

**Gender-Biased Behavior at Work:
What Can Surveys Tell Us About the Link Between Sexual Harassment and Gender
Discrimination?**

Heather Antecol

Claremont McKenna College
Department of Economics
500 E. Ninth Street
Claremont, CA 91711
Email: heather.antecol@claremontmckenna.edu
Fax: (909) 621-8249
Phone: (909) 607-7140

Vanessa E. Barcus

Mighty Karma
1738 Wynkoop St., Ste. 301
Denver, CO 80202
Email: vbarcus@mightykarma.com
Phone: (303) 903-7601

Deborah Cobb-Clark

Economics Program
and
Social Policy Evaluation, Analysis and Research Centre,
Research School of Social Sciences
Australian National University, ACT 0200 Australia
Email: dcclark@coombs.anu.edu.au
Fax: (612) 6125-0182 International
Phone: (612) 6125-3267 International
and
Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA)

February 22, 2007

Keywords: Sexual Harassment, Gender Discrimination, Job Satisfaction, Intentions to Quit
JEL-Code: J16, J28

Abstract

This paper examines the links between survey-based reports of sexual harassment and gender discrimination. In particular, we are interested in assessing whether these concepts measure similar forms of gender-biased behavior and whether they have the same effect on workers' job satisfaction and intentions to leave their jobs. Our results provide little support for the notion that survey-based measures of sexual harassment and gender discrimination capture the same underlying behavior. Respondents do appear to differentiate between incidents of sexual harassment and incidents of gender discrimination in the workplace. Both gender discrimination and sexual harassment are associated with a substantially higher degree of job dissatisfaction, particularly amongst men. While women who experience gender discrimination are somewhat more likely to intend to change jobs, amongst men it is sexual harassment that leads to an increased propensity to quit. We find no significant interactions between our two measures of gender bias, perhaps implying that the intensity of gender bias is relatively unimportant for understanding job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit. At the same time, this may reflect the lack of precision with which we estimate this interaction, especially for men.

1. Introduction

Workplaces are rarely gender-neutral. Though gender differences in the terms and conditions of ones employment are almost never codified in firms' personnel policies or in employment law, women nonetheless frequently find that they are paid less, are promoted less often, and receive less training than their male colleagues (Blau, 1998; Blau, et al., 1998). Reports of sexual harassment are also common with as many as one in two women experiencing sexual harassment at some point in their work lives (Schneider, et al., 1997; Fitzgerald and Omerod, 1993). The complex—and often ill-defined—nature of labor market discrimination and sexual harassment poses significant challenges for researchers wishing to assess the extent of gender bias in employment relationships. Economists typically define labor market discrimination to be that portion of the gender gap in aggregate employment outcomes that is not attributable to productivity differentials and have largely been concerned with understanding how these disparities can best be measured (see Altonji and Blank, 1999). In contrast, a universally accepted definition of sexual harassment has not yet emerged (see Foulis and McCabe, 1997), although psychologists have been working to develop ways of quantifying women's experiences of sexual harassment. In both cases, surveys are increasingly being used to provide information about the ways in which women may experience gender-bias at work.

Our objective is to add to a limited empirical literature on the links between two forms of gender-biased behavior—sexual harassment and gender discrimination—by using data drawn from the 2002 General Social Survey. Understanding workers' experiences of gender-bias in the workplace is especially important given a legal environment which relies on a reasonable victim standard—increasingly a reasonable woman standard—to make determinations in such cases (Prior, et al., 1997; Fitzgerald and Shullman, 1993; Konrad and Gutek, 1986).¹ Moreover, recent

evidence suggests that the negative consequences of unwanted sexual behavior at work are greater for women who believe themselves to be sexually harassed (Antecol and Cobb-Clark, 2006) and it also seems sensible to expect that perceptions of gender bias will be related to subsequent labor market behavior. Consequently, we are interested in the following questions. Do survey-based measures of sexual harassment and gender discrimination capture separate forms of gender bias or are they simply reflections of the same underlying behavior? Do they have similar consequences for workers' job satisfaction and intentions to remain in their current employment?

Our results provide little support for the notion that survey-based measures of sexual harassment and gender discrimination capture the same underlying behavior. Respondents do appear to differentiate between incidents of sexual harassment and incidents of gender discrimination in the workplace. Both gender discrimination and sexual harassment are associated with a substantially higher degree of job dissatisfaction, particularly amongst men. While women who experience gender discrimination are somewhat more likely to intend to change jobs, amongst men it is sexual harassment that leads to an increased propensity to quit. We find no significant interactions between our two measures of gender bias, perhaps implying that the intensity of gender bias is relatively unimportant for understanding job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit. At the same time, this may reflect the lack of precision with which we estimate this interaction, especially for men.

In what follows, we review the literature on survey-based measures of sexual harassment and gender discrimination. Details of the GSS data used in this analysis and the incidence of sexual harassment and gender discrimination as well as the link between them are provided in Section 3. Following that evidence on the consequences of these forms of gender-biased

behavior for job satisfaction and intentions to leave ones current employment are presented. Finally, our conclusions and suggestions for future research are discussed in Section 5.

2. Using Surveys to Identify Sexual Harassment and Gender Discrimination

While economists have a long history of quantifying gender discrimination as the portion of the gap in men's and women's outcomes that cannot be attributed to differences in observable, productivity-related characteristics, there is a recognition that gender discrimination is "unlikely to be completely captured by so crude a measure as a log-earnings regression" (Kuhn, 1990). Unfortunately, omitted variables, unobserved heterogeneity, and measurement error can all confound statistical, residual-based estimates of labor market discrimination. These econometric problems have led to an increased interest in using alternative strategies—including direct, survey questions—to measure women's experience of gender discrimination (e.g., Kuhn, 1987, 1990; Hampton and Heywood, 1993; Laband and Lentz, 1993; Hallock, et. al, 1998; Antecol and Kuhn, 2000).² Not surprisingly, there has been an intense interest in understanding the relationship between self-reports and statistical, residual-based measures of discrimination. Some authors find that those women reporting the most gender discrimination, in fact, face the least statistical discrimination (Kuhn 1987, 1990; Barbezat and Hughes, 1990; Antecol and Kuhn, 2000). Others find that these measures are positively related suggesting that the wording of survey questions about discrimination may be important (Hampton and Heywood, 1993). There is less evidence about the ways in which self-reports of gender discrimination are related to other gender-biased behavior—like sexual harassment—that we might care about. Our goal is to begin to fill this gap in the literature.

The economics literature on sexual harassment is not as developed as that on gender discrimination. Nonetheless, there are several broad conclusions that can be drawn. First, reports of sexual harassment are pervasive in the United States (for example, Antecol and Cobb-Clark, 2003, 2006; Schneider, et al., 1997; Laband and Lentz, 1998; USMSPB, 1995) and abroad (ILO, 1992). Second, many men also experience sexual harassment at work and research suggests that the sexual harassment of men may be increasing (USMSPB, 1995). Finally, employment-related sexual harassment almost certainly imposes large costs on workers and firms through increased job turnover, higher absenteeism, reduced job satisfaction, lower productivity, and adverse health outcomes.³

While the measurement of gender discrimination has historically relied upon statistical analysis of the disparity in men's and women's mean labor market outcomes, analysis of sexual harassment is based almost exclusively on surveys that ask directly about experiences of unwanted sexual behavior at work or in the classroom. Unfortunately, research has been hampered by the lack of a commonly accepted definition of and a standardized approach to measuring sexual harassment (see for example, Arvey and Cavanaugh, 1995). Surveys, for example, occasionally ask women to report on events that may have occurred in the distant past leading to potential recall bias. Moreover, there is a great deal of ambiguity about what constitutes sexual harassment making the exact phrasing of survey questions important. While many women report experiencing unwanted sexual behavior, they often do not label their experiences as sexual harassment per se (see, Marin and Guadagno, 1999; Magley, et al., 1999; Antecol and Cobb-Clark, 2006). Not surprisingly, women are more likely than men to see unwanted sexual behavior at work as harassing, though training seems to be useful in altering

men's views about "gray areas" including unwanted sexual behavior originating with co-workers rather than supervisors (Antecol and Cobb-Clark, 2003).

To our knowledge there is also no evidence on the extent to which reports of unwanted sexual behavior and sexual harassment are linked to reports of gender discrimination more generally. Specifically, it is unclear whether survey-based measures of sexual harassment and gender discrimination identify separate forms of gender bias at work and whether they have different consequences for workers' job satisfaction and future career plans. A deeper understanding of this issue will shed light on the causes and consequences of gender bias at work more generally.

3. Data

This paper uses data drawn from the 2002 General Social Survey (GSS).⁴ This data set is ideal for our purposes because it includes detailed questions on overall job satisfaction, a respondent's intentions to quit, and whether respondents have experienced gender discrimination and/or sexual harassment. Furthermore, the GSS also includes detailed demographic and work-environment variables, such as, age, education, region, tenure, hours worked, and occupation.

We restrict the sample to individuals between the ages of 18 and 65 who are employed. The latter restriction is necessary because the questions on job satisfaction, gender discrimination and sexual harassment, which are our questions of interest, were only asked of employed individuals. This leaves a final sample of 1,696 observations, with 874 women and 822 males with non-missing values for our variables of interest.

Men and women in the sample were asked whether or not they have experienced gender discrimination. In particular, "Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because

of your gender?” We create an indicator variable for gender discrimination which equals one for respondents who reported that they feel that they have been discriminated against due to their gender and zero otherwise. In this case, 11.4 percent of females and 3.3 percent of males indicated that they have been discriminated against due to their gender at work (see Table 1). Men and women were also asked if they experienced sexual harassment. Specifically, “In the last twelve months, were you sexually harassed by anyone while you were on the job?” We create an indicator variable for sexual harassment which equals one for respondents who reported that they have been sexually harassed and zero otherwise. Responses to this question showed that while 7.2 percent of females felt that they had been sexually harassed at work, only 2.7 percent of males felt that they had been sexually harassed.⁵ Table 1 also reveals that of the 49 men who reported any gender bias, only 9 (roughly 18 percent) report both sexual harassment and gender discrimination. The proportion of women reporting both forms of gender bias is even less (i.e., approximately 15 percent). Moreover, the correlation between gender discrimination and sexual harassment, while statistically significant, is relatively low. Specifically, the correlation between these forms of gender bias is 0.27 for both males and females combined, 0.23 for females, and 0.35 for males. Thus, these simple statistics indicate that sexual harassment and gender discrimination are a much more important issue for working women, as opposed to men. At the same time, there is little evidence that our measures of sexual harassment and gender discrimination capture the same underlying behavior.

Table 1 here

4. The Effect of Gender-biased Behavior on Job Satisfaction and Intentions to Quit

Given that survey respondents appear to differentiate between incidents of sexual harassment and incidents of gender discrimination in the workplace, it is interesting to ask whether these

alternative forms of gender bias have similar consequences for workers' job satisfaction and intentions to remain in their current employment. Understanding the effect of gender bias on job satisfaction is important because low job satisfaction is associated with increased absenteeism (Clegg 1983), lower worker productivity (Mangione and Quinn 1975), and an increased incidence of mental and physical health problems (Locke 1976). Gender bias is also likely to be particularly costly for both firms and employees if it results in higher levels of job turnover. Consequently, it is essential to understand the effect that incidents of gender bias have on workers' intentions to leave their jobs.⁶

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

We begin by assessing the unconditional relationship between our measures of gender bias on the one hand and job satisfaction and intentions to quit on the other. Specifically, respondents to the GSS were asked: "On the whole, how satisfied are you with the work you do—would you say you are very satisfied, moderately satisfied, a little dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied?" Respondents were also asked about their plans for future job changes. In particular, "Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it you will make a genuine effort to find a new job with a different employer within the next year—very likely, somewhat likely, or not likely?" Indicator variables were created for each response to the questions on job satisfaction and intentions to quit.

Overall, job satisfaction amongst GSS respondents is high, with almost one in two men and women reporting that they are very satisfied with their jobs. More than sixty percent of employees report that they are not at all likely to search for new employment in the coming year. Given that women are approximately three times as likely as men to report gender bias on the job (see Table 2), it is striking that there is no evidence of gender differentials in either overall levels

of job satisfaction or in intentions to quit.⁷ There do appear to be gender differences in the consequences of gender bias, however. While one third of women who report that they experienced sexual harassment also report that they are very satisfied with their jobs, only 4.5 percent of sexually harassed men reporting being very satisfied in their current employment. Sexually harassed men are also much less likely than sexually harassed women to report that they are not at all likely to attempt to find a new job in the next 12 months. It is interesting that, for both men and women, gender discrimination appears to have a weaker effect on job satisfaction and intentions to quit than does sexual harassment.

Table 2 here

4.2 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis allows us to investigate the relative importance of sexual harassment and gender discrimination in increasing job dissatisfaction and strengthening intentions to quit in more depth. We begin by assuming that reports of gender bias are exogenous to job dissatisfaction and intended job change. This assumption will be considered further below. Suppose J_i^* measures a propensity to report being dissatisfied with ones job, while Q_i^* captures the propensity to report the intention to look for new employment in the coming year. We can then model these propensities as:

$$\begin{aligned} J_i^* &= Z_i\gamma^d + H_i\delta^d + D_i\phi^d + H_iD_i\lambda^d + \eta_i^d \\ Q_i^* &= Z_i\gamma^q + H_i\delta^q + D_i\phi^q + H_iD_i\lambda^q + \eta_i^q \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\eta_i^d \sim N(0,1)$, $\eta_i^q \sim N(0,1)$, and i indexes individuals. In addition, Z_i is a vector of demographic, human capital, and job characteristics related to job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit ones job.⁸ Finally, H_j and D_j are the measures of sexual harassment and gender discrimination discussed in Section 3. We include an interaction term (H_iD_i) in the model to

allow for the possibility that workers reporting both sexual harassment and gender discrimination suffer additional negative consequences from these events. Although the propensity to report job dissatisfaction or an intention to quit are unobserved, we create an indicator variable (D) that equals one for individuals reporting that they are either a little dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their job, and zero otherwise. We also create an indicator variable (Q) that equals one for individuals who report being either very likely or somewhat likely to find new employment and zero otherwise. The probabilities that an individual reports being dissatisfied with his or her job or to intend to look for new employment are then given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(J_i = 1) &= \Pr(Z_i\gamma^d + H_i\delta^d + D_i\phi^d + H_iD_i\lambda^d + \eta_i^d > 0) = \Phi(Z_i\gamma^d + H_i\delta^d + D_i\phi^d + H_iD_i\lambda^d) \\ \Pr(Q_i = 1) &= \Pr(Z_i\gamma^q + H_i\delta^q + D_i\phi^q + H_iD_i\lambda^q + \eta_i^q > 0) = \Phi(Z_i\gamma^q + H_i\delta^q + D_i\phi^q + H_iD_i\lambda^q) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where Φ is the standard normal cumulative density function. The estimated probit marginal effects of sexual harassment and gender discrimination on job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit—as well as the associated standard errors and p-values—resulting from these models are reported in Table 3.⁹

Table 3 Here

Our results indicate that both men and women who experience gender discrimination are significantly more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs. In particular, men who report that they experienced gender discrimination at work are 18.5 percentage points more likely than men experiencing no gender bias to be dissatisfied with their jobs, while similar women are 9.8 percentage points more likely to be dissatisfied. Given that only approximately one in ten workers in our sample overall reports being dissatisfied with their job, these are particularly large effects—especially for men. Gender discrimination is also associated with a higher probability (11.2 percentage points) that women intend to seek new employment. This effect, however, is

relatively small in comparison to the more than 40 percent of women in the sample who are somewhat or very likely to look for new employment. Moreover, there is no significant relationship between gender discrimination and men's intended job changes.

Incidents of sexual harassment are also positively related to the propensity to report job dissatisfaction, although this relationship is estimated somewhat less precisely. Men and women reporting that they experienced sexual harassment on the job are 16.1 and 10.2 percentage points more likely to say that they are dissatisfied with their current employment. The magnitude of this effect is strikingly similar to that associated with experiencing gender discrimination on the propensity to report job dissatisfaction. Although sexual harassment is associated with a slightly higher probability that women report that they intend to make a job change, this relationship is not significant. In contrast, men who report incidents of sexual harassment are 29.3 percentage points (75 percent) more likely to intend to leave their current job. On balance, gender bias seems more strongly related to job dissatisfaction than to the intention to quit.

There are no significant interactions between our two measures of gender bias. This is interesting, because reporting both gender discrimination and sexual harassment might be taken as evidence that a worker's experience of gender bias was particularly severe. Women, for example, who report experiencing both sexual harassment and gender discrimination are only slightly more likely (2.5 percentage points) to be dissatisfied with their jobs than women reporting only one form of gender bias. To some extent, the lack of a significant interaction may reflect the lack of precision with which we estimate this effect, especially for men. At the same time, it may be the case that it is incidents of gender bias generally, rather than their specific form or intensity, which are most closely related to job dissatisfaction. The intention to quit appears to be more sensitive to the form of gender bias with women reacting more strongly to

gender discrimination and men reacting more strongly to sexual harassment. Moreover, the magnitude of the interaction effect is particularly large for men, suggesting that perhaps for them the intensity of gender bias is related to future career plans. Unfortunately, given our small sample sizes, we cannot estimate this effect precisely enough to be sure.

Other worker and job characteristics are related to job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit as expected. In particular, blacks are more likely to be planning to look for a new job, while black men are also much more likely (7.4 percentage points) to be dissatisfied with their current employment. Job dissatisfaction is higher amongst foreign-born workers and male immigrants are significantly more likely than their native-born counterparts to be planning a job change. In general, marital status and family structure are unrelated to either job dissatisfaction or intended job changes. The exception is that married women are significantly less likely than single women to intend to find new work, while men report less job dissatisfaction as the number of children they have increases.

Interestingly, the intention to change jobs is unrelated to a workers' educational level, despite the fact that job dissatisfaction is significantly higher amongst those workers not completing high school. In particular, women with a high school degree are 66.3 percent (8.1 percentage points) less likely to report being dissatisfied with their jobs than are women without a high school degree. Perhaps not surprisingly, individuals working full time are significantly less likely to indicate that they intend to seek new employment, while men working full-time report less job dissatisfaction. Finally, job satisfaction and the intention to quit are both related to labor market sector. In particular, self-employed women report less job satisfaction, while men employed by the government are significantly less likely to be seeking new employment.

4.3 The Potential Endogeneity of Reported Sexual Harassment and Gender Discrimination

Consistent with the most of the previous literature, our empirical strategy assumes that reports of gender bias are exogenous to reports of job satisfaction and intentions to quit. However, this may not be the case. As Antecol and Cobb-Clark (2006) note, heterogeneity in workers' perceptions of, tolerance towards, or willingness to report unpleasant events in the workplace can potentially affect both reports of gender bias and satisfaction with (intentions to remain in) ones current job. The effect that this omitted variables problem would have on our estimates depends on the relationship between the underlying variables. If having a positive disposition or a high degree of tolerance for negative job situations reduces both the propensity to both report gender bias and job dissatisfaction then our estimates of the effect of gender bias on the probability of being dissatisfied are overstated (Antecol and Cobb-Clark, 2006). The primary approach to dealing with this problem has been the use of multivariate probit models that rely on exclusion restrictions for identification (see Shields and Wheatly Price, 2002; Antecol and Cobb-Clark, 2005, 2006). Unfortunately, our GSS data are not sufficiently detailed to provide us with sensible exclusion restrictions for estimating such a model. Consequently, we have maintained the assumption that reported incidents of gender bias are exogenous and suggest that our estimates are best thought of as upper bounds on the true effect of gender bias on job dissatisfaction and intentions to quit. To the extent that the degree and direction of omitted variable bias is similar for our two measures of gender bias, our conclusions regarding their relative effects on job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit would remain substantially the same.

5. Conclusions

Despite the decades that have passed since Equal Opportunity legislation was first passed, gender bias persists in many workplaces. The complex, ill-defined nature of labor market discrimination and sexual harassment, however, have made it difficult to develop a fuller understanding of the ways in which gender bias might affect workers' experiences, relationships and opportunities while on the job. This paper adds to the limited evidence on this issue by using survey data to explore the links between two gender-biased behaviors—sexual harassment and gender discrimination.

Our results indicate that, when asked directly, survey respondents do appear to differentiate between incidents of sexual harassment and incidents of gender discrimination in the workplace. Both are linked to a substantially higher degree of job dissatisfaction, especially amongst men. Women experiencing gender discrimination are somewhat more likely to intend to look for new work, though men's future job changes are much more closely linked to incidents of sexual harassment. To the extent that reporting both gender discrimination and sexual harassment provides information about the intensity of gender bias a worker has experienced, it would seem that it is incidents—rather than the intensity—of gender bias that is important for understanding job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit.

These results give us reason to be optimistic about the potential for using surveys to enhance our understanding of the ways in which gender bias intrudes on men and women's working lives. When asked directly, men and women in the GSS do appear to discriminate between incidents of gender discrimination and incidents of sexual harassment. This is important because these events appear to have distinct effects on men's and women's happiness and intentions to remain in their current jobs. At the same time, there is a great deal that the GSS

cannot tell us. In particular, the GSS data are not sufficiently detailed to provide us with sensible exclusion restrictions that would allow us to account for the potential endogeneity of reported gender discrimination and sexual harassment. We are therefore left to speculate about the role that omitted variable bias might play in estimating the effect of gender bias on job dissatisfaction and the intention to quit. Moreover, this lack of detail implies that there remains a great deal that we do not know about the circumstances surrounding incidents of gender bias in the workplace and its consequences. Still, the GSS is one of the few surveys that asks about incidents of sexual harassment separately from incidents of gender discrimination. Developing richer surveys that also allow alternative forms of gender bias to be identified is likely to be an important next step in deepening our understanding of the consequences of gender bias in the workplace.

References:

- Altonji, Joseph G. and Rebecca M. Blank, 1999. "Race and Gender in the Labor Market", in the Handbook of Labor Economics, O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds), Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 3143-3259.
- Antecol, Heather and Deborah A. Cobb-Clark, 2003. "Does Sexual Harassment Training Change Attitudes? A View from the Federal Level", *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 84 (4), December 2003, pp. 826-842.
- , 2005. "Racial Harassment, Job Satisfaction, and Intentions to Remain in the Military", Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) Discussion Paper No. 1636, June.
- , 2006. "The Sexual Harassment of Female Active-Duty Personnel: Effects on Job Satisfaction and Intentions to Remain in the Military", *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, Vol. 61 (1), pp. 55-80.
- Antecol, Heather and Peter Kuhn, 1990. "Gender as an Impediment to Labor Market Success: Why Do Young Women Report Greater Harm?", *Journal of Labor Economics*, 18(4), pp. 702-728.
- Arvey, Richard D. and Marcie A. Cavanaugh, 1995. "Using Surveys to Assess the Prevalence of Sexual Harassment: Some Methodological Problems", *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 51(1), pp. 39 – 52.
- Barbezat, Debra A. and James W. Hughes, 1990. "Sex Discrimination in Labor Markets: The Role of Statistical Evidence: Comment", *American Economic Review*, 80(1), March, pp. 277-286.
- Blau, Francine D., 1998. "Trends in the Well-Being of American Women, 1970-1995", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 36(10), March, pp. 112-165.
- Blau, Francine D., Marianne A. Ferber, and Anne E. Winkler, 1998. *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*. Third Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Chow, Winston K. and J. Michael Polich, 1980. "Models of the First-Term Reenlistment Decision", R-2468-MRAL, September, 1980, Santa Monica: RAND.
- Clegg, C.W., 1983. Psychology of employee lateness, absence, and turnover: a methodological critique and an empirical study. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 68, 88-101.
- Fitzgerald, Louise F. and Alayne J. Ormerod, 1993. "Breaking Silence: The Sexual Harassment of Women in Academia and the Workplace", in *Psychology of Women: A Handbook of Issues and Theories*, Florence L. Denmark and Michele A. Paludi, editors. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

- Fitzgerald, Louise F., Fritz Drasgow, Charles L. Hulin, Michele J. Gelfand, and Vicki J. Magley, 1997. "Antecedents and Consequence of Sexual Harassment in Organizations: A Test of an Integrated Model", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), pp. 578—589
- Fitzgerald, Louise F. and S.L. Shullman, 1993. "Sexual Harassment: A Research Analysis and Agenda for the 1990s", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 5-27.
- Foulis, Danielle and Marita McCabe, 1997. "Sexual Harassment: Factors Affecting Attitudes and Perceptions", *Sex Roles*, 37 (9/10), pp. 773 – 798.
- Hallock K.F., W. Hendricks, and E. Broadbent, 1998. "Discrimination by gender and disability status: Do worker perceptions match statistical measures?", *Southern Economic Journal*, 65 (2), October, pp. 245-263.
- Hampton, Mary B. and John S. Heywood, 1993. "Do Workers Accurately Perceive Gender Wage Discrimination?", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 47(1), October, pp. 36-49.
- International Labour Office (ILO), 1992. *Combating Sexual Harassment at Work, Conditions of Work Digest*, Vol. 11(1), Geneva.
- Johnson, Richard W. and David Neumark, 1997. "Age Discrimination, Job Separations, and Employment Status of Older Workers: Evidence from Self-Reports" *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 32(4), Autumn, pp. 770-811.
- Konrad, Alison M. and Barbara A. Gutek, 1986. "Impact of Work Experiences on Attitudes Toward Sexual Harassment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 31 (3), pp. 422–438.
- Kuhn, Peter J., 1987. "Sex Discrimination in Labor Markets: The Role of Statistical Evidence", *American Economic Review*, 77, September, pp. 567-583.
- , "Sex Discrimination in Labor Markets: The Role of Statistical Evidence: Reply", *American Economic Review*, 80(1), pp. 20-297.
- Laband, David N. and Bernard F. Lentz, 1993. "Is There Sex Discrimination in the Legal Profession? Further Evidence on Tangible and Intangible Margins", *Journal of Human Resources*, 28(2), Spring, pp. 230-258.
- Locke, E.A., 1976. "The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction" in M. Dunnette (Ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, pp. 1297-1349.
- Magley, Vicki J., Charles L.Hulin, Louise F. Fitzgerald, and Mary DeNardo, 1999. "Outcomes of Self-Labeling Sexual Harassment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), pp. 390-402.

- Mangione, T. W., and R. P. Quinn, 1975. "Job Satisfaction, Counterproductive Behaviour and Drug Use at Work." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60. pp. 114-116.
- Marin, Amy J. and Rosanna E. Guadagno, 1999. "Perceptions of Sexual Harassment Victims as a Function of Labeling and Reporting", *Sex Roles*, 41(11/12), 921 – 940.
- Prior, John B., Julie Fitness, Claudio Hutz, Martin Kumpf, Karin Lubbert, Outi Pesonen, Maureen Wang Erber, 1997. "Gender Differences in the Interpretation of Social-Sexual Behavior: A Cross-Cultural Perspective on Sexual Harassment", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28(5), 509 – 534.
- Rostker, Bernard D.; Harris, Scott A.; Kahan, James P.; Frinking Erik J.; Fulcher, C. Neil; Hanser, Lawrence M.; Koegel, Paul; Winkler, John D.; Boultinghouse, Brent A.; Heilbrunn, Johana; Lever, Janet; MacCoun, Robert; Tiemeyer, Peter; Zellman, Gail L.; Berry, Sandra H.; Hawes-Dawson, Jennifer; Ravich, Samantha; Schlossman, Steven L.; Haggarty, Timothy; Jacobson, Tanjam; Livers, Ancella; Mershon, Sherie; Cornell, Andrew; Schuster, Mark A.; Kanouse, David E.; Kington, Raynard; Litwin, Mark; Schmidt, Conrad Peter; Builder, Carl H.; Jacobson, Peter; Saltzburg, Stephen A.; Brown, Roger Allen; Fedorochko, William; Fisher, Bubbles; Peterson, John F. and James A. Dewar, 1993. "Sexual Orientation and U.S. Military Personnel Policy", MR-323-OSD, Santa Monica: RAND.
- Schneider, Kimberly T., Suzanne Swan, and Louise F. Fitzgerald, 1997. "Job-Related and Psychological Effects of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Empirical Evidence From Two Organizations." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(3), pp. 401 – 515.
- Shields, Michael and Stephen Wheatley Price. 2002. "Racial Harassment, Job Satisfaction and Intentions to Quit: Evidence from the British Nursing Profession." *Economica*, 69(274), pp. 295-326.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (USMSPB), 1995. *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Trends, Progress, Continuing Challenges*, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Endnotes

¹ Specifically, 1980 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines emphasized that sexual harassment is *unwelcome* sexual behavior (emphasis added) (Prior, et al., 1997).

² Johnson and Neumark (1997) analyze the effect of self-reported age discrimination on subsequent employee separations.

³ See Schneider, et al., (1997) and Fitzgerald, et al., (1997) for reviews of the literature regarding the incidence and consequences of sexual harassment in the workplace.

⁴ Ideally we would have liked to use data from all years of the GSS (i.e., 1972-2004), however the GSS only asked questions on job satisfaction, intentions to quit, gender discrimination, and sexual harassment in 2002.

⁵ These values can be calculated by tabulating column percentages in Table 1.

⁶ Previous research indicates that workers' intentions to quit are related to future quitting behavior. For example, military personnel's stated intentions regarding reenlistment are highly predictive of actual reenlistment behavior (Chow and Polich, 1980; Rostker, et al., 1993).

⁷ The one is exception that men are 5 percentage points more likely to report they are somewhat satisfied with their job than are women.

⁸ Information about the variables included in Z, including means and standard deviations, are provided in Appendix Table 1.

⁹ The indicator variables capturing self-employment (n=2) or employment in the government sector (n=20) are set to zero when the underlying variable is missing. Job tenure is replaced with mean job tenure for two women who had missing values for this variable.

**Table 1. Cross-Tabulations of Sexual Harassment and Gender Discrimination by Gender
(Frequency and Row Percentages)**

Panel A: Men			
Sexual Harassment	Gender Discrimination		
	Not Reported	Reported	Total
Not Reported	782	18	800
	97.75	2.25	100.00
Reported	13	9	22
	59.09	40.91	100.00
Total	795	27	822
	96.72	3.28	100.00
Panel B: Women			
Sexual Harassment	Gender Discrimination		
	Not Reported	Reported	Total
Not Reported	735	76	811
	90.63	9.37	100.00
Reported	39	24	63
	61.90	38.10	100.00
Total	774	100	874
	88.56	11.44	100.00

Table 2. Reports of Sexual Harassment, Gender Discrimination, Job Satisfaction, and Intentions to Find New Job

Panel A: Men								
	Reports of Behavior	Job Satisfaction				Intentions to Find New Job		
		Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not At All Likely
		0.466 (0.499)	0.429 (0.495)	0.073 (0.260)	0.032 (0.175)	0.182 (0.386)	0.206 (0.404)	0.612 (0.488)
Sexual Harassment	0.027 (0.161)	0.045 (0.213)	0.591 (0.503)	0.182 (0.395)	0.182 (0.395)	0.500 (0.512)	0.273 (0.456)	0.227 (0.429)
Gender Discrimination	0.033 (0.178)	0.333 (0.480)	0.333 (0.480)	0.222 (0.424)	0.111 (0.320)	0.259 (0.447)	0.222 (0.424)	0.519 (0.509)
Panel B: Women								
	Reports of Behavior	Job Satisfaction				Intentions to Find New Job		
		Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not At All Likely
		0.499 (0.500)	0.380 (0.486)	0.085 (0.279)	0.037 (0.188)	0.196 (0.397)	0.205 (0.404)	0.600 (0.490)
Sexual Harassment	0.072 (0.259)	0.333 (0.475)	0.365 (0.485)	0.175 (0.383)	0.127 (0.336)	0.381 (0.490)	0.159 (0.368)	0.460 (0.502)
Gender Discrimination	0.114 (0.318)	0.310 (0.465)	0.450 (0.500)	0.150 (0.359)	0.090 (0.288)	0.260 (0.441)	0.220 (0.416)	0.520 (0.502)

Number of observations are 822 and 874 men and women, respectively.

**Table 3. Determinants of Job Dissatisfaction and Intentions to Find a New Job
(Probit Marginal Effects)**

	Job Dissatisfaction		Intentions to Find New Job	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Sexual Harassment (H)	0.161 (0.122)	0.102 (0.066)	0.293 (0.145)	0.066 (0.086)
Gender Discrimination (D)	0.185 (0.113)	0.098 (0.049)	-0.139 (0.102)	0.112 (0.065)
H*D	-0.036 (0.064)	0.025 (0.082)	0.366 (0.249)	0.040 (0.149)
Race				
Black	0.074 (0.039)	-0.009 (0.027)	0.151 (0.059)	0.158 (0.052)
Other	0.016 (0.042)	0.018 (0.047)	0.120 (0.079)	0.105 (0.077)
Immigrant	0.107 (0.049)	0.066 (0.044)	0.155 (0.067)	0.099 (0.063)
Age	-0.002 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.007 (0.002)	-0.005 (0.002)
Marital Status				
Married	0.020 (0.026)	-0.041 (0.027)	0.011 (0.050)	-0.097 (0.048)
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	0.034 (0.036)	0.007 (0.031)	0.055 (0.061)	-0.022 (0.054)
Number of Children Ever Had	-0.016 (0.008)	0.001 (0.009)	-0.004 (0.016)	-0.001 (0.015)
Education				
High School	-0.030 (0.030)	-0.081 (0.036)	-0.001 (0.062)	0.017 (0.066)
Associate/Junior College	-0.039 (0.029)	-0.075 (0.024)	0.023 (0.085)	-0.048 (0.082)
Bachelor's	-0.072 (0.022)	-0.048 (0.031)	0.062 (0.075)	0.014 (0.076)
Graduate	-0.070 (0.020)	-0.085 (0.022)	-0.095 (0.079)	-0.030 (0.089)
Full-Time	-0.074 (0.041)	-0.019 (0.026)	-0.135 (0.059)	-0.113 (0.043)
Self-Employed	-0.022 (0.026)	-0.074 (0.023)	-0.079 (0.053)	-0.117 (0.055)
Government Employee	0.001 (0.029)	-0.013 (0.027)	-0.130 (0.049)	-0.024 (0.049)
Job Tenure	-0.000 (0.002)	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.013 (0.003)	-0.018 (0.003)
Observations	822	874	822	874

Probit also includes indicator variables for region and SMSA.

Appendix Table 1. Sample Means by Gender

	Male		Female	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Race				
White	0.810	0.392	0.762	0.426
Black	0.123	0.328	0.175	0.380
Other	0.067	0.250	0.063	0.243
Immigrant	0.097	0.297	0.101	0.301
Age	39.917	11.668	40.222	11.904
Marital Status				
Married	0.505	0.500	0.454	0.498
Separated/Divorced/Widowed	0.190	0.392	0.265	0.442
Single	0.305	0.461	0.280	0.449
Number of Children Ever Had	1.347	1.420	1.645	1.405
Education				
Less Than High School	0.103	0.305	0.082	0.275
High School	0.536	0.499	0.540	0.499
Associate/Junior College	0.084	0.277	0.095	0.293
Bachelor's	0.180	0.384	0.191	0.393
Graduate	0.096	0.295	0.092	0.289
Full-Time	0.882	0.323	0.749	0.434
Self-Employed*	0.140	0.347	0.112	0.316
Government Employee*	0.144	0.351	0.183	0.387
Job Tenure*	7.091	8.409	6.437	7.746
Region				
New England	0.060	0.237	0.059	0.237
Mid Atlantic	0.153	0.360	0.143	0.350
East North Central	0.163	0.370	0.161	0.368
West North Central	0.083	0.276	0.087	0.282
South Atlantic	0.189	0.391	0.190	0.392
East South Central	0.069	0.254	0.069	0.253
West South Central	0.090	0.286	0.093	0.290
Mountain	0.058	0.235	0.068	0.251
Pacific	0.135	0.342	0.130	0.337
SMSA	0.745	0.436	0.739	0.439
Number of Observations	822		874	

*Missing values coded as zero for self-employed (n=2) and government employee (n=20), respectively. Job tenure is replaced with mean job tenure for two women who had missing values for this variable.