

## **RESEARCH REPORT**

# **Sexual Harrassment: Perceptions of UP Students and Faculty**

*Elena L. Samonte*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Sexual harrassment, although not a new problem to the victims, was recognized as a social issue in the US only in the mid-70's (Brewer and Berk, 1982:1). It was "closely tied to the issue of social and economic equality of the sexes and to related feminist issues" (*Ibid.*). With this recognition, American social scientists embarked on empirically documenting the nature and frequency of harrassment, "its antecedents and consequents, situational correlates, characteristics of victims and perpetrators, and typical responses to the occurrence of harrassment" (*Ibid.*).

Sexual harrassment has been defined by the American Psychological Association, in the Ethical Principles of Psychologists (*American Psychologist*, 1981) as "deliberate or repeated comments, gestures or physical contacts of a sexual nature that are unwanted by the recipient." As noted by Sandra Schwartz-Tangri, a psychologist who conducted a study on sexual harrassment in the US Federal System (Tangri, et.al., 1982), this definition emphasizes three important aspects: 1) the recipient's definition of the situation 2) the range of behavior that can be viewed as sexual harrassment 3) the range of harrassers. A more recent definition notes that sexual harrassment may consist of a single act or multiple persistent ones (*American Psychologist*, 1992). It also notes that it is "unwelcome, offensive or creates a hostile workplace environment" and that it is "sufficiently severe or intense to be abusive to a reasonable person in the context."

Sexual harrassment has also been explained using three models derived from previous researches, court cases, and legal

defenses: the Natural or Biological model, the Organizational Model and the Socio-cultural Model (Tangri, *et.al.*, 1982:33). Each model suggests certain predictions regarding a) who should be likely victims of sexual harrassment, b) who should be likely harrassers, c) the kinds of acts or behavior to be expected, d) how victims should feel and react to those acts, e) what outcomes and consequences are likely and f) what characteristics of the work situation should be associated with greater harrassment. It is important to look into which model holds greater explanatory power as arguments regarding interpretation of the situation may be better understood when premises and assumptions are clear. Is sexual harrassment seen as 1) simply natural sexual attraction between people (Natural or Biological Model) 2) a result of certain opportunity structures created by organizational climate hierarchy and specific authority relations (Organizational Model) or 3) a reflection of the larger society's differential distribution of power and status between the sexes (Socio-cultural Model) (*Ibid.*: 34)?

In the Philippines, there is a paucity of written material on sexual harrassment. Aquino (1990:306-307) notes that this phenomenon "has not been studied or documented in any manner. No policies or guidelines in dealing with this offense are embodied in the manuals or codes governing personnel conduct in public or private institutions." However, the National Commission on the Role of Women (NCRW) has recognized the problem and will be submitting to the Philippine Congress recommendations for policy making on the matter.

In the US, surveys have shown that estimates of the incidence of sexual harrassment range from 5% to 40% in academic institutions (Brewer, 1982:150). These estimates are for the most serious forms of harrassment (physically intrusive or coercive acts). The estimates increase as other behavior is taken into consideration, "with those experiencing offensive or sexual comments ranging from 20% to 60% of working women, and flirtation and dating requests consistently reported at about 50%-60%" (*Ibid.*).

Sexual harrassment in the academic setting is said to be different from sexual harrassment in the workplace (Benson & Thomas, 1982 as cited in Reilly, *et.al.*, 1982:100). Several factors account for such a difference: 1) the "unique power relationship between a student and her instructor" and 2) the victim's age. Stu-

dents are very much dependent on their professors for grades, recommendations and even research opportunities. Moreover, "due to their youthfulness and lack of experience, female college students often look up to their older instructors, sometimes even in awe. For some, sexual advances from a professor may not even be perceived as sexual harrassment, but instead may be viewed as flattering behavior" (*Ibid.*). Students, are therefore, a vulnerable lot in this relationship.

The negative emotional consequences of sexual harrassment, particularly for students, also cannot be overemphasized. Various studies have shown that students who have been harrassed "consequently avoid taking a class from or working with a particular faculty member, change their major, or leave a threatening situation" (Adams, *et.al.*, 1983; Lott, *et.al.*, 1982 as cited in Riger, 1991:502). They also experience lowered self-esteem (Mc Cormack, 1985 as cited in Riger, *op.cit.*). Moreover, "decreased feelings of competence and confidence and increased feelings of anger, frustration, depression and anxiety" were noted as possible consequents of harrassment (Cammaert, 1985; Crull, 1982; Hamilton, Alagna, King & Lloyd, 1987; Livingston, 1982; Schneider, 1987 as cited in Riger, *op.cit.*). Such a negative impact must be underscored, given the educational institution's commitment to the student's learning and development.

## **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

Given the dearth of information on sexual harrassment in the Philippines, particularly in the academic setting, and its consequent ramifications not only in regard to the individual student but to the society as a whole (especially in terms of value formation), it is important to systematically gather data upon which to base future policies and legislation. This study aims to fill this information gap.

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- 3.1 To describe the perceptions of UP students and faculty on the:
  - 3.1.1 defining features of sexual harrassment
  - 3.1.2 extent of sexual harrasment in the UP campus
- 3.2 To determine the level of consciousness of UP students and faculty on the academic policies regarding sexual harrassment
- 3.3 To determine the possible actions UP students and faculty take regarding sexual harrassment

## **METHODOLOGY**

- 4.1 Sample: Purposive stratified random sampling. Colleges were chosen based on the criterion of dominance by number of gender representation
  - 4.1.1 undergraduate male-dominated colleges:  
College of Engineering, College of Architecture, College of Fine Arts, College of Human Kinetics, and Institute of Islamic Studies
  - 4.1.2 undergraduate female-dominated colleges:  
College of Home Economics, College of Education, College of Mass Communication, Asian Institute of Tourism, and Statistical Center
  - 4.1.3 graduate male-dominated colleges:  
College of Engineering, College of Business Administration, Institute of Islamic Studies
  - 4.1.4 graduate female-dominated colleges:  
College of Home Economics, College of Education, College of Music, College of Social Work and Community Development, and Institute of Library Science

- 4.1.5 Student sample: Four hundred nineteen (419) students, which is five percent (5%)<sup>1</sup> of the population in the identified colleges. Three hundred thirty-four (334) undergraduate students (143 from male dominated colleges and 191 from female dominated colleges) and 85 graduate students (30 from male dominated colleges and 55 from female dominated colleges).
- 4.1.6 Faculty sample: Seventy-three (73) faculty members, which is five percent (5%) of the faculty population in the Diliman campus (as of 1991, there were 1451 faculty members). Proportionate sampling according to rank was done to obtain the sample.
- 4.2 Questionnaire: The questionnaire was patterned after that used by Reilly, Carpenter, Dull and Bartlett, 1982. It consisted of vignettes and direct questions on knowledge of academic policies and possible course(s) of action. The 35 vignettes were brief descriptions of an interaction between a male faculty and a female student. The content of each vignette was computer-generated from a "master file" of eleven descriptive items representing situational and behavioral factors or variables considered potentially relevant to judgments of sexual harrassment. These factors were the:
  - 4.2.1 faculty's status (instructor, professor)
  - 4.2.2 faculty's age (young, old)
  - 4.2.3 faculty's marital status (single, married)
  - 4.2.4 student's academic status (undergraduate or graduate freshman or senior)
  - 4.2.5 number of students present (alone, two)
  - 4.2.6 setting of the interaction

---

1 Due to budgetary constraints, the sample was reduced to half of its original number.

- 4.2.7 nature of any past relationship between the student and the faculty
- 4.2.8 behavior of the student
- 4.2.9 faculty's verbal behavior
- 4.2.10 faculty's physical action
- 4.2.11 presence or absence of promise/threat by the faculty

Variables 4.2.6 to 4.2.11 were classified as either intimate, non-intimate, or ambiguous. These categories were identified through a pre-test of the items.

To ensure control, vignettes were presented in random order, thus resulting in 34 versions of the presentation of vignettes.

For each of the eleven factors, a set of vignette items was created that varied systematically on that factor. Below is an illustration of a vignette resulting from this procedure:

Tess, a senior student, is enrolled in Mr. Katigbak's class. Mr. Katigbak is a young, married instructor. These two have rarely had occasion to talk. One day, at the end of their class, the two started talking. Tess seemed worried and asked about her grades. Mr. Katigbak tried to get Tess to talk about the boys she goes out with and playfully poked her in the ribs.

After reading each vignette, respondents were asked to make a judgment on a fifteen point scale, of the extent to which the incident did or did not constitute an instance of sexual harrassment. The resulting ratings were analyzed using multiple regression, with each vignette serving as the unit of analysis.

The analysis identified the features of an interaction that had the greatest impact on judgments of harrassment when averaged across many different contexts.

- 4.3 Focused Group Discussion: Three groups, consisting of three to five members were interviewed about their concept of sexual harrassment and knowledge of its incidence on campus. These were transcribed and content-analyzed.
- 4.4 Essay on the concept of sexual harrassment and non-verbal behavior, focusing on the concept of touch: Data were gathered from two classes of Psychology 145, Psychology of Language. Students were given as guideline for their discussion the nine factors<sup>2</sup> suggested by Heslin and Alper that may influence the meaning of touch. Answers were content-analyzed.
- 4.5 Analysis of Questionnaire Data — Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, mean, mode, chi square), as well as Spearman rank correlation and regression analysis.

## QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Out of the 502<sup>3</sup> questionnaires distributed, 338 were returned making for a 67.3% rate of return. The rate of return varied across the three types of respondents. It was highest for undergraduates (80%), lower for the graduates (47.9%) and lowest for the faculty (34%). Almost three-fourths (71%) came from female-dominated colleges (Table 1).

### 5.1 Respondent Profile

#### 5.1.1 General profile

There were 221 undergraduates, 47 graduate students and 25 faculty members. Among the three groups, there were more female respondents than males. (Table 2). The majority were single (87.6%) (Table 3).

It was a relatively young sample, the mean age being

---

2 The nine factors are: 1) part of the 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) relationship of two people 9) situation

3 Some colleges requested extra copies for dissemination

22.8 (s.d. = 7.5) (Table 4).

#### 5.1.2 *Student Respondents*

Among the undergraduates, the biggest group represented were seniors (37.1%), followed by juniors (24.6%), sophomores (15.2%) (See Table 5). Of the student respondents, graduate students made up 17.4%.

#### 5.1.3 *Faculty respondents*

The biggest number represented were the instructors (40.9%), followed by the assistant professors (27.3%) and the full professors (22.7%) (Table 6).

### 5.2 **Defining Features of Sexual Harrassment**

Results of the regression analysis showed the following variables to be highly significant in explaining the respondents' judgment of a situation as sexual harrassment or not: (Table 7):

- Promises/threats by Faculty (  $p < .000$ ;  $p < .05$ )
- Past relationship ( $p < .000$ )
- Faculty's verbal behavior ( $p < .05$ )
- Teacher's physical action ( $p < .05$ )

A look at the values for  $R^2$  shows that these variables explained 87% of the differences in the perception of respondents as to whether the situation was sexual harrassment or not.

A comparison of the defining features found to be highly significant ( $p < .000$  to  $p < .05$ ) for the students (Table 8) and those for the faculty (Table 9) revealed a greater number of defining features for the latter. These included more items on the faculty's physical action as well as verbal behavior. It also included items on the student's action, the setting and the number of people in the setting (i.e., whether the student was alone or with others). For the faculty, these variables explained 99% of the differences in perception.

### 5.3 **Ratings of Vignettes by Type of Respondents**

Ratings given by respondents were compared across respondents and vignettes (Table 10). A look at the mean scores shows that though ratings of both faculty and students were similar across vignettes, they differed in their ratings of



those where the student's verbal or non-verbal behavior seemed suggestive.

#### **5.4 Awareness of UP Academic Policies Regarding Sexual Harrassment**

Of the 281 respondents who answered this question, the majority (87.2%) were not aware of any UP academic policies regarding sexual harrassment. The rest (12.8%) indicated they were aware of such policies (Table 11). It would be interesting to find out exactly what they knew of such policies which are non-existent.

#### **5.5 Personally Know Somebody Who Has Been Sexually Harrassed**

To this question, one fourth (25.4%) of the respondents gave a positive reply while the rest answered that they did not know any victim of sexual harrassment (Table 12).

#### **5.6 If Victim Did Anything Regarding the Harrassment Incident**

As shown in Tables 13 and 14, there were more victims who did not do anything about the incident. In general, only about a fourth did anything about it. The main reasons given for doing something about it were: 1) to show guts 2) could not take it anymore 3) why not (Table 15). The main reasons for not doing anything about it were: 1) fear 2) embarrassment 3) both gained from it 4) avoidance of scandal 5) lack of knowledge as to what to do (Table 16).

#### **5.7 Course(s) of Action Respondent Would Take in Case of Harrassment by Faculty**

Responses were ranked according to frequency; occupying first rank across all types of respondents was "reporting to authorities" (e.g., dean, department chair, college secretary, President of the University, etc.).

As to number of courses of action to take, undergraduates listed the greatest number (29) while the faculty had the least number (9) of courses of action. Among the students, females listed twice as many courses of action as the males.

Among the faculty, it was only the female faculty that indicated "no action" and "solve alone."

Male students indicated committing violence as an option. Undergraduate males also noted that their reaction would "depend" on some factors, one of which is their degree of liking for the harrasser.

Undergraduates listed the greatest number of people they could turn to (e.g., parents, police, friends, other teachers, guidance counselor, lawyer, the *Collegian*, hotline). Graduates had less variety (parents, friends, other teachers). Other than the school authorities, the faculty listed only their friends as people to turn to.

Females, more than males, tended to adopt avoidance measures (e.g, avoiding the person, dropping the subject). See Table 17.

#### **5.8 Course(s) of Action Respondent Would Take in Case of Harrassment by Student**

Similar to the preceding results, undergraduates listed more courses of action (29) than graduates (15) or faculty (8). Females also noted down more options than males across all three groups.

One of the primary courses of action not found in the preceding situation was "reprimand."

Female students are more apt to tell their parents than male students. Undergraduates more than graduates and faculty entertain such options as "violence" and "depends if I like the harrasser."

Options which students entertain but which faculty do not are: 1) seeking help from people other than authorities (e.g., friends, guidance counselor, lawyer, other teachers) 2) exposing the harrasser 3) taking revenge 4) establishing proof and getting harrasser sanctioned. See Table 18.

#### **5.9 Course of Action Respondent Would Take in Case of Harrassment by Administrative Personnel**

As in the previous discussions, undergraduates listed the greatest number of courses of action to take. The list of female respondents also outnumbered that of the male respondents.

The primary course of action listed across all types of respondents was "reporting to authorities."

Persons, other than school authorities, to whom undergraduate students would turn are: parents, police, friends, the *Collegian*, other teachers, guidance counselor and lawyer. Graduate students would turn only to parents and friends while faculty would tell other teachers. See Table 19.

#### 5.10 Personal Experience of being Sexually Harrassed

Of the 71 who responded, there were 68 who indicated their gender. Of this number, more females (76.1%) than males (19.7%) have been sexually harrassed at some point in their lives (Table 20).

Proportionate to the sub-sample, a greater percentage of the faculty have experienced sexual harrassment (31.6%) as compared to the students (21%).

#### 5.11 Identity of Harrasser

As shown in Table 22, 15.5% of those who responded to the question were harrassed by their teacher. Of this proportion, there were more females than males who experienced harrassment from their teacher. Other harrassers were: fellow passenger (jeep/bus), stranger, classmate, boss, gays, co-worker, movie viewer, males, relatives, neighbors, friend, etc.

## RESULTS OF ESSAY

There were sixty respondents. One did not indicate his/her gender. But of the rest who indicated their gender, almost three fourths (72.9%) were female and the rest (27.1%) were male.

### 6.1 Factors Involved in the Definition of Sexual Harrassment

6.1.1 *Consent/approval*: If there is consent or approval, then it is less likely to be considered as harrassment.

6.1.2 *Feelings for the person*: If one has positive feelings for the person, such feelings can diminish one's perception of sexual harrassment.

- 6.1.3 *Level of relationship*: 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 harrassment if it were done by someone that the person trusted.
- 6.1.4 *Cultural norms*: It was noted that Filipinos are not demonstrative about their feelings; they terminate contact as soon as possible. There are certain forms of behavior not for public display, e.g., touching boyfriend's knee in public, is 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 the persons of the same sex is more tolerated than touching of persons of the opposite sex. A female touching a male is more tolerated than a male touching a female. 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 by family members is allowed.

- 6.1.5 *Audience's perception*: If the people around one find one's behavior offensive ("not so nice to those who see them"), this is perceived as sexual harrassment.
- 6.1.6 *Duration of touch*: Inordinately longer than expected under certain circumstances. 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."

- 6.1.7 *Pressure of touch*: If, after the initial touch or tap, the person still does not withdraw his hand, and in fact, presses harder, this is perceived as harassment. If pressure is forceful and hard, this is also considered as a defining feature.
- 6.1.8 *Part of body touched*: When the private parts of a female (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, this is perceived as sexual harassment. However, a touch on the breast is perceived as sexual harassment irrespective of duration of touch but touch of a man's chest is said to be influenced by amount of pressure applied (the greater the pressure, the more likely is the perception of sexual harassment).
- 6.1.9 *Location*: Secluded and semi-secluded areas; singles bar, nightclub are more prone to instances of sexual harassment. Sexual harassment may also take place in a crowded vehicle (jeep, bus, LRT) or crowded place (department store, movie house, public market, gatherings, Cubao) where the harasser is anonymous.
- 6.1.10 *Part of body used for touching*: Use of mouth, face or private parts; use of hands for touching private parts.
- 6.1.11 *Effect on victim*: Resistance (struggle, yelling, rigidity), fear, sexual injury or harm, trauma, physical, mental or emotional injury.
- 6.1.12 *Personal norms*: As influenced by society's norms. Feeling of invasion of one's personal space. If the behavior is received positively, it may be labeled as "casual sex, flirting, having fun, etc." (Male respondent).
- 6.1.13 *Presence of other people*: Usually happens when there are just the two people. However, it may also happen in a room full of people but the vic-

tim is unable to react because she is afraid of attracting attention. One noted that "it is less embarrassing if the ones 'who' are present are family members... the harrassed feeling increases with decreasing intimacy of others present." (Female respondent). Another noted that "if offended party has no one to call [turn to], the incident can be interpreted as harrassment.

- 6.1.14 *Time*: Often happens late at night
- 6.1.15 *Context*: Incongruous behavior to previous behavior, e.g., teaching and touching. Certain situations/nonverbal cues are obviously interpreted as sexual harrassment, e.g., locking of doors, drawing of curtains, dimming of lights.
- 6.1.16 *Behavior of Harrasser*: If the person is "apologetic" the "victim" may reconsider her perception of the situation.
- 6.1.17 *Physical Characteristics of Harrasser (Attractiveness)*: If the harrasser is handsome, the incident may not be judged as harrassment but if the person is ugly, it may be perceived as such.
- 6.1.18 *Use of verbal statements*: If the person makes statements which reflect sexual overtones and innuendos or direct sexual desires, it is easier to label the situation as sexual harrassment.

## 6.2 Characteristics of Sexual Harrasser

- 6.2.1 *Can be under the influence of alcohol, drugs, lust*
- 6.2.2 *Knows the victim*: Sometimes, it can be one's relative; if it is, then the bonding is not close, strong.
- 6.2.3 *Does things to escape suspicion*
- 6.2.4 *Motive*: personal, sexual satisfaction; to inflict embarrassment or damage to the person; men are perceived to be "biologically 'mapusok'" (Male respondent); intentional not accidental behavior.
- 6.2.5 *Status*: Usually high ranking executives or someone with relatively high status as compared to the victim.

### 6.3 Manifestations

6.3.1 *Verbal behavior*: words like “wow sexy, pare, ang laki ng..., Hanep, pare, akin na yan, pahipo naman, pahawak naman...” Also, “ikukuwatro ba kita o ikukuwarto?”

6.3.2 *Nonverbal behavior*: eye gaze, winking, following, whistling, peeping, touching student’s shoulder, paralanguage (bedroom voice), exhibitionism

6.3.3 *Sexual assault*: e.g., rape

### 6.4 Gender Differences

There were gender differences noted in attribution of locus of responsibility. For example, manner of dressing as in wearing tight skirts or sporting low necklines are perceived by some male respondents as contributing to the perception of harrassment. Female respondents, however, do not see these in the same manner.

## DISCUSSION

### Defining Features

Results obtained regarding the defining features point to an interesting factor that affects perception of an incident. Faculty respondents seemed to give importance to student’s behavior (e.g., the student made it obvious that she would do anything for a grade). Those vignettes judged as ambiguous included students’ action which were suggestive or a history of dating/going out or talking with one another. It would seem that locus of responsibility plays an important role in the definition of sexual harrassment.

Similar to results found in the Reilly, *et.al.* (1982) study, items with the greatest impact on whether an incident was judged as sexually harrassing were those that involved promises, threats, or physical action that suggested coercion (e.g., forcing student on to a secluded area). However, even nonverbal behavior such as “winking” is deemed inappropriate for teachers by the faculty and contributes to the definition of sexual harrassment.

For students, having gone out several times with the faculty member contributes to defining the incident as not sexual harassment. This factor, however, was not a defining feature for the faculty respondents.

Not all verbal behavior of teachers contribute positively to the definition of sexual harassment. For the faculty, some of the verbal behavior that contribute to the judgment of "not sexual harassment" are: sitting next to the student, talking about one's wife and children, stating that one wishes the student were still unattached, offering the student a ride, asking about the boys she goes out with, and remarking that the student reminded him of his old girlfriend. For the students, there were fewer forms of faculty verbal behavior contributing to such a judgment: wishing student were still unattached, offering a ride, getting the student to talk about boys she goes out with and stating that one looks forward to working with the student. It would seem that these statements are interpreted as either showing concern or flirtation.

The gender differences in the perception of what constitutes harassing behavior also underscores what the literature raises as issues: 1) differences in attributions of locus of responsibility and 2) perception of the incident (Jensen and Gutek, 1982). Studies on rape (Brownmiller, 1975; Field, 1978; Medea and Thompson, 1974; Smith, Keating Hester and Mitchell, 1976; Krulewitz and Payne, Note 2 as cited in Jensen and Gutek, 1982) conclude that "general attitudes toward women, as incorporated in traditional versus pro-feminist views, are the best predictors of attitudes about rape." Thus a rapist would be viewed as "displaying an extreme version of such stereotypically masculine sex-role behavior, i.e., sexually active, aggressive, and opportunistic." (*Ibid.*: 131).

The gender differences as seen in respondents' answers regarding course of action to take (depends if I like the person) also point to the different models (Tangri, *et.al.*, 1982:45) which suggest that

*sexual harassment of women conforms more to a model suggesting intimidation while that of men conforms more to a model suggesting attraction (whether or not this is reciprocated).*

Results also point to the differences in views where men more than women hold views consistent with the biological/natural



model while women more than men hold views consistent with the cultural model (*Ibid.*: 51)

There is an interplay of factors which define the perception of sexual harassment. In the Philippine context, the cultural norms and practices have been pointed out as important considerations. In the Philippine setting, perpetrators of sexual harassment are not only those with status and power but also those who harass in the context of anonymity (e.g, fellow passengers, movie viewers, obscene callers, strangers). Gays are also noted as harassing basically men, although, in an attempt to exploit the more tolerant attitude of women regarding gays, some "straight" men pretend to be "gay" if only to be able to engage in behavior that gives them more liberal access to relating with women (e.g., "chancing").

Socialization patterns also seem to be an important consideration. Results from the focused group discussion show that males are rather tolerant of "advances from females" and even gays. Moreover, they also seem to be less prone to divulging to others such incidents. Females were shown to be more willing to seek help from parents, friends, and other professionals. This gender difference supports the findings of Tangri, *et.al.* (1982) where women's threshold is lower and they are more bothered by behavior they view as sexual harassment. Learned responses to such incidents also point to a possible explanation for such differences. One respondent noted in her essay that she usually hears elders say "Huwag mo na lang pansinin. Kasi kung babastusin mo iyan gumanti lang siya." (Don't mind him. If you treat him in like manner, he would have gotten one over you). This remark has serious implications in shaping one's response to such incidents. Another respondent (male) noted that touch in the Filipino setting is difficult to interpret "because of our close knit family system, relatives of the third or fourth degree can still touch us without any negative connotations." Such a statement also leads us to examine our norms.

Sex-role behavior as seen in such statements as "mothers and doctors" but not necessarily fathers are allowed to touch children point to socialization patterns which are used to judge and interpret "touching" situations. Females touching males is more tolerated but not males touching females. How extensive are such

norms at present?

### **Level of Awareness of UP Academic Policies Regarding Sexual Harrassment and Possible Courses of Action**

The low level of awareness of UP academic policies regarding sexual harrassment point to a real need for dissemination of information regarding such policies. Moreover, the low level of reporting by victims of sexual harrassment surfaces the need for structural supports and attitude change regarding the handling of sexual harrassment cases. Most of the reasons given for non-reporting of incidents indicate emotions (fear, embarrassment, and avoidance of scandal, repercussion, the hassle) which prevent victims from doing something about their situation. Moreover, despite the fact that one has already been harrassed, fear of not being believed or of ruining the professor's career and family were reasons given that point to real conflicting concerns of victims. There are also information-oriented needs that are more easily addressed: 1) actions to take 2) people to consult 3) type of proof needed.

Courses of action of respondents seem to be influenced by the following variables: 1) status of harrasser 2) status of victim 3) cost-benefit analysis 4) gender of victim. Options seem to decrease as the status of the victim increases. There seems to be an interaction between the loss of face and privacy involved and bringing the incident to other people's attention. Status and power, however, are clearly seen in the option of "reprimanding" noted by faculty and graduate students when the perpetrator is a student. Faculty prefer to solve their problem on their own while students are more willing to depend on other persons to help deal with the case. Gaining from the incident, e.g., one gets the grade or one likes the perpetrator seems to be a consideration in judging the incident as not harrassment.

The role of support-givers cannot be overemphasized. Friends seem to play a very strategic role in such cases. The critical role of school authorities at all levels is also underscored.

It is interesting, however, that 12.8% noted knowing the University's policy regarding sexual harrassment. As to what they

know exactly is a matter that must be examined since there is no clear policy regarding sexual harrassment at this time.

## IMPLICATIONS

The study points to both theoretical issues as well as policy considerations. Sex-role beliefs, as influenced by cultural norms, seem to play an important part in the definition of sexual harrassment. It is imperative therefore, to look more closely into the interaction of sex-role beliefs, the definition of sexual harrassment and the attribution of locus of responsibility. This interaction could also contribute to the course of action, the possible self-blame or other-blame strategy that will be taken by both victim and perpetrator.

The issue of which definition of sexual harrassment will be utilized as a guide remains critical. University officials would do well to take note of one of the reasons for variation in policy and procedure across colleges and universities, i.e., "*variation in operational definitions of sexual harrassment employed by educational institutions*" (*Ibid.*) It is nowhere stated in the *University Code* or *Faculty Manual* what the *operational definition* of sexual harrassment constitutes. As noted by Aquino (1990:306), a section on "Restrictions, Conduct and Discipline" in the *Faculty Manual* "does not include any sanctions against faculty who sexually harass or abuse their students. What is stated in the *Faculty Manual* (1989:68) of the University of the Philippines are the "causes for removal or suspension."<sup>4</sup>

There are also methodological and sampling considerations that must be underscored. It is difficult to generate a large and representative sample regarding such a sensitive topic. There is

---

4 These are: (1) dishonesty; (2) oppression; (3) misconduct; (4) neglect of duty; (5) conviction of crime involving moral turpitude; (6) notoriously disgraceful or immoral act; (7) improper or unauthorized solicitation or receipt of contributions from subordinate employees or students; (8) gross incompetence; (9) disloyalty to the Republic of the Philippines; (10) culpable negligence; (11) violation of the Civil Service Act or Laws of the Code or reasonable University regulations; and (12) other acts prejudicial to the service.

“also very little information about, or from the perspective of, the perpetrator” (Somers, 1982:31). Brewer (1982:154) has warned us about the exclusive focus on the victim limiting our understanding of the causes of sexual harassment. It is important, therefore, to avoid such a “unidirectional conceptualization of the phenomenon” and avoid neglecting “potentially important aspects of interpersonal communication and other dyadic features that may contribute to harassment incidents.” Studies have shown differences in perception according to gender as well as status. As noted, traditional versus pro-feminist views play a very important role in accounting for such a difference. This underscores a need for researches which will study such aspects.

University officials also need to examine both structure and policy in order to meet the real need of academic personnel as well as students in dealing with cases of harassment. Which model should it adopt: the individual, role related or social-structural model? (Kanter, 1976 in Livingston, 1982:19).

*Individual models focus on individual deficiencies and lead to programs which compensate for individuals' deficiencies. Role-related models identify problems in terms of the distribution of labor, recommending remedies that alter definitions and perceptions of roles. Social-structural models focus on the distribution of power and access to resources. Kanter feels that structural models accurately address causal factors and lead to effective remedies that involve structural changes and that result in individual and role changes as well.*

Moreover, the fact that there were 11 respondents who noted that they were sexually harassed by their teachers point to the issue of the University stand and action on the matter. Should the University take a more active stance in dealing with the problem?

Somers (1982:26) points to some of the criticisms raised regarding campus sexual harassment grievance policies and procedures:

*lack of clearly defined offices responsible for hearing such complaints; lack of knowledge about the matter by appointed officials; lack of wide*

*dissemination of information that would make policies and procedures clear to faculty, staff and students; and the inability of offices to maintain victim and harasser anonymity during investigation of complaints.*

It is important that these points be addressed by University officials.

Faculty and students vary in their social support groups and it would be beneficial to all if such differential needs were taken into consideration. The needs of all sectors in the academe must be addressed. Given the more narrowly-defined support system of the faculty, what procedures and venues must be adopted to be more responsive?

Clearly, there is a strong need for more information that go beyond anecdotes or victim's narration. It is important to study the interaction among socio-cultural, organizational and psychological aspects of the phenomenon in the Philippine setting.

Table 1

RESPONDENT BY TYPE OF COLLEGE

Type of College	n	%
Male Dominated	78	28
Female Dominated	198	71
Equal	3	1
Total	279	100

Table 2

TYPE OF RESPONDENTS BY GENDER

	Male		Female		Sub-total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Faculty	7		15		22	
Graduate	11		35		46	
Undergraduate	69		148		217	
Total	87	30.5	198	69.5	285	100.0

Table 3

RESPONDENTS BY CIVIL STATUS

Civil Status	n	%
Single	247	87.6
Married	31	11.0
Divorced	2	0.7
Separated	1	0.4
Widowed	1	0.4
Total	282	100.0

Table 4

RESPONDENTS BY AGE

Age Bracket	n	%
<20	93	33.4
20-29	152	54.7
30-39	18	6.5
40-49	9	3.2
50-59	6	2.2
	278	100

$\bar{x}$  = 22.8

sd = 7.5

Table 5

STUDENT RESPONDENTS BY YEAR LEVEL

Undergraduate	n	%
Freshman	5	1.9
Sophomore	40	15.2
Junior	65	24.6
Senior	98	37.1
Fifth	10	3.8
Graduate	46	17.4
Total	264	100

Table 6

FACULTY RESPONDENTS BY RANK

Rank	n	%
Instructor	9	40.9
Assistant Professor	6	27.3
Associate Professor	2	9.1
Full Professor	5	22.7
Total	22	100

TABLE 7 : RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF MAIN EFFECTS  
OF VIGNETTE CHARACTERISTICS (ALL RESPONDENTS)

VARIABLE	ITEM DESCRIPTION	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
Promises/Threats by Faculty (T1)	Teacher hinted at lowering student's grade if she didn't	3.39128	0.4924	0.59087	6.887	0
(T3)	Teacher said student could substantially improve her grade if she cooperated	1.48498	0.61726	0.21084	2.406	0.0239
Past Relationship (PREL2)	Had gone out several times	-3.24425	0.74185	-3.4271	-4.373	0.0002
Faculty's Verbal Behavior (FVB11)	Teacher tried to get student to talk about boys she goes out with	-2.95529	1.18196	-0.18596	2.5	0.0193
(FVB13)	Teacher said he wished student were still unattached	-4.04061	1.18196	-0.25426	-3.419	0.0022
(FVB16)	Teacher said he looked forward to working with student	-2.74369	1.18196	-0.17265	-2.321	0.0287



(FVB18)	Teacher saw student in bus stop and asked if she wanted a ride	-3.46041	1.18196	-0.21775	-2.928	0.0072
Teacher's Physical Action (FPA7)	Teacher forced student to a secluded area and attempted to have sex with her	2.98635	1.23452	0.18792	2.419	0.0232

TABLE 8 : RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF MAIN EFFECTS  
OF VIGNETTE CHARACTERISTICS (STUDENTS)

VARIABLE	ITEM DESCRIPTION	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
Promises/Threats by Faculty (T1)	Teacher hinted at lowering student's grade if she didn't have sex with him	3.25617	0.47748	0.58235	6.82	0.0000
(T3)	Teacher said student could substantially improve her grade if she cooperated	1.35597	0.59855	0.19762	2.265	0.0324
Past Relationship (PREL2)	Had gone out several times	-3.30025	0.71937	-0.35785	-4.588	0.0001
Faculty's Verbal Behavior						
(FVB13)	Teacher said he wished student were still unattached	-3.9097	1.14613	-0.25253	-3.411	0.0022
(FVB18)	Teacher saw student in bus stop and asked if she wanted a ride	-3.40224	1.14613	-0.21975	-2.968	0.0065
(FVB11)	Teacher tried to get student to talk about boys she goes out with	-2.88731	1.14613	-0.18649	-2.519	0.0185

(FVB16)	Teacher said he looked forward to working with student	-2.7306	1.14613	-0.17637	-2.382	0.0251
Teacher's Physical Action (FPA7)	Teacher forced student to a secluded area and attempted to have sex with her	2.9694	1.1971	0.1918	2.481	0.0202

TABLE 9 : RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF MAIN EFFECTS OF VIGNETTE CHARACTERISTICS (FACULTY)

VARIABLE	ITEM DESCRIPTION	B	BETA	SE B	T	SIG T
Promises/Threats by Faculty (T1)	Teacher hinted at lowering student's grade if she didn't have sex with him	7.04179	0.93992	0.21376	32.943	0
(T3)	Teacher said student could substantially improve her grade if she cooperated	4.94535	0.5379	0.24748	19.983	0
(T2)	Teacher promised he would do everything he could to help student	2.44966	0.22519	0.30297	8.086	0
Faculty Physical Action (FPA 12)	Teacher arranged to sit next to student	-9.9866	-0.48142	0.679	-14.708	0
(FPA7)	Teacher forced student to a secluded area and attempted to have sex with her	3.45012	0.16632	0.46582	7.406	0
(FPA6)	Teacher started to fondle and kiss her	3.99676	0.19267	0.45733	8.739	0
(FPA4)	Teacher playfully poked students in the rib	1.34409	0.09023	0.33774	3.98	0.0011
(FPA11)	Teacher winked at student	1.33519	0.10805	0.34718	3.846	0.0014

Faculty Verbal Behavior (FVB23)	Teacher talked about his wife/children	-3.18351	0.36516	-0.25763	-8.718	0
(FVB13)	Teacher said he wished students were still unattached	-3.08454	0.44467	-0.14869	-6.937	0
(FVB3)	Teacher told student that most students did not understand his lecture as well as she	-1.70413	0.32509	-0.1144	-5.242	0.0001
(FVB18)	Teacher saw student in bus stop and asked if she wanted a ride	-2.20324	0.45733	-0.10621	-0.4818	0.0002
(FVB11)	Teacher tried to get student to talk about boys she goes out with	-1.32454	0.44467	-0.06385	-2.979	0.0089
(FVB7)	Straying from subject, teacher remarked student reminded him of an old girlfriend	-3.10809	0.58598	-0.14983	-5.304	0.0001
Setting (SET2)	Student went to teacher's office after class	0.72863	0.26947	0.05897	2.704	0.0156
Student's action (SACT10)	Student made it obvious she would do anything for a grade	9.82027	0.52887	0.65927	18.568	0

Table 10

## MODE/ MEAN RATINGS OF VIGNETTES BY TYPES OF RESPONDENTS

Vignette No.	ALL			FACULTY			STUDENTS		
	Mode	Mean	S.D.	Mode	Mean	S.D.	Mode	Mean	S.D.
1	1	4.93	4.21	1	3.2	3.67	1	5.1	4.23
2	1	5.43	4.02	7	5.48	3.72	1	5.42	4.05
3	15	13.22	2.34	15	14.36	1.15	15	13.11	2.4
4	11	9.92	3.70	13	11.36	3.22	11	9.78	3.71
5	15	13.1	2.69	15	14.16	1.72	15	13	2.74
6	15	11.28	3.97	15	13.16	3.09	15	11.1	4
7	13	10.51	3.44	13	11.52	3.58	13	10.42	3.42
8	7	6.23	3.91	7	5.76	3.6	1	6.28	3.94
9	1	4.1	4.08	0	3.56	3.13	1	4.15	4.16
10	15	11.67	3.74	15	13.4	2.93	15	11.51	3.78
11	12	8.58	4.13	6	7.68	3.78	12	8.66	4.16
12	15	13.21	2.56	15	13.96	1.99	15	13.14	2.6
13	15	13.45	2.81	15	14.68	0.74	15	13.33	2.9
14	15	12.17	3.1	15	13.52	2.2	15	12.04	3.14
15	15	13.09	2.44	15	13.92	1.82	15	13	2.48
16	15	10.51	4.58	15	10.76	4.28	15	10.49	4.6
17	8	7.67	4.29	8	8.96	3.93	8	7.55	4.3
18	11	9.6	3.77	12	9.36	3.91	11	9.62	3.76
19	15	12.3	3.1	15	13.44	2.31	15	12.19	3.14
20	12	9.59	3.93	5	8.84	3.84	12	9.66	3.93

21	15	12.25	3.02	:	15	13.84	1.84	:	15	12.1	3.07
22	10	7.79	3.88	:	12	7.6	4.06	:	10	7.81	3.87
23	15	12.02	3.32	:	15	13.48	2.41	:	15	11.88	3.36
24	12	9.97	3.58	:	13	9.88	4.28	:	12	9.97	3.52
25	11	8.12	3.79	:	4	7.44	3.86	:	11	8.19	3.78
26	15	12.3	2.97	:	15	12.8	3.07	:	15	12.26	2.97
27	12	8.56	4.13	:	2	7.04	3.89	:	12	8.7	4.13
28	8	7.77	4.01	:	5	6.76	3.66	:	8	7.86	4.03
29	15	10.98	3.72	:	15	11.68	3.5	:	15	10.91	3.75
30	13	9.9	3.74	:	12	11.32	3.1	:	13	9.77	3.78
31	15	12.17	3.11	:	15	13.48	2.41	:	15	12.05	3.15
32	1	5.51	3.9	:	1	4.56	3.5	:	1	5.6	3.93
33	12	7.59	3.96	:	12	7.56	4.08	:	7	7.59	3.96
34	1	6.02	4.12	:	1	4.96	4.05	:	1	6.12	4.12

Table 11

Response to the Question: Are you  
Aware of any UP Academic Policies  
Regarding Sexual Harrassment

Response	n	%
Yes	36	12.8
No	245	87.2
Total	281	100

Table 12

RESPONSE TO QUESTION: DO YOU PERSONALLY KNOW  
SOMEBODY WHO HAS BEEN SEXUALLY HARRASSED  
BY SOMEONE IN THE UNIVERSITY

Response	n	%
Yes	72	25.4
No	212	74.6
Total	284	100

Table 13

Response to Question: Did the person who was sexually  
harrassed do anything about the incident?  
By Type of Respondent

Response	FACULTY		STUDENT		TOTAL (%)	
	n	(%)	n	(%)		
Yes	2		16		18	(22.8)
No	6		55		61	(77.2)
Total	8	(10.1)	71	(89.9)	79	(100.0)



Table 14

Response to the Question: Did the person do anything about the incident of sexual harrassment?  
By Gender of Respondent

Response	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL (%)	
	n	(%)	n	(%)		
Yes	6		13		19	(24.1)
No	19		41		60	(75.9)
Total	25	(31.6)	54	(68.4)	79	(100.0)

Table 15

REASONS for DOING SOMETHING about the incident:

REASONS	f	%
1. No Comment	1	7.1
2. Scared	1	7.1
3. Why Not	2	14.3
4. No Repeats	1	7.1
5. Show Guts	4	28.6
6. Male	1	7.1
7. Couldn't take it anymore	2	14.3
8. Moral Person	1	7.1
9. Feel Threatened	1	7.1
Total	14	99.8

Table 16

REASONS for NOT DOING SOMETHING about the  
HARRASSMENT INCIDENT

REASONS	f	%
1. Scared	10	17.2
2. Embarassing	6	10.3
3. Both Gained	6	10.3
4. Avoid Scandal	5	8.6
5. Did Not Know What To Do	4	6.9
6. Did Not Know Where To Go	3	5.2
7. Too Much Trouble	3	5.2
8. Harrasser was One's Superior	3	5.2
9. Only a Freshman Then	3	5.2
10. No One Will Believe	2	3.4
11. Afraid of Repercussion	2	3.4
12. No Proof	2	3.4
13. Tell Friends	2	3.4
14. Drop Subject	1	1.7
15. Want to Forget	1	1.7
16. Expose	1	1.7
17. Ruin Professor/Family	1	1.7
18. Drunk	1	1.7
19. Harrassment or Not	1	1.7
20. No Action	1	1.7
Total	58	100.0

Table 17 IF FACULTY MEMBER IS HARRASER,  
RANK ORDER OF COURSES OF ACTION  
by TYPE OF RESPONDENT AND GENDER OF RESPONDENT

ACTION	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE		FACULTY	
	(M)	(F)	(M)	(F)	(M)	(F)
1. Report to authorities	1	1	1	1	1	1
2. File a case	2.5	2	--	10	4	--
3. Depends	2.5	--	--	--	--	--
4. Have him fired	17	3.5	--	10	--	--
5. Tell parents	7.5	3.5	--	10	--	--
6. Avoid the person	4.5	7.5	--	2	--	--
7. Depends if I like	4.5	--	--	--	--	--
8. Violence	7.5	7.5	3.5	--	--	--
9. Tell friends	17	7.5	--	5	4	4
10. Drop the subject	--	7.5	--	4	4	--
11. Tell the police	7.5	7.5	--	--	--	--
12. No action	7.5	21	--	--	--	4
13. Confront	17	21	3.5	3	4	4
14. Kill	17	7.5	--	--	--	--
15. Fight	--	--	--	10	--	--
16. Tell other teachers	--	14	--	10	--	--
17. No!	--	--	--	10	4	--
18. Show proof & personal sanction	--	21	--	10	--	--
19. No answer	--	--	--	10	4	--

20. Hotline	11.5	-	-	-	-	-
21. Solve alone	21	-	-	-	-	2
22. Suspend-warn	21	-	3.5	-	-	-
23. Petition	21	-	-	-	-	-
24. Do not know	21	-	-	-	-	-
25. Send to jail	21	-	3.5	-	-	-
26. Go to lawyer	14	-	-	-	-	-
27. Expose	14	-	-	10	-	-
28. Harrass back	21	-	-	-	-	-
29. Go to Guidance Counsellor	11.5	-	-	-	-	-
30. Go to Collegian	21	-	-	-	-	-
31. Call 911	21	-	-	-	-	-

Table 18 IF STUDENT IS HARRASSER,  
 RANK ORDER OF COURSES OF ACTION  
 by TYPE OF RESPONDENT AND GENDER OF RESPONDENT

ACTION	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE		FACULTY	
	(M)	(F)	(M)	(F)	(M)	(F)
1. Report to authorities	1	1	--	1	2	1
2. File a case	5.5	3.5	--	5.5	--	--
3. Depends	3	9.5	--	5.5	3.5	2
4. Tell parents	12.5	5.5	--	12.5	--	--
5. Avoid the person	18	3.5	3.5	4	--	--
6. Depends if I like	2	--	--	12.5	--	--
7. Violence	4	2	--	--	--	--
8. Tell friends	18	13.5	--	--	--	--
9. Drop the subject	--	--	--	--	--	6
10. Tell the police	9.5	9.5	--	--	--	--
11. No action	8	7	3.5	--	--	6
12. Confront	9.5	5.5	1	2.5	--	6
13. Kill	18	9.5	--	12.5	--	--
14. Reprimand	--	19.5	3.5	2.5	1	3.5
15. Have expelled	18	9.5	3.5	12.5	--	--
16. Fight	5.5	19.5	--	12.5	--	--
17. Tell other teachers	--	19.5	--	--	--	--
18. Threaten	18	19.5	--	7.5	--	--
19. No!	12.5	13.5	--	--	--	--

20. Show proof & personal sanction	--	--	--	--	--	--
21. No answer	--	--	7.5	3.5	--	--
22. Solve alone	12.5	15.5	--	--	3.5	--
23. Do not know	12.5	12	--	--	--	--
24. Send to jail	--	15.5	--	--	--	--
25. Go to lawyer	--	25	12.5	--	--	--
26. Expose	--	25	--	--	--	--
27. Revenge	--	19.5	--	--	--	--
28. Ask protection/help	--	19.5	--	--	--	--
29. Go to Guidance Counsellor	18	25	--	--	--	--
30. OK lang	7	25	--	--	--	--
31. Ask to stop	18	--	--	--	--	--

Table 19 IF HARRASSER is ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL,  
 RANK ORDER OF COURSES OF ACTION  
 by TYPE OF RESPONDENT AND GENDER OF RESPONDENT

ACTION	UNDERGRADUATE		GRADUATE		FACULTY	
	(M)	(F)	(M)	(F)	(M)	(F)
1. Report to authorities	1	1	1	1	1.5	1
2. File a case	2	2	-	9	3	-
3. Depends	5	19	-	-	-	-
4. Have him fired	15	4	-	9	-	-
5. Tell parents	10	3	-	9	-	-
6. Avoid the person	7	5	-	9	-	-
7. Depends if I like	3.5	-	-	-	-	-
8. Violence	10	9	-	9	-	-
9. Tell friends	15	7.5	-	9	-	-
10. Tell the police	3.5	7.5	-	-	-	-
11. No action	7	11.5	-	-	-	-
12. Confront	-	19	2.5	2	-	4
13. Kill	15	6	-	-	-	-
14. Fight	-	-	-	9	-	-
15. Tell other teachers	15	-	-	-	-	4
16. Threaten	-	11.5	-	3	-	-
17. No!	7	19	-	-	-	-
18. Show proof & personal sanction	10	19	-	9	-	-
19. No answer	-	-	-	9	1.5	4

20. Hotline	11.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. Solve alone	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
22. Suspend-warn	19	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-
23. Petition	19	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
24. Do not know	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25. Send to jail	19	-	-	-	2.5	-	-	-	-
26. Go to lawyer	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27. Expose	-	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-
28. Harrass back	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29. Go to Guidance Counsellor	11.5	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30. Go to Collegian	-	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-



Table 20

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WITH PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF BEINGS SEXUALLY HARRASSED BY GENDER AND TYPE OF RESPONDENT

Type of Respondent	Male	%	Female	%	Not Id'd	%	Total	%
Undergraduate	10		37		1		48	67.6
Graduate	2		12		0		14	19.7
Faculty	2		5		2		9	12.7
Total	14	19.7	54	76.1	3	4.2	71	100

**Table 21**

**PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO  
HAVE BEEN SEXUALLY HARRASSED**

	<b>n</b>	<b>TOTAL N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>FACULTY</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>31.6</b>
<b>STUDENT</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>21.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>21.8</b>

**PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE BEEN  
SEXUALLY HARRASSED**

<b>Response</b>	<b>FACULTY</b>	<b>STUDENT</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(%)</b>
	<b>n</b>	<b>n</b>		
	<b>(%)</b>	<b>(%)</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>(21.8)</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>(78.2)</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>(100)</b>
	<b>(7.0)</b>	<b>(93.0)</b>		

**Have you, at any point in your life,  
been sexually harrassed?**

<b>Response</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 22

PROPORTION OF RESPONDENTS WHO WERE SEXUALLY  
HARRASSED BY TYPE OF HARRASSER AND SEX OF  
RESPONDENT

IDENTITY OF HARRASSER	f	%	SEX OF RESPONDENT		
			MALE	FEMALE	UNDETER- MINED
1. Teacher	11	15.5	2	8	1
2. Fellow jeep/ bus passenger	9	12.7	1	7	1
3. Stranger	8	11.3	3	5	0
4. Not identified	6	8.5	1	5	0
5. Classmate	5	7	0	5	0
6. Boss	5	7	1	4	0
7. Gays	4	5.6	3	0	1
8. Co-Worker	4	5.6	0	4	0
9. Movie Viewer	3	4.2	1	0	0
10. Males	3	4.2	0	3	0
11. Relative	2	2.8	0	2	0
12. Neighbor	2	2.8	0	2	0
13. Friend	1	1.4	1	0	0
14. Matron	1	1.4	1	0	0
15. DJ	1	1.4	0	1	0
16. Obscene Caller	1	1.4	0	1	0
17. Acquaintance	1	1.4	0	1	0
18. Istambay	1	1.4	0	1	0
19. Boardmate	1	1.4	1	0	0
20. AFP Major	1	1.4	0	1	0
21. Helper	1	1.4	0	1	0
Total	71	99.8	15	51	3

## REFERENCES

- Abbey, Antonia. "Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: do males misperceive females' friendliness?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 5, 1982, pp. 830-838.
- "Ethical Principles of Psychologists," *American Psychologist*. Vol. 36, 1981, pp. 633-638.
- "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Codes of Conduct." *American Psychologist*. Vol. 47 No. 12, 1981, pp. 1597-1611.
- Aquino, Belinda A. "Women in the workplace: the problem of sexual harassment." *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*. Vol. 34 No. 4, 1990, pp. 301-310.
- Brewer, Marilyn B. "Further beyond nine to five: an integration and future directions." *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 149-158.
- Brewer, Marilyn B. and Richard A. Berk, "Beyond nine to five: introduction." *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 1-4.
- Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs and Pilipina. *Sexual Harrassment in the Workplace*. Conference Proceedings No. 6. Quezon City, 1990.
- Faculty Manual*. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1989.
- Gutek, Barbara A. and Bruce Morasch. "Sex ratios, sex- role spillover, and sexual harrassment of women at work." *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 55-74.
- Hadjifotou, Nathalie. *Women and Harrassment at Work*. London: Pluto Press, 1983.
- Jensen, Inger W. and Barbara A. Gutek. "Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harrassment." *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 121-136.
- Livingston, Joy A. "Responses to sexual harrassment on the job: legal, organizational and individual actions." *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 5-22.
- Reilly, Timothy, Sandra Carpenter, Valerie Dull, and Kim Bartlett. "The factorial survey: an approach to defining sexual harrassment on campus." *Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 99-110.

- Riger, Stephanie. "Gender dilemmas in sexual harrassment policies and procedures." *American Psychologist*. Vol. 46 No. 5, 1981, pp. 497-505.
- Saccuzzo, Dennis P. and Robert M. Kaplan. *Clinical Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Vol. 19, 1984, p. 30.
- Schneider, Beth E. "Consciousness about sexual harrassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 75-98.
- Somers, Amy. "Sexual harrassment in academe: legal issues and definitions." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 23-32.
- Tangri, Sandra S., Martha R. Burt, Leanor B. Johnson. "Sexual harrassment at work: three explanatory models," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 33-54.
- Tongson, G. "Sexual harrassment." *Pananaw*. January-December, Vol. III, 1992, pp. 1-6.
- Weber-Burdin, Eleanor and Peter H. Rossi. "Defining sexual harrassment on campus: a replication and extension." *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 38 No. 4, 1982, pp. 111-120.
- Wyer, Robert S. Jr., Galen V. Bodenhausen and Theresa F. Gorman. "Cognitive mediators of reactions to rape." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 48 No. 2, 1985, pp. 324-338.