

## Sexual Harassment: Definitions and gender difference in perception

ELENA L. SAMONTE

Isang kahirapan sa pagbibigay kasagutan sa usapin ng panliligalig na sekswal (sexual harassment) ay ang kawalan ng malinaw, buo at tanggap na kahulugan ng panliligalig na sekswal. Isang pag-aaral ang isinagawa kung saan sinikap magbigay ng kahulugan ng "*sexual harassment*" at posibleng pagkakaiba sa pagpapakahulugan ng mga kababaihan at kalalakihan.

Napag-alaman, na ang mga depinisyon ay umiikot sa pagiging di tanggap nito. Ang talaan ng mga gawi (behavior) ay nagsasaad ng mga tahasang pisikal na pag-atake hanggang sa mga pasalita at di pasalita na mga insultong sekswal. Ilan pang aspetong ginamit ay ang mga sumusunod: mga bagay na may kinalaman sa biktima, ang manliligalig, ang gawi, ang antas ng relasyon, ang pinangyarihan at ang kultura. Malaking impluwensiya ang kultura lalo sa usapin ng paghipo (touch) at tamang gawi ng babae at lalaki. Magkaiba ang pananaw ng mga babae at lalaki sa usaping higit na nailalarawan ng mga babae ang mga detalye at mga masasalimuot na epekto sa emosyon ng biktima. Ipinakita rin ang ilang mga dapat pang pagtuunan ng pansin tulad ng pangangailan pa ng pagtataas ng antas ng kamalayan ng dalawang kasarian tungkol sa mga konsepto at isyung nakaugnay sa *sexual harassment*.

The past few years have seen the topic of sexual harassment making the front pages of Philippine dailies. A few well-known cases involving government officials and personnel as well as State University faculty have called more attention to a social issue that requires greater intervention in terms of research and policy. Certainly, the dearth of any systematic documentation available (Aquino, 1990), makes research in the area a top priority.

Some basic questions that need to be answered are:

- 1) What constitutes sexual harassment?
- 2) How widespread is sexual harassment in the Philippines?
- 3) Do men and women differ in their definitions of sexual harassment?

Part of the problem in answering these questions is the "lack of a clear, concise, widely accepted definition of sexual harassment." (Somers, 1982). A study of Lott and Reilly (Ibid.) defines sexual harassment as a "continuum of behavior ranging from physical sexual assault at one extreme through intimidation (threat or bribery) and encompassing verbal and non-verbal sexual insults on the other end." Similarly, another study by Benson and Thomas (1982, as cited in Somers, 1982) of female seniors at the University of California at Berkeley found that sexual harassment included behavior ranging from stares and comments to physical contact.

What are the statistics regarding its incidence? A survey at the University of California, Irvine of 183 female and 149 male undergraduate student respondents found that 5.5% of the females had experienced subtle pressure to engage in sexual activity in return for a grade, a job, or a promotion on campus, 10.5% of the female students reported that they had been unnecessarily touched, patted or pinched and 8 percent reported that they had or knew of someone who dropped a class or avoided a professor or teaching assistant due to embarrassing sexual language or advances.

Estimates of the incidence of sexual harassment thus differ depending on the definition that one adopts. In the United States, surveys have shown that estimates of the incidence of sexual harassment range from 5% to 40% in academic institutions (Brewer, 1982:150). The estimates are for the most serious forms of harassment, acts which are physically intrusive or coercive. Estimates increase as other behaviors such as

offensive or sexual comments, flirtation and dating requests are taken into consideration. Figures then range from 20% to 60%.

In the Philippines, Republic Act 7877 also known as the "Anti-Sexual Harassment Act of 1995," passed by the Congress of the Philippines, delineates the circumstances that define sexual harassment in an educational or training environment:

- "1) when the sexual favor is made a condition to the giving of a passing grade; or the granting of honors, or the payment of a stipend, allowance or other benefits, privileges or consideration
- 2) when the sexual advances result in an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment for the student, trainee or apprentice."

Although these guidelines specify certain conditions, a study by Samonte (1993), showed different defining features by a random sample of 73 faculty and 419 students from the University of the Philippines. Regression analysis showed that the defining features of faculty and students differed from each other, with the faculty using more features than students. These included more items on the faculty's physical as well as verbal behavior. It also included items on the student's action and the setting. Fourteen percent admitted that they had at some time in their lives been harassed.

If estimates on the incidence of sexual harassment depend on the definition of sexual harassment and if definitions are shaped by beliefs, values, orientations and socialization patterns learned by individuals, the next question to ask is, are there differences in the definitions as far as males and females are concerned? In the case of rape, Burt (1980, as cited in Lonsway and Fitzgerald, 1995) noted that a "cluster of attitudinal variables (traditional gender role attitudes, adversarial sexual beliefs, and acceptance of interpersonal violence) was a strong predictor of rape myth acceptance."

Several explanations have been forwarded to explain sexual harassment (Tangri, Burt & Johnson, 1982). The natural/biological model has two versions: the first argues that such behavior is "merely a natural expression of men's stronger sex drive; the second version stresses that any individual may be attracted to any other individual, and may pursue that attraction without intent to harass." The organizational model "argues that sexual harassment is the result of certain opportunity structures created by organizational climate, hierarchy and specific authority relations." The sociocultural model "argues that sexual harassment reflects the larger society's differential distribution of power and status between the sexes." In this third model, male dominance is generally maintained. Feminist theories argue that "sexual harassment and coercion are used by men to maintain their power advantage over women in society" (Brownmiller, 1975; Farley, 1978; Bohner, Weisbrod, Raymond, Barzvi & Schwarz, 1993 as cited in Bargh, et.al., 1995).

However, research has shown mixed support for these theories as well as differences in the way that men and women perceive sexual harassment. "More men than women hold views consistent with the biological/natural model while more women than men hold views consistent with the sociocultural model." Moreover, "women and men appear to apply the same criteria for using the term 'sexual harassment'," but it appears "women's threshold is lower and they are more bothered by it." (Tangri, Burt & Johnson, op.cit.:51). Women also tend to see sexual harassment as a "power play" more than do men. Why don't men see it as power play? Fitzgerald (1993, as cited in Bargh, 1995) notes that "majority of men who harass may not be aware that they are doing so." Bargh, et.al, (1995) found that there was an automatic power-sex association in men who were likely to sexually harass women. Another difference noted by Abbey (1982) was that "men tend to read sexual intent into friendly behavior" reflective of their greater tendency to make sexual judgments.

Given these differences seen in American data, how do Filipinos view sexual harassment? Is there a difference in the way males and females define and perceive sexual harassment?

### Objectives

The study sought answers to two questions:

- 1) How do UP students define sexual harassment?
- 2) Do males and females differ in their definitions of the phenomenon?

### Method

*Sample:* Two classes of Psychology 145 (Psychology of Language) students participated in the study. This consisted of 61 undergraduate students, mostly junior and senior students.

*Methodology:* Students were asked to write essays on the concept of sexual harassment and non-verbal behavior, focusing on but not limited to, the concept of touch. They were given as guideline for their discussion the nine factors suggested by Hellion and Leper (1993 as cited in Elise and Betty, 1986)<sup>1</sup> that may influence the meaning of touch. Answers were then content analyzed.

### Results/Discussion

Of the 61 respondents, all but one indicated their gender. For the 60 respondents who indicated their sex, there were more females (73%) than males (27%).

<sup>1</sup>The nine factors are: 1) part of body that touched the other 2) part of the body touched 3) duration of contact 4) amount of pressure applied 5) movement after the touch 6) presence of other people 7) people involved 8) relation of the two people 9) situation.

### *Definition Of Sexual Harassment*

The following were the key elements included in the definitions given by the respondents.

1. *Verbal or nonverbal behavior:* Nonverbal behavior is viewed as a more powerful medium for delivering "the message." Perceptions are strongly colored by the cultural norms. Filipinos are described as conservative, reserved and not a "touchy" race
2. *Sexual intent:* This is manifested in the touching of private parts/genitalia or sexual assault (rape).
3. *Non-consent of victim:* Clearly, the victim does not give her consent.
4. *Force:* Often, force and aggression are used.
5. *Invasion/ violation of the other:* One's privacy is invaded; one's body is violated.
6. *Male to female:* Often, it is a male harassing a female.

The essays gave a more extensive description of the key elements as well as other factors that interact and influence one's judgment of an event. Several categories were culled from the answers of the respondents in their description of sexual harassment. These included aspects related to the victim, to the harassed, to the action, level of relationship, to the setting and to the culture.

### *Aspects Related to the Victim*

Various features related to the victim were perceived as characteristics of sexual harassment.

1. *Consent/ approval*: Usually, permission is not asked. There is no consent nor approval given by the victim.
2. *Feelings for the person*: Positive sentiments seem to modify one's perception. If one has positive feelings for the person, such feelings can diminish one's perception of sexual harassment.
3. *Effect on/response of victim*: Since there was no consent, responses manifesting rejection of the intrusion are common: annoyance, anger, resistance (struggle, yelling, shouting, rigidity), fear, sexual injury or harm, trauma, physical, mental or emotional injury. It must be emphasized that harm need not be limited to physical harm but can also include psychological consequences. It can also lead to avoidance and guilt.
4. *Personal norms*: Labeling behavior as sexual harassment is dependent on one's "orientation, framework, values and attitudes." What is involved here is how one interprets the behavior in the light of one's norms. If the behavior is perceived positively, it is labeled as "casual sex, flirting, having fun."

#### *Aspects Related to the Harasser*

There were two factors considered to have a modifying effect on one's perception, i.e., which could make the victim change her assessment of the situation from negative to positive. These are:

1. *Behavior of harasser*: If the harasser is "apologetic" about his behavior, the victim may reconsider her perception of the situation.

2. *Physical characteristics of harasser (attractiveness):*

If the harasser is handsome, the incident may not be judged as harassment but if the person is ugly, it may be perceived as harassment.

The respondents also gave other descriptions and characteristics of a sexual harasser:

1. Can be under the influence of alcohol, drugs, lust.
2. Knows the victim: sometimes it can be one's relative; if it is, then the bonding is not close nor strong.
3. Does things to escape suspicion.
4. His motive is personal, sexual satisfaction, to inflict embarrassment or damage to the person. Men are perceived to be "biologically 'mapusok'" (male respondent). The behavior is intentional, not accidental.
5. As far as status is concerned, harassers are usually high ranking executives or someone with relatively high status compared to the victim.

*Aspects Related to the Action*

1. *Duration of touch:* For touching to be considered sexual harassment, it must be inordinately longer than expected under certain circumstances. For example, comforting someone by rubbing her back may be all right but once the person stops crying or feels better, such rubbing is expected to stop. This variable interacts with "part of body touched." According to one respondent, "the more private a body part is, the less time is allowed for it to be touched."



2. *Pressure of touch*: If after the initial touch or tap, the person still does not withdraw his hand or presses even harder, this is perceived as harassment. If pressure is forceful and hard, this is considered harassment.
3. *Part of body touched*: When private parts of a female (e.g., breast, genital organs, buttocks, lips, legs, midsection, waist, thigh) and/or those of a male (groin, buttocks, upper thighs) are touched by strangers or people who are not given permission to do so, this is perceived as sexual harassment. Touching the female breast is always perceived as sexual harassment irrespective of duration of touch. Touching a man's chest is said to be influenced by amount of pressure applied before it can be perceived as sexual harassment (i.e., the greater the pressure, the more likely it is perceived as harassment).
4. *Part of body used for touching*: The parts of the body used for touching the victim may be private or non-private. These are the mouth, face, hands (used for touching private parts) and genital organs.
5. *Use of verbal statements*: If the person makes statements with sexual overtones and innuendos or are direct expressions of sexual desires, it is easier to label the situation as sexual harassment.  
  
Other examples of verbal behavior are words like: "*wow sexy, pare ang laki ng...*"; *Hanep, pare akin na yan; pabipo naman; pahawak naman...*" Also "*ikukuwatro ba kita o ikukuwarto?*"
6. *Non-verbal behavior*: The following non-verbal behaviors were labeled as sexually harassing:

- eye gaze, winking, following, whistling, peeping, touching student's shoulder, paralanguage (bedroom voice), exhibitionism.
7. *Sexual assault*: This behavior, e.g., rape, is clearly indicative of sexual harassment.
  8. *Distance/space between two people*: Considering that Filipinos usually tend to keep their distance, a male who stands at an intimate distance (0-12 inches) from a female may be perceived to be harassing.<sup>2</sup>

### *Level of Relationship*

Usually those involved in a harassment incident are not related. If they are related, then the bond is not close. For lovers and close friends, touching the other's waist, neck and buttocks is allowed. However, one must take note of other factors which interact with this, e.g., cultural norms. Level of trust is an important factor. A certain behavior would most likely not be interpreted as harassment if it were done by someone that person trusted.

### *Aspects Related to the Setting*

1. *Audience's perception*: If the people around one find a person's behavior to be offensive ("not so nice to those who see them"), this is perceived as sexual harassment.

2. *Location*: The setting may be public places, often associated with negative perceptions, or neutral places like public vehicles. There are places more prone to harassment, e.g., singles bar or a nightclub. The public places may be secluded or semi-

<sup>2</sup>Hall (1959), in his classic research in proxemics, which is "the study of how human beings perceive, structure and use space in which they live, breathe and interact," (Ellis and Beattie, 1986) identified four distance zones which characterize how a person perceives and uses space between him and other people: intimate, personal, social, public.

secluded. Oftentimes, these areas (department store, moviehouse, public market, gatherings) and public conveyances (jeep, bus, LRT) are crowded and the harasser can slip into anonymity.

3. *Presence of other people*: Sexual harassment usually happens when there are just the victim and the harasser. However, it may also happen in a room full of people where the victim is unable to react because she is afraid of attracting attention to herself. One female respondent thought, "*mas malala kung ginawa ang pambabastos sa harap ng madla.*" Female respondents called more attention to the "*biya*" element when others are present. These are shown in the following views: "it is less embarrassing if the 'who' present are family members." Another said, "the harassed feeling increases with decreasing intimacy of others present." Another noted that "if offended party has no one to call [turn to]," the incident can be interpreted as harassment. There seems to be the notion that there is "safety" in being with people one knows or that sexual harassment is less likely in their presence.

4. *Time*: Sexual harassment often happens at night.

5. *Context*: Behavior must always be taken in context. If the occasion calls for touching, e.g., consoling a friend, then it may not be considered sexual harassment. However, if the behavior is not appropriate or is incongruous with previous behavior, e.g., teaching and touching, this is considered harassment. Certain situations/ nonverbal cues are obviously interpreted as sexual harassment, e.g., locking of the door, drawing of curtains, dimming of lights. It was noted by a female respondent that "sexual harassment can and does happen even between lovers or couples going 'steady.' This is when date-rape happens." However, several harassment/rape is hardest to distinguish when the relationship is more intimate.

### *Aspects Related to the Culture*

It was emphasized by many respondents that Filipinos are conservative and conventional. They are "sensitive about

sexually suggestive words or gestures." Filipinos are not demonstrative about their feelings and terminate physical contact as soon as possible. There are certain behaviors not for public display, e.g., touching boyfriend's knee in public is considered not in good taste. This factor interacts with the "audience's" perception.

Moreover, there are differential norms regarding touching by males and females. Touching between persons of the same sex is tolerated more than touching of persons of the opposite sex. A female touching a male is more tolerated than a male touching a female. Proper behavior is emphasized in the socialization of girls and boys such that "women are culturally oriented and enforced to be 'pino, (refined) mahinhin, (feminine)' and pure." Likewise, the men are supposed to be "maginoo." Any deviation from such expectations is considered "sexual harassment."

Certain contexts or situations allow for touching. Touching by a doctor or a mother is allowed especially when the person is sick or not feeling well. Touch by the mother is more tolerated than touch by the father. In general, touching made by family members is allowed.

In the Philippines, the term "chansing" is part of the lexical repertoire of Filipinos. It means taking the liberty/opportunity of touching/ kissing somebody with any body part (hand, legs, lips) without his/her consent. The area touched may be a private part or not. This is described by a female respondent in the following manner:

*"Masagi lamang ang braso't balikat o madampian ang likod ng babae, padaplis na tapik ng kamay o kabit anumang parte, pangtsatsansing."* (Even if one accidentally touched the arm or shoulder or back of a woman, lightly touched the hand or any part, this is "chansing.")

There is no direct translation of the term in English but it is a reality which most, if not all, Filipinos are familiar with.

### *Differences Between Males and Females*

Differences were noted in the responses of males and females. These can be identified within the different aspects of sexual harassment just described.

*Aspects related to the victim.* Females focused more on the finer details of emotions not noted by the males: shame, embarrassment, guilt, feeling of being violated, panic and feeling of helplessness. A female respondent who was harassed by a co-passenger in a jeepney succinctly describes these feelings:

"I wanted to slap his face but I couldn't afford the scandal. Red with anger, I went down the jeepney even when I wasn't supposed to go down yet...unknowingly, my tears were already rolling down my cheeks. I cried my heart out...I was mad at myself because I couldn't fight for myself."

Such details reflect the greater familiarity of the "usual victims" of the processes and feelings they go through when subjected to such behaviors. Responses of males, which tended to be general (e.g., offended, a lot of struggling), may also be reflective of the possible lack of awareness on the part of males of the intricacies and depth of emotions which victims of sexual harassment experience.

Another difference noted was the viewpoint of one male respondent which reflects a sexual harassment myth: "If the receiver does not complain about what the doer is doing, then harassment is eliminated." There seems to be the belief that the victim must verbally or behaviorally express her resistance. However, as noted by the female respondents, emotions such as panic, fear or feeling of helplessness can get the better of them and prevent them from expressing what they feel.

*Aspects related to the harasser.* It is interesting to note that there were hardly any detailed descriptions given by the male respondents regarding the harasser. The female respondents explored not only the behaviors of these respondents but also inferred the values and motivation of harassers, e.g., to appear macho, to embarrass or inflict damage on the victim. One female respondent described men's perception of women as "meat."

*Aspects related to the action.* There were no differences between males and females in judging that the longer the time and the greater the pressure in touching another person, the more likely was the interpretation of sexual harassment. However, some female respondents qualified their answer in the following manner, be it long or short, "kahit na padaplis" (even just a light brushing against the other person) for as long as the male and female involved do not know each other very well, this is considered sexual harassment. Interestingly, a male respondent spoke for the female and noted the difference in perception of pressure: "the pressure of touch is not that important, a touch on the breast is a touch on the breast. However, for the male, touching the chest with more pressure necessarily means a sexual advance."

One male respondent even gave a hierarchy of increasing privacy of body parts of males and females. For the males, this would be upper arms, chest or upper torso, upper thighs, buttocks and genitalia, in that order. For the females, the hierarchy of increasing privacy would be from arms, to thighs, to upper torso, to buttocks, to breast, to genitalia.

The validation of such a dichotomization remains to be seen. What is important is that there is an acknowledgment of difference in perception of what is considered a more private or sensitive part. It would be interesting to validate this with other respondents.

Males and females were unanimous that touching the breast, genitalia and buttocks of a person by strangers was

sexual harassment. These are areas touched only by people one is intimate with, namely one's spouse and for some, one's boyfriend/girlfriend. The moderating variables, in interpreting touching non-sensitive parts of a female would be duration, pressure of touch and relationship between the two persons.

Male and female respondents were unanimous that different parts of the body could be used to touch another person's body part.

As far as verbal statements were concerned, females were more descriptive and detailed in quoting possible statements that male harassers make (See previous section on general verbal statements). Only two male respondents mentioned this variable as "vocal advances" and "threats."

Both male and female respondents pointed to a variety of non-verbal behavior that could be interpreted as sexual harassment: gestures, facial expressions, eye gaze, sexually suggestive body movements, hand movements, etc. Some comments by both males and females pointed to subjective interpretations of the action, e.g., "para siyang hinuhubaran sa tingin" (as though she were being undressed through the person's stare- female respondent); "what makes people recognize cases of sexual harassment is because of the person himself (or herself) and the 'vibrations' emanating from him. It may not be verbal but it could be recognized. 'It' has to be something in his looks, stance, posture, whatever" according to a male respondent.

*Level of relationship.* There were no differences noted in the responses of male and female respondents on this aspect. They both acknowledged that sexual harassment could occur between people who were totally unrelated or who had some relationship, be this as boyfriend/girlfriend, father-daughter, grandfather-granddaughter, uncle-niece, acquaintance.

*Aspects related to the setting.* As far as setting was concerned, there were no differences in the responses of male

and female respondents except perhaps in the focus. Responses from male respondents focused on the variables that must be taken into consideration. These are shown in the following statements:

"It will depend on where the touching is done."

"The main factor would always be part of body touched."

"Factors are all interdependent. Depends on the intentions of toucher and how the intentions are perceived by the 'touchee.'"

"Perception of sexual harassment is even greater if it were man to woman rather than woman to man, if done in private rather than in public, if done by one in authority."

Female respondents, on the other hand, focused more on the "appropriate settings/contexts" for touching another person, e.g., "funerals, one person congratulates the other," "calling the person's attention," "doctor-patient relationship."

*Aspects related to the culture.* Female and male respondents had similar statements regarding the role that culture plays in shaping one's perceptions and interpretations of an event. They both dichotomize gender-related behavior.

### Issues for Concern

Although there were differences between male and female respondents, some areas for concern are introjected beliefs, myths and norms that reflect on the socialization of Filipino children.

*The greater tolerance for touching given to relatives.* Several respondents indicated touching by relatives as "normal." But comments like the following can be disturbing: "a presumed relative would not be prevented from touching the legs or



thighs or other body part of a girl because this is just normal for relatives and besides if the relative is older and viewed as powerful, the victim usually conceded" (male respondent). There seems to be a fusion in the acceptance of norms regarding touching done by relatives and the power of an older relative over a young person. This may prevent people from interpreting behaviors as sexual harassment by relatives.

*Interaction of variables used to define the concept of sexual harassment versus variables that independently account for a behavior being defined as sexual harassment.* There seems to be greater consensus that touching another person in his/her sensitive parts, e.g., genitalia, constitutes sexual harassment. However, touching in other areas, e.g., hand, arm, shoulder may be more open to variability in perception. This seems to be a function of the conservatism-liberalism variable and how one's culture interprets certain behaviors. This seems to imply that as the individual or one's culture becomes more liberal, in all likelihood, the definition of sexual harassment will change accordingly.

*Advice received by respondents from their elders and teachers.* Female respondents were taught by their elders/teachers to respond with passivity and acceptance in cases of sexual harassment. This is reflected in the following statements

"When things like these happen, just don't mind the person and he'd stop. He's only seeking for attention. This was what I did but it didn't work" (referring to what respondent learned from a teacher).

"They say that it's usually helpful to just cooperate. There is another belief too that a shout or shriek may even reinforce the act of sexual harassment. Filipino elders say '*Huwag mo na lang pansinin. Kasi kung babastusin mo iyan, baka gumanti lang siya.*'"

These are disturbing advice since they reinforce the "helplessness" of the victim and prevent the female respondents from doing something to actually stop the harassment.

*Acceptance of certain myths.* Some respondents' statements are reflective of myths that need to be challenged, e.g. "A student wearing micromini skirts and showing an ample area of her cleavage could be said to be sexually harassing her teacher" (male respondent). Male respondents tended to put more emphasis on the use of force. Moreover, they emphasize the "game of exploration" and the "catch me if you can" mentality. One male respondent describes it as "a game of exploration, trial and error, seeing whether he can get away with it and how much 'crime' he can commit without any detrimental effect on him."

The above findings point to dilemmas of Filipino females when confronted with sexual harassment. Males enjoy relatively greater freedom in asserting their maleness and in trying to aggress towards females while females have to bear with such behavior and remain "meek, submissive, and rather weak-willed." (Torres, 1989). What is disturbing is that "Filipino women themselves subscribe to these same notions and values." (*Ibid.*).

There also seems to be a consistent pattern of women attending to more details regarding the action of sexual harassment and their consequent emotions as victims more than men. This may point to critical nuances in levels of awareness of males and females regarding the issue. Males may point to such details as "trivia" (MacKinnon in Eskenazi and Gallen, 1992). However, they may, in fact, shed more light on the interpretation of an action as being sexually harassing.

### Conclusion

There are common elements to the definition of sexual harassment by UP male and female respondents. Definitions contain the elements adopted in the United States of it being unwelcome, consisting of a continuum of behavior ranging from physical sexual assault at one extreme through

intimidation (threat or bribery), and encompassing verbal and non-verbal sexual insults on the other end (Somers, 1982). More descriptively, there were aspects related to the victim, the harassed, the action, the level of relationship, the setting and the culture. Clearly, definitions and conceptualizations were colored by cultural norms, particularly regarding touch and appropriate male-female behavior. Females differed from males in their seemingly greater familiarity with the details and intricacies of the victim's emotions.

There were areas for concern noted from the statements made by some respondents which point to cultural norms perpetuating not only the silence of females and preventing them from taking a more proactive stance against sexual harassment but also the differential morality that seems to rule men and women in Philippine society.

This raises implications for increasing the level of awareness of both males and females not only on the issue of sexual harassment but also of gender issues.

### Bibliography

Abbey, A.

1982 "Sex Differences in Attributions for Friendly Behavior: Do Males Misperceive Females' Friendliness?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 5, pp. 830-838.

Aquino, B.

1990 "Women in the Workplace: The Problem of Sexual Harassment." *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 301-310.

Bargh, J.A. ; Raymond, P.; Pryor, J.B.; and Strack, F.

1995 "Attractiveness of the Underling: An Automatic Power-Sex Association and Its Consequences for Sexual Harassment and Aggression." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68 No. 5, pp. 768-781.

Buss, D.M.

1995 "Psychological Sex Differences. Origins through Sexual Selection." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 164-168.

Carli, L.L.; LaFleur, S.J.; and Loeber, C.C.

1995 "Nonverbal Behavior, Gender, and Influence." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68 No. 6, pp. 1030-1041.

Eagly, A.H.

1995 "The Science and Politics of Comparing Women and Men." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 145-158.

Ellis, A. and Beattie, G.

1986 *The Psychology of Language and Communication*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Eskenazi, M. and Gallen, D.

1992 *Sexual Harrassment*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, Inc.

Fitzgerald, L.F.

1993 "Sexual Harrassment: Violence against Women in the Workplace." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 48 No. 10, pp. 1070-1076.

Gilligan, C.

1982 *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Goodman, L.A.; Koss, M.P.; Fitzgerald, L.F., Russo, N.F. and Keita, G.P.

1993 "Male Violence against Women: Current Research and Directions." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 48, pp. 1054-1058.

Hall, E. T.

1959 *The Silent Language*. New York: Fawcett World Library.

Lonsway, K. A. and Fitzgerald, L.F.

1995 "Attitudinal Antecedents of Rape Myth Acceptance: A Theoretical and Empirical Reexamination." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 704-711.

MacKinnon, Catherine

- 1992 "Sexual Harrassment: The Experience." In Eskenazi, M. and Gallen, D. (Eds). *Sexual Harrassment*. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, Inc.
- Marecek, J.
- 1995 "Gender, Politics, and Psychology's Ways of Knowing." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 162-163.
- Mendoza, E.E.
- 1995 *Gender-Based Violence: A Review of Literature*. Unpublished paper. 16 pp. Submitted to the Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines as partial requirement for Psychology 281.
- Reilly, T.; Carpenter, S.; Dull, V.; and Bartlett, K.
- 1982 "The Factorial Survey: An Approach to Defining Sexual Harrassment Policies and Procedures." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 99-110.
- Riger, S.
- 1991 "Gender Dilemmas in Sexual Harrassment Policies and Procedures." *American Psychologist*, Vol. 46, pp. 497-505.
- Samonte, E.
- 1993 "Sexual Harrassment: Perceptions of U.P. Students and Faculty." *Review of Women's Studies*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 101-145.
- Sato, A.
- 1992 *Understanding Japanese Communication*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.
- Sidanius, J.; Pratto, F.; and Bobo, L.
- 1994 "Social Dominance Orientation and the Political Psychology of Gender: A Case of Invariance." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 67, pp. 998-1011.
- Somers, A.
- 1982 "Sexual Harrassment in Academe: Legal Issues and Definitions." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 23-32.
- Tangri, S.S.; Burt, M.R.; and Johnson, L.B.
- 1982 "Sexual Harassment at Work: Three Explanatory Models." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 33-54.

Torres, A.T.

1989 *Gender Issues and Psychology: The Philippine Situation.*

Paper delivered for the Alfredo V. Lagmay Lecture Series.

Department of Psychology, College of Social Sciences and  
Philosophy, University of the Philippines, February 3, 40 pp.

Weber-Burdin, E. and Rossi, P.H.

1982 "Defining Sexual Harassment on Campus: A Replication  
and Extension." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp.  
111-120.