

©2007

Kimberly M. Fairchild

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

EVERYDAY STRANGER HARASSMENT: FREQUENCY AND CONSEQUENCES

by

KIMBERLY M. FAIRCHILD

A Dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-New Brunswick

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Psychology

written under the direction of

Dr. Laurie A. Rudman

and approved by

---

---

---

---

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May, 2007

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

EVERYDAY STRANGER HARASSMENT: FREQUENCY AND CONSEQUENCES

by KIMBERLY M. FAIRCHILD

Dissertation Director:

Dr. Laurie A. Rudman

Three studies demonstrate that stranger harassment (i.e., experiencing unwanted sexual attention from strangers in public) is a frequent experience for young adult women, and that it has negative implications for their well-being. Study 1, a laboratory survey, suggests that stranger harassment may increase self-objectification and thus, fear of rape and restriction in movement. Study 2, an online survey, shows a direct link from stranger harassment to fear of rape, but a surprisingly weak relationship with self-objectification. Finally, Study 3, using daily diaries, suggests that particularly young women may not view stranger harassment as a completely negative experience. In concert, the findings suggest that stranger harassment may have both direct and indirect negative effects on women's lives, but that its construal may sometimes be positive, and that it is a complex phenomenon worthy of future research.

## Acknowledgments

I would first like to thank Dr. Laurie Rudman, who served as my advisor for my six-year tenure at Rutgers University. Her enthusiasm and encouragement inspired and sustained me throughout the graduate school process. Dr. Rudman was my collaborator on this project. Portions of this dissertation, including Study 1, were previously published:

Fairchild, K. & Rudman, L.A. (in press). Everyday stranger harassment and women's objectification. *Social Justice Research*.

In addition, I would like to thank my committee members for their continued support. Dr. Dan Ogilvie and Dr. David Wilder have stuck with me through my qualifying exams and provided helpful and insightful feedback allowing me to refine my research focus. Dr. Patricia Roos brought a fresh perspective from sociology to spur me to look at my research questions from different angles.

I would also like to thank my undergraduate research assistants who always brought thoughtful and creative questions to our meetings, and without whom Study 3 would not have been possible. I especially want to thank Stephanie Ryan, Pamela Flores, and Daniel Mazzacola for their hard-work and dedication.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their support and encouragement. And most of all, I want to thank my fiancé, Kevin Driscoll, for everything.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
1.1. Sexual Harassment vs. Stranger Harassment.....	2
1.2. Consequences of Sexual and Stranger Harassment.....	7
1.2.1. Objectification.....	8
1.3. Stranger Harassment and Sexism.....	10
1.3.1. Fear of rape and restriction of movement.....	12
1.3.2. Personal Power.....	15
1.4. Coping With Stranger Harassment.....	16
1.5. Summary and Hypotheses.....	17
Study 1: Laboratory Sample.....	20
2.1. Method.....	20
2.1.1. Participants.....	20
2.1.2. Measures.....	20
2.1.2.1. Stranger harassment.....	20
2.1.2.2. Objectification.....	21
2.1.2.3. Objectification IAT.....	22
2.1.2.4. Personal power.....	22
2.1.2.5. Fear and risk of rape.....	23
2.1.2.6. Restriction of movement.....	23

2.1.2.7. Vanity.....	24
2.1.3. Procedure.....	25
2.2. Results and Discussion.....	25
2.2.1. Frequency of Stranger Harassment.....	25
2.2.2. Consequences of Stranger Harassment.....	26
2.2.3. Coping with Harassment.....	29
2.2.3.1. Objectification.....	30
2.2.3.2. Coping and Additional Outcome Variables.....	30
Study 2: Internet Sample.....	32
3.1. Methods.....	32
3.1.1. Participants.....	32
3.1.2. Measures.....	33
3.1.3. Procedure.....	33
3.2. Results and Discussion.....	35
3.2.1. Frequency of Stranger Harassment.....	35
3.2.2. Consequences of Stranger Harassment.....	35
3.2.3. Coping with Harassment.....	37
3.2.3.1. Objectification.....	38
3.2.3.2. Coping and additional outcome variables.....	38
3.2.4 Additional Comparisons.....	39
3.2.4.1. Heterosexuals vs. homosexuals.....	39
3.2.4.2. American vs. Canadian, British, & Indian Women.....	40
3.2.4.3. Age.....	41

Study 3: Classroom Sample with Diary Manipulation.....	42
4.1. Methods.....	42
4.1.1. Participants.....	42
4.1.2. Measures.....	42
4.1.2.1. Survey.....	42
4.1.2.2. Stranger harassment diary.....	43
4.1.3. Procedure.....	44
4.1.3.1. Time 1 assessment.....	44
4.1.3.2. Low response rate.....	45
4.1.3.3. Time 2 assessment.....	46
4.2. Results and Discussion.....	46
4.2.1. Diary Manipulations.....	46
4.2.2. Frequency of Stranger Harassment.....	47
4.2.3. Consequences of Stranger Harassment.....	48
4.2.4. Coping with Stranger Harassment.....	49
4.2.4.1. Objectification, fear of rape, & restriction of movement..	50
General Discussion	51
5.1 Coping with Stranger Harassment.....	53
5.2. Negative Consequences of Stranger Harassment.....	54
5.3. Limitations and Future Directions.....	55
Conclusion.....	60
References.....	61

Appendix.....	65
1. Stranger Harassment Index – Experiences.....	65
2. Stranger Harassment Index – Frequency.....	65
3. Coping with Stranger Harassment.....	66
4. Education Goal.....	67
5. Money.....	67
6. High Status Job Index.....	67
7. Self-Objectification Index.....	68
8. Restriction in Movement Scale.....	69
9. Physical Concern Vanity.....	70
10. Physical View Vanity.....	70
11. Achievement Vanity.....	70
Curriculum Vita.....	102

## List of Tables

Table 1.....	72
Table 2.....	73
Table 3.....	74
Table 4.....	75
Table 5.....	76
Table 6.....	77
Table 7.....	78
Table 8.....	79
Table 9.....	80
Table 10.....	81
Table 11.....	82
Table 12.....	83
Table 13.....	84
Table 14.....	85
Table 15.....	86
Table 16.....	87
Table 17.....	88
Table 18.....	89
Table 19.....	90
Table 20.....	91
Table 21.....	92
Table 22.....	93

Table 23.....	94
Table 24.....	95
Table 25.....	96
Table 26.....	97
Table 27.....	98
Table 28.....	99
Table 29.....	100
Table 30.....	101

## Introduction

In Margaret Atwood's novel, *A Handmaid's Tale*, women live in a society in which they are highly protected from men and the male gaze. Although they suffer other hellish forms of repression, they nonetheless enjoy the luxury of no longer being leered at by strangers. Stepping from fiction into reality, both the Japanese and Brazilian governments have recently deemed it necessary to take steps to protect women from public harassment by men. As reported by ABC News in June of 2005, the Japanese have designated women-only train cars to be used during rush hours. A Japanese survey revealed that nearly two-thirds of women in their twenties and thirties have been groped while riding the Tokyo trains and subways; the women reported feeling degraded, humiliated, and frightened by the groping ("Japan," 2005). Likewise, Women's eNews reported in May of 2006 that women in Rio De Janeiro, Brazil now have the option of riding female-only, pink-striped subway cars during rush hour (Sussman, 2006). These attempts to segregate male and female subway riders are less extreme than the gender segregation found in *A Handmaid's Tale*, but in all cases the intent is to shield women from being humiliated by men in public places.

The acknowledgement of stranger harassment, and the need to protect women from it, is virtually ignored in the social science and feminist literature. Stranger harassment is the "[sexual] harassment of women in public places by men who are strangers" (Bowman, 1993, p. 519). In other words, stranger harassment is perpetrated by men who are not known to the victim (i.e. not a coworker, friend, family member, or acquaintance) in public domains such as on the street, in stores, at bars, or on public transportation. While the phenomenon has been defined, it is infrequently studied (cf.

Gardner, 1995; MacMillan, Nierobisz, & Welsh, 2000; Lenton, Smith, Fox, & Morra, 1999). Why has stranger harassment been overlooked by social science researchers? As Bowman (1993) and Nielson (2000) suggest in their analyses of stranger harassment from a legal point of view, the study of stranger harassment may be lacking because there is no legal recourse; it is nearly impossible to sue a stranger who disappears in a flash for sexual harassment, and it is likely that few would support laws limiting the freedom of speech in public places. Gardner (1995) goes even further to suggest that stranger harassment is so pervasive that it is a part of the social fabric of public life: “Women... currently experience shouted insults, determined trailing, and pinches and grabs by strange men and [are] fairly certain that no one—not the perpetrator and probably no official—will think anything of note has happened” (p. 4). Thus, stranger harassment may be perceived to be an innocuous part of daily life, and not an important topic for study (Gardner, 1995).

However, as the Japanese and Brazilian examples suggest, stranger harassment may not be so innocuous; in both cases, the harassment experienced by women on the trains required segregating them from men. In view of the multitude of negative effects that sexual harassment has on women (described below), it becomes clear that the gap in the literature concerning stranger harassment needs to be filled. In the current research, I take a first step toward a social psychological understanding of stranger harassment.

### 1.1. Sexual Harassment vs. Stranger Harassment

Over the past twenty-five years, sexual harassment research has boomed as researchers have sought to define the components of sexual harassment and elaborate on its causes and consequences (Wiener & Gutek, 1999; Gutek & Done, 2001; Pryor &

McKinney, 1995). To do so, sexual harassment has been commonly parsed into three main components: sexual coercion, gender harassment, and unwanted sexual attention (Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). Sexual coercion is the direct request or requirement of sexual acts for job or school related rewards (e.g. promotion or a better grade); this component aligns with the legal conceptualization of *quid pro quo* sexual harassment. Gender harassment involves degradation of women at the group level such as making jokes about women as a group or posting pictures of women as sex objects. Unwanted sexual attention involves degradation of women at the individual level, such as treating a woman as a sex object by sending her dirty emails, grabbing her inappropriately, or leering at her. Both gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention fall into the legal category of hostile environment sexual harassment. Gelfand et al. (1995) note that while women frequently label sexual coercion as sexual harassment, it is experienced by only five to ten percent of samples, making it somewhat rare. Gender harassment is by far the most prevalent, experienced by approximately fifty percent or more of samples, followed by unwanted sexual attention, experienced by approximately twenty to twenty-five percent of samples.

Unfortunately, many sexual harassment researchers seem to assume that sexual harassment is a phenomenon experienced only in the workplace or at school. One of the most popular measures of sexual harassment is the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ; Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995), which asks for respondents' experiences with a variety of behaviors (e.g., "unwanted sexual attention," "told suggestive stories," and "touching in a way that made you feel uncomfortable"). The bulk of behaviors listed in the SEQ can be applied to many situations, but the majority of researchers ask

respondents to think about these experiences in the context of the workplace and school. As such, it is difficult to ascertain the frequency of sexual harassment outside of these locales. Moreover, while researchers examining sex discrimination more broadly have recognized that harassment can occur in a variety of settings (i.e., beyond the workplace and school; e.g., Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Landrine, Klonoff, Gibbs, Manning, & Lund, 1995; Landrine & Klonoff, 1997; Klonoff, Landrine, & Campbell, 2000), they often fail to separate out the effects of being harassed by strangers (as opposed to known perpetrators). For example, Berdahl (in press a) assessed undergraduate students' experiences of sexual harassment using the SEQ. Because the students had little work experience, they were encouraged to consider their experiences in relation to school and time with friends and family. While this study expands the realms of where and with whom sexual harassment can occur, Berdahl does not parse the results based on location or source. However, in more theoretical work, Berdahl (in press b) argues that sexual harassment stems from a need to maintain social status and as such can occur in any situation in which a perpetrator's status is threatened.

In *Passing By: Gender and Public Harassment*, Gardner (1995) provides an empirical focus on stranger harassment as she details the contexts in which stranger harassment takes place, the participants in stranger harassment, the behaviors that are characteristic of stranger harassment, the interpretations people have of stranger harassment, and the strategies employed to avoid stranger harassment. Her evidence stems from information obtained from 506 interviews with 293 women and 213 men. From her qualitative analysis, it is clear that stranger harassment is highly akin to sexual harassment researchers' conceptualization of unwanted sexual attention. As Bowman

(1993) describes it, stranger harassment “includes both verbal and nonverbal behavior, such as wolf-whistles, leers, winks, grabs, pinches, catcalls, and stranger remarks; the remarks are frequently sexual in nature and comment evaluatively on a woman’s physical appearance or on her presence in public” (p. 523). The information provided by Gardner (1995) gives the reader a vivid sense of the experience of stranger harassment, but she overlooks the connection between stranger harassment and the established literature on unwanted sexual attention.

To date, the work of Lenton et al. (1999) and MacMillan et al. (2000) provide the only known attempts to document experiences of stranger harassment as distinct from experiences of sexual harassment. In their study, Lenton et al. (1999) used telephone interviews to assess 1,990 Canadian women’s experiences of fear of crime and public sexual harassment. Their participants reported their levels of fear to situations such as “walking alone after dark in their own neighborhood, using public transportation alone after dark, [and] passing groups of men they do not know alone after dark” (p. 524). Then they asked participants how frequently (once, more than once, never) they had experienced unwanted sexual attention from strangers in public places since the age of sixteen. Their results suggest a high prevalence of stranger harassment with only nine percent of the sample reporting never experiencing any form of unwanted sexual attention from strangers. Over 60% experienced having unwanted sexual comments shouted at them and being stared at in a way that made them feel uncomfortable. Additionally, experiences of stranger harassment were related to increased fear of crime and use of protective strategies (i.e. avoiding certain places, carrying a whistle).

Using data collected in 1993 from a national sample of Canadian women responding to the Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS; Johnson & Sacco, 1995), MacMillan et al. (2000) focused on the data obtained from eight items measuring stranger and nonstranger sexual harassment. The stranger harassment items assessed “whether respondents had ever received an obscene phone call, received unwanted attention (i.e., anything that does not involve touching, such as catcalls, whistling, leering, or blowing kisses), been followed in a manner that frightened them, or experienced an indecent exposure” (p. 310). The items measuring nonstranger sexual harassment represented both *quid pro quo* and hostile environment sexual harassment. Their data show that eighty-five percent of the women reported experiencing stranger harassment, with the majority experiencing unwanted sexual attention (e.g., catcalls and leering). By contrast, fifty-one percent experienced nonstranger sexual harassment, with only five percent reporting having experienced *quid pro quo* sexual harassment.

Taken together Lenton et al. (1999) and MacMillan et al.’s (2000) research indicates that stranger harassment may be a more pervasive problem than nonstranger harassment. Moreover, both studies found that stranger harassment has a consistent and significant impact on women’s fears. Specifically, MacMillan et al. (2000) noted that, “Stranger harassment reduces feelings of safety while walking alone at night, using public transportation, walking alone in a parking garage, and while home alone at night” (p. 319). Both studies lend support to the notion that stranger harassment is a legitimate and important topic for further study.

## 1.2. Consequences of Sexual and Stranger Harassment

Because sexual harassment and stranger harassment are conceptually related, they are likely to produce many of the same consequences. Because MacMillan et al. (2000) showed remarkably high rates of stranger harassment, it can be further inferred that stranger harassment may affect more women than sexual harassment. The work of Louise Fitzgerald and her colleagues (Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997; Magley, Hulin, Fitzgerald, & DeNardo, 1999; Glomb, Richman, Hulin, Drasgow, Schneider, & Fitzgerald, 1997) is among the most prominent for investigating the outcomes of sexual harassment. In their model of the antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment, Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (1995) propose that sexual harassment results in decreased job satisfaction and physical well being. In addition, tests of their model suggest that sexual harassment has a negative impact on psychological outcomes; women who experienced low, moderate, and high levels of sexual harassment showed more negative psychological outcomes than women who experienced no sexual harassment (Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997). Furthermore, Schneider et al. (1997) found that experiencing harassment has negative outcomes for women even if they do not label the events as sexual harassment. This finding was also supported by research that investigated the outcomes of self-labeling (Magley, Hulin, et al., 1999); specifically, the researchers found no differences in negative outcomes between women who labeled their experiences sexual harassment and women who did not label them as such. Thus, sexual harassment negatively impacts women's psychological well-being whether the harassment is mild or severe, labeled or not labeled. Unfortunately, while the sexual harassment research indicates negative

psychological outcomes for women, it is unclear whether decreased psychological well-being refers to depression, anxiety, or some other mental health disorders. For example, Magley, Hulin, et al. (1999) used the Mental Health Index to assess psychological well-being. The Mental Health Index includes measures of depression, anxiety, and positive affect. However, the researchers used different variations of the index in their different samples, and did not separate depression and anxiety (combined as psychological distress). Moreover, no research on sexual harassment has examined self-objectification as a consequence, which has been linked to depression (e.g., Harrison & Frederickson, 2003; Tiggemann & Kuring, 2004) and thus, may account for some of the negative psychological outcomes. Additionally, sexual harassment research has not explored potentially significant consequences such as women's increased fear of rape or voluntarily restricting of their movements. The present research on stranger harassment was designed to address these gaps in the harassment literature relating to self-objectification, fear of rape, and restriction of movement.

1.2.1.Objectification. Sexual objectification is a clear component of both sexual harassment and stranger harassment. In both cases, women are treated as objects to be looked at and touched, and not as intelligent human beings. The main tenet of objectification theory (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997) is that the human body is not merely a biological system, but that “bodies exist within social and cultural contexts, and hence are also constructed through sociocultural practices and discourses” (p. 174). In American culture, women's bodies are constantly and consistently regarded as sexual objects through pornography, the mass media, and advertising. The unwanted sexual attention experienced in both sexual harassment and stranger harassment is another

example of women being regarded as sexual objects. Despite the diversity of mechanisms through which sexual objectification can occur (e.g., pornography, advertising, and stranger harassment), “the common thread running through all forms of sexual objectification is the experience of being treated as a body (or collection of body parts) valued predominantly for its use to (or consumption by) others” (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997, p. 174).

Objectification theory, as proposed by Frederickson and Roberts (1997), provides a framework for understanding the psychological experience of sexual objectification. They argue that this experience is uniquely female and can lead to mental health problems. For Frederickson and Roberts (1997), the consequences of objectification arise when the woman begins to objectify herself (i.e., self-objectify). Repeated exposure to sexual objectification increases the likelihood that women will objectify themselves. This leads women to regard themselves as mere sex objects, to experience body shame, and to chronically monitor their external appearance (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997). Prior research shows that self-objectification is positively correlated with negative outcomes, including depression and disordered eating (e.g. Tiggemann & Slater, 2001; Slater & Tiggemann, 2002; Harrison & Frederickson, 2003; Greenleaf, 2005; Muehlenkamp & Saris-Baglama, 2002; Tiggemann & Kuring, 2004; Muehlenkamp, Swanson, & Brausch, 2005). In the present research, I hypothesized that women who experience greater amounts of stranger harassment will be more likely to self-objectify. As such, it is a first attempt to test unwanted sexual attention (in the form of stranger harassment) as a predictor of self-objectification. While it has not been tested empirically, the link between sexual harassment and objectification has been theorized by Franke

(1997): "...the sexual aspect of sexual harassment does all the hegemonic work and has the effect and purpose of sexualizing women workers by reducing their humanity generally, and their status as workers specifically, to objects of male sexual pleasure" (p. 715).

### 1.3. Stranger Harassment and Sexism

The consequences of stranger harassment extend beyond the immediate outcomes for the victim to negatively impacting society at large by reinforcing differentiation of the sexes. As Bowman (1993) notes, "the harms of [stranger] harassment extend to its impact upon the relationship between the sexes, upon the construction of gender in our society, and upon social and political relationships in general" (p. 540). These "harms" from stranger harassment stem from the same sexism that drives sexual harassment. Franke (1997) emphatically states that "[sexual harassment] is a disciplinary practice that inscribes, enforces, and polices the identities of both harasser and victim according to a system of gender norms that envision women as feminine, (hetero)sexual objects, and men as masculine, (hetero)sexual subjects" (p. 693). In short, treating women as the object of male sexual gaze (and stranger harassment) reinforces society's view that men ought to be sexual initiators, even when women are not interested in a sexual relationship.

In their discussion of sexual harassment more generally, Burgess and Borgida (1999) have proposed that sex discrimination and sexual harassment stem from two different aspects of gender stereotypes. Under their framework, *descriptive* stereotypes (what characteristics men and women are believed *to have* and what roles they fill) are likely to cause discrimination based on competence, and this is particularly likely in the hiring process for women applying for masculine jobs. In other words, women may not

be viewed as “fit” for masculine jobs because they presumably lack the requisite agentic traits (e.g., assertiveness and initiative). But even if a woman proves she is capable of handling a “man’s job,” another aspect of gender stereotypes can prove to be costly. *Prescriptive* stereotypes (what characteristics men and women *should have* and what roles they should play) can lead to sexual harassment, which is used as a means of punishing those who step outside of traditional gender boundaries. As such, sexual harassment punishes women who violate rules about prescribed femininity by treating them as passive sex objects. Similar to Franke’s (1997) perspective, these authors argue that sexual harassment is a means by which gender stereotypes and gender roles are enforced and perpetuated in culture.

Stranger harassment can be a further extension of this model and thus another mechanism by which prescriptive stereotypes and traditional gender roles are reinforced in society. If it reinforces male agency and female passivity (with men the sexual initiators and women their passive targets), stranger harassment also reinforces sexism in society. And if women’s reactions to stranger harassment are passive (e.g., accepting or viewing it as benevolent), then sexism is doubly reinforced as stranger harassment will be viewed as normative, an “everyday” fact of life for women. .

Beyond maintaining sexism, experiences with stranger harassment are likely to simultaneously create in women a distrust of and dependence on men (Bowman, 1993). In order to avoid harassing experiences and reduce fears of sexual assault, women need to be in the protective company of a male escort. Women who are frequently harassed are likely to develop a distrust of unknown males and react negatively or fearfully when approached by male strangers. This fear and distrust strains the ability of men and

women to communicate, especially for strangers of the opposite sex to meet and talk in a public space (Bowman, 1993).

Stranger harassment has even greater implications for society than merely keeping men and women from interacting casually. Stranger harassment forces women to reconsider their place in society and to question their increased presence in the public sector. Bowman (1993) quotes McAllister (1978):

The first function of public harassment is to reinforce spatial boundaries that drastically limit women's "sphere." It clearly stakes out public space as male space. Women who want to be outside their homes must do so at their own risk and with the full knowledge that at any time they can be publicly humiliated or "complimented." Women are at all times subject to public scrutiny.

Stranger harassment discourages women from participating in the world outside of their homes. Only in the home or other private spheres are women protected from whistles, stares, and lewd commentary on their appearance by strangers. Thus, stranger harassment enforces sexist beliefs that men and women are not equal partners and must be relegated to separate spheres of labor. Restricting women's ability to enjoy a public life outside of the home heightens the inequality between men and women.

1.3.1. Fear of rape and restriction of movement. In order to empirically assess the impact of stranger harassment on maintaining sexism, I focused on two possible outcomes of stranger harassment that capture the ideas of distrusting men and being driven out of the public sphere. Specifically, the limited work on stranger harassment (MacMillan et al., 2000) suggests that it may increase women's fear of rape (i.e. distrust of men) and, increase their willingness to limit their freedom of movement (i.e. being driven from the public sphere, e.g., Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1997; Swim et al., 1998; Lenton, et al., 1999).

In the present research, I hypothesized that women would fear sexual assault to the extent they reported being harassed in public by strangers. Research on the fear of rape among women suggests that women are more fearful of stranger rape than acquaintance rape, even though most women recognize that stranger rape is much less prevalent than acquaintance rape (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1997). Research on sex differences in perception of danger and fear of victimization, such as murder or robbery, consistently illustrate that women are more fearful than men, although men are much more likely to be victims of crime than women (Ferraro, 1996; Harris and Miller, 2000). Ferraro's (1996) "shadow of sexual assault" hypothesis suggests that women are more fearful overall because the fear of rape permeates their fear of other victimizations. Because, for women, rape is a potential outcome of any face-to-face victimization, it may be a primary source of anxiety. In support of this hypothesis, Ferraro (1996) found that women's fear of rape predicted their fear of other personal crimes (e.g. murder, burglary). Fisher and Sloan (2003) replicated Ferraro's (1996) work, finding that the fear of rape did indeed shadow other fears of victimization for women.

Similarly, Harris and Miller (2000) discovered that women, compared with men, are consistently more fearful of ambiguously dangerous situations involving men. They suggest that women's higher fear of victimization may stem from daily experiences of minor victimizations, which are likely to be ignored because of their non-criminal nature. Although they did not test this hypothesis, they specifically posited that the experience of "stares, whistles, condescending behavior, being interrupted when speaking, and harassment at work" socializes women to be more fearful and more perceptive of danger (Harris & Miller, 2000, p. 857). When taken together with Ferraro's (1996) and Fisher

and Sloan's (2003) research, this suggests that stranger harassment may increase women's fear of rape, as well as their perceived risk of rape. Indeed, the most alarming part of stranger harassment is that it "remind[s] women that they are vulnerable to attack and... any man may choose to invade a woman's personal space, physically or psychologically, if he feels like it" (Bowman, 1993, p. 540).

Finally, the fear of rape literature suggests that women typically alter their behaviors by limiting how, when, and where they travel to protect themselves from rape (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1997; Krahe, 2005; Warr, 1985). By avoiding walking alone at night or in specific places (e.g., parking garages; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1997), women voluntarily restrict their freedom to move about in the world. Similarly, Swim, Cohen, and Hyers (1998) note that women's tendency to avoid sites of sexual harassment restricts their freedom of movement. One of the societal consequences of stranger harassment is that it makes the public world "uncomfortable, hostile, and frightening for women" (Bowman, 1993, p. 539).

When a woman does not feel safe in the public sphere, her liberty is greatly restricted. Bowman (1993), a law professor, quotes the political philosopher John Locke's declaration that "liberty is to be free from restraint and violence from others" (p. 520). Additionally, drawing on the writings of Hegel and Aristotle, Bowman (1993) asserts that the freedom to move about the world unrestricted is a fundamental liberty and that without this liberty it is impossible to be an equal participant in politics and society. If stranger harassment serves the purpose of pushing women out of the public sphere, it reinforces the sexist tradition of viewing women as less capable and less deserving than men. By scaring women away from public spaces, women lose "the rights to assemble

and petition for redress of grievances” (Bowman, 1993, p. 521). Women who are ogled on the street are not only figuratively stripped of their clothing, but are quite literally stripped of their civil rights.

Thus, in addition to fear of rape, I predicted that women’s voluntary restriction of movement would be a consequence of stranger harassment. The confirmation of such outcomes would support the greater idea that stranger harassment reinforces sexism.

1.3.2. Personal Power. Another potential area in which the effects of stranger harassment as a tool of sexism can be seen is in women’s desires for personal power. For example, Rudman and Heppen (2003) found that women’s implicit romantic fantasies (idolizing their boyfriends as chivalrous heroes) were negatively correlated with their desire for personal power, such as attaining high-status jobs. While stranger harassment is vastly different from romantic fantasies, it is likely that a similar mechanism of the woman’s assumed importance of herself as a sex object decreases her desire for power. For example, Rudman and Fairchild (in press) found that heterosexual women tended to stigmatize feminists as unattractive lesbians, and that this perception decreased their interest in identifying with feminists and expressing support for gender equality issues (e.g., equal pay, equal sexual standards, and the ERA). This research suggests a negative impact of women’s concerns about being attractive to the opposite sex on their commitment to gender equity. The sexual harassment literature also suggests that being harassed can have a negative effect on women’s job satisfaction and can ultimately lead to detrimental career behaviors, such as frequently calling out sick from work and even quitting (Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, & Magley, 1999; Magley, Hulin, et al., 1999). I hypothesized that to the extent women are

stranger harassed they will show a decrease in their desire for personal power as assessed by desire for high-status jobs, estimated income, and estimated years of schooling they will pursue.

#### 1.4. Coping With Stranger Harassment

Research on women's responses to sexual harassment suggests that the majority of women are likely to use passive, non-assertive coping strategies. Gruber's (1989) review of the literature found that less than 20% of women use assertive or active coping strategies. Women typically respond to harassment by ignoring it or attempting to avoid the harasser (see also Magley, 2002). Less frequently, women may cope with harassment by reporting or confronting the perpetrator, engaging in self-blame, or by perceiving the harassment to be a compliment or benign (Fitzgerald, 1990). While it is likely that many of the coping strategies used by women who are sexually harassed are similar to the strategies used by women who are stranger harassed (e.g. ignoring it), there may also be differences (e.g. there are no laws specifically against stranger harassment, so it is unclear to whom a stranger harasser would be reported).

For my purposes, I borrowed items from the Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ; Fitzgerald, 1990) that seemed most pertinent to stranger harassment and excluded items more descriptive of sexual harassment (e.g., "I filed a grievance," and "I told a supervisor or department head"). It was predicted that women who endorsed the active coping items (e.g., "I let him know I didn't like what he was doing") would experience less objectification than women who endorsed the passive items (e.g., "I pretended nothing was happening") or who engaged in self-blame (e.g., "I realized I had probably brought it on myself"). In rejecting the harassment through active coping

strategies, it is thought that these women will also be rejecting the objectified view of their bodies, thus limiting their self-objectification. On the other hand, women employing passive or self-blame strategies are not actively fighting the objectified view of their body and thus may be more likely to internalize the objectification. Finally, I had competing predictions about women who responded to stranger harassment as though it were benign (e.g., “I considered it flattering”). On the one hand, it was possible that these women would not be adversely affected by stranger harassment. On the other hand, women who perceived stranger harassment to be a compliment or innocuous might be already highly self-objectified. In essence, their response might reflect society’s view of stranger harassment as something women should “expect” by virtue of their gender. If so, these women should show high levels of objectification depending on the frequency of stranger harassment.

### 1.5. Summary and Hypotheses

Women’s experience of sexual harassment in public places (i.e. stranger harassment) is an area of research that has been ignored by traditional sexual harassment research. Stranger harassment shares many common themes with sexual harassment, most specifically the component of unwanted sexual attention. However, stranger harassment is unique from sexual harassment in that it is perpetrated by strangers (as opposed to co-workers, teachers, or peers) and that it takes place in public domains such as on the street, in stores, or in bars (as opposed to the office or school).

The current research investigated the frequency of and hypothesized outcomes of stranger harassment, as well as potential moderators of these consequences. In Study 1, I sought to determine the frequency of stranger harassment experiences in a sample of

female college students. I predicted that frequent experiences of stranger harassment would lead to increased levels of self-objectification. I also expected that stranger harassment would positively predict women's fear of sexual assault and perceived risk of rape and, therefore, voluntary restriction of movement. Finally, I predicted that frequent experiences of stranger harassment would lead to a decrease in desire for personal power, through lowered career and educational goals.

However, I also hypothesized that women's coping behaviors would moderate the relationship between stranger harassment and objectification. First, I expected that women who responded actively to stranger harassment (e.g., by confronting the harasser) would buffer themselves from self-objectification. Second, I predicted that women who responded passively (e.g., by ignoring the harassment) or who engaged in self-blame would be more likely to self-objectify with more experiences of stranger harassment. Finally, although women who viewed stranger harassment as benign might not be affected by their experiences, I suspected they might show high levels of objectification if their responses reflect being co-opted by society's view that women should expect to be sexually objectified.

In Study 2, I attempted to replicate the findings of Study 1, with a broader sample of women, by posting the survey on the Internet. The survey was advertised on various websites frequented by women. The websites included MySpace ([www.myspace.com](http://www.myspace.com)) and Live Journal ([www.livejournal.com](http://www.livejournal.com)) groups devoted to psychology and research, as well as sites such as the Blank Noise Project ([blanknoiseproject.blogspot.com](http://blanknoiseproject.blogspot.com)) and Bust ([www.bust.com](http://www.bust.com)) that include information about fighting stranger harassment.

Finally, in Study 3, I hypothesized that if women have a greater awareness of the stranger harassment in their lives, it may highlight the negative outcomes and increase the sensitivity of these survey measures. Women in Study 3 completed the same survey as in the previous studies, and then were required to keep a daily diary of their stranger harassment experiences for five weeks. The diary asked the participants to report details about the incident including attractiveness and age of the harasser, emotions experienced during and after the incident, and when and where the incident occurred. At the end of five weeks, the participants completed the survey again. It was hypothesized that women in the stranger harassment diary condition would show more self-objectification, fear of rape, and restriction in movement than women in a control group.

## Study 1: Laboratory Sample

The main objective of Study 1 was to document the frequency of stranger harassment and test support for my hypotheses regarding its consequences for women, using a laboratory sample of undergraduate women.

### 2.1. Method

#### 2.1.1. Participants

Female volunteers ( $N = 228$ ) participated in exchange for partial credit toward their Introductory Psychology research participation requirement. Forty-four percent (101) were White, 33% (75) were Asian, 8% (18) were Latina, 7% (16) were Black, and the remaining 8% reported another ethnicity. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 29 with a mean age of 19.3 years old. The vast majority (97%) reported being exclusively heterosexual.

#### 2.1.2. Measures

2.1.2.1. Stranger harassment. Experiences with stranger harassment were assessed using a modified version of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ; Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995). Participants were first asked whether they had ever experienced nine different behaviors from strangers; these behaviors ranged in severity (e.g. “Have you ever experienced unwanted sexual attention or interaction from a stranger?”; “Have you ever experienced catcalls, whistles, or stares from a stranger?; “Have you ever experienced direct or explicit pressure to cooperate sexually from a stranger?”; and “Have you ever experienced direct or forceful fondling or grabbing from a stranger?”). Table 1 shows the items. Participants then responded to the same

behaviors in terms of frequency (1 = *once*; 2 = *once a month*; 3 = *2-4 times per month*; 4 = *every few days*; 5 = *every day*).

Following this, participants were instructed to think about how they typically respond to the experiences described above and to rate statements about potential reactions on scales ranging from 1 (*not at all descriptive*) to 7 (*extremely descriptive*). The reactions were selected from the Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ; Fitzgerald, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1994) to reflect active coping (e.g., “I talked to someone about what happened”), passive coping (e.g., “I just ‘blew it off’ and acted like I didn’t care”), self-blame (e.g., “I realized he probably wouldn’t have done it if I had looked or dressed differently”) or treating harassment as benign or inconsequential (e.g., “I figured he must really like me,” and “I treated it as a joke”). Table 5 provides the items for each subscale.

2.1.2.2. Objectification. Self-objectification was measured using McKinley and Hyde’s (1996) Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBCS). The OBCS is comprised of three subscales (surveillance, body shame, and control beliefs) to which participants respond on scales ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). For the current study, only the body surveillance and body shame scales were used, consistent with prior research (Tiggemann & Kuring, 2004; Tiggemann & Slater, 2001; Muelenkamp & Saris-Baglama, 2002). The surveillance subscale assesses concern with body appearance over functioning (e.g. “I often worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good,” and “I am more concerned with how my body looks than with what it can do”). The body shame subscale assesses how respondents feel about their bodies’ imperfections (e.g. “When I’m not the size I think I should be, I feel

ashamed”; “When I can’t control my weight, I feel like something must be wrong with me”). Both subscales showed adequate internal consistency (surveillance  $\alpha = .86$ ; shame  $\alpha = .87$ ). As in past research, the body surveillance and body shame scales were significantly correlated ( $r(228) = .50, p < .01$ ). Thus, they were averaged to form the Self-Objectification Index ( $\alpha = .88$ ).

2.1.2.3. Objectification IAT. Objectification was assessed with an implicit association test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). This IAT measured the automatic association of self-relevant words (e.g. me, myself) with body relevant (e.g. breast, thighs, buttocks, legs) and mind- relevant (e.g. brain, intellect, mind, smart) words. Scoring of the IAT followed the precedent of Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz (1998). A high score on the objectification IAT reflected greater association of the self with the body, as compared with the mind attributes (i.e., implicit objectification). The Objectification IAT revealed a slight tendency for women to associate self with mind more than body words ( $M = -61.26, SD = 96.19$ ). However, it failed to correlate with the modified Objectified Body Consciousness Scale,  $r(228) = .02, ns$ . The Objectification IAT did not prove to be an accurate measure of objectification, likely because it was an exploratory measure that relied on a single category IAT (as opposed to using it as a relative measure, as it has traditionally been operationalized). Therefore, it will not be further discussed.

2.1.2.4. Personal power. The high status job index asked participants to rate on a Likert-type scale (1 = *no interest*; 7 = *strongly interested*) their interest in high status (e.g. doctor, corporate lawyer) jobs and low status (e.g. teacher, artist) jobs. The High Status Job Index (HSJI) was created such that high scores equaled strong interest in high status

jobs ( $\alpha = .51$ ). Participants were also asked to estimate the number of years of education post-high school they believed they would attain, as well as the amount of money (in thousands of dollars) they would make in their career. Years of education, money, and the HSJI were all positively correlated, all  $r(228) > .18$ ,  $ps < .01$ .

2.1.2.5. Fear and risk of rape. Women reported their fear of being raped by a stranger and an acquaintance on scales ranging from 1 (*not at all afraid*) to 10 (*very afraid*). Specifically, the items read, “How afraid are you of being raped by a stranger [acquaintance]?”. They also responded to two items assessing perceived risk of being raped on scales ranging from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 10 (*very likely*). These items were, “How likely is it that you will be raped by a stranger [acquaintance]?”. Fear of rape by a stranger and fear of rape by an acquaintance were highly related,  $r(226) = .67$ ,  $p < .001$ , as were the likelihood measures,  $r(226) = .50$ ,  $p < .001$ . They were subsequently combined to form the fear of rape and risk of rape indexes, respectively. These subsequent indexes were modestly related,  $r(226) = .17$ ,  $p < .05$ .

2.1.2.6. Restriction of movement. Women also responded to 10 items designed to assess restriction of movement, on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Sample items include “I feel safe walking around campus alone at night,” “I would not feel comfortable walking alone in the city at night,” and “If I need to go out of my house at night, I often try to have a male friend accompany me.” Reliability analyses suggested removing two items (“I try to avoid certain places at night,” and “I feel as safe with a group of girlfriends as I do with a male companion even at night”). The 8-item scale showed adequate internal consistency ( $\alpha = .71$ ).

2.1.2.7. Vanity. The final scale was designed to assess vanity in regard to both physical appearance and achievement. It can be argued that the items used to assess body objectification may not reflect objectification for some women, but instead may reflect vanity (unfortunately, no research studies on objectification have assessed the vanity issue). The Netemeyer, Burton, and Lichtenstein (1995) Vanity Scale divides vanity into two components: physical concern and physical view. Physical concern ( $\alpha = .87$ ) relates to worry about one's appearance (e.g. "I am very concerned about my appearance"; "I would feel embarrassed if I was around people and did not look my best") and on the surface is very similar to the body shame subscale of the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale. The physical view scale ( $\alpha = .93$ ) relates to the individual's interpretation of how others perceive his/her appearance (e.g. "people are envious of my good looks"; "I have the type of body that people want to look at"). It was hypothesized that physical concern would be positively correlated with objectification (specifically body shame), while physical view would be negatively correlated with objectification. Women who objectify their bodies do not feel positively toward their bodies and thus should not experience vanity; however, women who are vain may show a high level of objectification because they are constantly concerned with their appearance. In other words, women who are self-objectifying are not necessarily vain, but women who are vain may be self-objectifying.

Additionally, Netemeyer, Burton, and Lichtenstein's (1995) Vanity Scale includes achievement vanity, also divided into concern and view components. The achievement concern scale ( $\alpha = .79$ ) relates to a worry and deep desire to be highly successful (e.g. "professional achievements are an obsession with me"; "I want others to look up to me

because of my accomplishments”). The achievement view scale ( $\alpha = .88$ ) relates to personal boasting or gratification in professional success (e.g. “I am an accomplished person”; “I am a good example of professional success”). Achievement concern and achievement view were highly correlated ( $r(228) = .53, p < .000$ ); they were combined to form the Achievement Vanity Index ( $\alpha = .87$ ). It is hypothesized that high levels of achievement vanity will be positively correlated to high levels of career aspiration. In other words, if women who experience stranger harassment show a decreased level of career aspiration, they will also have very low levels of achievement vanity.

### 2.1.3. Procedure

Participants were escorted to private cubicles equipped with a desktop PC. The experimenter administered the instructions, obtained informed consent, and started a computer program for the participants. Participants completed the measures in the order described above. Items were presented randomly within each measure. Participants were then asked to report their age, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. At the conclusion of the study, participants were thanked for their participation and were fully debriefed.

## 2.2. Results and Discussion

### 2.2.1. Frequency of Stranger Harassment

Table 1 displays women’s reported frequencies of stranger harassment experiences. The first two items (“catcalls, whistles, or stares” and “unwanted sexual attention”) were reported as experienced once a month by 32% and 40% of the sample, respectively. Strikingly, 31% reported experiencing “catcalls, whistles, or stares” from strangers every few days or more. Over one-third of participants reported hearing offensive sexual jokes or sexist remarks from strangers once a month. In addition, 36%

reported being the victim of unwanted touching or stroking once a month. These results support Gardner's (1995) assertion that stranger harassment is a common experience for many women. It should also be noted that the final three items in Table 1 ("subtle pressure to cooperate sexually," "direct pressure to cooperate sexually," and "forceful fondling") represent the most severe harassing behaviors from strangers and can be characterized as sexual coercion or assault. Remarkably, over a quarter of the sample reported experiencing these types of sexual coercion once a month.

To analyze experiences of stranger harassment in relation to self-objectification, fear of rape, risk of rape, and restriction of movement, the Stranger Harassment Index (SHI) was created. The SHI was computed by multiplying the respondents' yes/no responses to experiencing the 9 types of stranger harassment (coded as 1 or 0) by their reported frequency of occurrence (ranging from 1 to 5). The results were factor analyzed using a principle components analysis and varimax rotation. As can be seen in Table 2, two factors emerged. The first consists mainly of verbal stranger harassment, while the second consists of sexual pressure from strangers. Combining these items separately yielded sufficient reliabilities ( $\alpha = .85$  for verbal,  $\alpha = .75$  for sexual pressure). The two factors correlated well,  $r(226) = .54, p < .001$ . I therefore combined the two factors to form the SHI ( $\alpha = .85$ ). Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics for the SHI and all of the study's measures.

### 2.2.2. Consequences of Stranger Harassment

Table 4 presents the correlations among the measures. As hypothesized, experiences of stranger harassment were significantly related to self-objectification,  $r(226) = .16, p = .01$ . Thus, women reported greater body surveillance and shame depending on

their experiences of stranger harassment. In addition, stranger harassment was marginally related to fear of rape,  $r(226) = .12, p = .07$ , and reliably related to perceived risk of rape,  $r(226) = .25, p < .001$ .

Unexpectedly, Table 4 shows a negligible correlation between the SHI and the restriction of movement scale,  $r(226) = -.10, ns$ . Thus, the hypothesized relationship between stranger harassment and women's willingness to curb their movements was not supported. However, consistent with past research, women who feared rape were more likely to restrict their movements,  $r(226) = .31, p < .001$  (Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1997; Krahe, 2005; Warr, 1985). Moreover, self-objectification was related to both fear of rape and perceived likelihood of being raped, both  $r(226) > .17, ps < .05$ . The pattern shown in Table 4 suggests that stranger harassment may have an indirect effect on women's fear of rape (through increased self-objectification). As a result, stranger harassment may have an indirect effect on women's freedom of movement (through the link between objectification and increased fear of rape).

The measures of achievement were reliably related,  $r(226) > .18, ps < .01$ , but only achievement vanity was related to stranger harassment,  $r(226) = .19, p < .01$ . This correlation along with the marginal positive correlation between stranger harassment and the high status job index ( $r(226) = .12, p = .07$ ) is counter to the predicted hypothesis. While I hypothesized that women who are stranger harassed would be less interested in high power careers, the current result is not inexplicable. Women who are invested in attaining success and high status jobs are violating gender norms and challenging male power; such women may, as a result, incur more harassment as men attempt to regain some of their power by engaging in stranger harassment. The correlation between

achievement vanity and stranger harassment cannot speak to causality; future research needs to parse rates of stranger harassment in populations of nontraditional and traditional women.

Finally, both self-objectification and stranger harassment were significantly related to the two measures of physical (appearance) vanity. As predicted, self-objectification was positively correlated with physical concern vanity ( $r(226) = .65, p < .01$ ) and negatively correlated with physical view vanity ( $r(226) = -.21, p < .01$ ). This supports the hypothesis that women who are self-objectifying are not necessarily vain, but women who are vain may be self-objectifying. More precisely, the strong correlation between self-objectification and physical concern vanity suggests that women who are overly invested in their physical appearance are likely objectifying themselves by being concerned with how their body parts look rather than how their body functions. However, the negative correlation with physical view vanity suggests that women who self-objectify are not internalizing a vain perception of how others view their body. In other words, women who self-objectify did not share with vain women the belief that, “I have the type of body that people want to look at.”

Even though these data suggest a distinction between vanity and self-objectification, the current data cannot distinguish between vain women and self-objectifying women in this sample, nor speak to the causality that stranger harassment may play in vanity and self-objectification. The separation between self-objectifying and vain women as assessed by the physical concern vanity questions is less distinguishable because physical concern vanity, like self-objectification, correlates with fear of rape,  $r(226) = .22, p < .01$ . Thus, conceptually we can distinguish vanity and self-

objectification, but methodologically the two may be confounded and indistinguishable. Additional research is necessary to understand the relationship between vanity and self-objectification and to develop measures that can reliably separate the two.

While I did not have specific hypotheses regarding stranger harassment and physical vanity, both measures of physical vanity were positively correlated with stranger harassment,  $r_s(226) > .19, p_s < .01$ . This result may suggest that women who are more concerned with their appearance (physical concern vanity) may be more likely to dress in ways that attract stranger harassment; alternatively, women who are stranger harassed are likely to be more aware of how others view their bodies (physical view vanity). The interpretation of the link between stranger harassment and vanity cannot ignore the strong correlations between vanity and self-objectification.

### 2.2.3. Coping with Harassment

To assess whether these data adequately captured multiple coping with harassment strategies, I conducted a principle components factor analysis, using varimax rotation. This analysis revealed the expected four factors (each with eigenvalues greater than one), which I labeled passive, self-blame, benign, and active (see Table 5). I averaged the appropriate items to form four subscales; each showed adequate reliability (all  $\alpha_s > .73$ ). Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for each subscale. Paired sample  $t$ -tests showed that women were more likely to report passive coping strategies compared with active, self-blame, and benign, all  $t_s(227) > 3.87, p_s < .01$ . Thus, as with sexual harassment, women were more likely to respond passively rather than actively to stranger harassment (e.g., Magley, 2002; Gruber, 1989).

2.2.3.1. Objectification. The next set of analyses tested support for the hypothesis that women's coping strategies would moderate their levels of self-objectification in response to stranger harassment. Because women reported how they coped with stranger harassment, support for this prediction would be shown by main effects in regression analyses (e.g., if you coped passively, you might objectify), but it was also possible that stranger harassment would interact with coping (e.g., higher levels of harassment, in tandem with passivity, might lead to greater objectification). Table 6 presents the results. As can be seen, results support the hypotheses that women who responded either passively or with self-blame to stranger harassment would self-objectify, both  $\beta$ s  $> .16$ ,  $p$ s  $< .01$ . Moreover, benign coping strategies were positively related to objectification,  $\beta = .14$ ,  $p < .05$ . Thus, viewing stranger harassment as innocuous or complimentary does not protect women from self-objectification. Finally, active coping did not show a main effect but instead, interacted with stranger harassment such that the more women were harassed and responded actively, the less they self-objectified,  $\beta = -.15$ ,  $p < .05$ . In sum, non-active coping strategies predicted self-objectification, and these effects did not depend on how many types of harassment they experienced, or how often they occurred. By contrast, active coping depended on harassment level to dampen its effects on this consequence.

2.2.3.2. Coping and Additional Outcome Variables. Although I did not have *a priori* predictions concerning coping strategies and the remaining outcome variables, Table 7 shows some intuitive relationships. First, benign responses were negatively related to fear of rape and restriction of movement, suggesting that viewing stranger harassment as innocuous may protect women from fears of being victimized (and

therefore, they may feel freer to move about in public). Second, self-blame, which may reflect the need for an internal locus of control, was positively linked to fear of rape, suggesting that it may not be an effective means of increasing women's perceived sense of control. The bottom row of Table 7 shows that increased frequency of stranger harassment was associated with using active strategies. Thus, women may become more confrontational the more they are harassed and, as the regression analysis suggests, if that strategy is used often, it may protect them from self-objectification.

The remaining outcome variables were not significantly correlated with the coping strategies, with three exceptions. Physical view vanity was negatively correlated to passive coping strategies,  $r(226) = -.24, p < .01$ , but positively correlated to active coping strategies,  $r(226) = .17, p < .05$ . Because physical view vanity is measuring one's impressions of how others view and envy one's body, one explanation for this result may be that women who ignore the harassment (react passively) do not believe that their bodies are worthy of attention, while women who confront harassers (react actively) may trust that their bodies are attractive to others, but only desire that attention on their own terms. However, because I did not have any hypotheses regarding coping and vanity, this explanation is merely speculation, and needs further investigation alongside the research to separate objectification and vanity. Finally, passive coping responses were also negatively correlated to achievement vanity,  $r(226) = -.18, p < .01$ . This could suggest that ignoring stranger harassment is related to decreased achievement goals, but this interpretation lacks support in that none of the other measures of achievement were correlated with passive coping strategies.

## Study 2: Internet Sample

The main objective of Study 2 was to continue to document the frequency of stranger harassment and replicate Study 1's results using an Internet sample of women, which should represent a broader demographic spectrum (e.g., age and geographic region).

### 3.1. Methods

#### 3.1.1. Participants

The participants for the Internet survey were solicited from a variety of websites (described below in the procedure). The survey received 714 responses to the first question, but only 363 participants completed the entire questionnaire. As Tuten, Urban, and Bosnjak (2002) note, it is impossible to accurately assess response rates to Web-based surveys because unlike emailed or mailed surveys, the entirely Web-based survey is not addressed to a specific population; thus the common method for Web-based surveys is to report the total number of useable participants. Responses to the demographic questions at the end of the survey showed 10 male respondents. Their data was dropped from the analyses, leaving a total of 353 participants who reported their sex as "female." Seventy-five percent of the sample reported "white" as their ethnicity, and 76% reported being exclusively heterosexual. The average age of the respondents was 23.8 years old, with a range from 15 to 65 years old. The majority of participants (80%) reported living in the United States, but as Table 16 shows, participants came from various parts of the world.

### 3.1.2. Measures

The survey was comprised of the same measures as Study 1 with the exception of the Objectification IAT (the website hosting the study did not have the capacity to administer an IAT). Additionally, the Job Index, and money and education questions were dropped because of their high correlation in Study 1 with the measure of Achievement Vanity. By removing these measures and the IAT, the survey was significantly shortened. It was hoped that participants on the Internet would be more likely to complete a survey that required 15 minutes than a survey that required 30 or more. Demographic questions at the end of the survey asked participants to report their race, age, sex, sexual orientation, location (city, state, or country), and how they found the survey.

### 3.1.3. Procedure

The survey was hosted on SurveyMonkey.com and was advertised to potential participants in a variety of ways. Advertisements for the survey were posted at the following websites: (1) <http://psych.hanover.edu/research/exponnet.html>, (2) [http://www.bust.com/girlweb/Got\\_A\\_Life/Our\\_Bodies\\_\\_Our\\_Hells/index.html](http://www.bust.com/girlweb/Got_A_Life/Our_Bodies__Our_Hells/index.html), (3) <http://blanknoiseproject.blogspot.com/>, and (4) <http://www.livejournal.com>. The first website is hosted by Hanover College and contains links to hundreds of psychology-related web surveys. The Hanover site is most likely used by college students and professors. The second website is hosted by Bust Magazine, which invites readers to post links to their personal webpages, blogs, or surveys. The Bust Magazine Girl Wide Web is frequented by women. The third website is run by Jasmeen Patheja in India and addresses Indian women's experiences of stranger harassment, which they refer to as Eve

Teasing. The final website Livejournal.com is a site that is comprised of communities devoted to a wide variety of topics; the link for the survey was posted in community sites for advocates, women's studies, researchers, psychology, and psychology in the UK. In the end, participants arrived to the survey site by a variety websites, as seen in Table 8. In addition to the four advertised sites, many participants (20%) reported being directed to the site by their psychology professor; it is likely that many of these participants were directed to the Hanover site by their professor and not directly to the survey. Some participants reported finding the link on other websites (that were not placed by the experimenter), through friends, and even through web search engines (such as Google or Yahoo).

When participants arrived at the website for the survey, they first read the informed consent. If they consented to participate, they clicked the "next" button at the bottom of the screen. Each survey measure was presented on successive pages of the survey.<sup>1</sup> Participants were required to answer each question before being able to continue to the next measure. The components of the study were presented in the following order: Stranger Harassment Index (first "have you ever experienced...", and then on the next page, "how frequently have you experienced..."), Coping with Harassment, Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (surveillance followed by shame), Vanity (physical and achievement mixed together), Restriction in Movement, Fear of Rape, Risk of Rape, and demographic questions. After completing the survey, participants were debriefed with a final screen that described the study's hypotheses. Participants could quit the study at

---

<sup>1</sup> This presentation format has been shown by Granello & Weaton (2004) to be successful in attaining high completion rates, however, more participants may be retained if a meter or gauge had been included to let participants know how many more questions remained.

any time by clicking “exit this survey” or by simply closing their web browser. As noted above, the final  $N$  consisted of 353 female participants.

### 3.2. Results and Discussion

#### 3.2.1. Frequency of Stranger Harassment

Table 9 displays the participants’ reported frequencies of stranger harassment experiences. Twenty-three percent or more of the women in this sample reported experiencing all of the verbal harassment items approximately once a month. Similar to Study 1, 38% reported experiencing “catcalls, whistles, or stares” from strangers every few days or more. In addition, a quarter of the sample reported experiencing sexist remarks and behaviors every few days or more. As with the previous study, reported rates of sexually coercive behaviors were lower than rates of verbal harassment. However, it was still startling to see 10% of the sample experiencing pressure (subtle or direct) to cooperate sexually and experiencing forceful fondling at least once a month.

The SHI items were factor analyzed using a principle components analysis and varimax rotation. Table 10 shows that as with Study 1 two factors emerged: verbal ( $\alpha = .87$ ) and sexual pressure ( $\alpha = .73$ ). The two factors correlated well,  $r(353) = .56, p < .01$ . I therefore combined the two factors to form the SHI ( $\alpha = .87$ ). Table 11 presents the descriptive statistics for the SHI and all of the study’s measures.

#### 3.2.2. Consequences of Stranger Harassment

Table 12 presents the correlations among the measures. Contrary to my hypothesis, experiences of stranger harassment were not significantly related to self-objectification,  $r(353) = -.03, ns$ . In contrast to Study 1, stranger harassment was reliably and directly related to both fear of rape and risk of rape,  $r_s(353) > .18, p_s < .01$ . But as

with Study 1, Table 4 shows no correlation between the SHI and the restriction of movement scale,  $r(353) = .02, ns$ . This pattern of results suggests that self-objectification may not always be a factor in stranger harassment and its potential outcomes, as self-objectification was not related to fear of rape, risk of rape, or restriction in movement,  $rs(353) < .07, ns$ .

While these results do not support Study 1's relationship between stranger harassment and self-objectification (or self-objectification and the other outcomes), the results in Table 12 do show that women who feared rape were more likely to restrict their movements,  $r(353) = .32, p < .01$ . The pattern of results in this sample suggests that stranger harassment may have an indirect effect on women's freedom of movement through an increased fear of rape, as was found in Study 1.

Also echoing Study 1, there is again a strong correlation between self-objectification and physical concern vanity,  $r(353) = .57, p < .01$ . As discussed with regard to the first study, the measure of self-objectification may be confounded with measures of vanity, and as such it is unclear what the OBCS is measuring. The development and validation of the OBCS included measures of body esteem and appearance orientation, but not vanity (McKinley & Hyde, 1996). As in Study 1, stranger harassment was significantly correlated to the physical vanity measures,  $rs(353) > .12, ps < .05$ , which adds further confusion as to how objectification is being assessed. Considerably more research is needed to distinguish self-objectification and vanity.

Finally, as in Study 1, stranger harassment was positively correlated to achievement vanity,  $r(353) = .21, p < .01$ . This result is contrary to my original hypothesis that women who are stranger harassed would be less interested in high power

careers or have high professional achievement goals. As postulated in the results and discussion of Study 1, this result may indicate that women who are successful or desire professional success are violating gender norms and challenging male claim's to power; this may result in more harassment as men attempt to regain some of their power by engaging in stranger harassment. For example, women with high achievement goals may dress professionally, walk in a determined manner, or otherwise indicate nonverbally that they believe themselves worthy of equal treatment and respect. Alternatively, women who are stranger harassed may be particularly cognizant of the gender status hierarchy (i.e., reminded of it frequently) and especially resolved to overcome it through personal power. The causal direction of this relationship can only be speculated from the correlation, but additional research on groups of professional and nonprofessional women is certainly necessary.

### 3.2.3. Coping with Harassment

I submitted the coping items to a principle components factor analysis, using varimax rotation. The analysis revealed the same four factors (each with eigenvalues greater than one) as Study 1: passive, self-blame, benign, and active (see Table 13). I averaged the appropriate items to form four subscales; each showed adequate reliability (all  $\alpha$ s > .67). Table 11 shows the descriptive statistics for each subscale. Paired sample *t*-tests showed that women were more likely to report passive coping strategies compared with active, self-blame, and benign, all  $t$ s(352) > 12.58,  $p$ s < .01. This supports the sexual harassment research and the conclusion from Study 1 that women are more likely to respond passively rather than actively to stranger harassment (e.g., Magley, 2002; Gruber, 1989).

3.2.3.1. Objectification. Even though self-objectification was not related to stranger harassment, it was correlated with the coping responses (see Table 15). Table 14 presents the results of the regression analyses with stranger harassment and the coping styles predicting self-objectification. The results support my hypotheses and echo Study 1, such that women who responded with passive, self-blame, or benign coping strategies to stranger harassment would self-objectify, all  $\beta$ s  $> .12$ ,  $p$ s  $< .02$ . Thus, ignoring stranger harassment, viewing it as innocuous or complimentary, or blaming it on oneself does not protect women from self-objectification. Finally, and unlike Study 1, I found a main effect for active coping,  $\beta = -.16$ ,  $p < .01$ . For this sample, the amount of harassment did not influence the effectiveness of active strategies in reducing self-objectification. This result suggests that standing up to one's harasser may have positive outcomes irrespective of the frequency of being harassed.

3.2.3.2. Coping and additional outcome variables. Consistent with Study 1, I found some of the same intuitive relationships concerning coping strategies and the remaining outcome variables (see Table 15). Benign responses were, again, negatively related to fear of rape and restriction of movement, suggesting that viewing stranger harassment as innocuous protects women from fears of being victimized. Self-blame was positively linked to fear of rape. The bottom row of Table 15 shows that increased frequency of stranger harassment was associated with using active strategies. Thus, women may choose active strategies more frequently when they experience more harassment. Overall, more research is needed to identify traits and behaviors of women who predominantly select one strategy over another; additionally, more research is necessary to determine the context and setting in which certain strategies are employed.

Understanding who uses which strategies, where, and when will help in elucidating which outcomes are more associated with which strategies.

### 3.2.4. Additional Comparisons

3.2.4.1. Heterosexuals vs. non-heterosexuals. The majority (76%) of the current sample reported being exclusively heterosexual, while 24% reported being bisexual or homosexual. Comparisons between heterosexual and non-heterosexual respondents were conducted with the major variables of the study: stranger harassment index, objectification, fear of rape, risk of rape, restriction of movement, and the coping strategies. As Table 17 shows, there were virtually no significant differences between the groups, with two exceptions. First, there was a marginally significant difference in scores on the Stranger Harassment Index between heterosexuals ( $M = 14.09$ ,  $SD = 7.21$ ) and non-heterosexuals ( $M = 15.88$ ,  $SD = 8.44$ ),  $t(351) = -1.91$ ,  $p = .057$ . This result suggests that non-heterosexual women may experience more stranger harassment. T-tests on each of the factors of the SHI (verbal and pressure) revealed a significant difference between heterosexual and non-heterosexual women on the verbal factor ( $M_h = 2.28$ ,  $SD_h = 1.08$ ,  $M_{nh} = 2.57$ ,  $SD_{nh} = 1.23$ ,  $t(351) = -2.03$ ,  $p = .04$ ), but not the pressure factor ( $M_h = .67$ ,  $SD_h = .68$ ,  $M_{nh} = .76$ ,  $SD_{nh} = .78$ ,  $t(351) = -1.09$ ,  $ns$ ). Second, there was a significant difference in restriction in movement between heterosexual ( $M = 4.11$ ,  $SD = 1.10$ ) and non-heterosexual ( $M = 3.53$ ,  $SD = 1.05$ ) women,  $t(351) = 4.29$ ,  $p < .01$ . Even though they were reporting slightly more stranger harassment, non-heterosexual women are less restricted in their movement than heterosexual women. Overall, these results suggest that heterosexual and non-heterosexual women may have somewhat different experiences with stranger harassment. Future research should investigate if there is a difference in

frequency and/or a difference in the type of harassment experienced. Interestingly, there were no differences between the two groups on the coping strategy indexes. Thus, heterosexual women were no more (or less) inclined to view stranger harassment as benign, or to respond passively to it.

3.2.4.2. American women vs. Canadian, British, and Indian women. The current data set also allowed an investigation of regional differences in women's experiences. Unfortunately, many of the locations women reported living in were represented by only 1 or 2 individuals. Canada, Great Britain, and India, however, each had at least 10 individuals. Comparisons were conducted between these three countries and the United States. Table 18 displays the results. The most intriguing findings were that women in India report significantly more stranger harassment than women in the US, Canada, or Great Britain,  $t_s > 2.79$ ,  $ps < .01$ . In addition, Indian women were less likely than each of the others to use benign coping strategies,  $t_s > 2.80$ ,  $ps < .01$ . These analyses suggest that Indian women may be victims of more malicious stranger harassment that cannot be brushed off as merely a joke or as unimportant. Of course, definitive conclusions about similarities and differences between these countries cannot be drawn from such small samples. In addition, it is highly likely that the women from India responded to the survey after reading the Blank Noise Project, which is devoted to fighting stranger harassment in India. The women coming to the survey from that site were likely more sensitized to stranger harassment, so the differences between Indian women and American, British, and Canadian women need to be viewed with caution. Future cross-cultural research is necessary to ascertain the types of harassment, frequency, and

consequences experienced by women in different countries and regions throughout the world.

3.2.4.3. Age. Finally, because this sample contained a wider age range than the standard college sample, I divided the sample at the mean age (23) into two groups: women 22 and younger and women 23 and older. Table 19 shows the comparisons between these groups. The younger women reported more restriction in their movement, more fear of rape, and more perceived risk of rape than the older women,  $t_s > 2.00$ ,  $p_s < .05$ . In addition, the younger women were significantly more likely to use passive, benign, or self-blame strategies to cope with harassment than older women,  $t_s > 2.40$ ,  $p_s < .05$ . While not significant, the difference in reported use of active coping strategies suggests potentially more frequent use of these strategies by older women ( $M = 3.13$ ,  $SD = 1.33$ ) than younger women ( $M = 2.99$ ,  $SD = 1.28$ ). Even though there was no difference between younger and older women in reported experiences of stranger harassment, the data do suggest that the means of coping and consequences may be different for older women. The implication for future research is that experiences of college co-eds may not be representative of the experiences of post-college women. Cross-sectional research is needed to more thoroughly and accurately compare the experiences of women of various age groups. In addition, longitudinal studies are needed to understand if and how the experience of stranger harassment changes over the lifespan.

### Study 3: Classroom Sample with Diary Manipulation

The main objective of Study 3 was to randomly assign women to complete either a daily diary of their experiences with stranger harassment or a daily diary of their study habits. If the former group were made more aware of stranger harassment, they might show more self-objectification, fear of rape, and restriction in movement than women in the study habits control group. In addition, the daily diary afforded a check on whether one-time reports of stranger harassment are biased by memory (i.e., either over-exaggerated or under-recalled).

#### 4.1. Methods

##### 4.1.1. Participants

Female and male volunteers participated in exchange for extra credit toward their Introductory Psychology course, taught by the dissertation's author. Because the majority of male participants failed to respond appropriately to the survey questions (i.e., leaving the majority of the questionnaire unanswered or writing in inappropriate answers), their results will not be discussed. The resulting female sample contained 141 participants at Time 1 (pre-diary) and 114 participants at Time 2 (post-diary); there were 5 weeks between the Time 1 and Time 2 assessments. Approximately 44% were Asian, 35% were White, 9% were Black, 4% were Latina, and the remaining 8% reported another ethnicity. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 25 with a mean age of 18.5 years old. The majority (99%) reported being exclusively heterosexual.

##### 4.1.2. Measures

4.1.2.1. Survey. Participants responded at Time 1 and Time 2 to the questionnaire used in Study 2. Because reliabilities were virtually identical across time and groups,

they are reported for Time 1 and collapsed across groups. The surveillance and shame subscales of the Objectified Body Consciousness Scale both showed adequate internal consistency (surveillance  $\alpha \geq .82$ ; shame  $\alpha \geq .83$ ). The body surveillance and body shame scales were significantly correlated ( $r \geq .38, p < .01$ ). Thus, they were averaged to form the Self-Objectification Index ( $\alpha \geq .86$ ). Fear of rape by a stranger and an acquaintance were highly related,  $r \geq .65, p < .001$ , as were the likelihood measures,  $r \geq .56, p < .001$ . They were subsequently combined to form the fear of rape and risk of rape indexes, respectively; the subsequent indexes were positively related,  $r \geq .25, p < .01$ . The 10-item Restriction in Movement scale showed adequate internal consistency ( $\alpha \geq .72$ ). The physical concern and physical view vanity scales both showed adequate internal consistency (concern  $\alpha \geq .90$ ; view  $\alpha \geq .94$ ). Finally, the achievement vanity scale was also internally consistent,  $\alpha \geq .88$ . The reliabilities for the SHI are presented in the results section.

4.1.2.2. Stranger harassment diary. Between Time 1 and Time 2, participants completed a daily diary on their stranger harassment experiences or their study habits (in the control condition). The diaries were administered over the Internet and designed to be completed in less than 10 minutes to encourage participants to complete them on a daily basis.

In the stranger harassment diary, the participants were first asked to think about their experiences during that day with strangers. Next, they were asked to select a variety of items that described the setting of one particular incident with strangers that occurred that day (e.g. nighttime, on the street, off campus, whether or not they were alone). Participants answered questions about the main perpetrator, including gender,

approximate age, race, and student status. They also rated the attractiveness of the main perpetrator on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*not very attractive*) to 7 (*very attractive*). The participants were then asked to provide a brief description of the incident and to estimate the number of individuals involved. They rated the severity of the incident on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*not at all severe*) to 10 (*extremely severe*). Finally, respondents indicated which emotions (happy, sad, excited, anxious, fearful, nervous, disgusted, joyous, complimented, angry) they experienced during the incident and after the incident.

The study habits diary mirrored the questions in the stranger harassment diary in length and form. Because the responses to the study habits diary are irrelevant to the current research, they will not be discussed. However, the control group will be used as a comparison group in the described results.

#### 4.1.3. Procedure

4.1.3.1. Time 1 assessment. The participants were drawn from the experimenter's General Psychology course and were notified of the dates when the survey portions of the study would be conducted. The survey at Time 1 was administered during class time by a pair of research assistants. The participants were informed that the study was related to their college experiences and that there were several different questionnaires being administered which may or may not relate to their personal experiences. The participants were instructed to answer the questions to the best of their ability. Before receiving the survey, participants read and signed an informed consent that detailed the requirements of the study including an explanation of the diary portion. The participants completed the questionnaire in the same order as Study 2.

After completing the questionnaire, the participants were randomly assigned to the stranger harassment and study habits diaries and given the following instructions regarding accessing the diary on the Internet:

This portion of the study will be conducted on the Internet. You will be required to log onto a specific website each day and complete a diary of your daily experiences. There are a variety of diaries in this portion of the survey, but you will be assigned to one for the following 5 weeks. Please do not discuss your diary topic with the other participants in class. To maintain the integrity of the research it is essential that the diary topics remain secret. At the end of the research period, you will be fully debriefed and allowed to discuss the research. Until that time, you must quietly complete your assigned diary without discussion. Once you have accessed the diary, please answer all of the questions truthfully and honestly.

4.1.3.2. Low response rate. Over the course of 5 weeks with 141 participants in the Time 1 sample, it was estimated that full compliance would yield 4,935 total diaries, approximately 2,468 in the stranger harassment condition. Only 241 completed stranger harassment diaries were obtained, yielding an unexpectedly low 9.7% response rate. The study habits diary had a slightly higher response rate of 12.9% with 320 completed diaries. At Time 2, both groups of participants reported completing on average 3 diary entries per week. Although when asked to estimate how many total entries they completed, both groups estimated a total between 6 and 10 entries. In emails to the experimenter and in debriefing discussions following the study, many participants confessed to forgetting to complete the diary, losing the web address of the diary, and

misplacing the password to access the diary. Participants were instructed to access the diary everyday even if they did not experience the particular event (i.e. an incident with a stranger or studying) that day. In reviewing the diaries, it became clear that many participants ignored this instruction. Only a handful of diary entries, however, expressed that no events with strangers occurred. Thus it is unclear if the low number of diary entries is indicative of infrequency of events or poor response rates from participants.

4.1.3.3. Time 2 assessment. After five weeks, the Time 2 survey was administered during class time by three research assistants. The Time 2 questionnaire presented the survey items in the same order as Time 1. However, two items were added to assess participants' frequency of diary entries. Participants were first asked how many days per week they completed the diaries, and then were asked to estimate how many total entries they completed. The printing and formatting of the two questionnaires was slightly varied to help reduce consistency effects. After completing the questionnaire, the participants were thanked for their participation and debriefed about the true purpose of the research.

## 4.2. Results and Discussion

### 4.2.1. Diary Manipulations

In order to test if the diary manipulation was successful, independent sample t-tests were performed between the women completing the stranger harassment diary (N = 61) and the study habits diary (N = 53). However, as shown in Table 21, no significant differences were found between the means of the two diary samples for stranger harassment, objectification, fear or risk of rape, restriction in movement, or the vanity measures. Likewise, there were no significant differences between Time 1 (N = 139) and

Time 2 ( $N = 114$ ), with one exception (Table 20). Fear of rape was lower in Time 2 than Time 1,  $t(253) = 3.70, p < .01$ . Overall, the diary failed to impact the participants' perceptions of stranger harassment and outcomes, likely because of the low response rate. As a result, I was not able to adequately test my hypotheses or investigate whether filling out the diary would result in different event frequencies (higher or lower), compared with one-time assessment procedures. Therefore, the remainder of the data analyses were conducted with the Time 1 data and collapsed across groups.

#### 4.2.2. Frequency of Stranger Harassment

Table 22 displays the participants' reported frequencies of stranger harassment experiences. Twenty percent of the women in this sample reported experiencing "catcalls, whistles, or stares" once a month, and 25% reported experiencing "unwanted sexual attention" once a month. Similar to Study 1 and 2, 30% reported experiencing "catcalls, whistles, or stares" from strangers every few days or more. In addition, reported rates of sexually coercive behaviors were lower than for the verbal behaviors more representative of stranger harassment.

The SHI items were factor analyzed using a principle components analysis and varimax rotation. Table 23 shows that, as with Studies 1 and 2, two factors emerged: verbal ( $\alpha = .60$ ) and sexual pressure ( $\alpha = .67$ ). In this sample, "subtle pressure or coercion to cooperate sexually from a stranger" fell into the verbal category. The two factors correlated well,  $r(141) = .35, p < .01$  and were therefore combined to form the SHI ( $\alpha = .64$ ). Table 24 presents the descriptive statistics for the SHI and all of the study's measures.

Data obtained from the diaries help to shed light on where and when stranger harassment occurred for this sample of college coeds. Table 25 displays the frequencies for each descriptor of the event. As the table shows, nearly 50% reported that the harassment incidents occurred on-campus. Women were almost equally likely to report being victimized when alone or with friends (27.8% and 31.5%, respectively), at night or during the day (31.1% and 29.5%, respectively). In addition, eighty-four percent of the incidents were reportedly perpetrated by four or few harassers; in many cases, there was only one (31.5%) or two (29.9%) harassers. Participants estimated the instigators to range in age from 16 to 72 with an average age of 23.3. Harassers were rated low on attractiveness ( $M = 3.04$ ,  $SD = 1.74$ ).

#### 4.2.3. Consequences of Stranger Harassment

Table 26 presents the correlations among the measures. Contrary to my hypothesis, experiences of stranger harassment were not significantly related to self-objectification,  $r(141) = .03$ ,  $p = ns$ . Stranger harassment was only reliably related to perceived risk of rape,  $r(141) = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ .

As in Studies 1 and 2, there was a negligible correlation between the SHI and the restriction of movement scale,  $r(141) = -.06$ ,  $ns$ . Again, I did find a significant relationship between fear of rape and restriction in movement,  $r(141) = .18$ ,  $p < .05$ . Interestingly, self-objectification was related to neither fear of rape nor perceived likelihood of being raped, both  $rs(141) > .03$ ,  $ps < ns$ . Self-objectification was again positively correlated with physical concern vanity ( $r(141) = .44$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and negatively correlated with physical view vanity ( $r(141) = -.17$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Self-objectification was related to restriction in movement,  $r(141) = .22$ ,  $p < .01$ . The pattern shown in Table 26

is markedly different from the results of the previous studies. The pattern of these correlations suggests that stranger harassment may have some influence on restriction in movement indirectly through perceived risk of rape. The correlations support also the findings in Studies 1 and 2 that self-objectification and vanity are overlapping concepts that need to be teased apart.

An interesting feature of the current sample is that the diary gives us a glimpse into the harassment experience and how the participants felt about it. On a ten-point scale, the participants rated the severity of the incidents as extremely mild ( $M = 2.51$ ,  $SD = 2.13$ ). Table 27 displays the frequency reports for the emotions felt during and after the event. As the table illustrates, happiness was the most common emotional response to a stranger harassment experience. Indeed, reports of the positive emotions (happy, joyous, complimented) tended to increase after the event was over, while negative emotions (anxious, fearful, nervous, disgusted, angry) decreased after the event. This sample's overall enjoyment of the harassing experiences may, in part, account for the lack of relationship between harassment and fear of rape and restriction in movement; something that is pleasant is unlikely to result in fear and restriction.

#### 4.2.4. Coping with Stranger Harassment

As with Studies 1 and 2, I conducted a principle components factor analysis, using varimax rotation to assess whether these data adequately captured multiple coping with harassment strategies. This analysis revealed the expected four factors: passive, self-blame, benign, and active (see Table 28). I averaged the appropriate items to form four subscales; each showed adequate reliability (all  $\alpha$ s  $> .74$ ). Table 24 shows the descriptive statistics for each subscale. Paired sample  $t$ -tests showed that women were

more likely to report passive coping strategies compared with active, self-blame, and benign, all  $t_s(140) > 9.32$ ,  $p_s < .01$ .

4.2.4.1. Objectification, fear of rape, and restriction of movement. Regression analyses did not support my hypothesis that women's coping strategies would moderate their levels of self-objectification in response to stranger harassment. Table 29 presents the results. As can be seen in Table 30, there is little relationship between the coping strategies and self-objectification ( $r_s < .15$ ,  $p_s = ns$ ). Unlike Studies 1 and 2, the coping strategies were not significantly related to any of the outcome variables. Again, because this sample reported high enjoyment for the stranger harassment experience, it may be that these coping strategies were not particularly relevant or necessary.

## General Discussion

*It was always a feeling of shame. Shame that when 14, a passing cyclist grabbed me. Shame that in the school bus, the driver always fiddled with the rearview mirror so he could look at my chest. Shame that men leered with smug smiles when I walked past. Or tried to brush up against me. Shame because I felt it happened only to me and only because there was something wrong with the way I looked or dressed or walked or talked or was. Something wrong - terribly, terribly so - with me. And the only reaction seemed to be silence. Because confrontation might lead to attention being drawn to a dirty experience I wanted to keep secret. Because speaking out meant acknowledging that something was wrong when I could cloak it. (<http://blanknoiseproject.blogspot.com/2006/12/action-heroes-in-bangalore.html>)*

As the above quotation shows, stranger harassment is potentially detrimental to women and often an invisible source of shame. The present findings represent a first step toward a social psychological analysis of stranger harassment. In both college and Internet samples, I found a relatively high frequency of reports of stranger harassment. Approximately 25% reported experiencing unwanted sexual attention from strangers at least once a month, including sexist remarks or seductive “come ons.” Additionally, 30% of the sample reported experiencing catcalls, whistles, and stares every few days or more. Strikingly, between 8 and 25% of the samples suffered experiences akin to sexual coercion or assault (e.g., forceful grabbing) at least once a month. These data support treating stranger harassment as a significant form of humiliation and indignity that targets women and is likely to undermine the quality of their lives. In essence, stranger harassment turns public spaces into an everyday hostile environment for women.

With respect to the consequences of stranger harassment, I predicted that it would positively predict women’s self-objectification; this hypothesis was only supported by the first study. Unfortunately, the strong correlations between self-objectification and vanity suggest that the two concepts, at least as measured by the OBCS and vanity scales, are

not entirely distinct. Partial correlations controlling for the two forms of vanity did not significantly improve the correlations between self-objectification and stranger harassment ( $r_{\text{study1}} = .16, p = .02; r_{\text{study2}} = -.10, p = .07; r_{\text{study3}} = .12, p = .15$ ). In both Study 1 and Study 2, stranger harassment was reliably linked to physical concern vanity and physical view vanity. As postulated in the results of Study 1, one interpretation of this link is that physical concern vanity leads women to dress in clothing that may attract more attention (and more harassment), and women who are harassed more frequently may have more physical view vanity in that they are aware that their bodies are appealing to other people.

Unfortunately, until a greater distinction can be made between self-objectification and vanity, it is difficult to understand self-objectification's elusive relationship with stranger harassment. Noll and Fredrickson (1998) argue that self-objectification does not necessarily lead to disliking of one's body; self-objectification merely leads to an obsession or preoccupation with one's appearance. These authors suggest that some of the negative consequences of self-objectification may stem not from shame about one's own body, but from the anticipation of potential shame. In other words, some women who may be satisfied and even proud of their appearance may still take preventive measures (i.e. dieting, exercise, surgery) to maintain that satisfaction and avoid body shame. In fact, body surveillance ( $4.53 > M < 4.74$ ) was reported significantly more than body shame ( $3.49 > M < 3.60$ ),  $t_s > 14.05, p_s < .01$  in all three studies. Noll and Fredrickson (1998) assess body shame as a separate construct from self-objectification, which again reinforces the need for a more precise measure of self-objectification.

Despite the methodological issues, it is still likely that stranger harassment is one potential source of women's self-objectification since self-objectification reflects emphasizing the body's appearance over its function. If this link exists, the large literature on self-objectification that predicts negative outcomes in women, including depression and disordered eating (e.g. Tiggemann & Slater, 2001; Slater & Tiggemann, 2002; Harrison & Frederickson, 2003; Greenleaf, 2005; Muehlenkamp & Saris-Baglama, 2002; Tiggemann & Kuring, 2004; Muehlenkamp, Swanson, & Brausch, 2005), may become applicable to stranger harassment. Thus, it remains conceivable that stranger harassment indirectly promotes psychological and behavioral problems in women, through its link to self-objectification.

#### 5.1 Coping with Stranger Harassment

In Studies 1 and 2, women's coping responses to stranger harassment were significantly related to self-objectification. First, active coping predicted less objectification. Women, who acknowledge the behavior as inappropriate by confronting or reporting the harasser, or talking the experience over with a friend, may be able to resist feeling sexually objectified. Second, women who responded passively (e.g., by ignoring or denying the harassment) reported feeling self-objectified. Because passive strategies were more prevalent than active (or any other type) of coping, the likelihood of women feeling objectified by stranger harassment is high. Third, self-blame responses were also positively related to self-objectification. As predicted, women who viewed the harassment as their own fault (i.e., as something they could have avoided) also reported feeling self-objectified. Finally, coping with harassment by viewing it as benign, innocuous, or even complimentary was also positively related to self-objectification. By

coping with the harassment as though it was a form of flattery (or “no big deal”), women may be capitulating to being sexually objectified. Even if they enjoy the attention from men, being objectified by others can lead to self-objectifying (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997) which, as noted above, predicts serious outcomes in women such as depression and disordered eating.

### 5.2. Negative Consequences of Stranger Harassment

I also predicted that stranger harassment would be positively related to women’s fears of victimization and voluntary restriction of movement. This hypothesis was only partially supported by Study 2, which found a correlation between stranger harassment and fear of rape, but not between stranger harassment and restriction in movement. Additionally, Study 1 and Study 3 only demonstrate a link between stranger harassment and perceived risk of rape. Collectively, these studies suggest that stranger harassment’s effect on restriction in movement may be indirect. All three studies supported the research of Hickman and Muehlenhard (1997) that has found that women who feared rape were more likely to curb their movements (e.g., to avoid going out alone at night). This research extended these findings to include stranger harassment and self-objectification as potential antecedents of victimization fears.

An unexpected finding was the positive correlation between stranger harassment and achievement vanity. I predicted that experiences with stranger harassment would decrease women’s desire for personal power and professional success, but this was not supported by the data. Instead, both Studies 1 and 2 found that stranger harassment was positively linked with pride in one’s accomplishments and achievements. This finding may suggest that women are undeterred by stranger harassment as a barrier to their

professional lives, and that it may even inspire harder work and more dedication to success. Alternatively, the finding may reflect that professional and successful women, those who are violating prescribed gender stereotypes, are more likely to be victims of stranger harassment. If stranger harassment is a mechanism through which men exert their power and influence over women, targeting the women who most threaten their positions is a likely strategy for harassing. This interpretation is supported by the sexual harassment research that suggests women in male-dominated jobs are more likely to be harassed for violating prescribed gender stereotypes (Burgess & Borgida, 1999) and being in a position of role-conflict (Popovich & Licata, 1987).

While the relationships may not be direct, the influence of stranger harassment on fear of rape, restriction in movement, and pride in one's professional success does support the hypothesis that stranger harassment may be a powerful way of reinforcing sexist beliefs about the roles and rights of women and men. Stranger harassment appears to function as a tool of sexism in much the same way as sexual harassment. As Franke (1997) states, "sexual content or coercion in workplace relationships is merely the inevitable result of a sexually heterogeneous workplace—it is the price women pay for participating equally in the public sphere" (p. 700). Both sexual harassment and stranger harassment function to maintain differences between the sexes and reinforce the sexism that is pervasive in society.

### 5.3. Limitations and Future Directions

One major limitation of the current research is that it is assumed that stranger harassment is a universally negative experience. As Magley, Hulin et al. (1999) found regarding sexual harassment, many women fail to label their experiences as harassment.

While there are a variety of hypotheses to explain this lack of labeling, one prime contender is the assessment of the severity of the incident (Barak, Fisher, Houston, 1992; Ellis, Barak, & Pinto, 1991; Fitzgerald, et al., 1988; Giuffre & Williams, 1994; Stockdale & Vaux, 1993; Stockdale, Vaux, & Cashin, 1995). In the sexual harassment literature, it is generally assumed that sexual coercion is more severe than unwanted sexual attention, which is in turn more severe than gender harassment. Several studies (Barak, Fisher, Houston, 1992; Ellis, Barak, & Pinto, 1991; Fitzgerald, et al., 1988) have found that the more severe forms of sexual harassment (i.e. sexual coercion) are consistently labeled harassment, but others (Stockdale & Vaux, 1993) have not been able to support this finding. Unfortunately, many of these studies (Barak, Fisher, Houston, 1992; Ellis, Barak, & Pinto, 1991; Fitzgerald, et al., 1988; Stockdale & Vaux, 1993) do not ask participants to report how severe they believe their personal experiences to have been, and thus the severity hypothesis for the link between acknowledging one has been sexually harassed and one's experiences is based on experimenter assumptions of severity. Stockdale, Vaux, and Cashin (1995) do show that how upsetting women rate their experiences is likely to predict whether they label their experience sexual harassment. Drawing from this literature and applying it to the current set of studies, one explanation for the lack of significant correlations between stranger harassment and the outcome measures is that the participants did not view their experiences as upsetting or severe. As reported in Study 3, the predominant emotional response to the harassment was happiness. Study 3's participants were asked to rate the severity of their experience on a 10-point scale; the average rating was 2.51 ( $SD = 2.13$ ) suggesting that the participants did not view their experiences as severe. Interestingly, Magley, Hulin's et al. (1999) work suggests that

whether or not a woman labels her experiences as sexual harassment has little impact on the experience of negative consequences. In other words, both women who labeled and did not label their experiences reported the same negative outcomes. Study 3 did not support Magley's finding as the women in the sample reported no negative consequences. The lack of negative consequences, reported happiness, and low levels of severity suggest that the women of Study 3 may have viewed the stranger harassment as a compliment and not as a disturbance. Because participants in Studies 1 and 2 were not asked to report the severity of their experiences, it remains unclear exactly what role severity plays in interpretation of harassing events. Research on stranger harassment needs to investigate whether the labeling effects for sexual harassment hold true across concepts. Future research needs to investigate the links between severity and interpretation of the event with the outcomes of stranger harassment.

Another limitation is that Studies 1 and 2 did not address the issue of where the harassment took place. While it is theorized that stranger harassment can occur in public places ranging from the street to stores to public transit, the unique characteristics of a college campus may present different "public" experiences than the average woman faces. For example, college women may be more likely to attend parties at fraternities or bars that allow for more harassment opportunities (that may or may not be unwanted). Study 3 provides some support for this idea with 50% of the sample reporting harassing experiences on campus with about 12% occurring at parties. In addition, evidence from Gardner (1995) suggests that women in metropolitan areas are more susceptible to harassment than women in suburban and rural areas. Future research needs to address the specifics of where stranger harassment is most frequent for a variety of settings.

The present research also suggests the need for further investigation of the link between objectification and sexual harassment. It seems likely that if women who are harassed by strangers experience self-objectification, women harassed by known perpetrators (e.g., in the workplace or school) may also suffer a similar outcome. Moreover, self-objectification and sexual harassment have been independently linked to negative psychological outcomes (e.g., depression and anxiety; Fitzgerald, et al., 1997; Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995; Fitzgerald, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1995). Thus, future work should test the possibility that self-objectification may serve to mediate the relationship between sexual harassment and psychological dysfunction. Additionally, the current research assumes that the negative consequences of stranger harassment will be similar to the negative consequences of sexual harassment (i.e. decreased psychological well-being). Future research should directly assess the relationship of depression and anxiety to experiences of stranger harassment.

Women's strategies for coping with stranger harassment should be further investigated. For example, passive and self-blame responses may reflect women's gender role socialization (e.g., to avoid confrontation and blaming others), whereas active strategies may require more agency. Future research should explore a likely connection between women's acceptance of gender roles or stereotypes and their use of passive (versus active) strategies. Because passive and self-blame strategies were linked to self-objectification, future work may reveal a vicious cycle whereby women are taught to ignore or fault themselves for harassment, which then makes them more vulnerable to experiencing its negative effects. Results for self-blame were particularly poignant in this regard, as self-blame was related to perceived risk of rape. Although women who

viewed stranger harassment as benign or complimentary were less likely to fear rape and restrict their movements, they also reported greater self-objectification. Feeling flattered by sexual attention from strangers may reflect women's acceptance of sexual objectification as normative – something women should expect from men as positive reinforcement (e.g., for being attractive). In this respect, stranger harassment may be similar in function to benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001), in which women are praised for being a “good woman,” but which actually has a pernicious influence by making them feel weak.

Finally, the present research focuses on quantifying the stranger harassment experience. Qualitative interviews and focus group research is necessary in order to elaborate a complete picture of how and when stranger harassment takes place. Such research would help to describe which circumstances are likely to lead to active versus passive coping strategies. Additionally, qualitative research would shed light on which situations are more likely to elicit negative outcomes and which situations are likely to be viewed favorably. Future research needs to address the qualitative aspects of stranger harassment in order to gain a full understanding of the individual woman's experience.

## Conclusion

Despite the wealth of sexual harassment research, women's analogous experience of public harassment by strangers has been largely ignored. The present findings suggest that stranger harassment is a remarkably common occurrence for many women, and that common means of coping with it may lead to increased self-objectification. Because self-objectification has negative consequences for women (e.g., depression and eating disorders), stranger harassment may be a serious form of discrimination. Moreover, stranger harassment may have direct and indirect consequences that decrease the quality of women's lives, such as increased fear of rape and restriction of movement. Overall, stranger harassment appears to be a frequent and significant experience for women and, therefore, is deserving of future research designed to more fully elaborate the experience and its consequences.

## References

- Atwood, M. (1986). *The Handmaid's Tale*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Barak, A., Fisher, W.A., & Houston, S. (1992). Individual difference correlates of the experience of sexual harassment among female university students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*(1), 17-37.
- Berdahl, J. (in press a.) The sexual harassment of uppity women.
- Berdahl, J. (in press b). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review*.
- Bowman, C. G. (1993). Street harassment and the informal ghettoization of women. *Harvard Law Review, 106*, 517-580.
- Burgess, D. & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 5* (3), 665-692.
- Ellis, S., Barak, A., & Pinto, A. (1991). Moderating effects of personal cognitions on experienced and perceived sexual harassment of women at the workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*(16), 1320-1337.
- Ferraro, K. (1996). Women's fear of victimization: Shadow of sexual assault? *Social Forces, 75* (2), 667-690.
- Fisher, B.S. & Sloan, J.J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the "shadow of sexual assault hypothesis" supported? *Justice Quarterly, 20* (3), 633-659.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990, March). Assessing strategies for coping with sexual harassment: A theoretical/empirical approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Women in Psychology, Tempe, AZ.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C.L., Gelfand, M.J., & Magley, V.J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82* (4), 578-589.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Drasgow, F., & Magley, V.J. (1999). Sexual harassment in the armed forces: A test of an integrated model. *Military Psychology, 11* (3), 329-343.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Gelfand, M.J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17* (4), 425-445.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Hulin, C.L., & Drasgow, F. (1994). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: An integrated model. In G.P. Keita & J.J. Hurrell (Eds.), *Job Stress in a Changing Workforce: Investigating Gender, Diversity, and Family Issues* (pp. 55-73). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*(2), 152-175.
- Franke, K.M. (1997). What's wrong with sexual harassment? *Stanford Law Review, 49*, 691-772.
- Fredrickson, B.L. & Roberts, T.A. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173-206.

- Gardner, C. B. (1995). *Passing By: Gender and Public Harassment*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gelfand, M.J., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 47(2), 164-177.
- Giuffre, P.A., & Williams, C.L. (1994). Boundary lines: Labeling sexual harassment in restaurants. *Gender & Society*, 8(3), 378-401.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent sexism. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (vol. 33, pp. 115-188), Thousand Oaks, CA: Academic Press.
- Glomb, T.M., Richman, W.L., Hulin, C.L., Drasgow, F., Schneider, K.T., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1997). Ambient sexual harassment: An integrated model of antecedents and consequences. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 71 (3), 309-328.
- Granello, D.H. & Wheaton, J.E. (2004). Online data collection: Strategies for research. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 82, 387-393.
- Greenleaf, C. (2005). Self-objectification among physically active women. *Sex Roles*, 52 (1/2), 51-62.
- Greenwald, A.G., McGhee, D.E., & Schwartz, J.L.K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1464-1480.
- Gruber, J.E. (1989). How women handle sexual harassment: A literature review. *Sociology and Social Research*, 74, 3-9.
- Gutek, B.A. & Done, R.S. (2001). Sexual harassment. In R.K. Unger (Ed.), *Handbook for the Psychology of Women and Gender* (pp. 367-387). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Harris, M.B. & Miller, K.C. (2000). Gender and perceptions of danger. *Sex Roles*, 43 (11/12), 843-863.
- Harrison, K. & Fredrickson, B.L. (2003). Women's sports media, self-objectification, and mental health in Black and White adolescent females. *Journal of Communication*, 216-232.
- Hickman, S.E. & Muehlenhard, C.L. (1997). College women's fears and precautionary behaviors relating to acquaintance rape and stranger rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 527-547.
- Japan tries women-only train cars to stop groping. (June 10, 2005). Retrieved June 14, 2005, from <http://abcnews.go.com/GMA/International/story?id=803965&CMP=OTC-RSSFeeds0312>
- Johnson, H. & Sacco, V.F. (1995). Researching violence against women: Statistics Canada's national survey. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 37, 281-304.
- Klonoff, E.A. & Landrine, H. (1995). The schedule of sexist events: A measure of lifetime and recent sexist discrimination in women's lives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 19, 439-472.
- Klonoff, E.A., Landrine, H., & Campbell, R. (2000). Sexist discrimination may account for well-known gender differences in psychiatric symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 93-99.

- Krahe, B. (2005). Cognitive coping with the threat of rape: Vigilance and cognitive avoidance. *Journal of Personality, 73* (3), 609-643.
- Landrine, H. & Klonoff, E.A. (1997). *Discriminating Against Women: Prevalence, Consequences, and Remedies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Landrine, H., Klonoff, E.A., Gibbs, J., Manning, V., & Lund, M. (1995). Physical and psychiatric correlates of gender discrimination: An application of the schedule of sexist events. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19*, 473-492.
- Lenton, R., Smith, M.D., Fox, J., & Morra, N. (1999). Sexual harassment in public places: Experiences of Canadian women. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 36* (4), 517-540.
- McKinley, N.M. & Hyde, J.S. (1996). The objectified body consciousness scale: development and validation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 181-215.
- MacMillan, R., Nierobisz, A. & Welsh, S. (2000). Experiencing the streets: Harassment and perceptions of safety among women. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 37*, 306-322.
- Magley, V.J. (2002). Coping with sexual harassment: Reconceptualizing women's resistance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 930-945.
- Magley, V.J., Hulin, C.L., Fitzgerald, L.F., & DeNardo, M. (1999). Outcomes of self-labeling sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology 84* (3), 390-402.
- Magley, V.J., Waldo, C.R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1999). The impact of sexual harassment on military personnel: Is it the same for men and women? *Military Psychology, 11* (3), 283-302.
- Muehlenkamp, J.J. & Saris-Baglama, R.N. (2002). Self-objectification and its psychological outcomes for college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*, 371-379.
- Muehlenkamp, J.J., Swanson, J.D., & Brausch, A.M. (2005). Self-objectification, risk-taking, and self-harm in college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 24-32.
- Netemeyer, R.G., Burton, S., & Lichtenstein, D.R. (1995). Trait aspects of vanity: Measurement and relevance to consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*, 612-626.
- Nielsen, L. B. (2000). Situating legal consciousness: experiences and attitudes of ordinary citizens about law and street harassment. *Law & Society Review, 34*, 1055-1090.
- Noll, S.M. & Fredrickson, B.L. (1998). A mediational model linking self-objectification, body shame, and disordered eating. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 623-636.
- Popovich, P.M. & Licata, B.J. (1987). A role model approach to sexual harassment. *Journal of Management, 13* (1), 149-161.
- Pryor, J.B. & McKinney, K. (1995). Research advances in sexual harassment: Introduction and overview. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17* (4), 421-424.
- Rudman, L. A., & Fairchild, K. (in press). The F word: Is feminism incompatible with beauty and romance? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*.
- Rudman, L. A., & Heppen, J. (2003). Implicit romantic fantasies and women's interest in personal power: A glass slipper effect? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1357-1370.

- Schneider, K.T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82* (3), 401-415.
- Slater, A. & Tiggemann, M. (2002). A test of objectification theory in adolescent girls. *Sex Roles, 46* (9/10), 343-349.
- Stockdale, M.S. & Vaux, A. (1993). What sexual harassment experiences lead respondents to acknowledge being sexually harassed? A secondary analysis of a university survey. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 43*(2), 221-234.
- Stockdale, M.S., Vaux, A., & Cashin, J. (1995). Acknowledging sexual harassment: A test of alternative models. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*(4), 469-496.
- Sussman, A. (May 23, 2006) In Rio rush hour, women relax in single sex trains. Retrieved May 24, 2006, from <http://www.womensenews.org/article.cfm?aid=2750>
- Swim, J.K., Cohen, L.L., & Hyers, L.L. (1998). Experiencing everyday prejudice and discrimination. In J.K. Swim & C. Stangor (Eds.), *Prejudice: The Target's Perspective* (pp. 37-60) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Tuten, T.L., Urban, D.J., & Bosnjak, M. (2002). Internet surveys and data quality: A review. In Batinic, B., Reips, U.D., Bosnjak, M. (Eds.), *Online Social Sciences* (pp. 7-26) Seattle. Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.
- Tiggemann, M. & Kuring, J.K. (2004). The role of body objectification in disordered eating and depressed mood. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 43*, 299-311.
- Tiggemann, M. & Slater, A. (2001). A test of objectification theory in former dancers and non-dancers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 25*, 57-64.
- Warr, M. (1985). Fear of rape among urban women. *Social Problems, 32*, 238-252.
- Wiener, R.L. & Gutek, B.A. (1999). Advances in sexual harassment research, theory, and policy. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 5* (3), 507-518.

## Appendix

### 1. Stranger Harassment Index – Experiences (YES or NO)

1. Have you ever experienced sexist remarks or behaviors from a stranger?
2. Have you ever experienced crude and offensive sexual remarks, jokes, or actions from a stranger?
3. Have you ever experienced seductive behavior, remarks, or 'come ons' from a stranger?
4. Have you ever experienced unwanted sexual attention or interaction from a stranger?
5. Have you ever experienced subtle pressure or coercion to cooperate sexually from a stranger?
6. Have you ever experienced direct or explicit pressure to cooperate sexually from a stranger?
7. Have you ever experienced unwanted touching, stroking, or hugging from a stranger?
8. Have you ever experienced direct or forceful fondling or grabbing from a stranger?
9. Have you ever experienced catcalls, whistles, or stares from a stranger?

### 2. Stranger Harassment Index – Frequency (once; once a month; 2-4 times per month; every few days; every day)

1. How frequently have you experienced sexist remarks or behaviors from a stranger?
2. How frequently have you experienced crude and offensive sexual remarks, jokes, or actions from a stranger?
3. How frequently have you experienced seductive behavior, remarks, or 'come ons' from a stranger?
4. How frequently have you experienced unwanted sexual attention or interaction from a stranger?

5. How frequently have you experienced subtle pressure or coercion to cooperate sexually from a stranger?
6. How frequently have you experienced direct or explicit pressure to cooperate sexually from a stranger?
7. How frequently have you experienced unwanted touching, stroking, or hugging from a stranger?
8. How frequently have you experienced direct or forceful fondling or grabbing from a stranger?
9. How frequently have you experienced catcalls, whistles, or stares from a stranger?

3. Coping with Stranger Harassment (1 = not at all descriptive; 7 = extremely descriptive)

Think about your personal experience with the situations described on the previous pages.

Rate each statement for how you would typically react.

1. I treated it as a joke.
2. I pretended nothing was happening.
3. I considered it flattering.
4. I realized that I had probably brought it on myself.
5. I let him know I didn't like what he was doing.
6. I reported him.
7. I talked to someone about what happened.
8. I acted like I didn't notice.
9. I assumed he meant well.
10. I felt stupid for letting myself get into the situation.
11. I just let it go.

12. I just ignored the whole thing.
13. I assumed he didn't know better.
14. I blamed myself for what happened.
15. I let him know how I felt about what he was doing.
16. I tried to forget the whole thing.
17. I figured he must really like me.
18. I realized he probably wouldn't have done it if I had looked or dressed differently.
19. I didn't do anything.
20. I assumed he was trying to be funny.
21. I just 'blew it off' and acted like I didn't care.

#### 4. Education Goal

1. How many years of post-high school education (including undergrad) do you plan to achieve?

<4                  4-5                  6-7                  8-9                  10-11                  >11

#### 5. Money

2. In thousands of dollars, how much money do you (on your own) expect to earn annually?

<20    21-30    31-40    41-50    51-60    61-70    71-80    81-90    91-100

>100

#### 6. High Status Job Index (1 = not interested, 7 = very interested)

Please rate how interested you are in the following jobs.

- a. Finance
- b. Teacher

- c. CEO
- d. Politician
- e. Artist
- f. Reporter
- g. Doctor
- h. Therapist
- i. Social Worker
- j. Corporate Lawyer
- k. Dentist
- l. Psychiatrist
- m. Counselor
- n. Physician's Assistant

7. Self-Objectification Index (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I rarely think about how I look.
2. I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me.
3. I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks.
4. I rarely compare how I look with how other people look.
5. During the day, I think about how I look many times.
6. I often worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.
7. I rarely worry about how I look to other people.
8. I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks.

9. When I can't control my weight, I feel like something must be wrong with me.
10. I feel ashamed of myself when I haven't made the effort to look my best.
11. I feel like I must be a bad person when I don't look as good as I could.
12. I would be ashamed for people to know what I really weigh.
13. I never worry that something is wrong with me when I am not exercising as much as I should.
14. When I am not exercising enough, I question whether I am a good person.
15. Even when I can't control my weight, I think I'm an okay person.
16. When I'm not the size I think I should be, I feel ashamed.
17. I am uncomfortable with the size of my thighs.
18. I am not ashamed by the size and shape of my buttocks.
19. I avoid wearing shirts that are tight or cropped because I don't like the way my stomach looks.
20. I am happy with the size and shape of my breasts/chest.
21. Overall, I am comfortable with how my body looks.

8. Restriction in Movement Scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. I feel safe walking around campus alone during the day.
2. I feel safe walking around campus alone at night.
3. I would not feel comfortable walking around a city alone at night.
4. I try to avoid certain places at night.
5. If I need to go out of my house at night, I often try to have a male friend accompany me.

6. I do not need to have a male escort to feel safe.
7. I am always careful to lock my car doors when driving through unfamiliar neighborhoods.
8. I try to complete all of my errands before nightfall.
9. I feel as safe with a group of friends as I do with a single companion.
10. I feel most comfortable walking alone.

9. Physical Concern Vanity (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. The way I look is extremely important to me.
2. I am very concerned about my appearance.
3. I would feel embarrassed if I was around people and did not look my best.
4. Looking my best is worth the effort.
5. It is important that I always look good.

10. Physical View Vanity (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. People notice how attractive I am.
2. My looks are very appealing to others.
3. People are envious of my good looks.
4. I am a very good-looking individual.
5. My body is sexually appealing.
6. I have the type of body that people want to look at.

11. Achievement Vanity (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

Please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. In a professional sense, I am a very successful person.
2. My achievements are highly regarded by others.
3. I am an accomplished person.
4. I am a good example of professional success.
5. Others wish they were as successful as me.
6. Professional achievements are an obsession with me.
7. I want others to look up to me because of my accomplishments.
8. I am more concerned with professional success than most people I know.
9. Achieving greater success than my peers is important to me.
10. I want my achievements to be recognized by others.

Table 1

Reported Frequency (in Percent) of Women's Stranger Harassment Experiences – Study 1

	Once a Month	Twice a Month	Every Few Days or More
Catcalls, whistles, or stares	32.0	33.3	30.9
Unwanted sexual attention	40.8	24.1	14.5
Crude or offensive sexual jokes	37.3	25.9	11.4
Sexist remarks or behaviors	40.8	22.4	11.4
Seductive remarks or “come ons”	30.0	24.6	15.8
Unwanted touching or stroking	36.0	11.4	2.7
Subtle pressure to cooperate sexually	30.3	6.1	8.1
Direct pressure to cooperate sexually	25.9	5.3	1.3
Forceful fondling or grabbing	26.3	4.8	1.3

*Note.* Percent = percent of sample reporting.

Table 2

## Factor Analysis of the Stranger Harassment Index – Study 1

Factor	Question	Loading Factor 1	Loading Factor 2
Verbal <sup>a</sup>	Crude and offensive sexual remarks, jokes, or actions from a stranger.	.78	.21
	Seductive behavior, remarks, or “come ons” from a stranger.	.77	.27
	Catcalls, whistles, or stares from a stranger.	.76	.09
	Sexist remarks or behaviors from a stranger.	.71	.16
	Unwanted sexual attention or interaction from a stranger.	.70	.27
Sexual Pressure <sup>b</sup>	Direct or explicit pressure to cooperate sexually from a stranger.	.06	.82
	Subtle pressure or coercion to cooperate sexually from a stranger.	.21	.75
	Direct or forceful fondling or grabbing from a stranger.	.22	.71
	Unwanted touching, stroking, or hugging from a stranger.	.41	.61

*Note.* Items factor analyzed were responses to each question (Have you ever experienced...?) multiplied by the frequency of the experience. <sup>a</sup> Eigenvalue = 4.55, variance = 45.55%, and  $\alpha = .83$ . <sup>b</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.27, variance = 14.17%, and  $\alpha = .75$ . The cut-off for loading on a factor was .40.

Table 3

## Descriptive Statistics – Study 1

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Stranger Harassment Index	13.96	7.18
Self-Objectification	4.04	1.00
Objectification IAT	-61.26	96.19
High Status Jobs Index	3.86	.71
Physical Concern Vanity	4.52	1.19
Physical View Vanity	3.97	1.30
Achievement Vanity	4.48	.94
Fear of Rape	7.84	2.43
Risk of Rape	3.18	1.87
Restriction of Movement	4.16	.95
<u>Coping Responses</u>		
Passive	4.01	1.54
Self-Blame	2.77	1.34
Benign	2.72	1.15
Active	3.36	1.49

Table 4  
Correlations between Measures – Study 1

	SHI	SO	PCV	PVV	HSJI	AV	FoR	RoR
Self-Objectification	.16*							
Physical Concern Vanity	.19**	.65**						
Physical View Vanity	.22**	-.21**	.19**					
High Status Jobs Index	.12	.07	.18**	.08				
Achievement Vanity	.19**	-.11	.13*	.45**	.20**			
Fear of Rape	.12	.17*	.22**	.09	.17**	-.02		
Risk of Rape	.25**	.25**	.09	.03	-.03	-.04	.17*	
Restriction of Movement	-.10	.12	.16*	.03	.17**	.04	.31**	.06

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . SHI = Stranger Harassment Index, SO = Self-Objectification, PCV = Physical Concern Vanity, PVV = Physical View Vanity, HSJI = High Status Jobs Index, AV = Achievement Vanity, FoR = Fear of Rape, RoR = Risk of Rape.

Table 5

## Factor Analysis of the Coping with Stranger Harassment Scale – Study 1

Factor	Question	Loading
Passive <sup>a</sup>	I just “blew it off” and acted like I didn’t care.	.80
	I just let it go.	.80
	I just ignored the whole thing.	.78
	I didn’t do anything.	.77
	I acted like I didn’t notice.	.75
	I tried to forget the whole thing.	.74
	I pretended nothing was happening.	.73
Self Blame <sup>b</sup>	I realized that I had probably brought it on myself.	.83
	I blamed myself for what happened.	.81
	I realized he probably wouldn’t have done it if I had dressed differently.	.70
	I felt stupid for letting myself get into the situation.	.67
Benign <sup>c</sup>	I considered it flattering.	.75
	I assumed he meant well.	.75
	I figured he must really like me.	.67
	I assumed he was trying to be funny.	.62
	I treated it as a joke.	.58
Active <sup>d</sup>	I let him know I didn’t like what he was doing.	.85
	I let him know how I felt about what he was doing.	.82
	I talked to someone about what happened.	.63
	I reported him.	.46

Note. <sup>a</sup> Eigenvalue = 5.76, variance = 27.43%, and  $\alpha = .90$ . <sup>b</sup> Eigenvalue = 3.63, variance = 17.30%, and  $\alpha = .77$ . <sup>c</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.68, variance = 7.98%, and  $\alpha = .75$ . <sup>d</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.51, variance = 7.20%, and  $\alpha = .74$ . The cut-off for loading on a factor was .40.

Table 6

Predicting Self-Objectification from Coping Strategies and Stranger Harassment – Study 1

Measure	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	$R^2$
<b>Passive</b>	.27	4.32	.001	
Stranger Harassment	.16	2.48	.014	
Stranger Harassment x Passive	.06	.88	.378	.11
<b>Self-Blame</b>	.17	2.61	.010	
Stranger Harassment	.14	2.14	.030	
Stranger Harassment x Self-Blame	.11	1.72	.086	.07
<b>Benign</b>	.14	2.14	.030	
Stranger Harassment	.16	2.41	.010	
Stranger Harassment x Benign	-.08	1.23	.220	.08
<b>Active</b>	-.08	1.23	.217	
Stranger Harassment	.15	2.23	.026	
Stranger Harassment x Active	-.15	2.22	.027	.06

Table 7  
Correlations with Coping Responses – Study 1

	Passive	Self-Blame	Benign	Active
Outcome				
Objectification Index	.28**	.21**	.15*	-.07
Physical Concern Vanity	.08	.10	.02	.06
Physical View Vanity	-.24**	.06	-.01	.17*
Achievement Vanity	-.18**	.04	-.02	.11
Fear of Rape	-.02	-.04	-.14*	.05
Risk of Rape	.01	.13*	.08	-.01
Restriction in Movement	-.04	.03	-.18**	-.05
Stranger Harassment Index	.05	.10	.08	.16*

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 8

## Participants' Access Points to Web Survey (in Percent) – Study 2

Site	Percent
Hanover College ( <a href="http://psych.hanover.edu/research/exponnet.html">http://psych.hanover.edu/research/exponnet.html</a> )	13
Bust's Girl Wide Web ( <a href="http://www.bust.com/girlweb/Got_A_Life/Our_Bodies__Our_Hells/index.html">http://www.bust.com/girlweb/Got_A_Life/Our_Bodies__Our_Hells/index.html</a> )	7
Blank Noise Project ( <a href="http://blanknoiseproject.blogspot.com/">http://blanknoiseproject.blogspot.com/</a> )	6
Live Journal ( <a href="http://www.livejournal.com">http://www.livejournal.com</a> )	25
Recommended by a Professor	20
Other (other websites, word of mouth, web searches)	28

*Note.* Percent = percent of sample reporting.

Table 9

Reported Frequency (in Percent) of Women's Stranger Harassment Experiences – Study

2

	Once a Month	Twice a Month	Every Few Days or More
Catcalls, whistles, or stares	23.7	25.4	38.3
Unwanted sexual attention	30.1	20.8	18.3
Crude or offensive sexual jokes	28.5	24.8	16.6
Sexist remarks or behaviors	29.6	20.8	25.4
Seductive remarks or “come ons”	28.7	22.8	20.9
Unwanted touching or stroking	16.1	7.9	3.1
Subtle pressure to cooperate sexually	13.2	5.9	2.3
Direct pressure to cooperate sexually	10.7	3.4	3.4
Forceful fondling or grabbing	10.4	2.5	1.1

*Note.* Percent = percent of sample reporting.

Table 10

## Factor Analysis of the Stranger Harassment Index – Study 2

Factor	Question	Loading Factor 1	Loading Factor 2
Verbal <sup>a</sup>	Crude and offensive sexual remarks, jokes, or actions from a stranger.	.80	.20
	Seductive behavior, remarks, or “come ons” from a stranger.	.77	.25
	Catcalls, whistles, or stares from a stranger.	.83	.18
	Sexist remarks or behaviors from a stranger.	.77	.27
	Unwanted sexual attention or interaction from a stranger.	.71	.27
Sexual Pressure <sup>b</sup>	Direct or explicit pressure to cooperate sexually from a stranger.	.13	.79
	Subtle pressure or coercion to cooperate sexually from a stranger.	.21	.71
	Direct or forceful fondling or grabbing from a stranger.	.23	.71
	Unwanted touching, stroking, or hugging from a stranger.	.34	.64

*Note.* Items factor analyzed were responses to each question (Have you ever experienced...?) multiplied by the frequency of the experience. <sup>a</sup> Eigenvalue = 4.38, variance = 48.62%, and  $\alpha = .87$ . <sup>b</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.19, variance = 13.22%, and  $\alpha = .73$ . The cut-off for loading on a factor was .40.

Table 11

## Descriptive Statistics – Study 2

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Stranger Harassment Index	14.52	7.53
Self-Objectification	4.08	1.09
Physical Concern Vanity	4.20	1.47
Physical View Vanity	4.44	1.24
Achievement Vanity	4.08	1.18
Fear of Rape	6.42	3.05
Risk of Rape	2.80	2.11
Restriction of Movement	3.97	1.11
<u>Coping Responses</u>		
Passive	4.55	1.48
Self-Blame	2.16	1.29
Benign	2.45	1.19
Active	3.06	1.30

Table 12  
Correlations between Measures – Study 2

	SHI	SO	PCV	PVV	AV	FoR	RoR
Self-Objectification	-.03						
Physical Concern Vanity	.12*	.57**					
Physical View Vanity	.19**	.10	.40**				
Achievement Vanity	.21**	-.19**	.26**	.58**			
Fear of Rape	.18**	.07	.07	.15**	.01		
Risk of Rape	.24**	-.03	-.05	.01	-.02	.34**	
Restriction of Movement	.02	.05	.18**	.03	.04	.32**	.13*

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . SHI = Stranger Harassment Index, SO = Self-Objectification, PCV = Physical Concern Vanity, PVV = Physical View Vanity, AV = Achievement Vanity, FoR = Fear of Rape, RoR = Risk of Rape.

Table 13

## Factor Analysis of the Coping with Stranger Harassment Scale – Study 2

Factor	Question	Loading
Passive <sup>a</sup>	I just “blew it off” and acted like I didn’t care.	.77
	I just let it go.	.65
	I just ignored the whole thing.	.84
	I didn’t do anything.	.70
	I acted like I didn’t notice.	.76
	I tried to forget the whole thing.	.63
	I pretended nothing was happening.	.71
Self Blame <sup>b</sup>	I realized that I had probably brought it on myself.	.70
	I blamed myself for what happened.	.85
	I realized he probably wouldn’t have done it if I had dressed differently.	.57
	I felt stupid for letting myself get into the situation.	.75
Benign <sup>c</sup>	I considered it flattering.	.75
	I assumed he meant well.	.77
	I figured he must really like me.	.62
	I assumed he was trying to be funny.	.66
	I treated it as a joke.	.58
Active <sup>d</sup>	I let him know I didn’t like what he was doing.	.83
	I let him know how I felt about what he was doing.	.81
	I talked to someone about what happened.	.52
	I reported him.	.54

Note. <sup>a</sup> Eigenvalue = 5.57, variance = 26.50%, and  $\alpha = .85$ . <sup>b</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.86, variance = 8.87%, and  $\alpha = .75$ . <sup>c</sup> Eigenvalue = 2.90, variance = 13.82%, and  $\alpha = .77$ . <sup>d</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.60, variance = 7.60%, and  $\alpha = .67$ . The cut-off for loading on a factor was .40.

Table 14

Predicting Self-Objectification from Coping Strategies and Stranger Harassment – Study 2

Measure	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	$R^2$
<b>Passive</b>	.12	2.33	.02	
Stranger Harassment	-.04	.66	.51	
Stranger Harassment x Passive	-.02	.37	.71	.02
<b>Self-Blame</b>	.23	4.24	.001	
Stranger Harassment	-.05	.90	.37	
Stranger Harassment x Self-Blame	-.04	.85	.40	.05
<b>Benign</b>	.16	3.07	.002	
Stranger Harassment	-.01	.19	.85	
Stranger Harassment x Benign	.05	.85	.40	.03
<b>Active</b>	-.16	2.98	.003	
Stranger Harassment	.001	.03	.98	
Stranger Harassment x Active	-.02	.40	.69	.02

Table 15  
Correlations with Coping Responses – Study 2

	Passive	Self-Blame	Benign	Active
Outcome				
Objectification Index	.12*	.21**	.17**	-.16**
Physical Concern Vanity	.13*	.18**	.20**	-.03
Physical View Vanity	.11*	.12*	.11*	-.01
Achievement Vanity	-.01	.10	-.04	.06
Fear of Rape	-.07	.15**	-.12*	.13*
Risk of Rape	-.06	.21**	-.03	.10
Restriction in Movement	-.06	.06	-.12*	.06
Stranger Harassment Index	.03	.09	-.06	.19**

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

Table 16

## Participant Location – Study 2

Country	N
United States	283
Canada	15
India	14
England	11
Scotland	4
Australia	4
Germany	2
Bangladesh	1
Chile	1
Costa Rica	1
Egypt	1
Ireland	1
Israel	1
Jordan	1
New Zealand	1
Norway	1
Singapore	1
Switzerland	1
Taiwan	1
United Arab Emirates	1
No Response	7

Table 17

## Outcomes of Stranger Harassment Based on Sexual Orientation – Study 2

	Heterosexual	Non-heterosexual	t	p
Stranger Harassment Index	14.09 (7.21)	15.88 (8.43)	-1.91	.06
Self-objectification	4.10 (1.06)	3.97 (1.16)	1.01	.31
Physical Concern Vanity	4.27 (1.45)	3.98 (1.52)	1.60	.11
Physical View Vanity	4.42 (1.20)	4.49 (1.37)	-.45	.66
Achievement Vanity	4.07 (1.18)	4.08 (1.19)	-.01	.99
Fear of Rape	6.52 (3.05)	6.06 (3.06)	1.21	.23
Risk of Rape	2.77 (2.14)	2.91 (2.03)	-.53	.59
Restriction in Movement	4.11 (1.10)	3.52 (1.05)	4.29	.00
Passive Coping	4.60 (1.47)	4.41 (1.50)	1.01	.31
Self-Blame Coping	2.16 (1.30)	2.17 (1.27)	-.04	.97
Benign Coping	2.50 (1.21)	2.30 (1.09)	1.32	.19
Active Coping	3.04 (1.33)	3.11 (1.20)	-.45	.65

Table 18

## Outcomes of Stranger Harassment for Women based on Location – Study 2

	USA	Canada	India	England
N	283	15	14	11
Age	23.3	26.7	24.6	23.6
Stranger Harassment Index	14.32 (7.55)	13.40 (6.21)	20.92 (5.87)	14.64 (5.18)
Self-objectification	4.12 (1.10)	3.92 (.90)	3.43 (.85)	4.31 (1.10)
Physical Concern Vanity	4.24 (1.48)	4.24 (.96)	3.72 (1.14)	3.95 (1.40)
Physical View Vanity	4.49 (1.17)	2.28 (1.01)	4.31 (.99)	3.53 (1.88)
Achievement Vanity	4.10 (1.15)	4.19 (1.03)	4.15 (.76)	3.29 (1.73)
Fear of Rape	6.52 (3.07)	5.63 (3.02)	7.89 (2.70)	6.32 (3.75)
Risk of Rape	2.78 (2.08)	3.00 (2.30)	4.17 (3.02)	2.18 (1.19)
Restriction in Movement	3.98 (1.10)	3.72 (1.12)	4.25 (1.32)	3.66 (1.01)

Table 19

## Outcomes of Stranger Harassment for Women based on Age – Study 2

	22 and Under	23 and Over	t	p
Stranger Harassment Index	14.82 (6.99)	14.16 (8.14)	.83	.41
Self-objectification	4.16 (1.12)	3.97 (1.05)	1.64	.10
Physical Concern Vanity	4.27 (1.51)	4.13 (1.43)	.86	.39
Physical View Vanity	4.55 (1.23)	4.30 (1.24)	1.87	.06
Achievement Vanity	4.05 (1.23)	4.10 (1.13)	-.41	.68
Fear of Rape	6.84 (3.00)	5.92 (3.07)	2.82	.01
Risk of Rape	3.01 (2.22)	2.56 (1.96)	2.00	.05
Restriction in Movement	4.09 (1.08)	3.83 (1.14)	2.19	.03
Passive Coping	4.73 (1.42)	4.35 (1.52)	2.40	.02
Self-Blame Coping	2.32 (1.42)	1.98 (1.10)	2.49	.01
Benign Coping	2.61 (1.23)	2.26 (1.11)	2.80	.01
Active Coping	2.99 (1.28)	3.13 (1.33)	-1.01	.31

Table 20

## Outcomes of Stranger Harassment Time 1 vs. Time 2 – Study 3

	Time 1	Time 2	t(df)	p
Stranger Harassment	11.45 (8.39)	10.65 (6.96)	.81 (251)	.41
Index				
Self-objectification	4.00 (.91)	3.90 (.95)	.89 (248)	.38
Physical Concern Vanity	4.52 (1.36)	4.52 (1.38)	.06 (253)	.95
Physical View Vanity	3.86 (1.45)	3.84 (1.33)	.12 (251)	.90
Achievement Vanity	4.64 (1.11)	4.70 (1.21)	.45 (251)	.65
Fear of Rape	7.60 (2.80)	6.21 (3.20)	3.70 (253)	.00
Risk of Rape	2.02 (2.18)	2.47 (2.48)	1.53 (252)	.13
Restriction in Movement	4.62 (.95)	4.60 (.92)	.20 (251)	.84

Table 21

## Stranger Harassment vs Study Habits Diary – Study 3

	Stranger Harassment	Study Habits	t(df)	p
Stranger Harassment Index	11.07 (7.46)	10.17 (6.36)	.68 (112)	.46
Self-objectification	3.82 (.97)	4.00 (.91)	1.00 (112)	.32
Physical Concern Vanity	4.40 (1.41)	4.67 (1.35)	1.03 (112)	.30
Physical View Vanity	3.84 (1.35)	3.83 (1.33)	.04 (112)	.97
Achievement Vanity	4.90 (1.34)	4.48 (1.01)	1.88 (112)	.06
Fear of Rape	6.53 (3.38)	5.83 (2.96)	1.17 (112)	.24
Risk of Rape	2.32 (2.30)	2.64 (2.67)	.69 (112)	.49
Restriction in Movement	4.50 (.89)	4.71 (.95)	1.18(112)	.24

Table 22

Reported Frequency (in Percent) of Women's Stranger Harassment Experiences – Study 3

	Once a Month	Twice a Month	Every Few Days or More
Catcalls, whistles, or stares	19.9	27.7	30.2
Unwanted sexual attention	25.5	17.7	11.9
Crude or offensive sexual jokes	27.0	13.5	9.9
Sexist remarks or behaviors	24.1	16.3	9.2
Seductive remarks or “come ons”	25.5	21.3	11.3
Unwanted touching or stroking	14.9	9.2	3.5
Subtle pressure to cooperate sexually	8.5	5.0	0.7
Direct pressure to cooperate sexually	8.5	1.4	0.0
Forceful fondling or grabbing	7.1	4.3	0.0

*Note.* Percent = percent of sample reporting.

Table 23

## Factor Analysis of the Stranger Harassment Index – Study 3

Factor	Question	Loading Factor 1	Loading Factor 2
Verbal <sup>a</sup>	Crude and offensive sexual remarks, jokes, or actions from a stranger.	.86	.19
	Seductive behavior, remarks, or “come ons” from a stranger.	.81	.25
	Catcalls, whistles, or stares from a stranger.	.44	-.15
	Sexist remarks or behaviors from a stranger.	.75	.21
	Unwanted sexual attention or interaction from a stranger.	.63	.47
Sexual Pressure <sup>b</sup>	Direct or explicit pressure to cooperate sexually from a stranger.	.31	.53
	Subtle pressure or coercion to cooperate sexually from a stranger.	.51	.47
	Direct or forceful fondling or grabbing from a stranger.	-.08	.85
	Unwanted touching, stroking, or hugging from a stranger.	.15	.85

*Note.* Items factor analyzed were responses to each question (Have you ever experienced...?) multiplied by the frequency of the experience. <sup>a</sup> Eigenvalue = 3.88, variance = 43.16%, and  $\alpha = .57$ . <sup>b</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.39, variance = 15.41%, and  $\alpha = .71$ . The cut-off for loading on a factor was .40.

Table 24

## Descriptive Statistics – Study 3

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Stranger Harassment Index	11.29	8.44
Self-Objectification	3.86	1.16
Physical Concern Vanity	4.52	1.36
Physical View Vanity	3.85	1.46
Achievement Vanity	4.63	1.11
Fear of Rape	7.60	2.80
Risk of Rape	2.01	2.18
Restriction of Movement	4.55	1.09
<u>Coping Responses</u>		
Passive	4.22	1.42
Self-Blame	2.29	1.29
Benign	2.28	.98
Active	2.71	1.08

Table 25

Reported Descriptions of Where and When Stranger Harassment Occurs (in Percent) –

Study 3

	Percent
On the street	19.9
In a store	10.0
In an academic building	18.7
At a party	11.6
Daytime	29.5
Nighttime	31.1
On campus	49.8
Off campus	14.5
While alone	27.8
While with friends	31.5
At a crowded location	28.2

*Note.* Percent = percent of sample reporting.

Table 26  
Correlations between Measures – Study 3

	SHI	SO	PCV	PVV	AV	FoR	RoR
Self-Objectification	.03						
Physical Concern Vanity	.02	.46**					
Physical View Vanity	.27**	-.17*	.25**				
Achievement Vanity	.05	-.04	.36**	.54**			
Fear of Rape	-.08	.05	.11	.02	.12		
Risk of Rape	.23**	.03	.13	.16	.14	.24**	
Restriction of Movement	-.06	.22**	.13	.14	.22**	.18*	.22**

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . SHI = Stranger Harassment Index, SO = Self-Objectification, PCV = Physical Concern Vanity, PVV = Physical View Vanity, AV = Achievement Vanity, FoR = Fear of Rape, RoR = Risk of Rape.

Table 27

Emotional Responses During and After Stranger Harassment (Percent of Sample) – Study

3

	During	After
Happy	36.5	45.2
Sad	2.5	4.1
Excited	17.8	16.2
Anxious	17.8	6.2
Fearful	12.0	5.8
Nervous	20.3	6.6
Disgusted	16.2	12.9
Joyous	12.4	15.4
Complimented	10.8	14.1
Angry	10.0	8.7

*Note.* Percent = percent of sample reporting.

Table 28

## Factor Analysis of the Coping with Stranger Harassment Scale – Study 3

Factor	Question	Loading
Passive <sup>a</sup>	I just “blew it off” and acted like I didn’t care.	.82
	I just let it go.	.74
	I just ignored the whole thing.	.85
	I didn’t do anything.	.75
	I acted like I didn’t notice.	.73
	I tried to forget the whole thing.	.55
	I pretended nothing was happening.	.81
	I treated it as a joke.	.55
Self Blame <sup>b</sup>	I realized that I had probably brought it on myself.	.76
	I blamed myself for what happened.	.81
	I realized he probably wouldn’t have done it if I had dressed differently.	.62
	I felt stupid for letting myself get into the situation.	.73
Benign <sup>c</sup>	I considered it flattering.	.41
	I assumed he meant well.	.66
	I figured he must really like me.	.64
	I assumed he was trying to be funny.	.52
Active <sup>d</sup>	I let him know I didn’t like what he was doing.	.79
	I let him know how I felt about what he was doing.	.74
	I talked to someone about what happened.	.51
	I reported him.	.47

Note. <sup>a</sup> Eigenvalue = 5.50, variance = 26.17%, and  $\alpha = .88$ . <sup>b</sup> Eigenvalue = 3.06, variance = 14.55%, and  $\alpha = .75$ . <sup>c</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.58, variance = 7.50%, and  $\alpha = .56$ . <sup>d</sup> Eigenvalue = 1.75, variance = 8.31%, and  $\alpha = .67$ . The cut-off for loading on a factor was .40.

Table 29

Predicting Self-Objectification from Coping Strategies and Stranger Harassment – Study 3

Measure	$\beta$	$t$	$p$	$R^2$
<b>Passive</b>	.15	1.80	.07	
Stranger Harassment	.02	.28	.77	
Stranger Harassment x Passive	.02	.26	.79	.02
<b>Self-Blame</b>	.14	1.64	.10	
Stranger Harassment	.02	.19	.85	
Stranger Harassment x Self-Blame	-.05	-.49	.63	.02
<b>Benign</b>	.09	.99	.32	
Stranger Harassment	.02	.23	.82	
Stranger Harassment x Benign	-.02	-.16	.87	.01
<b>Active</b>	-.03	-.38	.71	
Stranger Harassment	.02	.25	.80	
Stranger Harassment x Active	-.07	-.89	.38	.01

Table 30

## Correlations with Coping Responses – Study 3

	Passive	Self-Blame	Benign	Active
Outcome				
Objectification Index	.15	.14	.09	-.03
Physical Concern Vanity	.20*	.24**	-.02	-.09
Physical View Vanity	-.07	.06	.03	-.07
Achievement Vanity	-.03	.18*	-.03	.08
Fear of Rape	.11	-.07	-.13	-.07
Risk of Rape	-.02	.14	.07	-.03
Restriction in Movement	-.001	.09	-.10	-.01
Stranger Harassment Index	.02	.03	.06	-.01

*Note.* \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ .

## Curriculum Vita

EDUCATION

*Rutgers University*, New Brunswick, NJ, 2001-2007.

- PhD. in Psychology, May 2007, Area of Specialization: Social Psychology.
- M.S. in Psychology, January 2004, Area of Specialization: Social Psychology.

*The College of New Jersey*, Ewing, NJ, 1997-2001.

- B.A. in Psychology, with honors.
- Minor in Classical Studies.

PUBLICATIONS

Fairchild, K. & Rudman, L. A. (in press). Everyday stranger harassment and women's self-objectification. *Social Justice Research*.

Rudman, L. A. & Fairchild, K. (in press). The *F* Word: Is feminism incompatible with beauty and romance? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*.

Rudman, L. A., Dohn, M. C., Fairchild, K., & Kirschner, M. (2006). Implicit self-esteem compensation: Automatic ego-threat defense. Manuscript revised and resubmitted to *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Rudman, L. A. & Fairchild, K. (2004). Reactions to counterstereotypic behavior: The role of backlash in cultural stereotype maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87 (2), 157-176.

Rudman, L. A., Feinberg, J. M., & Fairchild, K. (2002). Minority members' implicit attitudes: Ingroup bias as a function of group status. *Social Cognition*, 20(4), 295-323.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

*Lab Coordinator*: Psychology 101, Princeton University, Fall 2006, Spring 2007.

- Revise and develop lab activities for Introductory Psychology course
- Train seven assistant instructors and monitor their teaching of lab courses
- Coordinate lab activities with lecture course material
- Manage administrative duties and interact with undergraduate students

*Instructor*: Social Psychology, Rutgers University, Spring and Fall 2005, Spring 2006.

- Lecture course detailing the major areas of social psychological research.
- Approximately 400 students per class.
- Average Rating for Overall Quality of the Course: 4.55 out of 5

*Instructor*: General Psychology, Rutgers University, Spring 2004, Fall 2006.

- Lecture course providing students an introduction to the field of psychology.
- Approximately 400 students.
- Average Rating for Overall Quality of the Course: 4.33 out of 5

*Instructor:* Psychology of Women, Rutgers University, Summer 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006.

- Lecture and discussion course focusing on feminist psychology, as well as developmental and social issues important to women.
- Focused on broadening students' horizons and decreasing negative stereotypes about women and feminism, while providing an intellectually stimulating atmosphere for class discussion.
- Approximately 40 students per class.
- Average Rating for Overall Quality of the Course: 4.62 out of 5

*Instructor:* Cognition Lab, Rutgers University, Fall 2003.

- Laboratory course providing students with hands-on research experience.
- Lectures on relevant cognitive psychology principles.
- Focused on improving and enhancing students writing skills.
- Approximately 12 students.

*Instructor:* General Psychology, Rutgers University, Summer 2002.

- Lecture course providing students an introduction to the field of psychology.
- Approximately 70 students.