

Situation-Specific Assessment of Sexual Harassment

Suzanne E. Mazzeo

Virginia Commonwealth University

and

Mindy E. Bergman, NiCole T. Buchanan, Fritz Drasgow,
and Louise F. Fitzgerald

University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign

Although empirical investigations into the phenomenon of sexual harassment have increased exponentially over the past decade, many basic questions about the measurement of this construct remain unanswered. Most research has utilized an aggregate-level approach, which assesses the frequency of all offensive sex-related behaviors experienced by an individual within a given time period. However, this approach has several limitations, including obscuring the etiology and impact of separate harassment incidents on a particular individual. Consequently, in the present study, a situation-specific approach to the measurement of sexual harassment experiences, the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire—Specific Experience version (SEQ-SE), was evaluated. Results of confirmatory factor analysis suggested that the measure has adequate construct validity. In addition, the substantive information yielded by this measure indicated that it is an important tool in the investigation of the prevalence and correlates of sexual harassment experiences. © 2001 Academic Press

Key Words: sexual harassment; Sexual Experiences Questionnaire; measurement.

It is a truism that any construct studied by the methods of empirical science must be reliably and validly measured; sexual harassment is no exception. However, despite growing interest in this topic, a number of basic questions remain (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995). Of these, perhaps the most perplexing has to do with the level of specificity at which such experiences should be measured. Early studies were primarily designed to collect frequency data and typically examined

This research was supported by Grant 1 R01 MH50791-01A2 from the National Institute of Mental Health, the Consortium Research Fellow Program, and the Defense Manpower Data Center. Mindy E. Bergman was also supported as a DoD Research Fellow during this project. We are grateful to Chuck Hulin and the members of the SexHarass Research Group for their collaboration and contribution to the research project on which this article is based.

This study was designed while Suzanne E. Mazzeo was a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Suzanne E. Mazzeo, Department of Psychology, P.O. Box 842018, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23284-2018.

harassment at the item level; that is, they calculated the number of individuals who experienced one or more of a number of specific acts (e.g., Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Martindale, 1990; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). The general procedure was to present individuals with lists of behaviors and count as harassed all respondents who reported experiencing any of these during the time frame of the study.

Recent work has begun to conceptualize harassment as a higher order construct (e.g., Fitzgerald et al., 1995) that is more appropriately assessed by a scale score than by individual items. Such an approach has the advantage of being amenable to traditional reliability and validity investigations as well as to examination by IRT methodologies (see Donovan & Drasgow, 1999, for an example in the harassment context). Research at the aggregate level assesses the frequency of all offensive sex-related behaviors experienced by an individual within a given time period. This methodology has taught us a great deal. For example, we now know a considerable amount about the dimensions of harassment (e.g., Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995), its prevalence in various organizational settings (e.g., Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999), and its consequences (Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Magley, Waldo, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997). Possibly most important for preventive purposes, a number of antecedents (i.e., facilitating conditions) have been identified, with many studies confirming that a masculinized job context and permissive organizational climate are associated with higher levels of sexual harassment for women (see, e.g., Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1993; Culbertson & Rosenfeld, 1994).

Despite these insights, aggregate methodology suffers from its own limitations. Specifically, aggregate measurement ignores the fact that behaviors can combine to produce both more and less than the sum of their parts. More because the meaning of complex experiences is not well captured by simply summing their components; less because such aggregations obscure the experience of multiple incidents, possibly perpetrated by different people across time, departments, and so forth. When separate experiences are aggregated, their etiology cannot be determined. Thus, it is impossible to explore potential associations between antecedents (e.g., organizational climate) and specific types of experiences. Similarly, the impact of a given experience is difficult to evaluate when data are "collapsed" over multiple incidents and perpetrators.

Another problem of aggregation is that it equates incidents of varying types and can thus underestimate the importance of situations that, though rare, are particularly severe. For instance, a woman who reports hearing offensive jokes at work "many times" over the past 2 years receives 5 points (on a 5-point scale) toward her score on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ; Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995), a widely used aggregate measure of harassment. In contrast, a woman whose supervisor tried to rape her in a single violent incident theoretically receives only 2 points. Because items on the SEQ are unit-weighted, the measure's major source of variance is the frequency ratings assigned by the participants; thus,

repeated exposure to “minor” events carries much more weight than a single violent incident. In practice, this problem arises infrequently, as virtually all respondents who report sexual coercion or sexual assault describe it as embedded in a network of other offensive behaviors; still, the situation is conceptually unsatisfying as well as occasionally empirically problematic.

A final limitation of aggregate-level measurement is that it complicates examination of targets’ coping strategies, including whether they report their experiences. Research has demonstrated that fewer than 15% of harassment targets formally complain about their experiences (Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997) and the question of why this is so, and under what circumstances, is not completely understood. These predictors are obscured, however, when an aggregate measure is employed and multiple incidents are collapsed.

This article explores an alternative approach to the measurement of sexual harassment experiences, the *Sexual Experiences Questionnaire—Specific Experience* (SEQ-SE), which assesses such situations at the level of a *unitary experience* (i.e., it inquires about the behaviors that comprise a single harassment incident). This approach, which we label situation-specific measurement, is not new to sexual harassment research; situation-specific data have been collected for as long as researchers have been exploring this topic. Both Merit Systems (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987, 1995) and U.S. military researchers (e.g., Martindale, 1987) have employed this technique in numerous studies over the years; however, the data concerning these situations are virtually never analyzed. Even the basic measurement characteristics of this approach are unknown, and the information it provides has received virtually no attention. Rather, researchers typically use the incident simply as a “focusing” technique for gathering overall demographics concerning perpetrators and the frequencies of various coping responses; the nature of these significant experiences, as well as their associations with other variables, have so far been largely ignored. To our minds, this is unfortunate because situation-specific assessment enables researchers to examine the associations among the type of experience; its consequences for job attitudes, psychological adjustment, and other outcomes; and the effectiveness of particular coping strategies. Moreover, individual differences among targets of harassment (e.g., race and socioeconomic status) and the context of harassing experiences (e.g., perpetrator status and organizational climate) can also be examined. These influences, difficult to assess with either item-level or aggregate data, are critical next steps to examine if we are to further our knowledge of sexual harassment in organizations.

Thus, the major purposes of the present study were to examine the psychometric properties of a situation-specific measure of sexual harassment and to begin to explore the substantive information this measure provides. We first examine the psychometric properties and structure of the situation-specific measure and then compare them to those of the aggregate measure from which it is derived. We conclude with a discussion of the methodological implications of our results for future research on sexual harassment in organizations.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 13,743 women who responded to the relevant section of the *1995 Status of the Armed Forces: Gender Issues Survey* (Form B; Bastian, Lancaster, & Reyst, 1996) and met the data consistency requirement described below. Participants' ages ranged from 17 to 60 years ($M = 31.01$). Their average tenure in the Armed Services was 9.28 years. Although the sample was predominantly Caucasian ($n = 8,622$; 62.7%), it included significant numbers of African Americans ($n = 3,363$; 24.5%), Latinas ($n = 1,123$; 8.2%), Asian American/Pacific Islanders ($n = 189$; 1.4%), and Native Americans ($n = 401$; 2.9%). Forty-five women (0.3%) did not report their race. Half were married ($n = 6,894$; 50.1%), whereas approximately one-third had never married ($n = 4,055$; 29.5%). The remainder were divorced ($n = 2,193$; 16.0%), separated ($n = 514$; 3.7%), or widowed ($n = 47$; 0.3%). Forty women (0.3%) did not report their marital status.

Participants were distributed primarily among the Army ($n = 4,705$; 34.2%), Navy ($n = 2,899$; 21.1%), and Air Force ($n = 3,835$; 27.9%). Marines accounted for 10.8% ($n = 1,487$) and the Coast Guard comprised the remainder ($n = 817$; 5.9%). The majority were enlisted ($n = 9,536$; 69.4%), 29.3% ($n = 4,026$) were officers, and 1.2% ($n = 181$) were warrant officers.

Measures

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire—Department of Defense version (SEQ-DoD). The SEQ-DoD (Fitzgerald et al., 1999) is a behaviorally based measure of offensive sex-related experiences derived from Fitzgerald et al.'s (1988) measure; it was revised and expanded for use in military settings. All questions share a common stem: "In the past 12 months, have you been in situations involving military personnel and/or civilian employers and contractors employed in your workplace where one or more of these individuals . . ." The body of each item describes behaviors that the respondent may have experienced, such as "Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?" and "Continued to ask you out after you had repeatedly said you weren't interested?" Responses are made on a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). Factor analyses of the original SEQ (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995) have consistently yielded a three-factor solution (*gender harassment*, *unwanted sexual attention*, and *sexual coercion*); the first two factors are conceptually similar to the legal concept of hostile work environment, whereas the last more closely corresponds to the concept of *quid pro quo* harassment. New items were incorporated in the SEQ-DoD that formed an additional fourth dimension, *sexist hostility* (see Fitzgerald et al., 1999); these items assess behavior that, although not explicitly *sexual* in content (e.g., comments that women are not suited to be leaders or do not belong in the military), convey sex-based antipathy and discriminatory attitudes. As with previous forms of the measure, the words "sexual harassment" do not appear until the final item, at which point respondents are asked if they have been sexually harassed during

the time frame of the study; this item is not included in SEQ scores. Fitzgerald et al. (1999) report internal consistency reliabilities of .83, .91, .85, and .95 for the sexist hostility, sexual hostility, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion scales, respectively. The 23 items of the SEQ-DoD appear in Table 1.

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire—Significant Experience (SEQ-SE). Based directly on the SEQ-DoD, this measure asks respondents who marked *any* items on the SEQ-DoD to provide information about the *one* such experience that had the greatest impact on them. Respondents are then directed to review the items they have marked (on the SEQ-DoD) and indicate *all* behaviors involved in this single, significant incident. Operationally, the SEQ-SE is a readministration of the SEQ-DoD with a different instructional set. In contrast to the parent measure, responses to the SEQ-SE are dichotomous (i.e., “yes/no”).

As a check on reliability, data from the SEQ-DoD and the SEQ-SE were first examined for response consistency. Because the SEQ-SE assesses the *one* situation that had the greatest effect on the respondent in the past 12 months (whereas the SEQ-DoD asks about *all* experiences during the same time frame) the items checked on the former should logically be a subset of the latter. Therefore, women who marked an item on the SEQ-SE not marked in their overall SEQ-DoD were excluded from subsequent analysis; less than 2% of respondents (1.6%) failed to satisfy this consistency requirement.

RESULTS

Structure of the SEQ-SE

The structure of the SEQ-SE was examined via factor analysis, employing the four-factor pattern of the SEQ-DoD (Fitzgerald et al., 1999) as a template. Tetra-choric correlations among items and their asymptotic variances were submitted to LISREL 8.14 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993) for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), using the diagonally weighted least-squares method of estimation (DWLS). DWLS is a compromise between unweighted and fully weighted least squares in that it considers the asymptotic sampling variances of the input correlations, but not their covariances (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993).

Initial analysis indicated that the hypothesized four-factor model explained the data fairly well; fit statistics for this model (Model 1) appear in Table 2. Large residuals and modification indices for item L (“stared, leered, or ogled you in a way that made you uncomfortable”), however, suggested its responses were more strongly related to the unwanted sexual attention factor than the sexual hostility factor, on which it had been hypothesized to load. Although moving item L to the latter factor provided a slightly better fit (Table 2, Model 2), the residuals and modification indices remained sizeable; we consequently estimated loadings for item L on both factors. The resulting model (Table 2, Model 3) provided a superior fit to either of the two previous results and was thus retained as the best representation of the instrument’s structure.

Factor loadings appear in Table 1; excluding item L, the loadings for the SEQ-DoD and the SEQ-SE (from Fitzgerald et al., 1999) are similar in pattern, although the latter are consistently smaller. Internal consistency coefficients (α) were then

TABLE 1
SEQ-DoD/SEQ-SE Items and Factor Loadings

Item	SEQ-SE	SEQ-DoD
Sexist Hostility		
E. Treated you differently because of your sex?	.50	.89
H. Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?	.29 ^a	.47
I. Made offensive sexist remarks?	.39	.89
K. Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?	.55	.90
Sexual Hostility		
A. Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?	.47	.80
B. Whistled, called, or hooted at you in a sexual way?	.57	.80
C. Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?	.68	.87
D. Made crude and offensive sexual remarks, either publicly or to you privately?	.66	.87
F. Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?	.66	.86
G. Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?	.68	.86
L. Stared, leered, or ogled you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	.29 ^a	.87
M. Exposed themselves physically in a way that embarrassed you or made you feel uncomfortable?	.57	.80
Unwanted Sexual Attention		
H. Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?	.37 ^a	.35
J. Made attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?	.74	.95
L. Stared, leered, or ogled you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	.32 ^a	.90
N. Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?	.68	.81
Q. Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	.63	.89
R. Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you?	.74	.89
W. Attempted to have sex with you without your consent or against your will, but was unsuccessful?	.64	.89
X. Had sex with you without your consent or against your will?	.43	.87
Sexual Coercion		
O. Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?	.87	.94
P. Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative?	.79	.93
S. Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?	.78	.94
T. Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?	.79	.94
U. Made you afraid you would be treated poorly if you didn't cooperate sexually?	.86	.97

Note. Alphabetical item labels denote the order that items appeared in the survey. Results for the SEQ-DoD are from Fitzgerald et al. (1999).

^a These items load on multiple factors.

TABLE 2
Fit Statistics for the CFA Models

Model	Fit statistics						
	χ^2	<i>df</i>	χ^2/df	SRMR	GFI	AGFI	NNFI
1. Original Model ^a	2281.87	223	10.23	.085	.99	.98	.91
2. Revision: Item L moved to Unwanted Sexual Attention factor	2199.42	223	9.86	.086	.99	.99	.92
3. Revision: Item L cross-loads on Unwanted Sexual Attention and Sexual Hostility factors	1977.36	222	8.91	.083	.99	.99	.93

Note. SRMR = Standardized Root-Mean-Square Residual; GFI = Goodness-of-Fit Index; AGFI = Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index; NNFI = Nonnormed Fit Index.

^aOriginal model was the four-factor structure found in CFA analysis of the aggregate-level SEQ-DoD (Fitzgerald et al., 1999).

estimated for each factor: sexist hostility (.27), sexual hostility (.55), unwanted sexual attention (.51), and sexual coercion (.59). These estimates are considerably lower than those obtained with the SEQ-DoD. However, it is unclear that coefficient alpha is necessarily the best estimate of reliability in this case, as it tends to underestimate internal consistency when item variance is restricted. This issue is addressed under Discussion.

The matrix of correlations among the SEQ-SE factors appears below the diagonal in Table 3, with corresponding correlations from the SEQ-DoD presented above the diagonal (from Fitzgerald et al., 1999). As can be seen, the two sets of factor correlations are quite different. For example, Fitzgerald et al. (1999) reported that *sexist hostility* and *unwanted sexual attention* correlate .54 at the aggregate level; measured at the situation-specific level, however, these factors are strongly *negatively* correlated ($r = -.67$). Furthermore, sexist hostility and sexual hostility are virtually orthogonal ($r = -.09$) at the level of a specific experience, although they

TABLE 3
Correlations among the Factors of the SEQ-SE^a and the SEQ-DoD^b

	Sexist Hostility	Sexual Hostility	Unwanted Sexual Attention	Sexual Coercion
Sexist Hostility		.76	.54	.63
Sexual Hostility	-.09		.86	.83
Unwanted Sexual Attention	-.67	.45		.89
Sexual Coercion	.15	.48	.71	

Note. Correlations among the factors for the SEQ-SE are shown below the diagonal. For comparison, correlations among the factors of the SEQ-DoD are shown above the diagonal ($n = 22, 696$).

^a $n = 13, 743$.

^b $n = 22, 696$.

correlated .76 in the SEQ-DoD. Other entries in the SEQ-SE matrix are small or moderate in magnitude and positive; only the correlation between unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion ($r = .71$) is similar to that yielded by the SEQ-DoD. These results suggest that, at the level of a specific situation, sexual harassment experiences are considerably more homogeneous than previously thought.

Types and Frequencies of Significant Experiences

We next compared the relative frequencies of the types and patterns of behavior produced by the two assessment methods; these results appear in Table 4. Differences in the proportion of respondents endorsing each subtype of harassment across the two measures were evaluated using a test described by McNemar (1969, pp. 54–56). All differences were statistically significant ($p < .05$; z values ranged from $z = -2.30$ for sexual hostility, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion to a remarkable $z = -59.29$ for sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and unwanted sexual attention). More specific examination of participants' *overall experiences* during the period covered by the survey (e.g., their responses to the SEQ-DoD) indicates that three combinations of behavior predominated: (1) sexist hostility combined with sexual hostility (30.1%), (2) sexist and sexual hostility combined with unwanted sexual attention (29.4%), and a combination of

TABLE 4
Frequencies of Harassing Behaviors Reported at the Aggregate and Specific Levels

Type of harassment	SEQ-DoD		SEQ-SE	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Sexist alone	1245	9.1	5576	40.6
Sexual alone	905	6.6	2629	19.1
USA alone	167	1.2	1977	14.4
Coercion alone	3	0.0	143	1.0
Sexist & Sexual	4205	30.1	1003	7.3
Sexist & USA	235	1.7	314	2.3
Sexist & Coercion	6	0.0	52	0.4
Sexual & USA	822	6.0	593	4.3
Sexual & Coercion	4	0.0	19	0.0
USA & Coercion	5	0.0	96	0.7
Sexist, Sexual, & USA	4051	29.4	331	2.4
Sexist, Sexual, & Coercion	74	0.5	39	0.3
Sexist, USA, & Coercion	14	0.0	51	0.4
Sexual, USA, & Coercion	111	0.0	81	0.6
Sexist, Sexual, USA & Coercion	1621	11.8	129	0.9
Missing data/ no SE	275	2.0	710	5.0
Total	13,743		13,743	

Note. SEQ-DoD = Sexual Experiences Questionnaire for all events within the prior 12 months by women who also responded to the SEQ-SE. EQ-SE = Sexual Experiences Questionnaire for events reported in the significant experience. Sexist = Sexist Hostility; Sexual = Sexual Hostility; USA = Unwanted Sexual Attention; Coercion = Sexual Coercion/quid pro quo. All differences between frequencies were significant ($p < .05$).

all four types (11.8%). These three patterns characterized over 70% of respondents. Other types and combinations occurred less frequently, with many reported by less than 1%; for example, just three participants reported sexual coercion in isolation.

Responses to the SEQ-SE were strikingly different. When harassment is assessed at the level of a specific experience, sexist hostility alone (40.6%), sexual hostility alone (19.1%), and unwanted sexual attention (14.4%) were the most frequent patterns. Indeed, the patterns that characterize aggregated experiences rarely typify specific ones. For example, only 7.3% of SEQ-SE respondents indicated that their most salient experience was characterized by a combination of sexist and sexual hostility. Further, although 29.4% of respondents endorsed a combination of sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and unwanted sexual attention on the SEQ-DoD, only 2.4% did so on the SEQ-SE. Given the previously demonstrated stability of the SEQ (test-retest reliability of .86 across a 2 week period; Fitzgerald et al., 1988) and the fact that the present sample responded to both instruments within a single administration, such substantial differences are most likely attributable to the level of analysis.

DISCUSSION

What do these results tell us about sexual harassment and the utility of examining it at the situation-specific level? Perhaps most obviously, we suggest they point to the importance of the *level of analysis* for understanding harassment experiences. We begin our discussion of this concept by examining the technical qualities of our instrument; we then explore the substantive findings provided by the contrasting methodologies and conclude by considering the important issue of which approach is most appropriate for which problem and under what circumstances.

Psychometric Properties of the SEQ-SE

Considered from the perspective of traditional psychometric analysis, the SEQ-SE appears to provide a technically adequate method for collecting situational-level data concerning sexual harassment. CFA results confirm that the four dimensions of harassment are stable across levels of measurement (i.e., analysis); indeed, the factor structures of the two instruments were virtually identical. In contrast, the relationships among these factors differed substantially, depending on which instrument was examined.

Although some might consider this more a substantive issue than a psychometric one, it does cast some light on the validity of the SEQ-SE. Specifically, although permissive organizational environments facilitate all types of harassment experiences, it seems unlikely that distinctly different types would co-occur *within a single situation*. After all, putdowns, pornography, and epithets (i.e., sexist and sexual hostility) are probably not the best strategy for eliciting sexual cooperation, presumably the goal of unwanted sexual attention. Similarly, although many individuals may express the opinion that men and women should adhere to traditional roles or that women do not make good leaders (sexist behavior), it does not

necessarily follow that large numbers of them would also express sexualized hostility in the form of pornography, sexualized put downs, and so forth (i.e., sexual hostility). Only unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion could intuitively be expected to co-occur in the same incident, and it is exactly this pattern of relationships that situation-specific measurement in the form of the SEQ-SE displays. We suggest that such discriminations are good evidence of validity.

At the same time, reliability estimates of the subscales of the SEQ-SE are less than ideal; in particular, the coefficient alpha estimate for sexist hostility is markedly low. For a number of reasons, we believe these data provide serious underestimates. First, the range of these coefficients is artificially restricted by the nature of the instrument; not only are the items dichotomously scored, but every individual who completes the SEQ-SE has, by definition, experienced some form of unwanted sex-related behavior. The effects of such range restriction on the magnitude of the internal consistency coefficient are well known. In addition, there is no *a priori* reason to believe that all indicators (i.e., items) of a particular construct (e.g., sexual hostility) should necessarily co-occur in any particular way *at the level of a specific experience*. Specific situations are just that, specific; their pattern and structure will depend to a large degree on the vagaries of individual perpetrator characteristics and situational contingencies and are not likely to represent highly homogeneous patterns of behavior. Thus, it may well be that coefficient alpha is not the most appropriate estimate of reliability for this type of instrument; rather, test-retest comparisons may give more appropriate information. To the degree that we can generalize from the correspondence of the SEQ-DoD and the SEQ-SE in the present sample (i.e., less than 2% of respondents were inconsistent in their responses to the two instruments), such estimates are likely to be quite high. Based on these results, we suggest that the situational approach is sufficiently reliable and valid for research use at the present time.

Which Approach for Which Question?

Our study highlights the fact that answers inevitably reflect the form of their questions and we are thus led to consider which of these approaches will be more fruitful for sexual harassment research. We believe the answer is neither simple nor dichotomous; rather, the way in which one assesses harassment experiences should depend directly on what it is that one wants to know. For estimating the overall frequency and type of offensive sex-related behavior in an organization, as well as for examining the overall impact of such behavior on individuals, an aggregate level measure providing both total and subscale scores is probably the most useful. Such scores are also good criterion variables when seeking to identify conditions that give rise to higher levels of harassing behavior. For other questions (e.g., what types of situations are most likely to be reported; questions about characteristics of targets and perpetrators), a situation-specific measure such as that described here is probably most appropriate. Tracking incidence levels across time may be best approached by a combination procedure, such as that reported by Palmieri, Harned, Collinsworth, Fitzgerald, and Lancaster (1999). These

authors recently described a multistep procedure for determining who should be classified as sexually harassed in organizational studies; they suggest "counting" only those individuals who (1) mark at least one behavior on the SEQ, (2) complete the SEQ-SE, and (3) report that this specific situation caused them some level of psychological distress. This multiple-criterion approach minimizes both false positives and false negatives and appears to show considerable promise for illuminating the perennially muddy issue of incidence and prevalence rates. In sum, the decision to employ a particular approach should be informed by the goals of the study, the needs of the organization, and common sense. For the present, we suggest that the situational approach is not a replacement, but rather a promising addition to the aggregate level strategies on which research has previously depended.

REFERENCES

- Bastian, L. D., Lancaster, A. R., & Reyst, H. E. (1996). *Department of Defense 1995 sexual harassment survey* (Rep. No. 96-014). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Culbertson, A. L., & Rosenfeld, P. (1994). Assessment of sexual harassment in the active-duty Navy. *Military Psychology*, **6**, 69-93.
- Dansky, B. S., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1997). Effects of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 152-174). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Donovan, M. A., & Drasgow, F. (1999). Do men's and women's experiences of sexual harassment differ? An examination of the differential test functioning of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. *Military Psychology*, **11**, 265-282.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J., & Magley, V. J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment: Test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **82**, 578-589.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, **17**, 425-445.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The SEQ-DoD. *Military Psychology*, **11**, 243-263.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **32**, 152-175.
- Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory factor analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **47**, 164-177.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8 User's Reference Guide*. Chicago: Scientific Software International.
- Magley, V. J., Waldo, C. R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). The impact of sexual harassment on military personnel: Is it the same for men and women? *Military Psychology*, **11**, 283-302.
- Martindale, M. (1990). *Sexual harassment in the military: 1988*. Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- McNamar, Q. (1969). *Psychological Statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Palmieri, P., Harned, M., Collinsworth, L. L., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Lancaster, A. (1999). *Who counts? A rational-empirical algorithm for determining the incidence of sexual harassment in the military*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of International Military Testing Association, Monterey, CA.
- 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.

- Schneider, K. T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **82**, 401–415.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace—Is it a problem?* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1987). *Sexual harassment of federal workers: An update*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1995). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Trends, progress, continuing challenges*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Received April 24, 2000; published online March 29, 2001