Measuring Workplace Harassment Based on Gender Nonconformity

Amanda M. Main

College of Business and Management, Lynn University, Florida, United States

*Correspondence: Amanda M. Main, Email: amain@lynn.edu

ABSTRACT: The rise of research on workplace mistreatment in the past twenty years can be attributed to the realization that workplace mistreatment is associated with a host of deleterious outcomes for both the individual targets of the mistreatment and the organizations in which they work. However, the extant literature is failing to capture the full range of sex-based mistreatment that people may experience through a tendency to focus solely on sexual harassment and sex discrimination, which are very specific types of behavior based on one's sex and gender stereotypes. This study introduces the construct of Not Woman Enough Harassment, or the extent to which women perceive that they are treated unfavorably because they do not meet traditionally held stereotypes of femininity. A scale was developed and validated in order to measure this type of harassment. Results demonstrated that not woman enough harassment was experienced by approximately 32.5% of the sample. The scale showed good psychometric properties, with two distinct factors of harassment based on physical and non-physical traits. Not woman enough harassment was demonstrated to be distinct from other forms of sexual and workplace harassment.

General Terms: Scale Development, Psychometrics, Harassment, Gender

Keywords: Not woman enough harassment, Gender nonconformity, Workplace harassment, Sexual harassment

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Author(s): Amanda M. Main

Received: 24 Dec, 2020; **Accepted:** 18 Jan, 2021; **Published:** 01 Feb, 2021 ;
e-ISSN: 2347-4696;

Paper Id: BMN-IJBMR-2021-3;

Citation: doi.org/10.37391/IJBMR.090103

Webpage-link:

<https://ijbmr.forexjournal.co.in/archive/volume-9/ijbmr-090103.html>

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past several decades, there has been a growing interest in interpersonal forms of mistreatment in the workplace. A Google Scholar search of the extant literature on mistreatment at work between 1900 and 1980 yields merely 5,410 results, while a search between 1980 and 2021 yields 57,000 results. This increase in interest can be attributed to the realization that experiencing workplace mistreatment leads to a plethora of deleterious outcomes for both the individual target of the mistreatment and the organization in which the mistreatment is occurring. Recent meta-analyses have shown that workplace discrimination and sexual harassment are associated with decreased job attitudes, decrements in performance, and weakened physical and mental health [1-3]. In addition, mistreatment resulting from one's social identity, such as discrimination and sexual harassment, has serious legal consequences, including considerable financial costs associated with lawsuits. For example, in 2012, Mercy General Hospital in Sacramento, California was required to pay 168 million dollars to Ani Chopourian for a hostile environment sexual harassment claim [4]. Although this is an extreme case, it demonstrates the potential financial costs associated with workplace mistreatment. Further, given that there were 125,905 sexual harassment charges filed between 2010 and 2019 [5], the cumulative cost for organizations with sexual

harassment and discrimination problems is substantial.

The aforementioned negative outcomes that can be incurred by both the individual target and the organization involved in workplace mistreatment illustrates the importance of continued study on this topic. However, the majority of the extant work in this area has been focused on more established forms of group-based mistreatment, such as discrimination and sexual harassment. While it is well documented in the extant literature that mistreatment is associated with deleterious outcomes [2, 6], focusing singularly on these forms of interpersonal mistreatment likely fails to capture the full scope of employee experiences. There is literature in other areas that suggest that other forms of sex-based mistreatment exist outside of traditional sexual harassment and sex-based discrimination. Until other forms are fully explored it is impossible to measure, to understand who is likely to experience it, and to know the magnitude of the outcomes. This study seeks to expand the understanding of workplace harassment by exploring a mistreatment construct that captures the mistreatment of women, not based on traditional gender-based stereotypes, but on perceived violations of those stereotypes (referred to as not woman enough harassment). Essentially, not woman enough harassment is mistreatment that occurs when women do not meet traditionally held stereotypes of femininity. This not woman enough harassment construct directly mirrors the not man enough harassment construct proposed by Berdahl and Moore [7], in which men are harassed for not adhering to traditional masculine gender norms. Further research on not man enough harassment has shown that it was related to a threatened sense of manhood, decreased cognitive ability, and lowered attentional self-control [8].

The current study seeks to develop a scale that will assess the extent to which women experience harassment based on physical appearance as well as behavioral traits that are perceived to violate gender norms. Additionally, this study will contribute to the extant literature by broadening our understanding and definition of sex-based harassment beyond forms born of an adherence to gender stereotypes. Ultimately, the analyses from this study will illuminate the current state of sex-based harassment suffered by women who do not conform to traditional feminine stereotypes and inform future theorizing on this topic.

1.1 Sexual Harassment

Although sexual harassment at work has arguably existed for as long as organizations have been around, it is only in the last 30 years that research has begun to consider it an issue in need of being addressed [9]. The original view of sexual harassment was the model of a male boss engaging in sexual coercion of a female subordinate, motivated by sexual desire for the target [10]. This embodies quid pro quo harassment, which was the first form to be recognized by the legal system [11]. However, recent work on sexual harassment has broadened this definition to include a more expansive set of gender-motivated behaviors. Today, one of the most widely accepted definitions of sexual harassment is “unwanted sex-related behavior at work that is appraised by the recipient as offensive, exceeding resources, or threatening well-being” [12].

In addition to the conceptualization of sexual harassment outlined above, researchers have also recognized a type of harassment that is not sexually motivated, but is experienced by a victim because of his or her sex; this is referred to as sex-based harassment [13]. Sex-based harassment behaviors include the not man enough harassment construct [7], where men are harassed for possessing traditionally feminine characteristics and the analogous not woman enough harassment construct examined here, in which women are harassed for possessing traditionally masculine characteristics. The assumption underlying sex-based harassment is that the behaviors are motivated by a desire to maintain traditional gender structures [14-16]. This idea will be explored throughout the discussion of not woman enough harassment.

1.2 Not Woman Enough Harassment

The not woman enough harassment construct captures the extent to which women perceive that they are treated unfavorably because they do not meet traditionally held stereotypes of femininity. Not woman enough harassment is composed of comments, suggestions, and teasing related to a woman's lack of conformity to feminine gender norms in terms of physical traits (i.e., hair, clothing, makeup) and non-physical traits (i.e., assertiveness, humor, low levels of sensitivity). However, in addition to objective occurrences of these behaviors, not woman enough harassment also includes women's perceptions of this harassment. This is an important component of the construct, as many scholars argue that the perception of workplace mistreatment is more important than discrete behaviors for determining individual outcomes [17, 178]. Stated differently, mistreatment only has the ability to

affect one's job attitudes and behavior if one perceives the behaviors as mistreatment. This represents a direct analog to the not man enough harassment construct proposed by Berdahl and Moore [7], which captures men's perceptions of mistreatment resulting from their perceived deviation from stereotypes of masculinity. Support for the proposed construct of not woman enough harassment can be found in the extant literature on the topic of agentic women in leadership roles. Gender stereotypes serve both a descriptive and prescriptive role in society, such that the descriptive stereotypes of women are proscribed for men, while the descriptive stereotypes of men are proscribed for women [19]. Women's descriptive stereotypes are generally those of being communal, caring, and interdependent, while men's descriptive stereotypes are those of being agentic, ambitious, and self-reliant [20]. Hence, women who display agentic traits are both simultaneously disconfirming their descriptive stereotypes and violating the norms of proscriptions toward men's descriptive stereotypes. Research has found that while agentic women are perceived as equally competent as agentic men in leadership positions, these women suffer social backlash that their male counterparts do not experience [21-23]. In 2007, Berdahl found that women with masculine personalities are more victimized by traditional sexual harassment than women with feminine personalities. In another series of studies, men used electronic communication to interact with women who had different mindsets regarding gender roles. Half of the men communicated with a woman who was studying economics, planned to become a bank manager, believed men and women were equal, and belonged to women's rights groups. The other half of the men communicated with a woman who was interested in becoming a lawyer but chose to become a school teacher instead in order to dedicate more time to her family, and because she felt law was more appropriate for men and was afraid to compete with them. The men were given the option to respond to these messages with different images, and the men who were communicating with the future bank manager were more likely to respond with offensive pornographic images than the men speaking to the school teacher [24, 25]. Women who do not conform to traditional gender stereotype behaviors may also suffer career related setbacks through discrimination, such as the case of *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, where a female accountant was denied a promotion for being too “macho” and was directed to “walk more femininely, talk more femininely, dress more femininely, wear makeup, have her hair styled, and wear jewelry” (1989).

In addition to behaviors that are prescribed for women through traditional gender stereotypes, there are also appearance norms that, when violated may result in female employees experiencing not woman enough harassment. This is illustrated by the *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins* [26] case, in which the plaintiff was directed by her superiors to wear more makeup in an effort to appear more feminine. Similarly, in *Jespersen v. Harrah's* [27], a female server was fired for a refusal to wear makeup. Additionally, in *Sanchez v. City of Miami Beach* [28], a female police officer who was also a body builder was subjected to sexual noises and materials, and

found vibrators, urinal devices, used condoms and sanitary napkins in her office mailbox. Taken together, these court cases demonstrate that appearance can have significant influence on female employees' outcomes. Empirical evidence also supports the notion that appearance can influence how women are perceived and treated. In one qualitative study, women shared that they felt pressure to wear makeup to work in order to conform to the gender norms associated with being a heterosexual female, and those who did not conform revealed the discrimination they faced, including being fired from a job for not having the "right look" [29]. Feminine appearance gender norms are pervasive throughout different industries, although they may manifest in different ways. Bell and McLaughlin [30] suggest that working in a nightclub may call for a highly sexualized appearance, while working as a schoolteacher may require a "mother image" (p. 458). In sum, regardless of the role a woman is in, her femininity is still at the forefront of the appearance norms that she will be evaluated against.

Not woman enough harassment differs from other forms of sex-based mistreatment, such as sexual harassment and sex discrimination, in that it does not result solely from the existence of stereotypes about women and the general subordination of women in our society. Instead, not woman enough harassment results from the *deviation* from sex-related stereotypes. Stated differently, not woman enough harassment occurs when women behave in ways that are stereotype-inconsistent, leading others to react negatively to this violation of gender expectations.

1.3 Comparison of Not Woman Enough Harassment to Not Man Enough Harassment

As stated in the introduction, the construct of not woman enough harassment was inspired by the not man enough harassment construct proposed by Berdahl and Moore [7], in which men are mistreated for a lack of adherence to traditional masculine norms. The sexual harassment of men in the workplace is not a new concept. Waldo, Berdahl, and Fitzgerald [31] were among the first to explore a framework for understanding the experiences of male victims of sexual harassment. In their paper, they posited that the use of instruments intended to measure sexual harassment of women were inappropriate for use in a male population, as similar experiences are likely to be interpreted differently by males and females due to variances in socialization and power (both organizational and physical). In their scale, Waldo, Berdahl, and Fitzgerald identified five dimensions of male sexual harassment: sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention, lewd comments, negative remarks about men, and enforcing the male gender role. While the sexual harassment of women is nearly exclusively perpetuated by the opposite sex, male sexual harassment was found to be surprisingly divided between offenders of the same and opposite sex. Males more often perpetrated lewd comments and enforcement of the male gender role, women were more often the instigators of negative remarks about men, and unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion were equally divided among male and female offenders [31]. Additionally, it was found that gender

role enforcement was the most upsetting form of sexual harassment faced [31].

While masculine gender norms are proscriptive for females, masculinity is a highly prized trait that society encourages males to actively demonstrate across cultures [32-35]. With the value placed on the demonstration of masculine traits for males, deviations from these norms are poorly tolerated, with significantly more male children than female children receiving psychological referrals for treatment of Gender Identity Disorder [36]. Hence, males are highly motivated to reject non-masculine traits in themselves [37, 38] and others [39]. Berdahl [40] posited that sexual harassment is motivated not by sexual desire, but rather by a drive to protect the status of one's social identity, which in this context is one's sex. As men enjoy the majority status between the two sexes, it makes sense that women are the victims of traditional sexual harassment, which may humiliate or derogate them into submission in the view of the harasser, and that women are the victims of not woman enough harassment, which punishes them for not complying with their prescriptive gender norms. It also makes sense that men are both the perpetrators and the victims of not man enough harassment, or gender norm enforcement sexual harassment, as men who do not actively display their masculinity in line with male prescriptive gender norms may be viewed as a threat to the "superiority" of the male sex.

Prior research on the not man enough harassment construct has demonstrated that it is related to feelings of upset [31]; a threatened sense of manhood, decreased cognitive ability, and lowered attentional self-control [8]; and decreased psychological well-being and job satisfaction [41]. However, the outcomes of men regarding sexual harassment may not carry the same impact that they do for women. Berdahl, Magley, and Waldo [14] demonstrated that men report significantly less anxiety due to sexual harassment than women do. Cochran, Frazier, and Olson [42] also found that men rate sexual harassment experiences as less upsetting than women. Waldo, Berdahl, and Fitzgerald [31] point out that sexual harassment is only considered harassing if the victims find the experience to be "offensive, threatening, or upsetting" (p.74), and found in their study that men reported their experiences to be only "slightly" upsetting.

In sum, it appears that males may face more societal pressure to embrace masculine traits than women do to embrace feminine traits. However, it also appears that women face more severe outcomes of sexual harassment than do men. Not man enough harassment is still in its nascence and there are still many questions to be answered. The present research seeks to take the first steps toward the creation of a unified theory of harassment based on deviation from traditional gender norms.

2. THE CURRENT STUDY

A study was performed in order to develop and assess the items of the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale and to identify the factor structure thereof.

2.1 Participants and Procedure

Participants were students at a large southeastern university who were at least 18 years of age and employed at least part-time. Participants were given experimental credit in exchange for their participation. Data collection took place online through a survey form. Prior research has indicated that online surveys are effective in the collection of data for psychological studies [43-47] and are possibly superior to paper and pencil questionnaires when the items are about sensitive topics such as discrimination and harassment [48]. Participants were guided to the survey after signing up for the study, where they read an informed consent letter before proceeding. Female participants completed a survey related to not woman enough harassment, while male participants completed a survey related to not man enough harassment.

A total of 294 females and 286 males responded to the survey. The average time it took to complete the survey was 22.63 minutes for females and 24.96 for males. Three quality check items were included in the survey and participants who failed to correctly answer these quality check items were excluded from the final analysis. Additionally, participants who indicated that they were unemployed or of the incorrect sex for each survey, were also excluded.

The final female sample consisted of 287 participants, which exceeded the recommended minimums of 100 [49, 50], 150 [50], and 200. The average age was 21.71 years ($SD = 5.42$). 50.2% of the sample was Caucasian, 23.7% were Hispanic, 13.9% were African-American, 4.5% were Asian, and 7.7% identified as "other." 88.2% of the sample identified as heterosexual, 7.7% identified as bisexual, 1.4% identified as homosexual, and 2.8% identified as "not sure" regarding their sexual orientation. 77.4% of the samples were employed part-time, and 22.6% were employed full-time. The average tenure at current position was 19.44 months ($SD = 28.98$), and the average lifetime tenure was 52.04 months ($SD = 59.85$).

The final male sample consisted of 274 participants. The average age was 20.57 ($SD = 4.94$). 54.7% of the sample was Caucasian, 22.3% were Hispanic, 8.8% were African-American, 6.6% were Asian, and 7.7% identified as "other." 91.2% of the sample identified as heterosexual, 5.1% identified as homosexual, 2.6% identified as bisexual, and 1.1% identified as "not sure" regarding their sexual orientation. 83.9% of the samples were employed part-time, and 16.1% were employed full-time. The average tenure at current position was 16.53 months ($SD = 32.85$), and the average lifetime tenure was 39.15 months ($SD = 60.91$).

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Not Woman Enough Harassment

Not woman enough harassment was measured using the 46-item Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale developed for this study, in which respondents were asked to identify the frequency with which they receive harassment ranging from comments to suggestions to teasing in regard to the masculinity of their physical and non-physical traits. A sample item is "During the past two years at work, have any of your

supervisors or co-workers suggested or advised you to change your hairstyle to be more feminine." Perception of harassment was also measured with a single item that assesses how harassed a woman has felt from being the recipient of not woman enough harassment.

2.2.2 Discriminant Validity

Both gender-related and general harassment were measured in order to establish the discriminant validity of the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale. Sexual harassment was measured by the 17-item Sexual Experiences Questionnaire [52], in which respondents were asked to report the frequency with which they have experienced sexually harassing behaviors from their supervisors or co-workers in the past two years. A sample item is "Have any of your supervisors or co-workers...made unwanted attempts to discuss sexual matters with you." The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire has demonstrated good reliability and validity in samples across contexts and cultures [53]. In this study Cronbach's alpha was .96 for the female sample and .95 for the male sample. General workplace harassment was measured by the 20-item Aggressive Experiences Scale [54], which assesses participants' general experiences with negative treatment without reference to any social group. A sample item is "During the past two years at work, have you ever been in a situation where someone belittled your opinion in front of others?" Prior research has demonstrated high reliability of this scale ($\alpha = .75$). In this study Cronbach's alpha was .93 for the female sample and .94 for the male sample.

2.2.3 Not Man Enough Harassment

Not man enough harassment was measured using a parallel scale to the one developed for not woman enough harassment for this study. Respondents were asked to identify the frequency with which they have received harassment ranging from comments to suggestions to teasing in regard to the femininity of their physical and non-physical traits. A sample item is "During the past two years at work, have any of your supervisors or co-workers suggested or advised you to change your hairstyle to be more masculine." Perception of harassment was also measured with a single item that assesses how harassed a man has felt from being the recipient of not man enough harassment.

2.3 Item Generation

Items were created from a review of the extant literature on female stereotypes and stereotype violations. Indicators of not woman enough harassment that assessed both physical (e.g., hair, makeup) and non-physical (e.g., assertiveness, sense of humor) traits were used in developing the scale. In addition to assessing physical and non-physical dimensions, the scale also examines the intensity of harassment, by assessing which behaviors were suggestions, which behaviors were comments, and which behaviors were teasing. For example, in assessing not woman enough harassment pertaining to a target's hair style, the scale measures suggestions that the target change her hair to be more feminine, comments about her hair style being masculine, and teasing her about her masculine hair style. Comments, suggestions, and teasing are actions commonly

used in popular harassment scales. In this scale, comments are considered the lowest intensity behavior, as a comment's attribution is largely left to the interpretation of the recipient, and could thus be interpreted as positive, negative, or neutral. Suggestions are of medium intensity, as while the target could interpret the attribution as positive (i.e., the speaker wishes to assist the target), it is also clearly conveying that the target's trait is not valued. Finally, teasing is the highest intensity behavior in this scale, as it is a degrading behavior that also conveys a lack of value for the target's trait. The response scale assesses the frequency with which each behavior is experienced, and ranges from 1 (never) to 5 (most of the time). As a result of sampling from the literature on female stereotypes and harassment intensity, 45 items were generated for the scale. Faculty and graduate students familiar with the workplace mistreatment literature reviewed the items for face validity.

2.4 Analyses

2.4.1 Not Woman Enough Harassment

In order to retain only the most robust items from the initial Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale, inter-item correlations were examined and items were excluded that fail to correlate .40 or higher with more than three other items, following the suggested guidelines of Hinkin [55]. Additionally, any items that are endorsed by less than 5% of the sample were also dropped due to inadequate variance. The items that remain were used for the subsequent analyses.

As the scale was developed in order to assess physical and non-physical trait-related not woman enough harassment and the intensity of the harassment, the scale was expected to represent one of three competing factor structures. The first was a 2-factor structure of physical and non-physical traits. The second was a 3-factor structure of low intensity behaviors (comments), medium intensity behaviors (suggestions), and high intensity behaviors (teasing). The third was a combination of the two prior structures: a 6-factor structure of low intensity physical trait harassment, medium intensity physical trait harassment, high intensity physical trait harassment, low intensity non-physical trait harassment, medium intensity non-physical trait harassment, and high intensity non-physical trait harassment.

These three competing models were tested for model fit through a maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis using Amos Graphics v. 23 [56]. Model fit was evaluated using the chi-square statistic (χ^2), confirmatory fit index (CFI), non-normed fit index (NNFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). Although it was included in the analyses, chi square statistics are heavily influenced by sample size, and thus CFI, NNFI, and RMSEA are more appropriate estimates of fit in this sample. CFI and NNFI values that are greater than .95 are indicative of good-fitting models [57]. A value of .06 or less for RMSEA is indicative of acceptable model fit [58].

2.4.2 Reliability and Validity of the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale

Upon establishment of the factor structure of the scale, analyses were conducted for reliability and validity. Coefficient alphas were examined for each subscale and for the total scale, and correlations among the subscales were assessed. In order to establish construct validity for not woman enough harassment, discriminant validity was assessed in order to establish the distinctiveness of not woman enough harassment from other forms of gender-based and general forms of mistreatment at work. More specifically, correlations were examined between not woman enough harassment and sexual harassment and not woman enough harassment and general workplace harassment. Positive, moderately significant correlations were expected, demonstrating that not woman enough harassment is related to, but distinct from other forms of workplace mistreatment.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Item Analyses

Before examining the factor structure, the 45 items written for the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale were examined for initial acceptability. The 13 items that participants endorsed as "not applicable" were dropped from the scale to ensure that the final items were applicable to a broad range of women. The remaining 33 items demonstrated acceptable inter-item correlations with none falling below .40. Further, all 33 items were endorsed by at least 5% of the sample. Thus, all remaining items met the suggested guidelines set by Hinkin [55].

The same criteria were applied to the 42 items of the Not Man Enough Harassment Scale. The 15 items for which participants responded "not applicable" were excluded from the final scale. The remaining 27 items demonstrated acceptable inter-item correlations with none falling below .40, and all were endorsed by at least 5% of the sample.

3.1.1 Not Woman Enough Harassment Factor Structure

To test the proposed factor structures, a two-factor model (physical and non-physical), a three-factor model (low intensity, medium intensity, and high intensity), and a six-factor model (trait by intensity) were tested. The two-factor model demonstrated poor fit to the data ($\chi^2(494) = 3612.51$, $p < .001$), RMSEA = .15, CFI = .66, NNFI = .64). Similarly, the three-factor model ($\chi^2(492) = 3115.56$, $p < .001$), RMSEA = .14, CFI = .72, NNFI = .69) and the six-factor model ($\chi^2(480) = 2409.88$, $p < .001$), RMSEA = .12, CFI = .79, NNFI = .77) also demonstrated unacceptable model fit. Given that none of the factor structures proposed a priori were supported by the data, additional factor structures were explored. First, a model was explored in which all 33 not woman enough harassment items reflected a single factor, but this model demonstrated poor fit ($\chi^2(495) = 4054.56$, $p < .001$), RMSEA = .16, CFI = .61, NNFI = .59). Next, a series of single-factor models were tested that examined items at each level of intensity (i.e., a model testing low intensity, a model testing medium intensity, and a model testing high intensity). The single-factor low intensity ($\chi^2(44) = 398.25$, $p < .001$), RMSEA = .16, CFI = .78, NNFI = .71), medium intensity ($\chi^2(44) = 491.66$, $p < .001$), RMSEA = .19, CFI = .83, NNFI = .78), and high

intensity models ($\chi^2(44) = 507.99, p < .001$), RMSEA = .18, CFI = .86, NNFI = .82) demonstrated unacceptable fit. Next, two-factor models within each intensity level were examined, with the two factors reflecting physical and non-physical items. The two-factor low intensity model demonstrated improved fit over the single-factor low intensity model ($\chi^2(43) = 308.42, p < .001$), RMSEA = .14, CFI = .85, NNFI = .80), but still did not reach adequate fit. The two-factor medium intensity model similarly fit better than the single-factor model ($\chi^2(43) = 277.95, p < .001$), RMSEA = .14, CFI = .91, NNFI = .88), but this model still fell below the cutoffs for acceptable model fit. The last model tested, a two-factor model that retained high intensity items, showed adequate fit ($\chi^2(43) = 318.09, p < .001$), RMSEA = .12, CFI = .93, NNFI = .90).

Item	Physical Factor	Non-Physical Factor
"Have any of your supervisors or co-workers ever teased or made fun of you for":		
...Having a masculine hairstyle?	.93	
...Not being pretty enough?	.83	
...Your attire at work being masculine?	.81	
...Not wearing enough makeup?	.87	
...Displaying masculine traits and behaviors at work?		.92
...Not being sensitive enough?		.67
...Being too assertive or aggressive?		.69
...Your mannerisms or style of speech being masculine?		.88
...Being "one of the guys"?		.85
...Your sense of humor being masculine?		.93
Note: $N=287$		

Table 1: Not woman enough harassment items and factor loadings

The two-factor high intensity model demonstrated the best model fit and loading, and was thus retained. While the RMSEA is higher than recommended cutoffs, the value is consistent with prior findings in the area of workplace mistreatment [58, 59]. As Nye and colleagues [58, 59] point out, responses to mistreatment scales tend to concentrate at the lower end of the scale, which may inflate RMSEA scores. This model likely emerged with best fit due to the lack of ambiguity in the interpretation of teasing behaviors as harassment, as opposed to comments or suggestions. Hence, the 11 items representing high intensity harassment (i.e., teasing) were retained, and the 22 items representing medium intensity (i.e., suggestions) and low intensity (i.e., comments) were dropped. Of the 11 retained items, four reflected harassment based on physical traits and six reflected harassment resulting from non-physical characteristics. All subsequent analyses were performed using the final 11 items. Item factor loadings are presented in Table 1 & Figure 1. Cronbach's alpha was .95 for

the overall scale, .94 for the physical factor, and .92 for the non-physical factor.

Figure 1: Measurement Model of Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale

3.1.2 Not Man Enough Harassment Factor Structure

The factor structure for the Not Man Enough Harassment Scale showed a similar pattern of results. The proposed two-factor (physical and non-physical) ($\chi^2(323) = 3162.46, p < .001$, RMSEA = .18, CFI = .61, NNFI = .58), three-factor (intensity) ($\chi^2(321) = 1862.21, p < .001$, RMSEA = .13, CFI = .79, NNFI = .77), and six-factor models ($\chi^2(309) = 1717.23, p < .001$, RMSEA = .13, CFI = .81, NNFI = .79), all demonstrated unacceptable model fit. Similar to the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale, additional factor structures were explored. The first model tested all 27 items loading onto a single factor. This model demonstrated poor fit ($\chi^2(324) = 3200.73, p < .001$, RMSEA = .18, CFI = .61, NNFI = .58). The single-factor low intensity items only model ($\chi^2(27) = 166.62, p < .001$, RMSEA = .14, CFI = .91, NNFI = .89), single-factor medium intensity items only model ($\chi^2(27) = 228.64, p < .001$, RMSEA = .16, CFI = .93, NNFI = .88), and the single-factor high intensity items only model ($\chi^2(27) = 204.19, p < .001$, RMSEA = .15, CFI = .92, NNFI = .90) all showed inadequate fit. When testing two-factor (physical and non-physical) models within each intensity level, results showed that the two-factor low intensity model ($\chi^2(26) = 134.55, p < .001$, RMSEA = .12, CFI = .93, NNFI = .91) and the two-factor medium intensity model ($\chi^2(26) = 214.11, p < .001$, RMSEA = .16, CFI = .91, NNFI = .88) showed moderate fit. The two-factor high intensity items only model demonstrated the best fit ($\chi^2(26) = 189.19, p < .001$, RMSEA = .15, CFI = .93, NNFI = .90). As with the not woman enough harassment models, the RMSEA values did exceed the recommended cutoffs for determining model fit. However, this is again consistent with prior findings in the area of workplace mistreatment [58, 59]. Thus, the 9 items representing high intensity harassment regarding teasing were retained (3 physical items and 6 non-physical items), and the 18 items representing comments and suggestions were dropped. All subsequent analyses were performed using the final 9 items. Item factor loadings are presented in Table 2 & Figure 2. Cronbach's alpha was .94 for the overall scale, .81 for the physical factor, and .94 for the non-physical factor.

Item	Physical Factor	Non-Physical Factor
"Have any of your supervisors or		

co-workers ever teased or made fun of you for”:		
...Having a feminine hairstyle?	.69	
...Being too pretty?	.74	
...Your attire at work being feminine?	.87	
...Displaying feminine traits and behaviors at work?		.92
...Being too sensitive?		.78
...Not being assertive or aggressive enough?		.77
...Your mannerisms or style of speech being feminine?		.90
...Being “one of the girls”?		.89
...Your sense of humor being feminine?		.87
Note: N=274		

Table 2: Not man enough harassment items and factor loadings

Figure 2: Measurement Model of Not Man Enough Harassment Scale

3.1.3 Validity

In order to further establish the validity of the Not Woman/Man Enough Harassment Scales, discriminant validity was assessed in order to establish the distinctiveness of not woman/man enough harassment from other forms of gender-based and general forms of mistreatment. The correlations between not woman enough harassment and sexual harassment ($r = .40, p < .01$), and generalized workplace harassment ($r = .33, p < .01$) suggest that these forms of mistreatment are related but distinct constructs representing unique forms of harassment. In the male sample, not man enough harassment was moderately positively correlated with sexual harassment ($r = .46, p < .01$), and generalized workplace harassment ($r = .40, p < .01$), which also suggests that not man enough harassment is distinct from other forms of harassment.

3.1.4 Incidence Rates

In the female sample, results demonstrated that 32.8% of women reported experiencing at least one form of not woman enough harassment. Non-physical harassment was reported by more women (26.5%) in comparison to harassment based on physical characteristics (16.7%).

The most commonly endorsed item was “Have any of your supervisors or co-workers teased or made fun of you for being too assertive or aggressive?” which was endorsed by 16.4% of respondents. However, only 5.2% of respondents endorsed the

item regarding teasing for not being pretty. Further, not woman enough harassment was experienced by 33.3% of racial majority participants, and 32.2% of racial minority participants, 33.6% of heterosexual respondents and 26.5% of non-heterosexual respondents. Therefore, not woman enough harassment was relatively equal across demographic groups. In exploring the sources of not woman enough harassment, 23.4% of women reported that it came primarily from co-workers, 9.6% reported that it came primarily from supervisors, and 7.4% reported that it came equally from both co-workers and supervisors. Further, 20.2% of respondents reported that the perpetrators were primarily female, 11.7% reported that the perpetrators were primarily male, and 12.8% reported that they received not woman enough harassment from both females and males evenly. Together, this demonstrates that co-workers and females appear to perpetrate not woman enough harassment more than supervisors and males.

For the male sample, 40.1% of males reported experiencing at least one form of not man enough harassment. Non-physical forms of harassment were reported by more men (24.5%) than harassment related to physical characteristics (17.5%). The most commonly endorsed item for males was “Have any of your supervisors or co-workers teased or made fun of you for not being assertive or aggressive enough?” which was endorsed by 17.9%. However, only 7.3% of respondents endorsed the item regarding teasing for having a feminine sense of humor. Further, not man enough harassment was experienced by 40.0% of racial majority participants, and 40.3% of racial minority participants, 40.4% of heterosexual respondents and 37.5% of non-heterosexual respondents. As with not woman enough harassment, not man enough harassment is experienced by a similar number of men in each demographic group. When considering the source of not man enough harassment, 29.1% of men reported that it came primarily from co-workers, 5.8% reported that it came primarily from supervisors, and 9.3% reported that it came equally from both co-workers and supervisors. 15.1% of respondents reported that the perpetrators were primarily female, 23.3% reported that the perpetrators were primarily male, and 9.3% reported that they received not man enough harassment from both females and males evenly. This supports the notion that this form of harassment is most commonly enacted by one’s co-workers. However, unlike not woman enough harassment, not man enough harassment appears to be predominantly perpetrated by other males.

4. DISCUSSION

This study was designed to address the gap in the extant literature on workplace sex-based harassment that fails to capture mistreatment based on deviation from gender stereotypes for women. To that end, the construct of not woman enough harassment, or mistreatment that occurs when women do not meet traditionally held stereotypes of femininity, was proposed in order to expand the conceptualization of harassment experienced by women in the workplace. In order to measure this construct, the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale was created, in which two types of

not woman enough harassment emerged: harassment based on physical characteristics (e.g., hair and attire) and harassment based on non-physical characteristics (e.g., assertiveness and humor). The results showed that not woman enough harassment is an issue faced by women in the workplace. In fact, it is likely a larger issue than the present data of university students captured, as full-time employment significantly predicted not woman enough harassment, and the majority of the present sample were part-time workers.

The findings of this study have several important implications for both the extant literature and for real-world applications. Until now, sex-based harassment has focused on sexual harassment and sex discrimination, which are both based on one's sex and gender stereotypes. The introduction of not woman enough harassment expands the construct space to include women who are punished for violating those stereotypes, more fully capturing the full range of experiences women face in the workplace. This construct should inform future research into workplace harassment and mistreatment, and be integrated into interventions and policies aimed at reducing the occurrence of such.

The development of the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale contributes to both practical and theoretical applications. If researchers or practitioners are interested in a global construct of harassment, the general scale would be more applicable, whereas if a more finely grained analysis of harassment is desired, the Not Woman Enough Harassment Scale provides a measurement of harassment based on deviation from gender norms.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jones, K.P., Peddie, C.L., Gilrane, V.L., King, E.B., & Gray, A.L. (2013). Not so subtle: A meta-analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*, 1-26.
- [2] Willness, C.R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(1), 127-162.
- [3] Howard, M.C., Cogswell, J.E., Smith, M.B. (2020). The antecedents and outcomes of workplace ostracism: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(6), 577-596.
- [4] Elssesser, K. (2015). *Sex and the office: Women, men, and the sex partition that's dividing the workplace*. Lanham, Maryland: Taylor Trade Publishing.
- [5] Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2019). *Charges alleging sex-based harassment (Charges filed with EEOC) FY 2010 – FY 2019*.
- [6] Bowling, N.A., & Beehr, T.A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 998-1012.
- [7] Berdahl, J.L. & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: Double jeopardy for minority women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 426-436.
- [8] Funk, L.C., & Werhun, C.D. (2011). "You're such a girl!" The psychological drain of the gender-role harassment of men. *Sex Roles*, 65, 13-22.
- [9] Berdahl, J.L. & Raver, J.L. (2011). Sexual harassment. In S. Zedeck (Ed.) *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. (pp. 641-689). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/12171-018
- [10] Schultz, V. (1998). Reconceptualizing sexual harassment. *Yale Law Journal*, 107, 1683-1796.
- [11] *Williams v. Bell*, 587 F. 2d 1240 (D.C. Cir. 1978).
- [12] Fitzgerald, L.F., Swan, S., & Magley, V.J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment? Legal, behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp.5-28). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- [13] Berdahl, J.L. (2007). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 641-658.
- [14] Berdahl, J.L., Magley, V.J., & Waldo, C.R. (1996). The sexual harassment of men? Exploring the concept with theory and data. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(4), 527-547.
- [15] Stockdale, M.S., Visio, M., & Batra, L. (1999). The sexual harassment of men: Evidence for a broader theory of sexual harassment and sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 5(3), 630-664.
- [16] Burn, S.M. (2019). The psychology of sexual harassment. *Teaching of Psychology*, 46(1), 96-103.
- [17] Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1244-1261.
- [18] Swanson, J. L., & Wotike, M. B. (1997). Theory into practice in career assessment for women: Assessment and interventions regarding perceived career barriers. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 5(4), 443-462.
- [19] Fiske, S.T., & Stevens, L.E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 173-196). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- [20] Rudman, L.A., & Phelan, J.E. (2008). Backlash effects for disconfirming gender stereotypes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 61-79.
- [21] Glick, P., Zion, C., & Nelson, C. (1988). What mediates sex discrimination in hiring decisions? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(2), 178-186.
- [22] Rudman, L.A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk-factor for women: The costs and benefits of counter-stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 629-645.
- [23] Hoover, A.E., Hack, T., Garcia, A.L., Goodfriend, W., & Habashi, M.M. (2019). Powerless men and agentic women: Gender Bias in hiring decisions. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 80(11-12), 667-681.
- [24] Dall'Ara, E., & Maass, A. (1999). Studying sexual harassment in the laboratory: Are egalitarian women at higher risk? *Sex Roles*, 41(9), 681-704.
- [25] Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 853-870.
- [26] *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, 490 (U.S. 228 1989).

- [27] Jespersen v. Harrah's Entertainment, Inc. 392 F.ed 1076 (9th Cir. 2004); vacated, 409 F.3d 1061 (May 13, 2005); 444 F.3d 1104 (9th Cir., April 14, 2006 rehearing en banc).
- [28] Sanchez v. City of Miami Beach, 720 F. sup. 974 (S.D. Fla. 1989).
- [29] Dellinger, K., & Williams, C.L. (1997). Makeup at work: Negotiating appearance rules in the workforce. *Gender & Society* 11(2), 151-177.
- [30] Bell, M.P., & McLaughlin, M.E. (2006). Outcomes of appearance and obesity in organizations. In A.M. Konrad, P. Prasad, & J.K. Pringle (Eds.) *Handbook of workplace diversity* (pp. 455-474). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [31] Waldo, C.R., Berdahl, J.L., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1998). Are men sexually harassed? If so, by whom? *Law and Human Behavior*, 22(1), 59-79.
- [32] Gilmore, D.D. (1990). *Manhood in the making*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- [33] Kimmel, M. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- [34] Vandello, J.A., & Cohen, D. (2003). Male honor and female fidelity: Implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5), 997-1010.
- [35] Masters, S.L., Hixson, K., & Hayes, A.R. (2020). Perceptions of gender norm violations among middle school students: An experimental study of the effects of violation type on exclusion expectations. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*.
- [36] Zucker, K.J., Bradley, S.J., & Sanikhani, M. (1997). Sex differences in referral rates of children with Gender Identity Disorder: Some hypotheses. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 25(3), 217-227.
- [37] Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumper, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles*, 57(1), 55-59.
- [38] Vohs, K.D., Baumeister, R.F., & Ciarocco, N.J. (2005). Self-regulation and self-presentation: Regulatory resource depletion impairs impression management and effortful self-presentation depletes regulatory resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(4), 632-657.
- [39] Schmitt, M.T., & Branscombe, N.R. (2001). The good, the bad, and the manly: Threats to one's prototypicality and evaluations of fellow in-group members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(6), 510-517.
- [40] Berdahl, J.L. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 425-437.
- [41] Holland, K.J., Rabelo, V.C., Gustafson, A.M., Seabrook, R.C., & Cortina, L.M. (2016). Sexual harassment against men: Examining the roles of feminist activism, sexuality, and organizational context. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 17(1), 17-29.
- [42] Cochran, C.C., Frazier, P.A., & Olson, A.M. (1997). Predictors of responses to unwanted sexual attention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(2), 202-227.
- [43] McCabe, S.E., Boyd, C.J., Couper, M.P., Crawford, S., & D'Arcy, H. (2002). Mode effects for collecting alcohol and other drug use data: Web and U.S. mail. *Journal of Studies of Alcohol*, 63(6), 755-761.
- [44] Gosling, S.D., Vazire, S., Srivastava, S., & John, O.P. (2003). Should we trust web-based studies? A comparative analysis of six preconceptions about internet questionnaires. *The American Psychologist*, 59(2), 93-104.
- [45] Knapp, H., & Kirk, S.A. (2003). Using pencil and paper, internet, and touch-tone phones for self-administered surveys: Does methodology matter? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 19(1), 117-134.
- [46] McCabe, S.E. (2004). Comparison of web and mail surveys in collecting illicit drug use data: A randomized experiment. *Journal of Drug Education*, 34(1), 61-72.
- [47] Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Hargreaves, E.A. (2006). Pixels vs. paper: Comparing online and traditional survey methods in sports psychology. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology* 28(1), 100-108.
- [48] Schonlau, M., Fricker, R.D., & Elliott, M.N. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the Web*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- [49] Gorsuch, R.L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- [50] Kline, P. (1979). *Psychometrics and psychology*. London: Academic Press.
- [51] Hutcheson, G., & Sofronious, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist: Introductory statistics using generalized linear models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Press.
- [52] Fitzgerald, L.F., Gelfand, M.J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 425-445.
- [53] Gutek, B.A., Murphy, R.O., & Duoma, B. (2004). A review and critique of the sexual experiences questionnaire (SEQ). *Law and Human Behavior*, 28(4), 457-482.
- [54] Glomb, T.M. (2002). Workplace anger and aggression: Informing conceptual models with data from specific encounters. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(1), 20-36.
- [55] Hinkin, T.R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1(1), 104-121.
- [56] Arbuckle, J.L. (2006). *Amos (Version 7.0) [Computer Program]*. Chicago: SPSS.
- [57] Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1-55.
- [58] Nye, C.D., Brummel, B.J., & Drasgow, F. (2010). Too good to be true? Understanding change in organizational outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 36, 1555-1577.
- [59] Nye, C.D., & Drasgow, F. (2011). Assessing goodness of fit: Simple rules of thumb simply do not work. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14, 548-569.

© 2020 by the Amanda M. Main. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).