

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS

Authors should submit three copies of their manuscript (double spaced typed) to the Editor. Electronic submissions are also acceptable, preferably as PDF files or Word documents. Manuscripts should follow the style of the American Psychological Association (5th edition). The normal length for Short Notes and Regular Articles is 4000 words and 8000 words, respectively, including references, tables, and figures. Please state the number of words in your manuscript on its front page. Each manuscript must contain an abstract of approximately 100 words. All articles published by the Journal will be in English. However, authors may submit their manuscripts in English, Chinese, Japanese, or Korean. If their manuscript is accepted, the Journal will assist the authors to translate their article into English. Please note that the authors will be asked to bear the cost of translation if necessary.

Please send your manuscript to the Editor, Yoshihisa Kashima, Department of Psychology, the University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia (ajsp@psych.unimelb.edu.au). In your submission letter, please state that (1) the article has not been published in any language before, (2) it is not being considered concurrently for publication elsewhere, and (3) the research reported in the manuscript was conducted in accordance with general ethical guidelines in psychology. If you prefer a blind review, please make your request in your submission letter. Your manuscript will be handled by the Editor or one of the Associate Editors and, if accepted, the electronic version of the final manuscript should be sent to the Editor electronically (ajsp@psych.unimelb.edu.au) or on an IBM or MacIntosh-compatible disk.

Copyright. Papers accepted for publication become copyright of Blackwell Publishing Ltd with the Asian Association of Social Psychology and the Japanese Group Dynamics Association 2004 and authors will be asked to sign a transfer of copyright form. In signing the transfer of copyright it is assumed that authors have obtained permission to use any copyrighted or previously published material. All authors must read and agree to the conditions outlined in the Copyright Assignment Form, and must sign the Form or agree that the corresponding author can sign on their behalf. Articles cannot be published until a signed Copyright Assignment Form has been received.

Author material archive policy. Authors who require the return of any submitted material that is accepted for publication should inform the Editorial Office after acceptance. If no indication is given that author material should be returned, Blackwell Publishing will dispose of all hardcopy and electronic material two months after publication.

Proofs. Authors will receive proofs of their article from the Publisher, and are required to correct and return them to the production editor as specified in the Publisher's accompanying letter.

Offprints. Twenty offprints will be sent free of charge to the first-named author of each article after publication of the Journal. Extra offprints may be ordered using the form supplied with the proofs. The order form must be returned to the Publisher at the same time as the corrected proofs are returned to the Editor.

Information about the Associations

The Asian Association of Social Psychology (AASP) was launched with the Inaugural Conference of the Asian Association of Social Psychology in Hong Kong, 21–23 June 1995. The Association was formed to advance the following three goals: (i) to promote the development of social psychological research and its application in the Asia–Pacific region; (ii) to provide opportunities for students to pursue education and careers in social psychology; and (iii) to provide a forum for social psychologists in the Asia–Pacific region, in order to promote research and education in social psychology.

The Japanese Group Dynamics Association (JGDA) was established in 1950. JGDA is one of the oldest of 30 psychology-related associations in Japan. The current membership is 800. JGDA has published a journal named *The Japanese Journal of Experimental Psychology* in the Japanese language twice a year since 1960. An English issue was also published as the third annual issue from 1989 to 1995. From 1996, the English portion was replaced by the *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* (AJSP), jointly published by the Asian Association of Social Psychology and JGDA with Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ethical considerations

Authors must state that the protocol for the research project has been approved by a suitably constituted Ethics Committee of the institution within which the work was undertaken and that it conforms to the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki in 1995 (as revised in Edinburgh 2000), available at <http://www.wma.net/e/policy/b3.htm>

The Prevalence, Antecedents and Consequences of Sexual Harassment in the Myanmar Workplace

Nilar KYU, and Atsuko KANAI
(Nagoya University)

Abstract: The primary purpose of this study was to explore female workers experiences of sexual harassment and the antecedents and the outcomes of those experiences in the Myanmar workplace. Using the Myanmar versions of Sexual Experiences Questionnaire developed originally by Fitzgerald and colleagues (1988, 1995), a questionnaire survey of working women in Myanmar was conducted. The representative sample included 271 working Myanmar women at a university, along with government and private sectors. The antecedent variables (personal vulnerability, organizational context) and three general types of negative outcome variables (psychological outcomes, physical outcomes, and work-related outcomes) were identified through victims of sexual harassment. Analyses explored the relationship of these antecedents and negative outcomes to type of sexual harassment, and the victim's coping responses. In addition, the influences of self-role belief and attribution style were explored.

Sexual harassment is a widespread social problem with important consequences in most countries. In the Western countries, prevalence rates reported by women in various professional and work-settings tend to fluctuate between 30% and 55% (eg., Fitzgerald et al, 1988; Gruber & Bijorn, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Morach, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988; Wyatt & Riederer, 1995). In contrast, research on sexual harassment in the Myanmar workplace is still in its beginning stages. Since there are no official statistics on the problem, it is difficult to estimate any figures.

In the last few years, however, some studies have begun to appear, that attempt to address the issue in a formal manner. Myanmar government has created a national committee named, "Myanmar National Committee for Women's Affairs" (MNCWA), with the aim to implement the Beijing Platform for Action and future programmes for women's advancement. Violence against women has been included in the six areas taken up by the Myanmar National Working Committee for Women's Affairs. The working committee has

selected "Violence Against Women" as a critical area of concern and is implementing activities in the various States and Divisions (MNCWA, 1997). To date, however, no community-based study has examined the prevalence of sexual harassment among the working women of Myanmar. However, case studies, and data from law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system, as well as shelters, document the problem's existence.

The population of the Myanmar for the year 2000 is estimated to be 50.13 million of which the female population being 25.22 million. In Myanmar, there is no gender discrimination and Myanmar laws protecting women are at hand (Khin Win Shwe, 2002). Since the 19th century, Myanmar women have been participating actively in both social and political fields (MNCWA, 1997).

Concerned with the lack of systematic investigation of workplace sexual harassment in Myanmar, this study attempts to explore the prevalence rate of sexual harassment in the workplace and to contribute to the understanding of the nature of sexual harassment in Myanmar by exploring the relationship between various

antecedent variables and outcome variables. In addition, the influence of victim's attributions and responses style and the type of sexual harassment were all explored.

Sexual Harassment Experiences

Fitzgerald and her colleagues (Fitzgerald et al., 1988) developed the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) undertaken by Till (1980). It contains several items assessing the participant's experiences of the five levels of sexual harassment behavior: gender harassment, seductive behavior, sexual bribery, sexual coercion, and sexual imposition or assault. Exploratory factor analysis of the SEQ (Fitzgerald et al., 1988) suggested that the five categories could be combined to yield a more parsimonious classification, as a three-factor solution adequately accounted for their data: gender harassment (level one), sexual coercion (a combination of level 3 and 4), and unwanted sexual attention (level 2 and 5). Fitzgerald and her colleagues (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995; Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995) identified three types of sexual harassment using the SEQ. Confirmatory factor analyses provide extensive evidence that the latent construct of sexual harassment is composed of three separate dimensions: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Gender harassment is characterized by insulting, misogynistic, and degrading remarks and behavior, that are not designed to elicit sexual cooperation but that convey hostility and degrading attitudes toward women. Unwanted sexual attention consists of unwelcome sexual behavior that is undesired and unreciprocated by the recipient, but not tied to any job-related reward or punishment. Sexual coercion refers to implicit or explicit threats or promises of job-related outcomes, pertaining to sexual favors. The first two factors are conceptually similar to the legal concept of hostile work environment, where as the last more closely corresponds to the concept of quid pro quo harassment. The SEQ is widely used, has excellent psychometric properties (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995; Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995), and

is generally regarded as the best self report instrument available for assessing experiences (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995; Munson et al., 2001). The SEQ, as a multidimensional construct, offers a more detailed and clarified conceptualization of sexual harassment (O'Connell & Korabik, 2000).

Antecedents of Sexual Harassment

Personal vulnerability

While women as a group are victimized by sexual harassment, not all women are equally vulnerable. Particularly, women who lack cultural power and status advantages are especially apt to be the targets of sexual harassment. Young, unmarried, and minority women have been found to be the target of severe, persistent harassment (Gruber and Bijen, 1982; Lafontaine & Tredeau, 1986). Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow, (1994) have grouped these characteristics into personal vulnerability, which they consider to be a moderating variable in their integrated model.

Organizational context

The organizational context in which a woman must perform has been implicated as a possible antecedent to harassing behaviour. Gutek & Morasch's (1982) sex-role spillover model proposes that in occupations dominated by one sex or the other, the gender role of the predominant group influences the work role expectation for that job, and the treatment of women within the work group. Indeed, survey data suggest that unbalanced sex ratio with respect to the job and the work setting are related to experience of sexual harassment among working women (Terpstra & Baker, 1986). Research has found that women in nontraditional jobs (who naturally possess less formal power) were more extensively harassed than women in other occupations (Lafontaine & Tredeau, 1986). According to the integrated model (Fitzgerald, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1994), sexual harassment is a function of organizational context and job context.

Responses to Sexual Harassment

The available research suggests that ignoring or

doing nothing is a common response, as is avoiding the harasser, but these are not particularly effective. Gruber (1989) found that only 10% to 15% of women either responded assertively to or reported the harasser. Of those who did take some action, the most frequent response was to tell the harasser to stop. Linvinstone (1982) found that 46% objected to the harasser and Loy and Stewart (1984) found that 39% said something to him. The use of assertive responses may be related to the severity of harassment. Women who were more severely harassed tended to respond in a more assertive and direct manner than those who were not so severely harassed (Gruber & Bijorn, 1982; Gruber & Bijorn, 1986; Gruber & Smith, 1995; Linvinstone, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984). Victims are more likely to ignore the harassment, joke about it, or evade the harasser when the harassment is mild. Also, women who perceive men's behaviour as sexual harassment are more apt to report it (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Gruber & Smith, 1995). Gruber and Bijorn (1986) presented a personal resources model to explain the influence of women's attitudes on harassment response. Researchers have found other variables that mediate assertive responses by victims of sexual harassment, including sex-role attitudes and self-blame (Jensen & Gutek, 1982). They found that 25% of female victims attributed harassment in some way to their own behavior, an attribution that inhibited both reporting and seeking social report. Victims who evidenced behavioral self-blame were more likely to feel anger and disgust as a result of the incident. They also found that more traditional women tend to blame themselves for incidents of sexual harassment. Indeed, women having nontraditional sex-role attitudes perceived the behaviour to be more inappropriate and expected more assertive coping responses of the target than women having a traditional sex-role attitude (Matsui et al., 1995). Women with substantial job skills or tenure, whose workplaces were not disproportionately male, or who were harassed by peers rather than supervisors opted to confront the harasser or to report him (Gruber & Bijorn, 1986; Gutek & Morasch, 1982).

Although, assertive responses are reported to be quite effective, these are less often used. Many women do not use assertive responses that they fear might elicit individual or organizational retaliation for complaining (Gutek, 1985). Gruber and Bijorn (1982) also suggested that women may perceive the assertive responses as riskier and less certain in their outcome, while nonassertive responses may allow a women to manage the situation without disrupting the work routines or relationship. Moreover, Linvinstone, (1982) found that an assertive response was associated with greater psychological distress and somatic symptoms. Hesson-McInnis and Fitzgerald (1997) also found that more assertive responding to both severe and less severe forms of sexual harassment was associated with more negative outcomes of every sort: job related, psychological and health related, even after severity of harassment was controlled. Fitzgerald and her colleagues (1994) consider response as a moderator in their integrated model.

Outcomes of Sexual Harassment

Considerable data have been accumulated, confirming that harassment is widespread in both the public and the private sectors, and that it has significant consequences for employee health and psychological well being (Fitzgerald, 1993; Schneider, Swan & Fitzgerald, 1997). Crull (1982) found that the majority of harassed women reported negative outcomes related to work performance (75%), psychological health (90%), and physical health (63%). A review by Gutek and Koss (1993) also suggested that the impact of sexual harassment has been examined within at least three domains: psychological, physical, and work-related. Within each area, victims of sexual harassment report numerous consequences. Psychological effects include lowered self-confidence, decreased self-esteem, increased stress, depression, frustration, anxiety, irritability, and anger (Crull, 1982; Dan et al., 1995; Gruber & Bijorn, 1982; Gutek & Koss, 1993, Loy & Stewart, 1984). Physical effects include stomachaches, headaches, sleep disturbance, nausea, and bursting out in

tears (Crull, 1982; Dan et al., 1995, Gutek, 1985). Work-related effects include difficulty with interpersonal relations, decrements in job performance, job loss and career interruption (Crull, 1982; Gruber & Bijen, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Linvigston, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984).

Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (1994) developed an integrated model suggesting that sexual harassment is a function of organizational context and job context, with personal vulnerability and response style characteristics acting as moderators. In turn, sexual harassment is thought to contribute to three sets of outcomes (psychological, health, and job-related) that ultimately can result in work or job withdrawal.

Severity of sexual harassment is a strong predictor of the degree to which women suffer negative psychological, physical, and job related outcomes (Fitzgerald et al., 1995)

As we understand so little about sexual harassment in Myanmar, the present study should explore the nature of sexual harassment in the workplace, and drawing upon theoretical models as well as previous research to identify variables that are likely to be antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment. This study included (1) personal vulnerability, (2) organizational context, (3) victim's response styles (assertive, non assertive), (4) outcome variables, (ie, work related, psychological, physical), and the relationship amongst them and types of sexual harassment (gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, sexual coercion) involved were also explored. In addition, the influences of self-role belief and attribution style were explored.

Since we knew of no previous research exploring the prevalence rate and examining the antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in Myanmar, this study is exploratory in nature. Based on previous literature, the following expectations were formulated:

1. Less severe forms of sexual harassment will be more widely reported than more severe forms (Fitzgerald et al., 1988)
2. More severe forms of harassment will be

associated with more negative outcomes than less severe forms (Fitzgerald et al., 1995)

3. Younger women will more likely be the targets of severe and frequent harassment than older women (Gruber and Bijen, 1982; Lafontaine & Tredeau, 1986)
4. Sexual harassment will be more frequent in male-dominated environments than in those with a higher ratio of women to men (Lafontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Terpstra & Baker, 1986)
5. The respondents will be more likely to employ assertive strategies when the type of harassment is sexual coercion, or when women do not endorse self-blame (Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984)
6. Women who make assertive responses will be associated with more negative outcomes than women who make nonassertive responses (Fitzgerald et al., 1994; Hesson-McInnis & Fitzgerald, 1997; Linvinstone, 1982)

METHOD

Subjects

Participants consisted of four groups of female employees in Mandalay; 130 (48%) were university faculty; 38 (14%) were government employees; 71 (26%) were company employees; 24 (9%) were nurses. Sampling and recruiting methods were tailored to each group in order to maximize representativeness within the constraints of time and resources.

Procedure

Faculty sample. Permission to approach participants to voluntarily take part in the study during work time was obtained from professors at a Mandalay university. In September of 2001, a prospective sample of 150 female faculty (from 14 departments) was pooled, and surveys were administered to all female faculty present in the departments on the scheduled day. A packet of materials containing (a) a cover letter explaining the study and requesting participation, (b) the questionnaire, and (c) a return envelope were distributed to all female faculty. Because of the

sensitive nature, the survey forms were distributed personally by the researcher and research assistants. Employees were asked to seal the completed questionnaire in the envelope and return the envelope directly to the researcher. The academic employees completed the survey forms administered in groups of varying size, or individually at their place of work, or an alternative private site of their choosing. Valid responses were obtained from 87% of the respondents -130 women. Some respondents did not complete the demographic section of the survey.

The private sector employee sample. For the present study, company employee, and private hospital employees (nurses) were combined. Sampling of private sector employees was pursued through a random selection of general organizational units. One hundred and fifty female employees of seven private-sector organizations were pooled, and surveys were administered by the same procedure as above. Surveys were conducted in groups of varying size, depending on the basic nature of the facility in which they were employed. Because sessions were held during work hours, a large number of scheduled employees could not attend due to absences and prior engagements, but a total of 63% of the selected employees (71 company employees and 24 nurses) participated.

The government employee sample. After consent was obtained from the chairman of the township peace and development council, the randomly selected departments within a large government-sector organization were contacted, and requested to provide assistance with the study. Three of these departments agreed to take part in the study. The survey was administered by the same procedure as above. Overall participant rate for this sample was 76%, (38 of 50 employees). The most frequent reason employees gave for not participating in this study was that they were not willing to spend the time necessary to complete the questionnaire, which took an average of 35 min.

Measures

Sexual Harassment Experiences

The Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ; Fitzgerald et al., 1988) was translated into a Myanmar version. This questionnaire contains 28 items; a typical item reads "Have you ever been in a situation where a male supervisor or coworker habitually told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?" Respondents also answered the direct question, "Have you ever been sexually harassed?" This question was placed at the end of the section containing sexual harassment items and was used to assess "acknowledged harassment". For each item, subjects were asked to circle the response most closely describing their own experiences. The response options included: (1) Never; (2) Once; and (3) More Than Once. As with previous forms of the measure, the words "sexual harassment" do not appear until the final item. Factor analyses of the original SEQ (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995) have consistently yielded a three-factor solution (gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion).

Regarding the reliability and validity of the SEQ, Fitzgerald et al., (1988) reported internal consistency estimates of .92 for the original student sample and .86 for the employee sample; test-retest stability analyses computed on a small subsample of graduate students ($n=46$) yielded a coefficient of .86 over a 2-week period.

The descriptions were translated into Myanmar by the author and checked by a bilingual Myanmar professor against the original version to ensure the conceptual equivalence of the Myanmar version to the original version. Four out of 28 items covering the SEQ scale were omitted due to lack of variance (these behaviors just do not happen frequently in Myanmar). The 23 items of the SEQ of Myanmar study appear in Table 1.

Personal Vulnerability

Single-item questions assessed respondents' age (four categories ranging from 18~29 years to 50~59 years), education level (six categories ranging from grade 8 or less to advanced degree),

marital status, occupational status (later transformed to eight categories) and income bracket (four categories ranging from <Ks5000 to> Ks15000) as well as length of service.

Feminism Attitude

The questionnaire included the 19-item Attitudes Toward Feminism Scale (FEM; Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975), also translated into Myanmar version. The descriptions were translated into Myanmar by the author and checked by a bilingual Myanmar professor against the original version to ensure the conceptual equivalence of the Myanmar version to the original version. This scale used 5-point Likert-type items ranging from "strongly disagree" (0) to "strongly agree" (4) to measure acceptance or rejection of central beliefs of feminism and the acceptance or rejection of traditional sex-role beliefs. Seven out of 19 items covering the FEM scale needed better Myanmar expressions, due to inadequate translation result.

Organizational Context

Occupational sex composition (% women), workplace sex composition (joint work), the gender of immediate boss (man=1; women=2), employing sector, occupational category, and size of corporation were determined using single-item questions. Single-item questions also assessed the harasser's status in the demographic section. Harasser status referred to boss/supervisors, coworkers or student/subordinate as the source of harassment.

Attribution of Blame

An attribution questionnaire consisting of six items were included to assess the victim's perceptions of causality for the event. These items were derived from measures used in previous studies (Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Summer, 1996; Valentine-French and Randtke, 1989), each rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale. Three items ($\alpha = .73$) assessing the victim's responsibility for reason of behavior and character (e.g., perhaps something in my behavior may have encouraged the men) were also included. Two items ($\alpha =$

.61) were used to determine the extent to which the perpetrator was perceived to be at fault (e.g., he is using his status unfairly to pressure me into spending time with him). The last item (e.g., his behavior was not so unusual as to have been complained) was used to determine the extent to which the perpetrator was perceived to be free of fault/blame.

Coping Responses

Across several different questions in this survey, respondents were asked in a checklist format, how they responded to each of the offensive behaviors. From an examination of questions used in previous research (Gruber, 1989; Terpstra & Baker, 1989; Pryor, 1995), 17 specific coping responses (9 assertive items; $\alpha = .78$ and 8 nonassertive items; $\alpha = .79$) were identified. Assertive coping responses included telling the harasser to stop, threatening to harm the harasser, threatening to tell others, taking formal action, reporting to a supervisor, transferring, slapping/hitting, quitting the job, verbally attacking or abusing. Nonassertive coping responses included avoiding, ignoring, telling a friend/family, getting third party to speak, seeking professional counseling, going along, making a joke, doing some other unspecified action. These were scored 1 (I did this) or 2 (I did not do this).

Outcomes

Using a 3-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 2 (very), respondents rated the degree to which they felt each of nine psychological effects; $\alpha = .92$ (e.g., lowered self-confidence, increased stress, depression, frustration, anxiety, irritability, and anger). They also rated (on the same scale) five somatic consequences; $\alpha = .73$ (stomachaches, headaches, sleep deprivation, nausea, and bursting out in tears). Finally, respondents rated ten work-related consequences; $\alpha = .85$ (e.g., absenteeism, tardiness, decreased job satisfaction, career goal changes, and job changes).

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Of harassment targets surveyed, approximately 66% of women were in their 30's. About 65% had worked for more than 3 years at present workplaces. For educational attainment, 15.9% had completed high school and 79.7% had BA/BSc degrees or above. Subjects working for organizations with more than 100 employees constituted 11.1% of the total, compared to those working for organizations with 26 to 49 employees at 41.7%. About 21% of employees were married and 77.9%

were single. Salaries ranged from under Ks5000 (9% of the sample) to over Ks 15000 (11% of the sample) with most (50%) earning in the Ks5000 to Ks9999 range.

Respondents were asked the frequency with which they had experienced to 28 different forms sexual harassment on the job. From the data, 58% (N=156) of the female respondents experienced at least one form of sexual harassment in general, 55% (N=148) of women reporting at least one form of gender harassment, 14% (N=38) of women reporting at least one form of unwanted sexual attention, and 2% (N=5) of women report-

Table 1 Items from the Sexual Experience Questionnaire and Varimax rotated factor loadings

Original category	Item number	Statement	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	<i>h</i> ²
<i>Factor 1: Unwanted Sexual attention (alpha=.78)</i>						
COER	17	Subtle bribery for sexual cooperation	.72	-.03	.26	.59
USA	8	Unwanted discussion of personal or sexual matters	.66	-.09	.28	.52
USA	24	Deliberate touching	.64	.32	.03	.52
USA	25	Unwanted attempts to touch or fondle	.63	-.01	.01	.40
COER	20	Subtle threat of retaliation for noncooperation	.59	-.08	-.07	.36
USA	10	Unwanted sexual attention	.50	.29	.03	.34
COER	18	Direct bribery	.49	-.07	.36	.37
USA	15	Crude or offensive sexual remarks made about the respondent to others	.40	-.04	.07	.17
USA	9	Unwelcome seductive behavior	.36	.32	.34	.35
<i>Factor 2: Sexual coercion (alpha=.81)</i>						
COER	22	Engage in unwanted sexual behavior due to threat of retaliation	-.04	.90	-.00	.81
COER	19	Actually rewarded for sexual cooperation	.08	.84	-.01	.72
COER	23	Actually experienced negative consequences for sexual noncooperation	-.03	.81	.06	.67
USA	27	Attempts at interaction that resulted in the respondent crying, pleading, or physically struggling	.23	.75	-.06	.61
COER	21	Direct threats	-.18	.36	.11	.17
<i>Factor 3: Gender harassment (alpha=.74)</i>						
GEND	4	Staring, leering, ogling	.05	.04	.69	.48
GEND	1	Suggestive stories or offensive jokes	.08	.06	.63	.40
USA	14	Sexual insinuations or innuendos	-.00	.19	.57	.36
USA	11	Attempt to establish a sexual relationship, despite discouragement	.41	-.05	.53	.44
USA	13	Invasion of privacy	.13	-.07	.51	.28
GEND	7	Sexist remarks about women's behavior and career options	-.03	-.06	.50	.25
GEND	2	Crudely sexual remarks	.16	-.03	.44	.22
GEND	3	Seductive remarks	.15	-.02	.41	.19
GEND	6	Treated differently due to gender	.37	.18	.39	.32
Residual items						
GEND	5	Display, use, or distribution of sexist material or pornography	-.11	.03	.28	.09
USA	12	Propositions	.05	.01	.11	.01
USA	16	Sexual rumors spread about the respondent	.01	.01	.07	.00
USA	26	Forceful attempts to touch or fondle	.00	.00	.00	.00
Note. Sum of squares			3.37	3.27	3.02	9.66
Percentage of variance			12.5	12.1	11.2	35.8
(N = 271)						

ing at least one form of sexual coercion, throughout their careers. Of those who did experience this, more than 60% experienced it more than once. The most common type of harassment reported by women was staring (35%), sexist remarks about women (31%), offensive jokes (22%), and invasion of privacy (16%). However, 2% of the total sample reported having been subjected to unwanted stroking or fondling; approximately 3% had been deliberately touching; 4% had been subtly bribed; and nearly 1% of the total sample had been either engaged in sexual behavior due to threat of retaliation or subjected to unwanted attempt of intercourse that resulted in the respondent crying, pleading, or physically struggling. Despite the severity of these situations, only 3% of the total sample indicated that they acknowledged they had been sexually harassed. When women were asked about the organizational role(s) of their harasser(s) (some were harassed by not only one of the harasser), the most frequently identified role was that of coworker (48%). Finally, 84% of the harassed women did not taking formal action varied, the majority (71%) simply stated, "I avoided the harasser". Calculating the proportion of harassed women who experienced any of the specific outcomes related to each of the three negative outcome factors, 81% experienced psychological outcomes, 67% experienced physical outcomes, and 51% experienced work-related outcomes from sexual harassment.

Factor analysis

A principal-components factor analysis using varimax rotation was performed on the 28-items sexual experience questionnaire to assess whether there was coherence among the items that were hypothesized to form different subscales. Three factors with eigenvalues greater than one emerged from the analysis. The three factors, (1) unwanted sexual attention ($\alpha = .78$), (2) sexual coercion ($\alpha = .81$), and (3) gender harassment ($\alpha = .74$), accounted for 36% of the variance. As a result, four items had to be deleted from the scale, owing to insufficient loading on all three factors, and because they were unable to constitute the fourth

factor adequately. Individual factor items and loadings are shown in Table 1.

The factor "sexual coercion" for the Myanmar sample was found to be similar to that of the original SEQ study regarding item composition, except for item 27 which constituted an item from "unwanted sexual attention" in the original SEQ. As shown in table 1, this item fell into "sexual coercion" for the Myanmar study.

The remaining two factors, "gender harassment" and "unwanted sexual attention", were slightly different from the original SEQ. "Gender harassment" in Myanmar included three items originally affiliated with "unwanted sexual attention" in the original SEQ study, namely items 11, 13 and 14. Also, "unwanted sexual attention" included three items originally affiliated with "sexual coercion" in the original SEQ study, namely items 17, 18 and 20, as shown in table 1. This result indicates that Myanmar women must consider gender harassment when they experience invasion of privacy or sexual insinuations or innuendos. In addition, they probably can only think about gender harassment when making an attempt to establish a romantic sexual relationship. The result of the factor analysis suggests that in Myanmar, a lack of distinction between gender (classification of noun or pronouns as masculine or feminine) and sex (condition of being male or female, sexual intercourse) seems more evident than what Fitzgerald et al., (1988, 1995) pointed to in their SEQ study.

Next, another principal-components factor analysis using varimax rotation was conducted for the coping responses, producing two factors: (a) assertive ($\alpha = .78$), and (b) nonassertive responses ($\alpha = .79$). For the attitude toward feminism scale (FEM; Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975), seven items had to be deleted from the factor structure because of insufficient loading, and 12 items were retained and aggregated into a single scale.

Correlation analysis

Means, standard deviations and the correlation matrix calculated between measures are shown in

Table 2 Correlations between measures used for the study (N=271)

	Mean(SD)	Range	OSC	WSC	GIB	ES	SC	Age	EDU	MS	OS	IC
OSC	2.66(1.10)	(1-4)	-									
WSC	3.65(1.30)	(1-5)	.58***	-								
GIB	1.48(0.50)	(1-2)	.38***	.42***	-							
ES	1.73 (0.97)	(1-3)	-.27***	-.29***	-.02	-						
SC	2.33(0.90)	(1-4)	.10	-.06	.00	.05	-					
Age	1.80(0.69)	(1-4)	.26***	.26***	.25***	-.38***	.02	-				
EDU	5.13 (1.04)	(1-6)	.38***	.28***	.13*	-.41***	.03	.10	-			
MR	1.79(0.41)	(1-2)	-.13	-.14*	-.17**	.19**	.10	-.34***	-.01	-		
OS	3.56(1.29)	(1-8)	.29***	.32***	.12	-.48***	.04	.38***	.68***	-.18**	-	
IC	10179(15754)	(3200-180000)	-.15*	-.11	-.05	.34***	-.12	-.09	-.01	-.01	.19**	-
LS	1.67(0.47)	(1-2)	.37***	.24**	.21***	-.41***	.07	.48***	.28***	-.26***	.44***	-.00
FEM	1.95(0.68)	(0-4)	.20**	.18**	.16*	-.13*	.10	.06	.16**	-.04	.19**	-.07
USA	1.04(0.13)	(1-3)	-.06	-.14*	-.08	.08	-.01	-.08	-.00	.06	-.10	.07
COER	1.01 (0.06)	(1-3)	-.09	-.09	.00	.06	.01	.03	-.00	.06	-.06	-.00
GEND	1.23 (0.30)	(1-3)	-.12	-.18**	-.08	.13*	.02	-.06	.00	.00	-.01	.19**
HR	2.26 (1.07)	(1-4)	.08	-.09	.06	-.14	-.06	.10	.16	-.26**	.05	.21
ACK	1.04 (0.21)	(1-3)	.04	.01	.01	.09	-.03	-.03	-.08	.01	.01	-.00
SB	2.44(1.48)	(1-7)	-.11	-.03	.01	.02	.08	-.01	-.06	.01	.02	-.07
HB	3.15 (1.88)	(1-7)	-.09	.08	.11	-.09	.06	.03	.22**	-.06	.23**	-.11
HE	3.83 (2.35)	(1-7)	-.08	.10	-.03	-.07	.15	.14	.24**	-.03	.24**	.13
AR	1.17 (0.23)	(1-2)	-.07	-.03	.07	.11	.10	-.04	.04	-.01	.11	-.07
NAR	1.46 (0.32)	(1-2)	-.00	.02	-.00	-.00	.19*	-.06	.20**	.10	.21**	-.09
PSE	0.48 (0.49)	(0-2)	-.11	-.07	-.03	.16*	.11	-.05	-.03	.08	.02	.03
PHE	0.32 (0.41)	(0-2)	-.11	-.07	-.04	.14	.12	-.00	-.12	.06	-.06	.06
WE	0.19 (0.32)	(0-2)	-.18*	-.06	-.02	.16*	.01	-.05	-.25***	.06	-.10	.17*

table 2. Workplace sex composition showed a significant negative correlation with unwanted sexual attention ($r = -.14, p < .05$), and gender harassment ($r = -.18, p < .01$), but not with sexual coercion ($r = -.09, ns$). Age was not significant correlated with all type of harassment: gender harassment ($r = -.06, ns$), unwanted sexual attention ($r = -.08, ns$), and sexual coercion ($r = -.03, ns$). Gender harassment was significantly correlated with unwanted sexual attention ($r = .43, p < .001$), but not with sexual coercion ($r = .03, ns$). Unwanted sexual attention was significantly correlated with sexual coercion ($r = .13, p < .05$). Gender harassment was significantly correlated with psychological outcomes ($r = .39, p < .001$), physical outcomes ($r = .25, p < .001$), and work-related outcomes ($r = .23, p < .01$). Unwanted sexual attention was significantly correlated with psychological outcomes ($r = .18, p < .05$), but not with physical outcomes ($r = .06, ns$), nor work-related outcomes ($r = .11, ns$).

Sexual coercion was significantly correlated only with physical outcomes ($r = .21, p < .01$). Gender harassment had significant positive correlations with nonassertive responses ($r = .27, p < .001$) and assertive responses ($r = .19, p < .05$). Sexual coercion was significantly correlated only with assertive responses ($r = .23, p < .01$), unwanted sexual attention was not significantly correlated with assertive ($r = .12, ns$), nor nonassertive responses ($r = .07, ns$).

Assertive responses had a significant positive correlation with harasser blame ($r = .36, p < .001$), but not with self-blame ($r = .05, ns$) nor harasser excuse ($r = .10, ns$). Nonassertive responses had significant positive correlations with self-blame ($r = .22, p < .01$), harasser blame ($r = .35, p < .001$), and harasser excuse ($r = .37, p < .001$). Assertive responses had significant positive correlations with psychological outcomes ($r = .42, p < .001$), physical outcomes ($r = .42, p < .001$) and work-related outcomes ($r = .35, p < .001$). Nonassertive

Table 2 - Continued

	LS	FEM	USA	COE	GEN	HR	ACK	SB	HB	HE	AR	NAR	PSE	PHE
OSC														
WSC														
GIB														
ES														
SC														
Age														
EDU														
MR														
OS														
IC														
LS	-													
FEM($\alpha = .69$)	.16**	-												
USA($\alpha = .78$)	-.07	-.03	-											
COER($\alpha = .81$)	-.02	-.00	.13*	-										
GEND($\alpha = .74$)	-.04	.02	.43***	.03	-									
HR	.08	.03	-.10	-.06	-.00	-								
ACK	.01	.08	.45***	.03	.24***	-.02	-							
SB($\alpha = .73$)	.10	-.09	.01	.07	.11	-.12	-.03	-						
HB($\alpha = .61$)	-.04	.06	.24**	.09	.22**	-.34**	.23**	.16*	-					
HE	.11	-.11	-.07	.03	.19*	.04	-.11	.41***	.23**	-				
AR($\alpha = .78$)	-.11	-.01	.12	.23**	.19*	-.09	.11	.05	.36***	.10	-			
NAR($\alpha = .79$)	-.01	-.09	.07	.02	.27***	-.09	-.01	.22**	.35***	.37***	.52***	-		
PSE($\alpha = .92$)	-.06	-.08	.18*	.09	.39***	-.12	.17*	.23**	.28***	.11	.42***	.40***	-	
PHE($\alpha = .73$)	-.06	-.07	.06	.21**	.25***	-.04	.08	.14	.10	.05	.42***	.32***	.84***	-
WE($\alpha = .85$)	-.10	-.14	.11	.11	.23***	-.10	.13	.20**	.11	.06	.35***	.24**	.66***	.72***

Note. OSC = occupational sex composition, WSC = workplace sex composition, GIB = gender of immediate boss (man = 1, woman = 2), ES = employing sector (governmental = 1, private enterprise = 2), SC = size of cooperation, EDU = education, MR = marital status (married = 1, not married = 2), OS = occupational status, IC = income, LS = length of service (3 years or less = 1, more than 3 years = 2), FEM = feminism attitude, USA = unwanted sexual attention, COER = sexual coercion, GEND = gender harassment, HR = harasser role, ACK = acknowledged of sexual harassment, SB = self blame, HB = harasser blame, HE = harasser excuse, AR = assertive responses, NAR = nonassertive responses, PSE = psychological effects, PHE = physical effects, WE = work-related effects.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

responses also had significant positive correlations with psychological outcomes ($r = .40$, $p < .001$), physical outcomes ($r = .32$, $p < .001$) and work-related outcomes ($r = .24$, $p < .01$).

Analysis by Age Group

In order to examine expectation 3, scores on each scale by age group were calculated. The results of ANOVA and multiple comparison tests by Tukey's method showed that there were no significant differences among age groups related to type of harassment experience. Although these findings were different from what was predicted in expectation 3, it was shown that unwanted sexual attention was rated the highest among respon-

dents under 30 years old, decreasing as respondent age increased, and was lowest for the age group of 40 years and older. Similarly, gender harassment was rated lower as the respondent age groups became older, and was the lowest for the age group over 40 years old (although there same ratings were found in the age groups 18-29 and 30-39). Sexual coercion was rated only in the 30 to 39 years old category.

Concerning other scales, self-blame decreased as respondent age increased, and the middle-aged respondents had the highest harasser-blame score, which was found to be significantly higher than any other age category. There were no significant differences among age categories related

to negative outcomes and no significant differences were found in the area of coping responses.

Analysis by workplace sex composition

Table 3 shows the summary of means with SDs computed for each group of workplace sex composition. Results of ANOVA and multiple comparison tests by Tukey's method are also presented. In the measures of sexual experience, male dominated group had the highest gender harassment score, which was found to be significantly ($p < .05$) higher than female dominated group. Although, there were no significant differences among workplace sex composition categories related to unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion, the analysis for workplace sex composition comparisons showed that respondents belonging to the female dominated category had the lowest score and to the male dominated category had the highest score, suggesting male dominated environment had the highest sexual harassment tendencies. Therefore, expectation 4 was supported. In addition, other interesting results were found. Employees in the male dominated category and mostly male category had the lowest feminism

score. There were no significant differences among workplace sex composition categories related to negative outcomes, and no significant differences were found in the area of coping responses and attributions to blame.

Regression analysis

To examine our expectations (2, 5, and 6) in more detail, a hierarchical multiple regression analyses on coping responses and outcomes were undertaken with other variables, including the three types of sexual harassment, being introduced as explanatory variables. Hierarchical multiple regressions were performed to obtain precise information concerning the contribution of independent variables to the prediction of each of the dependent variables. Table 4 presents the result of these analyses. The values displayed in Table 4 are beta coefficients derived from the regression analyses.

The independent variables used for the analyses consisted of seven groups of variables. The occupational sex composition and harasser role were excluded because the number of participants per cell was insufficient to obtain reliable slope esti-

Table 3 Means and SDs of sexual harassment related variables for the five different work place sex composition (joint work) groups, with the results of ANOVA and multiple comparison tests by the Tukey's methods¹⁾

Scale	1		2		3		4		5		F value
	Male dominated (N = 20)	Mostly male (N = 33)	Balanced (N = 37)	Mostly female (N = 66)	Female dominated (N = 80)						
FEM	1.86 (.67)	1.61* (.69)	1.97 (.58)	2.02 ^b (.67)	2.06 ^b (.68)						3.02*
USA	1.11 (.26)	1.06 (.11)	1.02 (.06)	1.05 (.15)	1.02 (.13)						1.99
COER	1.00 (.00)	1.02 (.14)	1.03 (.11)	1.00 (.02)	1.00 (.00)						1.63
GEND	1.41* (.40)	1.27 (.30)	1.22 (.25)	1.23 (.25)	1.18 ^b (.29)						2.61*
SB	2.96 (1.59)	2.21 (1.38)	2.39 (1.51)	2.21 (1.44)	2.61 (1.58)						1.12
HB	3.03 (1.78)	2.64 (1.74)	3.60 (1.96)	3.30 (1.96)	3.28 (1.87)						.88
HE	3.12 (2.09)	3.76 (2.55)	4.19 (2.38)	3.74 (2.35)	4.15 (2.39)						.70
AR	1.14 (.17)	1.20 (.27)	1.23 (.23)	1.17 (.22)	1.15 (.25)						.69
NAR	1.39 (.31)	1.50 (.31)	1.46 (.32)	1.44 (.31)	1.42 (.33)						.42
PSE	.47 (.52)	.63 (.63)	.52 (.39)	.55 (.44)	.43 (.51)						.86
PHE	.31 (.37)	.46 (.54)	.38 (.38)	.30 (.39)	.31 (.41)						.82
WE	.17 (.34)	.31 (.44)	.16 (.24)	.16 (.26)	.19 (.35)						1.13

Note. FEM = feminism attitude, USA = unwanted sexual attention, COER = sexual coercion, GEND = gender harassment, PSE = psychological effects, PHE = physical effects, WE = work related effects, NAR = nonassertive responses, AR = assertive responses, SB = self blame, HB = harasser blame, HE = harasser excuse

1) When superscript letters differ, there was a statistically significant means difference between groups.

* $p < .05$.

mates. The first was a set of organizational context variables that include workplace sex composition, the gender of the immediate boss, employing sector, and size of cooperation. The second set consisted of personal vulnerability that included age, education, marital status, occupational status, personal monthly income, and length of service. The third set consisted of feminism attitude to women's role (FEM; Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975). The alpha coefficient for the feminism scale was found to be .69. These three sets of variables were considered to be control variables whose effects needed to be partial out to evaluate the net impact of individual differences in sexual harassment experience. The fourth set of variables consisted of three types of sexual harassment, namely gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion, and these were put into the regression equation independently to test the effect of each type on coping responses and outcome variables.

Table 4 indicates that sexual coercion has the strongest impact on assertive responses and gender harassment was significant in explaining both assertive and nonassertive responses. Unwanted sexual attention was found not to be significant for both responses. Regarding outcome variables, sexual coercion demonstrated significance on physical outcomes only and gender harassment was found to be significant on all negative outcomes. Unwanted sexual attention was found to be not significant on all negative outcomes. The fifth set of variables, acknowledging harassment was found to be non-significant for all types of coping responses and outcome variables. The sixth set of variables consisted of three types of attribution: self-blame ($\alpha = .73$), harasser blame ($\alpha = .61$), and harasser excuse (single item). Table 4 indicates that self-blame and harasser blame proved to have a significant effect on psychological outcomes and harasser excuse was found to have a negative effect on physical outcomes. Regarding coping responses, harasser blame demonstrated a significant effect on assertive responses and harasser excuse demonstrated a significant effect on nonassertive responses. For

the final step, assertive and nonassertive response variables were put into the regression equation independently to test the effect of each type on outcomes variables. Only nonassertive responses was found to be significant on psychological, physical and work related outcomes.

In summary, the results shown in Table 4 indicate that outcomes variables can be best predicted by the nonassertive responses which in turn are explained partly by sexual coercion and gender harassment and partly by attribution to self blame or not, after controlling for organizational context, personal vulnerability, and feminism attitude variables.

DISCUSSION

Prevalence and Types of Sexual Harassment

The frequency data in our study shows that sexual harassment is widespread and occurs in the Myanmar workplace. According to our respondents, over half of all female workers (156 of 271) have experienced at least one incident of harassment during their working life. However, in accordance with our expectation 1 and previous studies (e.g., Fitzgerald et al., 1988), we found that less severe forms of sexual harassment were more widely reported than the more severe types. Gender harassment was the most frequently reported type of sexual harassment with unwanted sexual attention being less frequent and sexual coercion being a relatively rare occurrence.

The outcome of ANOVA and regression analyses indicates that the type of sexual harassment is a meaningful correlate of negative outcomes, coping responses and work place sex composition. These results suggest adequate validity of the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) translated from the original English questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1988) and tested on Myanmar female workers. Although these results are highly suggestive, important issues remain unexplored in the present study.

Our study indicated that some differences may exist between US and Myanmar workers regarding outcome related responses. As discussed earlier, previous research (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995;

The Prevalence, Antecedents and Consequences of Sexual Harassment in the Myanmar Workplace

Table 4 Summary of regression conducted for response styles and outcomes as dependent variables

Independent variables	Dependent variables				
	Response styles		Outcomes		
	Assertive responses	Nonassertive responses	Psychological outcomes	Physical outcomes	Work-related outcomes
<i>Organizational context</i>					
Workplace sex composition	.05	.11	.17	.24*	.30**
The gender of immediate boss	-.05	-.09	-.08	-.17	.02
Employing sector	.13	.12	-.06	-.06	-.15
Size of corporation	.23*	.30**	.14	.16	.12
R ₁ ²	.03	.05	.04	.04	.03
Adjusted R ₁ ²	.00	.03	.02	.01	.00
<i>Personal vulnerability</i>					
Age	-.04	-.20	-.10	-.08	-.13
Education	.18	.11	.05	.04	-.23
Marital status	-.08	.02	-.11	-.18	.02
Occupational status	-.01	.06	-.20	-.26	-.01
Personal monthly income	-.10	-.24*	.25*	.34**	.37**
Length of service	-.06	.00	.02	-.01	-.09
R ₂ ²	.14	.22**	.12	.11	.19**
Adjusted R ₂ ²	.06	.14**	.04	.03	.11**
R ₂ ² - R ₁ ²	.11	.17**	.08	.07	.16**
<i>Feminism attitude</i>					
	-.10	-.00	-.11	-.11	-.23*
R ₃ ²	.14	.24**	.12	.11	.21**
Adjusted R ₃ ²	.05	.16**	.04	.02	.13**
R ₃ ² - R ₂ ²	.00	.02	.00	.00	.02
<i>Sexual harassment</i>					
Unwanted sexual attention	-.03	.07	-.05	-.16	.01
Sexual coercion	.33***	.05	.06	.31**	.18
Gender harassment	.26*	.28**	.30**	.27**	.22*
R ₄ ²	.26**	.35***	.36***	.33***	.38***
Adjusted R ₄ ²	.15**	.26***	.28***	.24***	.29***
R ₄ ² - R ₃ ²	.12**	.11**	.24**	.22**	.17**
<i>Acknowledge of harassment</i>					
	.09	-.04	.11	.07	.12
R ₅ ²	.26**	.36***	.39***	.35***	.39***
Adjusted R ₅ ²	.15**	.26***	.31***	.26***	.31***
R ₅ ² - R ₄ ²	.00	.01	.03	.02	.01
<i>Attribution</i>					
Self blame	-.09	.16	.18*	.14	.10
Harasser blame	.23*	.07	.25**	.11	.13
Harasser excuse	-.00	.30**	-.17	-.25*	-.09
R ₆ ²	.38***	.54***	.49***	.41***	.44***
Adjusted R ₆ ²	.24***	.44***	.38***	.28***	.32***
R ₆ ² - R ₅ ²	.12*	.18**	.10*	.06	.05
<i>Response style</i>					
Assertive response			.15	.10	.01
Nonassertive response			.30**	.37**	.26*
R ₇ ²			.57***	.49***	.48***
Adjusted R ₇ ²			.46***	.37***	.35***
R ₇ ² - R ₆ ²			.08*	.08*	.04

Note. Figures other than R's are standardized beta coefficients.

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001. (N = 160)

Gelfand et al., 1995) has identified three forms of sexual harassment: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion. For the Myanmar sample, the item composition of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion scale were slightly different between original SEQ and Myanmar, although exploratory factor analyses results that the three dimensions of sexual harassment, and with sufficiently high reliability coefficients (Cronbach alpha = .74, .78 and .81 for three dimension respectively).

A factor analysis conducted for the Myanmar study, gender harassment factor included some aspects of unwanted sexual attention, and the unwanted sexual attention factor included some aspects of sexual coercion. Also, the sexual coercion factor included some aspects of unwanted sexual attention. Cultural differences might have been involved here. When Myanmar researcher translated the instrument, the two frequently used terms "sex" and "gender" were found to be difficult to differentiate in Myanmar. Wordings were chosen carefully in an attempt to establish the meanings of these words, but the factor dimension was still mixed. Thus, for Myanmar, some of the unwanted sexual attention may actually mean gender harassment, suggesting no clear distinction between sex and gender among Myanmar people in their workplace.

Another possibility is that unwanted sexual attention represents experiences that Myanmar sample can be considered primarily discriminatory based on ambiguity of the seriousness of the harasser's nondirected behavior. For example, item 17 asks participants "Have you ever been in a situation where you felt you were being subtly bribed with some sort of reward (e.g., preferential treatment) to engage in sexual behavior with a male supervisor or coworker." In contrast, experiences of gender harassment and sexual coercion are more explicitly directed behavior; the former, a typical item asks participants "Have you ever experienced invasion of privacy (repeated calling, request for dates, dropping in) by a male supervisor or coworker"; and the latter, "Have you ever been in a situation where a male supervisor or

coworker made an unwelcome attempt at interaction that resulted in you crying, pleading, or physically struggling?" This needed further examination.

Personal Vulnerability

On the basis of the personal vulnerability argument, we might expect women who are young, single or divorced, and minority women have been found to be the target of severe and for frequent harassment. Of course, we must assume that the status of these women is evident when they are in workplace. Overall, the findings do not offer much support for this argument, with the exception that married and older women are also likely to report being harassed, with little differences with the younger and single women. The findings pertaining to age are difficult to interpret since the harassment measures refer to any experience during their working life. It is likely that older women to have more opportunity to experience harassment over their careers. Similarly, we lack data on whether women were married or not at the time the harassment occurred. Overall, the outcome of ANOVA and correlations suggest that age was not strongly related to sexual harassment experience. Thus, expectation 3 was not supported.

Organizational Context

Previous research (Lafontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Terpstra & Baker, 1986) has indicated that sexual harassment is more prevalent in male-dominated settings. While our findings from the workplace sex composition analysis were in accordance with this, our results suggested that gender harassment is more prevalent in male-dominated settings. Thus, expectation 4 was partially supported.

Coping Responses

As expected, we found that respondents were more likely to employ assertive strategies, when the type of harassment was sexual coercion. However, gender harassment was also found to be significantly related to assertive responses, while unwanted sexual attention was not significantly related assertive responses. Gruber and Bjorn

(1982) suggested that some harassment is ambiguous because it combines a degree of sexual interest with offensive behavior. "This ambiguity may reduce a woman's ability to respond in an assertive or direct manner" (p.276). Similarly to previous research (Linvingstone, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1982; Kelly & Persons, 2000), though, the most common responses to sexual harassment were avoiding, ignoring and telling a friend or family member, and 39% were ask or tell the harasser to stop. Possibly victims of gender harassment by co-workers were more likely than victims of unwanted sexual attention to use such kind of assertive response. Linvingstone (1982) found that victims ignored, joked with or avoided co-workers as frequently as supervisors. However, they more frequently objected to coworkers than supervisors.

It was also expected that women who do not endorse self-blame would be more likely to employ assertive responses. This expectation 5 was generally supported by the data. Similarly to previous research (Jenson and Gutek, 1982), the correlation matrix revealed that self-blame was significantly related to nonassertive response, although there was no negative relationship between self-blame and assertive responses. Again, the correlation matrix and regression analyses also indicated that the women victim who attributed to harasser blame was more likely to employ assertive responses than the other women victim.

We expected that women who make assertive responses would be associated with more negative outcomes than women who make nonassertive responses. Result of correlation analysis showed that both assertive and nonassertive responses were significantly positively related to psychological, physical, and work-related outcomes. However, the regression analyses did not show any significantly positive effect of assertive response on psychological, physical and work related outcomes after controlling other factors. The result indicated that nonassertive responses was associated with all types of negative outcomes. Thus, these finding do not support expectation 6. It is likely that, assertive responses may be

more likely to be effective in stopping the immediate harassment of that person, and it has no other consequences for the person who responses assertively. The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1988) found that most people who told the harasser to stop said it "made things better". Furthermore, Bringham and Scherer (1993) found that talking to the harasser is effective at stopping the harassment. It is possible that because, in our study, the result indicated that the most common harasser was a coworker, and the most widely used assertive response types was "to tell the harasser to stop". Unfortunately, we did not ask what type of coping response is more effective for them, and if there was an organizational policy at the workplace against sexual harassment and how much support there was for it.

Outcomes

We expected that more severe forms of harassment would be associated with more negative outcomes than less severe forms. The analyses generally supported this expectation 2. The highest significant relation between sexual coercion and physical outcome factors was found by multiple regression analyses. However, gender harassment was associated with a variety of negative outcomes (psychological, physical and work-related). Most likely, there were over half of the women in our sample who reported gender harassment and very little sexual coercion was reported. Schneider, Swan, and Fitzgerald (1997) reported that "although much of the behavior described by the women could be characterized as low-level, relatively mild, hostile environment sexual harassment, consisting mostly of put-down and offensive sexual remarks, they still experienced negative job-related and psychological outcomes, harassment apparently does not have to be particularly egregious to result in negative consequences" (p.412). Similarly, O'Connell and Korabik (2000) reported that the negative effects of gender harassment alone, particularly when instigated by men at higher levels of organizational authority, are considerable and should not be underestimated. On the

other hand, it seems reasonable to expect that, Myanmar women may be considered, directly bothered by behavior base on sex is more offensive that causes devalue them and they are likely to see themselves as victims of male actions. This belief may affect that gender harassment leading to various negative outcomes. Unfortunately, we do not have the data for the women's perception of what constitutes sexual harassment, whether behavior is inappropriate or not. More research is needed to understand the cultural effect in harassment by the victim perception of sexual harassment and why the victim's reports are more negative outcomes in gender harassment than unwanted sexual attention.

CONCLUSION

This study may be helpful for better understanding of sexual harassment in the Myanmar workplace, and ultimately to help create organizational cultures that prevent and remedy sexual harassment in Myanmar. It suggest that sexual harassment is widespread and occurs in the Myanmar workplace, and even the less severe form of sexual harassment (gender harassment) are likely to impact the victims with a variety of negative outcomes. The less Myanmar women acknowledged they had been sexually harassed, the less likely Myanmar women are taking formal action to unwanted sexual behavior at the organizational settings. However, our results suggested that assertive coping responses are less likely to be associated to all types of negative outcomes of sexual harassment experiences. Hopefully, as women (and men) in Myanmar are less educated about sexual harassment, they may not be sensitized to it and less likely to deal with it by using assertive responses in sexual harassment behavior in work or the educational setting.

Thus, it might be advisable to include clear policies discouraging any sexual relationships between men and women in the workplace, and letting women workers know that they can complain if a man (supervisor or coworker) is harassing them on the basis of their gender.

As a primarily exploratory study, ours had a

number of weaknesses and limitations. We sampled only working women, who may be better informed about sexual harassment than less-well educated, college or university students. Moreover, differential response rates for different groups affect the generalizability of our result due to sampling bias. These ranged from as high as 48% for faculty to as low as 9% for nurse. Certain conditioned combined to result in this pattern. In Mandalay, when asking for approval prior to data collection, some heads of private companies and government units refused to participate due to they are not decision makers and necessary to ask the permission of their general's office in Yangon (a capital city of Myanmar) and also mentioned that it may be cost of time. Because private company and government workers were underrepresented in our sample, we suggest that particular caution be used when generalizing the results pertaining to them. Future research should examine whether these findings generalize in different samples populations, and alternative contexts. Future studies tapping the reaction of other groups as well as other university settings are warranted. In addition, although the model presents the antecedents of harassment in the workplace as organizational climate for sexual harassment and the gender nature of the job (Fitzgerald et al., 1994, 1997), we only examined the latter. Gruber et al. (1995) suggest that the climate of an organization toward sexual harassment is a factor in women's assertiveness. In the future, organizational climate ought to be investigated in Myanmar. Also, the type of sexual harassment, the antecedents and the consequences of such experiences, may be different for students than working women. Furthermore, more work is needed in order to understand the subtle relationship between characteristic of the harassment, and its impact and the victims' responses.

REFERENCES

- Arvey, R.D., & Cavanaugh, M.A. (1995). Using surveys to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment: Some methodological problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 39-52.
- Bringham, S.G., & Scherer, L.L. (1993). Factors associated with responses to sexual harassment and satisfaction with outcome. *Sex Roles*, 29, 239-269.
- Crull, P. (1982). Stress effects of sexual harassment on the job: Implications for counseling. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52(3), 539-544.
- Dan, A.J., Pinosof, D.A., & Riggs, L.L. (1995). Sexual harassment as an occupational hazard in nursing. *Basis and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 563-580.
- Fitzgerald, L.F. (1993). Sexual harassment: Violence against women in the workplace. *American Psychologist*, 48(10), 1070-1076.
- 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.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Gelfand, M.J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment : Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basis and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 425-445.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Hulin, C.L., & Drasgow, F. (1994). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: An integrated model. In G.P. Keita & J.J. Hurrell, Jr. (Eds.), *job stress in a changing workforce: Investigation gender, diversity, and family issues* (pp.55-73). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Swan, S., & Fisher, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 117-138.
- Gelfand, M.J., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47, 164-177.
- Gruber, J.E. (1989). How women handle sexual harassment: A Literature Review. *Sociology and social research*, 74(1), 3-9.
- Gruber, J.E., & Bjorn, L. (1982). Blue-collar blues: The sexual harassment of women autoworkers. *Work and Occupation*, 9, 271-298.
- Gruber, J.E., & Bjorn, L. (1986) Women's responses to sexual harassment: An analysis of sociocultural, organizational, and personal resource models. *Social Science Quarterly*, 67, 814-826.
- Gruber, J.E., & Smith, M.D. (1995). Women's responses to sexual harassment: A multivariate analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 543-562.
- Gutek, B.A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace: Impact of sexual behavior and harassment on women, men, and organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B.A., & Morasch, B. (1982) Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 55-74.
- Gutek, B.A., & Koss, M.P. (1993). Changed women and changed organizations: Consequences of and coping with sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 28-48.
- Hesson-McInnis, M.S., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1997). Sexual harassment: A preliminary test of an integrative model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 877-901.
- Jensen, I.W., & Gutek, B.A. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4),

- 121-136.
- Kelly, M.L., & Persons, B. (2000) Sexual harassment in the 1990s: A university-wide survey of female faculty, administration, staff, and students. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71 (5), 549-568.
- Khin Win Shwe. (2002). Global and Myanmar Perspective: Violence Against Women. Yangon, MNCWA: Myanmar.
- Lafontaine, E., & Tredeau, L. (1986). The frequency, sources, and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. *Sex Roles*, 15, 433-442.
- Linvingston, J.A. (1982). Response to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational, and individual actions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 5-22.
- Loy, P.H., & Stewart, L.P. (1984) The extent and effects of sexual harassment of working women. *Sociological focus*, 17, 31-43.
- Matsui, T., Kakuyama, T., Onglatco, M.L., & Ogutu, M. (1995). Women's perceptions of social- sexual behavior: A cross-cultural replication. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 46, 203-215.
- Myanmar National Committee For Women's Affairs. (1997) Myanmar National Action Plan for the Advancement of women. Yangon, MNCWA: Myanmar.
- Munson, L.J., Miner, A.G., & Hulin C. (2001) Labeling sexual harassment in the military: An extension and replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 86(2), 293-303.
- O'Connell, C.E., & Korabik, K. (2000). Sexual harassment: The relationship of personal vulnerability, work context, perpetrator status, and type of harassment to outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 299-329.
- Pryor, J.B. (1995). The psychosocial impact of sexual harassment on women in the U.S. Military. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17 (4), 581-603.
- 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 Psychological*, 82(3), 401-405.
- Smith, E.R., Ferree, M.M., & Miller, F.D. (1975). A short scale of attitudes toward feminism. *Representative Research in social psychology*, 6, 51-56.
- Summer, R.J. (1996). The effect of harasser performance status and complainant tolerance on reactions to a complaint of sexual harassment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 49, 53-67.
- Terpstra, D.E., & Baker, D.D. (1986). A framework for the study of sexual harassment. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 17-34.
- Terpstra, D.E., & Baker, D.D. (1989). The identification and classification of reactions to sexual harassment. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 10, 1-14.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1988). *Sexual harassment in the federal government: An update*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Valentine-French, S., & Randtke, K. (1989). Attribution of responsibility for an incident of sexual harassment in a university setting. *Sex Roles*, 21(7/8), 545-555.
- Wyatt, G.E., & Riederle, M. (1995). The prevalence and context of sexual harassment among african American and white American women. *Journal of Interpersonsl Violence*, 10(3), 306-318.

Received September 20. 2002

Accepted March 1. 2003