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ABSTRACT

Harris, Krista N. M.S., Department of Psychology, Wright State University, 2023. Development and Validation of a Norm Violation Sexual Harassment Scale

Sexual harassment continues to be an important area of study. However, there’s a dearth of research regarding sexual harassment towards others that considers sex, gender, and sexual orientation. Previous research has suggested that gender harassment and heterosexist harassment are intertwined (Leskinen & Cortina, 2014), but little research has examined how the empirical and conceptual overlap of gender harassment and heterosexist harassment could allude to a more general construct, norm violation sexual harassment. Norm violation sexual harassment is an overarching construct focusing on norm violations rather than sex, gender, or sexual orientation specifically. Using two samples, my study demonstrates evidence for the unidimensional construct of norm violation sexual harassment. Moreover, I developed the norm violation sexual harassment scale (NVSHS), providing evidence for reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and its usefulness over the SHP. Therefore, the NVSHS should be considered in future harassment work and studied further to provide additional validation evidence.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................................................................................................................. 1
Development and Validation of a Norm Violation Sexual Harassment Scale .......................................... 3
Defining Sex, Gender, and Sexual Orientation ......................................................................................... 2
Sexual Harassment ............................................................................................................................................. 3
The Intertwining of Gender Harassment and Heterosexist Harassment ........................................... 4
Legislation ............................................................................................................................................................ 6
Development of a Norm Violation Sexual Harassment scale .............................................................. 8
Validation evidence ........................................................................................................................................... 10
    Norm Violation Sexual Harassment: A unidimensional construct ........................................ 10
    Norm Violation Sexual Harassment: Reliability, validity, and the nomological network ... 10

II. METHOD ........................................................................................................................................................... 14
Item Development .............................................................................................................................................. 12
Pilot Study ........................................................................................................................................................... 13
    Participants and Procedure ................................................................................................................... 13
    Additional Measures .......................................................................................................................... 14
    Data Cleaning .......................................................................................................................................... 15
    Item analysis ........................................................................................................................................... 16
Main Study ......................................................................................................................................................... 16
    Participants and Procedure ................................................................................................................... 16
    Additional Measures .......................................................................................................................... 17
    Data Cleaning .......................................................................................................................................... 19
    The second sample ............................................................................................................................... 19

III. RESULTS .......................................................................................................................................................... 22
College Sample ..................................................................................................................................................... 20
    Item Analyses and Reliability Evidence ........................................................................................... 20
    Exploratory Factor Analysis ............................................................................................................ 21
    Validity Evidence ...................................................................................................................................... 21
    Regression Analyses ........................................................................................................................... 22
Online Sample .................................................................................................................................................. 23

IV. DISCUSSION ..................................................................................................................................................... 26
Norm Violation Sexual Harassment ............................................................................................................ 25
Convergent and Discriminant Validity ........................................................................................................ 27
Implications ....................................................................................................................................................... 30
Limitations and Future Directions ............................................................................................................. 31
Conclusion ......................................................................................................................................................... 35
References.....................................................................................................................38
Appendices..................................................................................................................63
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 ........................................................................................................................................... 47
Figure 2 ........................................................................................................................................... 48
Figure 3 ........................................................................................................................................... 49
Figure 4 ........................................................................................................................................... 50
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development and Validation of a Norm Violation Sexual Harassment Scale

Researchers have found that 81% of women and 43% of men in the United States reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment in their lifetimes (Stop Street Harassment, 2018). Previously, research has focused on more intense, sexualized forms of sexual harassment, such as unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion (Fitzgerald et al. 1995). However, evidence has suggested that the subtler form of sexual harassment, gender harassment (hostile and degrading attitudes), is the most prevalent (Pryor & Fitzgerald, 2003).

Levisken and Cortina (2014) divided gender harassment into the facets of sexist remarks, sexually crude behavior, infantilization, work/family policing, and gender policing. More specifically, sexist remarks refer to insulting behaviors that do not have sexually crude implications, the second factor covers sexually crude behaviors, infantilization contains belittling behaviors such as treating people as ignorant or dumb, the work/family policing factor assesses the policing of boundaries between work and home life (e.g., the “proper” place for a woman is at home), and the final factor refers to policing appearance and violations of gender norms. Gender harassment has been found to lead to host of negative professional outcomes, such as lower levels of job satisfaction, disengagement from work, and impaired team relationships (Fitzgerald & Cortina, 2017).

Past research has found that gender harassment is complementary to the mistreatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) populations (Rabelo & Cortina, 2014) and highly correlated with heterosexist attitudes, specifically insensitive verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey disdain for nonheterosexuality (Leskinen & Cortina, 2014). Even though
these harassing behaviors are intertwined, little research has examined how the empirical and conceptual overlap of gender harassment and heterosexist harassment could allude to a more general underlying construct, norm violation sexual harassment. The construct of norm violation sexual harassment refers to more subtle sexual harassing behaviors (see Figure 1). More specifically, norm violation sexual harassment encompasses underlying attitudes and behaviors that demonstrate a contempt for those violating societal norms. In other words, norm violation sexual harassment is an overarching construct that consists of both gender harassment and heterosexist harassment, suggesting that there is a more general form of harassment focusing on norm violations rather than sex, gender, or sexual orientation specifically.

This focus on norm violations can be elucidated by social psychological theories. Specifically, social identity theory states that individuals form a social identity based upon the groups to which they perceive that they belong (Tajfel, 1974, Turner et al., 1975). Turner and colleagues (1975) continue by stating that social identity corresponds to positive feelings towards one’s perceived group, also known as ingroup bias. One of the required components for ingroup bias is an outgroup to form comparisons against and thus increase positive views for the ingroup. These social comparisons lead to negative outcomes such as moral superiority, fear or distrust of outgroup members, and prejudice against outgroup members (Brewer, 1990). In fact, even if there are not aggressive responses to outgroups, members of an ingroup might have an “absence” of positive feelings for outgroups, leading to more subtle forms of discrimination (Brewer, 1990). This aligns with the concept of norm violation sexual harassment, in which the more subtle form of sexual harassment, gender harassment (and the conceptually similar construct heterosexist harassment), are not outwardly aggressive and sexualized forms of sexual harassment but consist of negative attitudes and behaviors towards outgroup members. The
outgroup members would be those individuals who fall outside of the gender and sexual norms. An important emphasis on social identity theory is that an individual’s social identity is formed around perceived belonging (Tajfel, 1974). Therefore, if individuals perceive themselves to belong to certain social groups, they can engage in outgroup prejudices, even if they may objectively belong in that outgroup. For example, if a woman perceives herself to belong in a group that supports traditional values, she might perceive other women more negatively if they violate that traditional role. More specifically, she might have negative attitudes towards another woman who violates gender norms, such as placing work ahead of family or dressing in a masculine fashion.

On the other hand, research has found that mere exposure to outgroups can lead to decreased negative effects and increased liking (Zajonc, 1968; Zebrowitz et al., 2008). Therefore, individuals who have increased exposure to those violating gender norms would likely have lower levels of prejudice towards that outgroup. For example, age or geographic location could impact exposure to, and therefore, feelings towards gender and sexual outgroups. Overall, the theories of social identity, social comparisons, ingroup-outgroup behaviors, and mere exposure can help explain why individuals may or may not engage in norm violation harassing behaviors, even if they are of similar sex, gender, or sexual orientation.

A unidimensional construct of norm violation sexual harassment extends the literature by expanding the definition of gender harassment to include harassment regarding persons of gender minority status (people whose gender identification does not coincide with assigned sex at birth and people whose gender identity does not fit within the gender binary; Salomaa & Matsick, 2019), persons of differing sexual orientations, and in situations in which relationships of a sexual nature are not an issue. Not only that, but the construct of norm violation sexual
harassment draws from social psychological theory and gives a better understanding of the nuances of sexual harassment that is more diverse and less sexualized in nature. Therefore, the purpose of my study is to develop and provide validation evidence for a measure to effectively capture the construct of norm violation sexual harassment.

**Defining Sex, Gender, and Sexual Orientation**

Sex and gender are often used interchangeably, and sexual orientation and gender identity are often conflated, so it is important to clarify these constructs (see Table 1 for an overview). Sex refers to a person’s biological status, and indicators of sex are sex chromosomes, hormones, internal reproductive organs, and external genitalia (Heise et al., 2019). On the other hand, gender refers to the social and behavioral characteristics of individuals (Pryzgoda & Chrisler, 2000). Defining sex and gender interchangeably implies a binary gender system (i.e., male and female) and could lead to the exclusion of individuals with different identities (Lindqvist et al., 2020). Because gender is complex and needs more than a simple definition, Lindqvist et al. (2020) suggested deconstructing gender into four facets: physiological aspects (sex), gender identity (how a person internally identifies and identity can be stable or fluid), legal gender (assigned gender at birth or gender today), and gender expression (how individuals outwardly present themselves).

Sexual orientation refers to attraction, and sexual minorities refer to those who do not identify as heterosexual. Previously, sexual orientation research emphasized stable homosexual versus heterosexual groups, but recently researchers have acknowledged the fluidity of sexual orientation (e.g., Diamond, 2005; Hu, Xu, & Tornello, 2016) and have been more aware of the expanding list of sexual identities (e.g., asexual, pansexual, undecided; Salomaa & Matsick, 2019). Gender minorities include people whose gender identification does not coincide with
assigned sex at birth and people whose gender identity does not fit within the gender binary (Salomaa & Matsick, 2019). Often the two groups are equated with one another. However, sexual orientation and gender are distinct with some overlap: gender minorities may or may not identify as heterosexual and sexual minorities may or may not identify as a gender minority. Therefore, the two groups might share the umbrella term of LGBTQ+ but are distinct.

Also, gender within organizations is becoming more nuanced and diverse, with an increase of individuals identifying outside of a binary (male and female) and more individuals identifying as different from their assigned sex at birth (Dray et al., 2019). Often, those identifying differently fall under the transgender umbrella and can include (but are not limited to) trans men, trans women, non-binary individuals, gender-fluid individuals, and multi-gender individuals.

**Sexual Harassment**

There are many terms and definitions used within sexual harassment research, so it is important to clarify those terms as well. Multiple court cases (see legislation section for more detail) have used the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC; 1980) guidelines to define sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination. These court cases defined sexual harassment as either quid pro quo harassment (sexual coercion and exchange) or a hostile work environment (behaviors leading to distress at work). However, these legal definitions did not specify different types of sexual harassment or examine possible dimensions. Fitzgerald et al. (1995) bridged this gap and broadly defined sexual harassment by three dimensions: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. As previously stated, a frequent definition of gender harassment refers to attitudes that are degrading or insulting and can result in degrading interpersonal behaviors such as jokes, slurs, taunts, or sexist comments about a
person’s gender. Furthermore, Fitzgerald described unwanted sexual attention as sexually driven behavior that is offensive and unwanted, and sexual coercion as sexual cooperation for job opportunities. “Simply put, gender harassment is a put-down whereas unwanted sexual attention/coercion is a come-on” (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). When comparing the aforementioned legal definitions to the three dimensions defined by Fitzgerald, gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention often fall under hostile work environment, and sexual coercion aligns with quid pro quo harassment (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). Fitzgerald et al.’s work implicitly assumed interactions between binary male and female individuals, including a connotation of sexuality.

My research extends the literature by expanding the definition of gender harassment to include persons of gender minority (people whose gender identification does not coincide with assigned sex at birth and people whose gender identity does not fit within the gender binary; Salomaa & Matsick, 2019) status and in situations in which relationships of a sexual nature are not an issue. My research defined sex discrimination as discrimination based on sex, gender, or sexual orientation, regardless of whether the discrimination is sexual in nature.

The Intertwining of Gender Harassment and Heterosexist Harassment

Gender harassment is often associated with other forms of harassment, with the most conceptually similar being heterosexist harassment. Heterosexist harassment is defined as a construct similar to gender harassment because heterosexist harassment also includes insensitive verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Heterosexist harassment is harassment geared specifically towards animosity for nonheterosexuality and can include offensive comments about sexual orientation, name-calling, and crude jokes (Leskinen & Cortina, 2014). There are similarities between heterosexist harassment and gender harassment. For example, Konik and Cortina (2008) found stronger correlations between gender harassment and heterosexist harassment ($r = .84$)
compared to gender harassment and sexualized harassment ($r = .68$) or heterosexist harassment and sexualized harassment ($r = .59$). Even though the correlation between gender and heterosexist harassment was high, Konik and Cortina found that including all three separate factors resulted in the best fitting model of harassment. However, behaviors that stigmatize LGBTQ+ individuals include gender identity and expression along with sexual orientation, so gender harassment and heterosexist harassment are intertwined (Rabelo & Cortina, 2014).

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) individuals face heightened levels of harassment and discrimination. Research has suggested that many LGBTQ+ employees encounter heterosexist harassment during their careers (Eliason et al., 2011) and experience increased levels of gender harassment as a result of deviating from gender norms (Rabelo & Cortina, 2014). Even though strides have been made, approximately 21% of the United States population is still of the opinion that homosexuality should not be accepted by society (Pew Global Attitudes Project, 2019). Discrimination and harassment for gender minorities can include unique types of harassment such as incorrect gendering, insensitive and intrusive questions (Nadal et al., 2012), and rejection or mistreatment from coworkers (Dray et al. 2019). Furthermore, nonbinary gender identities tend to be delegitimized in workplaces. Specifically, these individuals are more likely to repeatedly be called by incorrect pronouns and forced into a gender binary (Dray et al., 2019). These aspects of incorrect gendering and intentionally being called the wrong pronoun align with the previously defined gender harassment subdomain of gender policing. Other evidence of gender policing of LGBTQ+ employees was found: one in five workers were told to dress more masculinely or femininely (Human Rights Campaign, 2018). Also, the survey stated that 53% of LGBTQ+ employees heard insensitive jokes, 41%
heard transgender-specific jokes, and 18% received inappropriate sexual comments because a coworker thought it was okay due to the respondent’s sexual orientation or gender identity.

Finally, gender harassment and heterosexist harassment are also similar in that they are not a “come on” like sexual harassment, but a “put down” (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). The harassment is not necessarily sexual in nature, but due in part to discrepancies in power and ingroup-outgroup biases. Therefore, the intertwining and clear similarities among the concepts could suggest a unidimensional norm violation sexual harassment construct. Creation of an inclusive unidimensional scale to examine a person’s proclivities to harass not only towards one sex, but all genders and not only from a heterosexual perspective, but all sexual orientations, is necessary for the advancement of harassment research.

**Legislation**

To gain a deeper understanding of sexual harassment and the issues that still arise within the law, I describe below the court cases that helped set sex discrimination precedents (see Table 2 for an overview). Although sex discrimination is typically portrayed as interactions of a sexual nature between men and women in the workplace, the legal system focuses on negative treatment because of an individual’s sex, gender, or sexual orientation. The following court cases are a few examples of precedents that led to this current legal view of sex discrimination.

Sexual harassment was first considered illegal in the court case of *Barnes v Costle* (1977), when it was identified as a type of sex discrimination. In 1980, the EEOC defined sexual harassment at work as “Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual’s employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual’s work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment” (EEOC,
1980). Hostile work environment harassment was added to the protections of Title VII in the ruling of *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson* (1986). This was the first sexual harassment case to reach the supreme court, and this case advanced the legal definition of sex-based harassment by stating that harassment need not be tied to sexual exchange to be considered a violation. In *Harris v. Forklift Systems Inc.* (1993), unlawful behaviors included gender harassment under Title VII because a hostile work environment included an environment that was abusive due to “intimidation, ridicule, and insult.” Some examples of comments made to Harris included, “You’re a woman, what do you know” and “We need a man as the rental manager.” *Williams v. General Motors Corp.* (1999) decided that even if a behavior is not sexually explicit, it is sex-based if it targets women. However, a variety of other cases dismissed hostile work environment claims or claims that were not sexually motivated (e.g., *Wilson v. City of Des Moines*, 2004; *Duncan v. General Motors Corp.*, 2002; *Pirie v. The Conley Group, Inc.*, 2004; *LaMont v. Ind. Sch. Dist.*, 2012). Often, gender harassment has been overlooked in the law even if the harassment has met all criteria for a hostile work environment (Leskinsen & Cortina, 2014).

Within the LGBTQ+ community, legislation has made strides to grant equality and protections at work. For example, the Supreme Court ruling of *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins* (1989) defined mistreatment because of non-conformance to gender norms and stereotypes as a type of sex discrimination. However, the *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins* (1989) case also concluded that an employer is not liable if there is proof that the same employment decision would be made without the addition of discrimination. *Polly v. Houston Lighting and Power Company* (1992) is an example in which the male plaintiff was taunted physically, sexually, and verbally by male coworkers because he was perceived as too effeminate. *Onacle v. Sundowner Offshore Services, Inc.* (1998) clarified that same-sex harassment is included under sex
discrimination. The decision ruled that discrimination based on sex extends to “discrimination of any kind that meets the statutory requirements.” In Bostock v. Clayton County (2020), the Title VII protections for sex discrimination extended to LGBT discrimination. However, recent court cases have ruled that businesses are exempted from nondiscrimination laws when the conveyed messages go against the business because it violates the first amendment (303 Creative LLC v. Elenis, 2023). This decision demonstrates that sex discrimination against the LGBTQ+ community is still unsettled.

These cases are important for gender and heterosexist harassment research because they are not sexually explicit or motivated. However, similar to gender harassment, lawmakers are still debating whether and when LGBTQ+ harassment should be considered protected under Title VII. For example, the Bostock v. Clayton County (2020) decision did not address the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and left whether it could supersede the Title VII protections up to future cases. The 303 Creative LLC v. Elenis (2023) case is one such example of protections being superseded. Overall, the legal view of sex discrimination and Title-VII protections have expanded to include mistreatment relating to sex, gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation. However, regarding gender discrimination and LGBTQ+ discrimination, there is still much that needs to be done.

**Development of a Norm Violation Sexual Harassment scale**

Previous studies (as shown in Table 3) have attempted to measure the likelihood that individuals will engage in sexual harassment (e.g. Bartling & Eisenman, 1993, Pryor, 1987) but only included more severe forms of sexual harassment. Not only that, but Pryor’s (1987) scale only examined men harassing women, and whereas Bartling and Eisenman’s (1993) scale included women, it did not examine gender harassment. Other measures of sexual harassment
were from the viewpoint of victims and asked about the prevalence of harassment (e.g., Sexual Experiences Questionnaire; Fitzgerald et al., 1995), and these included measures of gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. More recently, researchers have developed measures building on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire to examine the prevalence of different facets of gender harassment (e.g., Gender Experiences Questionnaire; Leskinen & Cortina, 2014). When examining heterosexist harassment, researchers have developed scales to measure incidents of harassment (e.g., Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire; Waldo, 1999), and more recently researchers have modified the Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire to be more applicable to gender minorities (e.g., Brewster et al., 2012). However, I found no scales that attempted to measure gender or heterosexist harassment from the perpetrator’s perspective, and more specifically, no measures that provide evidence for a unidimensional construct of norm violation sexual harassment.

Despite advances in sexual harassment research, researchers need additional scales to measure norm violation harassing behaviors from the perpetrator’s perspective. The creation and validation of a scale that is inclusive of gender and sexual orientation is important to further harassment research. Typically, harassment research and legislation have focused on sexual harassment as being sexual in nature and through a heterosexual lens. Due to recent court cases discussed above, legally, sex discrimination covers anyone being harassed because of their sex or gender, regardless of sexual orientation. However, recent legislation has also shown that sex discrimination is still unsettled in the form of LGBTQ+ discrimination. Therefore, sexual harassment research needs to consider the current legal atmosphere and include a measure that comprises of sex, gender, and sexual orientation.
Validation evidence

Norm Violation Sexual Harassment: A unidimensional construct

To date, there are no measures of norm violation sexual harassment. A norm violation sexual harassment scale (NVSHS) would reflect harassment regarding sex, gender, and sexual orientation, demonstrating the overarching form of harassment towards norm violations. Moreover, the mistreatment would not necessarily be sexual in nature, making it unique from more sexualized harassment (e.g., sexual coercion and unwanted sexual attention). Therefore, the nature of the harassing behaviors along with how previous research has shown these variables to be intertwined, would reflect a unidimensional construct.

Hypothesis 1: Harassment regarding sex, gender, and sexual orientation reflects a unidimensional construct, norm violation sexual harassment.

Norm Violation Sexual Harassment: Reliability, validity, and the nomological network

Along with the aforementioned hypothesis, several other criteria were established to collect validation evidence for the norm violation sexual harassment scale (NVSHS). The first condition was that my measure demonstrates acceptable reliability via internal consistency. The second (positive correlations), third (negative correlations), and fourth (low correlations) criteria for validation examine how my measure fits into the current nomological network (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). Due to the definitions of gender and heterosexist harassment, it is intuitive to think that higher levels of sexism and lower levels of allyship will be associated with gender harassment and heterosexist harassment, and therefore the NVSHS. Although sexualized harassment and subtler forms of sexual harassment are unique, they are also positively correlated (e.g., Konik & Cortina, 2008), therefore the Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale should correlate positively with the NVSHS. Counterproductive work behaviors (CWBs), or workplace
deviance, are often defined as intentional behaviors that harm or intend to cause harm to people or the organization (Spector et al., 2006). Barrett and Robinson (2000) found that workplace deviance could be separated into two general factors: deviance towards others (interpersonal deviance; CWBs towards individuals, CWB-I) and deviance towards the organization (organizational deviance; CWBs towards the organization, CWB-O). They also suggested that individuals who partake in interpersonal deviance are likely different from those who engage in organizational deviance. Based on the definition of CWB and the two factors mentioned, sexual harassment could be defined as a specific type of CWB towards others. Due to sexual harassment’s similarity with counterproductive work behaviors towards others, the NVSHS should correlate with CWB-I. However, Barrett and Robinson (2000) stated that individuals would differ depending on the type of deviance they engage in, therefore my scale should not correlate strongly with CWB-O. Personality traits have been measured in past harassing behaviors research. Conscientiousness (e.g., Hardies, 2019; Ménard et al., 2010; Pryor & Meyers, 2000) and Agreeableness (Lee et al., 2003; Krings & Facchin, 2009; Ménard et al., 2010) has been found to correlate negatively with sexual harassing behaviors. Neuroticism was found to correlate positively with sexual harassing behaviors (Ménard et al., 2010). Extraversion has also been found to positively correlate with harassing behaviors, however, the correlation was low (Menard et al., 2010). Openness has also been studied with sexual harassment, and results demonstrated that higher levels of sexual harassment behaviors were reported by those lower in openness (Hardies, 2018). Along with that, one of the prominent criteria in workplace research is job satisfaction, therefore, it seemed like a valuable criterion variable to examine. Fitzgerald and Cortina (2017) found that those who experienced higher levels of gender harassment had lower job satisfaction. Perhaps those engaging in norm violation sexual harassment behaviors would
also demonstrate lower levels of job satisfaction. Finally, participants might respond to my measure with the motivation to be seen positively instead of responding truthfully. Therefore, the addition of a social desirability scale is included and should not correlate with my measure. If items correlate significantly with the social desirability measure, it will give evidence for a strong motivation to be seen positively by society and distort responses (DeVellis, 2016). See Table 4 for all hypothesized variables.

In summary, there are multiple conditions to provide validation evidence for my measure:

1) The NVSHS will be reliable based on internal consistency.

2) The NVSHS will be positively correlated with the sexual harassment proclivities, ambivalent sexism, and neuroticism.

3) The NVSHS will be negatively correlated with allyship, conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, CWB-I, and job satisfaction.

4) The NVSHS will show weak correlations with extraversion, CWB-O, and social desirability.

**Method**

First, I conducted my study with a pilot sample. Then, I collected two samples for the main study. I followed similar formats with all samples in terms of data cleaning, descriptive statistics, and analyses.

**Item Development**

I developed the norm violation sexual harassment scale by combining two techniques: a literature review of previous scales and a content analysis of relevant court cases. I conducted a literature review and found existing scales addressing sexuality and gender such as the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1995), the Likelihood of Sexual Harassment Scale
(Pryor, 1987), and the modified Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire (Brewster et al., 2012). I modified potential items that I deemed important. Also, I conducted a content analysis of the court cases mentioned previously. I analyzed the reports for any content discussing harassment based on gender or sexuality and constructed items similar to that conduct. Between those techniques and additional items I created based on the definitions of gender and heterosexist harassment, I created an initial list of 158 items. The norm violation sexual harassment scale was presented on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Following the guidelines discussed by Hinkin (1998), I kept statements short, I used simple and consistent language, and made sure that each item had only one issue stated. Then, I asked fellow graduate students and a professor with knowledge of the construct to assess the items I developed. This involved an independent review of the items by each individual. They were asked whether each item captured norm violation harassing behaviors and reviewed the items for clarity and phrasing. The edited items were selected for the pilot study.

**Pilot Study**

With the first iteration of the scale, I conducted a pilot study \( (n = 149) \) to make sure the items were clear, make sure there was no redundancy, gather any relevant feedback, and conduct item reliabilities. Another purpose of the pilot study was to find the most reliable items and shorten the scale (see the item analysis section for more detail).

**Participants and Procedure**

A sample of 149 participants from a Midwestern college participated in my pilot study online. Qualified participants had to be at least 18 years of age and speak fluent English. Also, to better ensure data quality, I had participants complete three attention checks during the questionnaire. The insufficient effort responding (IER) checks were implemented within the
personality questionnaire and stated, “I do not understand a word of English” (Meade & Craig, 2012) and “I can travel through time and space” (Huang et al., 2012). Along with that, I asked participants to write out what number to dial in case of an emergency. Also, previous research (e.g., Berry et al., 2012) has found that more than one step to assure anonymity increases the quality of the obtained data. Therefore, I was not only be explicit in explaining that all responses will be anonymous and confidential, but also assigned participants survey IDs. The participants took the previous proclivities measure first (Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale) followed by a social desirability scale, the Ambivalent Sexism scale, and finally the current measure. Those who completed the survey received 2 extra credit points through the college’s online system.

The final sample for my pilot study included 111 participants after cleaning. The average age of my sample was 20.41 (SD = 3.84). The majority of the sample identified as female (71.8%), white (76.1%), and straight (71.6%).

**Additional Measures**

**Demographics.** I assessed various demographic items for each participant (Appendix K).

**Social Desirability scale.** I included Strahan and Gerbasi’s (1972) 10-item M-C X1 scale, a short, homogenous version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960). I implemented this scale because it is one of the shortest social desirability questionnaires, has previously been found to have a high internal consistency (KR-20 = .79), is highly correlated with the original measure (r = .96), and has been found to be an improvement over the original scale (Chi-square difference from original form: $\chi^2 = 641.26, p < .01$; Fischer & Fick, 1993). Participants responded with a true-false format, and correct answers were summed (KR-20 = .62). An example item is: “I always try to practice what I preach”). See Appendix A for the items.
Ambivalent Sexism. I assessed ambivalent sexism with Glicke and Fiske’s (1996) 22-item measure (original scale reliabilities: $\alpha = .83$ to .90). The measure included the subscales of hostile sexism (e.g., “Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist”) and benevolent sexism (e.g., “Women should be cherished and protected by men”). Respondents indicated how much they agreed or disagreed with each item on a 6-point scale from 0 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). I summed and averaged the scores and participants with higher scores were higher in both benevolent and hostile sexism. The reliability for the benevolent sexism subscale was $\alpha = .72$ and the reliability of the hostile sexism subscale was $\alpha = .85$. See Appendix G for the full measure.

Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale. I implemented the 10-item Bartling and Eisenman (1993) Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale (SHP; $\alpha = .86$ for men and $\alpha = .74$ for women in the original scale) as a measure of sexual harassment likelihood. Participants responded on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). I summed the scores, and higher scores represented higher levels of sexual harassment proclivities. An example item is: "If I were a supervisor on a job, I would not hesitate to ask an attractive subordinate for a date.” The reliability was sufficient ($\alpha = .80$). See Appendix B.

Data Cleaning

I checked for and removed the data for those who had a pattern of insufficiently responding. I flagged those who failed the attention checks and the written response question. Those who did not pass at least two of the three previously mentioned IER checks and those who did not complete the questionnaire had their data removed. A total of 38 participants’ data were removed.
**Item analysis**

I conducted a series of analyses on the pilot study sample ($N = 111$) to refine the items based on scale reliabilities as measured by Cronbach’s alphas. I examined the intercorrelations and dropped the worst performing items, repeating the process until at 50 items. After that, items were evaluated theoretically and based upon their wording and the potential repetition between items. Items that were deemed too similar were discussed with a professor knowledgeable in the construct, and the agreed upon best item was kept for further studies. Other items were also removed or altered due to their phrasing, in which discussions were conducted to determine if potential items were confusing or could be misread. See Table 5 for examples of theoretically dropped items.

Finally, I went through and kept items that were considered important for the construct, producing a 48-item scale ($\alpha = .97$; Appendix I). Along with that, the pilot study examined the correlations between my measure, Bartling and Eisenman’s (1993) measure, and Glicke and Fiske’s (1996) measure (Table 6).

**Main Study**

**Participants and Procedure**

The sample for the first data collection of the study included 203 participants from a Midwestern college who completed my study online. I determined my sample size by calculating the number of participants I would need for a small effect size of 0.20 at 80% power. This came out to 150 participants in G*power, and I rounded up to 200 to account for unusable participants (e.g., bots, IER). Qualified participants had to be at least 18 years of age and speak fluent English. Also, following the suggestions of Aguinis et al. (2020), I had participants complete six attention checks during the questionnaire and asked them to write out what number they should
call in case of an emergency. The insufficient effort responding (IER) checks asked during the questionnaire included items such as “I do not understand a word of English,” “I am paid biweekly by leprechauns,” (Meade & Craig, 2012) and “I can travel through time and space” (Huang et al., 2012). See Appendix K for all items. Further, I checked response time and flagged anyone who responded quicker than 2 seconds per item (Bowling et al., 2018). Also, previous research (e.g., Berry et al., 2012) has found that more than one step to assure anonymity increases the quality of the obtained data. Therefore, I was not only explicit in explaining that all responses will be anonymous and confidential, but also assigned participants survey IDs. The participants took the validity measures first (social desirability, perspective taking, personality, allyship, ambivalent sexism, CWB, job satisfaction, political attitudes), followed by the current measure, and finally the SHP scale. The participants from a Midwestern college were compensated with 2 extra credit points through the online system. The final sample for the first data collection included 171 participants. The average age of my sample was 22.43 (SD = 6.85), with the majority being female (73.10%), white (61.99%) and straight (71.35%).

Additional Measures

Along with the measures of Social Desirability (KR-20 = .59), Ambivalent Sexism (benevolent sexism: $\alpha = .75$; hostile sexism: $\alpha = .87$), and the Sexual Harassment Proclivities scales ($\alpha = .87$) used in the above pilot sample, I also implemented additional measures.

**Personality.** I used the 50-item International Personality Item Pool representation of the Costa and McCrae (1992) NEO-PI-R domains to assess personality traits. The scales have been reported to have sufficient reliabilities ($\alpha = .77-.86$). I examined the traits of Extraversion ($\alpha = .85$; e.g., “I make friends easily”), Agreeableness ($\alpha = .74$; “I believe others have good intentions”), Conscientiousness ($\alpha = .79$; e.g. “I am always prepared”), Neuroticism ($\alpha = .83$;
Participants responded to each item on the 10-item subscales on a 5-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). I summed the scores and higher scores indicated higher levels of each trait. A higher score in extraversion indicated more thrill-seeking and energetic behaviors compared to sober and solitary ones, higher agreeableness indicated more kind and trusting behaviors compared to competitive ones, conscientiousness ranged from disciplined (high) to laidback (low), neuroticism ranged from emotional distress to emotional stability, and low openness referred to traditional features whereas high indicated curious features (Costa & McCrae, 1992). See Appendix C for the full measure.

**Allyship Identity.** I used the 38-item Ally Identity Measure (Jones & Brewster, 2020) to measure three areas of ally identity that have reported sufficient reliabilities (α = .76-.82). The three areas were knowledge and skills (α = .87; e.g., “I am aware of policies in my workplace and or community that affect sexual minority groups”), openness and support (α = .88; e.g., “I try to increase my knowledge about sexual minority groups”) and oppression awareness (α = .80; e.g., “I think the sexual minority groups are oppressed by society in the United States”). Participants responded on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). I summed the scores and higher scores on each subscale indicated higher levels of that area of allyship. See Appendix D for the full measure.

**Counterproductive Work Behaviors.** I included Bennett and Robinson’s (2000) 19-item Workplace Deviance Measure (original scale α = .78) as a measure of counterproductive work behavior towards the individual. Participants responded with their engagement for each item during the past year on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (daily). I averaged the scores, with higher scores representing higher engagement in deviant behaviors. I found
acceptable reliabilities for the individual ($\alpha = .83$; “I have made fun of someone at work”) and organizational ($\alpha = .84$; “I have taken property from work without permission”) subscales. See Appendix F for full measure.

**Job Satisfaction.** I incorporated the 3-item Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Scale (MOAQ-JSS; original $\alpha = .82$) as a measure of global job satisfaction (Cammann et al., 1979). I decided to use this scale over other job satisfaction scales because of the advantages of its length, face validity, and because it assesses global job satisfaction (Bowling & Hammond, 2008). Participants responded on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). I averaged the scores, and higher scores represented higher levels of job satisfaction. I found acceptable reliability for the scale ($\alpha = .92$). An example item is “All in all I am satisfied with my job.” See Appendix G for the full measure.

**Data Cleaning**

I checked for and removed those who had a pattern of insufficiently responding. First, I flagged those who did not pass the attention checks or the written response question. Along with that, I flagged those who did not meet the page time minimum. Finally, I removed the data for those who were flagged on at least three attention check items, over half of the pages for page time, and those who did not complete the questionnaire Overall, the data for 29 participants were removed.

**The second sample**

The sample for the second data collection of the study included 500 participants who completed the study online via Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). The data for the second sample was part of a larger data collection, in which the items for my measure were included but
not used. The study for the second sample was approved by the AFRL Institutional Review Board.

Qualified participants had to be at least 18 years of age and speak fluent English. Also, participants completed six attention checks during the questionnaire such as “I do not understand a word of English,” “I am paid biweekly by leprechauns,” (Meade & Craig, 2012) and “I can travel through time and space” (Huang et al., 2012). See Appendix K for all items. Further, I checked response time and flagged anyone who responded quicker than 2 seconds per item (Bowling et al., 2018), and conducted long string analyses on the data as well. Also, previous research (e.g., Berry et al., 2012) has found that more than one step to assure anonymity increases the quality of the obtained data. Therefore, I was not only explicit in explaining that all responses will be anonymous and confidential, but also assigned participants survey IDs. I paid those who completed the study in MTurk $3.00 for their time, denying compensation for any participants who did not pass over half of the IER checks. The final MTurk sample for my study included 420 participants. The average age of my sample was 39.96 (SD = 10.94), with the majority being male (55.48%).

Results

College Sample

Item Analyses and Reliability Evidence

First, I conducted a series of analyses on the college sample (N = 171) to further refine the items based on scale reliabilities as measured by Cronbach’s alphas. I examined the intercorrelations and dropped the worst performing items. I then evaluated the kept items for wording, phrasing, and repetitiveness until I was at the proposed 20 items. I tested the internal
consistency of my measure and found that the Cronbach’s alpha value was sufficient ($\alpha = .94$). The first criterion for the creation of my scale was supported.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

Next, I was interested in the fit of the NVSHS. Therefore, I conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the items with maximum likelihood extraction and set to a single factor. As illustrated in Figure 2, results of the scree plot indicated a one factor solution. Results of the EFA demonstrated adequate fit ($RMSR = 0.05$, $TLI = 0.90$; $RMSEA = 0.07$). Factor loadings from the single factor solution are illustrated in Table 7. Hypothesis 1 was supported.

**Validity Evidence**

I then examined the evidence for construct validity for the NVSHS via convergent and discriminant validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Convergent validity is obtained when scales that should be related theoretically are related, whereas discriminant validity evidence occurs when scales that are theoretically independent are not significantly correlated to one another (Binning & Barrett, 1989). I examined the convergent validity of my scale for both positive (criterion 2) and negative (criterion 3) relationships along with the discriminant validity of my scale (criterion 4).

First, I tested the correlations of the NVSHS with the proposed positively correlated scales (ambivalent sexism, neuroticism, CWB-I, and SHP). I found partial support for criterion 2. More specifically, my scale was significantly correlated with all three measures, however, neuroticism was negatively correlated with my scale (see Table 8). These results demonstrated that the NVSHS was significantly positively related to both factors of ambivalent sexism (hostile and benevolent), interpersonal deviance, and a previous sexual harassment proclivities scale.
Interestingly, neuroticism was significantly negatively correlated with the NVSHS, suggesting that those lower in neuroticism had higher levels of norm violation harassment.

Then, I examined the correlations between the NVSHS and the proposed negatively correlated scales (allyship, conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, and job satisfaction). Overall, I found significant correlations between my scale and all three factors of allyship along with openness. I found marginal significance for the correlation between the NVSHS and agreeableness but lacked evidence for a significant relationship between my scale and conscientiousness or job satisfaction (see Table 9). Thus, there was partial support for criterion 3. More specifically, there were significant negative relationships between the NVSHS and all three factors of allyship (knowledge and skills, openness and support, and oppression awareness) and openness, suggesting that as allyship and openness increased, norm violation sexual harassment decreased. Interestingly, neither conscientiousness nor agreeableness were statistically significant, even though prior research has found significant results (e.g., Ménard et al., 2010). There was also no significant correlation with job satisfaction, the proposed criterion variable.

Finally, I examined the discriminant validity of my scale. I tested the correlations between my scale and the proposed weakly correlated scales (extraversion, CWB-O, and social desirability. Overall, I found support for criterion 4 because there was no evidence for significant correlations between my scale and any of the three discriminant validity scales (see Table 10). The results demonstrated that there was not a significant relationship between norm violation sexual harassment and socially desirable responding, extraversion, or organizational deviance.

**Regression Analyses**

To examine the usefulness of the NVSHS compared to the previous sexual harassment proclivities scale (SHP), I utilized hierarchical regressions. For the first set of regressions, I
controlled for the SHP to examine if my scale explained unique variance in the ambivalent sexism, allyship, and openness scales. I chose these measures because the correlations between the NVSHS and these measures were significantly high, these measures were statistically significant, and the ambivalent sexism, allyship, and openness scales share conceptual overlap with the construct of norm violation harassment. In step 1 of each analysis, I regressed the variables onto the SHP, and then in step 2 I added in the NVSHS. The results demonstrated that the NVSHS accounted for incremental variance for both factors of sexism, all three factors of allyship, and openness. In Table 11, I reported the unique variance for all scales that was explained by my scale after the SHP was accounted for. Along with that, I conducted a second set of hierarchical linear regressions to examine the effects of the SHP after controlling for the current NVSHS. I found that the SHP accounted for significant incremental variance in only two of the variables, hostile and benevolent sexism. The lack of significance for the allyship and openness measures demonstrates that the NVSHS is an important contribution to the harassment literature, especially concerning harassment regarding sexual orientation and gender. Not only that, but the unique explained variance provided by the NVSHS demonstrates the usefulness of the scale and how it contributes above and beyond the SHP, despite the high correlation between the two measures, and the high correlations between the two sexual harassment measures and the examined variables.

**Online Sample**

The sample collected via MTurk was used to test the internal consistency of the measure in a different study population. The reliability for the second sample was also found to be sufficient (α = .96), providing additional evidence for the first criterion for validation evidence regarding my scale. Along with that, I was interested in performing a confirmatory factor
analysis (CFA) on my scale using the new sample, following the EFA from the first sample. To assess model fit, I utilized the CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR. I used the cutoff criteria discussed by Hu and Bentler (1999): a CFI close to 0.95, an RMSEA value close to 0.06, and an SRMR value close to .08 for acceptable model fit. My results demonstrated acceptable fit based upon these criteria: CFI = 0.92, RMSEA = 0.09, SRMR = 0.04.

Furthermore, I was interested in examining sex differences in the NVSHS. To test for this, I conducted an independent samples t-test on men versus women on the average NVSHS scores. Results demonstrated that men ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 1.05$) scored significantly higher than women ($M = 2.21$, $SD = 0.93$; $t(595.5) = 2.92$, $p < .01$). This suggests that overall men are more likely to endorse norm violation harassing behaviors than women. Alongside men and women, three participants identified as other. Interestingly, this third group had the lowest average NVSHS score ($M = 1.80$, $SD = 0.59$), but due to the small sample size they were not included in the analysis.

Overall, my criteria for scale validation were generally supported. The first criterion stated that my scale would have acceptable internal consistency, and the reliability estimates for both samples were sufficient ($\alpha = .94-.96$). The additional criteria (two through four) were presented in the proposed relationships table (see Table 4). Therefore, the overall actual findings are shown similarly in Table 12.

**Discussion**

The purpose of my study was to propose the construct of norm violation sexual harassment and to create and validate a measure of norm violation sexual harassment. My results indicated that the scale was internally consistent, had acceptable convergent validity, and had evidence for discriminant validity. My results contribute to the literature by providing evidence
for a unidimensional construct of norm violation sexual harassment and in creating a measure of harassment proclivities that is inclusive of sexuality and gender. This is especially important because recent court cases have demonstrated that even though sex discrimination includes sexual orientation and gender (*Bostock v. Clayton County*, 2020), there is ongoing debate regarding this outcome (*303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*, 2023), and it is therefore still unsettled and pervasive. Therefore, adequately measuring proclivities to engage in these norm violation sexual harassment behaviors is imperative and necessary for researchers and organizations alike to better understand the nuances and impact of sexual harassment that is inclusive of sex, sexual orientation, and gender.

**Norm Violation Sexual Harassment**

The NVSHS was determined to be composed of a single factor by an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on a student sample and additional evidence for the single factor was collected via a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on a separate MTurk sample. The presence of a single factor, and therefore, a unidimensional construct, infers that there is an underlying form of harassment regardless of sex, gender, or sexual orientation. Norm violation sexual harassment is based more so on norm violations, demonstrating that those engaging in gender harassment and heterosexist harassment are focusing on the violation of norms instead of specifically targeting someone based on sex, gender, or sexual orientation. This draws from social psychological theory regarding social identity theory and social categorization, providing more insight into sexual harassment that is more diverse and less sexualized in nature. As an example, someone who scored high on the NVSHS would target not only women who violate societal norms (e.g., works in a male-dominated role or acts masculinely), but also men who violate societal norms
(e.g., is not traditionally masculine or is gay) and people who do not conform to gender norms or identify outside of the binary.

Research has suggested that gender harassment and heterosexist harassment comprise of unique constructs even though they were found to be highly correlated at $r = 0.84$ (Konik and Cortina, 2008). However, others have concluded that the two constructs are very intertwined and consist of similarities such as gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation (Rabelo & Cortina, 2014), along with composing of “put downs” instead of “come ons” (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). The current measure emphasizes the overlapping of these concepts and suggests that there is an underlying form of harassment that encompasses both gender and heterosexist harassment, coined as norm violation sexual harassment.

Along with evidence supporting a unidimensional construct, the NVSHS also had sufficient reliabilities as demonstrated by the college sample ($\alpha = .94$) and the MTurk sample ($\alpha = .96$). Previous work has suggested that the acceptable Cronbach’s alpha value should not drop below .70, however, more recently it has been suggested that ideally adequate reliability should not be lower than .80 because .70 reliability only indicates modest reliability (Chung et al., 2023). The authors go on to state that low reliability in a scale might not be considered relevant because error is accounted for when examining relationships between constructs, however, low reliability does not wash out and leads to less powerful testing. The NVSHS had reliability values above this threshold, adequately demonstrating sufficient reliability and less error variance to account for between relationships with the other variables of interest.

Furthermore, additional exploratory analyses were conducted on the MTurk sample to examine the effect of sex on the NVSHS. Results demonstrated that there were significant differences between those identifying as men and women on the NVSHS. More specifically, men
had significantly higher scores than women, suggesting that men were more likely to engage in norm violation harassing behaviors. This was an interesting finding demonstrating sex differences, and further research would be beneficial to gain a better understanding of how various demographics respond to the NVSHS. In fact, it is important to note that although only men and women were examined, there were additional participants who identified as other. Because of the small sample size, they were omitted from the analysis, however descriptive statistics demonstrated that those identifying as other had the lowest average NVSHS scores. Therefore, it would be interesting to examine these differences statistically in a larger and more diverse sample. Although beyond the scope of this paper, additional group differences would be interesting and important to examine. For example, research has demonstrated that increased exposure to outgroups reduces prejudice, therefore there may be group differences in NVSHS scores regarding other genders, age, geographic location, political preferences, and religiosity.

**Convergent and Discriminant Validity**

The NVSHS showed sufficient discriminant validity for all proposed variables and sufficient convergent validity for all but three of the hypothesized variables. These results demonstrated that the NVSHS yielded relationships that match the criteria put forth for the nomological network. The NVSHS had high correlations (> .60) with multiple variables, specifically a high positive correlation with the hostile sexism (.67) and sexual harassment proclivities (.64) scale and a high negative correlation with the allyship subscales of openness and support (-.75) and oppression awareness (-.68). These high correlations are not unexpected because the current measure includes content that overlaps with these scales: hostile sexism refers to attitudes that are negative towards women and stereotypically sexist (Glicke & Fiske, 1996), the sexual harassment proclivities scale measures hostile work environment sexual
harassment proclivities, the openness and support subscale concerns an openness to learn about the LGBTQ+ community and engage in activism, and the oppression awareness subscale encompasses empathy for and having awareness of LGBTQ+ discrimination and oppression (Jones et al., 2014). As seen in Appendix J below, the current scale contains items such as “Women who dress seductively want to be noticed”, “Men tend to be more rational than women,” and “Transgender discrimination does not exist,” which overlap with the constructs of hostile work environment sexual harassment, hostile sexism, and allyship respectively.

Along with that, the high correlations between the current measure and hostile sexism could be explained by sexist behaviors comprising the most common form of gender harassment (e.g., Leskinen et al., 2011). The high negative correlations with the allyship subscales could be due in part to LGBTQ+ individuals facing heightened levels of gender harassment because of their failure to conform to gender norms and stereotypes (Rabelo & Cortina, 2014). In fact, Rabelo and Cortina found that heterosexist harassment rarely occurred without gender harassment (<10% of the time). Also, the high correlation between the sexual harassment proclivities scale and the current measure demonstrates that the current scale also measures sexual harassment.

It is also important to mention that although the correlations between the constructs are high, recent work suggests that they are not at a level of concern. Chung et al. (2023) state that any relationship below .70 shares no more than 49% of the variance, and therefore has more unique variance than shared variance between the constructs. They go on to mention that additional steps should be taken, and more concern should be given to relationships that exceed .80 and .85. Because none of the relationships with the NVSHS exceeded .80, I was not
concerned that the NVSHS and the highly correlated measures were accounting for the same construct.

Furthermore, the NVSHS is an important contribution because of its usefulness over the Sexual Harassment Proclivities scale. This can be demonstrated by the exploratory hierarchical regressions using ambivalent sexism, LGBTQ+ allyship, and openness as the outcome variables. I found that the NVSHS explained unique variance in all these variables after controlling for the previous harassment proclivities scale, the SHP. When controlling for the NVSHS, the SHP only accounts for significant incremental variance in the ambivalent sexism scales. The usefulness of the current scale is greater as it considers not only sexual harassment based on sex, but sexual orientation and gender as well.

Interestingly, the lack of validation evidence for my scale mostly occurred within personality factors, with there being a lack of significance for a negative relationship with conscientiousness, a marginal significance for a negative relationship with agreeableness, and a significant relationship with neuroticism in the opposite direction (negative relationship). The other non-significant finding was job satisfaction. The neuroticism relationship was interesting and when examining its relationship with other variables, we can see neuroticism was consistent with most other variables in Table 7. Neuroticism was negatively related to sexism (hostile and benevolent) and sexual harassment proclivities. These relationships could be unique to the current sample. However, prior research has demonstrated that neuroticism predicts sexual harassment differently for men and women (Hardies, 2018), so further research could examine the potential sex differences of these variables.

A possible explanation for the lack of significance in these variables is the range restriction of my scale. The mean of the scale was 2.22, which reflects the low base rates of the
scale. This could be unique for the specific sample, however, the MTurk sample had low base rates as well, with an average of 2.38. Both samples were negatively skewed as seen in Figures 3 and 4. Due to the nature of the scale, a high level of disagreement is not surprising. Socially desirable responding can occur in questionnaires regarding sensitive topics, suggesting that items are often not answered genuinely. However, the issue of socially desirable responding and how it was accounted for, is discussed in the limitations section below.

Between the aforementioned concerns and other potential issues, the current measure has a low mean and range of responses. This distortion could influence the relationship between my measure and other measures in the study. Therefore, the possibility of range restriction could have attenuated the relationships with contentiousness, agreeableness, and job satisfaction, and those high in neuroticism would have no high ratings of the current scale with which to correspond.

**Implications**

The current study has implications for sexual harassment literature and theory along with practical implications as well. First, the current study demonstrates a single factor construct of norm violation sexual harassment that encompasses harassment regarding sex, gender, and sexual orientation. This suggests that there is a common underlying factor for those who have the propensity to engage in gender or heterosexist harassment. Prior research surrounding this topic has often focused on the victim’s perspective and found that gender and heterosexist harassment, though highly correlated, consisted of separate constructs. The current research not only examines gender harassment from the harasser’s perspective but found that gender and heterosexist harassment are best represented by single construct. This adds to the harassment
literature and can inform researchers about the similarities between those who would engage in norm violation harassing behaviors.

Furthermore, there are a lack of scales measuring sexual harassment from the harasser’s perspective, specifically regarding less sexualized forms of harassment. Moreover, most scales measuring sexual harassment are not inclusive of sexual and gender minorities. Finally, the norm violation sexual harassment scale was developed with theory in mind and utilizing the content of court cases regarding sexual and gender-based harassment. Therefore, the norm violation sexual harassment scale is advisable over other scales that measure gender harassment proclivities due to the inclusive nature of the scale and the psychometric rigor used in the development of the scale.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

Adequately defining the constructs of sex, gender, and sexuality was an issue that could have affected how confident I was in my conclusions. This influenced my conclusions because sex and gender are often confounded, the distinction between the variables is sometimes not known, and individuals might not have a sufficient knowledge base of the LGBTQ+ community. I made sure to be explicit about the LGBTQ+ aspect of the study to make sure that participants knew what was involved, but future research should take additional steps. Future research should examine knowledge of the constructs when using the sexuality and gender scale and should analyze how and when people confound sex and gender. This will give a better understanding of the variables and will help future research by giving ways to separate the two constructs.

One issue raised by my research is socially desirable responding of participants due to the nature of the questionnaire. Because of the emotional and controversial nature of workplace harassment, the likelihood of socially desirable responding is a potential methodological issue.
(Barling, 1998). Participants may have responded in a socially desirable way due to the sensitive nature of the scale. I included a scale to measure and account for social desirability (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972), and I made sure to be explicit about the anonymity and confidentiality of the study, but I did not take additional measures to reduce it. My scale’s low base rates could suggest that future research needs to address socially desirable responding by taking steps to reduce it by embedding it in a cover story or with other items.

Another issue raised by my research is common method variance. Many authors and reviewers are concerned about common method variance and how it spuriously inflates relationships, which leads to criticisms and issues with the use of self-report measures (e.g., Edwards, 2008; Conway & Lance, 2010). To account for this, I was careful when writing the item content, made sure to report evidence of reliability and validity for the current measure and similar measures (Conway & Lance, 2010), and I provided evidence of discriminant validity. Even though I used more stringent guidelines, the use of self-report measures might have led to monomethod effects. My additions might not have eliminated the effects, but just reduced them. Therefore, my results suggest that future research should address this issue by potentially adding in a measure that is not self-report in nature or by conducting a research design that investigates common method variance with latent variables (see Williams & McGonagle, 2016 for four such designs).

A third limitation of my study was that it was correlational and cross-sectional in nature. By using a correlational design, I could not draw causal inferences. This is common in survey research, especially when studying a topic as sensitive as harassment. Also, the design was cross-sectional, which impacts the confidence I have in the reliability of my scale. Future research should include measures of test-retest reliability and test-retest reliability with alternate forms. A
second study design limitation was that the study did not measure actual harassing behaviors. When developing a scale to measure harassment proclivities, it would be expected to use that scale to predict the occurrence of actual harassment. However, due to the nature of the study, this was not feasible. It is prudent for future research to continue validating my scale and use it to predict actual harassing behaviors in the workplace.

A final limitation of my study was the non-normality of the NVSHS. I tested for normality by observing the histogram for the average NVSHS responses along with conducting the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality (Royston, 1982). My results demonstrated evidence of non-normality, therefore, I accounted for the non-normality by transforming the responses on the NVSHS. I did this by conducting the square root transformation (see Osborne, 2002) and the histogram for the transformed data was approximately normally distributed. After this, I re-ran the EFA with the transformed data and found comparable results to the non-transformed data. Therefore, for the sake of clarity and interpretability (Osborne, 2002), I kept the original data and EFA results. However, future research would do well to take additional steps to analyze and account for non-normal data.

One of the most important future directions for the validation of a new measure consists of the collection of additional validation evidence. More specifically, the NVSHS should be further validated to better understand the construct and also test for other forms of reliability, such as test-retest reliability. Sufficient test-retest reliability would demonstrate that the NVSHS is consistent and stable over time. Moreover, it would be interesting to not only test the same individuals for stability of the measure, but also test them before and after giving them information about sexual harassment and LGBTQ+ populations to examine if that alters their scores on the NVSHS. This would provide evidence for changes in actual NVSHS scores with
additional information, or exposure, regarding the outgroups of interest. Furthermore, future researchers would do well to continue to validate the NVSHS. There needs to be additional validation evidence to better understand how the NVSHS relates to similar and dissimilar constructs via additional convergent and discriminant validity respectively. Also, additional research should examine how the NVSHS is understood by individuals, such as by examining the substantiative validity (Anderson & Gerbing, 1991) of the NVSHS via a card sorting task. According to Anderson and Gerbing (1991), substantiative validity is an item-level analysis that examines how each item aligns with a construct of interest. Therefore, the implementation of a card sorting task would give researchers additional information about the NVSHS, specifically how participants sort the content of each of the items. For example, the participants could sort items from the NVSHS and other scales into areas such as sexual harassment, norm violations, and LGBTQ+. The items would be considered to have high substantive validity if most participants correctly place the items under the construct of interest, in this case norm violation harassment. Additionally, an item sorting task could elucidate if the items on related measures such as the Sexual Harassment Proclivities scale (Bartling & Eisenman., 1993) and the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glicke & Fiske, 1996) are seen by participants to also be measuring norm violations.

The current study demonstrated that the NVSHS yielded relationships that matched what was proposed in the criteria for the nomological network (Cronbach & Meele, 1955). However, the aforementioned future research, along with additional research, could provide additional evidence to determine where the NVSHS resides in the nomological network. Using this information, researchers could better understand how the NVSHS fits into the current nomological network and it would provide additional information for future work regarding
norm violation sexual harassment. Overall, the NVSHS has begun to be validated, but additional evidence still needs to be procured. The current study was just the first of many steps to validate this new measure.

Conclusion

Sexual harassment research has been an important area of study for decades, but it was not until more recently that gender harassment, and how gender harassment overlaps with heterosexist harassment, was considered (e.g., Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Konik & Cortina, 2008). However, even with the increased research interest in these areas of study, there is a lack of an inclusive scale that examines someone’s propensity to engage in these norm violation harassment behaviors. This is especially poignant because of the recent court cases regarding sexual harassment and discrimination surrounding LGBTQ+ individuals (e.g., Bostock v. Clayton County, 2020; 303 Creative LLC v. Elenis, 2023). Across a pilot study as well as two different study populations, I found validation evidence for a scale supporting a unidimensional construct of norm violation sexual harassment. Therefore, the NVSHS should be further studied and validated and considered in future harassment work.
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### Table 1

**Defining Sex, Gender, and Sexual Orientation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Sub-terms</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>The biological status of individuals.</td>
<td>Gender identity: It defines how an individual internally identifies.</td>
<td>male, female, intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>The social and behavioral characteristics of individuals.</td>
<td>Gender expression: It defines how an individual outwardly presents themselves.</td>
<td>transgender individuals, non-binary individuals, gender-fluid individuals, multi-gender individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender minority: An individual whose gender identification does not coincide with their assigned sex at birth; their gender identity does not fit within the gender binary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>The attraction of individuals.</td>
<td>Sexual minority: An individual who does not identify as heterosexual.</td>
<td>gay, lesbian, bisexual, asexual, pansexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

#### Summary of Sexual Harassment Legislation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnes v Costle (1977)</td>
<td>Sexual harassment was considered illegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOC (1980)</td>
<td>Sexual harassment was defined by Title VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson (1986)</td>
<td>Hostile work environment harassment was added to the protections of Title VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly v. Houston Lighting and Power Company (1992)</td>
<td>A male plaintiff was harassed by male coworkers because he was perceived as feminine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris v. Forklift Systems Inc. (1993)</td>
<td>Hostile work environment was included gender harassment under Title VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onacle v. Sundowner Offshore Services, Inc. (1998)</td>
<td>Same-sex harassment was included under sex discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams v. General Motors Corp. (1999)</td>
<td>Behaviors were considered sex-based harassment if they targeted women, even if the behaviors were not sexually explicit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostock v. Clayton County (2020)</td>
<td>Title VII protections for sex discrimination extended to LGBTQ+ discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Creative LLC v. Elenis (2023)</td>
<td>The first amendment exempted businesses from LGBTQ+ antidiscrimination laws.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3**

*Review of Current Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Facets and Descriptions</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pryor (1987)</td>
<td>Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale</td>
<td>1) Sexual exploitation: elicit sexual favors from another person through the threat of punishment/promise of reward (quid pro quo harassment)</td>
<td>Perpetrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartling &amp; Eisenman (1993)</td>
<td>Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale</td>
<td>1) Unwanted sexual attention: unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other conduct of a sexual nature (hostile work environment)</td>
<td>Perpetrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Waldo (1999)             | Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire | 1) Direct heterosexist discrimination: behaviors causing physical harm  
2) Indirect heterosexist discrimination: behaviors that suggest the concealment of an identity                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Victim       |
| Fitzgerald et al. (1995) | Sexual Experiences Questionnaire | 1) Gender harassment: attitudes that are degrading or insulting (hostile work environment)  
2) Unwanted sexual attention: sexually driven behavior that is offensive and unwanted (hostile work environment)  
3) Sexual coercion: sexual cooperation for job opportunities (quid pro quo harassment)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Victim       |
| Brewster et al. (2012)   | Workplace Heterosexist Experiences Questionnaire – Transgender Form | 1) Direct heterosexist discrimination: behaviors causing physical harm  
2) Indirect heterosexist discrimination: behaviors that suggest the concealment of an identity                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Victim       |
| Levisken and Cortina (2014) | Gender Experiences Questionnaire | 1) sexist remarks: insulting behaviors (not sexually crude)  
2) sexually crude behaviors  
3) infantilization: belittling behaviors  
4) work/family policing: policing of boundaries between work and home life  
5) gender policing: policing appearance and violations of gender norms                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | Victim       |
Table 4

*Proposed Relationships between Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesized Correlation with NVSHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent sexism</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyship</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5

**Examples of Theoretically Dropped Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wording</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phrasing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repetition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Items in italics were kept for further studies.
Table 6

**Pilot Study Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Scale</th>
<th>SHP</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>SocDes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Scale</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHP</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 111. ** = p < .01. * = p < .05. SHP = Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale. HS = Hostile Sexism. BS = Benevolent Sexism. SocDes = Social Desirability.*
### Table 7

*Factor Loadings for Scale Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>$\lambda_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Some people in the gay community need to learn how to take a joke.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I use requested pronouns. (r)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transgender people are just confused.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If I see a transgender individual in the bathroom, they are a pervert</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Straight men tend to be more rational than gay men.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The “wage gap” between men and women does not exist.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The gay community forces their lifestyle onto others.</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A degree in sexuality and gender studies is ridiculous.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gay people are too sensitive.</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Transgender people are just trying to trick straight people.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Transgender discrimination does not exist.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People use their gender identity to obtain special privileges.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The idea of pride month is ridiculous.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Transgender people should not be allowed to play sports.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sex reassignment surgery is genital mutilation.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Children will grow out of wanting to change genders.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Women that dress seductively want to be noticed.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. You are less of a man if you have feminine interests.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If something is not meant sexually, then it is not sexual harassment.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Men tend to be more rational than women.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. $N = 171$. r = reverse-scored item.*
Table 8

**Correlations for Criterion 2: Positively Correlated Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>NVSHS</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CWB-I</th>
<th>SHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NVSHS</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHP</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 171. **p < .01. *p < .05. NVSHS = Norm Violation Sexual Harassment Scale. HS = Hostile Sexism. BS = Benevolent Sexism. N = neuroticism; CWB-I = interperson al counterproductive work behavior; SHP = sexual harassment proclivities scale.*
Table 9

*Correlations for Criterion 3: Negatively Correlated Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NVSHS</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>OA</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>JS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NVSHS</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.75**</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-0.68**</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.14†</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.49**</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 171. ** = p < .01. * = p < .05. † = p < .10. NVSHS = Norm Violation Sexual Harassment Scale. KS = Allyship Knowledge and Skills; OS = Allyship Openness and Support; OA = Allyship Oppression Awareness; C = Conscientiousness; A = Agreeableness; O = Openness; JS = Job Satisfaction.*
Table 10

Correlations for Criterion 4: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NVSHS</th>
<th>SocDes</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>CWB-O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NVSHS</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SocDes</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 171. ** = p < .01. * = p < .05. NVSHS = Norm Violation Sexual Harassment Scale. SocDes = Social Desirability; E = Extraversion; CWB-O = Organizational Counterproductive Work Behavior.
Table 11

Explaining Variance: Usefulness Analysis of NVSHS and SHP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion (Sexism)</th>
<th>NVSHS controlled for</th>
<th>SHP controlled for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordered predictors</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent Sexism (Benevolent Sexism)</td>
<td>NVSHS 0.26**</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHP 0.14*</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. NVSHS 0.38**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHP 0.47**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. NVSHS -0.78**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHP 0.05</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. NVSHS -0.92**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHP 0.08</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. NVSHS -0.40**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHP -0.11</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. NVSHS -0.31**</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SHP -0.10</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 171. ** = p < .01. * = p < .05. NVSHS = Norm Violation Sexual Harassment Scale; SHP = Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale.
Table 12

Proposed Versus Actual Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesized Relationships</th>
<th>Online Study Relationships</th>
<th>Online Study Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent sexism</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.67** (HS) /0.48** (BS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allyship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.48** (KS) /-0.75** (OS) /-0.68** (OA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-0.14†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-I</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB-O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Findings that did not support study criteria are italicized. H = Hostile Sexism; B = Benevolent Sexism; KS = Knowledge and Skills; OS = Openness and Support; OA = Oppression Awareness; CWB-I = Interpersonal Counterproductive Work Behavior; CWB-O = Organizational Counterproductive Work Behavior.
APPENDIX A

Social Desirability Scale

1. I like to gossip at times.
2. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
3. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
4. I always try to practice what I preach.
5. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
6. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
7. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
8. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
9. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
10. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.
APPENDIX B

Sexual Harassment Proclivities Scale

1. Women are flattered by sexual advances from men even when they fail to respond positively to these advances.
2. It is natural for men to be more aggressive when it comes to sexual relations with women.
3. Women are often inconsistent in terms of their non-verbal communications with men.
4. Women often mean “maybe” or even “yes” when they say “no” to sexual advances by men.
5. It is important for men to control the initial development of their relationships with women.
6. Women frequently use men to obtain status, security, or other things they want.
7. Women who dress in a sexy manner at work are deliberately sending a sexual message to men.
8. Highly attractive individuals (opposite in gender to me) “drive me crazy” and I sometimes do or say things around them that I can’t help.
9. Pregnant women use their conditions to justify doing less work on many jobs in comparison to their coworkers.
10. Women often are flattered by sexual advances by their coworkers.
APPENDIX C

50-item International Personality Item Pool representation of the NEO-PI-R domain

Neuroticism
+ keyed
   1. Often feel blue.
   2. Dislike myself.
   3. Am often down in the dumps.
   4. Have frequent mood swings.
   5. Panic easily.
– keyed
   6. Rarely get irritated.
   7. Seldom feel blue.
   8. Feel comfortable with myself.
  10. Am very pleased with myself.

Extraversion
+ keyed
   1. Feel comfortable around people.
   2. Make friends easily.
   3. Am skilled in handling social situations.
   4. Am the life of the party.
   5. Know how to captivate people.
– keyed
   6. Have little to say.
   7. Keep in the background.
   8. Would describe my experiences as somewhat dull.
   9. Don't like to draw attention to myself.
  10. Don't talk a lot.

Openness to Experience
+ keyed
   1. Believe in the importance of art.
   2. Have a vivid imagination.
   3. Tend to vote for liberal political candidates.
   4. Carry the conversation to a higher level.
   5. Enjoy hearing new ideas.
– keyed
   6. Am not interested in abstract ideas.
   7. Do not like art.
   8. Avoid philosophical discussions.
   9. Do not enjoy going to art museums.
  10. Tend to vote for conservative political candidates.
APPENDIX C cont.

Agreeableness
+ keyed
  1. Have a good word for everyone.
  2. Believe that others have good intentions.
  3. Respect others.
  4. Accept people as they are.
  5. Make people feel at ease.
– keyed
  6. Have a sharp tongue.
  7. Cut others to pieces.
  8. Suspect hidden motives in others.
  9. Get back at others.
 10. Insult people.

Conscientiousness
+ keyed
  1. Am always prepared.
  2. Pay attention to details.
  3. Get chores done right away.
  4. Carry out my plans.
  5. Make plans and stick to them.
– keyed
  7. Find it difficult to get down to work.
  8. Do just enough work to get by.
  9. Don't see things through.
 10. Shirk my duties.
APPENDIX D

Ally Identity Measure

Knowledge and skills
1. I know about resources (for example: books, Web sites, support groups, etc.) for sexual minority people in my area.
2. I have developed the skills necessary to provide support if a sexual minority person needs my help.
3. I know about resources for families of sexual minority people (for example: PFLAG).
4. I know of organizations that advocate for sexual minority issues.
5. I keep myself informed through reading books and other media about various issues faced by sexual minorities groups, in order to increase my awareness of their experiences.
6. I am aware of the various theories of sexual minority identity development.
7. I am aware of policies in my workplace and/or community that affect sexual minority groups.
8. If requested, I know where to find religious or spiritual resources for sexual minority people.

Openness and support
9. I have engaged in efforts to promote more widespread acceptance of sexual minority people.
10. I have taken a public stand on important issues facing sexual minority people.
11. I try to increase my knowledge about sexual minority groups.
12. I am comfortable with knowing that, in being an ally to sexual minority individuals, people may assume I am a sexual minority person.
13. If I see discrimination against a sexual minority person or group occur, I actively work to confront it.
15. I am open to learning about the experiences of sexual minority people from someone who identifies as an LGBTQ person.

Oppression awareness
16. I think the sexual minority groups are oppressed by society in the United States.
17. I think sexual minority individuals face barriers in the workplace that are not faced by heterosexuals.
18. Sexual minority adolescents experience more bullying than heterosexual adolescents.
19. Sexual minority adolescents experience more depression and suicidal thoughts than heterosexual adolescents.
APPENDIX E

Ambivalent Sexism Scale

Benevolent Sexism
1. No matter how accomplished be is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.
2. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men. (r)
3. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex. (r)
4. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.
5. Women should be cherished and protected by men.
6. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.
7. Men are complete without women. (r)
8. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.
9. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.
10. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well-being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.
11. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Hostile Sexism
12. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."
13. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.
14. Women are too easily offended.
15. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men. (r)
16. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.
17. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.
18. work.
19. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.
20. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.
21. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances. (r)
22. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men. (r)
APPENDIX F

Interpersonal and Organizational Deviance

Interpersonal Deviance
1. Made fun of someone at work.
2. Said something hurtful to someone at work.
3. Made an ethnic, religious, or racial remark at work.
4. Cursed at someone at work.
5. Played a mean prank on someone at work.
6. Acted rudely toward someone at work.
7. Publicly embarrassed someone at work.

Organizational Deviance
8. Taken property from work without permission.
9. Spent too much time fantasizing or daydreaming instead of working.
10. Falsified a receipt to get reimbursed for more money than you spent on business expenses.
11. Taken an additional or longer break than is acceptable at your workplace.
12. Come in late to work without permission.
13. Littered your work environment.
14. Neglected to follow your boss's instructions.
15. Intentionally worked slower than you could have worked.
16. Discussed confidential company information with an unauthorized person.
17. Used an illegal drug or consumed alcohol on the job.
18. Put little effort into your work.
19. Dragged out work in order to get overtime.
APPENDIX G

Job Satisfaction Measure

1. All in all I am satisfied with my job.
2. In general, I don’t like my job. (r)
3. In general, I like working here.
APPENDIX H

Demographics

1. Age
2. Gender
3. Sexual Orientation
4. Employment Status
APPENDIX I

NVSHS Scale following Pilot Study

1. Some people in the gay community need to learn how to take a joke.
2. I feel comfortable making sexual comments about someone anonymously.
3. People should be expected to act in gender conforming ways.
4. I use requested pronouns. (r)
5. I do not think people should be able to change their pronouns.
6. Transgender people are just confused.
7. If I see a transgender individual in the bathroom, they are a pervert.
8. Straight men tend to be more rational than gay men.
9. The “wage gap” between men and women is based on work ethic.
10. The “wage gap” between men and women does not exist.
11. People use their sexual orientation to obtain special privileges.
12. The gay community forces their lifestyle onto others.
13. A degree in sexuality and gender studies is ridiculous.
14. Gay people are too sensitive.
15. Transgender people are just trying to trick straight people.
16. Transgender discrimination does not exist.
17. Transgender people have been fed lies.
18. We need to convince gay people that they are straight.
19. People use their gender identity to obtain special privileges.
20. The idea of pride month is ridiculous.
21. Transgender people should not be allowed to play sports.
22. Transgender athletes are just boys playing in girls’ sports.
23. Sex reassignment surgery is genital mutilation.
24. Minors should not have access to transgender healthcare (e.g., puberty blockers, hormone therapy).
25. Children will grow out of wanting to change genders.
26. Women that dress seductively want to be noticed.
27. You are less of a woman if you have masculine interests.
28. You are less of a man if you have feminine interests.
29. A person’s sex and gender should match
30. I feel comfortable making homophobic comments anonymously.
31. Concerns about sexual harassment make it harder to have normal relationships.
32. If something is not meant sexually, then it is not sexual harassment.
33. Women who take a man’s job should expect harassment.
34. Men who take a woman's job should expect harassment.
35. People love to hate straight men.
36. Men tend to be more rational than women.
37. Men should not ask to take parental leave.
38. Women should not ask to take parental leave.
39. Gay parents should not be allowed to take parental leave.
APPENDIX I cont.

40. All parents should be treated equally regarding parental leave. (r)
41. Gay people develop thick skins. (r)
42. “Real men” can have feminine interests. (r)
43. Straight men are privileged. (r)
44. It is never okay to make fun of periods. (r)
45. Crude, sexual remarks are never appropriate (r)
46. School systems should teach about sexuality. (r)
47. School systems should teach about gender. (r)
48. Workers should be protected regardless of adherence to gender norms.
APPENDIX J

Final NVSHS Scale

1. Some people in the gay community need to learn how to take a joke.
2. I use requested pronouns.
3. Transgender people are just confused.
4. If I see a transgender individual in the bathroom, they are a pervert.
5. Straight men tend to be more rational than gay men.
6. The “wage gap” between men and women does not exist.
7. The gay community forces their lifestyle onto others.
8. A degree in sexuality and gender studies is ridiculous.
9. Gay people are too sensitive.
10. Transgender people are just trying to trick straight people.
11. Transgender discrimination does not exist.
12. People use their gender identity to obtain special privileges.
13. The idea of pride month is ridiculous.
14. Transgender people should not be allowed to play sports.
15. Sex reassignment surgery is genital mutilation.
16. Children will grow out of wanting to change genders.
17. Women that dress seductively want to be noticed.
18. You are less of a man if you have feminine interests.
19. If something is not meant sexually, then it is not sexual harassment.
20. Men tend to be more rational than women.
APPENDIX K

Careless Responding Items

Attention Check Items
1. I do not understand a word of English.
2. I can travel through time and space.
3. I get paid biweekly by leprechauns.
4. I have never brushed my teeth.
5. I have never used a computer.
6. I am interested in pursuing a degree in parabanjology.

Written Response Careless Responding Item
1. What number do you call in case of emergencies in the USA?