: McGraw-Hill

Fehn, M. (2000). Notes From a Practitioner: A Response to Julie Laible's Loving Epistemology. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 13(6), 705 – 707.

Fitzgerald, L. (1990). Sexual Harassment: The Definition and Measurement of a Construction. In Paludi, M. A. (Ed.). Sexual Harassment on Campus pp 21 – 44. New York: State University of New York Press.

Fitzgerald, L. F. & Shullman, S. (1993). Sexual Harassment: A Research

Analysis and Agenda for the 1990s. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 42, 5 – 27.

Fitzgerald, L. F. & Weitzman, L. M. (1990). Men Who Harass: Speculation and Data. In M. Paludi (Ed.). Sexual Harassment on College Campuses: Abusing the Ivory Power pp 125 - 141. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Fitzgerald, L. F. (1993). Sexual Harassment: Violence Against Women in the Workplace. American Psychologist, 48(10), 1070 – 1076.

Fitzgerald, L. F. (1996). Sexual Harassment: The Definition and Measurement of a Construct pp 79 - 97. In M. Paludi (Ed.). Sexual Harassment on College Campuses: Abusing the Ivory Power. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Fitzgerald, L. F.; Magley, V. J.; Drasgow, V. J. & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring Sexual Harassment in the Military: The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). Military Psychology, 11(3), 243 – 263.

Fitzgerald, L.; Weitzman, L.; & Gold, Y.; Ormerod, M. (1988). Sex and Denial in Scholarly Garb. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 329 - 340.

Fitzgerald, L. & Weitzman, L. M. (1990). Men Who Harass: Speculation and Data. In Paludi, M. A. (Ed.). Sexual Harassment on Campus pp 125 - 140. New York: State University of New York Press.

Flax, J. (1987). Post-Modernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory. Signs, 12, 621 – 643.

Flax, J. (1992). The End of Innocence. Feminists Theorise the Political pp 445 - 463. London: Routledge.

Flax, J. (1998). The American Dream in Black and White: The Clarence Thomas Hearings. New York: Cornell University Press.

Foss, K. A. & Rogers, R. A. (1994). Particularities and Possibilities: Reconceptualising Knowledge and Power in Sexual Harassment. In Bingham, S. G. (Ed.). Conceptualising Sexual Harassment as Discursive Activity pp 159 - 172. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Foucault, M (1980). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In Bouchard, D.F. (Ed.). Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault pp 139 - 165. New York: Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980b). Body / Power. In Gordon, C. (Ed.). Power / Knowledge, Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 – 1977 by Michel Foucault pp 55 - 62. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Foucault, M. (1980c). Two Lectures. In Gordon, C. (Ed.). Power / Knowledge.

Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 – 1977 by Michel Foucault pp 78 - 108. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Foucault, M. (1980d). The Confessions of the Flesh. In Gordon, C. (Ed.). Power / Knowledge, Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972 – 1977 by Michel Foucault pp 194 - 228. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Foucault, M (1981). The Order of Discourse. In Young, R. (Ed.). Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader pp 48 - 79. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Foucault, M. (1986). The Foucault Reader. Rabinow, P. (Ed). The Foucault Reader. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1986b). Kant on Enlightenment and Revolution. Economy and Society, 15(1), 88 – 96.

Foucault, M (1991a). The Archaeology of Knowledge. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M (1991b). Politics and the Study of Discourse. In Burchell, G.; Gordon, C.; Miller, P. (Eds.). The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality pp 53 - 73. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M (1991c). Questions of Method. In Burchell, G.; Gordon, C.; Miller, P. (Eds.). The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality pp 73 - 87. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M (2000a). Foucault. In Faubian, D. J. (Ed.). Michel Foucault: Aesthetics, Method and Epistemology, 1954 – 1884, Volume 2 pp 495-465. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1990). The Care of Self. The History of Sexuality Volume 3. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1991d). Discipline and Punish. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1992). The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality, Volume 2. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1998). The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality, Volume 1. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2000b). Self Writing. In Rabinow, P (Ed.). Michel Foucault, Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984 pp 207 - 222. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2000c). Technologies of Self. In Rabinow, P (Ed.). Michel Foucault, Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984 pp 223 - 252. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2000d). On the Genealogy of Ethics: A Overview of Work in Progress. In Rabinow, P. (Ed.). Michel Foucault, Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984 pp 253 - 280. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2000f). What is Enlightenment? In Rabinow, P. (Ed.). Michel Foucault, Ethics, Subjectivity and Truth: Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984 pp 304 - 319. London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2001). Madness and Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2002). The Subject and Power. In Faubion, J. D. (Ed.). Michel Foucault, Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984, Volume 4, (326 - 349). London: Penguin Books.

Francis, L. P. (2001). Sexual Harassment as an Ethical Issue in Academic Life. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Frazier, P. A. & Cohen, B. B. (1992). Research on the Sexual Victimization of Women: Implications for Counselling Training. The Counselling Psychologist, 20, 141 – 158.

Gallivan Nelson, C.; Halpert, J. & Cellar, D. (2007). Organizational Responses for Preventing and Stopping Sexual Harassment: Effective Deterrents or Continued Endurance? Sex Roles, 56, 811 – 822.

Gallop, J. (1997). Feminist Accused of Sexual Harassment. Durham: Duke University

Gannon, T. A.,; Collie, R. M.; Ward, T. & Thakker, J. (2008). Rape: Psychotherapy, theory and treatment. Clinical Psychology Review, 28(6), 982 – 1008.

Gavey, N. (1989). Feminist Post-Structuralism and Discourse Analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13. 459 – 475.

Geiger, W., Harwood, J., & Hummert, M. (2006). College Students' Multiple Stereotypes of Lesbians: A Cognitive Perspective. Journal of Homosexuality, 51(3), 165–182.

Gelfand, M.; Fitzgerald, L. & Drasgow, F. (1995). The Structure of Sexual Harassment: A Confirmatory Analysis Across Cultures and Settings. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 47, 164 – 177.

Giddens, A. (1991). Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gill, R. (1995). Relativism, Reflexivity and Politics: Interrogating Discourse

Analysis From a Feminist Perspective. In Wilkinson, S. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). Feminism and Discourse: Psychological Perspectives pp 165 – 186. London: Sage.

Glass, N. & Kierrynn, D. (1998). An Emancipatory Impulse: A Feminist Postmodern Integrated Turning Point in Nursing Research. Advances in Nursing Science, 21(1), 43 - 52.

Glomb, T. M.; Munson, L.J.; Hulin, C. L.; Bergman, M. E. & Drasgow, F. (1999). Structural Equations Models of Sexual Harassment: Longitudinal Explorations and Cross Sectional Generalisations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 14 – 28.

Golden, J. H.; Johnson, C. & Lopez, R. (2001). Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Exploring the Effects of Physical Attractiveness on Perceptions of Harassment, Sex Roles, 45, 767 – 784.

Goodrum, S. & Keys, J. L. (2007). Reflections of Two Studies of Emotionally Sensitive Topics: Bereavement from Murder and Abortion. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 10(4), 249 – 258.

Gough, H. G. (1960). Theory and Measurement of Socialization. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 23 – 30.

Government Equalities Office (2010). Equality Act 2010: The public sector Equality Duty Promoting equality through transparency A consultation. http://www.equalities.gov.uk/pdf/402461_GEO_EqualityAct2010ThePublicSectorEqualityDuty_acc.pdf 16th October 2010

Government Equalities Office (2011). Equality Act 2010: Public Sector Equality Duty – What do I Need to Know? A Quick Start Guide for Public Sector Organisations.

Grauerholz, E. (1989). Sexual Harassment of Women Professors by Students: Exploring the Dynamics of Power, Authority and Gender in a University Setting. Sex Roles, 21 (11-12), 789 – 801.

Grey, C. (1995). Review Article: Gender as a New Grid of Intelligibility. Gender, Work and Organization, 2(1), 46 – 50.

Grosz, E. (1994). Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gruber, J. E. & Bjorn, L. (1986). Women's Responses to Sexual Harassment: An Analysis of Socio-Cultural, Organization and Personal Resource Models. Social Science Quarterly, 67, 814 – 826.

Gruber, J. E., Smith, M., & Kauppinen-Toropainen, K. (1996). Sexual harassment types and severity: Linking research and policy. In M. S. Stockdale

(Ed.). Sexual harassment in the workplace: Perspectives, frontiers, and response strategies pp.151–173. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gustafson, D. L. (2000). Best Laid Plans: Examining Contradictions Between Intent and Outcome in a Feminist Collaborative Research Project. Qualitative Health Research Journal, 10(6), 717 - 733.

Gutek, B. (2001). Women and Paid Work. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25, 379 – 393.

Gutek, B. & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-Ratios, Sex-Role Spillover and Sexual Harassment of Women at Work. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55 – 74.

Gutek, B. A. (1985). Sex and the Workplace: Impact of Sexual Behavior and Harassment on Women, Men and Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutek, B. A., & Done, R. S. (2001). Sexual Harassment. In R. K. Unger (Ed.), Handbook of the Psychology of Women and Gender pp 367–387. Chichester: John Willey & Sons Inc.

Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex Ratios, Sex-Role Spillover and Sexual Harassment of Women at Work. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55–74.

Gutting, G. (2003). Introduction. Michel Foucault: A User's Manual. In Gutting, G. (Ed.). The Cambridge Companion to Foucault, 2nd Edition pp 1 – 28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Handy, J. (2006). Sexual Harassment in Small-Town New Zealand: A Qualitative Study of Three Contrasting Organizations. Gender, Work and Organizations, 13(1), 1 – 24.

Harding, S. (1987a). Introduction: Is There a Feminist Method? In Harding, S. (Ed.). Feminism and Methodology pp 1 – 14. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S. (1987b). Conclusion: Epistemological Questions. In Harding, S. (Ed.). Feminism and Methodology pp 181-190. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S. (1993). Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: 'What is Strong Objectivity'? In Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (Eds.). Feminist Epistemologies pp 49 – 83. London: Routledge.

Hartsock, N. (1983). The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In Harding, S. (Ed.). Feminism and Methodology pp 157-181. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hartsock, N. (1990). Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women? In Nicholson, L. (Ed.). Feminism/Postmodernism pp 157 - 175. London: Routledge.

- Health and Safety at Work (2007). Harassment: High Court Decision Puts Employers on Guard. H.S. at W., 14(10), 654 – 655.
- Herbert, C. (1997). Off With the Velvet Gloves. In Thomas, A. M. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). Sexual Harassment: Contemporary Feminist Perspectives, pp 21 – 31. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hesse-Biber, S.; Leavy, P. & Yaiser, M. L. (2004). Feminist Approaches to Research as a Process: Reconceptualising Epistemology, Methodology, and Method. In Hesse-Biber, S.H. & Yaiser, L. (Eds.). Feminist Perspectives on Social Research pp 3 - 26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hesson-McInnis, M. S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Sexual harassment: A preliminary test of an integrative model. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 27(10), 877–901.
- Heward, C. & Taylor, P. (1992). Women at the Top in Higher Education: Equal Opportunities Policies in Action? Policy and Politics, 20 (2), 111 – 121.
- Hill, A. (2001). Speaking Truth to Power. In LeMoncheck, L. & Sterba, J. (Eds.). Sexual Harassment: Issues and Answers pp 150 – 158. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hinze, S. W. (2004). 'Am I Being Over-Sensitive?' Women's Experiences of Sexual Harassment During Medical Training. Health, 8, 101 – 127.
- Holland, J. (2007). Emotions and Research. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 10(3), 195 – 209.
- Hollon, S. D., & Kriss, M. R. (1984). Cognitive factors in clinical research and practice. Clinical Psychology Review, 4(1), 35–76.
- Holloway, I. & Freshwater, D. (2007). Vulnerable Story Telling: Narrative Research in Nursing. Journal of Research in Nursing, 12, 703 – 711.
- hooks, b. (1990). Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics. Boston: South End Press.
- Huerta, M.; Cortina, L. M.; Pang, J. S.; Torges, C. M. & Magley, V. J. (2006). Sex and Power in the Academy: Modelling Sexual Harassment in the Lives of College Women. Personality and Social Psychology, 32(5), 616 – 628.
- Huerta, M; Cortina, L. M.; Pang, J. S.; Torges, C. M. & Magley, V. J. (2006). Sex and Power in the Academy: Modelling Sexual Harassment in the Lives of College Women, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32, 616 – 628.
- Hunter, R. (2002). Taking up Equality: Women Barristers and the Denial of Discrimination. Feminist Legal Studies, 10, 113 – 130.

- Hurt, J.; Maver, J. & Hofmann, D. (1999). Situational and Individual Influences on Judgements of Hostile Environment Sexual Harassment. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29, 1395 – 1415.
- Hyden, M. (1999). The World of the Fearful: Battered Women's Narratives of Leaving Abusive Husbands. Feminism & Psychology, 9, 449 – 469.
- Hyden, M. (2005). 'I Must Have Been an Idiot to Let it Go On': Agency and Positioning in Battered Women's Narratives of Leaving. Feminism & Psychology, 15, 169 – 188.
- Illies, R.; Hauserman, N.; Schwochau, S. & Stibal, J. (2003). Reported Incidents of Work-Related Sexual Harassment in the US: Using Meta-Analysis to Explain Reported Rate Disparities. Personnel Psychology, 56, 607 – 618.
- Jackson, S. (2002). Transcending Boundaries: Women, Research and Teaching in the Academy. In Howie, G. & Tauchert, A. (Eds.). Gender, Teaching and Research in Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century, pp 20-31. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Jeffels, S. (2002). A Theology of Survival: Faith Narratives of Women who Have Survived Domestic Violence. Unpublished Thesis (PhD). The University of Derby.
- Jensen, K. & Kleiner, B. (1999). How to Determine Proper Corrective Action Following Sexual Harassment Investigations, Equal Opportunities Review, 18, 23 – 29.
- Jones, S. J. (1998). Subjectivity and Class Consciousness: The Development of Class Identity. Journal of Adult Development, 5(3), 145 – 162.
- Jones, T. & Remland, M. (1992). Sources of Variability in Perceptions of and responses to Sexual Harassment. Sex Roles, 27, 121 – 141.
- Jordanova, L. (1993). Natural Facts: An Historical Perspective on Science and Sexuality. In Jackson, S. (Ed.). Women's Studies: A Reader pp 374 – 377. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Kaiser, C. R. & Miller, C. T. (2004). A Stress and Coping Perspective on Confronting Sexism. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28, 168 – 178.
- Kelly, L. (1987). The Continuum of Sexual Violence. In Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (Eds.). Women, Violence & Social Control pp 46 – 59. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Kelly, L. (1988). Surviving Sexual Violence. Cambridge: Polity Press in Association with Basil Blackwell Ltd.

- Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. (1999). Using Foucault's Methods. London: Sage Publications.
- Kerfoot, D. & Whitehead, S. (2000). Keeping All the Balls in the Air': Further Education and the Masculine/Managerial Subject. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 24(2), 183 – 201.
- Kirkham, S. (2005). Dangerous Liaisons in Class, Times Educational Supplement. 11th November 2005
- Kitzinger, C. & Thomas, A. (1995). Sexual Harassment: A Discursive Approach. In Wilkinson, S & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). Feminism and Discourse: Psychological Perspectives pp 32 - 48. London: Sage Publications.
- Kitzinger, C. (1995). Anti-Lesbian Harassment. In Brant, C. & Too, Y.L. (Eds.). Rethinking Sexual Harassment, pp 125 - 147. London: Pluto Press.
- Knights, D. & Richards, R. (2003). Sex Discrimination in UK Academia. Gender, Work and Organisations, 10(2), 213 – 237.
- Knights, D. & Vurdubakis, T (1994). Foucault, Power, Resistance and All That. In Jermier, J. M.; Knights, D. & Nord, W. R. (Eds.). Resistance and Power in Organisations pp 167 – 198. London: Routledge.
- Komaromy, M., Bindman, A. B., Haber, R. J., & Sande, M. A. (1993). Sexual Harassment in Medical Training. The New England Journal of Medicine, 328(5), 322–326.
- Konik, J. & Cortina, L. (2008). Policing Gender at Work: Intersections of Harassment Based on Sex and Sexuality. Social Justice Review, 21, 313 – 337.
- Koss, M. P. (1991). The Rape Victim: Clinical and Community Interventions. London: Sage Publications.
- Kosson, D. S., Kelly, J. C., & White, J. W. (1997). Psychopathy-Related Traits Predict Self-reported Sexual Aggression Among College Men. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12 (2), 241–254.
- Kremer, J. M. & Marks, J. (1992). Sexual Harassment: The Response of Management and Trade Unions. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 65, 5 – 15.
- Kvale, S. (1996). Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviews. London: Sage Publications.
- LaFontaine, E., & Tredeau, L. (1986). The frequency, sources and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. Sex Roles, 15(7–8), 433–442.

Laible, J. C. (2000). A Loving Epistemology: What I Hold Critical in my Life, Faith and Profession. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 13(6), 683 – 692.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy with/in the Postmodern. London: Routledge.

Lather, P. (2006). (Post)Feminist Methodology: Getting Lost OR a Scientificity We Can Bear to Learn From. Paper Presented at the Research Methods Festival, Oxford, July 2006.

Lee, D. (1998). Sexual Harassment in PhD Supervision. Gender and Education, 10(3), 299 – 312.

Lee, D. (2001). 'He Didn't Sexually Harass Me, As in Harass For Sex... He Was Just Horrible': Women's Definitions of Unwanted Male Sexual Conduct at Work. Women's Studies International Forum, 24(1), 25 – 38.

Lee, J.; Heilmann, S. & Near, J. (2004). Blowing the Whistle on Sexual Harassment: Test of a Model of Predictors and Outcomes. Human Relations, 57, 297 – 322.

Lees, S. (1996). Unreasonable Doubt: The Outcomes of Rape Trials. In Hester, M.; Kelly, L. & Radford, J. (Eds.). Women, Violence and Male Power pp 188 – 198. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Lee-Treweek, G. (2000). The Insight of Emotional Danger: Research Experiences in a Home for Older People. In Lee-Treweek, G & Linkogle, S (Eds.). Danger in the Field: Risks and Ethics in Social Research pp 114 – 131.

Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (1995). Sexual Harassment Research: A Methodological Critique. Personnel Psychology, 48, 841–864.

Letherby, G. (2002). Claims and Disclaimers: Knowledge, Reflexivity and Representations in Feminist Research. Sociological Research Online, 6(4). <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/6/4/letherby.html>. 29/06/2011.

Littler-Bishop, S.; Seidler-Feller, D. & Opaluch, R. E. (1982). Sexual Harassment in the Workplace as a Function of Initiator's Status : The Case of Airline Personnel. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 137 – 148.

Livesey, L. (2002). Telling It Like It Is: Understanding Adult Women's Life-Long Disclosures of Childhood Sexual Abuse. In: Narrative, Memory and Life Transitions. University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, pp 53 – 64.

Lonsway, K. A.; Cortina, L. M. & Magley, V. J. (2008). Sexual Harassment Mythology: Definition, Conceptualisation and Measurement, Sex Roles, 58, 599 – 615.

Lucero, M. A., Middleton, K. L., Finch, W. A., & Valentine, S. R. (2003). An Empirical Investigation of Sexual Harassers: Toward a Perpetrator Typology. Human Relations, 56, 1461–1483.

Luthar, H. K.; Tata, J. & Kwesiga, E. (2009). A Model for Predicting Outcomes of Sexual Harassment Complaints by Race and Gender. Employment Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 21, 21 – 35.

MacKinnon, C (1979). Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination. London: Yale University Press.

MacKinnon, C. (2004). Afterword. In MacKinnon, C. A. & Siegel, R. B. (Eds.). Directions in Sexual Harassment Law pp 672 - 704. London: Yale University Press.

Magley, V.; Hulin, C. Fitzgerald, L. F. & DeNardo, M. (1999). Outcomes of Self-Labeling Sexual Harassment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84(3), 390 – 402.

Mahood, L. & Littlewood, B. (1997). Daughters in Danger: the Case of Campus Sex Crimes. In Thomas, A. M. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). Sexual Harassment: Contemporary Feminist Perspectives, pp 172 - 187. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Malovich, N. J., & Stake, J. E. (1990). Sexual harassment on campus: Individual differences in attitudes and beliefs. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14(1), 63–82.

Markert, J. (2005). The Globalisation of Sexual Harassment. Advances in Gender Research, 9, 133 – 160.

Marshall, A. (2005). Idle Rights: Employees' Rights Consciousness and the Construction of Sexual Harassment Policies. Law and Society Review, 39, 83 – 124.

Martin, B. (1996). Femininity Played Straight: The significance of being a lesbian. London: Routledge

Masselot, A. (2004). The New Equal Treatment Directive.

Matchen, J., & DeSouza, E. (2000). The sexual harassment of faculty members by students. Sex Roles, 42(3–4), 295–306.

Matthaei, J. (1998). Some Comments on the Role of Lesbianism in Feminist Economic Transformation. Feminist Economics 4(2), pp 83–88.

Mauthner, M. (1998). Bringing Silent Voices into Public Discourse: Researching Accounts of Sister Relationships. In Edwards, R. & Ribbens, J. (Eds.). Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research pp 39 - 57. London: Sage

Publications.

Mauthner, N. & Doucet, A. (1998). Reflections on a Voice-Centred Relational Method: Analysing Maternal and Domestic Voices. In Edwards, R. & Ribbens, J. (Eds.). Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research pp 119 - 146. London: Sage Publications.

Mawby, R. I. & Walklate, S. (1994). Critical Victimology: International Perspectives. London: Sage Publications.

McCabe, M. & Hardman, L. (2005). Attitudes and Perceptions of Workers to Sexual Harassment. Journal of Social Psychology, 145, 719 – 740.

McNay, L. (1992). Foucault and Feminism: Power, Gender and the Self. Cambridge: Polity Press.

McNay, L. (1994). Foucault: A Critical Introduction. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.

McWilliam, E; Singh, P & Taylor, P. (2002). Doctoral Research, Danger and Risk Management. Higher Education Research and Development, 21(2), 119-129.

Miller, T. (1998). Shifting Layers of Professional, Lay and Personal Narratives: Longitudinal Childbirth Research. In Edwards, R. & Ribbens, J. (Eds.). Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research pp 58 - 71. London: Sage Publications.

Millett, K. (1971). Sexual Politics. London: Hart-Davis.

Mills, S. (2003). Caught Between Sexism, Anti-Sexism and 'Political Correctness': Feminist Women's Negotiations with Naming Practices. Discourse & Society, 14 (1), 87 - 110.

Mohipp, C. & Senn, C. (2008). Graduate Students' Perceptions of Contrapower Harassment. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23, 1258 – 1276.

Moran-Ellis, J. (1996). Close to Home: The Experience of Researching Child Sexual Abuse. In Hester, M; Kelly, L. & Radford, J. (Eds.). Women, Violence and Male Power pp 176 - 188. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Nash, J. C. (2010). On Difficulty: Intersectionality as Feminist Labor. The Scholar and Feminist Online, 8(3).

National Union of Students (2010). Hidden Marks: A Study of Women Students' Experiences of Harassment, Stalking, Violence and Sexual Assault. London: NUS.

Newton, A. (2007). Beyond the Common Law: Employer Held Responsibility for

Rape by Employee – Is This a New Frontier in Vicarious Liability? Law Society Journal, 45, 38 – 39.

Niebuhr, R. E., & Boyles, W. R. (1991). Sexual harassment of military personnel: An examination of power differentials. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 445–457.

O'Donohue, W.; Downs, K. & Yeater, E. A. (1998). Sexual Harassment: A Review of Literature. Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 3(2), 111 – 128.

O'Grady, H. (2004). An Ethics of Self. In Taylor, D & Vintges, K (Eds.). Feminism and the Final Foucault pp 91 - 117. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

O'Hare, E., & O'Donohue, W. (1998). Sexual harassment: Identifying risk factors. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 27(6), 561–579.

Oakley, A. (1990). Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms. In Roberts, H. (Ed.). Doing Feminist Research pp 30 – 61. London: Routledge.

Office of Public Sector Information (OPSI (2008). Explanatory Memorandum to the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 (Amendment) Regulations 2008, No 656. [online]. Retrieved, 2nd October, 2008 from:
http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2008/em/uksem_20080656_en.pdf

Osman, S. L. (2004). Victim Resistance: Theory and Data on Understanding Perceptions of Sexual Harassment. Sex Roles, 50(3/4), 267 – 275.

Parr, J. (1998). Theoretical Voices and Women's Own Voices: The Stories of Mature Women Students. In Edwards, R. & Ribbens, J. (Eds.). Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research pp 87 - 102. London: Sage Publications.

Phipps, A. (2009). Rape and Respectability: Ideas About Sexual Violence and Social Class. Sociology, 43(4), 667 – 682.

Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, Catharsis, or Cure? Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 16(2), 175 – 196.

Pina, A.; Gannon, T. A. & Saunders, B. (2009). An Overview of the Literature on Sexual Harassment: Perpetrator, Theory and Treatment Issues. Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 14, 126 – 138.

Plummer, K. (1995). Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds. London: Routledge.

Popovich, P. & Warren, M. (2010). The Role of Power in Sexual Harassment as a Counterproductive Behaviour in Organizations. Human Resources Management Review, 20, 45 – 53.

Pryer, A. (2001). 'What Spring Does With the Cherry Tree': The Eros of Teaching and Learning. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 7(1) 75 – 88.

Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual Harassment Proclivities in Men. Sex Roles, 17, 269–290.

Pryor, J. B. (1995). The Phenomenology of Sexual harassment: Why does Sexual Behavior Bother People in the Workplace. Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 47, 160–168.

Pryor, J. B., & Stoller, L. M. (1994). Sexual Cognition Processes in Men who are High in the Likelihood to Sexually Harass. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 163–169.

Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). A Social–Psychological Model for Predicting Sexual Harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 51, 69–84.

Pryor, J. B., LaVite, C. M., & Stoller, L. M. (1993). A Social Psychological Analysis of Sexual Harassment: The Person/Situation Interaction. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42, 68–83 (Special Issue).

Pryor, J. B., & Meyers, A. B. (2000). Men who Sexually Harass women. In L. B. Schlesinger (Ed.), Serial offenders: Current Thought, Recent Findings, Unusual Syndromes pp. 207–228. Boca Raton. FL: CRC Press.

Purkiss, D. (1995). The Lecherous Professor Revisited: Plato, Pedagogy and the Scene of Harassment. In Brant, C. & Too, Y. L. (Eds.). Rethinking Sexual Harassment pp 189 - 219. London: Pluto Press.

Quinn, B. (2002). Sexual Harassment and Masculinity: The Power and Meaning of 'Girl Watching'. Gender & Society, 16, 386 - 402.

Quinn, R. (1977). Coping with Cupid: The Formation, Impact and Management of Romantic Relationships in Organisations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22(1), 30–45.

Rabinowitz, V. C. (1990). Coping with Sexual Harassment. In Paludi, M. A. (Ed.). Sexual Harassment on Campus pp 103 - 118. New York: State University of New York Press.

Ramage, C. (2004). Negotiating multiple roles: link teachers in clinical nursing practice. Issues and Innovations in Nursing Education, 45(3), 1-10.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1987). Sex and Violence in Academic Life or You Can Keep a Good Woman Down. In Hanmer, J & Maynard, M (Eds.). Women, Violence and Social Control pp 61 – 74. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1998). Feminism and the Problem of Patriarchy. In Sim, S. (Ed). Post-Marxism: A Reader pp 173 – 183. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ramazanoglu, C. (Ed.). (1993). Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Feminism and Foucault. London: Routledge.

Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A Narcissistic Personality Inventory. Psychological Reports, 45, 590.

Rasmussen, B. (2005). An Intersubjective Perspective on Vicarious Trauma and its Impact on the Clinical Process. Journal of Social Work Practice, 19(1), 19 – 30.

Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist Methods in Social Research. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, K. H. (2005). Reinforcing Hegemonic Masculinities Through Sexual Harassment: Issues of Identity Power and Popularity in Secondary Schools, Gender and Education, 17(1), 19 – 37.

Roiphe, K. (1994). The Morning After: Sex, Fear and Feminism. London: Hamish Hamilton Limited.

Roosmalen, E. V. & McDaniel, S. A. (1999). Sexual Harassment in Academia: A Hazard to Women's Health. Women & Health, 28(2), 33 – 54.

Rouse, J. (2003). Power/Knowledge. In Gutting, G. (Ed.). The Cambridge Companion to Michel Foucault, 2nd Edition pp 95 – 122. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubenstein, M. (1987). The Dignity of Women at Work: A Report on the Problems of Sexual Harassment in the Member States of the European Community, COM V/412/87

Rubin, L.; Hampton, B. R. & McManus, P. W. (1997). Sexual Harassment of Students by Professional Psychology Educators: A National Survey. Sex Roles, 37(9/10), 753 – 771.

Rubin, P. N. (1995). Civil rights and criminal justice: primer on sexual harassment. National Institute of Justice [on-line]. Retrieved October, 2008 from: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/txtfiles/harass.tx>

Samuels, H. (2003). Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: A Feminist Analysis of Recent Developments in the UK. Women's Studies International Forum, 26, 467 – 482.

Sawicki, J. (1991). Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, Power and the Body. London: Routledge.

- Sbraga, T. P., & O'Donohue, W. (2000). Sexual harassment. Annual review of sex research, vol. XI. [on-line]. Retrieved July, 8th 2008 from: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3778/is_200001/ai_n8901651/pg_1?tag=artBody:col1
- Schacht, S. P., & Atchison, P. H. (1993). Heterosexual Instrumentalism: Past and Future Directions. Feminism and Psychology, 3, 37–53.
- Schneider, B. E. (1991). Put Up and Shut Up: Workplace Sexual Assaults. Gender & Society, 5(4), 533–548.
- Schneider, M. & Philips, S. (1997). A Qualitative Study of Sexual Harassment of Female Doctors by Patients. Social Science and Medicine, 45(5), 669 – 676.
- Schulz, V. (1998). Reconceptualizing Sexual Harassment. Yale Law Journal, 107(6), 1683–1805.
- Schweinle, W.; Cofer, C. & Schatz, S. (2009). Men's Empathic Bias, Empathic Inaccuracy and Sexual Harassment. Sex Roles, 60, 142 – 150.
- Scott, J. C. (1990). Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts. London: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. W. (1992). Experience. In Butler, J & Scott, J. W. (Eds.). Feminists Theorise the Political, pp 22 – 40. New York: Routledge.
- Scourfield, J. & Welsh, I. (2002). New Times or Same Old Story? Risk, Reflexivity and Social Control in Child Protection. Working Paper Series, Paper 23, School of Social Sciences: Cardiff University.
- Seghorn, T., & Cohen, M. (1980). The Psychology of the Rape Assailant. In W. Curran, A. McGarry, & C. Petty (Eds.). Modern Legal Medicine, Psychiatry, and Forensic Science pp. 320–344. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis.
- Sheffey, S., & Tindale, R. S. (1992). Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22(19), 1502–1520.
- Sheridan, A. (1980). Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An Intersectional Perspective. Sex Roles, 59, 301 – 311.
- Siegel, R. B. (2004). Introduction: A Short History of Sexual Harassment. In MacKinnon, C. A. & Siegel, R. B. (Eds.). Directions in Sexual Harassment Law pp 1 - 39. London: Yale University Press.
- Sikes, P. (2006). Scandalous Stories and Dangerous Liaisons: When Female

Pupils and Male Teachers Fall in Love. Sex Education, 6(3), 265 – 280.

Sizoo, E. (1997). How Women Change Places and Women. in Sizoo, E. (Ed.). Women's Life Worlds 221 – 248. London: Routledge,

Skaine, R. (1996). Power and Gender: Issues in Sexual Dominance and Harassment. Mc Farland

Skeggs, B. (1997). Formations of Class and Gender: Becoming Respectable. London: Sage.

Skeggs, B. (2004). Class, Self, Culture. London: Routledge.

Smart, C. (1989). Feminism and the Power of Law. London: Routledge.

Smith, C. (2002). Punishment and Pleasure: Women, Food and the Imprisoned Body. The Sociological Review, 50(2), 197 – 214.

Smith, D. E. (2004). Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology. In Hesse-Biber, S.H. & Yaiser, L. (Eds.). Feminist Perspectives on Social Research pp 27 - 38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soper, K. (1993). Productive Contradictions. In Ramazanoglu, C (Ed.). Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism pp 29 – 50. London: Routledge.

Spender, D. (1985). Man Made Language, 2nd Edition. London: Pandora.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1999). An analysis of empirical estimates of sexual aggression, victimisation and perpetration. Violence and Victims, 14, 241–260.

Stamler, V. L. & Stone, G. L. (1998). Faculty – Student Sexual Involvement. London: Sage.

Standing, K. (1998). Writing the Voices of the Less Powerful. In Ribbens, J. & Edwards, R. (Eds.). Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research. pp 186 - 202. London: Sage Publications.

Stanko, E. (1996). Reading Danger: Sexual Harassment Anticipation and Self Protection. In Hester, M.; Kelly, L. & Radford, J. (Eds.). Women, Violence and Male Power pp 50 – 62. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Stephens, T. & Hallas, J. (2006). Bullying and Sexual Harassment: A Practical Handbook. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.

Stockdale, M. (1998). The Direct and Moderating Influences of Sexual Harassment Pervasiveness, Coping Strategies and Gender on Work-Related Outcomes. Psychology of Women's Quarterly, 22, 379 – 392.

Stockdale, M. S. (1993). The Role of Sexual Misperceptions of Women's Friendliness in an Emerging Theory of Sexual Harassment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42, 84–101.

Stockdale, M. S. (Ed.). (1996). Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Perspectives, Frontiers, and Response Strategies. Women and Work: A Research and Policy Series, vol. 5. London: Sage.

Strine, M. (1992). Understanding “How Things Work”: Sexual Harassment and Academic Culture. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 20, 391 – 400.

Studd, M. V., & Gattiker, U. E. (1991). The Evolutionary Psychology of Sexual Harassment in Organizations. Etology and Sociobiology, 12, 249–290.

Talbot, A. (2011). The Equality Act 2010: Changes to Previous Law. Private Client Business. 2, 104-109.

Tang, N. (2002). Interviewer and Interviewee Relationships Between Women. Sociology, 36(3), 703 – 721.

Tangri, S. S., Burt, M. R., & Johnson, L. B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 33–54.

Tangri, S., & Hayes, S. (1997). Theories of Sexual Harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.). Sexual Harassment: Theory, Research, and Treatment pp. 112–128. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Taylor, Y. (2009). Complexities and Complications: Intersections of Class and Sexuality. Journal of Lesbian Studies, 13(2), 189 – 203.

Terpstra, D. E. & Baker, D. D. (1986). A Framework for the Study of Sexual Harassment. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 7(1) 17 – 34.

Tester, G. (2008). An Intersectional Analysis of Sexual Harassment in Housing. Gender & Society, 22, 349 – 366.

Thapar-Bjorkert, S. & Henry, M. (2004). Reassessing the Research Relationship: Location, Position and Power in Fieldwork Accounts. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 7(5), 363 – 381.

Thomas, A. (2004). Politics, Policies and Practice: Assessing the Impact of Sexual Harassment Policies in UK universities. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 25(2), 143 – 160.

Thomas, A. M. (1997). Men Behaving Badly? A Psychosocial Exploration of the Cultural Context of Sexual Harassment. In Thomas, A. & Kitzinger, C. (Eds.). Sexual Harassment: Contemporary Feminist Perspectives, pp 131 – 153. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Thompson, K. (2003). Forms of Resistance: Foucault on Tactical Reversal and Self-Formation. Continental Philosophy Review, 36, 113 – 138.

Till, F. J. (1980). Sexual Harassment: A Report on the Sexual Harassment of Students. Washington: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programmes.

Timmerman, G. & Bajema, C. (1999). Incident and Methodology in Sexual Harassment Research in Northwest Europe. Women's Studies International Forum, 22, 673 – 681.

Timmerman, G., & Bajema, C. (1998). Sexual Harassment in European Workplaces. European Commission, (1998). Sexual Harassment in the European Union. pp. 1–148.

Townsley, G. & Geist, P. (2000). The Discursive Enactment of Hegemony: Sexual Harassment and Academic Organising. Western Journal of Communication, 64(2), 190 – 217.

Trethewey, A. (1997). Resistance, Identity and Empowerment: A Post Modern Feminist Analysis. Communication Monographs, 64, 281 – 301. University of New York.

US Merit Systems Protection Board (1981). Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Is it a Problem? Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

US Merit Systems Protection Board (1988). Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: An Update. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

US Merit Systems Protection Board (1994). Working for America: An Update. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office.

Valentine, G. (2007). Theorizing and Researching Intersectionality: A Challenge for Feminist Geography. The Professional Geographer, 59(1), 10 – 21.

Valverde, M. (2004). Experience and Truth Telling in a Post-humanist World: A Foucauldian Contribution to Feminist Ethical Reflections. In Taylor, D. & Vintges, K. (Eds.). Feminism and the Final Foucault pp 67 – 90. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Vaux, A. (1993). Paradigmatic assumptions in sexual harassment research: Being guided without being misled. Sexual harassment in the workplace [Special issue]. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42, 116–135.

Vogt, D.; Bruce, T. & Stafford, J. (2007). Attitudes Towards Women and Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Amongst Reservists. Violence Against Women, 13, 879 – 900.

- Walsh, V. (2002). Equal Opportunities Without 'Equality': Redeeming the Irredeemable. In Howie, G. & Tauchert, A. (Eds.). Gender, Teaching and Research in Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century pp 33 - 45. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Ward, T., Polaschek, D. L. L., & Beech, A. R. (2006). Theories of Sexual Offending. Wiley series in Forensic Clinical Psychology.
- Warner, L. R. (2008). A Best Practices Guide to Intersectional Approaches in Psychological Research. Sex Roles, 59, 454 – 463.
- Watson, H. (1994). Red Herrings and Mystifications: Conflicting Perceptions of Sexual Harassment. In Brant, C. & Too, Y. L. (Eds.). Rethinking Sexual Harassment pp 65 - 81. London: Pluto Press.
- Wear, D.; Aultman, J. Borgers, N. (2007). Rethorising Sexual Harassment in Medical Education: Women Students' Perceptions at Five US Medical Schools. Teaching and Learning in Medicine, 19, 20 – 29.
- Weedon, C. (1997). Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Weeks, J. (1985). Sexuality and its Discontents: Meaning, Myths and Modern Sexualities. London: Routledge.
- Welsh, S.; Carr, J.; MacQuarrie, B. & Huntley, A. (2006). 'I'm Not Thinking of it as Sexual Harassment': Understanding Sexual Harassment across Race and Citizenship. Gender & Society, 20(1), 87-107.
- Williams, C. (1997). Sexual Harassment in Organizations: A Critique of Current Research and Policy. Sexuality Culture, 1, 19 – 43.
- Williams, C. L., Giuffre, P. A., & Dellinger, K. (1999). Sexuality in the workplace: Organisational control, sexual harassment and the pursuit of pleasure. Annual Review of Sociology, 25, 73–93.
- Willness, C., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. Personnel Psychology, 60, 127–162.
- Wilson, F. (2000). The Social Construction of Sexual Harassment and Assault of University Students. Journal of Gender Studies, 9(2), 171-187.
- Wise, S. & Stanley, L. (1987). Georgie Porgie: Sexual Harassment in Everyday Life. London: Pandora Press.
- Wise, S. & Stanley, L. (1993). Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology. London: Routledge.

- Wolhuter, L.; Olley, N. & Denham, D. (2009). Victimology: Victimisation and Victims' Rights. London: Routledge.
- Wood, J. T. (1992). Telling Our Stories: Narratives as a Basis for Theorising Sexual Harassment. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 20, 349 – 362.
- Wood, J. T. (1994). Saying it Makes it So: The Discursive Construction of Sexual Harassment. In Bingham, S. G. (Ed.). Conceptualising Sexual Harassment as Discursive Activity pp 17 - 32.. Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Woods, K.; Buchanan, N. & Settles, I. (2009). Sexual Harassment Across the Colour Line: Experiences and Outcomes of Cross-Versus Intra-racial Sexual Harassment Among Black Women. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15, 67 – 76.
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2008). Multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women: Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses [on-line]. Retrieved, September 2008 from: http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/en/index.html
- Young, R (1981). Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Zalk, S (1990). Men in the Academy: A Psychological Profile of Harassment. In Paludi, M (Ed.). Ivory Power pp 125 – 141. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Zippel, C. (2006). The Politics of Harassment: A Comparative Study of the US, the European Union and Germany. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

University of Derby Letterhead

Information about the research:

I am a PhD student at the University of Derby and I am researching women's experiences of sexual harassment from male lecturers during their time as a student of higher education.

I would like to interview you about your experiences of sexual harassment. If you choose to take part in this research, you are free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason. You can ask for the information provided to be destroyed at any time up until the data has been anonymised.

The information I collect from this research will be confidential. Interview transcripts will be kept in a locked drawer and all identifying features (for example your name and your university) will be removed.

If you have any concerns, you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Kristin Aune, at the University of Derby on 01332 591428 or email: k.aune@derby.ac.uk

Certificate of consent:

I have read the foregoing information. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about it and any questions that I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I can withdraw from this research at any time and I consent voluntarily to participate in this research.

Print Name of Participant _____

Signature of Participant _____

Date _____

Tabular Presentation of Previous Studies on Sexual Harassment *

Authors	Year	Sample Size	All Harassment		Harassment from Lecturers	
			Sexual Violence	Sexual Harassment	Sexual Violence	Sexual Harassment
Till US.	1980	259 data sets (including researchers on sexual harassment, administrators, student governments, campus women's centres, national student organisations & professional education associations).				Defines the sexual harassment of students as: 'an increasingly visible problem of great, but as yet unascertained, dimensions'. Most SH goes unreported – even when extreme. It is noted that there are 5 levels of sexual harassment ranging from 1 (generalised sexist remarks or behaviour) to 5 (sexual assaults).
US Merit Systems Protection Board	1981	20, 000 federal employees.			42% of women and 15% of men reported sexual harassment. Many victims reported	

<p>US.</p>				<p>repeat victimisation. The most common experience was 'unwanted sexual remarks'. The least common experience 'actual or attempted rape or sexual assault'.</p>		
<p>Eagly & Wood UK.</p>	<p>1982</p>	<p>470 male students and 425 female university students (895 in total).</p>		<p>How gender stereotypes (including job status, male and female interactions, perceived compliance of women and behavioural compliance) influence perceptions of sexually harassing behaviour.</p>		
<p>Tangri, Burt & Johnson US.</p>	<p>1982</p>	<p>20, 083 members of the federal workforce.</p>		<p>Exploring the 3 main models of sexual harassment: natural/biological, organisational model and socio-</p>		

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

	<p>Dziech & Weiner US.</p>	<p>1984</p>	<p>No identified sample size.</p>		<p>cultural model. No clear-cut support emerged for any of these models, suggesting that a more nuanced and complex approach is needed.</p>		<p>Sexual harassment in academia is systematic and endemic. Social constructions and myths about college women influence behaviour and experiences. The balance of power is held by male lecturers who support each other in their harassment of female students.</p>
	<p>LaFontaine & Tredeau US.</p>	<p>1986</p>	<p>160 women in traditional male occupations</p>		<p>Women in male defined occupations were likely to experience sexual harassment. As with sexual violence,</p>		

<p>Kelly</p>	<p>1987</p>	<p>In depth interviews with 60 women. Follow up interviews with 48 women.</p>	<p>Women's experiences of sexual violence moves from choice, to pressure, to coercion to force. This continuum acknowledges that all women experience sexual violence at some point in their lives and avoids the false distinction</p>	<p>experience of harassment negatively impacts upon women's feelings of safety and security. Organisations with high equal employment opportunities reported less sexual harassment than those with low opportunity.</p>		
--------------	-------------	---	---	--	--	--

Pryor	1987	Study 1: 117 male undergraduate students. Study 2: 185 male undergraduate students.	between 'victims' and 'other women'.	The likelihood of sexual harassment can be reliably measured and this measure correlates with attitude and belief measures. Individual differences (e.g. poor social skills) may be important in 'less serious' harassment. Men who are likely to harass are more likely to hold traditional sexual beliefs, low empathy and higher rape proclivities.		
Kelly	1988	60 in depth interviews with women victims of sexual violence.	Sexual violence as a continuum – most women have experienced sexual violence			

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

<p>Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold & Ormerod US.</p>	<p>1988.</p>	<p>235 male faculty members of a prestige university.</p>	<p>in their lives. This may include sexual harassment, pressure to have sex, coercive sex, sexual abuse and rape (amongst others). This forms a part of women's reality – many forms of sexism women encounter everyday.</p>			<p>37% admitted initiating personal relationships with female students. 25% indicated that they had dated female students. 11% indicated that they had attempted to 'stroke, caress or touch' female students. 6% believed they had been sexually</p>
---	--------------	---	--	--	--	---

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

US Merit Systems Protection Board	1988	8, 523 federal employees (a comparison with 1980 survey).		42% of women and 14% of men reported sexual harassment. Compared to 1980 survey, more federal workers are now more inclined to define certain behaviours as sexual harassment. The most frequent form of harassment was 'unwanted sexual teasing, jokes, remarks or questions'. The least frequent was 'actual or attempted rape or assault'.		harassed by their female students.
Eagly & Mladinic	1989	99 men and 104 women (total of 203 students).		Attitude theory is used to analyse how men and women relate to gender stereotypes. Subjects did not		

					universally perceive women in a positive manner. However, the research does challenge the idea that people hold negative stereotypes about women.		
Grauerholz UK.	1989	208 female lecturers at a major university.					Contrapower harassment between female lecturers and male students. This reflects cultural power differences between men and women. However, the students lack of power and authority does change the experiences of sexual harassment.
Malovich & Stake	1990	224 undergraduate students.					Female students least aware of sexual harassment and its potential harm were high

	Rabinowitz	1990	Review of existing literature.			<p>self-esteem women with traditional gender roles. Responses were measure against the Performance Self Esteem Scale (PSES) and Attitudes Towards Women Scale (AWS).</p>
						<p>Sexual harassment in academia is experienced as 'a particularly devastating betrayal of trust'. The power that the professor holds over the student makes it easier for harassment to occur and more likely that that the victim will blame themselves. 'Sexual harassment syndrome' describes the</p>

Fitzgerald & Weitzman	1990	Using existing data including the US Merit Systems Protection Board (1981).				physical and emotional symptoms often suffered.
Ellis, Barak & Pinto Israel.	1991	138 women employed in 4 organisations.		Exploring actual and perceived sexual harassment and the differences between the two. The higher the severity of the harassment correlated with the tendency to perceive the behaviours as sexually harassing.		Men who sexually harass women (including male professors & female students) have no easily identifiable characteristics by which they can be distinguished. The harasser is the 'average man'.
Niebuhr &	1991	Data from		To explore the		

<p>Boyles US.</p>		<p>existing military survey</p>		<p>impact of ethnicity on experiences of sexual harassment. Although there was some interaction between gender, status, ethnicity and harassment, the main effect of ethnicity on harassment was not clarified.</p>		
<p>Schneider US.</p>	<p>1991</p>	<p>A report on 64 cases of attempted or actual rape of heterosexual and lesbian women.</p>	<p>It is the victim of rape (rather than the perpetrator) that is considered deviant. Cases of sexual assault (and sexual harassment) in the workplace go underreported. Women cope with sexual assaults in the workplace in a variety of way, including leaving the job.</p>			
<p>Heward &</p>	<p>1992</p>	<p>A review of</p>				<p>Within the current</p>

Taylor UK.		existing equal opportunities in higher education.				financial climate, equal opportunity policies are not likely to find favour in higher education institutions. However, the new market (with students from more diverse backgrounds) are likely to push forward stronger and more effective policies.
Sheffey & Tindale US.	1992	114 males and 120 female undergraduates.		Ambiguous behaviours are far more likely to be perceived as sexual harassment in male dominated and mixed settings than in female dominated settings. This suggests some support for the sex role spillover model.		
Fitzgerald	1993	Review of literature		The data suggests that one in every		

US.				two women will be harassed at some point in their academic or working lives. Harassment can be experienced as frightening or degrading and have both career and psychological consequences.	
Fitzgerald & Shullman US.	1993	An overview of the research.		Sexual harassment has been documented since the industrial revolution and can be harmful to women's career development. Future research should be multi-level and multi-disciplinary.	
Komaromy, Bindman, Haber & Sande US.	1993	133 medical students (men and women)			Female students were more likely to have been physically harassed than the male students.

<p>Pryor & Stoller US.</p>	<p>1994</p>	<p>40 subjects (20 male and 20 female) undergraduates.</p>		<p>Cognitive processes that underlie sexual harassment proclivities in men. Sexuality and social dominance were linked through cognitive processes to produce a higher likelihood of sexual harassment.</p>		<p>The women's harassers were of higher professional status. More women than men reported a negative impact on their performance at work.</p>
<p>US Merit Systems Protection Board</p>	<p>1994</p>	<p>13, 432 federal employees. General questions about satisfaction with job / working environment.</p>		<p>Although the differences are small, generally more men felt treated unfairly than women, particularly with regard to</p>		

				<p>promotions and awards. Women reported discrimination based on gender only slightly more frequently than men. No specific questions on sexual harassment were asked.</p>		
<p>Barak, Pitterman & Yitzhaki Israel.</p>	<p>1995</p>	<p>Sample 1 (60 working women exposed to Western-style society). Sample 2 (60 kibbutz women).</p>		<p>The overall rates of reported sexual harassment were similar in both samples. Reactions to sexual harassment were also similar. These findings question models of harassment based on power differentials between men and women.</p>		
<p>Pryor US.</p>	<p>1995</p>	<p>2, 600 working men and women.</p>		<p>Exploring how people interpret sexually harassing</p>		

					behaviours. Conditional reasons for identifying sexual harassment included exploitation of power and unprofessional behaviour.		
Pryor, Giedd & Williams US.	1995	Review of data from 1994 survey and existing literature.			Social norms in specific organisation contexts may permit sexual harassment. When persons with high likelihood to harassment are placed in such conditions, sexual harassment is more likely to occur.		
Barling, Dekker, Loughlin, Kelloway, Johnson	1996	202 female workers and 137 male workers.			The frequency of sexual harassment influences workplace negative mood which, in turn, predicts poor		

Canada.					well being, workplace relationships and job dissatisfaction.		
Collinson & Collinson UK.	1996	Interviews with 5 women (drawn from a wider sample [for previous research] of 45 male and female junior and senior managers of life insurance.			Sexual harassment for women in non traditional work environments may be more extensive and problematic than for women working in traditional female occupations. Women had a variety of strategies and coping responses to deal with sexual harassment including resistance, integration, indifference, distancing, denial & exclusion.		
Kosson, Kelly & White	1997	378 college men. US.				Uses the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), the Socialisation	

<p>Rubin, Hampton & McManus US.</p>	<p>1997</p>	<p>From a broad sample of 750 members of the American Psychological Association, 240 educators (from 3 educational departments) were selected.</p>			<p>Scale and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. University men with higher psychopathic traits committed more sexual violence than students with lower scores.</p>	
<p>Driscoll, Kelly</p>	<p>1998</p>	<p>Study 1: 36 men</p>		<p>Men who differ in</p>		<p>As students, women reported experiencing more sexual harassment than men and were more uncomfortable when it happened. Within the teaching departments, there was a strong relationship between the perceived ethics of sexual harassment and its frequency of occurrence.</p>

and Henderson US.		Study 2: 81 men & 76 women.		their likelihood to sexually harass reported more traditional attitudes toward women's roles, had less empathy with women and lower competency ratings in male/female interactions.		
O'Hare & Donohue US.	1998	266 university staff and students.				High risk factors associated with sexual harassment including unprofessional work environments, sexist atmospheres and lack of knowledge regarding formal grievance procedures.
Brogan, Frank, Elon, Sivanesan & Hanlan	1999	10,000 women physicians.		Lesbian physicians had a high chance of experiencing sexual orientation harassment at work. Lesbian physicians were 4		

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

Glomb, Munson, Huijin, Bergman, Dragow US.	1999	217 women.					times more likely than heterosexual physicians to experience sexual orientation based harassment in a medical setting.		
Hurt, Maver & Hoffman	1999	75 men and 51 women (124 in total)					Sexual harassment negatively impacted upon many variables in women's working lives including: job satisfaction, work withdrawal, job withdrawal & psychological well being / distress. To consider 3 rd party evaluators of sexual harassment. Participants were asked to record the appropriateness and judgements of sexually harassing behaviours. The frequency of the behaviour influenced ratings		

	<p>Magley, Hulin, Fitzgerald & DeNardo UK.</p>	<p>1999</p>	<p>12 women working in 3 organisations.</p>		<p>as did the effects of gender and the evaluators own tolerance for harassment. There is a discrepancy between reporting unwanted / unwelcome experiences and labelling these experiences. Women exposed to sexual harassing behaviours experience similar consequences regardless of whether or not they label their experiences as sexual harassment. Thus, organisational culture is important.</p>	
<p>Spitzberg US.</p>		<p>1999</p>	<p>120 studies involving over 100, 000</p>	<p>13% of women and 3% of men have been raped.</p>		

			subjects.	5% of men admit to perpetrating rape. About 25% of men and women have been sexually coerced and to perpetrated sexual coercion. More research is need to clarify mediating variables.			
Timmerman & Bajema The Netherlands	1999	A review of 74 surveys on workplace harassment conducted in 11 Northern and Western European countries.			Workplace sexual harassment was a problem in all the countries, although incident rates vary. Rates of sexual harassment was not seen to be a reflection of national culture but the different definitions and methodologies used.		
Matchen & DeSouza	2000	359 college students and 102 faculty members					An exploration of the socio-cognitive characteristics of

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

US.	(461 in total).				male perpetrators of sexual harassment. The findings link men's sexual harassment to aggression rather than seduction.
Townsley & Geist US.	2000 41 interviews with female students & faculty members who had experienced sexual harassment.				Dominant sexual harassment discourses are evident in participants narratives. The degree of influence from these discourses were dependent on gender and organisational practices and structures. There was also resistance to the gendered subject positions.
Wilson UK.	2000 236 male & female undergraduates & postgraduates in				Gender (rather than just organisational power) impacts

De Judicibus & McCabe	2001	30 female / 32 male workers <u>and</u> 102 female university students / 18 male university students	a Scottish university.			upon individual experiences of sexual harassment. There was a reluctance to label non-contact behaviour as harassing. More research is needed on the social construction of harassment and its impact upon the lived experience.
				Women reported more sexual harassment than men (although the male rate was higher than expected). The majority of respondents attributed little blame to the victim, although men blamed the victim more than women (workers attributed blame to the victim		

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

Wilson & Thompson UK.	2001	From existing literature				more than the students).	Sexual harassment within organisations lies within the exercise of power.	
Golden, Johnson & Lopez US.	2001	150 male and female college students				The effect of attractiveness stereotypes on perceptions of sexual harassment. The attractiveness of the female target was more influential than the attractiveness of the male perpetrator. The effectiveness of attractiveness stereotypes is expected to stem from socio-cultural experiences but may also be linked to evolutionary factors.		
Bagilhole	2002	Semi-structured interviews with 37						University officials found ways of

UK.		men and women from different academic levels working in one pre-1992 university.				circumnavigating equal opportunity policies. Old universities proved resistant to equal opportunities, especially given academic's (male) professional autonomy and subsequent levels of power.
Charlesworth Australia.	2002	A case study of the banking industry.		Sexual harassment as gendered workplace harm. Organisational and legal discourses intersect within the workplace grievance process to individualise and decontextualise sexual harassment.		
Cortina, Lonsway, Magley, Freeman, Collinsworth, Hunter & Fitzgerald	2002	4, 608 practicing attorneys		Nearly 75% of female attorneys had experienced some form of sexual harassment (compared to half of male attorneys).		

<p>US.</p>				<p>Most attorneys responded with avoidance and denial. The effects of sexual harassment on the professional lives of attorneys is discussed, particularly with relevance to social dominance and sex-role spillover theories.</p>		
<p>Hunter Australia</p>	<p>2002</p>	<p>25 men and 25 women (total of 50 interviews)</p>		<p>Women barristers often face discrimination at the Bar. Structural / psychological explanations of this discrimination are not experienced as adequate. However, the discrimination was widespread through all levels and many of the women interviewed aspired towards</p>		

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

DeSouza & Fansler	2003	158 college students and 209 professors (both male and female).		perceived gender neutrality (a signifier for masculinity).		1/3 of the students reported to sexually harassing a professor at least once. Male students were more likely to be the perpetrators. Over half of the professors (male and female) reported harassment by students (although for women the outcome was more psychologically negative).
Illies, Hauseman, Schwochau & Stibal	2003	86, 000 from 55 probability samples. US.		Sexual harassment is more prevalent in organisations with larger power differentials between organisational levels. 58%		

	2003	Uses data on gender from RAE 1996.		women reported experiencing sexual harassment and 24% report experiencing harassment at work.		
Knights & Richards UK.						Review of sex discrimination in UK universities. Women are more likely to be employed on insecure contracts & earn less than male colleagues. The masculine structures of HE disadvantage women.
Lucero, Middleton, Finch & Valentine US.	2003	Using an existing data set (92 arbitrary decisions published in Labor Arbitration Reports).		Developing a typology of sexual harassment perpetrators will protect women from sexual harassing behaviours (identifying likely behaviours and the		

<p>Lee, Heilmann & Near US.</p>	<p>2004</p>	<p>Using an existing data set (LISREL 13, 000 US government employees).</p>		<p>potential threat from such actions). The process of whistle-blowing incidents of sexual harassment is similar to other forms of whistle-blowing. Many cases of sexual harassment continue after reporting and include retaliation.</p>		
<p>Bingham & Battey US.</p>	<p>2005</p>	<p>96 male and female professors.</p>				<p>Discussing social support provider by professors when students report sexual harassment. Professors of both sexes offered various forms of support. Attempting to 'solve' the problem (rather than offering 'solace') was the most common. Professors who</p>

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

							perceived emotional distress in the students (more often the female professors) were more likely to offer pastoral support.
McCabe & Hardman Australia.	2005	251 (176 white collar workers & 75 blue collar workers)		Organisational and individual factors predicted workers' attitudes regarding the tolerance of sexual harassment.			
Huerta, Cortina, Pang, Torges & Magley US.	2006	1, 455 college women					Harassers' power (lecturer over student) increases psychological distress, greater physical illness, impacting upon academic attainment. Regardless of frequency of harassment, academic satisfaction declined.
Ward &	2006	A review of	A development of				

Polaschek		current theories on sexual offending.	strong links between theory and practice. It discusses the separate clinical implications for specific theories.		
Welsh, Carr, MacQuarrie & Huntley Canada.	2006	6 focus groups with women from diverse ethnic background working with a male dominated manufacturing environment.		'Race' and citizenship shape diverse women's definitions of harassment. The term 'sexual harassment' (and its meaning) is interlocked with 'race' and citizenship status. Conceptual and legal understandings of sexual harassment do not often take these complexities into account.	
Gallivan, Halpert & Cellar US.	2007	194 graduate students.		Women were more likely than men to perceive as serious gender harassment,	

Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Approach

				<p>unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion. How organisations were seen to respond to perpetrators of harassment was rated as crucial. Investigations and mild punishments alone were not considered enough to prevent sexual harassment.</p>		
<p>Wear, Aultman & Borgers US.</p>	<p>2007</p>	<p>30 female students at medical school.</p>				<p>Most female students had witnessed or experienced sexual harassment. Medical educators need to be aware of high frequency of sexual harassment and how to better support their female students.</p>
<p>Willness, Steel & Lee</p>	<p>2007</p>	<p>41 studies with a total sample size</p>		<p>Negative consequences of</p>		

<p>US.</p>		<p>of 70, 000.</p>		<p>sexual harassment include decreased job satisfaction, lower organisational commitment, withdrawing from work, ill health (both physical and mental), symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder.</p>		
<p>Bergman & Henning US.</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p>8, 000 male and female military personnel from 4 ethnicity groups.</p>		<p>Organisational group composition differentially affects sexual harassment frequency. Sex is an important moderator in frequency of harassment but ethnicity was not. In addition, sex and ethnicity were not found to moderate the effect of sexual harassment & its impact on emotional and physical well</p>		

<p>Buchanan & Fitzgerald US.</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p>91 African American women involved in a sexual harassment employment lawsuit.</p>		<p>beings. Both sexual harassment and racial harassment significantly contributed to the women's career and psychology outcomes. The interaction between the racial and sexual harassment had an impact upon perceived organisation tolerance of the harassment.</p>		
<p>Chamberlain, Cowley, Tope & Hodson US.</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p>110 published book length ethnographies data on organisational, managerial, worker, and labour force characteristics.</p>		<p>Workplace organisational issues (worker power, workplace culture, and gender composition) impact on both the presence of sexual harassment and the specific form which it takes. Such normative cultures may</p>		

		impede the effectiveness of sexual harassment awareness training.				
Chan, Chun, Chow & Cheung US.	2008	Experiences of sexual harassment are negatively associated with job satisfaction and organisational commitment, emotional well being and distress, and physical health.		Total sample size of 89, 382 men and women.		
Konik & Cortina	2008 US.			629 employees (both male and female, gay and straight) in higher education.		Developing an integrative model of sexualised harassment, gender harassment and heterosexist harassment. Thus, when considering sexual harassment, the interplay and intrinsic links between gender, sexuality and power.

<p>Lonsway, Cortina & Magley US.</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p>337 college students</p>	<p>The development of a psychometric instrument to assess sexual harassment mythology on a parallel rape mythologies. Attitudes and beliefs regarding sexual harassment were widely and persistently held and served to deny and justify male sexual harassment of women. Assessing cultural mythologies will, eventually, enable an understanding of where such beliefs come from and what the impact of these beliefs are.</p>		
<p>Mohipp & Senn Canada.</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p>172 graduate students (involved in undergraduate</p>			<p>A comparison of 'traditional' harassment and contrapower</p>

			teaching).					harassment. Findings suggest that contrapower harassment is often taken less seriously than traditional harassment.
Berdhal & Aquino US.	2009	Study 1: 238 workers (male and female manufacturing and social services workers). Study 2: 1, 004 (male and female university staff).				Study 1: 58% of employees experienced workplace sexual harassment. Study 2: 40% of employees had experienced workplace sexual harassment. Experiences of sexual harassment produced negative work and psychological well being, even for employees who reported enjoying the incident.		
Blackstone, Uggen & McLaughlin	2009	Data from the Youth Development				Targets of harassment are partly selected		

US.			Survey (1,010 adolescents). In addition 33 interviews with 25 – 26 year olds.		because they are perceived to be least likely to report their experiences. Individuals respond to harassment through sets of complex behaviours rather than dichotomous reactions.		
Collinsworth, Fitzgerald & Dragow US.	2009		Study 1: 1, 200 women in a financial industry class-action lawsuit. Study 2: 85 female plaintiffs in sexual harassment litigation.		The severity of the sexual harassment was the most important influence on the symptoms of psychological distress and subsequent impact on health.		
Estrada & Bergren Sweden.	2009		324 officers and cadets in the Swedish military.		Hostile environment harassment was more common than quid pro quo harassment. Harassment often led to decreased job satisfaction.		

				<p>decreased work effectiveness and decreased psychological and physical health.</p>		
<p>Woods, Buchanan & Settles US.</p>	<p>2009</p>	<p>105 black women who had been sexually harassed by a white man (cross-racial harassment) or a black man (intra-racial sexual harassment).</p>		<p>Women experienced cross-racial harassment more negatively (also likely to include racialised sexual harassment). Negative experiences of cross-racial harassment was linked to increased post-traumatic stress symptoms.</p>		
<p>De Haas & Timmerman</p>	<p>2010</p>	<p>1295 female police officers</p>		<p>Male dominated work places support are likely to experience normative male dominance (e.g. sexual bravado, sexual posturing and denigration of feminine</p>		

<p>World Health Organization</p>	<p>2011</p>	<p>Based on the WHO (2010) multi-country study (population study) on women's health, sexual violence and domestic violence.</p>	<p>15 – 71% of women reported physical and/or sexual violence by an intimate partner at some point in their lives. This ranges from 15% of women in Japan and 70% of women in Ethiopia and Peru. This violence has serious short and long term physical, mental, sexual and reproductive health problems for victims and their children.</p>	<p>behaviours). These cultural norms increase the risk of women experiencing sexual harassment.</p>	
----------------------------------	-------------	---	--	---	--

- Samples that involved university students, but which did not situate the research within the specific context of university life, are presented here within the 'all harassment' category.