

CULTURAL FACTORS AS ASSOCIATES OF WORKPLACE SEXUAL
HARASSMENT PERCEPTIONS AND COPING PREFERENCES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

DİDEM DİNÇAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE OF PSYCHOLOGY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

OCTOBER 2019

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science of Psychology.

Prof. Dr. Sibel Kazak Berument
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science of Psychology.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Yonca Toker
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu

(METU, PSY)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Yonca Toker

(METU, PSY)

Assist. Prof. Dr. A. Başak Ok

(Ankara Uni., PSİ)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Didem Dinçal

Signature :

ABSTRACT

CULTURAL FACTORS AS ASSOCIATES OF WORKPLACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT PERCEPTIONS AND COPING PREFERENCES

Dinçal, Didem

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Yonca Toker

October 2019, 111 pages

The present study examined the association of cultural variables which were liberalism/conservatism, uncertainty avoidance, ambivalent sexism, and organizational climate related to workplace Sexual Harassment (SH) with perceiving the ambiguous forms of social-sexual incidents namely sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest as SH. Women's coping preferences for different forms of SH were examined on an exploratory basis. Data were collected from 226 women and 154 men employers who were mostly white-color workers. Results showed that there were no significant relationships between benevolent sexism and participants' perception of ambiguous SH forms in either sample. Hostile sexism had small negative correlations with perceiving the composite ambiguous forms of SH, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest; while it had no correlation with sexist hostility in the women sample. It had a small significant negative correlation with sexist hostility in the men sample. Conservatism had a significant negative correlation with perceiving only sexist hostility amongst women. Uncertainty avoidance had a significant positive but small correlation with perceiving sexual

hostility as a form of SH amongst women. Amongst men there were no associations between conservatism and uncertainty avoidance with perceiving ambiguous forms of SH. Finally, there were no significant associations between SH related organizational climate and ambiguous SH forms for either sample. Results of exploratory analyses showed that perceiving sexual hostility was correlated with a preference for reporting to authorities and avoiding the harasser as coping mechanisms; while perceiving sexist hostility correlated with an inclination towards reporting to authorities and not avoiding the harasser.

Keywords: Workplace sexual harassment, ambivalent sexism, conservatism, uncertainty avoidance, organizational climate

ÖZ

KÜLTÜREL DEĞİŞKENLERİN İŞ YERİNDE CİNSEL TACİZ ALGILARI VE BAŞA ÇIKMA YÖNTEMLERİ İLE İLİŞKİLERİ

Dinçal, Didem

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yonca Toker

Ekim 2019, 111 sayfa

Bu çalışmada liberalizm/muhafazakarlık, belirsizlikten kaçınma, korumacı ve düşmanca cinsiyetçilik kültürel değişkenleri ve cinsel taciz ile ilgili örgütsel iklimin; cinsiyetçi düşmanlık, cinsel düşmanlık ve ilginin iması gibi görece daha muğlak cinsel taciz türlerinin algılanması üzerindeki etkisi incelenmiştir. Ayrıca, kadın katılımcıların farklı cinsel taciz türleri karşısında tercih ettikleri başa çıkma mekanizmaları incelenmiştir. Çoğunlukla beyaz yakalı, toplam 226 kadın ve 154 erkekten veri toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar, korumacı cinsiyetçilik ile görece daha muğlak cinsel taciz türlerinin algılanması arasında anlamlı bir ilişki olmadığını göstermiştir. Düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin, cinsel düşmanlık ve ilginin imasının algılanmasıyla küçük negatif korelasyonu varken; kadın örnekleminde cinsiyetçi düşmanlık ile anlamlı korelasyon bulunmamıştır. Düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin cinsiyetçi düşmanlıkla sadece erkek örnekleminde küçük anlamlı ve negatif korelasyonu bulunmuştur. Muhafazakarlık, kadınlar arasında yalnızca cinsiyetçi düşmanlığı algılamakla önemli bir negatif korelasyona sahiptir. Erkekler arasında muhafazakarlık düzeyleri ile görece daha muğlak cinsel taciz türlerinin algılanması arasında hiçbir ilişki

bulunmamıştır. Belirsizlikten kaçınma, kadınlar arasında yalnızca cinsel düşmanlığı cinsel taciz olarak algılamakta anlamlı ve küçük bir korelasyona sahiptir. Erkekler arasında belirsizliğe tahammülsüzlük ile ilgili anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Son olarak, erkekler veya kadınlar için örgütsel iklim ile görece daha muğlak cinsel taciz türleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Yapılan araştırmaların sonuçlarına göre, cinsel düşmanlığı cinsel taciz olarak algılamak ile savunma mekanizması olarak yetkililere bildirme ve tacizciden kaçınma seçme arasında anlamlı bir ilişkili olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Öte yandan, cinsiyetçi düşmanlığı algılamak ile savunma mekanizması olarak yetkililere bildirme ve tacizciden kaçınmamayı tercih etme arasında anlamlı bir ilişkili olduğu gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İş yerinde cinsel taciz, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, muhafazakarlık, belirsizlikten kaçınma, örgüt iklimi

To My Beloved Family
&
My Husband

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude and special thanks to my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Yonca Toker for guiding and supporting me. Her patience and care about the study from start to the end was the best motivator for me.

I would like to thank to the Examining Committee members Prof. Dr. Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu and Assist. Prof. Dr. A. Başak Ok for their valuable recommendations and comments.

The support of my friends, especially Meltem Düzgün, Yelda Kaplan and Bilgesu Kaçan, is undeniable in my thesis writing process. I would like to thank them for their endless support and encouraging me especially at every challenging steps during the study.

Finally, I would like to thank my family Nevzat, Gamze, Doğaç Dinçal and, Levent Kuytak for everything, especially unconditional trust. Without their support and patience completing this study would be impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Overview.....	1
1.2 Perceiving Workplace Social-Sexual Incidents as Sexual Harassment and the Role of Culture.....	2
1.3 Sexual Harassment Forms	7
1.4 Ambivalent Sexism.....	8
1.5 Conservatism	11
1.6 Uncertainty Avoidance	14
1.7 Organizational Climate.....	15
1.8 Coping Preferences toward Sexual Harassment	17
2. METHOD.....	20
2.1 Procedure and Participants	20
2.2 Measures	21
2.2.1 Demographic Information Form	22
2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)	22
2.2.3 Social/Economical Conservatism Scale.....	23
2.2.4 Intolerance for Uncertainty Scale (IUS)	23

2.2.5	Organizational Climate toward Sexual Harassment Questions	24
2.2.6	Social-Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ).....	24
2.2.7	Coping Preferences Scale	25
3.	RESULTS	26
3.1	Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA).....	26
3.1.1	Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI).....	26
3.1.2	Intolerance for Uncertainty Scale (IUS).....	27
3.1.3	Social-Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ).....	28
3.2	Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA).....	30
3.2.1	Social/Economical Conservatism Scale	30
3.2.2	Organizational Climate toward Sexual Harassment Questions	31
3.2.3	Coping Preferences Scale	32
3.3	Descriptive Statistics, Gender Differences and Correlations	34
3.4	Hypothesis Testing	45
3.5	Exploratory Analyses across Perceiving Sexual Harassment and Preferred Coping Styles.....	50
4.	DISCUSSION	56
4.1	Overview	56
4.2	Study Findings and Contributions	56
4.3	Limitations and Future Directions.....	65
	REFERENCES.....	69
	APPENDICES	
A.	ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL.....	78
B.	INFORMED CONSENT	79
C.	DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM	80
D.	AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY (ASI).....	82
E.	SOCIAL/ECONOMICAL CONSERVATISM SCALE	84
F.	INTOLERANCE FOR UNCERTAINTY SCALE (IUS)	85
G.	ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE TOWARD SEXUAL HARASSMENT QUESTIONS.....	86

H. SOCIAL-SEXUAL INCIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE (SSIQ).....	88
I. COPING PREFERENCES SCALE.....	90
J. POST-PARTICIPATION INFORMATION FORM.....	96
K. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET.....	97
L. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of study variables for the entire sample	36
Table 2 Descriptive statistics and t-test results of study variables for men and women participants	37
Table 3 Pearson correlation coefficients for all participants.....	41
Table 4 Pearson correlation coefficients for men and women sample, separately	46
Table 5 Pearson correlation coefficients for items of social/economical conservatism scale and ambiguous SH forms	48
Table 6 Regression analysis for women participants.....	49
Table 7 Regression analysis for men participants.....	50
Table 8 Summary of canonical loadings for first canonical correlation	52
Table 9 Pearson correlation coefficients between coping mechanisms and other variables	53
Table 10 Descriptive statistics for coping with SH by scenario	55

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

SH: Sexual Harassment

SEQ-DoD: Sexual Experiences Questionnaire Department of Defense

SSIQ: Social-Sexual Incidents Questionnaire

BS: Benevolent Sexism

HS: Hostile Sexism

CFA: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

EFA: Exploratory Factor Analysis

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Different forms of discrimination and violence against women have emerged due to various factors such as socio-cultural constructions of gender dynamics, perceptions of gender norms, power, law and policies. With the increasing presence of women at various fields of business, workplace sexual harassment (SH) is one of the forms of discrimination and violence that women have begun to face. SH toward women at the workplace is an important issue to investigate since it is acknowledged as a serious and pervasive human rights violation according to the results of studies conducted around the world (Stop Violence Against Women, 2010). Turkey was found as the country in Europe with the largest gender difference in employment rates (Eurostat Statistics Explained, 2015). According to the data from the Fourth European Working Conditions Survey in which around 30,000 workers from 31 countries were included, 6% of employed women reported being targets of SH in Turkey, while this rate is lower than 1% in some European countries such as Italy and Spain (Eurofound, 2007). As can be seen, even though women in Turkey have lower rate of involvement in the labor force than women in European countries and U.S.; likelihood of exposure to SH is higher in Turkey than Europe. In the light of this information, it can be argued that SH in workplace is a substantial issue to work on, especially in Turkey. The main aim of the present study is to investigate employees' perceptions of SH in the workplace in Turkey by taking into account several cultural factors and SH-related organizational climate. In addition, such factors' predictive role on women's coping preferences were investigated.

1.2 Perceiving Workplace Social-Sexual Incidents as Sexual Harassment and the Role of Culture

Many researchers addressed the definition and the scope of the concept of workplace SH. For instance, as one of the pioneers of the SH concept MacKinnon (1979) stated that “Sexual harassment... refers to the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power” (as cited in Till, 1980). Despite the existence of many other different definitions of the SH concept, it was not accepted as a legal concept until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 passage and until its definition was made in 1980. The most widely-accepted and well-known definition of MacKinnon (1979) accepted by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) recognized that SH consists of two broad behavior classes; “quid pro quo harassment” which involves experiences of job-related threats or benefits in exchange for sexual collaboration and “hostile environment harassment” which involves individual experiences of undesirable and assailable sex-related physical or verbal behavior without involving any job related threats or benefits (EEOC, 1980; as cited in Fitzgerald, 1993).

Debates about the conceptualization of SH (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995; MacKinnon, 1979; Nye, Brummel, & Drasgow, 2014) led to different SH taxonomies. For instance, in the light of content analysis of women’s individual experiences, Till (1980) divided SH behaviors into five distinct categories, which are “Generalized sexist remarks or behavior (gender harassment); inappropriate and offensive, but essentially sanction-free sexual advances (seductive behavior); solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by promise of rewards (sexual bribery); coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment (sexual coercion); and sexual assaults”. In order to assess SH experiences Fitzgerald et al. (1988) developed the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) by using Till’s (1980) categorization of SH. According to the results of analysis, it seemed that there were three factors which were gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. While seductive behaviors and sexual assault dimensions in Till’s categorization were included in unwanted sexual attention; sexual bribery and sexual coercion dimensions were included in the sexual coercion category, according to this

analysis. If those three general dimensions are categorized according to the U.S. legal definition of SH, sexual coercion is viewed as “quid pro quo harassment”, while unwanted sexual attention and gender harassment are viewed as “hostile environment harassment” (Kabat-Farr & Cortina, 2014). Finally, according to the structure analysis of Sexual Experiences Questionnaire Department of Defense (SEQ-DoD), which was developed by Fitzgerald and colleagues (1999), a four-factor categorization was reported. Those categories are sexual coercion and bribery, unwanted sexual attention (including physical offenses), sexual hostility, and sexist hostility.

Just as it is the case that all disturbing behaviors are not acknowledged as SH, it is also the case that all types of behaviors attributed to SH do not have the same severity. According to the different classifications of SH types, studies showed that SH includes different types of behaviors or attitudes and some of those behaviors such as using gender discriminatory language while talking to women seem milder than the others such as wanting sexual cooperation in return for work related reward or punishment (Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999; MacKinnon, 1979; Till, 1980). Former studies found that there is discrepancy between perceiving the “quid pro quo harassment” and “hostile environment harassment” types. Studies showed that while nearly all individuals perceived quid pro quo harassments as SH (Frazier, Cochran, & Olson, 1995); hostile environment harassment is not perceived as SH by some individuals (Thacker, 1992; as cited in Toker and Sümer, 2010). It is obvious that some factors impact the perception of SH behavior; since one of two different people can appraise the same behavior as SH; while the other one does not perceive it as SH.

At that point, the issue comes to the point of the antecedents and consequences of perceiving workplace SH. It seems like some people are more inclined to perceive certain kinds of behaviors as SH, while others do not perceive those same behaviors as SH. Hence, for years another focus of SH studies has been finding the reasons of perceptual differences. Gender (Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001), personal variables such as gender role attitudes, self-esteem, and negative affectivity (Toker, & Sümer, 2010) and types of sexually oriented behaviors

(Sheffey & Tindale, 1992) are some of the variables that have been investigated in the former academic studies. In addition to antecedents, examining health, psychological or work-related consequences of workplace SH has been another topic in the scope of former studies (Buchanan, & Fitzgerald, 2008; Dionisi, Barling, & Dupré, 2012; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997). It was reported that the coping preferences of people also differ (Cortina, & Wasti, 2005; Wasti, & Cortina, 2002) and those preferences might be a buffer for bad consequences. Hence, besides the fact that people have different SH perceptions, they have different coping mechanisms in the face of SH. As can be seen from the former knowledge, the scope of SH studies is quite broad, and the number of studies is ample; however, there are still important issues which should be investigated in the SH literature.

Within the context of the present study it is thought that culture with its interiorized norms, rules, and traditions can impact SH perceptions of individuals, and in turn their coping preferences. Even though SH literature has been continuing to develop from past to present, the number of cross-cultural studies is still rare. Indeed, most of the leading studies in the literature had been conducted in the US or some European countries by using samples from those cultural backgrounds. As Zimbhoff (2007) argues, the key features to determine which behaviors will or will not be perceived as SH are linked to cultural values and beliefs; hence, SH should be comprehended in relation to such culture specific factors. For example, according to the study conducted by Limpaphayom, Williams and Fadil (2006), data were collected from students both in USA and Thailand in order to assess their perception about sexual harassment behavior. Study results showed that USA students evaluate quid pro quo situations, in which harassment affects one's employment, as SH; on the other hand, Thai students evaluate behaviors which lead to a hostile and offensive environment also as sexual harassment. Moreover, different from USA students, Thai students viewed sexual jokes and language as a form of sexual coercion. It can be said that culture with its lots of different dynamics may alter people's perceptions toward SH. However, the issue mostly depends on which dimensions of culture are predictive to determine SH perceptions.

There are different studies in the SH literature in which culture was investigated from different points. It is stated that even though the overall harmful consequences of workplace SH on women was constantly reported across different cultures, measurement, structure, and interpretation of SH can change according to the cultural context (Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). Differences on the measurement and structure of SH in the Turkish culture compared to other cultures is explained in the SH part of this paper. However, since the present study mainly focused on the cultural differences affecting the perception of SH, it is important to know what kind of cultural determinants need to be investigated in this area. In the present study, ambivalent sexism, liberal/conservative attitudes, and uncertainty avoidance were defined as cultural dimensions to be investigated.

In the study conducted by Ulusoy, Swigart, and Erdemir (2011), perception of SH among students of medicine in Turkey as a Middle Eastern culture was investigated which was a subject already studied in the U.S., Europe and Asia. The study by Ulusoy et al. aimed to identify SH faced by woman doctors in a hospital by male patients or their relatives. Researchers stated that as a society in which the majority is conservative and hierarchy is recognized, culture showed its impact when researchers tried to reach woman doctors to fill in the questionnaires. When the potential participants had heard the topic of that study, they denied participating in by saying that they did not experience such a harassment even though they did experience it. Even though this study did not make a cross-cultural comparison, authors argued that some cultural aspects such as patriarchy, power and socio-cultural aspects affected the way people evaluate SH. In another study from the Turkish literature, perceptual differences on the three more ambiguous forms of SH; namely sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and insinuation-of-interest, were compared between the US and Turkish cultures by taking some cultural variables into consideration (Toker, 2016). In this study, the author argued that some cultural dimensions in Turkey, such as the high-context culture, traditional societal norms and values which are mostly evaluated as conservative, high ambivalent sexism levels and uncertainty avoidance levels, might be related to perception differences between these two cultures. According to the results of this study, as expected sexist

hostility was perceived more sexually harassing; while sexual hostility and insinuation of interest were perceived less sexually harassing by US participants than Turkish participants. Moreover, at the end of the study it is argued that because the above-mentioned cultural characteristics had not been measured for individuals, within-group variations could not be assessed. Hence, it might be expected that those characteristics create differences on SH perceptions within groups. Based on the study's suggested future investigation, employees' conservatism, ambivalent sexism, and uncertainty avoidance levels – at the individual level - are investigated in relation to SH perceptions in this study.

In the present study, in addition to the abovementioned cultural characteristics, organizational climate was investigated as another predictive characteristic of perception differences. Organizational climate might be an essential determinant of how people perceive SH especially within the more conservative cultures. For instance, in a study, researchers tested a conceptual model of SH empirically. As well as psychological, physical and work-related consequences of SH; antecedents which are organizational climate and job-gender context were examined (Fitzgerald et al., 1997). Study results showed that when women think that their organization is tolerant toward SH; in other words when they believe that complaining about SH is hazardous, that the organization would not take those complaints seriously and would not be willing to punish perpetrators, they stated higher level of SH experiences. However, researchers also stated that these findings might also be a result of the women's sensitivity toward SH and for that reason they might give biased ratings to items. According to those results, it can be said that women's evaluation of SH is already affected by some factor, and the organizational climate itself can be one of those factors. That means, working women's awareness of whether the organization has protective measures and if it is implementing policies in the face of SH, and whether those behaviors are tolerated in the organization affect their perception of SH. Because of that reason, organizational climate is another variable which was investigated in the present study.

Finally, in the present study coping preferences against different SH types were investigated. As explained in the coping preferences section it is known that

there are different coping mechanisms people prefer to use against SH and five of them which are avoidance, denial, negotiation, advocacy seeking, and social coping, were identified for Turkish women by Wasti and Cortina (2002). Hence, it is important to emphasize that the present study was expected to contribute to the existing literature by examining the effects of cultural dimensions which are ambivalent sexism, conservatism/liberalism, uncertainty avoidance and organizational climate awareness in the Turkish culture on the SH perceptions; and in turn on the coping preferences.

1.3 Sexual Harassment Forms

As mentioned before, all abovementioned categorizations about the SH types were mostly studied in western cultures, especially in U.S. Therefore, it was suggested that there may be some cross-cultural variations in the perception of SH by the women from different countries and cultures. For example, in the study conducted by Toker and Sümer (2010), they investigated the behaviors Turkish women perceived as SH by developing Social-Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ). Although in the pre-study a 5-factor structure of SH was found, Turkish women did not perceive all those factors as SH at the same level. According to the results participants did not perceived Sexist Hostility as a form of SH, while they perceived Physical Sexual Offense, which includes physically close behaviors such as sitting closely, using physical force to become closer, trying to kiss, looking the sexual parts of women, and Sexual Bribery and Coercion, which includes job-related threats of rewards in return to sexual association, as definitely severe forms of SH; and Insinuation of Interest and Sexual Hostility as moderately severe forms of SH.

In the scope of the present study, the three more ambiguous forms of SH dimensions, which was found in Toker and Sümer's (2010) study, was examined. Those more ambiguous forms of SH which was not perceived as SH or was not perceived as severe forms of SH by Turkish women are Sexist Hostility, Insinuation of Interest and Sexual Hostility. Insinuation of Interest mostly includes implying an interest toward women and to desire a romantic relationship, without any explicit sexual content. For example, addressing the woman with affectionate words such as "my dear" and continuously demanding a date with the woman are some behaviors in

that category. Sexual Hostility is mostly about being subjected to sexuality with verbal or visual means. Sexual jokes, mentioning about pornography and sexuality, presenting sexual materials are some example behaviors of this category. Finally, Sexist Hostility dimension is related to gender discriminatory behaviors such as evaluating woman's career as worthless, thinking that women's ideas are insignificant and referring to women with improper language (Toker & Sümer, 2010). It is important to note that for those three subtle forms of SH; perception means are lower, and variances are wider than the other two forms amongst samples of women; that means those forms of SH are relatively more ambiguous when they are compared to the Physical Sexual Offense and Sexual Bribery and Coercion factors.

The present study focuses on perceiving these three ambiguous forms of social-sexual incidents as SH. Individual-level variations in the cultural characteristics identified and SH-related organizational climate are potential predictors of especially such ambiguous forms due to variations in perceiving them as SH, even amongst women employees.

1.4 Ambivalent Sexism

Two of the factors which were investigated in this study are the dimensions of ambivalent sexism which are Benevolent Sexism (BS) and Hostile Sexism (HS). Glick and Fiske (1996), who are the pioneers of the ambivalent sexism concept, stated that sexism, which is defined as hostility toward women, has some aspects lacking in its definition. They defended the idea that positive feelings toward women may go along with the sexist attitudes; thus, sexism should be conceptualized as a multidimensional concept. In their well-know and accepted Ambivalent Sexism conceptualization, they mentioned two types of sexism which are HS and BS. HS, on the one hand, was defined as traditional sexist antipathy or hostile sexuality, which promotes dominance and superiority of males. On the other hand, BS was defined as attitudes which are not only sexist in nature due to seeing women stereotypically and restricting their roles but also positive due to revealing prosocial and intimacy-seeking behaviors. However, Glick and Fiske (1996) stated that even though BS seems positive, they did not appraise it positively, since it substantially includes the

dominance of male and conventional stereotypes for women-men relationships. For that reason, in the long run its consequences are also harmful. Finally, they stated that people can hold those two sexism types at the same time; hence, dimensions of ambivalent sexism are not conflicting or unconnected.

In the SH literature, impacts of BS on gender-related issues had been investigated by many studies from different points. For instance, some researchers examined whether the relationship between authoritarianism and engaging in SH behaviors was mediated by some variables including hostile and BS (Begany & Milburn, 2002); while the others investigated the relationship between HS and BS and attitudes toward abuse, specially wife abuse (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira, & Souza, 2002). Those studies mainly showed that hostile and BS have an impact on those gender-related issues, even though hostile sexism's impact is higher than BS.

In their study Glick, Fiske, Mladinic, Saiz, Abrams, Masser, ... and López, (2000) stated that the more a nation has higher levels of hostility, the more women as compared to men reported BS. This finding is coherent with the opinion that women use BS as a self-defense mechanism and adopt it, if the sexism level of a culture is high. That means, to a certain extent, sexism is a culture-related phenomenon and it can be expected to impact women's perception of SH, so Turkish women may react differently to SH behaviors depending on their hostile and BS levels.

Secondly, BS is positively associated with women's traditional homemaker role which is evaluated as positive by men; while, HS is associated with nontraditional female roles such as career women which is evaluated as negative by men (Glick and Fiske, 1997). Based on the abovementioned idea, Sibley and Wilson (2004) tested men's hostile and benevolent attitudes toward different stereotypes of women in terms of sexual female subtypes such as chaste and promiscuous. As expected, and consistent with the abovementioned idea, researchers found that men showed higher HS but lower BS toward the women who portrayed a negative sexual female stereotype; while they showed exact opposite attitudes toward women who portrayed a positive sexual female type. Therefore, because career women are evaluated negatively by men and exposed to HS more, women may also interiorize those types of stereotypes which are brought from cultures and show BS or HS

toward their counterparts. It is important to know whether or not those benevolent and hostile attitudes of women are associated with their perception of SH in the workplace which career women who are evaluated as having nontraditional female roles are mostly involved.

Finally, the effects of hostile and BS on SH perceptions were investigated in the literature; however, those findings came from mostly other cultures. For instance, in their study Wiener, Hurt, Russell, Mannen, and Gasper (1997) examined whether or not the perception of SH changes according to the reasonable woman or reasonable person standards when two different SH scenarios were given to the participants. Reasonable person (woman) standard means that participants were given the information of “hostile work environment SH results when an employee is subjected to unwelcome sexual conduct that a reasonable person (woman) would view as sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of employment and create an abusive work environment”. Most importantly, in this study dimensions of ambivalent sexism were used to see their impact on perception differences for both gender groups. Hence, differently from some other studies both men and women’s HS and BS were also assessed. According to the results of this study, female participants found the cases more unwelcome than did male participants, while participants low in HS also found the cases more unwelcomed than participants who had moderate or high levels of HS. For the interaction effect it was found that participants high on HS thought harassers’ behaviors to be less severe, less unwelcome and less likely to create negative work impact; while participants high on BS thought those conducts as more severe (only under the reasonable person standard not in the reasonable woman standard). To sum up, that study showed that HS and BS levels of participants showed different effects on the perception of SH environment according to the gender of participants and victim’s gender.

In another study, without using different standards like reasonable women, nearly the same conclusions were reached. Russell and Trigg (2004) investigated the impact of gender, gender roles (masculinity and femininity), ambivalent sexism, and social dominance orientation on SH tolerance of participants. It was found that, as expected women were less tolerant to SH when compared to men; moreover,

ambivalent sexism and hostility toward women explained the majority of variance on tolerance to SH. That means, sexism is a better predictor of SH perception than gender in a way that both men and women tolerated SH if they have higher levels of sexism. Moreover, there are some studies from the Turkish literature in which ambivalent sexism and SH were investigated. Sakallı-Uğurlu, Salman, and Turgut (2010) examined the association between ambivalent sexism, ambivalence toward men and Turkish men and women's attitudes toward SH. In this study attitudes toward seeing SH because of provocative behaviors of women (ASHPBW) and attitudes toward viewing SH as a trivial matter (ASHTM) were also examined. In terms of the impact of ambivalent sexism and ambivalence toward men, findings showed that for both Turkish women and men, HS ($\beta_{\text{women}} = .36, t_{\text{women}} = 4.27, p_{\text{women}} < .01; \beta_{\text{men}} = .43, t_{\text{men}} = 3.74, p_{\text{men}} < .01$) and benevolence toward men ($\beta_{\text{women}} = .27, t_{\text{women}} = 2.55, p_{\text{women}} < .01; \beta_{\text{men}} = .37, t_{\text{men}} = 2.49, p_{\text{men}} < .01$) are predictors of ASHPBW; on the other hand, for men HS ($\beta_{\text{men}} = .31, t = 2.37, p < .01$) and BS ($\beta_{\text{men}} = -.54, t = -3.92, p < .01$) predicted their ASHTM, while they did not predict women's ASHTM.

Even though the aim of present study is different from foregoing example studies, those findings can lead for the hypothesized model. It can be expected that hostile and benevolent attitudes and the level of those attitudes may have an impact on perceptions toward more ambiguous forms of SH. Therefore, in the light of above-mentioned information;

Hypothesis 1a: BS level of participants will have small positive associations with perceiving Sexist Hostility, Insinuation of Interest and Sexual Hostility as forms of SH

Hypothesis 1b: HS level of participants will have moderate negative associations with perceiving Sexist Hostility, Insinuation of Interest and Sexual Hostility as forms of SH.

1.5 Conservatism

Besides ambivalent sexism, conservatism as a factor was thought to be a variable which may affect SH perceptions. However, as to my knowledge there is no study in the literature in which the impact of conservatism on SH perceptions was

directly investigated. Furthermore, conservatism is a difficult factor to measure its impact; because this topic has been defined and conceptualized under lots of different sub-dimensions. For instance, their study in which five different scales of liberalism and conservatism were compared, Hicks and Wright (1970) stated that there are at least four sub-dimensions of conservatism which are named as economic, political, religious, and esthetic. It is obvious that the meaning of the terms of conservatism and liberalism change across contexts in which they are used.

As a general term, conservatism is defined as a social attitude in which the dominant values of a social sphere where people live in are internalized. Moreover, it is stated that people who are high on conservatism usually withstand change, want to continue the status quo, and protect the social order; on the other hand people who are high on liberalism promote oncoming change; they think that this change should be legal, admissible and should not ruin social order (Pienaar, Beukes, & Esterhuysen, 2006). Moreover, Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, and Sulloway (2003) stated that resistance to change and opposition to equality, which are the features that decrease feelings of uncertainty and threat, were two core constituents of political conservatism. That means differences between left and right ideologies comprise some psychological roots in a way that hierarchy and stability ensure reassurance and structure; while equality and change mean unpredictability and confusion (Jost, Napier, Thorisdottir, Gosling, Palfai, & Ostafin, 2007). When conservatism and liberalism are evaluated in terms of moral values; Graham, Haidt, and Nosek (2009) found that liberal people were mostly concerned about harm and fairness related issues; while conservative people were concerned about in-group, authority and purity related issues of moral dimensions. That means, in accordance with the abovementioned features liberals defend that people can do what they want only if their actions are fair, legal and do not harm others; whereas conservatives give importance to the in-group identity, maintenance of the authority, and purity.

With those features it can be said that conservatism/liberalism may reflect on the gender roles and have important impacts on lots of different gender related issues including SH. For instance, Favreau (1997) stated liberalists try to exterminate social inequalities based on gender and race; while conservatives try to continue those

biologically determined inequalities. Since SH toward women at the workplace sometimes may imply the need of maintaining hierarchy and inequality; it can be defended that conservatism and liberalism also have an impact on this issue. When women take more and more place in the professional life and they move from the stereotypical women roles to career women, highly conservative people may feel that the hierarchical relationship and the inequality between men and women are damaged. Besides committing SH behaviors toward women, perceiving SH behaviors can also be affected by those attitudes. It can be expected that women who have conservative attitudes may admit the inequality between genders and hierarchy, resists the change of those defined roles, and define their role in workplace in accordance with those beliefs. Therefore, they may perceive some more ambiguous behaviors as related to the different gender roles of women and men instead of SH. Some studies from the literature supported this idea. For instance, Malovich and Stake (1990) found that students who had traditional sex-role attitudes were more tolerant of SH behaviors ($F(1, 216) = 9.09, p < .01$); while, students who had nontraditional attitudes were less tolerant. Toker (2003) found that women who had more conservative attitudes towards women's gender roles in terms of their educational rights, marital roles, appropriate courtship and sexual behavior perceived physical sexual assault ($\beta = .18$) and sexual bribery and coercion ($\beta = .18$) as less sexually harassing. Apparently conservative attitudes toward sex roles increase the proneness to legitimize coercive sexual behavior by evaluating men's sexually aggressive behaviors as appropriate (Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1990); while women who have conservative attitudes about sex roles perceived fewer behaviors as SH (Klemmack and Klemmack 1976; as cited in Baker et al., 1990). According to the abovementioned information, conservative/liberalist attitudes are expected to influence SH perceptions of Turkish women in workplace.

Hypothesis 2: Participants who have higher levels of Conservatism will be less likely to perceive Sexist Hostility, Insinuation of Interest and Sexual Hostility as forms of SH with a small effect size.

1.6 Uncertainty Avoidance

Hofstede, in his Cultural Dimension Theory, mentioned four dimensions of national culture which are power distance, individualism, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity. They are described as the values which differentiate the countries from each other and show the way to cope with some problems such as inequality and uncertainty. With time some additions were made and two other dimensions which are Long-Term Orientation and Indulgence versus Restraint were added (Geert Hofstede, n.d.). The concern of this study was the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension among the above stated dimensions.

Hofstede, Hofstede, and Minkov (2010) defined uncertainty avoidance as “the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations”. Moreover, it is argued that this feeling is manifested by nervous stress and written, or unwritten rules are needed. They argued that for diminishing the anxiety created by ambiguity, every society found ways pertaining to different domains of life such as technology, law, and religion. Accordingly, technology helps people avoid uncertainties originating from nature; while rules and laws protect people from uncertainties caused by other people’s behaviors. Finally, religion makes people feel somewhat in control of an unknown personal future.

According to this conceptualization of UAI, it can be said that as an inadequately defined concept in the eyes of many members of society, SH behaviors may also create uncertainty especially at the workplace. Tavakoli, Keenan, and Cranjak-Karanovic (2003) stated that members of high uncertainty avoidance cultures are more likely to evaluate unethical violations as severe. For instance, in the study conducted by Parboteeah, Bronson, and Cullen (2005) they hypothesized that as a cultural dimension uncertainty avoidance was positively correlated with justifying unethical behaviors and their hypothesis was rejected. Furthermore, according to the results, Turkey’s score on willingness to justify ethically suspect behaviors was the lowest one as compared to 20 other countries. That means Tavakoli and colleagues (2003) assumption might be expected for Turkish participants who are from a culture high on uncertainty avoidance which is 85 points over 112.

Furthermore, since according to Hofstede (2001) people from high uncertainty avoidant cultures do not tolerate ambiguity while perceiving other people, they can be more aggressive in their communication and try to avoid others when they perceive threatening situations (Merkin, 2006; as cited in Merkin 2012). They argued that people should be less likely to tolerate workplace SH if they are members of cultures with high uncertainty avoidance. As to my knowledge, there is not enough study in which impact of uncertainty avoidance was investigated on the SH issues, because researchers mostly investigated other dimensions of Hofstede such as individualism/collectivism (Dohi & Fooladi, 2008) and masculinity/femininity (Jeknić, 2014; as cited in Siddiqi & Shafiq, 2017). Therefore, it is essential to investigate the uncertainty avoidance dimension's impact on SH perceptions as an unexplored issue.

The extant SH literature mostly comes from countries with low uncertainty avoidance levels such as the US (46), United Kingdom (35), Sweden (29) and Netherlands (53), whereas Turkey has a very high uncertainty avoidance level which is 85 (Hofstede et al., 2010). In accordance with the previous notions, it can be expected that women employed in Turkey try to make sense of ambiguous behaviors, worry about the exact meaning of those behaviors, try to avoid ambiguous messages; and thus those who have higher uncertainty avoidance levels perceive behaviors more sexually harassing. Even though, Turkey was found high on uncertainty level as a country; of course, there can be within culture variations at the uncertainty level; in turn employees' perception of SH behaviors. In the light of all of that information, it is very likely that the more ambiguous forms of social-sexual behaviors will be perceived as SH by employees high on uncertainty avoidance.

Hypothesis 3: Participants who have higher levels of uncertainty avoidance will be more likely to perceive Sexist Hostility, Insinuation of Interest and Sexual Hostility as forms of SH with a small effect size.

1.7 Organizational Climate

Organizational climate was defined by Parker and colleagues (2003) as how individuals perceive their workplace, including workplace related policies, practices, and procedures (as cited in Buchanan, Settles, Hall, & O'connor, 2014).

Organizations have the significant opportunity to hinder the occurrence of SH, since the best single predictor of the incidents of SH in organizations has been the SH climate (Willness et al., 2007). It is argued that climate is important both at the organizational and cultural levels, because Sigal and Jacobsen (1999) argued that “climate” either in terms of country overall or organization specific is associated with SH. Country-level or organization-level climate were said to be related to the attitudes which either promote (or not condemn obviously) SH or explicitly and absolutely discourage SH by establishing some policies. Sigal and Jacobsen also mentioned that if countries show passive or even encouraging attitudes toward SH, it is not possible that placing any policies prohibiting SH could decrease the incidence rates of SH.

It is known that the US, where most of the leading SH literature has accumulated, has more detailed laws and legal sanctions about workplace SH, whereas Turkey has a legal gap related to workplace SH and is behind the US in terms of SH laws, policies and their implementation at the workplace. For instance, on the contrary to Turkey, in the US, sex discrimination harassment was also included in the legal definitions as a way of SH or “unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature...”. (EEOC, 2019). Furthermore, SH violates Title VII of the Civil Right Act which contains the notion of “prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex and national origins”, according to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2008; as cited in Pina, Gannon, & Saunders, 2009). On the other hand, according to the TR Labor Code (İs Kanunu, 2003) and Penal Code (Türk Ceza Kanunu, 2004) SH was recognized within the law by including the cases that can be faced in employment area, family and education; however sex discrimination was not covered by this definition. Even though with the National Action Plan Gender Equality, 2008 – 2013 Plan (KSGM, 2008) Labor Code against workplace gender discrimination was published; SH was not covered by this plan. Therefore, obviously Turkish laws and policies show some differences from US’s, consequently in the cultural level SH climate show also differences. Those

differences may alter the perception, evaluation, and reactions of members of those two cultures toward SH as some scholars mentioned.

As countries' strictness while enacting and implementing law and policies may reflect how much organizations within this country will take those law and policies seriously; those laws and policies designate the organizational climate toward SH incident, perception, evaluation and reaction. For instance, in the study conducted by Williams, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1999), it was found that SH related organizational practices such as implementation practices, resources, and training had significant positive effect on harassment incidence in the military for both men ($F(1, 2766) = 154.76, p < .01, R^2 = .150$) and women ($F(1, 10321) = 1203.88, p < .01, R^2 = .057$). Moreover, another important finding of the study was that job-related negative outcomes of perceiving organizational practices to be insufficiently affected service members more than the effects of experiencing harassment.

Even though there is no study investigating the relationship between organizational climate and SH perceptions, it may be argued that in organizations, in which SH is defined properly and possible actions are taken with law, rules and policies, employees are more sensitive toward perturbational and threatening incidences. Thereby, they may be expected that employees who are aware of the proactive organizational policies and rules will be more likely to perceive ambiguous behaviors as SH.

Hypothesis 4: Participants' perceptions of a proactive organizational climate towards SH will have small positive associations with the perception of Sexist Hostility, Insinuation of Interest and Sexual Hostility as forms of SH.

1.8 Coping Preferences toward Sexual Harassment

There is sizable amount of studies, investigating responses or coping preferences showed by women in the face of SH behaviors at workplaces. Literature in which the coping preferences of SH was investigated have varied among studies from a simple model to complicated hyper dimensional models. For instance, one of those one-dimensional simple structure models is Gruber's (1989) which is based on response assertiveness. According to that model, seeking social support, avoidance, and confrontation are some categories (as cited in Knapp, Faley, Ekeberg, & Dubois,

1997). However, Knapp and colleagues stated that according to the findings from the literature, responses to SH reflect multidimensional structures instead of one-dimensional models in which responses are evaluated on a single continuum. For instance, in their typology they offered a multidimensional response structure to SH. In that typology they suggested that responses can be either self-focused or initiator focus, and they placed those categories on the vertical axis. Self-focused responses mean that the responses do not include the perpetrator of the SH. On the other hand, initiator-focused responses directly refer to the perpetrator and the event. In this model, the horizontal axis is the mode of response, which means the variation of responses depend on the amount of external support the target looks for. Intersection of those axes creates a two-by-two model which include four cells. Those cells represent the coping preferences to SH which were named as avoidance/denial, social coping, confrontation/negotiation, and advocacy seeking (Knapp et al., 1997).

In avoidance/denial response, which refers to the self-focused pole and includes some or nonexternal support, women try to abstain from the harassing situations both physically and cognitively. Even though these self-focused and low interference coping preferences are the least influential methods, they are the most preferred one. In social coping, which is self-focused and includes external support seeking, women seek for advice and emotional support from people who they trust such as a friend, a family member or colleague. However, it is mentioned that, like other self-focused coping preferences this strategy is also not influential to cease harassment behavior. In the confrontation/negotiation response type, which is an initiator focused strategy and does not include external support, women directly try to decrease the offensive behavior by insisting and requesting the harasser. Even though it is an effective strategy to cease the harassment, it is used rarely. Finally, in advocacy seeking, which is initiator focused and involves external support, women appeal for formal support from organizational authorities or outside agencies. As confrontation/negotiation strategy, advocacy seeking is an effective one; however, targets use it rarely (Knapp et al., 1997). Although Knapp and colleague's typology are well-known and well-accepted model for coping preferences of targets toward SH, as many other leading studies about SH in the literature this typology is also

from western cultures. Therefore, it is important to know whether Turkish women have the same preferences toward those coping strategies and which strategy they would prefer depending on the SH type.

This universal typology of responses toward SH has gained some empirical support from different samples such as male versus female preferences (e.g., Malamut & Offerman, 2001). A cultural comparison of the typology was made by Wasti and Cortina (2002) that also included Turkish women. They examined this typology with four different groups of working women from two different occupations and three different cultures which are Turkish, Anglo American and Hispanic American by using five coping mechanisms, which were confirmed with preliminary analysis. Those five coping preferences which are avoidance, denial, negotiation, advocacy seeking, and social coping, were confirmed for all those cultural groups and supported the typology of Knapp et al. (1997). It is stated that Hispanic American and Turkish women showed more avoidance behavior than Anglo American women and the avoidance items generally clustered with negotiation items instead of denial in this study. Moreover, the most uncommon response to SH among all cultures and occupational groups was advocacy seeking. Furthermore, negotiation was used by Turkish women more than Anglo American women (Wasti & Cortina, 2002). In the light of those findings, in the present study because in group variations were examined based on some cultural variations, differences between coping preferences of women were also wanted to find out exploratorily. It was argued that different SH forms lead to prefer different coping preferences. Former studies did not assess coping preferences in accordance with the different SH forms. Hence, it was argued that ambiguous forms of SH forms can lead women prefer certain types of coping. Therefore, according to the results of this study because five different coping preferences were identified for Turkish women, in the present study ingroup variations about the preferences of coping strategies at the face of SH was investigated exploratorily.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Procedure and Participants

Before beginning the data collection process, an approval for the present study was obtained from the Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee (HSEC). An online survey was prepared via Qualtrics Survey Software after obtaining the approval from HSEC (See Appendix A). With the link created by Qualtrics, participants were invited to the study through Facebook, Twitter, e-mail, and some personal connections. At the beginning of the questionnaires, the informed consent (see Appendix B) was presented to the participants followed by the Demographic Information Form (see Appendix C), the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), the Social/Economical Conservatism Scale, the Intolerance for Uncertainty Scale, the Organizational Climate Questions, and the Social Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ), respectively. Finally, to assess coping preferences, only women participants were asked to respond to the Coping Preferences Scale. At the end of the questionnaires, the debriefing form was presented to the participants. In the debriefing form the aim of the study and the process were explained in detail and the participants were thanked for their participation.

As a condition of the study, all the participants had to have a full-time job experience in any period of their lives. At the end of the data collection process 420 people, which is around 50% of the total number of people who attempted to fill the questionnaire, fully completed the questionnaire package.

Fully completed data were screened in order to clean random responders. After, deleting random responders and after univariate and multivariate outliers were discarded 380 participants were left. In terms of gender, 154 (40,5%) were men, and 226 (59,5%) were women. Moreover, 340 (89.5%) of the participants were white-

collar workers, while 40 (10.5%) of them were blue-collar workers. Age mean of all participants was 37.18 ($SD = 11.46$); while the age mean of women was 37.26 ($SD = 10.97$) and of men was 37.05 ($SD = 12.18$). Average tenure of participants was 13.38 years ($SD = 11.27$). Of the participants 145 (38.2%) indicated working only in the private sector, and 104 (27.4%) of them worked only in the public sector; while 82 (21.6%) of them chose both private and public sectors. Of participants 10 (2.6%) chose private, public and research sectors together, and 9 (2.4%) of them chose only private and research. Furthermore, while 2 (0.5%) participants worked only in the research sector, 8 (2.1%) of them chose the “other” option. One hundred thirty-two (34.7%) of those participants mentioned they had a managerial position at their work.

When the data were analyzed in terms of sectoral distribution, among the 48 sector options most of the participants, that was 113 (29.7%) of them, were from the education sector; while 29 (7.6%) of them were from consultancy, 25 (6.6%) of them academy, 16 (4.2%) of them informatics, 16 (4.2%) of them were from the health sector. One hundred twenty participants (31.6%) were working in a work context where the number of men and women employees were nearly equal while 103 (27.1%) of them were working in a work context with more women employees and 107 (28.2%) of them were working in a work context with more man employees. Moreover, 34 (8.9%) of participants were working in a work environment in which nearly all employees were men and 16 (4.2%) of participants were working within the environment in which nearly all of workers were women. While 173 (45.5%) of participants mentioned they were quite liberal, 161 (42.4%) of them were slightly liberal, 36 (9.5%) of them were slightly conservative, and 10 (2.6%) of them were quite conservative.

2.2 Measures

Within the scope of this study, Demographic Information Form, Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI), Social/Economical Conservatism Scale, Intolerance for Uncertainty Scale, Organizational Climate Questions, Social Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ), and Coping Preferences Scale were given to the participants, respectively. Briefly, written instructions were provided at the beginning of all the scales. The scales used in the study are listed below.

2.2.1 Demographic Information Form

In the Demographic Information Form, participants were asked for their age, gender, the city they were still working, sector and institution they were still working, the period of time they had worked for their last job, political stance, whether they were a white or blue-collar employee, job-gender ratio of their workplace, whether they had an executive role in their company or not. Multiple choices and open-ended questions were used in this part of the questionnaire.

2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

The scale was developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) to assess related but different constructs of sexist attitudes toward women: HS and BS. It is comprised of 22 self-report items; half of those items measure BS; whereas the other half measure HS. Respondents rated their agreement to the items using a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 6 = strongly agree) (see Appendix D). There was no reverse item in the scale. In the scale, high scores indicated relatively greater hostile and BS.

A sample item for HS is “Women seek power by gaining control over men”, and for BS is “Women have a superior moral sensibility”. This inventory was adapted to Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002). It was found that HS and BS are positively correlated ($r = .29$.) with each other. The inventory’s criterion related validity was found .60, when it was compared to the related construct of Sex Role Stereotyping Scale (SRS) of Burt (1980; as cited in. Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002). along with the ASI. Moreover, the internal consistency coefficient of the entire inventory was reported to be .85, and for HS and BS were .87 and .78, respectively. Test-retest reliability analysis also showed high correlation ($r = .87$), which means measurement across times were consistent.

Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002) conducted a principle component analysis with varimax rotation to analyze the factor structure. Four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.00 were found and the four-factor solution accounted for 51.07 % of the total variance. According to the factor analyses, there were three BS sub factors: protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy, and one HS sub factor. In addition, when a rotated two-factor solution was

applied to the data, BS's sub-factors combined under the general BS factor and again the HS factor emerged as an independent factor as reported by Glick and Fiske (1996). In the present study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to see the factor structure of the present data on ASI. Results of the CFA are reported in the results section.

2.2.3 Social/Economical Conservatism Scale (SECS)

In the present study the Economic and Social Conservatism Scale developed by Everett (2013) was used. In this scale, 12 general items such as "Welfare benefits" and "Fiscal responsibility" assess conservative attitudes in terms of both social and economic issues (see Appendix E). Participants were asked to rate each statement on the 100-point scale with the interval of 10. If people select 0 it means they feel very negative on the particular item, indicating being liberal; on the other hand, 100 points mean quite positive feelings toward the present item, indicating being conservative. Point of 50 means feeling neutral about the item. The scale has good overall Cronbach's alpha of .88 for the complete 12-item scale, an alpha of .70 for the 5-item economic conservatism subscale, and an alpha of .87 for the 7-item social conservatism subscale. According to the results of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), a two-factor solution with the social and economic conservatism factors, showed moderate to good loadings for all variables with a minimum loading of .45, and no variables cross-loaded (Everett, 2013).

In order to use this scale 12 general items were translated to Turkish. While translating the items into Turkish, direct translation was made, since all the items in the scale composed of generic concepts such as patriotism and abortion. For the items of "Limited government" and "Fiscal responsibility" brief information was given to participants at the bottom of the Questionnaire in order to make those concepts clear for those who do not know the exact meanings. EFA was performed for the scale which is presented in the results section.

2.2.4 Intolerance for Uncertainty Scale (IUS)

The Intolerance for Uncertainty Scale was developed by Freeston, Rheaume, Letarte, Dugas, and Ladouceur (1994) and has 27 items related to the notion that uncertainty is unacceptable. A five-point Likert-type scale was used ranging from 1=

“not at all characteristic of me” to 5= “entirely characteristic of me”. This scale was adapted to the Turkish population by Sari and Dağ (2009). In this study the short version of this scale was used, which consists of 12 items and it is adapted by Sarıçam, Erguvan, Akın, and Akça (2014) (see Appendix F). According to the results of EFA factor loadings of the scale ranged from .55 to .87 and a two-factor solution explained 78.6% of the total variance. Cronbach alpha was reported to be .88 for the entire scale; while it was .84 for the “prospective anxiety” subscale, and .77 for the “inhibitory anxiety” subscale. CFA also supported the two-factor solution (Sarıçam et al., 2014).

2.2.5 Organizational Climate toward Sexual Harassment Questions

In order to assess organizational climate 6 questions were developed for this study. Three of those questions assess whether SH related regulations exist in the company. An example question is “My institution applies preventive and implementing policies against SH incidents in the workplace.” The questions which measures existence of the SH related regulations were answered with three options which are “Yes, always”, “Sometimes”, and “No, never”. The other three questions were related to the participants’ individual perceptions about the organization’s climate about SH related regulations, an example question is “I think that my institution will be willing to develop preventive and implementing policies against SH occurring in the workplace.” The questions which measures perception about the SH related regulations were answered with three options which are “Yes, I strongly believe it”, “I’m not sure”, and “No, I strongly do not believe it”. (see Appendix G).

2.2.6 Social-Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ)

The SSIQ was developed by Toker (2003) based on interviews with 53 employed women in Turkey. Women indicated what behaviors could constitute SH. Toker and Sümer (2010) identified a five-factor structure of physical sexual offense, sexual bribery and coercion, sexual hostility, insinuation of interest and sexist hostility, using a 5-point scale (1 = Not SH at all, 2 = Not SH, 3 = Could be considered SH, 4 = It is SH, 5 = Certainly is SH). In the present study, 18 of the items pertaining to sexual hostility, insinuation of interest and sexist hostility were used because the aim is measuring only the more ambiguous forms of SH (see Toker,

2016) (see Appendix H). Toker (2016) assessed the three-factor structure with 18 indicators with CFA. It was found that insinuation of interest had six indicators with a minimum loading of .60, sexual hostility had seven indicators with a minimum loading of .64, and sexist hostility had five indicators with a minimum loading of .72 in the Turkish sample. The internal consistency reliabilities for those three factors were .84 for Insinuation of Interest, .88 for Sexual Hostility, and .89 for Sexist Hostility.

2.2.7 Coping Preferences Scale

Six hypothetical scenarios developed by Toker (2011) were used in order to assess responses toward SH. Those six scenarios depicted a different form of SH; sexual hostility, severe physical abuse, insinuation of interest, mild physical abuse, sexual bribery, and sexist hostility respectively. All of the scenarios were rated with Knapp, Faley, Ekberg, and Duboi's (1997) 14 item measures ("Ask him to leave me alone") with a five-point Likert-type scale, from "1 = I would never respond this way" to "5 = I will definitely respond this way" (see Appendix I).

Two main and five subcategories of SH responses have been identified in the work context (Knapp et al., 1997; Wasti & Cortina, 2002). Those are the "self-focused responses" of denial, avoidance and social coping, and the "initiator-focused responses" of negotiation/confrontation and advocacy seeking. According to the results of the study conducted by Toker (2011) reliabilities of coping responses were as follows; .84 for denial, .77 for avoidance, .94 for social support, .67 for negotiation and .91 for advocacy seeking.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

As mentioned before, initially random responders were removed from the data. If participants responded to all the questions in the same manner or there were many missing variables in the same scale those data were excluded. The remaining missing values in the data set were replaced by the mean values of the scale distribution. EFA and CFA were run on the scales used in the study. Before proceeding with hypothesis testing, data were screened for multivariate analysis using Mahalanobis distance and only one multivariate outlier was detected and removed. Analyses were carried out with 380 participants; 226 of them women, 154 of them men.

3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA)

While running the CFA with EQS 6.1, data were checked for multivariate normality using the average off-diagonal absolute standardized residuals, the distribution of standardized residuals and Mardia's Z estimate in which values higher than 5 necessitate robust estimations. In order to assess how well the model, fit the data, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) were used. Chi-square test of fit shows us whether the covariance of estimated population fit our sample covariance matrix. In cases of multivariate kurtosis, Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square was used (Bentler, 2006). Moreover, when testing comparative fit CFI uses noncentral chi-square distribution and Bentler (1990) stated that it should be the chosen fit index (as cited in Byrne, 2006).

3.1.1 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

Based on former analysis, which was mentioned in the method section, this inventory has a 4-factor structure; three BS subfactors (protective paternalism with 4 items, complementary gender differentiation with 3 items, and heterosexual intimacy with 4 items) and one HS subfactor with the remaining 11 items (Sakallı-Uğurlu,

2002). Since many studies use the higher-order 2-factor model of benevolent and HS (Glick et al., 2000; Sibley & Wilson, 2004) and the present study hypotheses were developed accordingly, the fit of the 2-factor model to the data was tested.

According to the multivariate normality results (Mardia's $Z = 25.47$) robust estimation was used. The average off-diagonal absolute standardized residual was .05, and according to the distribution of standardized residuals, 88.93% of residuals fell between the -0.1 and 0.1 and remaining residuals (11.07%) fell between -0.1 and -0.2 or 0.2 and 0.1. Hence, most of the residuals were near zero. The model did not fit the data; S-B $\chi^2(208) = 506$, (χ^2/df) = 2.43, $p < .001$, CFI = .89, RMSEA = .06, 90% CI [.06, .07]. First modification was between the 19th item which is "Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility." and 21th item which is "Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.". A second proposed modification was between the 6th item of "Feminists are seeking more power than men" and the 20th item of "Feminists are not making reasonable demands". Results after the second modification showed slight improvement (S-B $\chi^2(206) = 407.62$, (χ^2/df) = 1.98, $p < .001$, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .05, 90% CI [.04, .06]) with an acceptable level of fit.

Internal consistency score for Ambivalent Sexism Inventory with 22 items was .90, while it was .89 for the 11-item HS factor, and .85 for the BS factor (see Table 1.). Hostile and BS were correlated moderately ($r = .50$, $p < .001$).

3.1.2 Intolerance for Uncertainty Scale (IUS)

Based on former analysis which was mentioned in the method section this inventory has a 2-factor structure. According to this model one of those factors, which is "Prospective Anxiety" (Future-related fear and anxiety), contains 7 items while the other one, which is "Inhibitory Anxiety" (Uncertainty inhibiting action or experience), contains 5 items (Helsen, Van der Bussche, Vlaeyen, & Goubert, 2013). According to the multivariate normality results, (Mardia's $Z = 18.44$) robust estimations was used. The average off-diagonal absolute standardized residual was .06. According to the distribution of standardized residuals, 92.31% of residuals fell between the -0.1 and 0.1 and remaining residuals (7.69%) fell between -0.1 and -0.2 or 0.2 and 0.1. So, most of the residuals were near zero. Results showed that the

model did not fit the data well ($S-B\chi^2(53) = 204.04$, $(\chi^2 / df) = 3.85$, $p < .001$, $CFI = .88$, $RMSEA = .09$, 90% CI [.07, .10]).

According to the Lagrange Multiplier test three modifications were recommended. All modifications were between the error-parameters. First modification was between the 8th item which is “I always want to know what the future will bring for me” and 11th item which is “I must be able to organize everything in advance”. A second modification was between the 11th item of “I must be able to organize everything in advance” and the 12th item of “I have to get away from all uncertain situations”. Finally, a third modification was between the 3rd item “Uncertainty prevents me from leading a life in the way I want” and the 2nd item “It prevents me from having all the information I need”. Results after the modifications were deemed adequate ($S-B \chi^2 (50) = 136.75$, $(\chi^2 / df) = 2.74$, $p < .05$, $CFI = .93$, $RMSEA = .07$, 90% CI [.05, .08]). RMSEA values between .05 and .08 have been defined as reasonable errors of approximation in the population by Browne and Cudeck (1993, as cited in Byrne, 2006).

Cronbach Alpha's for the Intolerance for Uncertainty scale with 12 items was .88, while it was .79 for Prospective Anxiety and .81 for Inhibitory Anxiety (see Table 1.). Intolerance for uncertainty had positive significant correlations with its sub factors which are prospective anxiety ($r = .95$, $p < .001$), inhibitory anxiety ($r = .93$, $p < .001$). Moreover, prospective anxiety had a strong positive significant correlation with inhibitory anxiety ($r = .76$, $p < .001$).

3.1.3 Social-Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ)

Because it was expected that women and men's data might show differences, the factorial structure of the SSIQ was analyzed separately for the two genders. Based on former information which was mentioned in the method section this inventory normally has a 5-factor structure; however, in the present study three of those factors were used. Therefore, CFA was conducted for the three ambiguous SH factors. According to the data of the women sample, multivariate normality results (Mardia's $Z = 11.75$) necessitated robust estimations. The average off-diagonal absolute standardized residual was .06 and 87.13% of the standardized residuals fell between the -0.1 and 0.1 and the remaining residuals (12.87%) fell between -0.1 and

-0.2, 0.2 and 0.1, or 0.3 and 0.2. So, most of the residuals were near zero. Results showed that the model did not fit the data well; S-B χ^2 (132) = 309.06, (χ^2 /df) = 2.34, $p < .001$, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .08, 90% CI [.07, .09].

According to the recommended modifications by Lagrange Multiplier test, the first proposed modification was between the 16th item which is “Harshly criticizing and belittling a woman’s ideas concerning work” and item 17th which is “A male co-worker insulting a woman employee”. A second modification was between item 11 which is “Although not encouraged by the woman, trying to get close by leaving notes showing his interest, constant phoning or e-mailing” and item 13 which is “Although discouraged once, constantly requesting a date”. Results after the second modification showed improvement (S-B χ^2 (130) = 243.00, (χ^2 /df) = 1.87, $p < .001$, CFI = .95, RMSEA = .06, 90% CI [.05, .07]). The second modified model fit the data well supporting the use of the 3-factor model.

According to the data of the men sample, multivariate normality results (Mardia’s $Z = 14.93$) necessitated robust estimations. The average off-diagonal absolute standardized residual was .06. According to the distribution of standardized residuals, 83.04% of residuals fell between -0.1 and 0.1. Remaining residuals (16.96%) fell between -0.1 and -0.2, 0.2 and 0.1, or 0.3 and 0.2. So, most of the residuals were near zero. Results showed that S-B χ^2 (132) = 212.20, (χ^2 /df) = 1.60, $p < .001$, χ^2 /df = 1.61, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .06, 90% CI [.05, .08], so the model did not fit the data well. First modification proposed by Lagrange Multiplier test was conducted by adding an error covariance between the 16th item which is “Harshly criticizing and belittling a woman’s ideas concerning work” and the 17th item which is “A male co-worker insulting a woman employee”. Results after the modification showed that (S-B χ^2 (131) = 187.73, (χ^2 /df) = 1.43, $p < .05$, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .05, 90% CI [.04, .07]), modification model has better fit than the first hypothesized model to the data.

Internal consistency in the entire sample for the SSIQ with 18 items was .89, while it was .86 for Sexist Hostility, .85 for Sexual Hostility and .84 for Insinuation of Interest (see Table 1.). Internal consistency in the sample of men was .89 for the entire scale, while it was .83 for Sexist Hostility, .84 for Sexual Hostility and .83 for

Insinuation of Interest. Internal consistency in the sample of women was .90, while it was .87 for Sexist Hostility, .86 for Sexual Hostility and .84 for Insinuation of Interest.

SSIQ had significant correlations with its sub factors which are sexist hostility ($r = .75, p < .001$), sexual hostility ($r = .79, p < .001$), and insinuation of interest ($r = .85, p < .001$). Sexist hostility had significant positive correlations with sexual hostility ($r = .34, p < .001$) and insinuation of interest ($r = .51, p < .001$). Sexual hostility had significant positive correlation with insinuation of interest ($r = .54, p < .001$).

3.2 Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA)

In order to see the factor structures of the Social/Economical Conservatism Scale, Organizational Climate towards SH Scale, and the Coping Preferences Scale, EFAs were conducted. Conducting EFAs for these measure were more appropriate as the Organizational Climate towards SH Scale was developed for this study, the Coping Preferences Scale was given to be rated for six different SH scenarios, and the Social/Economical Conservatism Scale was translated and used with a Turkish sample for the first time.

3.2.1 Social/Economical Conservatism Scale

An EFA with Principal Axis Factoring using oblique rotation was conducted on the 12-item Social/Economical Conservatism Scale. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (.84) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2(66) = 1484.11, (\chi^2 / df) = 21.94, p < .001$) indicated that the data could be factor analyzed. The results revealed an initial three-factor solution with eigenvalues over one. These factors explained 45.50% of the total variance. Structure matrix showed that there were some items such as "welfare benefits" and "abortion" which cross-loaded across these three factors and the factor structure could not be separated meaningfully. Because of that reason, factor analyses were repeated by forcing the solution into a 2-factor structure as proved in the former study by Everett (2013). The two-factor solution explained 40.79% of the total variance and there were again cross-loadings between the items. According to this model the Social and Economical conservatism factor items were separated better than the first model.

However, economical conservatism items which are “Gun Ownership” and “Limited Government” loaded on the first factor which mainly contained social conservatism items, while “Abortion” and “Religion” loaded on the second factor which mainly contained economical conservatism items. So, factor analysis was repeated to obtain a one-factor solution. Accordingly, the one-factor structure explained 30.87% of the total variance. Factor loadings of 8 items were higher than .50, while 3 items were lower than .40 and one item loaded reversed as expected. When the former analysis was examined, because some items not only loaded onto different factors but also disrupted the factor structure, the 4 items which were “Abortion”, “Limited Government”, “Welfare Benefits” and “Gun ownership” were removed from the inventory and a one-factor structure was tested again. According to this model the one factor structure explained 41.77% of the total variance and Cronbach’s alpha coefficient after the removal of 4 items was .84 (see Table 1). Because reliability is highly acceptable, the one factor structure for Social/Economical Conservatism Scale was used in hypothesis testing.

3.2.2 Organizational Climate toward Sexual Harassment Questions

An EFA with Principal Axis Factoring and oblique rotation was conducted in order to see the factor structure of the Organizational Climate scale developed in this study. Because this questionnaire was formed newly, first an EFA was conducted by looking at the number of factors produced based on eigenvalues larger than one. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (.74) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 (15) = 665.84$, $(\chi^2 / df) = 44,39$, $p < .001$) indicated that the data could be factor analyzed. According to the results there was 1 factor which explained 39.45% of the total variance and all items loaded between .37 and .76. Because in this questionnaire both the existence of SH policies and perceptions of organizational climate regarding SH attitudes were assessed in two different parts, alternative factor structures were also explored, but were not found to fit the content of the scales. Thus, the one-factor structure was used for hypothesis testing. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the Organizational Climate scale with 6 items was .78 (see Table 1.). In order to compute composite scale scores, the first, second and third items of two different question sets (ie., perception of employees and existence of SH policy

implementation in the organization) were multiplied with each other. For example, the first item of questions about existence of SH policy implementation at the organization was multiplied with the first item of questions about employees' perception about SH policy implementation of their organizations. At the end of the process, the sum of all those multiplications was divided into three. Existence of SH regulations and perception of organizational climate subfactors were also used in the correlation analysis on an exploratory basis in order to see whether they have differential associations with SH perceptions.

Organizational climate had significant positive correlations with existence of SH related regulations ($r = .93, p < .001$), and perception of SH related regulations ($r = .86, p < .001$). Existence of SH related regulations had significant strong positive correlation with perception of SH related regulations ($r = .60, p < .001$).

3.2.3 Coping Preferences Scale

An EFA with Principal Axis Factoring and oblique rotation was conducted only in the sample of women ($N = 226$) with responses to 14 items across the 6 scenarios. Although former studies showed there are five subfactors, the first analysis was conducted to see how many factors would emerge with eigenvalues of 1 and above. According to the results the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (.84) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 (3486) = 16165.22, (\chi^2 /df) = 4.64, p < .001$) were adequate and 19 factors were found. Those 19 factors explained 67.93% of the total variance. When structure matrix was investigated nearly all the items had cross loadings. Hence, the analysis was repeated by forcing the number of factors to five based on the five separate coping types in the literature. Results showed that five factors explained 45.01% of the total variance. First factor explained 19.23%, second factor explained 11.59%, third factor explained 7.07%, fourth factor explained 4.08%, and the fifth factor explained 3.03% of total variance.

When the factor structure was examined it was found that coping responses given for the 6th scenario about sexist hostility either loaded on factors other than sexist hostility or had cross-loadings on more than one factor. Because of that reason, a five-factor structure was tested again by removing items related to the 6th scenario on sexist hostility. Results showed that 48.49% of the total variance was explained

with the remaining responses to 14 items across five scenarios. Although total variance explained was higher than the former model; still there were cross-loadings between the factors. For example, 12 of the questions assessing reporting the SH loaded on at least two different factors at the same time. Six questions assessing denial loaded on different factors and six denial questions loaded under .30. Because of those reasons, the questions about “denial” were removed from the analysis and the factor structure was tested again firstly by forcing the number of factors to 4 and secondly to 3. Because the 4-factor structure did not eliminate cross loadings (21 cross-loadings remained over .30), it was decided to use the 3-factor structure. According to this model, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (.87) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($\chi^2 (1770) = 12216.58, (\chi^2 /df) = 6.90, p < .001$) were adequate. Moreover, the three factors explained 46.29% of total variance; while, the first factor explained 23.63%, the second factor explained 13.81%, and the third factor explained 8.84% of total variance. According to the final model; the first factor including 15 items, was named “seeking social support” since items were related to support as a coping mechanism, with loadings between .44 and .87. The second factor included 20 items; 15 of them were related to “reporting the incident to authorities”, while 5 of them belonged to the scale of seeking social support, with loadings between -.80 and -.56. The five items that originally belonged to the scale of seeking social support were the same item assessed across five different SH scenarios. This was the 13th item in the original scale, which was “I talk to my boss, my supervisor, or a union representative about the case”. It was thought that because the item could be perceived as reporting the harassment case to someone instead of seeking support, the content of the second factor obtained in the EFA was deemed homogeneous and was named “reporting to authorities”. The last factor consisted of 10 items related to negotiating with the harasser and 15 items related to avoiding the harasser with loadings between .74 and .23. Because the content of negotiating with the harasser involves attempts at ceasing the incident, they were like avoiding the harasser. The third factor was named “avoiding the harasser”. This factor structure shows similarities with Cortina and Wasti’s (2005) cluster analysis. In their study, which examined coping behaviors across for different cultural groups, they found

that one of the largest groups prefer avoiding the stressor at the same time negotiating with him to discourage. Hence, they labeled one of their cluster as “avoidant-negotiating”.

Internal consistency of the Coping Preferences Scale after the sixth scenario and denial items were removed (leaving 60 items) was .94. For the first factor which is “Social support seeking” internal consistency was .96, for the “Reporting to authorities” factor it was .95, and for the “Negotiate/Avoid” factor it was .90 (see Table 1). In order to find composite scores of Coping Preferences Scales, the same questions form a factor (e.g., all “seeking social support” questions across scenarios) were summed and divided into the numbers of items in the scale. By this way, three composite scores for three coping mechanism were created.

Seeking social support had significant negative correlations with reporting to authorities ($r = -.28, p < .001$) and avoiding the harasser ($r = -.33, p < .001$). Reporting to authorities had a significant positive correlation with avoiding the harasser ($r = .17, p = .01$).

3.3 Descriptive Statistics, Gender Differences and Correlations

Descriptive statistics for the measures are summarized in Table 1 for the entire sample, together with their internal consistencies. While mean scores range from 2.11 to 6.48, measures’ mean scores were higher than the mid-point of the related scales except for perceiving sexist hostility as SH. Moreover, standard deviations ranged from .52 to 2.07. Descriptive statistics were conducted for men and women participants separately. Results for men ($N = 154$) and women ($N = 226$) are given in Table 2.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to see whether there were differences on study variables between men and women participants. Firstly, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was examined. Levene’s test for equality of error variances was not significant for age of the participants, tenure, job-gender ratio, social/economical conservatism, intolerance for uncertainty, prospective anxiety, inhibitory anxiety, ambivalent sexism, hostile sexism, BS, organizational climate toward SH (existence of SH related regulation and perception of SH related regulations), and social sexual incidents (sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and

insinuation of interest) indicating that the homogeneity of variances assumption across groups was met.

According to t-test results, there were no significant mean differences for men and women in terms of age of the participants, tenure, social/economical conservatism, organizational climate toward SH (existence of SH related regulation and perception of SH related regulations), and sexist hostility.

As compared to men participants ($M = 2.56$, $SD = .95$) women participants ($M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.03$) reported that in their workplace the number of women workers was higher than the number of men workers $t(378) = -5.42$, $p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = .57$. Women ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .85$) reported higher levels of intolerance for uncertainty $t(378) = -2.50$, $p = 0.01$, Cohen's $d = .26$, as compared to men ($M = 3.68$, $SD = .83$). Moreover, women also reported higher levels of prospective anxiety ($M_{\text{women}} = 3.98$, $SD_{\text{women}} = .82$, $M_{\text{men}} = 3.78$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .85$, $t(378) = -2.34$, $p = 0.02$, Cohen's $d = .24$), inhibitory anxiety ($M_{\text{women}} = 3.77$, $SD_{\text{women}} = 1.00$, $M_{\text{men}} = 3.53$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .96$, $t(378) = -2.36$, $p = 0.02$, Cohen's $d = .24$). On the other hand, as compared to women, men reported higher levels of ambivalent sexism ($M_{\text{men}} = 3.42$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .75$, $M_{\text{women}} = 3.04$, $SD_{\text{women}} = .85$, $t(378) = 4.46$, $p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = .47$), HS ($M_{\text{men}} = 3.44$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .93$, $M_{\text{women}} = 2.89$, $SD_{\text{women}} = .94$, $t(378) = 5.62$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = .59$), and BS ($M_{\text{men}} = 3.40$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .89$, $M_{\text{women}} = 3.19$, $SD_{\text{women}} = .98$, $t(378) = 2.12$, $p = .04$, Cohen's $d = .22$). Furthermore, as compared to men women reported higher levels of perceiving the composite ambiguous social-sexual incidents as SH ($M_{\text{women}} = 3.31$, $SD_{\text{women}} = .63$, $M_{\text{men}} = 3.08$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .61$, $t(378) = -3.45$, $p = .001$, Cohen's $d = .37$), perceiving sexual hostility as SH ($M_{\text{women}} = 3.94$, $SD_{\text{women}} = .69$, $M_{\text{men}} = 3.69$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .70$, $t(378) = -3.44$, $p = .001$, Cohen's $d = .36$), and perceiving insinuation of interest as SH ($M_{\text{women}} = 3.33$, $SD_{\text{women}} = .80$, $M_{\text{men}} = 3.08$, $SD_{\text{men}} = .77$, $t(378) = -3.10$, $p = .002$, Cohen's $d = .32$) (see Table 2.).

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of study variables for the entire sample

	Number of Items	Cronbac h Alpha	Mean	SD	Range	Skewness
Job-Gender Ratio	1	-	2.89	1.04	4	-.05
Social/Economical Conservatism	8	.84	6.48	1.99	10	-.26
Uncertainty Avoidance	12	.88	3.81	.85	4.75	-.47
Prospective Anxiety	7	.79	3.90	.84	4.86	-.39
Inhibitory Anxiety	5	.81	3.67	.99	5	-.33
Ambivalent Sexism	22	.90	3.19	.83	4.37	-.16
Hostile Sexism	11	.89	3.11	.97	4.37	.12
Benevolent Sexism	11	.85	3.27	.95	5	-.14
Organizational Climate	6	.78	5.54	2.07	8	-.17
Existence of SH related regulations	3	.58	2.11	.53	2	-.18
Perception of SH related regulations	3	.73	2.50	.52	2	-.76
Perceptions of Social- Sexual Incidents	18	.89	3.21	.63	3.22	.38
Perceiving Sexist Hostility as SH	6	.86	2.33	.89	4	.60
Perceiving Sexual Hostility as SH	6	.85	3.84	.70	3.14	-.07
Perceiving Insinuation of Interest as SH	6	.84	3.23	.80	3.67	.17

Notes. Std. Error of Skewness = .125. Job gender ratio was rated on a 5-point scale; lower scores indicate that there are more men than women in the organization; while, higher scores indicate that there are more women than men in the organization. Uncertainty Avoidance and its subfactors, and Ambivalent Sexism were rated on a 6-point scale. Organizational climate, existence and perception of SH related regulations was rated on a 3-point scale. Perceptions of Social-Sexual Incidents was rated on a 5-point scale. Social/Economical Conservatism was rated on a 10-point scale. For all those questionnaires, higher scores indicate higher endorsement of the construct.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics and t-test results of study variables for men and women participants

		M	SD	Range	Skewness	<i>t</i> (df)	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Social/Economical						.80(378)	.08
Conservatism							
	Men	6.58	2.04	10	-.25		
	Women	6.41	1.98	10	-.27		
Uncertainty						-2.50(378)*	.26
Avoidance							
	Men	3.67	.83	4.58	-.61		
	Women	3.90	.85	4.58	-.42		
Prospective						-2.34(378)*	.24
Anxiety							
	Men	3.78	.85	4.71	-.43		
	Women	3.98	.82	4.43	-.36		
Inhibitory Anxiety						-2.36(378)*	.24
	Men	3.53	.96	4.60	-.43		
	Women	3.77	1	5	-.31		
Ambivalent						4.46(378)**	.47
Sexism							
	Men	3.42	.75	4.73	-.17		
	Women	3.04	.85	4.27	-.06		
Hostile Sexism						5.62(378)**	.59
	Men	3.43	.93	4.73	.08		
	Women	2.89	.94	4.45	.19		
Benevolent Sexism						2.12(378)*	.22
	Men	3.40	.89	5	-.17		
	Women	3.19	.98	4.55	-.09		

Table 2 (continued)

	M	SD	Range	Skewness	<i>t</i> (df)	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Organizational Climate					1.32(378)	.14
Men	5.71	2.10	7.67	-.23		
Women	5.43	2.04	8	-.14		
Existence of SH related regulations					1.09(378)	.11
Men	2.14	.53	2	-.29		
Women	2.08	.53	2	-.12		
Perception of SH related regulations					1.38(378)	.15
Men	2.55	.51	1.67	-.73		
Women	2.47	.53	2	-.77		
Perceptions of Social-Sexual Incidents					-3.45(378)**	.37
Men	3.08	.61	3.22	.39		
Women	3.31	.63	3	.38		
Perceiving Sexist Hostility as SH					-1.62(378)	.17
Men	2.24	.84	4	.69		
Women	2.39	.92	4	.54		
Perceiving Sexual Hostility as SH					-3.44(378)**	.36
Men	3.69	.70	2.86	.05		
Women	3.94	.69	3.14	-.15		

Table 2 (continued)

	M	SD	Range	Skewness	<i>t</i> (df)	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Perceiving Insinuation of Interest as SH					-3.10(378)**	.32
Men	3.08	.77	3.50	.28		
Women	3.33	.80	3.67	.10		

Notes. Std. Error of Skewness = .195. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Social/Economical Conservatism was rated on a 10-point scale. Uncertainty Avoidance and its subfactors and Ambivalent Sexism and its subfactors were rated on a 6-point scale. Organizational climate, existence and perception of SH related regulations was rated on a 3-point scale. Perceptions of Social-Sexual Incidents was rated on a 5-point scale. For all those questionnaires, higher scores indicate higher endorsement of the construct.

Bivariate correlation analysis was conducted between study variables (Table 3). According to the results, age of the participants was significantly and positively correlated with participants' tenure ($r = .92, p < .001$), job-gender ratio ($r = .15, p = .004$), level of ambivalent sexism ($r = .21, p < .001$), level of BS ($r = .29, p < .001$). Age of the participants was negatively and significantly correlated with their organizational climate towards SH ($r = -.12, p = .02$), perception of SH related regulations ($r = -.13, p = .01$), and sexist hostility ($r = -.14, p = .01$).

Participants' tenure had a positive significant correlation with job-gender ratio ($r = .14, p = .01$), ambivalent sexism ($r = .22, p < .001$), BS ($r = .30, p < .001$); while it had a small negative significant correlation with organizational climate towards SH ($r = -.12, p = .02$), perceptions of SH related regulations ($r = -.16, p = .002$), and sexist hostility ($r = -.13, p = .01$). Job-gender ratio had negative significant correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = -.13, p = .01$), HS ($r = -.11, p = .04$), and BS ($r = -.12, p = .02$) indicating that as the ratio of women increased in the organization, sexism levels decreased.

Social/economical conservatism had positive significant correlations with uncertainty avoidance ($r = .16, p = .002$), prospective anxiety ($r = .18, p = .001$), inhibitory anxiety ($r = .11, p = .03$), ambivalent sexism ($r = .27, p < .001$), HS ($r = .26, p < .001$), BS ($r = .21, p < .001$), as would be expected, and also with organizational climate towards SH ($r = .13, p = .01$) and existence of SH related

regulations ($r = .14, p = .01$); while it had a small negative significant correlation with perceiving the ambiguous forms of social sexual incidents ($r = -.15, p = .003$), sexist hostility ($r = -.22, p < .001$), and insinuation of interest ($r = -.14, p = .005$). Furthermore, uncertainty avoidance had positive significant correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = .25, p < .001$), HS ($r = .19, p < .001$), and BS ($r = .24, p < .001$). Prospective anxiety had positive significant correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = .26, p < .001$), HS ($r = .19, p < .001$), and BS ($r = .26, p < .001$). Inhibitory anxiety had positive significant correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = .21, p < .001$), HS ($r = .17, p < .001$), and BS ($r = .19, p < .001$).

Ambivalent sexism had positive significant correlations with organizational climate ($r = .12, p = .02$) and existence of SH related regulations ($r = .13, p = .01$); while it had negative correlations with perceiving the ambiguous form of social-sexual incidents as SH ($r = -.18, p = .001$), and perceiving sexist hostility ($r = -.13, p = .01$), sexual hostility ($r = -.15, p < .001$), and insinuation of interest ($r = -.13, p = .01$) as SH. HS had significant correlations with organizational climate ($r = .12, p = .02$) and existence of SH related regulations ($r = .14, p = .01$); while it had significant negative correlations with perceiving the ambiguous forms of social-sexual incidents ($r = -.22, p < .001$), and perceiving sexist hostility ($r = -.16, p = .002$), sexual hostility ($r = -.18, p < .001$), and insinuation of interest ($r = -.18, p < .001$) as SH. Perceiving insinuation of interest as SH had significant negative correlations with organizational climate ($r = -.13, p = .02$), existence of SH related regulations ($r = -.11, p = .04$), and perception of SH related regulations ($r = -.10, p = .04$).

Finally, gender of the participants, coded as 1 = men and 2 = women, had positive significant correlations with job-gender ratio ($r = .27, p < .001$), uncertainty avoidance ($r = .13, p = .01$), prospective anxiety ($r = .12, p = .02$), inhibitory anxiety ($r = .12, p = .02$), perceiving the ambiguous form of social sexual incidents as SH ($r = .18, p = .001$), sexual hostility ($r = .17, p = .001$), and insinuation of interest ($r = .16, p = .002$); while it had negative significant correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = -.22, p < .001$), HS ($r = -.28, p < .001$), BS ($r = -.11, p = .04$).

Table 3

Pearson correlation coefficients for all participants

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Gender	—							
2.Age	.01	—						
3.Tenure	-.01	.93**	—					
4.Job-Gender Ratio	.27**	.15**	.14**	—				
5.Conservatism	-.04	.01	.01	-.05	—			
6.Uncertainty Avoidance	.13*	-.02	-.02	.08	.16**	—		
7.Prospective Anxiety	.12*	-.03	-.02	.07	.18**	.95**	—	
11 8.Inhibitory Anxiety	.12*	-.01	-.02	.08	.11*	.93**	.76**	—
9.Ambivalent Sexism	-.22**	.21**	.22**	-.13*	.27**	.25**	.26**	.21**
10.Hostile Sexism	-.28**	.07	.09	-.11*	.26**	.19**	.19**	.17**
11.Benevolent Sexism	-.11*	.29**	.30**	-.12*	.21**	.24**	.26**	.19**
12.Org. SH Climate	-.07	-.12*	-.12*	-.03	.13*	-.00	.02	-.03
13.SH Climate Existence	-.06	-.08	-.07	-.04	.14**	.00	.02	-.02
14.SH Climate Perception	-.07	-.13*	-.16**	.00	.06	-.05	-.04	-.05
15.Ambiguous SH forms	.18**	-.07	-.08	.01	-.15**	-.00	.01	-.01
16.Sexist Hostility	.08	-.14**	-.14**	-.06	-.22**	-.05	-.04	-.05
17.Sexual Hostility	.17**	-.09	-.07	.06	-.02	.07	.08	.05
18.Insinnuation of Interest	.16**	.04	.01	.02	-.14**	-.03	-.03	-.03

Table 3 (continued)

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
9.Ambivalent Sexism	—									
10.Hostile Sexism	.87**	—								
11.Benevolent Sexism	.86*	.50**	—							
12.Org. SH Climate	.12*	.12*	.09	—						
13.SH Climate Existence	.13*	.14**	.09	.93**	—					
14.SH Climate Perception	.06	.06	.06	.84**	.60**	—				
15.Ambiguous SH forms	-.18**	-.22**	-.09	-.08	-.06	-.08	—			
16.Sexist Hostility	-.13**	-.16**	-.07	-.04	-.02	-.03	.75**	—		
17.Sexual Hostility	-.15**	-.18**	-.09	-.02	-.02	-.05	.79**	.34**	—	
18.Insinnuation of Interest	-.13**	-.18**	-.05	-.13*	-.11*	-.10*	.85**	.51**	.54**	—

Notes. N = 380, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Men was coded in the data as 1; while women were coded as 2. Job gender ratio was rated on a 5-point scale; lower scores indicate that there are more men than women in the organization; while, higher scores indicate that there are more women than men in the organization. Social/Economical Conservatism was rated on a 10-point scale. Uncertainty Avoidance with its subfactors and Ambivalent Sexism with its subfactors were rated on a 6-point scale. Organizational climate was rated on a 3-point scale. Ambiguous SH forms were rated on a 5-point scale. For all questionnaires, higher scores indicate higher endorsement of the construct.

Bivariate correlation analysis was conducted separately for genders. In Table 4, correlations for women are presented at the bottom triangle, while correlations for men are presented at the top triangle. According to the results, age had significant positive correlation with job-gender ratio ($r = .20, p = .01$) for only men's data; while it had significant positive correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = .31, p < .001$) and HS ($r = .20, p = .002$) for only women's data. On the other hand, age had significant negative correlations with organizational climate ($r = -.16, p = .05$) and perception of SH related regulations ($r = -.21, p = .01$) for only men's data; while it had significant negative correlations with perceiving the ambiguous forms of social sexual incidents ($r = -.13, p = .05$) and sexist hostility ($r = -.24, p < .001$) for only women's data.

Tenure had significant positive correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = .31, p < .001$), and HS ($r = .20, p = .003$) for only women's data as different from men's data. Furthermore, tenure had significant negative correlation with perception of SH related regulations ($r = -.21, p = .01$) for only men's data; while it had significant negative correlation with sexist hostility ($r = -.22, p = .001$) for only women's data.

Social/economical conservatism had significant negative correlation with perceiving the ambiguous forms of social-sexual incidents as SH ($r = -.17, p = .01$) for only women's data; while it had significant negative correlation with perceiving sexist hostility as SH ($r = -.21, p = .01$) for only men's data. Moreover, for only men's data social/economical conservatism had significant positive correlations with uncertainty avoidance ($r = .28, p < .001$), prospective anxiety ($r = .31, p < .001$), inhibitory anxiety ($r = .21, p = .01$). As different from men's data, uncertainty avoidance had significant positive correlation with HS ($r = .30, p < .001$) for women's data. On the other hand, as different from women's data, uncertainty avoidance had significant negative correlation with perceiving sexist hostility as SH ($r = -.17, p = .04$). As different from men's data, for women's data inhibitory anxiety had significant positive correlations with ambivalent sexism ($r = .30, p < .001$), HS ($r = .29, p < .001$), and BS ($r = .23, p < .001$). For only men's data, inhibitory anxiety had significant negative correlations with organizational climate ($r = -.18, p = .03$), existence of SH related regulations ($r = -.19, p = .02$), and sexist hostility ($r = -.16, p = .05$).

As different from men's data, ambivalent sexism had significant positive correlations with organizational climate ($r = .16, p = .02$) and existence of SH related regulations ($r = .20, p = .003$); while it had significant negative correlations with perceiving the composite ambiguous forms of social-sexual incidents ($r = -.21, p = .002$), sexual hostility ($r = -.21, p = .002$), and insinuation of interest as SH ($r = -.18, p = .01$) for only women's data. HS had a significant negative correlation with sexist hostility ($r = -.22, p = .01$) for only men's data; while it had significant negative correlations with perceiving the composite ambiguous forms of social sexual incidents ($r = -.23, p = .001$), sexual hostility ($r = -.22, p = .001$), and insinuation of interest as SH ($r = -.23, p = .001$) for only women's data. Moreover, for only women's data HS had significant positive correlations with organizational climate ($r = .16, p = .02$) and existence of SH related regulations ($r = .21, p = .002$). BS had significant positive correlation with existence of SH related regulations ($r = .14, p = .03$); while it had significant negative correlations with perceiving the ambiguous form of social sexual incidents as SH ($r = -.14, p = .04$), and sexual hostility ($r = -.15, p = .03$) for only women's data. Finally, perception of SH related regulations had significant negative correlation with perceiving the ambiguous form of social sexual incidents ($r = -.14, p = .04$) for only women's data.

Because to my knowledge there was no former study which investigated the relationship between conservatism and perception of ambiguous SH forms, correlation between social/economical conservatism scale items and ambiguous SH forms were also examined exploratorily (see Table 5). According to the results, while perceiving sexual hostility had no significant correlation with social/economical conservatism scale items; perception of composite ambiguous SH forms had significant negative correlations with "military and national security" ($r = -.18, p = .001$), "traditional marriage" ($r = -.15, p = .004$), "traditional values" ($r = -.13, p = .01$), and "patriotism" ($r = -.12, p = .02$). Sexist hostility had significant negative correlations with "military and national security" ($r = -.20, p < .001$), "religion" ($r = -.12, p = .02$), "traditional marriage" ($r = -.20, p < .001$), "traditional values" ($r = -.14, p = .01$), "business" ($r = -.14, p = .01$), "family unit" ($r = -.14, p = .01$), and "patriotism" ($r = -.19, p < .001$). Insinuation of interest had significant negative

correlations with “military and national security” ($r = -.16, p = .002$), “religion” ($r = -.11, p = .03$), “traditional marriage” ($r = -.15, p = .004$), “traditional values” ($r = -.15, p = .003$), and “patriotism” ($r = -.12, p = .02$).

3.4 Hypothesis Testing

In order to see the relationship between study variables regression analysis was conducted for men and women participants separately. With regression analysis effects of social/economical conservatism, HS, BS, uncertainty avoidance and organizational climate on perceiving the ambiguous form of social sexual incidents, sexist hostility, sexual hostility and insinuation of interest were examined. For women participants, age was controlled in predicting perceiving the ambiguous form of social sexual incidents and sexist hostility because of its higher correlations with those two variables.

According to the results in the women sample, age ($\beta = -.13, t(225) = -1.99, p = .05$) and HS ($\beta = -.21, t(225) = -2.52, p = .01$) significantly predicted perceiving the ambiguous forms composite of social sexual incidents. Furthermore, age ($\beta = -.25, t(225) = -3.65, p < .001$) and social/economical conservatism ($\beta = -.21, t(225) = -3.12, p = .002$) significantly and inversely predicted perceiving sexist hostility as a form of SH; while, HS ($\beta = -.25, t(225) = -3.11, p = .002$) negatively and uncertainty avoidance ($\beta = .19, t(225) = 2.82, p = .01$) positively significantly predicted perceiving sexual hostility as a form of SH. Finally, HS ($\beta = -.22, t(225) = -2.72, p = .01$) inversely and significantly predicted perceiving insinuation of interest as a form of SH (see Table 6.). Dominance analysis was conducted to see the individual and shared effects of social/economical conservatism, hostile sexism, BS, uncertainty avoidance and organizational climate on perceiving the ambiguous forms composite of social sexual incidents. According to the results, of the total variance in perceiving social-sexual behaviors as SH 8.9% of the variance was explained by all the five predictors. Of that 8.9%, 46% of variance was explained by hostile sexism, 25% of variance was explained by social/economical conservatism, 13% of variance was explained by BS, 9% of variance was explained by uncertainty avoidance and finally 8% of variance was explained by organizational climate. Hence, HS and social/economical conservatism were the most important predictors of perceiving the

Table 4

Pearson correlation coefficients for men and women samples, separately

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.Age	—	.94**	.20*	-.04	-.07	-.07	-.05	.08	-.09
2.Tenure	.91**	—	.16*	-.05	-.07	-.08	-.05	.11	-.06
3.Job-Gender Ratio	.12	.14*	—	-.02	.15	.14	.15	-.11	-.11
4.Conservatism	.06	.06	-.04	—	.28**	.31**	.21**	.31**	.28**
5. Uncertainty Avoidance	.01	.01	-.02	.08	—	.95**	.91**	.21**	.14
6.Prospective Anxiety	.00	.02	-.01	.09	.95**	—	.73**	.24**	.16*
7.Inhibitory Anxiety	.01	-.00	-.02	.06	.93**	.78**	—	.15	.09
8.Ambivalent Sexism	.31**	.31**	-.06	.24**	.33**	.32**	.30**	—	.83**
9.Hostile Sexism	.20**	.20**	.01	.24**	.30**	.28**	.29**	.88**	—
10.Benevolent Sexism	.34**	.34**	-.11	.18**	.28**	.30**	.23**	.89**	.57**
11.Org. SH Climate	-.08	-.11	.05	.13	.09	.08	.08	.16*	.16*
12.SH Climate Existence	-.08	-.09	.03	.12	.10	.10	.10	.20**	.21**
13.SH Climate Perception	-.07	-.12	.08	.07	-.00	-.01	.00	.05	.04
14. Ambiguous SH forms	-.13*	-.13	-.02	-.17**	.04	.05	.02	-.21**	-.23**
15.Sexist Hostility	-.24**	-.22**	-.09	-.22**	.01	.02	-.01	-.10	-.09
16.Sexual Hostility	-.10	-.08	.03	-.03	.10	.10	.10	-.21**	-.22**
17.Insinnuation of Interest	.02	-.02	.02	-.16*	-.02	.00	-.04	-.18**	-.23**

Table 4 (Continued)

	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1.Age	.22**	-.16*	-.07	-.21**	-.00	.01	-.08	.07
2.Tenure	.24**	-.14	-.05	-.22**	-.01	-.01	-.06	.05
3.Job-Gender Ratio	-.07	-.10	-.11	-.08	-.07	-.09	-.01	-.08
4.Conservatism	.24**	.12	.16	.04	-.12	-.21*	.02	-.11
5. Uncertainty Avoidance	.22**	-.11	-.13	-.09	-.12	-.17*	-.03	-.10
6.Prospective Anxiety	.24**	-.05	-.06	-.05	-.10	-.15	.01	-.11
7.Inhibitory Anxiety	.15	-.18*	-.19*	-.12	-.12	-.16*	-.07	-.07
8.Ambivalent Sexism	.82**	.02	.00	.05	-.03	-.15	.03	.04
9.Hostile Sexism	.36**	.03	.02	.03	-.10	-.22**	-.01	-.03
10.Benevolent Sexism	—	.01	-.01	.06	.06	-.03	.06	.09
11.Org. SH Climate	.12	—	.93**	.83**	-.00	.08	.03	-.11
12.SH Climate Existence	.14*	.93**	—	.61**	-.01	.07	.02	-.11
13.SH Climate Perception	.04	.84**	.60**	—	.05	.12	.04	-.04
14. Ambiguous SH forms	-.14*	-.11	-.08	-.14*	—	.74**	.81**	.84**
15.Sexist Hostility	-.08	-.10	-.07	-.11	.76**	—	.36**	.46**
16.Sexual Hostility	-.15*	-.04	-.02	-.09	.77**	.32**	—	.53**
17.Insinnuation of Interest	-.11	-.12	-.09	-.13	.86**	.53**	.52**	—

Notes. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Bottom triangle correlations are for women participants ($N = 226$), top triangle correlations are for men ($N = 154$) participants. Job gender ratio was rated on a 5-point scale; lower scores indicate that there are more men than women in the organization; while, higher scores indicate that there are more women than men in the organization. Social/Economical Conservatism was rated on a 10-point scale. Uncertainty Avoidance with its subfactors, and Ambivalent Sexism with its subfactors were rated on a 6-point scale. Organizational climate was rated on a 3-point scale. Ambiguous SH forms were rated on a 5-point scale. For all questionnaires, higher scores indicate higher endorsement of the construct.

Table 5

Pearson correlation coefficients for items of Social/economical conservatism scale and ambiguous SH forms

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Military and national security	—							
2. Religion	.52**	—						
3. Traditional Marriage	.36**	.38**	—					
4. Traditional Values	.51**	.54**	.56**	—				
5. Fiscal Responsibility	.37**	.28**	.17**	.31**	—			
6. Business	.37**	.26**	.16**	.25**	.44**	—		
7. Family Unit	.44**	.39**	.31**	.54**	.39**	.53**	—	
8. Patriotism	.56**	.51**	.29**	.57**	.29**	.33**	.58**	—
9. Ambiguous SH forms	-.18**	-.07	-.15**	-.13*	-.04	-.08	-.08	-.12*
10. Sexist Hostility	-.20**	-.12*	-.20**	-.14**	-.08	-.14**	-.14**	-.19**
11. Sexual Hostility	-.07	.05	-.01	-.03	-.00	-.04	-.01	.01
12. Insinuation of Interest	-.16**	-.11*	-.15**	-.15**	-.03	-.01	-.05	-.12*

Notes. N = 380, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Items of Social/Economical Conservatism was rated on a 10-point scale. Ambiguous SH forms were rated on a 5-point scale. For all questionnaires, higher scores indicate higher endorsement of the construct.

ambiguous forms of social-sexual incidents. On the other hand, for men participants, according to the results of regression analysis only HS ($\beta = -.21, t(153) = -2.45, p = .02$) significantly predicted perceiving sexist hostility as SH (see Table 7.)

Table 6
Regression analysis for women participants

	Perceiving the ambiguous forms composite of social sexual incidents (β)	Perceiving Sexist Hostility as SH (β)	Perceiving Sexual Hostility as SH (β)	Perceiving Insinuation of Interest as SH (β)
Block 1				
Age	-.132*	-.239**	-	-
R^2	.017	.057		
$F(df)$	3.95(1)*	13.55(1)**		
Block 2				
Age	-.093	-.250**	-	-
Social/Economical Conservatism	-.118	-.206**	.027	-.110
Hostile Sexism	-.205*	-.007	-.253**	-.223**
Benevolent Sexism	.007	.047	-.059	.038
Uncertainty Avoidance	.115	.025	.193**	.052
Organizational Climate	-.079	-.101	-.011	-.081
R^2_{change}	.074	.056	.084	.073
$F_{change}(df)$	3.54(5)*	2.75(5)*	4.06(5)*	3.44(5)*

Note. Values are Beta weights, unless otherwise indicated.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 7

Regression analysis for men participants

	Perceiving the ambiguous forms of social sexual incidents (β)	Perceiving Sexist Hostility as SH (β)	Perceiving Sexual Hostility as SH (β)	Perceiving Insinuation of Interest as SH (β)
Social/Economical Conservatism	-.086	-.155	.021	-.084
Hostile Sexism	-.116	-.209*	-.037	-.045
Benevolent Sexism	.143	.110	.075	.158
Uncertainty Avoidance	-.112	-.107	-.045	-.120
Organizational Climate	-.005	.089	.022	-.115
R^2	.043	.101	.007	.050
F (df)	1.34(5)	3.32(5)**	.21(5)	1.55(5)

Note. Values are Beta weights, unless otherwise indicated.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

3.5 Exploratory Analyses across Perceiving Sexual Harassment and Preferred Coping Styles

As it was mentioned before preferred coping mechanism of women participants at the face of three different SH types were examined exploratorily. A canonical correlation analysis was conducted to see the relationship between three SH types which are sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest; and three coping mechanisms which are seeking social support, reporting to authorities and avoiding the harasser using SPSS 22. So, the first set was Set A which was SH types and the second set was Set B which was coping mechanisms.

According to the results of analysis three canonical correlations was computed and first (Wilks' Lambda = .85, $\chi^2(9) = 35.28$, $p < .001$), and second one (Wilks' Lambda = .95, $\chi^2(4) = 12.00$, $p = .017$) of them were significant; while the third one was nonsignificant. Canonical correlation for the first canonical variate pairs from set A and B was .32 and it accounted for 10% of the total variance; while the second canonical correlation was .23 and it accounted for 5% of the total variance. For the loadings, the cut off was determined as higher than .30. According to the canonical loadings for Set A, which was SH types, the first canonical variate was characterized only by Sexual Hostility (-.93), and the second canonical variate was characterized only by Sexist Hostility (.92). According to the canonical loadings for Set B, which was coping mechanisms, the first canonical variate was characterized by reporting to authorities (-.69) and avoiding the harasser (-.82), whereas the second variate was characterized by reporting to authorities (.72) and avoiding the harasser (-.53), albeit in different directions.

Summary of canonical loadings for set A and B is presented in Table 8. According to the cross loadings results for the first variate pair, sexual hostility ($r = -.93$) of Set A correlated with the first variate, which is reporting to authorities and avoiding the harasser, of Set B; while sexist hostility ($r = .92$) of Set A correlated with the second variate which is an inclination towards reporting to authorities and *not* avoiding the harasser, of Set B. That means when a participant's perception of sexual hostility increases, the level of preferring to report to authorities and avoiding the harasser at the face of SH also increases. On the other hand, as a participant's perception of sexist hostility increases, the level of preferring to report to authorities increases; while the level of preferring to avoid the harasser decreases at the face of SH. Results of redundancy analysis showed that the first canonical variate (reporting to authorities and avoiding the harasser) of coping preferences set (A) explains 30% of total variance explained by its own set's variables. In the same way, second variate (inclination towards reporting to authorities and *not* avoiding the harasser) explains 30% of total variance.

Table 8

Summary of Canonical Loadings for first canonical correlation

		Canonical Variate Pairs	
<i>Sets</i>		<i>First</i>	<i>Second</i>
A	Sexist Hostility	-.128	.923
	Sexual Hostility	-.928	.075
	Insinuation of Interest	-.160	.168
	<i>Percent of variance</i>	.30	.30
	<i>Redundancy</i>	.03	.02
B	Seeking Social Support	-.276	.220
	Reporting to Authorities	-.690	.721
	Avoiding the harasser	-.819	-.526
	<i>Percent of variance</i>	.41	.28
	<i>Redundancy</i>	.04	.02
	Canonical Corr.	.32	.23
	Squared Can Corr.	.10	.05

Note. Numbers are variable loadings on the canonical variates, unless otherwise indicate.

Furthermore, bivariate correlation analysis was conducted in order to see correlations between study variables and coping mechanisms. In Table 9, all correlations are demonstrated. According to the results, seeking social support as a coping mechanism had negative significant correlations with age of participants ($r = -.21, p = .001$), tenure ($r = -.16, p = .02$), ambivalent sexism ($r = -.15, p = .03$), and HS ($r = -.18, p = .01$). Reporting to authorities had significant negative correlations with age of participants ($r = -.20, p = .003$), tenure ($r = -.19, p = .004$), ambivalent sexism ($r = -.17, p = .01$), HS ($r = -.17, p = .01$); while it had significant positive correlations with the ambiguous SH forms composite ($r = .19, p = .004$), sexist hostility ($r = .18, p = .01$), and sexual hostility ($r = .21, p = .001$). Finally, avoiding the harasser had significant positive correlations with conservatism level of participants ($r = .15, p = .02$), uncertainty avoidance ($r = .19, p = .01$), prospective

anxiety ($r = .20, p = .003$), inhibitory anxiety ($r = .15, p = .02$), and sexual hostility ($r = .23, p < .001$).

Table 9

Pearson correlation coefficients between coping mechanisms and other variables

	Seeking Social Support	Reporting to Authorities	Avoiding the Harasser
1.Age	-.21**	-.20**	-.07
2.Tenure	-.16*	-.19**	-.04
3.Job-Gender Ratio	.05	-.02	.03
4.Conservatism	-.06	-.09	.15*
5.Uncertainty Avoidance	.11	-.01	.19**
6.Prospective Anxiety	.10	-.05	.20**
7.Inhibitory Anxiety	.11	.03	.15*
8.Ambivalent Sexism	-.15*	-.17*	.03
9.Hostile Sexism	-.18**	-.17*	-.07
10.Benevolent Sexism	-.09	-.13	.11
11.Org. SH Climate	-.13	.08	.07
12.Org. SH Regulations	-.12	.08	.04
13.Org. SH Attitudes	-.08	.06	.06
14.Ambiguous SH forms	.07	.19**	.08
15.Sexist Hostility	.06	.18**	-.08
16.Sexual Hostility	.09	.21**	.23**
17.Insinnuation of Interest	.03	.06	.02

Notes. N = 226, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. Job gender ratio was rated on a 5-point scale; lower scores indicate that there are more men than women in the organization; while, higher scores indicate that there are more women than men in the organization. Social/Economical Conservatism was rated on a 10-point scale. Uncertainty Avoidance with its subfactors, and Ambivalent Sexism with its subfactors were rated on a 6-point scale. Organizational climate was rated on a 3-point scale. Ambiguous SH forms were rated on a 5-point scale. Coping mechanism was rated on 5-point scale for 14 different answers show different coping mechanisms. For all questionnaires higher scores indicate higher endorsement of the construct.

Finally, in order to see mean level of different scenarios depends on different coping mechanisms descriptive analysis conducted on an exploratory basis (see Table 10.). In scenario 1 which assess sexual hostility, it was seen that avoiding the harasser ($M = 4.47, SD = .52$) had the highest mean level, while seeking social support ($M = 4.01, SD = .91$) and reporting to authorities ($M = 3.87, SD = 1.01$) followed it respectively. Same trend observed in scenario 3 and 4. For the scenario 3 in which insinuation of interest assessed avoiding the harasser ($M = 4.43, SD = .59$) had the highest mean level, while seeking social support ($M = 4.03, SD = .95$) and reporting to authorities ($M = 3.34, SD = 1.01$) followed it respectively. Similarly, for the scenarios 4, in which physical touching (mild physical abuse) assessed, avoiding the harasser ($M = 4.51, SD = .56$) had the highest mean level, while seeking social support ($M = 3.99, SD = 1.01$) and reporting to authorities ($M = 3.38, SD = 1.07$) followed it respectively. For scenario 2 in which Physical offense (severe physical abuse) and scenario 5 in which sexual coercion assessed avoiding the harasser again had the highest mean score; however, for seeking social support and reporting authorities mean score ranking changed. For physical offense, avoiding the harasser ($M = 4.70, SD = .49$) followed by reporting to authorities ($M = 4.42, SD = .83$) after seeking social support ($M = 4.15, SD = .92$). In the same manner, for sexual coercion avoiding the harasser ($M = 4.66, SD = .62$) followed by reporting to authorities ($M = 4.22, SD = .94$) after seeking social support ($M = 4.20, SD = .98$). Finally, for scenario 6 in which sexist hostility assessed, means score ranking was different from other scenarios. As one of the ambiguous SH form focused in the present study, for sexist hostility seeking social support ($M = 4.15, SD = .80$) had highest mean score. Reporting to authorities ($M = 3.84, SD = .93$) and avoiding the harasser ($M = 3.35, SD = .91$) come from behind the seeking social support.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for Coping with SH by Scenario

	Scenario 1 Sexual Hostility	Scenario2 Physical Offense	Scenario 3 Insinuation of Interest	Scenario 4 Physical Touching	Scenario 5 Sexual Coercion	Scenario 6 Sexist Hostility
Seeking Social Suport	$M = 4.01$ $SD = .91$	$M = 4.15$ $SD = .92$	$M = 4.03$ $SD = .95$	$M = 3.99$ $SD = 1.01$	$M = 4.20$ $SD = .98$	$M = 4.15$ $SD = .80$
Reporting to authorities	$M = 3.87$ $SD = 1.01$	$M = 4.42$ $SD = .83$	$M = 3.34$ $SD = 1.01$	$M = 3.38$ $SD = 1.07$	$M = 4.22$ $SD = .94$	$M = 3.84$ $SD = .93$
Avoiding the harasser	$M = 4.47$ $SD = .52$	$M = 4.70$ $SD = .49$	$M = 4.43$ $SD = .59$	$M = 4.51$ $SD = .56$	$M = 4.66$ $SD = .62$	$M = 3.35$ $SD = .91$

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview

In the discussion section, outstanding findings of the present study are discussed in detail within the context of study hypotheses and exploratory examinations. The aim of the present study was examining the associations of some cultural variables which were liberalism/conservatism, uncertainty avoidance, ambivalent sexism with its dimensions, hostile and BS, organizational climate with perceiving ambiguous forms of SH namely sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest as SH. Furthermore, in the present study coping preferences of women participants in the face of 5 different SH types was examined exploratorily by using SH scenarios.

To my knowledge there is no former research in which the predictive effects of the abovementioned cultural characteristics and organizational climate were examined altogether on workplace SH perceptions of employed men and women. Results of hypotheses of the present study, whether they were supported or not, and findings of exploratory analyses will bring insights for both academical and professional contexts.

4.2 Study Findings and Contributions

Before the hypothesis testing, factor analyses were conducted for all the scales. From among these analyses, CFA which was conducted for Social/Sexual Incidents Questionnaires separately for both genders had important findings. According to the results, factor structures and fit indices for both men and women samples were similar. Furthermore, internal consistency results of entire sample, men sample and women sample were nearly same for the total questionnaire and its subfactors. That means the questionnaire is consistent across genders.

According to the t-test results, men had significantly higher mean scores than women only for ambivalent sexism and its subfactors. Except for ambivalent sexism, women showed higher mean scores on the variables of uncertainty avoidance and perceiving the ambiguous forms of SH. That means men are more positive about ambivalent sexism than women as expected from the former studies which emphasize the social dominance motives and gender stereotypes of men (e.g., Glick, & Fiske, 1997; Sibley, & Wilson, 2004). Hence, ambivalent sexism is still an important issue for future studies in which sex related discriminations and harassments will be investigated.

In the results section correlation analyses were performed in the women and men samples separately. According to the results total sample's correlation pattern showed similarities with women data's; while men data showed slightly different patterns. For instance, ambivalent sexism was correlated with all the study variables for total sample except for SH Climate Perception. While its correlations with conservatism, organizational climate and uncertainty avoidance were in positive direction; correlations between ambivalent sexism and perception of ambiguous SH forms and its subfactors were in the negative direction. When the results of women and men data were analyzed, ambivalent sexism had positive correlation with conservatism and uncertainty avoidance; while it had no correlation with organizational climate, ambiguous SH forms and its subfactors for the men data. According to women's data ambivalent sexism had positive correlations with conservatism, organizational climate and uncertainty avoidance; while it had negative correlations with perception of ambiguous SH forms, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest as similar with the results of total sample. Furthermore, for the whole sample conservatism had positive correlations with uncertainty avoidance, ambivalent sexism and organizational climate; while it had negative correlations with perception of ambiguous SH forms and its subfactors except for sexual hostility. For the women and men data pattern changed in uncertainty avoidance and perception of ambiguous SH forms. To be more precise, conservatism had significant positive correlations with ambivalent sexism for both men and women samples; on the other hand, it had significant positive correlation with uncertainty avoidance for only men

sample. Moreover, for women sample it had negative correlations with perception of ambiguous SH forms and its subfactors except for sexual hostility similar with total sample. According to men sample conservatism had only significant negative correlation with sexist hostility. Those findings might be the result of higher number of women participants in the sample. Even in that condition, those findings might lead future studies to also investigate gender differences. SH studies may expect differences depending not only on ingroup variance in cultural aspects but also depending on gender differences. Women are mostly seen as a victim of SH; while men are the initiator of it. Hence, depending on the focus of present study men participants might feel more defensive and show perception differences.

Because to my knowledge there was no former study in which the association between conservatism and SH perceptions was examined, conservatism and sexism relationship gained importance in the present study. Because of that reason, besides the abovementioned correlations, correlations between items of Social/economical conservatism scale and ambiguous SH forms was examined exploratorily to see whether different items had different correlations with SH perceptions. According to the results, items which are “military and national security”, “traditional marriage”, “traditional values”, and “patriotism” had negative significant correlations with sexist hostility, insinuation of interest and ambiguous forms composite of SH. “Religion” had negative significant correlations with sexist hostility and insinuation of interest; while “business” and “the family unit” had negative significant correlation with only sexist hostility. “Fiscal responsibility” had no significant correlation with ambiguous SH forms. That means conservatism level of participants had no relationship with sexual hostility; while it had negative correlation with sexist hostility and insinuation of interest according to different items of social/economical conservatism scale. These findings may present a new direction for conservatism and sexism studies, because according to these results it can be said that scale items mostly correlated with SH types which include sexual discrimination toward women.

Another important correlation in the present study was between the age and other variables for only women participants. According to the results, for women sample age had significant positive correlation with ambivalent sexism and its

subfactors which are hostile and BS. Furthermore, it had significant negative correlations with perceiving the ambiguous SH forms and sexist hostility. On the other hand, for men sample there was significant positive relationship only for the BS as a subfactor of ambivalent sexism. Furthermore, there were no relationship between age and perceiving ambiguous forms of SH for men data. That means age of the men does not affect perceiving ambiguous forms of SH; while, age of women increases their likelihood of perceiving the ambiguous SH forms and sexist hostility decreases. Because of that reason, while testing the hypotheses, age was controlled for women sample in order to see whether it has significant effect on the perception of SH forms in women sample.

In the present study hypothesis 1a argued that participants' BS level will have small positive association with perceiving the ambiguous forms of SH. According to the results there were no significant association between BS and ambiguous forms of SH for women and men data. Hence, hypothesis 1a was not supported. However, even though there were no significant results related with BS level, for men sample BS showed positive trend with the perception of both total ambiguous SH form and its subfactors. As mentioned before even there are no direct study related with the perception of SH and BS level, according to the study of Wiener et al. (1997) participants who have higher level of BS perceived sexual behaviors more severe than participants who have lower level of BS. In line with this result, it might be argued that male participants, who have higher level of BS in the present study, might assume the role of protector and feel more comfortable with the sexual harassment behaviors. This situation might lead them to rate SH perception questions on positive trend. Same positive but nonsignificant trend was found for women sample for the total ambiguous SH form, sexist hostility and insinuation of interest. On the other hand, there was negative nonsignificant relationship between sexual hostility and BS. Even though relationship between BS and, sexist hostility and insinuation of interest showed positive association trend for women sample, sexual hostility which is SH type related with the offensive sexual jokes and stories showed negative association trend. This differentiation on the women sample amongst the ambiguous SH forms also might be the future interest of the studies.

According to the hypothesis 1b, it is argued that participants' HS level will have moderate negative association with perceiving the ambiguous forms of SH. According to the results HS had small negative correlations with perceiving the ambiguous forms of SH, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest; while it had no correlation with sexist hostility for women sample. On the contrary to women sample, HS had only small significant negative correlation with sexist hostility for men sample. Hence, hypothesis 1b was partially supported for women and men samples. Interesting point from those finding was that association between HS and ambiguous SH forms showed differential results for two genders. That means its associations were significant with the ambiguous forms of SH, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest for women; while it significantly correlated only with sexist hostility for men. Besides different association patterns, possible underlying reasons of those relationship are important for the future studies. In accordance with the dissertation of Sibley and Wilson's (2004), as mentioned in the introduction section, for men sample, those results may reflect the idea of women's sex roles and men's attitude toward working women stereotype. If a man exhibits higher level of hostile sexism, he may perceive sexist hostile behaviors as normal for a woman who overthrow the societal gender roles. However, for women sample it can be important topic to investigate why perceiving sexist hostility was not affected by HS level of participants on the contrary to other SH types.

According to the hypothesis 2, it was argued that when the level of conservatism increase, perceiving the ambiguous SH types will decrease. Results showed that conservatism level of women participants had significant negative correlation with perceiving sexist hostility as SH. On the other hand, there were no associations between conservatism level and perceiving ambiguous forms of SH, sexual hostility and insinuation of interest for women sample. Moreover, for men there were also no associations between conservatism level and perceiving ambiguous forms of SH or its subfactors. Hence, hypothesis 2 was supported partially for only women sample and sexist hostility. As mentioned in the introduction chapter sexist hostility is mostly about gender discriminatory behaviors which include judging the ideas or careers of women as insignificant (Toker &

Sümer, 2010). Furthermore, it was stated that conservative people care about in-group identity and they want to maintain authority (Graham et al., 2009). In the light of those information, it can be argued that conservative women may want to maintain their in-group identity and evaluate working women negatively, even if they are working women. There also might be a relationship like the one found in the abovementioned study of Malovich and Stake (1990). In their study, they also examined the interaction between self-esteem and having traditional sex-roles and stated that when women were high on self-esteem and traditional sex-roles attitudes at the same time, they were more likely to perceive harassment issues as insignificant, undermine its seriousness, and do not criticize men who harass. Moreover, in accordance with Silverman's (1976) definition of "male identified" women who are skilled and successful but reluctant to admit the seriousness of harassment (as cited in Malovich & Stake, 1990), some women, even if they are successful business women, might interiorize male dominance because of having more traditional sex role attitudes. Hence, interaction between conservatism and other personal variables like self-esteem might be the topic of future studies. Why same results were not supported by men might be the result of some interactions between other factors like self-esteem as mentioned above. For future researches those findings might open new directions. Furthermore, it should be highlighted that in the present study 12.1% of the total participants denominated themselves as slightly or quite conservative. Moreover, among 154 men participants only 20 of them stated that they are slightly or quite conservative; while among 226 women only 26 of them stated they are slightly or quite conservative. Future studies might reach more conservative sample and investigate in group variances in terms of perceiving different ambiguous SH forms.

Hypothesis 3 argued that if a participant had higher level of uncertainty avoidance, he/she will be more likely to perceive ambiguous SH forms with moderate effect size. According to the results, uncertainty avoidance had small significant correlation with perceiving sexual hostility as a form of SH for women sample. There were no significant relationships between uncertainty avoidance and perceiving ambiguous forms of SH, sexist hostility and insinuation of interest for

women. In a similar direction, there were no significant associations between uncertainty avoidance and perceiving ambiguous forms of SH, sexist hostility, sexual hostility and insinuation of interest for men sample. Hence, hypothesis 3 mainly did not receive support. As one and only supported part, the correlation between uncertainty avoidance and sexual hostility was small instead of moderate. Because former studies stated that women evaluated sexual hostility and insinuation of interest as moderately severe forms of SH (Toker & Sümer, 2010), it can be expected that these two SH forms which are sexual hostility and insinuation of interest would show the same pattern in their relationship with other variables. According to these findings, as expected from former studies perceiving those two SH types did not show same pattern when the uncertainty level of participants changed. For women sample only supported part of the hypothesis is the relationship between sexual hostility and uncertainty avoidance; hence, it can be said that women who have higher uncertainty level tend to perceive SH harassment if it contains sexuality. That means, when compared to sexist hostility and insinuation of interest, sexual hostility shows sexuality implication more openly by containing sexual jokes and sexual materials as mentioned before. On the other hand, insinuation of interest consists of showing interest toward women without showing sexuality explicitly and sexist hostility consists of gender discriminatory items (Toker, 2016). Hence, it might be argued that when women who have higher level of uncertainty avoidance are faced with sexuality, they try to find out more meaningful marks of SH as it is seen as a more sensitive issue. According to the study conducted by Kardam (2005), dynamics of honor killings were examined in the Turkish culture. In general, findings showed that honor was mostly evaluated as a concept which is related with women and sexuality. Dressing properly, behaving in accordance with expectations, being acquainted with one's duties in accordance with traditions and chastity were some of the points of the study. Hence, it might be argued that women raised in that honor culture tend to see sexuality related behaviors or discourses more threatening and feel more sensitive.

Hypothesis 4 argued that if participants' perception about SH related organizational climate is positive, that means if they perceive their organizations as

proactive about SH related behaviors, they will be more likely to perceive ambiguous forms of SH. According to the results, it was found that there were no associations between organizational climate and ambiguous SH forms for both men and women sample. On the contrary to hypothesis, in the present study there were a trend in a way that if the organization were more tolerant to SH that means it is not proactive, women were more likely to perceive ambiguous SH forms, even though there were no significant result. This result seems coherent with the previous notions of Fitzgerald and colleagues (1997) that when women think that their organization is tolerant to the SH behaviors, they stated higher level of SH experiences. Hence, when women feel unsafe in an organization that is tolerant of SH related behaviors, they tend to perceive more behavior as malevolent and describe as SH. Moreover, in the present study organizational climate assessed self-constructed questions and participants were directly asked what they think about organizational climate about SH. It is obvious that Turkish literature needs a survey which assess facets of organizational climate implicitly. Because people feel sensitive about the topic of the study, they may also feel sensitive while expressing their opinions about their organizations and give biased answers.

As mentioned before, in the present study, coping preferences of only women participants at the face of six different SH forms were investigated exploratorily. Women participants were asked to read six different scenarios and rated each coping style according to their preferences in relation to those scenarios. For the coping preferences scale, after factor analysis was conducted, it was found that there were 3 different coping mechanism which are seeking social support, reporting to authorities and avoiding the harasser. For this examination a canonical correlation analysis was conducted to see the relationship between three SH types which are sexist hostility, sexual hostility, and insinuation of interest; and abovementioned three coping mechanisms. According to the results it was found that perceiving sexual hostility was correlated with reporting to authorities and avoiding the harasser; while perceiving sexist hostility correlated with the inclination towards reporting to authorities and not avoiding the harasser. That means when participants perceive sexual hostility as a form of SH, they preferred reporting to authorities and avoiding

the harasser as coping mechanisms at the face of SH. On the other side, if participants perceive sexist hostility as a form of SH, they preferred reporting to authorities; while they did not prefer avoiding the harasser as a coping mechanism at the face of SH. There was no significant relationship between preferring a coping mechanism at the face of perceiving insinuation of interest as a form of SH. However, according to the exploratory analysis in which descriptive analysis was conducted for 6 different scenarios and 3 different coping mechanisms, there might be some future directions for the literature about coping preference. For example, except for sexist hostility in which gender discriminatory items such as underrating women's role in work life are involved, the highest mean score amongst the coping styles was avoiding the harasser. It was followed by seeking social support for scenario 1 (sexual hostility), scenario 3 (insinuation of interest), and scenario 4 (physical touching); while, it was followed by reporting to authorities for scenario 2 (physical offense) and scenario 5 (sexual coercion). That means even though the severity of SH scenarios changed, women more likely to choose avoiding items as a way of coping. For the sexist hostility seeking social support had the highest mean score and it was followed by reporting to authorities. The lowest mean score was for the avoiding the harasser for sexist hostility scenario. That means, when compared to other scenarios, sexist hostility was exact opposite trend in terms of coping styles. As mentioned in the earlier part of the present study sexist hostility is the SH type involves least sexuality. It might be said that women who are faced with sexist hostility do not feel abused as much as in the other types; hence, they do not need to avoid from the harasser or do not beware of sharing their experience with others to receive social support.

Final important finding from the present study was result of bivariate correlation analysis between coping mechanisms and study variables. In the present study in order to see whether different coping mechanisms had significant correlation with the study variables, correlation analysis was conducted exploratorily. According to the results, seeking social support as a coping mechanism had significant negative correlations with the age of participants, tenure of participants, and their level of ambivalent and hostile sexism. In the same way, another coping mechanism which is

reporting to authorities had significant negative correlations with the age of participants, tenure of participants, and their level of ambivalent and hostile sexism. However, reporting to authorities also has significant positive correlations with ambiguous SH forms, sexist hostility and sexual hostility. As a final coping mechanism, avoiding the harasser had different pattern of correlations as compared to other two mechanism. There were significant positive correlations between avoiding the harasser and conservatism level of participants, level of uncertainty avoidance, prospective anxiety and inhibitory anxiety, and sexual hostility. That means younger and less experienced women workers are more likely to prefer seeking social support and reporting to authorities as coping mechanisms. Moreover, if participants' level of ambivalent and HS is higher, their likelihood to prefer seeking social support and reporting to authorities is lower. When participants perceive ambiguous forms of SH and sexist hostility as SH, they prefer to report to authorities as a coping mechanism; while if they perceive sexual hostility as SH, they prefer not only reporting to authorities but also avoiding the harasser. Finally, if participants have higher level of conservatism and uncertainty avoidance, they prefer to avoid the harasser. As mentioned before people who have higher uncertainty avoidance tend to be more aggressive in their communication and try to avoid others when they perceive threatening situations (Merkin, 2006; as cited in Merkin 2012); in the same direction as mentioned by Jost et al. (2003) people who are higher on political conservatism tend to decrease feelings of uncertainty and threat. Hence, avoiding to harasser might be most expected coping preference of uncertainty avoidant and conservative person.

4.3 Limitations and Future Directions

Even though the present study had some important finding and contributions, there were some limitations that should be highlighted. Firstly, although data were collected from different gender, age groups, sectors, tenure; most of the data (N = 340) composed of white-collar workers. By considering the different working conditions and educational level of white and blue-collar workers, different patterns might be expected about the association between study variables. As Parietti (2019) mentioned white and blue-collar workers may represent different social class, they

may differ according to their working conditions, how to work, and educational level. In the light of this information, SH related organizational climate and its perception as one of those variables in the study findings may differ for the blue-collar workers. Moreover, according to study conducted by Icenogle, Eagle, Ahmad and Hanks (2002), it was stated that blue-collar women workers were less sensitive to the behaviors which contains SH; while, white-collar women workers were more likely to identify SH behaviors correctly. Hence as a study variable white/blue-collar worker differentiation may be added to studies in which sex related discriminations are investigated. Furthermore, because the collection process was completed by distributing the Survey via personal contacts, participants were mostly from the metropolitans of the Turkey which are Ankara and İstanbul. Some cultural aspects may show an alteration even within the boundaries of the same country, data collected from different parts of the Turkey can be more comprehensive for the content of the present study. Moreover, as mentioned before at the demographic questions section, participants were asked to rate their liberalism/conservatism level in 4-point Likert that 1 means quite conservatist, 2 means slightly conservatist, 3 means slightly liberalist, and 4 means quite liberalist. According to the distribution of the data 173 (45.5%) of participants mentioned they were quite liberal, 161 (42.4%) of them were slightly liberal, 36 (9.5%) of them were slightly conservative, and 10 (2.6%) of them were quite conservative. It can be seen that, almost 88% of the sample consisted of people who defined themselves as liberalist. More homogeneous sample in terms of political orientation might create differences in the results. Therefore, in the future studies abovementioned demographic variables should be considered in order to see their impact.

Secondly, based on the comment of the participants, the length of the survey was long and took time to complete. Since the survey consisted of several questionnaires and some of them such as Coping Preferences Scale were slightly longer than the others, participants reported struggling to focus. Especially for the people who were stranger to logic of surveys, it took longer time than expected. Because of abovementioned reasons nearly one half of the people who attempted to fulfill the survey aborted it; hence, the process of data collection lasted longer.

Besides the length of the survey another reason which lead people to abort the survey might be the topic. Some people might have felt more sensitive toward to topic and did not complete it. In accordance with abovementioned study of Ulusoy, Swigart and Erdemir (2011), people who heard that the topic of the study was related to workplace SH felt sensitive about and did not want to complete it.

Thirdly, as mentioned in the introduction chapter conservatism as a concept is hard to define and it comprises different subtitles such as economic, political and religious (Hicks & Wright, 1970). Even though in the present study it was aimed to assess political and economic conservatism, it was realized that literature needs more comprehensive scales in order to assess conservatism/liberalism level most especially for Turkey. For instance, according to the exploratory factor analyses, two-factor solution of Everett (2013) was not supported in the present sample and items “Abortion”, “Limited Government”, “Welfare Benefits” and “Gun ownership” were removed from the inventory. This situation might be caused by different reasons such as properties of the sample or inventory’s itself. Hence, that can be a starting point for the researchers to investigate how to assess concept of conservatism/liberalism from a more comprehensive perspective.

Finally, for the present study, accordance with the future direction of Toker’s (2016) study, uncertainty avoidance as a cultural dimension of Hofstede was examined. It was argued that people’s uncertainty avoidance level affects their tolerance for the SH at work as Merkin stated (2012). On the other hand, according to the examination of Luthar and Luthar (2002), all cultural dimensions of Hofstede and their relationship with the managers’ likelihood of to sexually harass, blaming the harasser, and tolerance of SH by women at work were analyzed. According to the former literature and data pattern of countries they argued that level of Individualism/Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance and Masculinity/Femininity as cultural dimensions might affect the way of women’s perception about unwelcome behaviors and in some cultural conditions such as higher power distance and lower individualism lead them to tolerate those behaviors as SH. Although their study compared different culture’s data and Turkey was not included in the study; using other cultural dimensions of Hofstede as determinants of

perception and likelihood to perform sexually harassing behaviors in Turkish sample might be another future direction.

REFERENCES

- Begany, J. J., & Milburn, M. A. (2002). Psychological predictors of sexual harassment: Authoritarianism, hostile sexism, and rape myths. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*(2), 119-126. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.119
- Bentler, P. M. (2006). *EQS 6 Structural Equations Program Manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software, Inc.
- Baker, D. D., Terpstra, D. E., & Larntz, K. (1990). The influence of individual characteristics and severity of harassing behavior on reactions to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 22*(5- 6), 305-325. doi:10.1007/bf00288336
- Buchanan, N. T., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2008). Effects of racial and sexual harassment on work and the psychological well-being of African American women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13*(2), 137-151. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.13.2.137
- Buchanan, N. T., Settles, I. H., Hall, A. T., & O'connor, R. C. (2014). A review of organizational strategies for reducing sexual harassment: Insights from the U. S. military. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*(4), 687-702. doi:10.1111/josi.12086
- Cortina, L. M., & Wasti, S. A. (2005). Profiles in Coping: Responses to sexual harassment across persons, organizations, and cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(1), 182-192. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.1.182
- Dionisi, A. M., Barling, J., & Dupré, K. E. (2012). Revisiting the comparative outcomes of workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*(4), 398-408. doi:10.1037/a0029883
- Dohi I., & Fooladi M.M. (2008). Individualism as a solution for gender equality in Japanese society. *Forum on Public Policy: A Journal of the Oxford Round Table* (Online).

- Eurostat Statistics Explained (2015). *Employment Statistics*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Employment_statistics
- Eurofound (2007). Fourth european working conditions survey. Retrieved from <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/tr/publications/report/2007/working-conditions/fourth-european-working-conditions-survey>
- Everett, J. A. C. (2013). The 12-item social and economic conservatism scale (SECS). *PLoS ONE*, 8(12). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0082131
- Favreau, O. E. (1997). Evaluating political correctness: Anecdotes vs. research. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 38(4), 212-220. doi:10.1037/0708-5591.38.4.212
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, A., Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152–175.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1993). Sexual harassment: Violence against women in the workplace. *American Psychologist*, 48(10), 1070-1076. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.48.10.1070
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 425–445. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp1704_2
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J., & Magley, V. J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(4), 578-589. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.4.578
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Magley, V.J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C.R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The sexual experiences questionnaire (SEQ_DoD). *Military Psychology*, 11(3), 243–263.

- Frazier, P. A., Cochran, C. C., & Olson, A. M. (1995). Social science research on lay definitions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*(1), 21-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1995.tb01306.x>
- Freeston, M. H., Rhéaume, J., Letarte, H., Dugas, M. J., & Ladouceur, R. (1994). Why do people worry? *Personality and Individual Differences, 17*(6), 791-802. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(94)90048-5
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 119–135.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., ... López, W. L. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: Hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 763-775. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.5.763
- Glick, P., Sakalli-Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Souza, M. A. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychol of Women Q Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(4), 292-297. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(5), 1029-1046. doi:10.1037/a0015141
- Helsen, K., Bussche, E. V., Vlaeyen, J. W., & Goubert, L. (2013). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Dutch intolerance of uncertainty scale: comparison of the full and short version. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 44*(1), 21-29. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2012.07.004
- Hicks, J. M., & Wright, J. H. (1970). Convergent-discriminant validation and factor analysis of five scales of liberalism-conservatism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14*(2), 114-120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0028778>

- Hofstede, G. (n.d.). *Dimensions of national Cultures*. Retrieved May 30, 2016, from <http://www.geerthofstede.nl/dimensions-of-national-cultures>
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Icenogle, M. L., Eagle, B. W., Ahmad, S., & Hanks L. A. (2002). Assessing perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors in a manufacturing environment. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 16*(4), 601-16.
- Is Kanunu (2003). Law No. 4857, Official Gazette 10.06.2003, No.25134, 42, 8423–8460.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Exceptions that prove the rule -using a theory of motivated social cognition to account for ideological incongruities and political anomalies: Reply to Greenberg and Jonas (2003), *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 383-393.
- Jost, J. T., Napier, J. L., Thorisdottir, H., Gosling, S. D., Palfai, T. P., & Ostafin, B. (2007). Are needs to manage uncertainty and threat associated with political conservatism or ideological extremity? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(7), 989-1007. doi:10.1177/0146167207301028
- Kabat-Farr, D., & Cortina, L. M. (2014). Sex-based harassment in employment: New insights into gender and context. *Law and Human Behavior, 38*(1), 58-72. doi:10.1037/lhb0000045
- Kardam, F. (2005). *The dynamics of honor killings in Turkey: prospects for action*. Ankara: Population association.
- KSGM (2008). National Action Plan Gender Equality (2008–2013). Ankara: KSGM. Retrieved from: http://www.kadininstatusu.gov.tr/upload/kadininstatusu.gov.tr/mce/eski_site/Pdf/NAP_GE.pdf

- Knapp, D. E., Faley, R. H., Ekeberg, S. E., & Dubois, C. L. (1997). Determinants of target responses to sexual harassment: A conceptual framework. *The Academy of Management Review*, 22(3), 687. doi:10.2307/259410
- Limpaphayom, W., Williams, R. J., & Fadil, P. A. (2006). Perceived differences in sexual harassment between business school students in the US and Thailand. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 13(1), 32–42. doi: 10.1108/13527600610643466
- Luthar, V. K., & Luthar, H. K. (2002). Using Hofstede's cultural dimensions to explain sexually harassing behaviours in an international context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(2), 268-284. doi:10.1080/09585190110102378
- MacKinnon, C.A. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women: a case of sex discrimination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Malamut, A. B., & Offermann, L. R. (2001). Coping with sexual harassment: Personal, environmental, and cognitive determinants. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1152–1166. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.6.1152
- Malovich, N. J., & Stake, J. E. (1990). Sexual harassment on campus: Individual differences in attitudes and beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 14(1), 63-81. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1990.tb00005.x
- Merkin, R. S. (2012). Sexual harassment indicators: The socio-cultural and cultural impact of marital status, age, education, race, and sex in Latin America. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 21(1), 154-172.
- Nye, C. D., Brummel, B. J., & Drasgow, F. (2014). Understanding sexual harassment using aggregate construct models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1204-1221. doi:10.1037/a0037965.
- Parboteeah, K. P., Bronson, J. W., & Cullen, J. B. (2005). Does national culture affect willingness to justify ethically suspect behaviors? *International Journal of Cross-cultural Management*, 5(2), 123-138. doi:10.1177/1470595805054489

- Parietti, M. (2019, May 07). Blue collar vs. white collar: What's the difference? Retrieved from <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/wealth-management/120215/blue-collar-vs-white-collar-different-social-classes.asp>
- Pienaar, J. M., Beukes, R. B., & Esterhuysen, K. G. (2006). The relationship between conservatism and psychological well-being in adolescents. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 36(2), 391-406. doi:10.1177/008124630603600211
- Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14(2), 126-138. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.01.002
- Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 914-922. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.914
- Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 50(7/8), 565-573. doi:10.1023/b:sers.0000023075.32252.fd
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması (Ambivalent sexism scale: A study of validity and reliability). *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17(49), 47-58.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Salman, S., & Turgut, S. (2010). Predictors of Turkish women's and men's attitudes toward sexual harassment: Ambivalent sexism, and ambivalence toward men. *Sex Roles*, 63(11-12), 871-881. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9847-6
- Sari, S., & Dağ, İ. (2009). Belirsizliğe tahammülsüzlük ölçeği, endişe ile ilgili olumlu inançlar ölçeği ve endişenin sonuçları ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması, geçerliliği ve güvenilirliği [Problem solving style, hopelessness, helplessness and haplessness as the predictors of psychopathology assessed by MMPI-2]. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 10(4), 261-270.
- Sarıçam, H., Erguvan, F. M., Akın, A. & Akça, M. Ş. (2014). Belirsizliğe

tahammülsüzlük ölçeği (BTÖ-12) Türkçe formu: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Route Educational and Social Science Journal*, 1(3), 148-157.

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(3), 401-415. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.401

Sheffey, S., & Tindale, R. S. (1992). Perceptions of sexual harassment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(19), 1502-1520. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1992.tb00963.x

Sibley, C. G., & Wilson, M. S. (2004). Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes toward positive and negative sexual female subtypes. *Sex Roles*, 51(11-12), 687-696. doi:10.1007/s11199-004-0718-x

Siddiqi, N., & Shafiq, M. (2017). Cultural value orientation and gender equity: A review. *Social Psychology and Society*, 8(3), 31-44. doi:10.17759/sps.2017080304

Sigal, J., & Jacobsen, H. (1999). A cross-cultural exploration of factors affecting reactions to sexual harassment: Attitudes and policies. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5(3), 760-785. doi:10.1037/1076-8971.5.3.760

Stop Violence Against Women. (2010, January 18). *Prevalence of Sexual Harassment* Retrieved from http://www.stopvaw.org/prevalence_of_sexual_harassment

Tavakoli, A. A., Keenan, J. P., & Cranjak-Karanovic, B. (2003). Culture and whistleblowing: An empirical study of croatian and United States managers utilizing Hofstede's cultural dimensions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 43(1/2), 49-64. doi:10.1023/a:1022959131133

Till, F. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students*. Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.

- Toker, Y. (2003). *Individual differences factors affecting workplace sexual harassment perceptions*. Master's thesis. Ankara, Turkey: Middle East Technical University.
- Toker, Y., & Sümer, H. C. (2010). Workplace sexual harassment perceptions in the Turkish context and the role of individual differences. *Applied Psychology*, 59(4), 616-646. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00420.x
- Toker, Y. (2011). Predicting sexual harassment responses from harassment forms and harasser stereotypes. Poster presentation at Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington DC.
- Toker, Y. (2016). Perception differences in ambiguous forms of workplace sexual harassment: A comparison between the United States and Turkey. *The Journal of Psychology*, 150(5), 625–643. doi:10.1080/00223980.2016.1154810
- Türk Ceza Kanunu. (2004). Law No. 5237, Official Gazette, 12 Oct. 2004, No.25611.
- Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu Merkezi Dağıtım Sistemi (2016) *İş Gücüne Katılma Oranı (2014 ve sonrası)*. Retrieved from <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/>
- Ulusoy, H., Swigart, V., & Erdemir, F. (2011). Think globally, act locally: Understanding sexual harassment from a cross-cultural perspective. *Medical Education*, 45(6), 603-612. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2923.2010.03918.x
- United States Department of Labor (2016). *Labor force participation rates by sex, 2014 annual averages*. Retrieved from <http://www.dol.gov/>
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) (2019). *Sex-Based Discrimination*, Retrieved from <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sex.cfm>
- Wasti, S. A., & Cortina, L. M. (2002). Coping in context: Sociocultural determinants of responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 394-405. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.394

- Wiener, R. L., Hurt, L., Russell, B., Mannen, K., & Gasper, C. (1997). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The effects of gender, legal standard, and ambivalent sexism. *Law and Human Behavior*, *21*(1), 71-93. doi:10.1023/a:1024818110678
- 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. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00067.x
- Williams, J. H., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1999). The Effects of Organizational Practices on Sexual Harassment and Individual Outcomes in the Military. *Military Psychology*, *11*(3), 303-328. doi:10.1207/s15327876mp1103_6
- Zimbhoff, J., (2007). Cultural differences in perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment. *Duke Journal of Constitutional Law & Public Policy*, *11*, 1311-1341.

APPENDICES

A. ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Etik Komite Onayı

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 219 28 50
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 / 365

04 TEMMUZ 2017

Konu: Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi: İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yonca TOKER ;

Danışmanlığınızı yaptığınız yüksek lisans öğrencisi Didem DİNÇAL 'ın "*Kültürel Faktörlerin ve Örgütsel İklimin Bireylerin İş Yerinde Cinsel Taciz Algısı Üzerindeki Etkisi*" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülerek gerekli onay 2017-SOS-117 protokol numarası ile 01.08.2017 – 31.12.2017 tarihleri arasında geçerli olmak üzere verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize saygılarımla sunarım.

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN

Başkan V

Prof. Dr. Ayhan SOL

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Gürbüz DEMİR

Üye

Doç. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI

Üye

Doç. Dr. Zana ÇITAK

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Pınar KAYGAN

Üye

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Emre SELÇUK

Üye

B. INFORMED CONSENT

Gönüllü Katılım Formu

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu çalışma, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Didem Dinçal tarafından Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yonca Toker danışmanlığında yürütülen tez çalışması kapsamında yapılmaktadır. Çalışmanın amacı, kültürel faktörlerin ve örgütsel iklimin bireylerin iş yerindeki kadın-erkek etkileşimlerine dair algılarını araştırmaktır.

Çalışmaya katılım tamamıyla gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Ankette, sizden kurum kimliği veya kişisel kimlik belirleyici hiçbir bilgi istenmemektedir. Cevaplarınız tamamıyla gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; kesinlikle hiçbir kişi ya da kurumla paylaşılmayacaktır. Elde edilecek bilgiler sadece bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Anketin tamamlanması ortalama 15 dakika sürmektedir. Katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakabilirsiniz. Böylebir durumda anket linkini kapatmanız yeterli olacaktır.

Lütfen anket sorularını dikkatli okuyunuz ve yanıtız soru bırakmayınız. Araştırmanın güvenilir olabilmesi açısından soruları dikkatli ve içtenlikle cevaplamanız büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Çalışmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak için Didem DİNÇAL (e-mail: e171819@metu.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum.

Evet

Hayır

C. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Demografik Bilgi Formu

1. Cinsiyetiniz: ___ Erkek ___ Kadın

2. Yaşınız: _____

3. Bu güne kadar, stajlar da dahil olmak üzere, herhangi bir özel ya da devlet kurumunda çalıştınız mı? (okul asistanlıkları dışında)? ___ Evet ___ Hayır

* 3. soruya Evet dediyseniz, a, b, c, ve d sorularını da cevaplayınız.

a. Toplam ne kadar süre çalıştınız? (eğer birden fazla kurumda çalıştıysanız toplam süreyi belirtiniz): _____ yıl ve _____ ay

b. Çalıştığınız kurum (birden fazla kurumda çalıştıysanız, birden fazla seçeneği işaretleyebilirsiniz):

___ devlet kurumu

___ özel bir kuruluş

___ araştırma kurumu

___ diğer: _____

c. Çalıştığınız Sektör:

Ajans-Fuar-Organizasyon_ Akademi-Yüksek Öğretim_ Araştırma_

Bankacılık_ Basın-Yayın/Matbaa_ Bilişim_ Cam ve Seramik_ Çağrı Merkezi_

Danışmanlık_ Dayanıklı Tüketim_ Demir-Çelik_ Denetim_ Denizcilik ile

ilgili Üretim& Hizmetler_ Eğitim_ Eğlence-Sanat_ Elektrik-Elektronik_

Enerji_ Finansal Hizmet_ Gayrimenkul_ Gıda_ Güvenlik/Koruma

Hizmetleri_ Kimya/Kimyasal Ürünler_ Kozmetik_ Lojistik/Taşımacılık_

Madencilik_ Mağazacılık_ Medya/Televizyon/Radyo/Film_ Mimarlık/Dizayn_

Mobilya_ Mühendislik Hizmetleri_ Otomasyon_ Otomotiv_

Perakendecilik/Toptancılık_ Petrol ve Ürünleri_ Reklam ve Tanıtım_

Sağlık/Hastane_ Savunma Sanayii_ Sigorta_ Silahlı Kuvvetler_ Sivil Toplum

Kuruluşları_ Spor_ Tekstil_ Telekomünikasyon_ Tıbbi Malzeme_
Turizm/Otelcilik_ Üretim/İmalat_ Yapı/İnşaat_ Ziraat/Hayvancılık_

d. Aşağıda sunulan seçeneklerden, en uzun süre çalıştığınız kurumdaki kadın-erkek oranını en iyi şekilde tanımlayanı belirtiniz (sizin kurumdaki cinsiyet dağılımını nasıl algıladığınıza göre):

- _____ neredeyse herkes erkek
_____ erkeklerin oranı kadınlardan daha fazla
_____ erkek ve kadın oranı yaklaşık olarak eşit
_____ kadınların oranı erkeklerden daha fazla
_____ neredeyse herkes kadın

4. Çalıştığınız kurumda yönetsel bir role sahip misiniz? _____ Evet _____ Hayır

5. Çalıştığınız kurumdaki çalışma biçiminiz hangisidir?

- _____ Beyaz Yaka (Bedensel yerine zihinsel gücü ile maaş kazanan kişi)
_____ Mavi Yaka (Daha çok bedensel gücü ile maaş kazanan kişi)

6. Siyasi bakış açınızı genel olarak nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?

(1) oldukça muhafazakâr, (2) biraz muhafazakar, (3) biraz liberal ve (4) oldukça liberal

7. Çalıştığınız şehir: _____

D. AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY (ASI) (Glick & Fiske, 1996)

Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği- ÇDCÖ (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2002)

Bu bölümde kadınlar, erkekler ve kadın erkek ilişkileri hakkında toplam 22 madde bulunmaktadır. Sizden istenen, her bir maddede ifade edilen görüşe ne oranda katıldığınızı altı basamaklı ölçek üzerinde (1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum; 6 = Tamamen Katılıyorum), ilgili rakamın bulunduğu kutucuğu işaretleyerek belirtmenizdir.

1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum

2 = Katılmıyorum

3 = Pek Katılmıyorum

4 = Biraz Katılıyorum

5 = Katılıyorum

6 = Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

1. Ne kadar başarılı olursa olsun bir kadının sevgisine sahip olmadıkça bir erkek gerçek anlamda bütün bir insan olamaz.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Gerçekte birçok kadın “eşitlik” arıyoruz maskesi altında işe alınmalarda kendilerinin kayırılması gibi özel muameleler arıyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Bir felaket durumunda kadınlar erkeklerden önce kurtarılmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Birçok kadın masum söz veya davranışları cinsel ayrımcılık olarak yorumlamaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Karşı cinsten biri ile romantik ilişki olmaksızın insanlar hayatta gerçekten mutlu olamazlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Feministler gerçekte kadınların erkeklerden daha fazla güce sahip olmalarını istemektedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Birçok kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. Kadınlar çok çabuk alınırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Birçok kadın erkeklerin kendileri için yaptıklarına tamamen minnettar <u>olmamaktadırlar</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. İyi bir kadın erkeği tarafından yüceltilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Erkekler cinsel yönden yaklaşılabilir olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Feministler erkekler makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkine sahiptirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkekler karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınırırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6

E. SOCIAL/ECONOMICAL CONSERVATISM SCALE

Sosyal ve Ekonomik Muhafazakârlık Ölçeği

Lütfen aşağıdaki her bir konu için olumlu veya olumsuz hissettiğiniz seviyeyi belirtin.

Puan 0'a yaklaştıkça daha büyük olumsuzluğu, 100'e yaklaştıkça da daha fazla pozitifliği işaret etmektedir.

50 puan, konuyla ilgili tarafsız hissettiğinizi gösterir.

1. Kürtaj	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
2. Sınırlı hükümet*	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
3. Askeri ve ulusal güvenlik	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
4. Din	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
5. Sosyal Yardım	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
6. Silah mülkiyeti	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
7. Geleneksel evlilik	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
8. Geleneksel değerler	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
9. Mali Sorumluluk**	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
10. İş	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
11. Aile Birimi	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100
12. Vatanseverlik	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	100

*Sınırlı hükümet kavramı hükümet gücünün sivil özgürlüklerin korunması için genellikle yazılı bir anayasayla sınırlandırılmasını ifade eder.

**Mali sorumluluk kişinin hazineye veya bir başka kişiye verdiği zararın kendisine ödettilmesi sonucunu doğuran sorumluluk türüdür.

F. INTOLERANCE FOR UNCERTAINTY SCALE (IUS)

Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği (BTÖ)

Aşağıda insanların yaşamın belirsizliklerine nasıl tepki vereceğini anlatan bir dizi ifadeye yer verilmiştir. Lütfen her bir maddeyi okuyarak 1 ile 6 arasındaki ölçekte o maddenin ne kadar size tanımladığını belirtiniz.

	Beni hiç tanımlamıyor	Beni tanımlamıyor	Beni pek tanımlamıyor	Beni biraz tanımlıyor	Beni oldukça tanımlıyor	Beni tamamen tanımlıyor
1. Önceden kestirilemeyen olaylar beni alt üst ediyor	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. İhtiyaç duyduğum bilginin tümüne sahip olamamak beni engelliyor	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Belirsizlik istediğim şekilde bir yaşam sürmemi engelliyor	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Beklenmeyen durumlardan kaçınmak için insan hep ileriye bakmalıdır	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Çok iyi planlanmışken bile beklenmeyen ufak bir durum her şeyi bozabilir	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Harekete geçme zamanı geldiğinde belirsizlik elimi kolumu bağlıyor	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Emin olamadığım zaman çok iyi iş çıkartamıyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Geleceğin benim için neler getireceğini her zaman bilmek isterim	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Beklenmedik olaylara katlanamıyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. En ufak bir şüphe bile harekete geçmemi engelliyor	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Her şeyi önceden organize edebilmeliyim	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Bütün belirsiz durumlardan uzaklaşmalıyım	1	2	3	4	5	6

G. ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE TOWARD SEXUAL HARASSMENT QUESTIONS

İş Yerinde Cinsel Taciz ile ilgili Örgütsel İklim Soruları

Örgütteki Cinsel Taciz Önleyici Politikalar

Lütfen aşağıdaki her bir madde için kurumunuzda bulunan/uygulanan politikaları düşünerek cevap veriniz.

1. Çalıştığım kurum iş yerinde gerçekleşebilecek cinsel taciz olaylarına karşı önleyici ve uygulayıcı politikalar uygulamaktadır.
 Evet, her zaman
 Bazen
 Hayır hiçbir zaman
2. Çalıştığım kurumda cinsel taciz olayları gerçekleşmesi durumunda, bu olaylara karşı tolerans göstermemektedir.
 Evet, her zaman
 Bazen
 Hayır hiçbir zaman
3. Çalıştığım kurum çalışanları “iş yerinde cinsel taciz” konusunda bilgilendirmekte ve eğitimler vermektedir.
 Evet, her zaman
 Bazen
 Hayır hiçbir zaman

Örgütteki Cinsel Taciz Önleyici Politikalara Karşı Tutum

Lütfen aşağıdaki her bir maddeyi tamamen kendi algularınıza dayanarak cevaplandırınız.

1. Çalıştığım kurumun iş yerinde gerçekleşebilecek cinsel taciz olaylarına karşı önleyici ve uygulayıcı politikalar geliştirmek konusunda istekli olacağımı düşünüyorum.
 Evet, buna kesinlikle inanıyorum
 Emin değilim
 Hayır, kesinlikle inanmıyorum

2. Çalıştığım kurumda cinsel taciz olayları gerçekleşmesi durumunda, kurumun bu olaylara karşı tolerans göstermeyeceğine inanıyorum.
___Evet, buna kesinlikle inanıyorum
___Emin değilim
___Hayır, kesinlikle inanmıyorum
3. Çalıştığım kurumun çalışanlarını iş yerinde cinsel taciz konusunda bilgilendirme ve eğitimler verme konusunda istekli olacağımı düşünüyorum.
___Evet, buna kesinlikle inanıyorum
___Emin değilim
___Hayır, kesinlikle inanmıyorum

H. SOCIAL-SEXUAL INCIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE (SSIQ)

Sosyal-Cinsel Yaşantılar Ölçeği

Aşağıda herhangi bir iş yerinde samimi bir arkadaşlık ilişkisi içinde olmayan bir erkek çalışan ile bir kadın çalışan arasında geçebilecek çeşitli davranış örnekleri maddeler halinde verilmiştir. Ölçek 18 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Her bir maddede ifade edilen davranışı “ne derece cinsel taciz” olarak değerlendirdiğinizi, sunulan 5 noktalı ölçekteki açıklamalara göre, maddenin karşısında size uygun rakamı daire içine alarak değerlendirmeniz istenmektedir.

Size bu davranış “cinsel taciz” midir?

1	2	3	4	5
Kesinlikle cinsel taciz değildir	Pek cinsel taciz sayılmaz	Cinsel taciz sayılabilir	Cinsel tacizdir	Kesinlikle cinsel tacizdir

Davranış:	Cinsel taciz midir?				
1. Bir erkek çalışma arkadaşının, kadın çalışanın iş ile ilgili fikirlerini/önerilerini önemsememesi.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Bir erkek çalışanın iş yerinde bir kadın çalışan ile konuşurken sohbet konusunu cinselliğe çekmeye çalışması.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Herhangi bir erkek çalışanın iş yerinde bir kadın çalışana kadınların kullanıldığı pornografik resimler, karikatürler göstermeye çalışması veya iş yerinde görülebilecek ortamda bu tip materyaller bulundurması.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Bir üstün (patron/müdür/amir/şef) cinsiyet ayrımı yaparak erkeklerin iş yerindeki pozisyonunu yükseltip, kadınları yönetimden dışlaması. (sexist hostility)	1	2	3	4	5
5. Herhangi bir erkek çalışanın bir kadın çalışana onunla ilgili cinsel içerikli şakalar yapması.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Bir erkek çalışanın kadın çalışanın bulunduğu ortamda bilgisayarda pornografik sitelere girmesi.	1	2	3	4	5

7. Bir erkek çalışanın bir kadın çalışanın yanında kelime oyunu yaparak cinsel içerikli şakalar yapması.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Erkek çalışanın kadın çalışanın karşısında veya aynı ortamda iken kendi vücudunun bazı bölgelerine dikkati çekmesi, bacaklarını açarak veya elini bacaklarının arasına koyarak oturması.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Bir erkek çalışanın sorulmadığı halde, kadın çalışma arkadaşına kendi özel/cinsel hayatından veya cinsel tercihlerinden bahsetmesi. (sexual hostility)	1	2	3	4	5
10. Erkek çalışanın sık sık mesaiden sonra bir kadın çalışma arkadaşına beraber dışarı çıkma teklifinde bulunması. (Insinuation)	1	2	3	4	5
11. Bir erkek çalışanın, kadın çalışma arkadaşı tarafından yüz görmediği halde, sık sık onun masasına ilgisini belli eden notlar bırakarak, telefonla arayarak, telefonla mesaj atarak veya e-posta göndererek iletişim kurmaya çalışması. (Insinuation)	1	2	3	4	5
12. Kadın çalışanın icra etmekte olduğu mesleğini bir erkek çalışanın değersiz görmesi veya kabullenememesi.(Örneğin; “Sen kimsin ki, sadece bir hemşiresin.” demesi gibi) (sexist hostility)	1	2	3	4	5
13. Erkek çalışanın, cesareti bir kez kırıldığı halde, kadın çalışana ısrarlı çıkma teklifinde bulunması.(Insinuation)	1	2	3	4	5
14. Bir erkek çalışanın, kadın çalışana kişisel ilgisini belli eden imalı iltifatlar etmesi. (Örneğin; “Ah keşke erken doğsaydım, seninle evlenirdim” demesi gibi)-Insinuation	1	2	3	4	5
15. Bir erkek çalışma arkadaşının sık sık bir kadın çalışana “aşkım”, “bebeğim”, “hayatım”, tatlım”, “yavrum” gibi özel hitaplarda bulunması. (Insinuation)	1	2	3	4	5
16. Bir erkek çalışma arkadaşının, kadın çalışanın iş ile ilgili fikirlerini kötü bir şekilde eleştirmesi/aşağılaması. (sexist hostility)	1	2	3	4	5
17. İş yerinde bir erkek çalışanın bir kadın çalışana hakaret etmesi. (sexist hostility)	1	2	3	4	5
18. Zaman zaman bir erkek çalışanın kadın çalışma arkadaşına erkek arkadaşı, eşi ve/veya ailesi ile ilgili sorular sorarak veya yorum yaparak özel yaşamına karışması. (Insinuation)	1	2	3	4	5

I. COPING PREFERENCES SCALE

Baş Etme Tercihleri Ölçeği

BU BÖLÜMÜ **EĞER KADIN İSENİZ** DEĞERLENDİRİNİZ.

Aşağıda iş yerinde siz ve bir erkek çalışan arasında geçebileceği varsayılan altı senaryo okuyacaksınız. Bu senaryolardaki erkek çalışanın sizin yakın bir arkadaşınız olmadığını varsayın. Bu ölçek ile, eğer bu senaryolar gerçek olsaydı, belirtilen durumlara nasıl tepki vereceğinizi ölçmekteyiz. Tepki stilinizi her bir senaryo için değerlendiriniz.

İş yerinde her bir senaryoda belirtilen durumla karşılaşmış olsaydınız, aşağıda belirtilen tepkileri verme dereceniz ne olurdu? Her maddeyi sunulan 5 noktalı ölçekte size uygun gelen sayıyı cümlemin solundaki boşluğa yazarak değerlendiriniz.

1 = Asla bu şekilde tepki vermem

2 = Heralde bu şekilde tepki vermem

3 = Bu şekilde tepki verip vermeyeceğimden emin değilim

4 = Heralde bu şekilde tepki veririm

5 = Kesinlikle bu şekilde tepki veririm

Senaryo 1:

“Ahmet Bey ve siz aynı kurumda çalışmaktasınız. Ahmet Bey cinsel içerikli espiriler ve şakalar yapmaktan hoşlanmakta, siz bu şakalara gülmeseniz bile yapmaya devam etmektedir Bir gün, Ahmet Bey sizi kendi çalışma ofisine davet eder ve hiç beklenmedik bir şekilde size pornografik karikatürler gösterir. Ahmet Bey’in bu davranışı karşısında kendinizi rahatsız hissedersiniz.”

İş yerinde böyle bir olay yaşadığınız takdirde, aşağıdaki tepkileri verme ihtimalinizi değerlendiriniz.

- ___ 1. Kendime yaşadığım şeyin çok da önemli olmadığını söylerim.
- ___ 2. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan uzak durmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 3. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan beni rahat bırakmasını isterim.
- ___ 4. Güvendiğim birisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 5. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışmanı personel birimine rapor ederim.
- ___ 6. Olayı unutmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 7. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışana karşılaşmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 8. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışana, yaptığı davranıştan rahatsız olduğumu belirtmeye çalışırım.
- ___ 9. Resmi bir şikayette bulunurum.

- ___ 10. Destek bulmak ve anlayış görmek için arkadaşlarımla konuşurum.
- ___ 11. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla yalnız kalmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 12. Ne yapabileceğim konusunda tavsiye almak için bir arkadaşşıma danışıırım.
- ___ 13. Patronumla, süpervizörümle, veya bir sendika temsilcisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 14. Yazılı şikayette bulunurum.

Senaryo 2:

“Siz ve Samet Bey birkaç aydır aynı kurumda çalışmaktasınız. Bu zaman zarfında Samet Bey’i sık sık size bakarken gördüğünüzden size ilgi duyduğunu hissettiniz. Farketmemiş gibi davrandınız ve Samet Bey’i cesaretlendirmemeye özen gösterdiniz. Bir gün Samet Bey’le iş yeri koridorunda karşılaştınız ve sizi istediğini söyleyerek ve sizi kucaklamaya, vücudunuzun özel bölgelerine (örn., kalça, bacak, göğüs) dokunmaya çalıştı. Samet Bey’e karşı direndiniz ve hızlıca kendi ofisinize koştunuz.”

İş yerinde böyle bir olay yaşadığınız takdirde, aşağıdaki tepkileri verme ihtimalinizi değerlendiriniz.

- ___ 1. Kendime yaşadığım şeyin çok da önemli olmadığını söylerim.
- ___ 2. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan uzak durmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 3. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan beni rahat bırakmasını isterim.
- ___ 4. Güvendiğim birisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 5. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanı personel birimine rapor ederim.
- ___ 6. Olayı unutmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 7. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla karşılaşmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 8. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışana, yaptığı davranıştan rahatsız olduğumu belirtmeye çalışırım.
- ___ 9. Resmi bir şikayette bulunurum.
- ___ 10. Destek bulmak ve anlayış görmek için arkadaşlarımla konuşurum.
- ___ 11. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla yalnız kalmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 12. Ne yapabileceğim konusunda tavsiye almak için bir arkadaşşıma danışıırım.
- ___ 13. Patronumla, süpervizörümle, veya bir sendika temsilcisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 14. Yazılı şikayette bulunurum.

Senaryo 3:

“Siz ve Metin Bey aynı kurumda çalışmaktasınız. Metin Bey kimi zaman ne kadar iyi bir çalışan olduğunuza dair veya ne kadar hoş bir bayan olduğunuza dair

iltifatlar etmektedir. Bazen de saçınız, giyim tarzınız ve hatta fiziksel özelliklerinizle ilgili de iltifat etmektedir (örn., ne güzel bacaklarınız var demektir). Bununla da kalmayıp, sık sık özel hayatınızla ilgili sorular sormaktadır. Bu davranışları size Metin Bey'in profesyonelce davranmadığını düşündürür.

İş yerinde böyle bir olay yaşadığınız takdirde, aşağıdaki tepkileri verme ihtimalinizi değerlendiriniz.

- ___ 1. Kendime yaşadığım şeyin çok da önemli olmadığını söylerim.
- ___ 2. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan uzak durmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 3. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan beni rahat bırakmasını isterim.
- ___ 4. Güvendiğim birisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 5. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanı personel birimine rapor ederim.
- ___ 6. Olayı unutmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 7. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla karşılaşmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 8. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışana, yaptığı davranıştan rahatsız olduğumu belirtmeye çalışırım.
- ___ 9. Resmi bir şikayette bulunurum.
- ___ 10. Destek bulmak ve anlayış görmek için arkadaşlarımla konuşurum.
- ___ 11. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla yalnız kalmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 12. Ne yapabileceğim konusunda tavsiye almak için bir arkadaşıma danışırım.
- ___ 13. Patronumla, süpervizörümle, veya bir sendika temsilcisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 14. Yazılı şikayette bulunurum.

Senaryo 4:

“Siz ve Can Bey aynı kurumda çalışmaktasınız. Ne zaman Can Bey sizin ofisinize gelip işle ilgili bir konuda konuşmaya başlasa ellerinize, dirseğinize veya omzunuza dokunmaktadır. Her ne kadar Can Bey'in bu davranışlarından hoşlanmadığınızı göstermek için bir kaç adım uzaklaşsanız da, her fırsatta size dokunmaya devam etmektedir.”

İş yerinde böyle bir olay yaşadığınız takdirde, aşağıdaki tepkileri verme ihtimalinizi değerlendiriniz.

- ___ 1. Kendime yaşadığım şeyin çok da önemli olmadığını söylerim.
- ___ 2. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan uzak durmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 3. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan beni rahat bırakmasını isterim.
- ___ 4. Güvendiğim birisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 5. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanı personel birimine rapor ederim.
- ___ 6. Olayı unutmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 7. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla karşılaşmamaya çalışırım.

- ___ 8. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışana, yaptığı davranıştan rahatsız olduğumu belirtmeye çalışırım.
- ___ 9. Resmi bir şikayette bulunurum.
- ___ 10. Destek bulmak ve anlayış görmek için arkadaşlarımla konuşurum.
- ___ 11. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla yalnız kalmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 12. Ne yapabileceğim konusunda tavsiye almak için bir arkadaşşıma danışırım.
- ___ 13. Patronumla, süpervizörümle, veya bir sendika temsilcisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 14. Yazılı şikayette bulunurum.

Senaryo 5:

“Doğan Bey bir yıldır beraber çalıştığınız patronunuz. Bu güne kadar iş performansınızdan son derece memnun kalmıştır. Geçtiğiniz sene boyunca gösterdiğiniz performansa iltifatlar etmiş, sizde terfi beklentisi yaratmıştır. Ne varki bir gün Doğan Bey sizinle kişisel olarak ilgilendiğini itiraf eder. Siz ise iş dışında bir ilişkide bulunmak istemediğinizi belirtirsiniz. Doğan Bey sizin tarafınızdan geri çevrilmeyi kaldıramaz ve terfi istiyorsanız kendisiyle ilişkiye girmeniz gerektiğini ima eder.”

İş yerinde böyle bir olay yaşadığınız takdirde, aşağıdaki tepkileri verme ihtimalinizi değerlendiriniz.

- ___ 1. Kendime yaşadığım şeyin çok da önemli olmadığını söylerim.
- ___ 2. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan uzak durmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 3. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan beni rahat bırakmasını isterim.
- ___ 4. Güvendiğim birisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 5. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanı personel birimine rapor ederim.
- ___ 6. Olayı unutmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 7. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla karşılaşmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 8. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışana, yaptığı davranıştan rahatsız olduğumu belirtmeye çalışırım.
- ___ 9. Resmi bir şikayette bulunurum.
- ___ 10. Destek bulmak ve anlayış görmek için arkadaşlarımla konuşurum.
- ___ 11. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla yalnız kalmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 12. Ne yapabileceğim konusunda tavsiye almak için bir arkadaşşıma danışırım.
- ___ 13. Patronumla, süpervizörümle, veya bir sendika temsilcisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 14. Yazılı şikayette bulunurum.

Senaryo 6:

“Siz ve Baran Bey aynı kurumda çalışmaktasınız. Bazen bir kaç ay süren projelerde beraber görev alıyorsunuz. Bu zaman zarfında ne zaman projeye ilgili bir fikir öne sürseniz Baran Bey önerilerinizi geri çevirir. Proje toplantıları sırasında kadın çalışanların üretken veya yaratıcı olamadığına ve projelere dahil edilmemeleri gerektiğine dair şakalar yapmaktadır. Ne zaman yeni bir görevlendirme olsa Baran Bey bu görevi size vermekten kaçınmaktadır.”

İş yerinde böyle bir olay yaşadığınız takdirde, aşağıdaki tepkileri verme ihtimalinizi değerlendiriniz.

- ___ 1. Kendime yaşadığım şeyin çok da önemli olmadığını söylerim.
- ___ 2. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan uzak durmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 3. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışandan beni rahat bırakmasını isterim.
- ___ 4. Güvendiğim birisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 5. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanı personel birimine rapor ederim.
- ___ 6. Olayı unutmaya çalışırım.
- ___ 7. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla karşılaşmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 8. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışana, yaptığı davranıştan rahatsız olduğumu belirtmeye çalışırım.
- ___ 9. Resmi bir şikayette bulunurum.
- ___ 10. Destek bulmak ve anlayış görmek için arkadaşlarımla konuşurum.
- ___ 11. Hareketi yapan erkek çalışanla yalnız kalmamaya çalışırım.
- ___ 12. Ne yapabileceğim konusunda tavsiye almak için bir arkadaşşıma danışırım.
- ___ 13. Patronumla, süpervizörümle, veya bir sendika temsilcisi ile olay hakkında konuşurum.
- ___ 14. Yazılı şikayette bulunurum.

J. POST-PARTICIPATION INFORMATION FORM

Katılım Sonrası Bilgilendirme Formu

Değerli Katılımcı,

Öncelikle araştırmamıza katıldığınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Bu araştırma, daha önce de belirtildiği gibi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Didem Dinçal tarafından Yrd. Doç. Dr. Yonca Toker danışmanlığında yürütülen tez çalışması kapsamında yapılmaktadır. Araştırmanın amacı, kültürel etkilerin ve örgütsel iklimin; çalışan bireylerin iş yerinde yaşanan görece daha muğlak cinsel taciz olaylarına karşı algısı üzerindeki etkisini incelemektir. Buna ek olarak çalışmada kadınların iş yerinde cinsel tacize karşı kullandıkları savunma mekanizmaları da saptanacaktır.

Yapılan araştırmalar Türk kadınlarının cinsel taciz türlerinin her birini aynı oranda cinsel taciz olarak algılamadığını bazı cinsel taciz türlerinin algılanmasında kişiler arasındaki varyasyonun daha fazla olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu nedenle özellikle 3 görece muğlak Cinsel Taciz türü olan “Cinsiyetçi Düşmanlık”, “İlginin İması”, ve “Cinsel Düşmanlık” bu araştırmanın odağıdır. Araştırmada bireylerin yukarıda bahsedilen görece daha muğlak cinsel taciz tiplerine yönelik algıları kültürel faktörler ve örgütsel iklim faktörü de göz önünde tutularak incelenmeye çalışılmakta olup bunu ölçmek için katılımcılara bazı anketler verilmiştir. Sadece kadın katılımcılar için hazırlanmış olan son bölümde, kadınların cinsel taciz olayları karşısında tercih ettikleri savunma mekanizmaları incelenmektedir.

Bu çalışmadan alınacak ilk verilerin 2017 yılı sonunda elde edilmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Elde edilen bilgiler sadece bilimsel araştırma ve yazılarda kullanılacaktır. Çalışmanın sağlıklı ilerleyebilmesi ve bulguların güvenilir olması için çalışmaya katılacağını bildiğiniz diğer kişilerle çalışma ile ilgili detaylı bilgi paylaşımında bulunmamanızı dileriz. Bu araştırmaya katıldığınız için tekrar çok teşekkür ederiz.

Araştırmanın sonuçlarını öğrenmek ya da daha fazla bilgi almak için Didem Dinçal’a (e-mail:e171819@metu.edu.tr) başvurabilirsiniz.

K. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

GİRİŞ

Kadınların çeşitli iş kollarında varlığının artması ile, işyerinde cinsel taciz (CT), kadınların karşı karşıya kaldığı ayrımcılık ve şiddet biçimlerinden birisi haline gelmiştir. İşyerinde kadınlara yönelik CT, dünya çapında yapılan araştırma sonuçlarına göre ciddi ve yaygın bir insan hakları ihlali olarak kabul edildiğinden (Kadına Yönelik Şiddeti Durdur, 2010), araştırılması gereken önemli bir konudur. Türkiye, kadın erkek istihdam oranlarında en büyük cinsiyet farkına sahip olan Avrupa ülkesi olarak bulunmuştur (Eurostat İstatistikleri Açıklandı, 2015). Otuz bir ülkeden yaklaşık 30.000 işçinin katıldığı 4. Avrupa Çalışma Koşulları Araştırması verilerine göre, Türkiye’de çalışan kadınların %6’sı iş yerinde cinsel tacize maruz kaldığını bildirirken, bu oranın İtalya ve İspanya gibi bazı Avrupa ülkelerinde %1’den düşük olduğu görülmüştür (Eurofound, 2007). Bu veriler ışığında Türkiye’de kadınların işgücüne katılım oranının Avrupa ülkelerindeki ve ABD’deki kadınlardan daha düşük olmasına rağmen; Türkiye’de CT’ye maruz kalma olasılığı Avrupa’dan daha yüksek olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, işyerinde CT’nin özellikle Türkiye örneğinde çalışmak için önemli bir konu olduğu söylenebilir. Mevcut çalışmanın temel amacı, çeşitli kültürel değişkenler ve CT ile ilgili örgüt ikliminin katılımcıların CT algıları arasında ilişkiyi incelemektir. Ek olarak, kadın katılımcıların farklı cinsel taciz türleri karşısında tercih ettikleri baş etme yöntemleri de mevcut çalışmada incelenmiştir.

İşyerindeki Sosyal-Cinsel Olayların Cinsel Taciz Olarak Algılanması ve Kültürün Rolü

CT kavramının birçok farklı tanımının varlığına rağmen, CT, 1964 tarihli Medeni Haklar Yasası’nda yer alana ve 1980’de tanımı yapılanaya kadar yasal bir kavram olarak kabul edilmemiştir. ABD Eşit İstihdam Fırsatı Komisyonu (EEOC) tarafından kabul edilen ve en yaygın tanım olan MacKinnon’ın (1979) tanımına göre, CT iki geniş davranış sınıfından oluşmaktadır. Bu iki davranış; İşle ilgili tehditler ya da cinsel iş birliği karşılığında faydayı içeren “alınan şey karşılığında verilen şey” ve işle ilgili herhangi bir tehdit veya fayda içermeyen, cinsiyetle ilgili fiziksel ya da sözlü istenmeyen ve saldırgan davranışları içeren “düşmanca çevre” tacizinden

oluşmaktadır (EEOC, 1980; Fitzgerald, 1993'te belirtildiği gibi). Ek olarak, bugüne kadar CT'nin kavramsallaştırılması hakkındaki tartışmalar (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995; MacKinnon, 1979; Nye, Brummel ve Drasgow, 2014) farklı CT taksonomilerine yol açmıştır. Bu taksonomilere göre bütün rahatsız edici davranışların CT olarak kabul edilmediği gibi, CT'ye atfedilen tüm davranış türlerinin de aynı şiddette algılanmadığı görülmüştür. Araştırmalar CT'nin farklı davranış türlerini veya tutumlarını içerdiğini, kadınlarla konuşurken cinsiyetçi ve ayrımcı dili kullanma gibi davranışların işle ilgili ödül ve ceza karşılığında cinsel iş birliğini istemek gibi davranışlardan daha ılımlı görüldüğünü göstermiştir. (Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow ve Waldo, 1999; MacKinnon, 1979; Till, 1980). Bu nedenle, CT çalışmalarının bir başka odağı da algısal farklılıkların nedenlerini bulmak olmuştur. Cinsiyet (Rotundo, Nguyen ve & Sackett, 2001), cinsiyet rollerine karşı tutum, özsaygı ve olumsuz duygulanım gibi kişisel değişkenler (Toker ve Sümer, 2010) ve cinsel yönelimli davranış türleri (Sheffey ve Tindale, 1992) önceki akademik çalışmalarda incelenen değişkenler arasındadır. Zimbrot'un (2007) belirttiği gibi, hangi davranışların CT olarak algılanıp algılanmayacağını belirleyen temel özellikler kültürel değerler ve inançlar ile bağlantılıdır. Bu nedenle, CT bu kültüre özgü faktörlerle ilişkili olarak anlaşılmalıdır. Buna ek olarak insanların CT ile başa çıkma tercihlerinin de farklı olduğu bildirilmiş (Cortina ve Wasti, 2005; Wasti ve Cortina, 2002) ve bu tercihlerin CT'nin kötü sonuçları için bir tampon olabileceği bildirilmiştir.

Mevcut çalışmada, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, liberal / muhafazakâr tutumlar ve belirsizlikten kaçınma incelenecek kültürel boyutlar olarak tanımlanmıştır. Mevcut çalışmada, yukarıda belirtilen kültürel özelliklerin yanı sıra, CT ile ilgili örgütsel iklim algı farklılıklarını etkileyen bir başka değişken olarak çalışmaya dahil edilmiştir. Mevcut çalışmanın yukarıda verilen değişkenler ile iş yerinde cinsel taciz algısı arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırması sonucunda mevcut literatüre katkı sağlaması beklenmektedir.

Cinsel Taciz Türleri

Toker ve Sümer (2010) tarafından yapılan çalışmada, Türk kadınlarının CT olarak algıladıkları davranışlara ulaşabilmek adına Sosyal-Cinsel Yaşantılar

Ölçeği'ni geliştirmişlerdir. Çalışmada CT'nin 5 faktörlü bir yapısı bulunmasına rağmen, Türk kadınları tüm bu faktörleri aynı seviyede CT olarak algılamamıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre katılımcılar Cinsiyetçi Düşmanlığı CT olarak algılamazken, yakın oturmak, daha yakın olmak için fiziksel güç kullanmak, öpmeye çalışmak ve kadınların cinsel bölgelerine bakmak gibi fiziksel olarak yakın davranışları içeren Fiziksel Cinsel Saldırımı ve cinsel ilişkiye girme karşılığında işle ilgili ödül ve tehditleri içeren, Cinsel Rüşvet ve Zorlamayı şiddetli CT biçimleri olarak algılamışlardır. Ek olarak İlginin İması ve Cinsel Düşmanlığı ise CT'nin orta derece şiddetli formları olarak algılamışlardır.

Bu çalışma kapsamında Toker ve Sümer'in (2010) çalışmasında bulunan üç görece muğlak CT formu incelenmiştir. Bunlar, Türk kadınları tarafından CT olarak algılanmayan ya da şiddetli CT olarak algılanmayan görece muğlak CT biçimleri olan Cinsiyetçi Düşmanlık, İlginin iması ve Cinsel Düşmanlıktır. İlginin iması çoğunlukla kadınlara yönelik bir ilginin ima edilmesini ve açık bir cinsel içeriğe sahip olmadan romantik bir ilişki istenmesini içerir. Örneğin, "sevgili" gibi sevecen sözlerle kadına hitap etmek ve sürekli buluşma talep etmek, bu kategorideki bazı davranışlardır. Cinsel düşmanlık, çoğunlukla sözlü veya görsel yollarla cinselliğe maruz bırakmakla ilgilidir. Cinsel şakalar, pornografi ve cinsellikten bahsetmek, cinsel materyaller sunmak bu kategorideki bazı davranışlardır. Son olarak, Cinsiyetçi Düşmanlık boyutu, kadının kariyerini değersiz olarak değerlendirmek, kadınların fikirlerinin önemsiz olduğunu düşünmek ve uygunsuz dilde kadınlara atıfta bulunmak gibi cinsiyet ayrımcı davranışlarla ilgilidir (Toker ve Sümer, 2010).

Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik

Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin 2 alt boyutu olarak düşmanca cinsiyetçilik (DC) ile korumacı cinsiyetçilik (KC) Glick ve Fiske (1996) tarafından tanımlanmıştır. DC erkeklerin baskınlığını ve üstünlüğünü teşvik eden geleneksel cinsiyetçi antipati veya düşmanca cinsellik olarak tanımlanırken, KC ise doğası gereği kadınları basmakalıp görerek rollerini kısıtladığı için cinsiyetçi olmakla beraber toplum yanlısı ve yakınlık arayan özellikler de barındırdığı için pozitif algılanan davranışlar olarak tanımlanmıştır. Glick ve Fiske'e (1997) göre KC, kadınların erkeklerin olumlu olarak değerlendirdiği geleneksel ev kadını rolüyle

olumlu bir şekilde ilişkiyken, DC ise erkekler tarafından olumsuz olarak değerlendirilen iş kadını gibi geleneksel olmayan kadın rolleriyle ilişkili bulunmuştur. Yürüttükleri çalışmada, Russell ve Trigg (2004) cinsiyet, cinsiyet rolleri, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve sosyal baskınlık yönelimlerinin katılımcıların CT toleransı üzerindeki etkisini araştırmıştır. Beklenildiği gibi kadınların, erkeklerle karşılaştırıldığında CT'ye daha az tolerans gösterdiği; dahası, KC ve kadınlara karşı düşmanca tutumun CT'ye tolerans konusundaki varyansın çoğunu açıkladığı bulunmuştur. Hem kadınların hem erkeklerin cinsiyetçiliği yüksek olduğunda CT'ye karşı daha toleranslı olmaları, çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliğin CT'yi algılamada cinsiyetten daha önemli olduğunu göstermiştir.

Hipotez 1a: Katılımcıların Korumacı Cinsiyetçilik Düzeyi ile görece muğlak CT türlerini algılaması arasında küçük pozitif ilişki olacaktır.

Hipotez 1b: Katılımcıların Düşmanca Cinsiyetçilik düzeyi ile görece muğlak CT türlerini algılaması arasında orta düzeyde olumsuz ilişki olacaktır.

Muhafazakarlık

Muhafazakarlık kavramı, birçok farklı alt boyut içermesi nedeniyle etkisini ölçmekte zorlanılan bir değişkendir. Örneğin, Hicks ve Wright (1970) beş farklı liberalizm ve muhafazakarlık ölçeğinin karşılaştırıldığı çalışmalarında muhafazakarlığın ekonomik, politik, dini ve estetik olarak adlandırılan en az dört alt boyutunun olduğunu belirtmiştir. Muhafazakâr ve liberal terimlerinin kullanıldıkları bağlama göre anlamı değişiklik gösterebilmektedir.

Muhafazakârlık, insanların yaşadığı sosyal ortamın baskın değerlerini içselleştirildiği bir sosyal tutum olarak tanımlanır. Muhafazakâr olan kişilerin genellikle değişime dirençli, statükoyu devam ettirmek isteyen ve toplumsal düzeni koruma eğilimindeyken; daha liberal insanların yaklaşmakta olan değişimi destekleyen; bu değişimin sosyal düzeni bozmayan, yasal ve kabul edilebilir olması gerektiğini savunduğu belirtilmiştir (Pienaar, Beukes ve Esterhuysen, 2006). Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski ve Sulloway'e (2003) göre muhafazakarlığın iki temel bileşeni, belirsizliği ve tehdit duygusunu azaltmak için, değişime direnç ve eşitliğe karşı durmak olarak ifade edilmiştir. Daha muhafazakâr kadınların cinsiyetler arası eşitsizliği ve hiyerarşiyi kabul ederek bazı belirsiz davranışları CT yerine kadın erkek

rollerinin farkı olarak görebilirler. Örneğin, Malovich ve Stake (1990) çalışmalarında geleneksel cinsiyet rollerine sahip öğrencilerin CT davranışlarına daha toleranslı olduğunu, geleneksel cinsiyet rollerine sahip olmayan öğrencilerin ise daha az toleranslı olduğunu bulmuştur.

Hipotez 2: Muhafazakarlık seviyesi yüksek olan katılımcıların, görece daha muğlak CT türlerini algılama ihtimali küçük etki boyutu ile daha düşük olacaktır.

Belirsizlikten Kaçınma

Hofstede, Kültürel Boyut Teorisi'nde güç mesafesi, bireycilik, belirsizlikten kaçınma ve erkeklik olmak üzere ulusal kültürün dört boyutundan bahsetmiştir. Hofstede bu özellikleri Ülkeleri birbirinden ayıran ve eşitsizlik, belirsizlik gibi sorunlarla başa çıkmanın yolunu gösteren değerler olarak tanımlamaktadır. Hofstede, Hofstede ve Minkov (2010) belirsizlikten kaçınmayı “bir kültürün üyelerinin belirsizlik ya da bilinmeyen durumlarda tehdit altında hissettiği ölçü” olarak tanımlamışlardır.

Tavakoli, Keenan ve Cranjak-Karanoviç (2003) belirsizlikten kaçınmanın yüksek olduğu kültürlerin üyelerinin etik dışı ihlalleri daha şiddetli değerlendirme ihtimali olduğunu belirtmiştir. CT literatürü çoğunlukla, ABD (46), Birleşik Krallık (35), İsveç (29) ve Hollanda (53) gibi belirsizlikten kaçınma seviyelerinin düşük olduğu ülkelere gelirken, Türkiye'nin belirsizlikten kaçınma skoru (85) tüm bu ülkelere yüksektir (Hofstede ve arkadaşları, 2010). Hofstede'ye (2001) göre, belirsizlikten kaçınmanın yüksek olduğu kültürlerdeki bireylerin diğer insanları algılamakta belirsizliğe tahammül etmedikleri için, iletişimlerinde daha agresif olabildiği ve tehdit edici durumlarda diğerlerinden kaçınmaya çalışabilmektedirler (Merkin, 2006; Merkin 2012). Belirsizlikten kaçınmanın yüksek olduğu kültürlerin üyeleri için işyerinde CT'ye karşı tolerans göstermelerinin daha az mümkün olduğu savunulmuştur.

Hipotez 3: Belirsizlikten kaçınma seviyesinin daha yüksek olduğu katılımcıların, görece daha muğlak CT türlerini algılama ihtimalleri küçük bir etki boyutu ile daha muhtemel olacaktır.

Örgütsel İklim

Örgüt iklimi, Parker ve arkadaşları (2003) tarafından, işyeriyle ilgili politikalar, uygulamalar ve prosedürler de dahil olmak üzere bireylerin işyerini nasıl algıladıkları olarak tanımlanmıştır. (Buchanan, Settles, Hall ve O'connor, 2014'te belirtildiği gibi). İklim hem örgütsel hem de kültürel düzeyde önemlidir, çünkü Sigal ve Jacobsen (1999) "iklim" in ülke genelinde ya da belirli bir kuruluş özelinde CT ile ilişkili olduğunu savunmuştur.

Ülkelerin kanun ve politikaları yürürlüğe koyarken ve uygularken ne kadar katı oldukları, bu ülkedeki kuruluşların bu yasa ve politikaları ne kadar ciddiye alacağını yansıtabilir. Bu yasalar ve politikalar, CT olaylarına, bunların algılanmasına, değerlendirilmesine ve bunlara verilen tepkilere yön verebilir. Örneğin, Williams, Fitzgerald ve Drasgow (1999) tarafından yapılan çalışmada, CT ile ilgili örgütsel uygulamaların, her iki cinsiyet için de orduda taciz vakaları üzerinde önemli olumlu etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur. Literatürde örgütsel iklim ile CT algıları arasındaki ilişkiyi doğrudan araştıran bir çalışma olmamasına rağmen, CT'nin doğru tanımlandığı ve olası eylemlerin kurallar ve politikalar ile kontrol edildiği kurumlarda, çalışanların endişe yaratan ve tehditkâr vakalarda daha duyarlı olmaları beklenebilir.

Hipotez 4: Katılımcıların CT'ye karşı proaktif bir örgütsel iklim olduğunu düşünmeleri ile görece muğlak CT türlerini algılanması arasında küçük pozitif ilişki olacaktır.

Cinsel Taciz ile Baş Etme Tercihleri

CT ile başa çıkma tercihlerinin araştırıldığı literatür, basit bir modelden karmaşık hiper boyutlu modellere kadar olan çalışmalar içermektedir. Knapp, Faley, Ekeberg, ve Dubois (1997), literatürdeki bulgulara göre, CT'ye verilen yanıtların tek boyutlu modeller yerine çok boyutlu yapıları yansıttığını belirtmiştir. Onların tipolojisinde CT'ye karşı tepkilerin ya maruz kalan kişinin kendine odaklanabileceğini ya da başlatıcıya odaklanabileceğini belirtmiştir. Kendi kendine odaklanmış cevaplar, CT'nin failini içermediği anlamına gelirken, başlatıcı odaklı yanıtlar doğrudan fail ve olayı ifade etmektedir.

Tipolojinin Türk kadınına da içeren kültürel bir karşılaştırması, Wasti ve Cortina (2002) tarafından yapılmıştır. Bu tipolojiyi, iki farklı meslek grubundan dört farklı çalışan kadın grubu ve ilk analizlerde teyit edilen beş başa çıkma mekanizması kullanarak Türk, Anglo Amerikan ve İspanyol Amerikan olan üç farklı kültürle incelemişlerdir. Söz konusu 5 başa çıkma mekanizması olan Kaçınma, reddetme, müzakere, savunuculuk arayışı ve sosyal başa çıkma tüm bu kültürel gruplar için onaylanarak Knapp ve arkadaşlarının tipolojisini desteklenmiştir (1997). Latin Amerikalı ve Türk kadınların, Anglo Amerikalı kadınlardan daha fazla kaçınma davranışı gösterdikleri ve bu çalışmada genellikle inkâr yerine kaçınma maddeleriyle kümelendikleri belirtilmektedir. Üstelik, bütün kültürler ve meslek grupları arasında CT'ye en nadir görülen cevap, savunuculuk arayışıydı. Ayrıca, müzakere yöntemi Türk kadınlar tarafından Anglo Amerikalı kadınlardan daha fazla kullanılmıştır (Wasti ve Cortina, 2002). Mevcut çalışmada, kadın katılımcıların CT davranışı karşısında bu 5 baş etme mekanizmasını tercihleri noktasında grup içi varyasyonları araştırmacı olarak incelenmiştir.

YÖNTEM

Prosedür

Veri toplama sürecinden ilk olarak araştırma konusu için Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından onay alınmıştır. Onayın ardından Qualtrics anket yazılımı ile hazırlanan anket linki katılımcılara sosyal medya, e-mail ve kişisel bağlantılar yoluyla iletilmiştir. Anketin başında katılımcılardan Gönüllü Katılım Formunu doldurmaları istenmiş ardından sırayla Demografik Bilgi Formu, Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği, Sosyal ve Ekonomik Muhafazakârlık Ölçeği, Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği, Cinsel Taciz ile ilgili Örgütsel İklim Soruları, Sosyal-Cinsel Yaşantılar Ölçeği sunulmuştur. Çalışmada yer alan kadın katılımcılara iş yerinde cinsel tacize maruz kaldıklarında tercih ettikleri başa çıkma yöntemlerini anlamak için Cinsel Tacizle Başa Çıkma Ölçeği uygulanmıştır.

Katılımcılar

Çalışmanın ön şartı olarak hayatının bir döneminde ve/veya halihazırda tam zamanlı çalışmış/çalışan katılımcılardan alınan bilgiler kullanılmıştır. Ankete katılan

ve bu şartı sağlayan katılımcıların yaklaşık yarısı tüm anketleri sonuna kadar doldurmuştur ve bu sayı 420 kişi olarak tespit edilmiştir. Gelişigüzel cevap veren kullanıcıların yanı sıra tek değişkenli ve çok değişkenli aykırı değerli katılımcılar, toplanan veriden çıkarıldığında 380 katılımcıdan alınan veriler ışığında çalışma yürütülmüştür.

Bu katılımcılardaki 154 (40,5%) kişi erkek, 226 (59,5%) kişi kadındır. Üç yüz kırk (89,5%) kişi beyaz yaka, 40 (10,5%) mavi yaka çalışandır. Tüm katılımcıların yaş ortalaması 37.18 (SS = 11.46), katılımcıların ortalama çalışma tecrübesi 13.38 (SS = 11.27) yıldır. Çalışılan ortamdaki kadın erkek oranı göz önünde bulundurulduğunda tüm katılımcılardan 120 (31.6%) kişi kadın erkek sayısının neredeyse aynı olduğu iş yerlerinde çalıştıklarını, 103 (27.1%) kişi kadın ağırlıklı, 107 (28.2%) kişi erkek ağırlıklı, 34 (8.9%) hemen hemen herkesin erkek ağırlıklı olduğu, 16 (4.2%) kişi de hemen hemen herkesin kadın ağırlıklı olduğu ortamlarda çalıştığını belirtmiştir. Son olarak katılımcılardan 173 (45.5%) kişi kendini oldukça liberal olarak tanımlarken, 161 (42.4%) kişi kendini biraz liberal, 36 (9.5%) kişi kendini biraz muhafazakâr, 10 (2.6%) kişi de kendini oldukça muhafazakâr olarak tanımlamıştır.

Araçlar

Çalışmada katılımcılara yöneltilen Demografik Bilgi Formunda katılımcıların cinsiyet, yaş, çalışma tecrübesi, çalıştığı sektör, siyasi bakış açısı gibi demografik özelliklerini tanımlayan sorular sorulmuştur.

Glick ve Fiske (1996) tarafından oluşturulan ve Sakallı-Uğurlu (2002) tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği toplam 22 sorudan oluşan ve kadınlara yönelik düşmanca cinsiyetçilik (DC) ile korumacı cinsiyetçilik (KC) davranışlarını ölçümleyen bir ankettir. Bu anket 6'lı Likert tipi ölçekle (1 = kesinlikle katılmıyorum; 6 = kesinlikle katılıyorum) ölçümlenmektedir.

Everett (2013) tarafından oluşturulan Sosyal ve Ekonomik Muhafazakârlık Ölçeği katılımcıların sosyal ve ekonomik muhafazakarlık seviyelerini "Sosyal Yardım", "Mali Sorumluluk" ve bunun gibi toplam 12 kalıp madde üzerinden ölçümlemeyi hedefleyen bir ankettir. Burada katılımcılardan 0-100 puan skalası arasında 10'ar puanlık aralıklarla söz konusu kalıp maddeler hakkında ne kadar

pozitif hissettiklerini puanlamaları istenmiştir (0 = oldukça negatif hissediyorum; 100 = oldukça pozitif hissediyorum). Bu ölçekte kullanılan 12 kalıp madde Türkçe'ye çevrilerek katılımcılara yöneltilmiştir.

Freeston ve arkadaşları (1994) tarafından oluşturulan ve Sarıçam ve arkadaşları (2014) tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği belirsizliğe tahammülsüzlük ifadelerini içeren 27 maddenin 5'li Likert tipi ölçek ile (1 = beni hiç tanımlamıyor; 6 = beni tamamen tanımlıyor) ölçümlendiği bir ankettir.

Cinsel Taciz ile ilgili Örgütsel İklim Anketi toplamda 6 sorudan oluşmaktadır. İlk 3 soru çalışılan şirkette cinsel taciz ile alakalı bir düzenlemenin olup olmadığı katılımcıya sorarken, ardından gelen 3 soru ise katılımcılara mevcut kurumları tarafından cinsel tacize yönelik yapılan düzenlemeleri nasıl algıladıklarını sormuştur. Tüm sorularda değerlendirme ölçeği "Evet, her zaman", "Bazen", "Hayır, hiçbir zaman" şeklinde üç tipte verilen kalıp cevaplardan oluşmaktadır.

Sosyal-Cinsel Yaşantılar Ölçeği, Toker (2003) tarafından oluşturulmuştur ve Toker ve Sümer (2010) tarafından tanımlanmış 5 farklı cinsel taciz türününün ne derece cinsel taciz olarak değerlendirdiğini ölçmektedir. Mevcut çalışmada söz konusu 5 cinsel taciz türünden görece daha muğlak olan 3 tanesi ölçümlendiği için ölçeğin 18 maddesi kullanılarak 5 noktalı ölçek (1 = Kesinlikle Cinsel Taciz Değildir; 5 = Kesinlikle Cinsel Tacizdir) ile katılımcılardan bilgiler toplanmıştır.

Cinsel Tacizle Başa Çıkma Ölçeği Toker (2011) tarafından geliştirilen ve 6 farklı cinsel taciz türünü ölçümlemeyi sağlayan 6 varsayımsal senaryodan oluşmaktadır. Her bir senaryo Knapp, Faley, Ekberg, ve Duboi'nin (1997) farklı başa çıkma mekanizmalarını ölçen 14 maddenin 5'li Likert tipi ölçekle (1=Asla bu şekilde tepki vermem; 5=Kesinlikle bu şekilde tepki veririm) değerlendirilmesiyle ölçümlenmiştir.

SONUÇLAR

Veri temizlendikten sonra, çalışmada kullanılan ölçeklere Açıklayıcı Faktör Analizi (AFA) ve Doğrulayıcı Faktör Analizi (DFA) uygulanmıştır. Hipotez testine geçmeden önce, veriler Mahalanobis mesafesi kullanılarak çok değişkenli aykırı

değer için taranmış ve sadece bir tane tespit edilmiştir. Analizler 380 katılımcı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bunların 226'sı kadın, 154'u erkektir.

DFA, Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik Ölçeği, Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği, Sosyal-Cinsel Yaşantılar Ölçeği için gerçekleştirilmiştir. İki faktörlü Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik ölçeği için iç tutarlılık puanı .90, 11 maddeli düşmanca cinsiyetçilik faktörü için .89, korumacı cinsiyetçilik faktörü için .85'dir. (bkz. Tablo 1). Düşmanca ve yardımsever cinsiyetçilik arasında orta düzeyde bir ilişki bulunmaktadır. ($r = .50, p < .001$). İki faktörlü Belirsizliğe Tahammülsüzlük Ölçeği için iç tutarlılık puanı .88'dir. Sosyal-Cinsel Yaşantılar Ölçeği için 3 faktörlü yapı onaylanmış, tüm örnekleme ölçek iç tutarlılığı .89 iken Cinsiyetçi Düşmanlık için .86, Cinsel Düşmanlık için .85 ve İlginin İması için .84 olarak bulunmuştur (bkz. Tablo 1). Ölçek, cinsiyetçi düşmanlık ($r = .75, p < .001$), cinsel düşmanlık ($r = .79, p < .001$) ve ilginin iması ($r = .85, p < .001$) alt faktörleri ile anlamlı korelasyon göstermiştir.

AFA, Sosyal-Ekonomik Muhafazakarlık Ölçeği, CT ile ilgili örgütsel iklim soruları ve Baş Etme Tercihleri Ölçeği için gerçekleştirilmiştir. Analiz sonucunda Sosyal-Ekonomik Muhafazakarlık Ölçeği tek boyut ve 8 maddeye indirilmiştir ve iç tutarlılık puanı .84 olarak bulunmuştur. Tek faktörlü örgütsel iklim soruları için iç tutarlılık .78 olarak bulunmuştur. Son olarak, CT ile baş etme ölçeği için 3 faktörlü bir yapı bulunmuştur. Ölçeğin iç tutarlılığı .94 iken, alt faktörleri olan “Sosyal destek arayışı” için .96, “Makamlara raporlama” için .95, “Tacizciden kaçınma” için .90 olarak bulunmuştur.

Betimleyici istatistikler, iç tutarlılık puanları ile tüm örneklem için Tablo 1'de özetlenirken, Erkek ve kadın katılımcılar için sonuçlar Tablo 2'de verilmiştir. Çalışma değişkenleri için, kadın ve erkek katılımcılar arasında farklılık olup olmadığını görmek için bağımsız grup t testi uygulanmıştır (bkz. Tablo 1.). Buna ek olarak çalışma değişkenleri arasında iki değişkenli korelasyon analizi yapılarak Tablo 3'te sonuçlar sunulmuştur. İki değişkenli korelasyon analizi cinsiyetler için ayrı ayrı yapılarak, Tablo 4'te kadınlar için korelasyonlar alt üçgende, erkekler için korelasyonlar üst üçgende gösterilmektedir.

Çalışma değişkenleri arasındaki ilişkiyi görmek için erkekler ve kadınlar için ayrı ayrı regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Regresyon analizi ile sosyal / ekonomik muhafazakarlık, DC, KC, belirsizlikten kaçınma ve örgütsel iklimin, görece muğlak CT türleri olan cinsiyetçi düşmanlık, cinsel düşmanlık ve ilginin imasının algılanması üzerindeki etkisi incelemiştir. Kadın katılımcılar için, görece muğlak CT türleri ve cinsiyetçi düşmanlığı algılamak ile yaş değişkeni arasındaki yüksek korelasyon nedeniyle analizlerde yaş değişkeni kontrol edilmiştir.

Kadın örneklemindeki sonuçlara göre, yaş ($\beta = -.13, t(225) = -1.99, p = .05$) ve düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ($\beta = -.21, t(225) = -2.52, p = .01$) kompozit görece muğlak CT türlerinin algılanmasını anlamlı ve negatif şekilde yordamıştır. Ayrıca, yaş ($\beta = -.25, t(225) = -3.65, p < .001$) ve sosyal / ekonomik muhafazakarlık ($\beta = -.21, t(225) = -3.12, p = .002$) cinsiyetçi düşmanlığın bir CT türü olarak algılanmasını anlamlı ve ters yönde yordamıştır. Düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ($\beta = -.25, t(225) = -3.11, p = .002$) anlamlı ve negatif yönde ve belirsizlikten kaçınma ($\beta = .19, t(225) = 2.82, p = .01$) ise anlamlı ve pozitif yönde olmak üzere cinsel düşmanlığın bir CT türü olarak algılanmasını yordamıştır.. Son olarak, Düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ($\beta = -.22, t(225) = -2.72, p = .01$), ilginin imasının bir CT türü olarak algılanmasını negatif ve anlamlı şekilde yordamıştır. (bkz. Tablo 6.). Sosyal/cinsel muhafazakarlığın, düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin, korumacı cinsiyetçiliğin, belirsizlikten kaçınmanın ve örgütsel iklimin görece daha muğlak CT türlerinin algılanmasında bireysel ve ortak etkilerinin anlaşılabilmesi adına bir görece önem analizi olan baskınlık analizi yapılmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, görece daha muğlak CT türlerinin algılanmasındaki toplam varyansın, %8,9'u yukarıda verilen 5 değişken tarafından açıklanmaktadır. Bu varyansın %46'sı düşmanca cinsiyetçilik, %25'i sosyal/ekonomik muhafazakarlık, %13'ü çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik, %9'u belirsizlikten kaçınma ve %8'i örgütsel iklim tarafından açıklanmaktadır. Bu doğrultuda, düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ve sosyal/ekonomik muhafazakarlık, görece daha muğlak CT türlerinin algılanmasında en önemli belirleyiciler olarak bulunmuştur. Öte yandan, erkek katılımcılar için, regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre sadece düşmanca cinsiyetçiliğin ($\beta = -.21, t(153) = -2.45, p = .02$) cinsiyetçi düşmanlığı CT

türü olarak algılamayı anlamlı ve negatif yönde yordadığı bulunmuştur (bkz. Tablo 7.).

Cinsel Taciz Algılama ve Tercih Edilen Başa Etme Mekanizmaları Üzerine Keşifsel Analizler

Görece muğlak CT türleri olan cinsiyetçi düşmanlık, cinsel düşmanlık ve ilginin iması ile üç baş etme mekanizması olarak bulunan sosyal destek arayışı, makamlara raporlama ve tacizciden kaçınma arasındaki ilişkiyi görmek için kanonik korelasyon analizi yapılmıştır. Bu analize göre ilk set olan set A görece muğlak CT türlerini, ikinci set olan set B baş etme mekanizmalarını içermektedir.

Analiz sonuçlarına göre üç kanonik korelasyon hesaplanmış ve ilk (Wilks' Lambda = .85, $\chi^2(9) = 35.28$, $p < .001$) ve ikinci (Wilks' Lambda = .95, $\chi^2(4) = 12.00$, $p = .017$) anlamlı iken, üçüncü korelasyonda anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Set A ve B'deki ilk kanonik değişken çiftleri için kanonik korelasyon .32'dir ve toplam varyansın %10'unu açıklamaktadır. İkinci kanonik korelasyon ise .23'dür ve toplam varyansın %5'ini oluşturmaktadır. Set A ve B için kanonik yüklerin özeti Tablo 8'de verilmiştir. İlk değişken çifti için yapılan çapraz yüklemelerin sonuçlarına göre, A Set'inde cinsel düşmanlık ($r = -.93$) ile Set B'nin ilk değişkeni olan makamlara raporlama ile tacizciden kaçınma ile negatif ve anlamlı bir ilişki içerisindedir. A Set'indeki cinsiyetçi düşmanlık ($r = .92$) ile B Setinin ikinci değişkeni olan tacizciden kaçınma ile anlamlı negatif ve yetkililere rapor verme eğilimi ile anlamlı pozitif bir ilişki içerisindedir.

Ayrıca, çalışma değişkenleri ve baş etme mekanizmaları arasındaki korelasyonları görmek için iki değişkenli korelasyon analizi yapılmıştır. Tablo 9'da tüm korelasyon sonuçları gösterilmektedir. Son olarak, farklı baş etme mekanizmalarına bağlı olarak farklı senaryoların ortalama seviyesini görmek için, keşif esasına dayalı betimsel analiz yapılmıştır (bkz. Tablo 10.).

TARTIŞMA

Tartışma bölümünde, hipotezler ve keşfedici analizleri doğrultusunda öne çıkan bulgular tartışılmaktadır. Mevcut çalışmanın hipotezleri doğrultusunda beklenen tüm sonuçlar alınmamış olsa dahi, desteklenen hipotezlere ve keşifsel

analizlere dair bulguların hem akademik hem de profesyonel bağlamda iç görü sağlayacağına inanılmaktadır.

Çalışma Bulguları ve Katkıları

Hipotez testinden önce, Sosyal/Cinsel Yaşantılar Anketleri için kadın ve erkek katılımcılar için ayrı olarak yapılmış olan DFA analizi doğrultusunda hem erkek hem de kadınlar için faktör yapıları ve uyum endekslerinin benzer çıktığı görülmüştür. Buna ek olarak, tüm örneklem, erkek ve kadın örneklemini için tüm anketin ve anket alt faktörlerinin iç tutarlılık sonuçları benzer çıkmıştır. Bu sonuçlar, anketin cinsiyetler arasında tutarlı olduğu anlamına geldiği için önemli bulgulardandır.

Çalışmadaki bir diğer önemli bulgu, t-test sonuçlarına göre erkek katılımcıların değişkenler arasında sadece çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ve alt boyutlarında kadın katılımcılardan daha yüksek ortalamalara sahip olmalarıdır. Bu bulgu, önceki çalışmalarda da belirtildiği gibi (örn.; Glick ve Fiske, 1997; Sibley ve Wilson, 2004) erkeklerin sosyal baskınlık güdülerini ve toplumsal cinsiyet rollerini vurgulayan çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilikle alakalı daha olumlu bir tutum içerisinde olduğunu göstermiştir.

Çalışmadaki hipotez 1a, katılımcıların korumacı cinsiyetçilik düzeyinin, CT'nin görece daha muğlak biçimlerini algılamakla küçük pozitif bir ilişkiye sahip olacağını savunmuştur. Sonuçlara göre, korumacı cinsiyetçilik için kadın ve erkekler örnekleminde anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır. Hipotez 1a desteklenmemiş olsa da, erkekler için korumacı cinsiyetçilik ve görece muğlak CT türleri arasındaki ilişkide pozitif bir trend görülmüştür. Bu sonuçlar doğrultusunda, yüksek korumacı cinsiyetçilik düzeyine sahip erkek katılımcıların, koruyucu rol üstlendiği ve cinsel taciz davranışlarına karşı bu nedenle daha duyarsız oldukları söylenebilir.

Hipotez 1b'ye göre, katılımcıların düşmanca cinsiyetçilik düzeyinin görece muğlak CT'nin türlerinin algılanması ile orta düzey ve negatif yönde bir ilişkide olacağı beklenmiştir. 1b hipotezi, kadın ve erkek örneklemini için kısmen desteklenmiştir. Bir önemli bulgu da düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ile görece muğlak CT türleri arasındaki ilişkinin iki cinsiyet için farklı sonuçlar göstermesidir. Kadınlar için düşmanca cinsiyetçilik ile kompozit CT türleri, cinsel düşmanlık ve ilginin iması

arasındaki ilişkiler anlamlı iken, erkekler için sadece cinsiyetçi düşmanlık ile anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Bu sonuçlar, Sibley ve Wilson'ın (2004) erkeklerin olumsuz alt tipe sahip kadınlara (örn. Çalışan kadın) karşı yüksek düşmanca cinsiyetçilik gösterirken düşük korumacı cinsiyetçilik göstermeleri ve bu örüntünün olumlu alt tipe sahip kadınlara (örn. Ev kadını) karşı tam tersi olması tezine uygun olarak, erkeklerin kadınların cinsiyet rolleri karşı tutumunu ve erkeklerin çalışan kadın profiline bakışını yansıtıyor olabilir.

Hipotez 2 muhafazakarlık düzeyi arttıkça muğlak CT türlerini algılamanın azalacağını savunmuştur ve bu hipotez sadece kadın örnekleminde cinsiyetçi düşmanlık türü için desteklenmiştir. Aynı sonuçların erkekler tarafından desteklenmemiş olması gelecekteki araştırmalar için önemli bir konu olabilir. Örneğin, bu çalışmada toplam katılımcıların %12,1'inin kendilerini muhafazakâr olarak nitelendirdiği göz önünde bulundurularak daha muhafazakâr katılımcı gruplarında benzer ilişkiler araştırılabilir.

Hipotez 3, belirsizlikten kaçınma seviyesinin daha yüksek olmasının görece muğlak CT türlerini algılamada orta derecede etki büyüklüğüyle olumlu yönde yordayacağını savunmuştur. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre belirsizlikten kaçınma, sadece kadın örnekleminde cinsel düşmanlığı algılamada küçük ve pozitif bir korelasyon göstermiştir. Cinsiyetçi düşmanlık ve ilginin iması ile karşılaştırıldığında, cinsel düşmanlık, cinsel şakalar ve materyaller içererek cinselliğin daha açık bir şekilde ortaya çıkarttığı için (Toker, 2016), daha belirsiz bir durum olarak görülmüş ve kadın örnekleminde bu şekilde bir sonuç yaratmış olabilir.

Hipotez 4, katılımcıların CT ile ilgili örgütsel iklim hakkındaki algılarının olumlu olduğu takdirde daha çok davranışı CT olarak algılayacağını savunmuştur. Hem kadın hem erkek örnekleminde için örgütsel iklim ile alakalı anlamlı bir sonuç bulunamamıştır. Bu çalışmada örgütsel iklim sorularının araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilerek doğrudan katılımcılara düşünceleri sorulması dolayısıyla, örgütsel iklimin güvenilirlik ve geçerliliği sağlanmış daha örtük anketler aracılığıyla ölçülmesi sonuçları etkileyebilecektir.

Kısıtlar ve Gelecek Çalışmalar İçin Öneriler

İlk olarak mevcut data farklı yaş grupları, farklı sektörde çalışan ve farklı deneyim yılına sahip kişilerden toplanmış olsa da katılımcıların %89.5'i beyaz yaka çalışandır. Beyaz yaka ve mavi yaka çalışanlar arasındaki çalışma koşulları, eğitim düzeyleri ve iş yapış şekilleri anlamında farklılıklar olması nedeniyle, benzer bir çalışmanın mavi yaka çalışanların çoğunlukta olduğu bir örnekleme gerçekleştirilmesi literatür için faydalı olacaktır. Buna ek olarak benzer şekilde bu çalışmadaki katılımcıların neredeyse %88'i liberal olduklarını belirtmiştir. Bu anlamda daha homojen bir örnekleme ile çalışılması, Cinsel taciz konusu özelinde farklılıklar yaratabilecektir.

Çalışmadaki bir diğer kısıt, özellikle kadın katılımcıların cinsel taciz ile baş etme anketini de doldurması dolayısıyla anket uzunluklarının fazla olmasıdır. Daha önce de belirtildiği gibi katılımcıların neredeyse yarısının anketi sonuna kadar tamamlamadığı görülmüştür. Anket uzunluklarına ek olarak, mevcut çalışma konusu gereği katılımcı bulmak ve sonuna kadar doldurmalarını sağlamak görece zor bir konudur.

Muhafazakarlık bölümünde bahsedildiği üzere, muhafazakarlık tanımlaması ve ölçülmesi zor bir kavram olması dolayısıyla Türk örnekleminde geçerlilik ve güvenilirliği sağlanmış farklı muhafazakarlığı ölçeklerine de ihtiyaç duyulduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Bu çalışmada kullanılan ölçek özelinde, sınırlı hükümet ve kürtaç gibi kavramların faktör analizi sonrasında çıkarılması gerekmiştir. Bu doğrultuda mevcut çalışma muhafazakarlık kavramını daha detaylı incelemek ve ölçümleme adına bir başlangıç noktası oluşturabilir.

Son olarak mevcut çalışmada Hofstede'nin kültürel değişkenleri arasından sadece belirsizlikten kaçınma değişkeni olarak kullanılmıştır. Ancak Luthar ve Luthar'ın (2002) çalışmasına göre Hofstede'nin tüm kültürel değişkenlerinin iş yerinde yöneticiler tarafından cinsel taciz uygulanma ihtimalini ve kadınların bu davranışlara karşı toleransını yordadığı belirtilmiştir. Dolayısıyla, gelecek çalışmalarda belirsizlikten kaçınma boyutuna ek olarak Bireysellik/Kollektivizm, Güç Mesafesi ve Erkeklik/kadınlık boyutlarının da kullanılması faydalı olacaktır.

L. TEZ İZİN FORMU / THESIS PERMISSION FORM

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences**
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences**
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics**
- Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics**
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences**

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : DİNÇAL
Adı / Name : DİDEM
Bölümü / Department : PSİKOLOJİ

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) : CULTURAL FACTORS AS ASSOCIATES OF WORKPLACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT PERCEPTIONS AND COPING PREFERENCES

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master Doktora / PhD

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.**
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of two years. ***
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır. / Secure the entire work for period of six months. ***

** Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date