# THE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT ON REPORTING SEXUAL HARASSMENT: A META-ANALYTIC REVIEW

By

Emma Lloyd Best

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of
Business Administration

Charlotte

2021

Approved by:

_____
Dr. George Banks

_____
Dr. Janaki Gooty

_____
Dr. Jill Yavorsky

_____
Dr. Jennifer Ames Stuart

# ABSTRACT

EMMA LLOYD BEST. The impact of the organizational environment on reporting sexual harassment: A meta-analytic review. (Under the direction of DR. GEORGE BANKS)

This meta-analytic review integrates a micro-perspective theory of coping responses with the macro-perspective institutional theory of moral collapse to understand the likelihood of an employee reporting sexual harassment. I build on previous studies to evaluate three broad research questions: (1) What is the relatively most important predictor of workplace sexual harassment?; (2) To what extent do contingency factors influence employees reporting sexual harassment?; and (3) What are the gaps in the macro literature that need to be addressed to integrate macro and micro perspectives? Based on previous research, classifications of individual-, industry-, and country-level factors are proposed that influence reporting sexual harassment and then are used in the analysis of 284 independent samples, consisting of 538,426 individuals.

First, perception of the global organizational environment may be a relatively more important predictor of reporting sexual harassment than the individual difference variables of age and tenure under the institutional theory of moral collapse (Lawrence, 2011). For example, justice climate had a large effect size ($\rho$ = .43) in comparison to gender ($\rho$ = -.29) and age ($\rho$ = -.19) when predicting the reporting of work-related harassment. In addition, this study shows the extent to which various job attitudes correlated with the likelihood to report sexual harassment as employees' coping response (Sigal et al., 2003).

Second, the power and masculinity norms of the country where the business is located as well as the type of industry are contingency factors that likely moderate the relationship between global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment as a coping response

(Hofstede, 2015). The evidence shows that there was a large effect size difference between the correlation of the perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment when moderated by the high-power distance in other countries ($\rho = .24$) compared to the United States ($\rho = -.23$). Third, there is a lack of macro-level research with only 15% of the studies utilizing variables considered firm-level antecedents of sexual harassment, and only 3% of them focusing on firms' responses to sexual harassment claims in this meta-analysis. In the Discussion, I identify several gaps in the literature, suggest directions for future research, and highlight organizational policies to reduce the risk of sexual harassment.

# DEDICATION

To my husband, Dr. Kenneth Best, for his encouragement to pursue my Doctor in Business Administration and for his constant patience and understanding throughout the process. Also, to my loving children, Edward and Lily, who kept me smiling throughout the journey.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Janaki Gooty, Dr. Jill Yavorsky, and Dr. Jennifer Stuart for their guidance throughout this process. I would also like to thank the chair of my committee, Dr. George Banks, for his timely advice and expertise as well as his continuous mentorship throughout this journey.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Concerns regarding sexual harassment in the workplace have continued to grow since the revolutionary "#metoo" movement began in 2017 (Katz & Alejandro, 2019). Sexual harassment in the workplace has been defined as unwelcome sexual advances or physical conduct of a sexual nature that interferes with an individual's work performance or creates a hostile work environment (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Sexual harassment impacts employees' attitudes and psychological well-being, resulting in anxiety and depression (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Kimberly et al., 1997). Sexual harassment negatively impacts organizations because a hostile work environment results in performance issues, employee turnover, damage to an organization's reputation, and expensive litigation (Sims et al., 2005).

In 2016, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) released a comprehensive study of workplace harassment in the United States, "Select Task Force on the Study of Harassment in the Workplace" (the EEOC Report). The EEOC found that an estimated one in four people is affected by workplace harassment and roughly three out of four individuals who experience sexual harassment never report it (Feldblum, 2016). Therefore, it is important for organizations to understand the most important predictor of sexual harassment so that they are better equipped to reduce its risk. It is also necessary for organizations to take the contingency factors into account that influence employees to better encourage employees to report sexual harassment.

This research builds on previous studies to evaluate: (1) the relatively most important predictor of sexual harassment in organizations, (2) the extent to which contingency factors influence employees reporting sexual harassment, and (3) the gaps in macro literature that need

to be filled to integrate macro and micro perspectives. To address these questions, I integrate the institutional theory of moral collapse through perception of the global organizational environment with the theory of the victim's coping response (Lawrence, 2011; Sigal et al., 2003). Then I present a model that illustrates the relationships between individual perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment utilizing the power distance between harasser and victim (individual-level factor), the masculinity norms of the country (country-level factors), and the industry (industry-level factor) as moderators (Hofstede, 2015). I utilize meta-analytic techniques to test the hypothesized relations and to perform sensitivity analysis (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). In doing so, I am looking at the practical significance of effect sizes through correlations. Thus, there are no causal inferences since there are methodological challenges with the data, but I am providing a better roadmap for future research.

The present study makes several contributions to understanding the effect of the global organizational environment on reporting sexual harassment. First, using meta-analysis, I evaluate the negative effect of sexual harassment on employees' work attitudes (individual-level factor) and perceptions of the global organizational environment (individual-level factor) on the likelihood to report sexual harassment (Sojo et al., 2015). This meta-analysis reviews studies that utilize surveys of employees that report to researchers whether they experience sexual harassment, but it may help organizations encourage employees to report sexual harassment to human resources (Sojo et al., 2015). Understanding the most important individual-level predictor of reporting sexual harassment allows organizations to assess behavior that is creating a hostile work environment and to respond to sexual harassment claims while considering cultural effects of industry- and country-level factors.

Second, I consider important contingency factors as moderators, such as the power distance between a harasser and victim, the masculinity norms of the country (country-level factors), and the type of industry (industry-level factor) to determine the extent of influence on employees reporting sexual harassment (Hofstede, 2015; Remus Ilies, 2003). Power distance, masculinity norms, and industry are important moderators that offer insight into how organizations can effectively implement sexual harassment policies and procedures based on the country's priorities and the gender type that dominates the industry (Hofstede, 2015; Remus Ilies, 2003).

Third, I review sexual harassment in the workplace from both micro- and macro-level perspectives, including strategic human resource management (HRM) to uncover the gaps in the macro literature (Lawrence, 2011). I utilize firm-based institutional theoretical frameworks, which consider individual stakeholders and the impact of the organizational environment on sexual harassment of an employee (Rubino et al., 2018). While I could not test a fully integrated model because of the literature's data limitations, I integrate micro- and macro-level theories measured through individual-, industry-, and country-level factors to help guide future primary studies. Bridging the divide of micro and macro theories of sexual harassment and firm misconduct will highlight gaps in the macro literature that need to be filled to integrate macro- and micro-level perspectives.

# CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

## 2.1 Bridging the Divide of Micro and Macro Theories of Sexual Harassment and Firm Misconduct

To bridge the divide between micro and macro theories of sexual harassment and strategic HRM, I reviewed prior literature across management and strategic HRM disciplines for theories applied to sexual harassment in the workplace and found that most studies focused on the victim's perspective. In the current manuscript, I first discuss how strategic HRM theories apply to sexual harassment, including several theories specific to firm misconduct. By integrating the institutional theory of moral collapse with the coping response theory of sexual harassment from the victim's perspective, I bring together micro and macro theories to evaluate individual-, industry-, and country-level factors and present a set of hypotheses (Lawrence, 2011; Sigal et al., 2003). I test these novel hypotheses through a meta-analytic review to understand the impact of sexual harassment on all stakeholders and to propose solutions. Several integrated model relationships may not have been tested with meta-analytic data but could be explored and tested in future primary research.

## 2.2 Individual-Level Theories of Sexual Harassment

I reviewed prior literature to determine the theories that have been applied to sexual harassment in the workplace and to evaluate their impact at the micro- and macro-levels, which resulted in Table 1. In creating Table 1, I searched Google Scholar for primary studies and reviews on sexual harassment over the past 20 years in management, psychology, sociology, and related fields and reviewed the top management and applied psychology journals that address micro HRM topics such as sexual harassment. For example, I searched the term “sexual harassment” in a number of journals with management journal rankings listed in the 2018 InCites

Journal Citation Reports, the term “sexual harassment,” including the *Journal of Applied Psychology* (ranked #25 of 219), *Personnel Psychology* (ranked #9 of 219), and the *Journal of Management* (Ranked #3 of 219) to assess the applicable theories. I also contacted subject matter experts who research this topic for additional theory suggestions relevant to sexual harassment. In all, I found twenty-five theories and listed the articles' theoretical frameworks, brief descriptions, their key constructs, the perspectives taken, and then concluded with legal implications arising from the theories (Table 1).

The extant literature has focused on various theories from the micro perspective (typically, that of the victim). I have evaluated all identified theories based on an established set of criteria: (1) parsimony, (2) value, and (3) generalizability, and determined how the theory could be measured through individual-level factors (Naor et al., 2013). Parsimony describes a simple and necessary theory since the simplest solution is the preferred one to understand the connection between relationships and increased complexity (Naor et al., 2013). A parsimonious theory can explain relationships to solve practical problems and create value (Gioia, 2011). A theory is considered to create value if it has either scientific or practical utility in an organizational context; a theory adding complexity, however, should add sufficient value to justify the complexity (Gioia, 2011; Editor, 2019).

A valuable theory focuses on organizational phenomena and is more likely to be novel and insightful and, therefore, predict important outcomes, explain causal relations, or result in implications for practice or policymaking (Editor, 2019). Generalizability means that the theory is applicable in different contexts (Naor et al., 2013). Generalizability equates to a virtuous theory since it provides utility or a value-added contribution and can be applied to professions and organizations (Editor, 2019). In sum, parsimony and generalizability are both well-accepted

virtues of a good theory; value creation has been used to gauge contribution and, therefore, can be applied to evaluate and integrate the optimal micro and macro theories to understand sexual harassment (Naor et al., 2013). Thus, the criteria used herein to evaluate sexual harassment theories from a micro perspective are (1) parsimony, (2) the creation of value, and (3) generalizability (Akande, 1992; Editor, 2019).

For example, under the coping response theory, the impact of sexual harassment can be understood based on the victim's coping response, which could be external through individual-level factors (e.g., avoidance, assertion, seeking social support, reporting the perpetrator) or internal (e.g., distress) (Sigal et al., 2003). The victim's coping response is a (1) parsimonious, or a simple and necessary theory, that influences the victim's sexual harassment experience and, ultimately, impacts psychological and job-related outcomes (Munson, 2000). Also, the coping response theory (2) creates value because it can be utilized in an organizational context to understand how victims will respond to sexual harassment and (3) is generalizable to leadership responsiveness to complaints that could include all workplace misconduct. The coping response of the sexual harassment victim may be impacted by contingency factors, such as power distance or social inequality with leadership, the gender type dominating the industry of the organization, and masculinity norms or the preference for power through winning competitive sequences (Hofstede, 2015).

The coping response theory is best to use because it applies to all organizational stressors that result in an employee deviating from their usual behavior to cope with the situation (del Carmen Herrera & Herrera, 2014). It is also adaptable to continued periods of harassment to show how victims change their coping response over time. Specifically, women facing severe harassment or frequent sexual coercion from a harasser in a position of authority will implement

various coping responses, including social and formal support (Cortina & Wasti, 2005). Overall, the coping response theory has practical value for organizations to assess and respond appropriately to employee behavior based on organizational stressors and to implement policies and procedures. The coping response theory illustrates how sexual harassment is intertwined with the perception of leader theory since the victim's coping response depends upon how leaders enforce sexual harassment policies and could be impacted by the power differential among employees (Malamut, 2002).

As a second example of a sexual harassment theory, under the target's perception of leader theory, if employees perceive that leaders make honest efforts to stop harassment, then they are more likely to report harassment, be more satisfied with the complaint process, and be more committed to their jobs (Malamut, 2002). The target's perception of leader theory is (1) parsimonious because it clearly shows how the leader's actions impact the victim's response. It also (2) creates value and (3) is generalizable by practical application in the workplace through the leader making honest and reasonable efforts to stop misconduct and implement various policies that result in better individual outcomes (Malamut, 2002).

Alternatively, if senior leadership is the harasser, then the victim's supervisor may be conflicted about whom to believe (Malamut, 2002). A study that evaluated sexual harassment in the military by immediate supervisors, unit supervisors, and other leaders that are not in the same unit or a direct supervisor, found that sexual harassment by immediate supervisors had an impact on individual outcomes, whereas senior leadership's actions affected the victim's likelihood to report (Malamut, 2002). Therefore, this theory is limited because of victims' varying perceptions depending on the power distance of the harasser and who the victim looks to for a response to the sexual harassment. However, the target's perception of leader theory is necessary because it

impacts victims' reporting sexual harassment and being committed to their jobs. If the direct supervisor is the harasser, then the victim looks to the actions of senior organizational leadership with whom the victim may not have a relationship or trust, depending on the power distance and the level of the victim within the organization (Cortina & Wasti, 2005).

A third example of a sexual harassment theory, the social categorization theory (Hershcovis, 2010), is (1) a parsimonious theory that has been used to evaluate whether victims label the behavior as sexual harassment (Munson, 2001). This theory is necessary to help victims protect themselves if they generalize sexual harassment as attacking their social category or gender (Hershcovis, 2010). The social categorization theory (2) creates value since employees can invoke social categorization buffers to depersonalize workplace experiences to protect their self-concept and increase their self-worth and, (3) is generalizable because it has a practical application in the workplace to determine how employees label other incidents (e.g., bullying) (Hershcovis et al., 2010).

Under the social categorization theory, sexual harassment victims may be more prone to blame the harasser or the harasser's attitude about the gender of the victim rather than themselves (Hershcovis et al., 2010). Specifically, when sexual harassment is not clearly related to gender, the victim may seek additional information about the gender dominance of the work environment, for example, to self-categorize and explain the harassment (Hershcovis, 2010). This action, however, may perpetuate the victim's belief about gender discrimination, changing the victim's overall perspective about why the harasser has chosen him or her. Therefore, social categorization should not be the primary theory used but can be incorporated into the coping response theory to understand whether victims label the behavior as sexual harassment (Hershcovis, 2010).

After conducting a review in Table 1 of all 25 theories for parsimony, creation of value, and generalizability, the coping response theory rose to the top. The coping response theory, as the most (1) parsimonious, allows organizations to assess the overall impact of sexual harassment on the victim and the resulting costs. It incorporates the perceptions of leader theory and social categorization theory and can be impacted by the power distance of the harasser and victim, masculinity norms (country-level factors), and the organization's industry (industry-level factor). While perceptions of leader theory and social categorization theory can be useful independently, their applicability varies more than coping response theory. As the coping response theory (2) creates the most value due to its utility in the workplace and is the most (3) generalizable theory to apply to misconduct, it will be integrated from a micro perspective and measured through the individual-level factor of work attitude on sexual harassment reporting in this meta-analysis.

**2.3 Firm-Level Theories of Misconduct**

I reviewed prior literature to determine the strategic HRM theories that could be applied to sexual harassment from a macro perspective, such as human capital theory, institutional theory, the resource-based view, and the firm's behavioral view, which resulted in Table 2. In creating Table 2, I searched Google Scholar for all primary studies and papers over the past 20 years for these well-known strategic human resource theories applicable to sexual harassment. I also searched the terms "human capital theory," "institutional theory," "resource-based view," and "firm's behavioral view" separately to assess the applicable theories in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, and the *Journal of Management*.

Additionally, I searched for the four theories in conjunction with "sexual harassment" and "mistreatment" and found seven theories. I listed the theoretical framework of the articles;

gave each a brief description; and noted the key constructs, the perspective taken, and legal implications arising from the theories (Table 2). I used the same criteria to evaluate which strategic HRM theory to use from the macro perspective of a parsimonious theory that creates value and is generalizable to integrate with the sexual harassment theory of coping response from a micro perspective.

Although strategic HRM theories have not been frequently applied to sexual harassment, researchers have made some key points. For example, under the theory of planned behavior, the firm can utilize a model to predict the victim's intention to report sexual harassment based on the individual's attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived control over the behavior (Foster & Fullagar, 2018). Specifically, a victim is more likely to report sexual harassment if they know that the harasser will be punished, feels assurance that their reputation will not be ruined, and feels positive about reporting rather than embarrassed (Foster & Fullagar, 2018). This (1) parsimonious theory has been used in conjunction with the EEOC data to see if it is possible to predict when victims will report hostile work environments of sexual harassment (Foster & Fullagar, 2018). Furthermore, the theory of planned behavior (2) creates value because of its practical application to workplace discrimination against victims who report sexual harassment and (3) is generalizable to workplace misconduct (Foster & Fullagar, 2018).

In sum, the theory of planned behavior is necessary for a firm to understand an individual's intention to report sexual harassment. Even in the same organization, however, individuals' perspectives can vary in determining what constitutes sexual harassment and deciding whether to report it as such (Foster & Fullagar, 2018). Therefore, the applicability of this theory may vary widely depending on the victim's fear of retaliation, not being believed by leadership resulting in the organization's inaction, or relinquishing privacy in that specific

organization (Foster & Fullagar, 2018). For these reasons, I did not choose it as a primary theory for integration.

As another example of a strategic HRM theory, under institutional theory, which is primarily concerned with relationships among individuals, organizations, and society, firms are impacted by moral communities that affect both employees and leaders of the organization and may, as a result, suffer moral collapse (Lawrence, 2011). The institutional theory of moral collapse is (1) parsimonious because it helps explain the impact of relationships between levels in the organization to understand sexual harassment's repercussions and (2) creates value through its applicability to organizations to prevent misconduct (e.g., organizational sanctions). It may be measured through the perceptions of the global organizational environment (individual-level factor), which could be impacted by the power distance and masculinity norms (country-level factors), or the organization's industry (industry-level factor).

The institutional theory of moral collapse is (3) generalizable to the organizational environment, including culture, morality, and whether employees perceive the organization as fair regarding organizational intolerance of misconduct or the organizational justice climate, as well as the leader's responsiveness to misconduct (Rubino, Avery et al., 2018). Specifically, one study found that the management of fairness perceptions may decrease sexual harassment occurrence to the same extent as controlling sex similarity and the sexual harassment climate (Rubino et al., 2018). This theory is important to understand the impact of institutional processes on organizations' decision-making to address the root cause of moral collapse or when perception of the organizational environment is low because of high tolerance of misconduct (Lawrence, 2011). Moral ideals and ethics are reflected in the organizational environment, affecting employees' respect for others, benevolence, integrity, and promoting fairness for all

employees when organizations implement policies, procedures, and rewards (Rubino et al., 2018). Thus, the institutional theory of moral collapse is necessary to measure the perception of the global organizational environment (individual-level factor) and country-level factors that influence reporting sexual harassment.

The institutional theory of moral collapse is a (1) parsimonious theory that organizations can use to assess their tolerance for sexual harassment and the resulting costs to the organization. It incorporates perception of the global organizational environment through the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, and organizational sanctions with whether the victim will report sexual harassment under the theory of planned behavior. Therefore, the institutional theory of moral collapse (2) creates value because of its practical application to the workplace environment and (3) is generalizable to workplace misconduct. Thus, it will be integrated with the coping response theory to evaluate individual-, industry-, and country-level factors and will be measured by perception of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment in this meta-analysis.

### 2.4 Integration of Individual and Firm-Level Theories of Sexual Harassment

From the micro and macro perspectives, the coping response theory could be integrated with the institutional theory of moral collapse to assess the impact of sexual harassment on a victim's attitude about work (individual-level factor) and the resulting costs to the organization (Fox & Tang, 2017). From the micro perspective, sexual harassment is an organizational stressor that may result in uncomfortable feelings that a victim adapts to or copes with through various responses (del Carmen Herrera & Herrera, 2014). The victim may choose a coping response depending upon the power distance between the victim and the harasser, the severity of the sexual harassment, social support, or the masculinity norms of the country where the

organization is located (country-level factors) (Cortina & Wasti, 2005). Therefore, the institutional theory of moral collapse and the coping response theory bring together individual-, industry-, and country-level factors because job attitudes, the justice climate, the industry, the power distance, and masculinity norms impact whether a victim reports sexual harassment as a coping response.

Coping responses may include internal responses (emotionally focused), such as a shift in work attitudes about job stress, job satisfaction, and job withdrawal, or external responses (problem-focused), such as avoidance, assertion, seeking support, or reporting the harasser (Sigal et al., 2003). One scale used to measure coping responses to harassment consists of 15 external coping items and 5 internal coping items (Munson, 2000). Coping responses may also be classified as either active (i.e., confronting the harasser) or passive (i.e., ignoring the harasser) (Sigal et al., 2003). Victims appear to be less vulnerable to the negative mental consequences of sexual harassment when they choose active problem-focused (external) coping responses, such as reporting sexual harassment (Richman et al., 2001).

The victim's coping response may stop the harassment or perpetuate it (Weiss & Lalonde, 2001). If the sexual harassment continues, the victim may choose a different coping response, which then influences their experience of sexual harassment and the resulting psychological and job-related outcomes (del Carmen Herrera & Herrera 2014; Herrera et al., 2017). The victim will continue to engage in external responses, such as retaliation, advocacy seeking, avoidance, or negotiation, based on how they feel internally and on the identity of the harasser (Morganson & Major, 2014). One study that examined coping responses by surveying 138 women to explore their perception of sexual harassment and the implications of victims'

responses showed that participants believe that women who confront their harassers would be evaluated negatively by men (del Carmen Herrera & Herrera 2014, Herrera et al., 2017).

The most common coping responses to sexual harassment described in #metoo tweets are categorized as cognitive engagement (relabeling) or disengagement (endurance) versus behavioral engagement (reporting) or disengagement (avoidance) (Schneider & Carpenter, 2019). Therefore, the severity of the sexual harassment influences the victim's coping response, resulting in job-related outcomes such as job stress, negative job attitude, and poor health (Yagil, 2008). Thus, the coping response theory can be utilized from a micro perspective to measure how job attitudes (individual-level) affect the reporting of sexual harassment to then determine the impact on perception of the global organizational environment (individual-level) through integrating institutional theory and moderators of power distance, masculinity norms (country-level), and the organization's industry (industry-level).

From the macro perspective, institutional theory can be applied to an organizational environment's moral collapse, such as the individual-level factor of the impact on perception of the global organizational environment through the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, and organizational sanctions (Rubino et al., 2018). Institutional theory shows how socially constructed beliefs, norms, and rules drive organizational structure and behavior that results in institutional betrayal when an employee is a victim of sexual harassment (Gentile, 2019). Institutional theory can be used as the foundational perspective to assess the moral collapse or crisis of an organization because of its focus on the impact on the study of moral conduct, its concern with multi-level social processes, and the reinforcement of institutional expectations resulting in an institutional mindset (Wicks, 2001).

For example, the employee's perception of organizational tolerance of sexual harassment in the organizational environment relates to the frequency of sexual harassment and job-related outcomes (Wright & Fitzgerald, 2009). Specifically, the perception of a fair organizational environment impacts reducing sexual harassment and the employee's coping response of reporting sexual harassment. Therefore, the institutional theory of moral collapse explains the intersection of meaning and social control to understand how morality is constructed and enacted in social systems that include individuals and organizations based on institutional regulations, normative rules, and constative rules (Wicks, 2001). Thus, it is important to apply institutional theory to understand the occurrence of organizations' moral collapse through perception of the global organizational environment, including the fairness of organizations' tolerance of misconduct (Salin, 2009).

A moral collapse in organizational structure and behavior or a crisis occurs when there is a breakdown in the flow of moral ideals resulting in the institutionalization of a harmful mindset, with employees believing that the organization is unfair in its tolerance of misconduct (Wicks, 2001). Specifically, ideology and regulation from moral communities flow down through the organization, while moral ideals and influence from individuals flow up, explaining widespread misconduct that could create a hostile work environment (Lawrence, 2011). One study examined the impact of senior military officers condoning and sometimes observing junior officers sexually harassing other military members, illustrating a moral collapse of the organizational environment (Lawrence, 2011). Therefore, perceptions of the global organizational environment, including the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, and organizational sanctions should be examined to understand why the organizational mindset evolved to tolerate sexual harassment, resulting in the belief by victims of unfairness and institutional betrayal (Gentile,

2019). Thus, the perception of the global organizational environment based on the institutional theory of moral collapse from a macro perspective may affect the micro perspective of the victim's coping response of reporting sexual harassment.

In creating Figure 1, I reviewed primary studies for antecedents to sexual harassment at the macro-level, including risk factors of the firm environment (e.g., type of industry), and at the micro-level with individual differences, such as gender. I found that the individual's coping response impacts whether they will report sexual harassment, file a lawsuit, and continue to perform the job. Therefore, I look to extend the literature by reviewing sexual harassment in the workplace from the micro and macro perspectives by integrating the institutional theory of moral collapse through the organizational environment and the coping response of the victim to determine the outcomes of reporting sexual harassment, using power distance, masculinity norms (country-level factors), and industry (industry-level factor) as moderators.

Additionally, I reviewed the EEOC's report based on cases from 2010 to 2015 to compare quid pro quo harassment claims to hostile work environment claims and the applicable legal standard (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). This report was the result of an 18-month study, by 16 members of a select task force, of conduct and behaviors that may result in unlawful harassment that summarizes what is known about sexual harassment in the workplace and what can be done to prevent it (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). The report concluded with recommendations to prevent harassment by leadership, hold harassers accountable, implement harassment prevention policies and procedures, conduct anti-harassment compliance training, and provide outreach for employees (Feldblum & Lifnic, 2016). Therefore, I included the organization's response to the sexual harassment claim (Figure 1) since it impacts whether the employee leaves the organization, files a lawsuit, and ultimately wins the lawsuit. Although the implementation of the

EEOC recommendations through firms' responses to sexual harassment is important to prevent the consequences of sexual harassment, academics have understudied this topic.

**2.5 Review of Relevant Constructs**

The relevant concepts reviewed in this section are examples from Figure 1 that I utilize in developing the hypotheses (Section 2.6) and reviewing the current literature (Section 2.7). Under the institutional theory, the prevalence of sexual harassment and the individual-level factor of a negative perception of the global organizational environment (including the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, and organizational sanctions) and lack of a firm's response contributes to the moral collapse of the organization. The employee's perception of sexual harassment and the global organizational environment, along with the employee's job attitudes (individual-level factor) contribute to the employee's coping response of reporting sexual harassment. Furthermore, the extent to which perceptions of the global organizational environment under the institutional theory of moral collapse are related to the victim's coping response of reporting sexual harassment could be moderated by the contingency factors of industry (industry-level factor), power distance, and masculinity norms of the country where the organization is located (country-level factors).

*Sexual harassment.* The EEOC has defined sexual harassment in the workplace as unwelcome sexual advances or physical conduct of a sexual nature that interferes with an individual's work performance or creates a hostile work environment (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Courts recognize legal claims for sexual harassment as a quid pro quo or a hostile work environment (Druhan, 2013). A supervisor demanding sexual favors from an employee in exchange for promotion or continued employment is considered quid pro quo harassment (Druhan, 2013; Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Conduct that is severe and pervasive enough in the

workplace for a reasonable person to consider it hostile, intimidating, abusive, or altering employment conditions creates the perception of a hostile organizational environment under the institutional theory of moral collapse (Druhan, 2013; Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). The predominant measure for sexual harassment is the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ), which does not explicitly ask if the employee has been sexually harassed (Sojo et al., 2015).

*Perceptions of sexual harassment*. An employee's perception of sexual harassment refers to whether the employee perceives sexual advances, or physical conduct of a sexual nature, to interfere with work performance or create a hostile work environment (Feldblum, 2016). The courts are split as to whether to use a reasonable person standard or a reasonable woman standard when determining whether unwelcome sexual advances or physical conduct constitute sexual harassment (Druhan, 2013). Specifically, the reasonable woman standard assesses whether a reasonable woman would perceive the sexual advances to be sexual harassment. This is a lesser standard than the reasonable person standard, including whether men would consider the advances or physical conduct to be sexual harassment (Druhan, 2013). Also, under either standard, an employee may perceive supervisor harassment to be more severe than co-worker harassment (Druhan, 2013). Therefore, employees' perceptions of sexual harassment (individual-level factors) may be impacted by the global organizational environment, including the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, organizational sanctions, and industry- and country-level factors, and could be measured by the coping response through how many employees report sexual harassment.

*Reporting sexual harassment.* A sexual harassment victim may file a formal complaint within their organization or with the EEOC. Once a victim has filed a complaint with the EEOC, the EEOC then investigates the claim and decides whether to send the victim a "right to sue"

letter for the victim to have their legal fees paid. Only between 5 and 30 percent of sexual harassment victims file a formal complaint within their organization, and less than 1 percent pursue legal action (Hart, 2019). Victims may hesitate to report sexual harassment as their coping response because of professional retaliation, such as not being promoted, or social retaliation from other employees (e.g., being ostracized), or concerns of not being believed after filing the report (Karami et al., 2019). Since the #metoo movement started in 2017, however, the EEOC has reported a 12 percent annual increase of cases alleging sexual harassment (EEOC, 2020). This meta-analysis is based on studies that utilized surveys of victims of sexual harassment reporting to researchers their experience of sexual harassment (Sojo et al., 2015).

*Job Attitudes.* Countless scales exist to measure individual-level factors of job attitudes, such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, work satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, and supervisor satisfaction, that contribute to the employee's overall perception of the global organizational environment (Sojo et al., 2015). Specifically, organizational commitment has been measured through an organizational commitment questionnaire, and work satisfaction has been measured through the U.S. Armed Force's Sexual Harassment Survey (Sojo et al., 2015). A 5-item scale has been used to measure extrinsic job satisfaction by asking about participants' satisfaction with their job challenge, level of responsibility, and opportunities to use skills and abilities, whereas a seven-point scale has been used to measure intrinsic, extrinsic, and global job satisfaction (Lyness & Thompson, 1997). A job descriptive index has been used to measure supervisor satisfaction. Six-item scales have been used to measure co-worker satisfaction, asking how satisfied the employee is with their relationships (Sojo et al., 2015). Negative employee job attitudes may impact employees' coping responses of reporting sexual harassment.

*Perception of the global organizational environment.* The organizational context is composed of climates such as justice, sexual, service, and safety that make up the global organizational environment, which may be the relatively most important predictor of sexual harassment (Rubino et al., 2018). The individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment includes the employee's belief that the organization is fair (justice), the extent to which the employee believes that the organization is intolerant of sexual harassment through the implementation of policies and procedures (sexual), and enforcement of organizational sanctions against perpetrators (justice/safety) in the context of sexual harassment (Rubino et al., 2018; Sojo et al., 2015). Therefore, through the institutional theory of moral collapse, the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment may be assessed by (1) the justice climate, (2) the sexual harassment climate, and (3) organizational sanctions.

First, the organizational justice climate reflects the employee's belief about the fairness of organizational tolerance for misconduct and its reaction to the misconduct (Rubino et al., 2018). The organizational justice climate encompasses the sexual harassment climate and may reflect an organization's moral and ethical code (Lin & Leung, 2014). The Organizational Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory has been used to measure the perception of risk for reporting the event, the likelihood that complaints will be taken seriously, and the chances that the harasser will face sanctions, using three scenarios of sexual harassment followed by three items measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale (Magley et al., 1999). The employee's belief that the organization is unfair in responding to misconduct contributes to an overall negative perception of an organizational environment through the institutional theory of moral collapse.

Second, the sexual harassment climate is based on the implementation of sexual harassment policies and procedures, since the organization may be less likely to tolerate sexual harassment if it has invested in resources to ensure these policies are fairly implemented (Rubino et al., 2018). Sexual harassment policies and procedures refer to the documentation and training that an organization implements specifically prohibiting sexual harassment and reprimanding those who participate in sexual harassment (Rubino et al., 2018). The EEOC evaluates sexual harassment cases based on whether the organization has sexual harassment policies and procedures in place and how the organization responds to sexual harassment claims (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). The sexual harassment climate influences employees' perceptions of the organizational environment and their coping response of reporting sexual harassment if there is a process in place for employees to follow.

Third, organizational sanctions are the repercussions to the harasser who sexually harassed another employee and are mainly controlled by the organization (Dekker & Barling, 1998). Organizational sanctions have been measured with a 6-item scale, with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" and questions such as "my employer takes sexual harassment complaints very seriously" or "my employer has a sexual harassment policy just to make the lawyers happy but does not take it seriously" (Dekker & Barling, 1998). Whether the organization enforces organizational sanctions is a key factor measured in the perception of the organization's environment to understand the employee's belief about the fairness of the organization's tolerance of misconduct and the employee's resulting coping response.

*Firm-level antecedents.* Firm-level antecedents to sexual harassment may include the organizational context and job gender context (Willness et al., 2007). Organizational context refers to the organizational justice climate or tolerance of sexual harassment in the organization

and the policies and procedures implemented that provide effective remedies for sexual harassment; it may also include the social climate of the organization that permits sexual harassment to occur under the institutional theory of moral collapse (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Willness et al., 2007). The job gender context is the job's gendered nature that can include the gender ratio of the workgroup, the gender of the supervisor, and the gender traditionally affiliated with roles (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). Organizational context may be measured utilizing the Organizational Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory, whereas job gender context may be measured through evaluating workplace composition and the workplace gender ratio (Willness et al., 2007).

*Firm-level response.* A firm-level response to a sexual harassment claim could be assessed by how seriously the organization treats the complaint, the victim's riskiness in filing the claim, and the likelihood that the harasser will be reprimanded through organizational sanctions (Sojo et al., 2015). Organizations have been evaluated by the EEOC on their responsiveness to sexual harassment by the timeliness of the response, retaliation against the victim, and whether the organization implements sexual harassment policies after an incident of sexual harassment occurs. Under the institutional theory of moral collapse, employees could be more prone to perceive the global organizational environment negatively if the organization does not respond appropriately to sexual harassment.

*Moderators.* According to Hofstede's cultural dimensions, power distance, individualism, masculinity norms, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation, and indulgence of different countries can be measured and compared (Minkov et al., 2011). First, individualism is the individual's relationship with a group, which may or may not impact sexual harassment, depending on the country's culture (Minkov et al., 2011). Second, social implications for how an

individual deals with emotions through uncertainty avoidance could impact an individual's coping response to sexual harassment (Minkov et al., 2011). Third, long-term orientation measured by the acceptance of change in status and power rules could impact an organization's culture, leading to rules for the tolerance of misconduct (Hofstede, 2015). Fourth, indulgence, or the degree of control over orgasmic satisfaction, contributes to a country's cultural dimensions, affecting whether a person harasses someone else (Hofstede, 2015).

Under the institutional theory of moral collapse through the perception of a global organization's environment, however, the power distance between the employees' and the organization's leaders and the country's masculinity norms are the most important cultural dimensions (country-level factors) in considering the influence of contingency factors. When contemplating reporting sexual harassment, the victim may be influenced by how much authority organizational leaders have over them (power distance) and whether the country they are in is more masculine or values power or status through winning competitive sequences (Hofstede, 2015). Also, the extent to which the industry is male, or female-dominated impacts the relationship between perception of the global organizational environment and the likelihood of a victim's coping response to reporting sexual harassment (Remus Ilies, 2003). A female victim of sexual harassment may be less likely to report sexual harassment in a male-dominated industry where male co-workers may consider the behavior as part of the organizational culture and not as a hostile work environment. Therefore, power distance, the country's masculinity norms, and the organization's industry should be examined to determine the extent to which these contingency factors moderate the proposed hypotheses.

## 2.6 Hypotheses Development

I defined the variables from Figure 1 in Section 2.5 since all these variables were utilized in developing hypotheses (Section 2.6) and reviewing the current literature (Section 2.7). I fully describe the model in Figure 1 in this section but focus on boxes 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 because of data limitations. I first reviewed antecedents of sexual harassment for individuals, including gender, personality traits of the victim, and power differentials as factors that impact the victim's coping response to sexual harassment and attitude towards work (Box 9). For example, women with institutional power correlate with women becoming more targeted for sexual harassment because they assume characteristics more desirable for men (Box 7) (McLaughlin & Blackstone, 2012), while victims in lower positions of power with large distances between them and other workers are more likely to be sexually harassed (Box 7) (Akande, 1992). Antecedents of sexual harassment that influence males with a likelihood to sexually harass are gender type of the job and women taking on more masculine roles (Lee et al., 2008).

Once sexual harassment occurs, a victim's perception (individual-level factor) of labeling the behavior as sexual harassment (Box 8) and reporting it as such (Box 10) depends upon the victim's coping response (Box 9) (Munson & Hulin, 2001). Reporting sexual harassment may be moderated by contingency factors of the power distance between the victim and harasser (Box 7), the masculinity norms of the country where the organization is located (country-level factors) (Box 12), and the organization's industry (industry-level factor) (Box 3) (Salin et al., 2014). Personal and environmental determinants impact victims when deciding upon which coping response to implement when sexually harassed (Box 9) (Malamut, 2002). For example, victims' perception that their complaints will not be taken seriously, that they will be penalized for complaining, or lack of repercussions for the harasser (Box 8) correlates with victims not

reporting sexual harassment (Box 10) (Fitzgerald et al., 1997). Women who perceive that leadership makes honest efforts to stop harassment, however, are more likely to report sexual harassment (Box 10) (Malamut, 2002).

The victim's external coping response to sexual harassment may include reporting sexual harassment to a leader in the organization or filing an EEOC claim against the organization. Whether the victim reports sexual harassment may depend on the victim's job attitude (individual-level factor); for example, employees satisfied with their job may downplay their sexual harassment perceptions. Job attitudes as individual-level factors have been assessed through numerous scales, including organizational commitment, job satisfaction, work satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, and supervisor satisfaction (Sojo et al., 2015).

Organizational commitment is an employee's identification with and psychological attachment to the organization (Gettman & Gelfand, 2007). Job satisfaction has been defined as employees' general affective reaction to the job, which may or may not include specific facets of the job instead of work satisfaction, which includes the quality of the specific tasks performed (Sojo et al., 2015). Satisfaction with relationships is important in assessing job attitudes through employees' general affective reaction to their relationships with co-workers and their supervisor (Sojo et al., 2015). Employees may indicate a more positive job attitude based on the challenge of their job, their level of responsibility, and the opportunity to use their skills and abilities (Lyness & Thompson, 1997). Victims with a positive job attitude (individual-level factor) may be less likely to report sexual harassment while those with a negative job attitude may be more likely to report sexual harassment as their coping response.

**Hypothesis 1**: Positively valenced job attitudes are negatively correlated with reporting sexual harassment.

The institutional theory of moral collapse through the perception of the global organizational environment (individual-level factor) (Box 6) impacts whether sexual harassment takes place and could be a hostile work environment (Box 5) or quid pro quo harassment (Box 4). The institutional theory of moral collapse explains how moral ideals and regulations flow down from communities through organizations and then flow up from individuals through organizations. This theory correlates with perception of the organizational environment by impacting the culture of the organization, the enabling of sexual harassment, and employees' belief that the organization is fair in its tolerance of misconduct (Box 8) (Lawrence, 2011). Thus, the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment impacts the victim's coping response since it includes the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, and organizational sanctions and may be the relatively most important predictor of sexual harassment (Rubino et al., 2018).

First, the organizational justice climate assesses the organization's tolerance for sexual harassment by considering whether the organization treats the sexual harassment complaint seriously, the riskiness to the victim of making a complaint, and the repercussions to the harasser (Sojo et al., 2015). Specifically, a discrepancy between actual and ideal responses of the firm (Box 11), perceived severity of the behavior, and low organizational status of the victim correlates with a victim not reporting sexual harassment (Box 10) because they perceive the environment as unjust (Box 8) (Salin et al., 2014). Therefore, the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment may predict reporting sexual harassment because it includes the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, organizational sanctions, risk to the employee for making the complaint, and whether the organization will treat the complaint seriously through the policies and procedures that it has in place (Sojo et al., 2015).

Second, a sexual harassment climate is based on policies and procedures that specifically prohibit sexual harassment and reprimand those who participate in it (Rubino et al., 2018). The organization may be less likely to tolerate sexual harassment if it has sexual harassment policies and procedures in place and has invested in resources to ensure that the policies are fairly implemented (Rubino et al., 2018). Employees may be more prone to perceive that the organizational environment is fair when sexual harassment policies and procedures are implemented equally across the organization. Fairly implemented policies and procedures make employees feel valued and encourage them to treat each other with respect, resulting in less misconduct and employees feeling more comfortable reporting misconduct as their coping response (Lin & Leung, 2014).

Third, perceptions of the organizational environment's fairness concerning sexual harassment tolerance through organizational sanctions impact the frequency of sexual harassment and job-related outcomes (Wright & Fitzgerald, 2009). The frequency of sexual harassment can be assessed by the victim reporting either (1) conduct endured as a condition of continued employment (quid pro quo) or (2) conduct that is severe or pervasive enough to create a work environment that a reasonable person would consider intimidating, hostile, or abusive (hostile work environment) (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). The employee may be more likely to perceive the organization as tolerating sexual harassment under the institutional theory of moral collapse if the employee is experiencing quid pro quo harassment or a hostile work environment without the organization imposing sanctions (low organizational environment). The employee may perceive a high organizational environment and report sexual harassment as their coping response if the organization responds with organizational sanctions.

**Hypothesis 2:** Perceptions of a global organizational environment (e.g., the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, organizational sanctions) are positively correlated with reporting sexual harassment.

Individual-level factors also include individual differences such as gender, tenure (in a position or an organization), and age, which have been commonly studied as predictors for reporting sexual harassment in the workplace (Kabat-Farr et al., 2014). Studies have shown that females are more likely than males to experience sexual harassment and label it as such (del Carmen Herrera & Herrera, 2014; McLaughlin & Blackstone, 2012; Willness et al., 2007). Before 2017, both younger and middle-aged women were particularly vulnerable to sexual harassment, but both age categories were hesitant to file a report (O'Connell & Korabik, 2000). Since Alyssa Milano posted a tweet on October 15, 2017 ("if you've been sexually harassed or assaulted write 'me too' as a reply to this tweet"), younger females are more likely to report sexual harassment than their older counterparts, even though women over 35 are supportive of the #metoo movement (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016; Hart, 2019; McNamara, 2018; Schneider & Carpenter, 2019).

Also, there may be varying results based on the victim's tenure. Victims who recently joined the organization may be less tolerant of sexual harassment. With more tenure, however, victims may also have certain expectations about how they should be treated, have higher status, and, therefore, have more credibility to act (Kabat-Farr et al., 2014). Although other individual-level factor variables, such as education, risk perception, or race, may also predict reporting sexual harassment (Kabat-Farr et al., 2014). Therefore, the victim's perception of the organizational environment (individual-level factor), regardless of age, gender, or tenure, may be

a relatively more important predictor of reporting sexual harassment. Thus, the question then becomes what is the relatively most important predictor of sexual harassment?

Perception of the global organizational environment (Box 8) (individual-level factor) predicts reporting sexual harassment over and above individual difference variables by illustrating the conditions in which sexual harassment is likely to occur and influencing the victim's coping response (Box 9) (Willness et al., 2007). The organizational environment includes whether there is a perceived moral collapse of the organization (low organizational justice climate) (Box 6), resulting in the victim making different attributions about their mistreatment experience (Hershcovis 2010). Under the institutional theory of moral collapse, the morals, ideals, and regulations of the firm impact perception of the organizational environment (Box 8), whether the organization allows mistreatment, and if the mistreatment continues over a period of time (Box 11) (Rubino et al., 2018).

Since perception of the global organizational environment is based on the employee's belief that the organization responds fairly to misconduct based on its organizational tolerance, it is broader than organizational sanctions. Perception of the global organizational environment may predict reporting sexual harassment because it includes the employee's observations of organizational sanctions as well as the risk to the employee for making the complaint, whether the organization will treat the complaint seriously, and the sexual harassment climate (Sojo et al., 2015). The individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment may predict the variance of reporting sexual harassment over and above individual-level factor differences, such as gender, tenure, and age, because perception of the organization not only predicts the likelihood of sexual harassment to occur but also the coping response of the victim in the specific work environment (Willness et al., 2007).

Regardless of individual-level factors of gender, age, or tenure in the position, the victim may perceive that the global organizational environment is unfair (e.g., low organizational justice climate and no organizational sanctions) and be less likely to report sexual harassment. If the victim's perception of the global organizational environment is fair (e.g., high organizational justice climate and strict organizational sanctions) due to low organizational tolerance, however, then the victim may be more likely to report sexual harassment as a coping response.

**Hypothesis 3a**: Perceptions of the global organizational environment are relatively more important than individual difference variables when predicting reporting sexual harassment.

**Hypothesis 3b**: Perceptions of the global organizational environment predict variance in reporting sexual harassment over and above individual difference variables (e.g., gender, tenure, age).

Country-level factors may impact sexual harassment, such as abuse of power and power distance determined by the organizational structure (Remus Ilies, 2003). Under the institutional theory of moral collapse, sexual harassment may be more prevalent in highly structured, bureaucratic organizations with clearly defined levels, depending upon the industry (Niebuhr & Boyles, 1991). Therefore, the industry-level factor should be examined by grouping studies by industry to identify highly structured, bureaucratic organizations more easily and to examine the impact of gender in these industries (Remus Ilies, 2003). For example, the military is male-dominated and considered highly structured with large power differentials between levels, making it more likely for sexual harassment to occur compared to academia, an industry with less structure, lower power differentials, and more females (Scott, 2008). An industry with more females or that is female dominated may make it less likely for sexual harassment to occur

(Scott, 2008). Therefore, the question becomes to what extent do these contingency factors influence the employee reporting sexual harassment.

When perception of the global organizational environment (e.g., the justice climate, organizational sanctions, the sexual harassment climate) is high, employees believe that the employer is fair when implementing policies, procedures, and organizational sanctions. If the industry-level factor is also high, meaning the industry consists of highly structured, bureaucratic organizations with clearly defined levels, then the victim may be less likely to report sexual harassment as their coping response. When perception of the global organizational environment is low and the industry is low, meaning that the industry consists of less structured organizations with less power distance, then the victim may be more likely to report sexual harassment. When the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment is high and the industry-level factor is low, then the victim may be more likely to report sexual harassment. Under the institutional theory of moral collapse, when perception of the global organizational environment is low and the industry is high, the victim may be less likely to report sexual harassment.

**Hypothesis 4**: The extent to which perceptions of the global organizational environment are related to reporting sexual harassment is moderated by the organization's industry.

Masculinity norms of the country where sexual harassment occurs and power distance between the harasser and the victim are country-level factors that may moderate the hypotheses. The power distance between the harasser and the victim, or social inequality that includes the relationship with authority, is a relevant cultural dimension for studying sexual harassment, utilizing the institutional theory of moral collapse (Minkov et al., 2011). Power distance could indicate the likelihood of quid pro quo harassment or conduct that must be endured as a

condition of employment and whether the victim feels comfortable reporting harassment as their coping response due to the social inequality of the harasser and victim (Minkov et al., 2011).

For example, there is a greater power distance between those in authority and other individuals in China compared to the United States and the United Kingdom, with 80 representing the value of the power distance in China compared to 40 in the United States and 35 in the United Kingdom (Hofstede, 2015). Also, the country's masculinity norms may determine social or emotional implications (i.e., 66 in China and the United Kingdom compared to 62 in the United States) and whether one is more likely to be sexually harassed (Minkov et al., 2011). While the country-level factor of power distance is much greater in China than in the United States and the United Kingdom, the country-level factors of masculinity norms are closer together (Hofstede, 2015).

When the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment is high (the employee believes that the organization is fair) and the country-level factor of power distance is low, then the victim may feel more empowered to report sexual harassment as their coping response. Under the institutional theory of moral collapse, when perception of the global organizational environment is low (individual-level factor), meaning that the employee does not believe that the organization is fair in its tolerance of sexual harassment and power distance (industry-level factor) is low, then the employee may be less likely to report sexual harassment. When perception of the global organizational environment is high and power distance is high, the employee may be less likely to report sexual harassment. When perception of the global organizational environment is low and power distance is high, then the employee may be less likely to report sexual harassment under the institutional theory of moral collapse because an unjust environment engenders power differentials (Harned et al., 2002).

The cultural dimension of masculinity norms of a country where an organization is located remains another relevant country-level factor for a study on sexual harassment utilizing the institutional theory of moral collapse (Minkov et al., 2011). If a country is classified as more masculine than feminine, then there is a preference for power or status through winning competitive sequences or aligning with powerful winners (Hofstede, 2015). In contrast, femininity represents a reluctance to use power or status or to accept authority enacted in powerful ways (Hofstede, 2015). For example, there may be more positive social or emotional implications of being a boy in China than being a girl, since China prioritizes masculinity norms. Under the institutional theory of moral collapse, the country-level factors of power distance and masculinity norms can impact the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment, ultimately influencing the victim's coping response to sexual harassment.

When perception of the global organizational environment is high (e.g., high justice climate, strict organizational sanctions, sexual harassment policies, and procedures), meaning that the employee believes that the organization is fair through being less tolerant of misconduct, and the country-level factor of masculinity norms is low (reluctance to use power or status), then the victim may feel more empowered to report sexual harassment as their coping response. When perception of the global organizational environment is low, meaning that the employee does not believe that the organization is fair through being more tolerant of sexual harassment, and masculinity norms are low, then the employee may be less likely to report sexual harassment. When perception of the global organizational environment is high and the country's masculinity norms are high, then the employee may still be less likely to report sexual harassment. When victims' perception of the global organizational environment is low and the country's

masculinity norms are high, then employees may be less likely to report sexual harassment (Harned et al., 2002).

**Hypothesis 5a**: The extent to which perceptions of the global organizational environment are related to reporting sexual harassment is moderated by the power distance of the country.

**Hypothesis 5b**: The extent to which perceptions of the global organizational environment are related to reporting sexual harassment is moderated by the masculinity norms of the country.

Under the institutional theory of moral collapse, if a victim reports sexual harassment (Box 10) and the firm does not respond promptly or fires the employee (Box 11), then the employee may file a lawsuit against the firm for sexual harassment and retaliatory discharge as a coping response (Box 15) (Salin et al., 2014). From 2010 to 2015, firms paid approximately $698.7 million to victims going through the EEOC process before litigation (Box 14) (Commission, 2019). Alternatively, there are indirect costs to the firm even if the victim does not file a lawsuit; for instance, the victim's performance may suffer, the victim may quit the firm, or the victim may choose to harm the firm's reputation through social media as an external coping response (Box 15) (Sims et al., 2005).

Sexual harassment results in the decline of the victim's well-being (i.e., internal coping response) with added types of mistreatment in the workplace (Lim & Cortina, 2005) and continued mistreatment over time (Box 15) (Glomb et al., 1999). Furthermore, victims of sexual harassment may exhibit individual-level negative effects, such as the psychological effects of trauma (Box 15), independently of dispositional influences or response biases as their internal coping responses (Munson et al., 2000; Schneider, 1997). Therefore, through this meta-analytic

review of sexual harassment, I provide solutions for organizations to develop policies and procedures to prevent sexual harassment claims, avoid litigation, and increase individual-level factors of job satisfaction and well-being. In addition to developing five hypotheses, I reviewed current literature focused on firm-level antecedents and responses, measures, and publication status.

### 2.7 Current Literature (CL)

The institutional theory of moral collapse posits the organizational environment as the most influential antecedent of sexual harassment in a firm, and therefore, may be the most important predictor of workplace sexual harassment (Box 6) (Willness et al., 2007). Specifically, social climate factors may be necessary as precursors to sexual harassment (Box 1) (Willness et al., 2007). These antecedents include, but are not limited to, homogeneous workforces, cultural and language differences in the workplace, coarsened social discourse outside of the workplace, the presence of many young workers, workplaces with high-value employees, monotonous work, isolated or decentralized workplaces, and workplace cultures that encourage alcohol consumption (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). These risk factors make up the firm's moral ideals and the culture that correlates with the organizational environment, which may be more prevalent in certain industries (Box 3). The organizational context and job gender context may also be a firm-level predictor of sexual harassment and impact the victim's internal or external coping response to sexual harassment. Thus, one gap in the macro literature that may need to be filled is the study of firm-level antecedents of sexual harassment.

**CL1**: To what extent are researchers studying firm-level antecedents of sexual harassment?

A sexual harassment victim's individual coping response depends greatly on the organization's response or how its leadership handles misconduct and implements policies, procedures, and rewards (Rubino et al., 2018). For example, if sexual harassment policies and procedures are implemented fairly across the organization, employees are more likely to treat each other fairly and not engage in harassment (Rubino et al., 2018). Organizational response to a sexual harassment claim could be assessed by how seriously the organization treats the complaint, the risk to the victim riskiness in filing the claim, and the likelihood that the harasser will be reprimanded (Sojo et al., 2015). Specifically, does the organization retaliate against the victim of sexual harassment or against the harasser with organizational sanctions? If the organization retaliates against the victim, then the institutional theory of moral collapse may be applied to the organization's environment through the victim's perception that they have been mistreated.

Since one aspect of perception of the global organizational environment (individual-level factor) is based on the employee's belief that the organization responds fairly to misconduct based on its organizational tolerance (i.e., the justice climate), it is a broader construct than organizational sanctions. Observations of organizational sanctions against sexual harassment have been measured using a six-item scale to assess the perceived seriousness of the organization's response to sexual harassment and its sexual harassment grievance policy (Dekker & Barling, 1998). The victim's coping response is also impacted by the organization's response and organizational sanctions imposed for misconduct. Thus, another gap in the macro literature that may need to be filled is the study of firms' responses to sexual harassment claims.

**CL2**: To what extent are researchers studying firms' responses to a sexual harassment claim?

The measure of sexual harassment may serve as a methodological moderator of the research questions. For example, the most prevalent scale used in surveys about sexual harassment is the SEQ, which focuses on unwanted sexual attention, coercion, and sexist or offensive behavior (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). The nature of the SEQ may lead to moderation because the questions the victims are asked impact whether they have experienced sexual harassment and the SEQ does not explicitly mention sexual harassment. In contrast, the organizational tolerance for sexual harassment inventory and organizational sanctions against sexual harassment scales specifically ask about sexual harassment (Sojo et al., 2015). Therefore, the type of sexual harassment scale may moderate the hypotheses because participants are asked about sexual harassment and whether they label their experience as such.

**CL3**: To what extent do these hypothesized relations differ by the type of measure used?

Research is also impacted by the extent to which publication type (e.g., published article, dissertation, conference paper) moderates the hypotheses due to publication bias. For example, a dissertation on sexual harassment in academia may include variables on general topics, such as gender differences in stereotypical attitudes, gender differences in scenario judgments, and ethnic differences in scenario judgments, resulting in a null result (Hippensteele, 1991). Because dissertations or a faculty-led study may never get published if no evidence of sexual harassment is found or there is a null result, publication type could moderate a study's findings of sexual harassment.

**CL4**: To what extent do these hypothesized relations differ by publication status (i.e., published vs. unpublished)?

# CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Systematic Search

To identify published and unpublished samples for the current meta-analytic review, I first conducted a systematic search for past meta-analytic reviews of sexual harassment since January 2000. I researched the last twenty years because of the changing landscape of sexual harassment, especially since the #me too movement began in 2017, so that the data would be more representative of modern affairs. I searched Google Scholar because of its inter-disciplinary nature. Using the keywords of meta-analysis, sexual harassment, and workplace, I retrieved 1,282 total articles. After excluding 1,034 articles, I coded 248 articles to use in this study with 284 independent samples. I was particularly interested in identifying those studies in the workplace that included the firm perspective to consider the macro and micro impact of sexual harassment measured through individual-, industry-, and country-level factors.

Three past reviews were relevant to the stated objectives of this meta-analysis based on the following criteria: (1) workplace context, (2) consideration of the organization's as well as the victim's perspective, and (3) the focus on sexual harassment. The reviews focused on the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment (Willness et al., 2007), gender differences in the perception of sexual harassment (Rotundo, 2001), and comparisons of sexual versus non-sexual workplace aggression with the victim's overall job satisfaction (Lapierre et al., 2005). I conducted a backward and forward reference search for these three reviews; that is, I sought to acquire all past samples leveraged in the reviews as well as studies that referenced them, since they were published on Google Scholar and ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. To review publication bias, I sought all unpublished and published articles that cited these reviews on Google Scholar and ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. There were a couple of instances

when I could not track down articles, such as when no records were found under the citations or if the citations did not appear in a search.

As a second, complementary search, I searched through past reviews and primary studies to determine which scales were used to measure sexual harassment. In these studies, sexual harassment was measured through surveys of employees reporting to researchers whether they experienced sexual harassment (Sojo et al., 2015). I found twenty different scales, which were summarized in a review focused on harmful workplace experiences and women's occupational well-being (Sojo et al., 2015). To capture how frequently these scales were used, I searched for articles in Google Scholar using the following keywords: generalized workplace harassment questionnaire, overt-covert aggression scale, Northwestern National Life Insurance Company's survey on workplace violence (1993), sexual harassment survey, Organizational Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory, and the SEQ (Sojo et al., 2015). This search yielded 451 articles. The SEQ was the most prevalent, with 367 of 451 articles utilizing it as a measure (81%).

## 3.2 Coding

### Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

The final dataset included 284 independent samples, consisting of 538,426 individuals. Each primary study met the following criteria to be included in the meta-analytic review. First, the study used sexual harassment as a variable (e.g., sexual harassment, gender harassment, hostile work environment, quid pro quo, sexual coercion, unwanted attention, sexual behavior, crude behavior, sexual assault, unwanted touching, sexual victimization). Second, the study provided correlation coefficients or other pertinent information that could be used to assess the relationship between sexual harassment and other variables (e.g., *Cohen's d*, means, standard deviations, odds ratios). Third, the study relayed the sample size to calculate the effect size

weighted by the sample size. Finally, I used Wood's detection heuristics to screen for duplicate samples (Wood, 2008).

I included only those studies that used sexual harassment as a focal variable (e.g., sexual harassment, gender harassment, sexual coercion, sexual assault, work-related harassment, sexual harassment climate, and perceived level of severity of sexual harassment) (e.g., Cortina & Wasti, 2005; Sigal et al., 2003). I utilized samples that occurred inside of a prototypical working environment, such as a university (O'Connell & Korabik, 2000) or a hospital (Jenner et al., 2019), and included quantitative studies about sexual harassment that provided the information needed to assess correlations (e.g., Kabat-Farr et al., 2014; Robotham & Cortina, 2019).

**Inter-rater reliability**

Due to high volume, I coded the articles in this meta-analysis with the help of graduate assistants who were trained to extract the needed effect size information (e.g., correlations, sample sizes, reliability). All coders completed a training phase when their percent of agreement for the coding of three articles met or surpassed the project lead's 90% agreement (Bornmann et al., 2010; Hardwicke et al., 2018).

## 3.3 Variables

The relevant constructs (defined in Section 2.5) were coded to test the hypotheses (Section 2.6) and to review the current literature (Section 2.7). The first hypothesis analyzed the correlation between the individual-level factors of job attitudes and reporting sexual harassment. The second hypothesis evaluated the relationship between the individual-level factor of perception of a fair global organizational environment, consisting of variables such as justice climate, sexual harassment climate, organizational sanctions, and reporting sexual harassment. In the third hypothesis, I evaluated the dominant predictor variable of reporting sexual harassment

to understand the most relatively important predictor of sexual harassment. The remaining hypotheses tested whether the industry-level factor and country-level factor variables, such as power distance and masculinity norms, moderated the relationship between perception of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment to understand the extent of contingency factor influences.

First, to examine the methodological moderation of the industry-level factor of the organizations, I categorized the sexual harassment incident rate according to the type of work environment in which the study was conducted (Remus Ilies et al., 2003). The Industrial classification indicated the likelihood of the organization to be highly structured and bureaucratic, with large power differentials and clearly defined roles (Remus Ilies et al., 2003). Industry Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes were obtained for each organization. Given the hundreds of potential industries, the number of codes was reduced to the following male-dominated industries: (1) Industrial (e.g., mining, utilities, construction, manufacturing, transportation, warehousing), and (2) Military (e.g., Navy, Army, Air Force). Mixed male and female industries were coded as (3) Professional (e.g., information, finances and insurance, real estate and leasing, professional and management services, educational and health services), and (4) Miscellaneous (e.g., entertainment, hospitality) (Sweida & Woods, 2015).

Second, to examine the moderating effect of power distance (country-level factor) on perception of the global organizational environment, I coded the country in which the study took place (e.g., Japan, Turkey, Australia). I referred to Hofstede's cultural dimension scores to code the value of the country's power distance; for example, 66 in Turkey compared to 54 in Japan and 38 in Australia (Hofstede, 2015). The value of the power distance of the country or social inequality, including relationship with authority, illustrated the moderating effect on the relation

between the perception of the global organizational environment under the institutional theory of moral collapse and the employee's coping response to sexual harassment (Minkov et al., 2011). To do a multi-level analysis for these categorical moderators, the studies needed to contain a sufficient number of unique samples (i.e., *k*) (Gooty et al. 2019). Specifically, there were not enough samples across moderator categories to allow for a multi-level analysis with independent samples (Gooty et al. 2019).

Third, to examine the moderating effect of masculinity norms (country-level factor), I referred to Hofstede's cultural dimension score, defined as a preference for power or status through winning competitive sequences or aligning with a country's powerful authority figures (Hofstede, 2015). For example, Japan's cultural dimension score of masculinity norms is 95, compared to 61 in Australia and 45 in Turkey, meaning that Japan has a greater preference for status over Australia and an even greater preference over Turkey (Hofstede, 2015). Turkey, however, has a cultural dimension power distance score of 66, compared to 54 in Japan and 38 in Australia. Therefore, Turkey has a greater tolerance for social inequality compared to Japan and Australia.

Lastly, I evaluated the extent to which researchers studied firm-level antecedents of sexual harassment and firms' responses to sexual harassment claims to evaluate the gaps in macro literature and examined whether hypothesized relations differed by the type of measure used or publication status.

### 3.4 Meta-analytic Calculation

The meta-analytic techniques were based on the statistical procedure outlined by Hunter and Schmidt (2004). I calculated sample-size weighted mean effect sizes using random-effects models and I utilized internal reliability (e.g., Cronbach's alpha) to correct for measurement error

in the observed correlations (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). If a study did not include reliability, I computed missing reliability using that construct's average reliability. I followed Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) approach and computed the confidence intervals around the corrected mean effect sizes and calculated credibility intervals that indicate the potential for moderating variables.

I detected publication bias through the trim and fill procedure and cumulative meta-analysis. The trim and fill procedure examines the degree of symmetry in a funnel plot distribution to adjust the derived sample size due to possible publication bias (Kepes et al., 2012; Vevea et al., 2005). Also, cumulative meta-analysis sorts effect sizes by a specific character of interest, such as precision of effect size, and plots cumulative point estimates on a forest plot to examine evidence of drift (Kepes et al., 2012). The meta-analysis was run iteratively, adding an additional sample each time. Finally, I utilized Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) procedure to examine the credibility intervals.

I also performed a relative importance analysis of the correlation matrices to examine the contribution that a variable, such as perception of the organizational environment, made to the prediction of reporting sexual harassment by itself and with other predictor variables (e.g., gender, age, tenure) to understand the practical utility of the organizational environment (Tonidandel & LeBreton, 2011). For instance, to fully understand the practical importance of the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment, aspects of a particular situation were considered, such as the justice climate, the sexual harassment climate, and organizational sanctions (Cortina & Landis, 2009).

This meta-analysis also assessed the incremental predictive validity of perception of the global organizational environment over and above individual difference variables (e.g., gender,

age, tenure of the victim at the organization) in predicting reporting sexual harassment in the workplace. In determining whether perception of the organizational environment extended our understanding and prediction of the employee's coping response to sexual harassment, perception of the organizational environment must account for variance beyond that already accounted for by established predictors, such as gender, age, or tenure. Perceptions of the global organizational environment (individual-level factor) were relatively more important or were the dominant predictor of reporting sexual harassment (O'Boyle et al., 2011). For the incremental validity test, I used the corrected correlations and calculated the harmonic mean of the sample size, which provided a more conservative approach to testing models by giving less weight to extreme values (O'Boyle et al., 2011).

# CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

## 4.1 Test of Hypotheses

I began my analysis by testing hypotheses 1 through 3. Hypothesis 1 stated that positively valenced job attitudes were negatively correlated with reporting sexual harassment. I analyzed the reporting of sexual harassment, sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention, work-related harassment, sexual harassment climate, and perceived severity of sexual harassment as correlates; all served as dependent variables. I assessed the individual-level factors of job attitudes as independent variables based on work satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, organizational commitment, and supervisor satisfaction. Using the Bosco et al. (2015) standards for interpreting correlation effect sizes, I found that job satisfaction ($\rho$= -.17, k = 50, n = 44,404), organizational commitment ($\rho$ = -.05, k = 24, n = 70,978), co-worker satisfaction ($\rho$ = -.07, k = 19, n = 100,296), and supervisor satisfaction ($\rho$ = -.03, k = 12, n = 97,834) were negatively correlated with reporting sexual harassment, which supports Hypothesis 1.

In addition, I found work satisfaction to be negatively correlated with reporting sexual coercion ($\rho$ = -.13, k = 4, n = 20,602), unwanted sexual attention ($\rho$ = -.19, k = 4, n = 20,602), and work-related harassment ($\rho$ = -.15, k = 4, n = 7,581), with similar small effect sizes. There was also support for a moderate magnitude relation between co-worker satisfaction ($\rho$ = .22, k = 7, n = 50,840), organizational commitment ($\rho$ = .21, k = 6, n = 1,988), and sexual harassment climate, with similar medium effect sizes. Therefore, these findings support Hypothesis 1, since positively valanced job attitudes were negatively correlated with reporting sexual harassment, overall (Table 3).

Hypothesis 2 stated that perceptions of a global organizational environment (e.g., justice climate, sexual harassment climate, organizational sanctions) were positively correlated with reporting sexual harassment. Results of the analyses showed evidence of a very small magnitude relation between justice climate and reporting sexual harassment ($\rho = .06$, $k = 41$, $n = 106{,}771$) as well as reporting gender harassment ($\rho = .03$, $k = 10$, $n = 127{,}541$) (Table 4). Therefore, employees' perceptions of a global organizational environment did not appear to be practically significant when reporting sexual harassment and gender harassment as their coping response. I found a moderate to large magnitude relation between justice climate and reporting work-related harassment ($\rho = .43$, $k = 5$, $n = 24{,}107$); sexual harassment climate ($\rho = .66$, $k = 5$, $n = 33{,}253$) and perceived severity of sexual harassment ($\rho = .44$, $k = 7$, $n = 3{,}052$).

Organizational sanctions, however, were negatively correlated with reporting gender harassment ($\rho = -.37$, $k = 3$, $n = 642$) and sexual coercion ($\rho = -.08$, $k = 3$, $n = 642$). Therefore, perceptions of a global organizational environment through organizational sanctions were negatively correlated with reporting gender harassment and sexual coercion. As a result, there was mixed support for Hypothesis 2 since perceptions of a global organizational environment through the justice climate were positively correlated with reporting sexual harassment and gender harassment.

Hypothesis 3a predicted that perceptions of the global organizational environment were relatively more important than individual difference variables when predicting sexual harassment reporting. I tested Hypothesis 3a by comparing effect sizes and then performing a relative weight analysis to evaluate the relatively most important predictor of sexual harassment. The individual-level factor of perceptions of the global organizational environment through justice climate was

larger in magnitude than individual difference variables when predicting reporting work-related harassment, sexual harassment climate, and perceived severity of harassment (Table 5).

For example, justice climate had a large effect size ($\rho$ = .43, k = 5, n = 24,107) in comparison to gender ($\rho$ = -.29, k = 3, n = 528) and age ($\rho$ = -.19, k = 5, n = 1,286) when predicting reporting work-related harassment. In addition, justice climate had a large effect size ($\rho$ = .66, k = 5, n = 33,253) in comparison to gender ($\rho$ = -.03, k = 8, n = 24,459), age ($\rho$ = -.09, k = 4, n = 5,131), and tenure ($\rho$ = .09, k = 6, n = 25,813) when predicting reporting a sexual harassment climate. Furthermore, justice climate ($\rho$ = .44, k = 7, n = 3,052) had a large effect size when predicting reporting perceived severity of sexual harassment in comparison to gender ($\rho$ = .14, k = 12, n = 3,683) and age ($\rho$ = -.11, k = 3, n = 2,000). Therefore, perceptions of the global organizational environment had larger magnitude correlations with reporting work-related harassment, sexual harassment climate, and perceived severity than some individual difference variables, but not with gender when reporting sexual harassment, sexual assault, and gender harassment.

Gender was larger in magnitude when predicting reporting sexual harassment ($\rho$ = .25 k = 53, n = 97,512) than was justice climate ($\rho$ = .06, k = 41, n = 106,771). In addition, gender was larger in magnitude when predicting reporting sexual assault ($\rho$ = .26, k = 18, n = 60,785) than was justice climate ($\rho$ = -.18, k = 8, n = 92,930). Furthermore, gender was larger in magnitude when predicting reporting gender harassment ($\rho$ = .28, k = 10, n = 27,916) than was justice climate ($\rho$ = .03, k = 10, n = 127,541).

To further test these results, I completed a relative weights analysis that estimated the sum of explained variance ($R^2$) through epsilon weights (Table 6). Total $R^2$ =.14 indicates the

amount of variance explained in reporting sexual harassment by all independent variables. Comparison of justice climate to individual difference variables showed mixed dominance of victim's gender (42%) and victim's tenure of employment (30%) when reporting sexual harassment, since justice climate (20%) and age (8%) explained only 28% of the variance. Total $R^2 = .16$ indicates the amount of variance explained in reporting gender harassment by all independent variables. Results showed the dominance of victim's gender (96%) when reporting gender harassment, since justice climate (1%), age (2%), and tenure (1%) explained only a total of 4% of the variance.

Finally, total $R^2 = .11$ indicates the amount of variance explained in reporting sexual assault by all independent variables. Results showed mixed dominance of victim's gender (40%), justice climate (33%), and victim's age (26%) when reporting sexual assault, since tenure explained only 1% of the variance. First, it appeared that the gender of the victim was dominant and relatively more important in reporting gender harassment. Second, gender and justice climate were dominant and relatively more important when reporting sexual assault. Third, gender and tenure of employment were dominant and relatively more important when reporting sexual harassment. Therefore, I found mixed support for Hypothesis 3a, since perceptions of the global organizational environment were relatively more important than the individual difference variables of age in two examples and of tenure in two examples, but not gender in the three examples when predicting sexual harassment reporting.

Hypothesis 3b stated that perceptions of the global organizational environment predicted variance in reporting sexual harassment over and above individual difference variables (e.g., gender, tenure, age). I completed an incremental predictive validity test to assess whether the individual-level factor of perceptions of the global organizational environment through justice

climate predicted variance in reporting sexual harassment over and above individual difference variables of gender, tenure, and age. For example, when sexual harassment was the dependent variable, results showed that, according to Model 1, for age, gender, and tenure, $R^2$ =.11. In Model 2, when justice climate was added, $R^2$ = .14, which is a medium change in $R^2$ of .03.

When sexual assault was the dependent variable, results showed that in Model 1, for age, gender, and tenure, $R^2$ = .07. In Model 2, when justice climate was added, $R^2$ = .10, which is a medium change in $R^2$ of .03. When gender harassment was the dependent variable, results showed that in Model 1, for age, gender, and tenure, $R^2$ = .16. In Model 2, when justice climate was added, $R^2$ = .16, which is an insignificant change in $R^2$ of .002. Results did support Hypothesis 3b overall, however, since justice climate predicted variance in reporting sexual harassment over and above individual difference variables as shown by $R^2$ in two examples, and because p-values were significant at .00 in all three examples. Arguably, justice climate was only practically significant in two of the regression models where $R^2$ = .14 and $R^2$ = .10, but not the third model where $R^2$ = .16, which is only a minor incremental contribution of .002. Therefore, there are mixed results on what is the relatively most important predictor of sexual harassment, but the global organizational environment through the justice climate has support.

Next, I tested moderation of industry- and country-level factors in Hypotheses 4 and 5 to understand the extent of the influence of contingency factors on employees reporting sexual harassment. Hypothesis 4 predicted the extent to which the organization's industry (industry-level factor) moderated perceptions of the global organizational environment (individual-level factor) related to sexual harassment reporting. I divided industries as either male-dominated (Industrial and Military) or mixed male and female (Professional and Miscellaneous) (Sweida & Woods, 2015). I found that the correlation between perceptions of the global organizational

environment and reporting sexual harassment (ρ = .06, k = 41, n = 106,771) was similar in magnitude when moderated by the Professional (ρ = .53, k = 10, n = 3,802) and Industrial (ρ = .45, k = 4, n = 1,581) contexts (Table 7), as shown by the large effect size. The Military context (ρ = .47, k = 8, n = 78,796) did not appear to impact the relation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting work-related harassment (ρ = .43, k = 5, n = 24,107).

There was a moderate drop, however, in the relation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting work-related harassment (ρ = .43, k = 5, n = 24,107) when moderated by the Industrial context (ρ = .29, k = 3, n = 489). Therefore, there was a large effect size difference through moderation by the Professional and Industrial contexts on perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment. There was also a large effect size difference through moderation by the Professional and Industrial contexts on perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting work-related harassment.

Lastly, the relation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment (ρ = .06, k = 41, n = 106,771) did not change much in the Military (ρ = .03, k = 9, n = 95,848) or Miscellaneous (ρ = .11, k = 5, n = 5,890) contexts. Therefore, results support Hypothesis 4, since the relation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment was moderated by the Professional and Industrial contexts, with a large difference in effect size. Thus, more research is needed on the moderating effect of mixed male and female industries, male-dominated industries, and female-dominated industries on the individual-level factor of perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment.

Hypothesis 5a predicted the extent to which perceptions of the global organizational environment related to sexual harassment reporting were moderated by the country's power distance (country-level factor). Also, Hypothesis 5b predicted the extent to which the global organizational environment related to sexual harassment reporting was moderated by the country's masculinity norms (country-level factor). Since the United States was over-represented, I excluded studies based in the United States when determining the median split. I tested these hypotheses as categorical moderators with a median split of high (h) as above the median and low (l) as below the median and compared the results for power distance and masculinity norms. The median for power distance was 38 and the median for masculinity norms was 50, excluding studies based in the United States; scores were based on Hofstede's cultural dimensions for power distance and masculinity norms (Hofstede, 2015; Taras, 2010).

The original effect size of the correlation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment ($\rho$ = .06, k = 41, n = 106,771) includes studies in both the United States (29) and other countries (7). There was a large effect size difference between the correlation of perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment when moderated by high power distance ($\rho$ = .24, k = 3, n = 836) in other countries compared to the United States ($\rho$ = -.23, k = 16, n = 42,530). However, the correlation of perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment when moderated by low power distance in other countries ($\rho$ = -.17, k = 3, n = 854) was similar to the United States ($\rho$ = -.23, k = 16, n = 42,530).

Also, there was a large effect size difference between the correlation of the perceptions of the global organization environment and reporting sexual harassment when moderated by low masculinity norms in other countries ($\rho$ = .04, k = 4, n = 1,159) compared to masculinity norms

in the United States (ρ = -.23, k = 16, n = 42,530). Fewer than three studies based in countries outside the United States had high masculinity norms values and, therefore, were excluded from the analysis. Therefore, results support Hypotheses 5a and 5b, since the extent to which perceptions of the global organizational environment were related to reporting sexual harassment was moderated by the country-level factors of power distance and masculinity norms in the United States and other countries. Thus, the contingency factors of industry and country do influence employees' reporting sexual harassment in relation to their perceptions of the global organizational environment.

### 4.2 Sensitivity Analysis

**Measures Used.** To rule out alternative explanations for the results of the hypotheses tests, I performed additional analyses. First, I analyzed the extent to which the hypothesized relations differed based on the type of measure used and found that 30% of the studies in this meta-analysis used the SEQ. The nature of the SEQ led to moderation because its questions impacted whether victims answered that they have experienced sexual harassment and reported it as their coping response, since the SEQ does not explicitly mention sexual harassment. I looked at bivariate relations between two variables and assessed how the hypothesized relations differed based on the SEQ versus other measures.

For example, I found a large magnitude difference between utilizing the SEQ (ρ = -.06, k = 19, n = 102,406) versus other measures (ρ = .37, k = 12, n = 26,507) when analyzing the correlation of work satisfaction with reporting sexual harassment (Table 3). There was also a large magnitude difference in the correlation of perceptions of the justice climate with reporting perceived severity of sexual harassment when using the SEQ (ρ = -.05, k = 2, n = 497) versus other measures (ρ = .55, k = 5, n = 2,555) (Table 4), as well as in the correlation of gender to

reporting sexual assault using the SEQ (ρ = .23, k = 5, n = 52,905) versus other measures (ρ = .07, k = 13, n = 7,880) (Table 5).

There was a medium magnitude difference, however, when examining the correlation between job satisfaction and reporting gender harassment utilizing the SEQ (ρ = -.20, k = 3, n = 925) versus other measures (ρ = -.31, k = 9, n = 11,287). In addition, there was a medium magnitude difference in the correlation between job satisfaction and unwanted sexual attention utilizing the SEQ (ρ = -.04, k = 3, n = 1,066) versus other measures (ρ = -.19, k = 4, n = 9,200) (Table 3). Overall, the SEQ impacted the results, even if it was a small magnitude effect. Therefore, it makes sense to utilize the SEQ rather than other measures in future studies to solidify comparisons to past studies.

**Publication Status.** I evaluated the extent to which hypothesized relations differed by publication status by considering published versus unpublished studies. Unpublished studies, consisting of dissertations, conference papers, and reports accounted for 15% of my overall sample. I chose the relation between the independent variable and dependent variable from each table with the highest number of studies and evaluated published versus unpublished papers, since publication bias analyses are more robust when there are more samples (Kepes et al., 2012). For example, when analyzing the correlation of job satisfaction to the coping response of reporting sexual harassment (Table 3), I found a medium magnitude difference between the negative correlation (ρ = -.35, k = 6, n = 798) of unpublished studies compared to the negative correlation of published studies (ρ = -.21, k = 44, n = 43,606) as well as a large magnitude difference between justice climate and reporting sexual harassment with unpublished studies (ρ = .24, k = 10, n = 7,540) compared to published studies (ρ = .04, k = 31, n = 99,405) (Table 4).

There was a similar negative correlation, however, between age and reporting sexual harassment with published studies ($\rho$ = -.14, k = 39, n = 52,276) and unpublished studies ($\rho$ = -.12, k = 9, n = 2,837) (Table 5). Therefore, it is still important to include both types of studies to decrease the likelihood of publication bias in reporting results, since three out of four comparisons showed a small or moderate difference in magnitude between published and unpublished studies.

Furthermore, I analyzed publication bias using trim and fill funnel plots and cumulative meta-analysis. The trim and fill procedure examined the degree of symmetry in a funnel plot distribution and adjusted the derived effect size due to possible publication bias (Kepes et al., 2012; Vevea et al., 2005). If there was publication bias, then small sample studies reporting small effect sizes that did not have statistical significance may be disproportionately absent (Kepes et al., 2012; Vevea et al., 2005). The trim and fill procedure filled in missing studies of small sample sizes to avoid publication or availability bias. A cumulative meta-analysis plotted cumulative point estimates on a forest plot that examined evidence of drift by sorting effect sizes based on a specific criterion (Kepes et al., 2012). This meta-analysis was run iteratively, so an additional sample was added each time.

In analyzing the correlation between positively valenced job satisfaction with reporting sexual harassment, there was asymmetry to the left of the distribution; therefore, samples were required to create a symmetrical distribution, resulting in an absolute change of .12 in the effect size. In analyzing the correlation between positively valenced organizational commitment and sexual harassment reporting, no samples were needed to make the funnel plot symmetrical in trim and fill. There was a positive correlation between perceptions of the global organizational environment through the justice climate and reporting sexual harassment; the effect size drifted

from the 10% most precise samples to the final estimate by -.04. Lastly, in analyzing the correlation between the individual difference variable of gender and reporting sexual harassment, the cumulative meta-analysis drifted from .20 to .05. Also, through trim and fill, nothing was needed to the left of the distribution; however, 18 samples were needed on the right side of the distribution. The effect size rose from .05 to .21.

**Firm-level Antecedents to Sexual Harassment.** I reviewed the extent to which researchers are studying firm-level antecedents of sexual harassment. In reviewing the frequency distribution, I found that 38 studies out of 248 (15%) utilized variables considered firm-level antecedents of sexual harassment. Examples of these antecedents include anti-sexual harassment policies, sexual harassment climate, justice climate, communal goals, department gender ratio, distributive justice, equal employment opportunities, gender context, organizational context, job gender context, and hostile environment. This study focused mainly on the organizational context that encompassed justice climate and sexual harassment climate. Therefore, researching firm-level antecedents to sexual harassment is a gap in the macro literature.

This study advances theory by determining the relatively most important predictor of sexual harassment in organizations under the institutional theory of moral collapse by including organizational context (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). Organizational context, in reference to the organizational justice climate, has been a powerful predictor of sexual harassment because it includes organizational norms and culture (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). In addition, when harassing behavior was considered severe by being explicit, repetitive, and obvious, employees were more likely to report the hostile environment versus ignoring the behavior (Sojo et al., 2015). Antecedents to sexual harassment have been important to understand the risk factors and the likelihood that employees will report sexual harassment. Therefore, researchers could explore

these antecedents to identify which firms are more at risk and advise firms on minimizing the risk of sexual harassment through sexual harassment policies and procedures, as I suggest in the Discussion.

**Firms' Responses to Sexual Harassment.** I reviewed the extent to which researchers are studying firms' responses to sexual harassment claims. In calculating the frequency distribution, I found that eight studies out of 248 (only 3%) focused on firms' responses to sexual harassment claims. Examples of firm response variables include litigation status, organizational responsibility for the incident, organizational responsiveness to sexual harassment, organizational sanctions, organizational support, procedural justice, punishment, retaliation, tolerance for sexual harassment, and awarding compensation. This study focused mainly on organizational sanctions under perception of the global organizational environment because it has been an important factor in sexual harassment litigation. Therefore, researching firms' responses to sexual harassment is another gap in the macro literature.

This study extends knowledge by examining the impact of perceptions of the global organizational environment through organizational sanctions on reporting sexual harassment under the institutional theory of moral collapse. Organizational sanctions are important because the EEOC considers whether the harasser will face organizational sanctions to assess how seriously the organization treats the complaint (Sojo et al., 2015). Researchers have measured the effectiveness of organizational sanctions by surveying victims as to whether harassers are held accountable after a sexual harassment claim has been filed against them (Sojo et al., 2015). If firms did not respond appropriately, under the institutional theory of moral collapse, sexual harassment victims were more likely to prevail through litigation and receive significant monetary damages (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Judges have assessed firms' responses and their

sexual harassment policies and procedures in place when deciding compensation for victims through litigation (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Therefore, this area is ripe for research since firms' responses to sexual harassment greatly impact the monetary damages paid by firms as detailed in the Discussion.

# CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Sexual harassment remains a growing concern in the workplace and accounts for approximately one-third of the complaints received by the EEOC annually (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Sexual harassment in the workplace negatively impacts employees psychologically and results in employee turnover and performance issues, as well as damage to an organization's reputation and litigation costs (Sims et al., 2005). This study's primary objective is to further understand the current research on sexual harassment in the workplace through a meta-analytic review to determine (1) the relatively most important predictor of workplace sexual harassment, (2) to what extent do contingency factors influence employees reporting sexual harassment, and (3) the gaps in macro literature that need to be filled to integrate macro and micro perspectives. In addition, I integrate a macro theory of the institutional theory of moral collapse with a micro theory of the victim's coping response to sexual harassment.

This study assesses how to minimize the risk of sexual harassment in the workplace through perceptions of the global organizational environment. Second, it integrates the institutional theory of moral collapse from the macro level with a victim's coping response from the micro level to evaluate the impact of sexual harassment on both the organization and the employee. Third, by understanding how organizations' regulations and employees' ideals impact the moral collapse of the organizational justice climate, organizations can implement policies and procedures to prevent sexual harassment and impact employees' coping responses. Furthermore, this study assesses the moderation of country-level factors, including power distance, masculinity norms, and the organization's industry to illustrate how to prevent negative repercussions to employees and the organization. Since this study is a meta-analysis, I am

looking at the practical significance of effect sizes through correlations, so there are no causal inferences because of the methodological challenges with the data.

### 5.1 Theoretical Contributions

In this section, I discuss the theoretical contributions of this meta-analysis that includes integration of the institutional theory of moral collapse with the coping response theory and then consider the practical implications for organizations and employees. Finally, I explain the study's limitations and provide suggestions for future research.

First, I extend knowledge by evaluating how individual-level factors of job attitudes impact reporting sexual harassment through this meta-analytic review. I found that positively valenced job attitudes (i.e., job satisfaction, organizational commitment, co-worker satisfaction, and supervisor satisfaction) negatively correlate with reporting sexual harassment. This result shows that reporting sexual harassment under the coping response theory depends on victims' job attitudes because employees satisfied with their job appear to be less likely to report sexual harassment than employees with negative job attitudes (Sojo et al., 2015). Therefore, this study advances the coping response theory by identifying the employee job attitudes that predict reporting sexual harassment. Thus, employees with negative job attitudes under the institutional theory of moral collapse are more likely to report sexual harassment as their coping response.

Second, I advance the understanding of the most important sexual harassment predictor, the organizational environment, by utilizing the institutional theory of moral collapse to understand the relationship between the individual-level factor of perceptions of a global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment. Reporting of sexual harassment is measured through surveys of employees reporting to researchers whether they experienced sexual harassment in this meta-analysis (Sojo et al., 2015). The institutional theory of moral

collapse impacts perception of the global organizational environment by affecting the organization's justice climate, which includes enabling sexual harassment and employees' belief that the organization is fair in its tolerance of misconduct (Lawrence, 2011).

I found that perceptions of a global organizational environment through the justice climate are positively correlated with reporting work-related harassment, sexual harassment climate, perceived severity of sexual harassment, gender harassment, and sexual harassment. However, organizational sanctions negatively correlate with reporting gender harassment and sexual coercion. Overall, a positive employee perception of the global organizational environment through a fair justice climate makes employees feel valued, more likely to treat each other with respect (resulting in less misconduct), and more comfortable reporting sexual harassment as their coping response (Lin & Leung, 2014). Therefore, the institutional theory of moral collapse is advanced by the understanding that justice climate is an impactful factor in employees' perceptions of the global organizational environment predicting the likelihood of reporting more sexual harassment variables. Thus, repercussions of sexual harassment to the organization are directly impacted by the employee's perspective of the justice climate, which the organization can influence.

Third, firms are more likely to predict whether employees will report sexual harassment based on employees' gender and their perceptions of the global organizational environment. I examine the impact of the individual-level factor of perceptions of the global organizational environment in comparison to the individual difference variables of age, tenure, and gender and perform additional analysis to clarify the greatest dominance and incremental predictive validity impacting sexual harassment reporting as a coping response. I found that justice climate appears to be relatively more important than the individual difference variables of age and tenure when

predicting work-related harassment, sexual harassment climate, and perceived severity of sexual harassment. This result shows that if victims perceive the global organizational environment as unfair (as opposed to a fair justice climate), under the institutional theory of moral collapse, they are less likely to report sexual harassment (Wright & Fitzgerald, 2009). Gender, however, appears to predict the variance in reporting sexual harassment, sexual assault, and gender harassment over and above perceptions of the global organizational environment. This supports other studies' findings that females are more likely to experience sexual harassment and to report it (del Carmen Herrera & Herrera, 2014; McLaughlin & Blackstone, 2012; Willness et al., 2007).

Organizations can assess their risk for sexual harassment by recognizing the most important sexual harassment predictors. Relative weight analysis shows that the victim's gender has the greatest dominance with reporting gender harassment. Additionally, gender and justice climate have the greatest dominance in reporting sexual assault, while gender and tenure of employment have the greatest dominance with reporting sexual harassment. Even though gender is important (according to results of other studies) because women are more likely to be sexually harassed, women's perception of the global organizational environment and tenure at their job impacts whether women report sexual harassment (Kabat-Farr et al., 2014). Also, incremental predictive validity analysis confirms that, in addition to gender, age, and tenure of employment, perception of the global organizational environment through the justice climate is practically significant in predicting some variance in reporting sexual harassment and sexual assault but represents only a minor incremental contribution in reporting gender harassment.

Fourth, due to its impact on culture, gender dominance within the organization's industry indicates the likelihood of employees reporting sexual harassment. I highlight the importance of the industry-level factor as a moderator to understand the risk for sexual harassment and the

victim's likelihood to report it based on which gender dominates the industry (Remus Ilies, 2003). I found that the correlation between perception of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment and work-related harassment is moderated by the Professional and Industrial contexts, with large effect sizes. When the industry is highly structured and mixed male and female, such as Professional, or male-dominated, such as Industrial, victims are likely to report sexual harassment as their coping response (Remus Ilies et al., 2003). Therefore, more research under the institutional theory of moral collapse needs to evaluate male-dominated and mixed male and female industries in comparison to female-dominated industries to evaluate the impact of moderation on perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment (Scott, 2008).

Fifth, contingency factors influence whether employees report sexual harassment as their coping response. I demonstrate that the country-level factors of power distance and masculinity norms are important moderators to consider in practice to clarify how organizations can effectively implement sexual harassment policies and procedures based on the country's priorities (Hofstede, 2015). I found a large effect size difference in the correlation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment that is moderated by the high-power distance in other countries compared to the United States. Also, I found a large effect size difference in the correlation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment when moderated by low masculinity norms in other countries compared to the United States. This shows that power distance moderates the relationship between an employee's perception of the global organizational environment and the coping response of reporting sexual harassment, since an unjust environment, under the institutional theory of moral collapse, engenders power differentials.

## 5.2 Practical Implications

Workplace sexual harassment impacts all employees and organizations by decreasing productivity, increasing employee turnover, causing reputational damage, and imposing legal costs (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Because employees' ideals and organizational regulations impact the moral collapse of the organizational environment, the organization needs to implement policies and procedures to prevent sexual harassment, using five steps. First, organizational leadership should conduct climate surveys to assess employees' attitudes and the extent of sexual harassment in the organization, since employees' attitudes will impact the coping response of reporting sexual harassment. Surveys could also help the organization assess employees' perspectives of the global organizational environment by identifying risk factors and covert harassment to examine the likelihood of employees reporting sexual harassment. Survey results would help organizations explore ways to minimize risk and to foster a no-tolerance sexual harassment environment (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016).

Second, organizational leadership should implement effective harassment prevention policies based on impactful sexual harassment predictors, such as global perceptions of the organization and employee gender. If leadership considers these individual-level factors in prevention policies and includes accountability systems that hold harassers responsible for their actions, then employees would be more likely to report sexual harassment to the organization (Malamut, 2002). The organization could require mandatory anti-harassment training and bystander intervention training, which includes identifying sexual harassment, understanding potential consequences, and proposing alternative behaviors. Such training can be directed towards middle and upper management who oversee preventing harassment (Sojo et al., 2015).

Third, since the country-level factors of power distance and masculinity norms moderate employees' perception of the global organizational environment, organizations should offer multi-faceted reporting procedures. By offering a range of methods and multiple points of contact for reporting that take geographic and organizational diversity into account, employees will be encouraged to report sexual harassment to the organization as their coping response (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Fourth, since organizational sanctions negatively correlate with reporting sexual harassment under the institutional theory of moral collapse, organizations need to ensure that disciplinary action for engaging in sexual harassment is prompt, consistently implemented, and proportionate to the action (Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016). Fifth, organizations should periodically audit sexual harassment compliance policies and reporting systems to ensure effectiveness as the organizational environment evolves and impacts organizational culture.

### 5.3 Limitations and Future Directions

Since sexual harassment is a growing concern for organizations, these meta-analytic review results are essential to guide future research on sexual harassment in the workplace. Four primary points should be considered. First, under the institutional theory of moral collapse, this study found a strong correlation between the global organizational environment through the justice climate and the coping response of reporting sexual harassment. There are data limitations affecting studies on sexual harassment, however, because some do not consider female-dominated industries such as retail and food services (Sweida & Woods, 2015). An industry that has more females or is female dominated may make it less likely for sexual harassment to occur (Scott, 2008). In addition, studies did not specify the jobs within the industry or the gender composition of the jobs. Therefore, as more macro data emerges, future sexual harassment studies need to consider integrating macro and micro theories in female-dominated industries as

well as the sex composition of the jobs to evaluate the relationship between perception of the organizational environment and the likelihood of reporting sexual harassment (Remus Ilies et al., 2003).

Second, studies' outcomes vary by the type of measurement instruments used in reporting sexual harassment. Approximately 30% of the study samples used the SEQ measure rather than other measures. Specifically, there are large magnitude differences when using the SEQ versus other measures in the correlations between work satisfaction and reporting sexual harassment, perceptions of the global organizational environment through the justice climate and reporting perceived severity, and gender and reporting sexual assault. The SEQ impacts the results even if it has a small to moderate magnitude effect. Therefore, researchers should utilize the SEQ rather than other measures in future studies on reporting sexual harassment to allow consistent comparison to past studies.

Third, researchers should explore antecedents to sexual harassment to assess why firms are more at risk and advise firms on minimizing the risk of sexual harassment claims. The EEOC evaluates firms on their sexual policies and procedures before sexual harassment occurs and how quickly firms respond once a victim makes a sexual harassment claim (Wiener, Hackney et al., 2002). Examples of firm-level antecedents of sexual harassment include anti-sexual harassment policies, sexual harassment climate, justice climate, communal goals, department gender ratio, distributive justice, equal employment opportunities, gender context, gender ratio, organizational culture, and hostile environment. In addition, studies could investigate more about the harassers themselves, such as the title of the harassers, their demographics, and if there were warning signs prior to the harassment.

As research has indicated, the EEOC uses the reasonable person standard to decide sexual harassment cases (Wiener & Hurt, 2000). That is, would a reasonable person consider the environment to be hostile or a proposition by a manager to be quid pro quo? The literature mentions a reasonable woman perspective (i.e., how a reasonable woman would react in similar circumstances), which is a lesser standard than a reasonable person's perspective that most likely results in the victim winning the lawsuit, but it is not the standard that the EEOC uses (Wiener et al., 2002). The EEOC is a powerful regulatory body that enables victims to bring a claim against an organization for sexual harassment and provides legal representation. Therefore, future research could assess whether using a reasonable woman's standard to address the antecedents to sexual harassment minimizes the risk of sexual harassment claims filed with the EEOC.

Fourth, researchers should evaluate firms' responses to a sexual harassment claim because these responses are impactful factors used by the EEOC in determining whether a claim is valid. Once the victim wins a lawsuit, the firm pays the victim damages and cases are posted on the EEOC website, resulting in damage to the firm's reputation. Examples of firm response variables include litigation status, organizational responsibility for the incident, organizational responsiveness to sexual harassment, organizational sanctions, organizational support, procedural justice, punishment, retaliation, tolerance for sexual harassment, and awarding compensation. Therefore, future research could investigate whether a firm's response to sexual harassment is relatively more important in predicting the success of an EEOC case than a reasonable person's perspective. Researchers could measure which firm responses, such as organizational sanctions, punishment, providing support, or retaliation, have the greatest impact and should examine firms' responses to mitigate the risk of costly sexual harassment litigation.

## 5.4 Conclusion

Concerns about sexual harassment in the workplace have continued to grow since the revolutionary #metoo movement in 2017. As a result, it is important to understand why firms are more at risk for sexual harassment based on perceptions of the global organizational environment and how firms should respond once a sexual harassment claim is filed. The current meta-analysis considers the individual-level factors of employee attitudes, finding that employees with positive job attitudes are less likely to report sexual harassment. Also, the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment is a relatively more important predictor of reporting sexual harassment than the individual difference variables of age and tenure. Furthermore, the industry-level factor and the country-level factors of power distance and masculinity norms moderate the relationship between the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment.

Therefore, the individual-level factor of perception of the global organizational environment appears to be one of the relatively most important predictors of sexual harassment. The contingency factors of industry- and country-level appear to influence employees who have been sexually harassed by moderating the relation between perceptions of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment. The gaps in the macro literature of research on the antecedents of sexual harassment and the firms' responses to sexual harassment claims need to be filled to integrate micro and macro perspectives of the impact of workplace sexual harassment. Thus, researchers should integrate macro and micro theories to evaluate the relation between the perspective of the global organizational environment and reporting sexual harassment as the macro literature develops.

# REFERENCES


Akande, A. (1992). Sexual harassment an employment issue. *Equal opportunities international* 11(1).

*Akinfala, F., & Komolafe, T. (2017). Sexual harassment as a predictor of organizational outcomes. *African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues* 20(1), 60-73.

Argote, L., & Greve, H. (2007). A behavioral theory of the firm—40 years and counting: Introduction and impact. *Organization Science* 18(3), 337-349.

*Baker, A. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of observing workplace sexual behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.

*Bello, S. (2016). Gender Differences in Perception of Sexual Harassment Among Nigerian Banks Employees. *In Proceeding of ISER International Conference held 22nd April* (pp. 21-26).

Berdahl, J. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(2), 425.

*Bergman, B. (2003). The validation of the women workplace culture questionnaire: Gender-related stress and health for Swedish working women. *Sex roles* 49(5-6), 287-297.

*Bergman, M., & Drasgow, F. (2003). Race as a moderator in a model of sexual harassment: An empirical test. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 8(2), 131.

Bornmann, L., Mutz, R., & Daniel, H. (2010). A reliability-generalization study of journal peer reviews: A multilevel meta-analysis of inter-rater reliability and its determinants. (*Research Article*). PLoS ONE, 5(12), e14331.

Bosco, F., Aguinis, H., Singh, K., Field, J., & Pierce, C. (2015). Correlational effect size benchmarks. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 100: 431-449.

*Brough, P., & Frame, R. (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The role of social support and police organisational variables. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology* 33(1), 8-18.

*Buckner, G., Hindman, H., Huelsman, T., & Bergman, J. (2014). Managing workplace sexual harassment: The role of manager training. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 26(4), 257-278.

*Butler, A. (2008). To report or not to report: The impact of organizational justice perceptions on sexual harassment coping (Doctoral dissertation, University of Windsor).

*Buzzi, B. (1997). The relationship of gender role, parenting beliefs, prior sexual harassment, and other variables to the job satisfaction of working mothers (Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest information & learning).

Corley, K., & Gioia, D. (2011). Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of management review* 36(1), 12-32.

*Cortina, L. (2000). Measurement and modeling of Latina experiences of sexual harassment (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign).

*Cortina, L. (2004). Hispanic perspectives on sexual harassment and social support. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30(5), 570-584.

*Cortina, L., Fitzgerald, L., & Drasgow, F. (2002). Contextualizing Latina experiences of sexual harassment: Preliminary tests of a structural model. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 24(4), 295-311.

Cortina, J., & Landis, R. (2009). When small effect sizes tell a big story, and when large effect sizes don't. *Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends: Doctrine, verity and fable in the organizational and social sciences* 287-308.

Cortina, L., & Wasti, S. (2005). Profiles in coping: Responses to sexual harassment across persons, organizations, and cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(1), 182.

*De Haas, S., & Timmerman, G. (2010). Sexual harassment in the context of double male dominance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 19(6), 717-734.

Dekker, I., & Barling, J. (1998). Personal and organizational predictors of workplace sexual harassment of women by men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 3(1), 7.

del Carmen Herrera, M., & Herrera, A. (2014). Stop harassment! Men's reactions to victims' confrontation. *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context* 6(2), 45-52.

del Carmen Herrera, M., Herrera, A., & Exposito, F. (2017). To confront versus not to confront: Women's perception of sexual harassment. *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context* 10(1): 1-7.

Dekker, I., & Barling, J. (1998). Personal and organizational predictors of workplace sexual harassment of women by men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 3(1), 7.

*DİNÇAL, D. (2019). Cultural factors as associates of workplace sexual harassment perceptions and coping preferences. (Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University).

*Dionisi, A. (2014). Vicarious exposure to male sexual harassment: Correlates, perceived motives and ethical evaluations, & behavioral responses. (Doctoral dissertation, Queens University).

*Dionisi, A., Barling, J., & Dupré, K. (2012). Revisiting the comparative outcomes of workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 17(4), 398.

Dobbin, F., & A. Kalev (2019). The promise and peril of sexual harassment programs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(25): 12255-12260.

Druhan, V. (2013). Severe or pervasive: An analysis of who, what, and where matters when determining sexual harassment. *Vanderbilt Law Review* 66(1), 355-397.

Editor, A. (2019). Editor's comment there is nothing so theoretical as good practice - a call for phenomenal theory. *Academy of Management Review* 44(3), 493-497.

EEOC (2020). Sexual harassment charges filed FY 2019. https://www.eeoc.gov/enforcement/charges-alleging-sex-based-harassment-charges-filed-eeoc-fy-2010-fy-2019.

*Espinoza, C., & Cunningham, G. (2011). Relationships among sexual harassment, gender, and diversity culture in high school athletics. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education* 5(1), 85-104.

*Estrada, A., Olson, K., Harbke, C., & Berggren, A. (2011). Evaluating a brief scale measuring psychological climate for sexual harassment. *Military Psychology* 23(4), 410-432.

Feldblum, C., Lipnic A. (2016). Select task force on the study of harassment in the workplace. *Washington: US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.*

*Fitzgerald, F., Hulin, C., Gelfand, L., & Magley V. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations a test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 4: 578-589.

*Fitzgerald, L., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues* 51(1), 117–138.

*Fitzgerald, L., & Ormerod, A. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The influence of gender and academic context. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 15(2), 281-294.

Foster, P., & Fullagar, C. (2018). Why don't we report sexual harassment? An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 40(3), 148-160.

Fox, J., & Tang, W. (2017). Women's experiences with general and sexual harassment in online video games: Rumination, organizational responsiveness, withdrawal, and coping strategies. *New Media & Society* 19(8), 1290-1307.

Gentile, K. (2018). Give a woman an inch, she'll take a penis: The expanded version. *Contemporary Psychoanalysis* 54(4), 709-723.

Gettman, H., & Gelfand, M. (2007). When the customer shouldn't be king: Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment by clients and customers. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(3), 757–770.

*Glomb, T., Munson, L., Hulin, C., Bergman, M., & Drasgow, F., (1999). Structural equation models of sexual harassment: Longitudinal explorations and cross-sectional generalizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(1), 14–28.

*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.

*Goldberg, C., Rawski, S., & Perry, E. (2019). The direct and indirect effects of organizational tolerance for sexual harassment on the effectiveness of sexual harassment investigation training for HR managers. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 30(1), 81-100.

Gooty, J., Banks, G., Loignon, A., Tonidandel, S., & Williams, C. (2019). Meta-analyses as a multi-level model. *Organizational Research Methods*.

*Hardies, K. (2019). Personality, social norms, and sexual harassment in the workplace. *Personality and Individual Differences* 151.

Hardwicke, T., Mathur, M., MacDonald, K., Nilsonne, G., Banks, G., Kidwell, M., & Lenne, R. (2018). Data availability, reusability, and analytic reproducibility: Evaluating the impact of a mandatory open data policy at the journal Cognition. *Royal Society Open Science* 5(8).

*Harned, M., Ormerod, A., Palmieri, P., Collinsworth, L., & Reed, M. (2002). Sexual assault and other types of sexual harassment by workplace personnel: a comparison of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 7(2), 174.

Hart, C. (2019). The penalties for self-reporting sexual harassment. *Gender & Society* 33(4), 534-559.

*Hemmasi, M., Lee Graf, A., & Russ, G. (1994). Gender-related jokes in the workplace: Sexual humor or sexual harassment? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 24(12), 1114-1128.

*Hershcovis, M. (2010). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95(5), 874-888.

*Hershcovis, M., Parker, S., & Reich, T. (2010). The moderating effect of equal opportunity support and confidence in grievance procedures on sexual harassment from different perpetrators. *Journal of Business Ethics* 92(3), 415-432.

*Hesson-Mcinnis, M., & Fitzgerald, L. (1997). Sexual harassment: A preliminary test of an integrative model 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 27(10), 877-901.

Hippensteele, S. (1991). Sexual harassment in academia scenario construction and gender differences in students' behavioral definitions and judgments (Dissertation, University of Hawaii).

Hofstede, G. (2015). Culture's causes: The next challenge. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal* 22(4), 545-569.

*Holland, K., & Cortina, L. (2013). When sexism and feminism collide: The sexual harassment of feminist working women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 37(2), 192-208.

*Holland, K., Rabelo, V., Gustafson, A., Seabrook, R., & Cortina, L. (2016). Sexual harassment against men: Examining the roles of feminist activism, sexuality, and organizational context. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 17(1), 17.

*Huang, L., & Cao, L. (2008). Exploring sexual harassment in a police department in Taiwan. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management.*

Hunter, J., & Schmidt, F. (2004). Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.

Jenner, S., Djermester, P., Prügl, J., Kurmeyer, C., & Oertelt-Prigione, S. (2019). Prevalence of sexual harassment in academic medicine. *JAMA Internal Medicine* 179(1), 108-111.

*Jensen, I., & Gutek, B. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues* 38(4), 121-136.

*Kabat-Farr, D., Cortina, L., & Kabat-Farr, D. (2014). Sex-based harassment in employment: New insights into gender and context. *Law and Human Behavior* 38(1), 58–72.

Karami, A., Swan, S., White, C., & Ford, K. (2019). Hidden in plain sight for too long: Using text mining techniques to shine a light on workplace sexism and sexual harassment. *Psychology of Violence.*

*Kath, L., Swody, C., Magley, V., Bunk, J., & Gallus, J. (2009). Cross-level, three-way interactions among work-group climate, gender, and frequency of harassment on morale and withdrawal outcomes of sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 82(1), 159-182.

Katz, D., & Alejandro, H. (2019). Blue states are leading in sexual harassment reforms. Red states are leaving women behind. *The Washington Post.*

Kepes, S., Banks, G., & Mcdaniel, M. (2012). Publication Bias: A call for improved meta-analytic practice in the organizational sciences. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 20(2), 182-196.

*Kirkland, J. (2018). Equal opportunity climate strength: Antecedents and influence on work unit effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation).

*Knapp, D., Hogue, M., & Pierce, C. (2019). A gateway theory-based model of the eEscalation of severity of sexually harassing behavior in organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues* 31(2), 198-118.

*Knapp, D., DuBois, C., Hogue, M., Astakhova, M., & Faley, R. (2019). Russian workers' experiences with and perceptions of sexual harassment severity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 30(13), 2049-2076.

Kovera M., & Hebert K. (1999). Reasoning about scientific evidence effects of juror gender and evidence quality on juror decisions in a hostile work environment case. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(3), 362-375.

Lapierre, L., Spector, P., & Leck, J. (2005). Sexual versus nonsexual workplace aggression and victims' overall job satisfaction: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 10(2), 155-169.

Lawrence, M. (2011). Understanding widespread misconduct in organizations is an institutional theory of moral collapse. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 21(3), 379-407.

*Lee, J. (2018). Passive leadership and sexual harassment. *Personnel Review.*

*Lee, J., Welbourne, J., & Hoke, W. (2008). Examining the interaction among likelihood to sexually harass, rate Attractiveness, and job performance. *Journal of Management* 35(2), 445-461.

*Leskinen, E. (2012). Deviating, but not deviant: Conformity to gender norms and sex-based harassment at work (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan).

*Leskinen, E., Cortina, L., & Kabat, D. (2011). Gender harassment: Broadening our understanding of sex-based harassment at work. *Law and Human Behavior* 35(1), 25-39.

*Leskinen, E., Rabelo, V., & Cortina, L. (2015). Gender stereotyping and harassment: A 'catch-22' for women in the workplace. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 21(2), 192.

Lim, S., & Cortina, L. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 90(3), 483-496.

Lin, X., & Leung, K. (2014). What signals does procedural justice climate convey? The roles of group status, and organizational benevolence and integrity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 35(4), 464-488.

*Liu, X., Kwan, H., & Chiu, R. (2014). Customer sexual harassment and frontline employees' service performance in China. *Human Relations* 67(3), 333-356.

*Lonsway, K., Paynich, R., & Hall, J. (2013). Sexual harassment in law enforcement: incidence, impact, and perception. *Police Quarterly* 16(2), 177-210.

Lyness, K., & Thompson, D. (1997). Above the glass ceiling? A comparison of matched samples of female and male executives. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82(3), 359.

*Madera, J. (2018). When targets blame their organization for sexual harassment: A multilevel investigation of within-person appraisals. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly* 59(1), 49-60.

*Madera, J., Guchait, P., & Dawson, M. (2018). Managers' reactions to customer vs coworker sexual harassment. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.

Magley, V., Hulin, C., Fitzgerald, L., & DeNardo, M. (1999). Outcomes of self-labeling sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 84(3), 390.

Malamut, L. (2002). When leaders harass the impact of target perceptions of organizational leadership and climate on harassment reporting and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(5), 885-893.

*Malik, N., Malik, S., Qureshi, N., & Atta, M. (2014). Sexual harassment as predictor of low self-esteem and job satisfaction among in-training nurses. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences* 8(2), 107-116.

*Malik, M., & Sattar, S. (2019). Effects of despotic leadership and sexual harassment on emotional exhaustion of employees in health sector of Pakistan: Moderating role of organizational cynicism. *Review of Economics and Development Studies* 5(2), 269-280.

*Maneethai, D. (2019). Effects of a hostile work environment on production deviance (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston).

*Maurya, M., & Agarwal, M. (2014). Relationship between perceived workplace harassment, mental health status and job satisfaction of male and female civil police constables. *Indian Journal of Community Psychology* 10(1), 162-177.

*McKensey, M. (2017). Retention in the military: The role of harassment and discrimination in workplace satisfaction and perceived organization support (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University).

*McKinney, K. (1992). Contrapower sexual harassment: The effects of student sex and type of behavior on faculty perceptions. *Sex Roles* 27(11-12), 627-643.

McLaughlin H., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review* 77(4).

McNamara, B, (2018). A new survey shows that women of all ages support #metoo. *Teen Vogue* Retrieved 21 July 2020 from https://www.teenvogue.com/story/new-report-shows-women-of-all-ages-support-metoo.

Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G. (2011). The evolution of Hofstede's doctrine. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal* 18(1), 10-20.

*Moore, B. (2010). Effects of Sexual Harassment on Job Satisfaction, Retention, Cohesion, Commitment and Unit Effectiveness: The Case of the Air Force. State University of New York at Buffalo, United States.

*Morganson, V. (2008). The line in the sand: Understanding customer sexual harassment through a psychological contract framework (Doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University).

*Morganson, V., & Major, D. (2014). Exploring retaliation as a coping strategy in response to customer sexual harassment. *Sex Roles* 71(1-2), 83-94.

Munson, L., Hulin C., & Drasgow F. (2000). Longitudinal analysis of dispositional influences and sexual harassment effects on job and psychological outcomes. *Personnel Psychology* 53, 21-46.

Munson, L., & Hulin, C (2001). Labeling sexual harassment in the military an extension and replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(2), 293-303.

*Murry, W., Sivasubramaniam, N., & Jacques, P. (2001). Supervisory support, social exchange relationships, and sexual harassment consequences: A test of competing models. *The Leadership Quarterly* 12(1), 1-29.

Nafukho, F., Hairston, N., & Brooks, K. (2004). Human capital theory: Implications for human resource development. *Human Resource Development International* 7(4), 545-551.

Naor, M., Bernardes, E, & Coman, A. (2013). Theory of constraints: Is it a theory and a good one? *International Journal of Production Research* 51(2), 542-554.

Niebuhr, R., & Boyles, W. (1991). Sexual harassment of military personnel: An examination of power differentials. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 15(4), 445-457.

*Nye, C., Brummel, B., & Drasgow, F. (2014). Understanding sexual harassment using aggregate construct models. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 99(6), 1204.

O'Boyle Jr, E., Humphrey, R., Pollack, J., Hawver, T., & Story, P. (2010). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 32(5), 788-818.

*O'Connell, C., & Korabik, K. (2000). Sexual harassment: The relationship of personal vulnerability, work context, perpetrator status, and type of harassment to outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 56(3), 299-329.

*Palmer, A. (2016). Beyond the predator and the prey: Sexual harassment affects the conscientious (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston).

*Parker, S., & Griffin, M. (2002). What is so bad about a little name-calling? Negative consequences of gender harassment for overperformance demands and distress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 7(3), 195.

*Piotrkowski, C. (1998). Gender harassment, job satisfaction, and distress among employed white and minority women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 3(1), 33.

*Ragins, B., & Scandura, T. (1995). Antecedents and work-related correlates of reported sexual harassment: An empirical investigation of competing hypotheses. *Sex Roles* 32(7), 429-455.

*Raver, J., & Nishii, L. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95(2), 236.

Remus Ilies, N., Schwochau, S., & Stibal J. (2003). Reported incidence rates of work-related sexual harassment in the United States using meta-analysis to explain reported rate disparities. *Personnel Psychology* 56, 607-631.

Richman, J., Rospenda K., Flaherty J., & Freels, S. (2001). Workplace harassment, active coping, and alcohol-related outcomes. *Journal of Substance Abuse* 13(3), 347-366.

*Ritter, B. (2014). Deviant behavior in computer-mediated communication: Development and validation of a measure of cybersexual harassment. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 19(2), 197-214.

*Robotham, K., & Cortina, L. (2019). Promoting respect as a solution to workplace harassment. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal.*

*Rosen, L., & Martin, L. (1998). Incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment among male and female US Army soldiers. *Military Psychology* 10(4), 239-257.

*Rospenda, K. (1997). Sexual and non-sexual harassment as interpersonal conflict stressors in the workplace: Effects on job, mental health, and physical health outcomes. (Doctoral dissertation, DePaul University Chicago, Illinois).

*Rospenda, K. (2002). Workplace harassment, services utilization, and drinking outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 7(2), 141.

*Rospenda, K., Richman, J., & Shannon, C. (2009). Prevalence and mental health correlates of harassment and discrimination in the workplace: Results from a national study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 24(5), 819-843.

Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D., & Sackett, P. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(5), 914-922.

*Rubino, C., Avery, D., McKay, P., Moore, B., Wilson, D., Van Driel, M. et al. (2018). And justice for all: How organizational justice climate deters sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology* 71(4), 519-544.

*Rubin, M., Paolini, S., Subašić, E., & Giacomini, A. (2019). A confirmatory study of the relations between workplace sexism, sense of belonging, mental health, and job satisfaction among women in male-dominated industries. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 49(5), 267-282.

Salin, D. (2009). Organizational responses to workplace harassment. *Personnel Review.*

Salin, D., Tenhiala, A., Roberge M., & Berdahl, J. (2014). 'I wish I had . . .': Target reflections on responses to workplace mistreatment. *Human Relations* 67(10), 1189-1211.

*Salvaggio, A., Hopper, J., & Packell, K. (2011). Coworker reactions to observing sexual behavior at work. *Journal of Managerial Psychology.*

Schneider, K. (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.

Schneider, K. & Carpenter, N. (2019). Sharing # MeToo on Twitter: Incidents, coping responses, and social reactions. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal.*

*Schneider, K., & Swan, S. (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.

Scott, W. (2008). Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. *Theory and Society* 37(5), 427-442.

*Settles, I., Buchanan, N., Yap, S., & Harrell, Z. (2014). Sex differences in outcomes and harasser characteristics associated with frightening sexual harassment appraisals. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 19(2), 133.

Sigal, J., Braden-Maguire, J., Patt, I., Goodrich, C., & Perrino, C. (2003). Effects of type of coping response, setting, and social context on reactions to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles* 48(3-4), 157-166.

Sims, C., Drasgow F., & Fitzgerald, L. (2005). The effects of sexual harassment on turnover in the military: Time-dependent modeling. *Journal of Applies Psychology* 90(6), 1141-1152.

Snell, D. (1999). The human resource architecture toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *The Academy of Management Review* 24(1), 31-48.

Sojo, V., Wood, R., & Genat, A. (2015). Harmful workplace experiences and women's occupational well-being. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 40(1), 10-40.

*Stedham, Y., & Mitchell, M. (1998). Sexual harassment in casinos: Effects on employee attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Gambling Studies* 14(4), 381-400.

*Swan, S. (1997). Explaining the job-related and psychological consequences of sexual harassment in the workplace: A contextual model (Doctoral dissertation, ProQuest information & learning).

Sweida, G., & Woods, J. (2015). Comparing the development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy of female entrepreneurs in male- and female- dominated industries. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 20(3).

Kirkman T., (2010). Examining the impact of culture's consequences: A three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95, 405-439.

Tata, J. (2000). She said, he said: The influence of remedial accounts on third-party judgments of coworker sexual harassment. *Journal of Management* 26(6), 1133-1156.

*Tews, M., Stafford, K., & Jolly, P. (2020). An unintended consequence? Examining the relationship between visible tattoos and unwanted sexual attention. *Journal of Management & Organization* 26(2), 152-167.

*Tews, M., Stafford, K., & Jolly, P. (2019). The dark side? Fun in the workplace and unwanted sexual attention. *Employee Relations: The International Journal.*

Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. (2011). Relative importance analysis: A useful supplement to regression analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 26(1), 1-9.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2019). All charges alleging harassment (Charges filed with EEOC) FY 2010 - FY 2018. Retrieved 11 October 2019 from https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/all_harassment.cfm.

Vevea, J., Woods, C., & Vevea, J. (2005). Publication bias in research synthesis: Sensitivity analysis using a priori weight functions. *Psychological Methods* 10(4), 428–443.

*Walsh, B., Bauerle, T., & Magley, V. (2013). Individual and contextual inhibitors of sexual harassment training motivation. *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 24(2), 215-237.

*Wasti, S., Bergman, M., Glomb, T., & Drasgow, F. (2000). Test of the cross-cultural generalizability of a model of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85(5), 766.

Wayne, J. (2001). Is all sexual harassment viewing the same mock juror decisions in same and cross-gender cases? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(2), 179-187.

Weiss, D. & Lalonde, R. (2001). Responses of female undergraduates to scenarios of sexual harassment by male professors and teaching assistants. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science/Revue Canadienne des Sciences du Comportement* 33(3), 148.

Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal* 5(2), 171-180.

*Wessel, J., & Ryan, A. (2012). Supportive when not supported? Male responses to negative climates for women. *Sex roles* 66(1-2), 94-104.

Wicks, D. (2001). Institutionalized mindsets of invulnerability: Differentiated institutional fields and the antecedents of organizational crisis. *Organization Studies* 22(4), 659-692.

Wiener, R., Hackney, A., Kadela, K., Rauch, S., Seib, H., Warren, L., & Hurt, L. (2002). The fit and implementation of sexual harassment law to workplace evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(4), 747-764.

*Wiener, R., Bennett, S., Cheloha, C., & Nicholson, N. (2012). Gender policing: Harassment judgments when men target other men. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* 18(2), 245.

Wiener, R., & L. Hurt (2000). How do people evaluate social sexual conduct at work?: A psycholegal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 85(1), 75-85.

Willness, C., Piers, S., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology* (60), 127-162.

*Witt, L., King, W., Perry, S., Crepeau, L., Van Driel, M., & McDonald, D. (2012). A tale of two studies: Equal opportunity climate and mission readiness. *Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institution.*

Wood, J. (2008). Methodology for dealing with duplicate study effects in a meta-analysis. *Organizational Research Methods* 11(1), 79-95.

*Wright, C. & Fitzgerald, L. (2009). Correlates of joining a sexual harassment class action. *Law and Human Behavior* 33(4), 265-282.

Yagil, D. (2008). When the customer is wrong: A review of research on aggression and sexual harassment in service encounters. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 13(2), 141-152.

*Zhu, H., Lyu, Y., & Ye, Y. (2019). Workplace sexual harassment, workplace deviance, and family undermining. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.*

# APPENDIX A

**Table 1: Theories of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace.**

| Theoretical framework | Description | Key constructs | Perspective | Any legal implications? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Sexual harassment programs reduce harassment** (Dobbin and Kalev, 2019) | Explored how new sexual harassment programs affect the representation of white, black, Hispanic, and Asian-American women in management. | Harassment training<br>Workforce diversity<br>Grievance procedures | Firm | None |
| **2. Women who self-reported sexual harassment experienced normative discrimination** (Hart, 2019) | Posited promotion bias was significantly mediated by perceptions that she was less moral, warm, and socially skilled than the woman whose coworker reported her sexual harassment. | Sexual violence<br>Normative<br>Discrimination | Victim | Women may hesitate to report sexual harassment because they rightly perceive that doing so could cause them to experience bias. Bias can be avoided if a bystander reports the harassment. |
| **3. Organizational justice climate** (Rubino et al., 2018) | Beyond examining justice climate as a predictor of sexual harassment, assessed its potential moderation of well-established relationships between antecedents (i.e., climate for sexual harassment and sex similarity) and sexual harassment at both the individual and unit levels. | Climate for Sexual Harassment<br>Sex similarity | Firm | The attenuating effects of justice climate appear interchangeable with those of harassment climate or sex similarity, suggesting that managing justice climate effectively generally helps to deter sexual harassment. |
| **4. Target responses to workplace mistreatment** (Salin et al., 2014) | The size of the discrepancy between actual and ideal responses to mistreatment was predicted by the perceived severity of the behavior, the coping strategy chosen, and a difference in organizational status and gender between the perpetrator and the target of mistreatment. | Harassment<br>Mistreatment<br>Coping | Victim | None |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5. Power paradox theory** (McLaughlin & Blackstone, 2012) | There is evidence that suggests that women with institutional power who manage men, at least among mid-level managers, may experience more harassment than other women who do not manage men. | Power paradox<br>Sexual harassment | Victim | None |
| **6. Social categorization theory** (Hershcovis & Julian, 2010) | Victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment may make different attributions about their mistreatment experiences. | Sexual harassment<br>Workplace aggression | Victim | None |
| **7. Likelihood to sexually harass (LSH)** (Lee et al., 2008) | Males with a high-level position, when making performance ratings of female subordinates, were less likely to use objective performance information in their appraisals of female subordinates, as compared to males with a lower LSH. LSH will be more influenced by employee attractiveness and gender. | Employee attractiveness<br>Gender type of job | Firm | None |
| **8. Personality gender violations** (Berdahl, 2007) | Examined a relatively subtle form of violating gender ideals and offered a strict test of whether sexual harassment is primarily targeted at "uppity" women who step "out of place" by assuming characteristics considered more desirable for men. | Gender ideals<br>Sexual harassment | Victim | None |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **9. General incivility and sexual harassment were related constructs, with gender harassment bridging the two** (Lim & Cortina, 2005) | Behaviors tended to co-occur in organizations, and employee well-being declined with the addition of each type of mistreatment to the workplace experience. | General incivility<br>Sexual harassment<br>Gender harassment | Victim | None |
| **9. General incivility and sexual harassment were related constructs, with gender harassment bridging the two** (Lim & Cortina, 2005) | Behaviors tended to co-occur in organizations, and employee well-being declined with the addition of each type of mistreatment to the workplace experience. | General incivility<br>Sexual harassment<br>Gender harassment | Victim | None |
| **10. The effects of sexual harassment on turnover** (Sims et al., 2005) | Investigated whether turnover occurs because of harassment and when it occurs (e.g., the length of time until turnover occurs). | Turnover<br>Harassment | Firm | None |
| **11. Reporting sexual harassment** (Bergman & Drasgow, 2003) | Reporting defined as the act of telling an organizational authority (e.g., supervisor, equal employment opportunity representative) about unwanted or offensive sex-related behavior (whether the target explicitly labeled this experience as “sexual harassment”) and examine this process through two models. | Reporting<br>Sexual harassment | Victim | None |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **12. Effects of target perceptions of leader responses** (Malamut, 2002) | Results showed that women who perceived that leaders made honest efforts to stop harassment felt significantly freer to report harassment, were more satisfied with the complaint process, and reported greater commitment than did those viewing leaders as more harassment tolerant. | Hierarchical proximal leaders | Victim | None |
| **13. Legal standard instructions for sexual harassment** (Wiener et al., 2002) | Videotaped harassment complaints used to examine the impact of legal standards on the evaluation of social–sexual conduct at work. | Severity or Pervasiveness test<br>The rational woman approach | Firm | Predicting the outcome of lawsuits against companies. |
| **14. Labeling** (Munson & Hulin, 2001) | Examined the differences in job and personal outcomes associated with sexual harassment among individuals who do and do not label offensive harassing behaviors as harassment. | Labeling<br>Sexual harassment | Victim | None |
| **15. Coping responses to sexual harassment** (Malamut, 2002) | Examined personal and environmental determinants of these coping strategies as well as the cognitive processes involved in the target's choice of strategy. | Coping strategies<br>Cognitive processes | Victim | None |
| **16. Sex role theory** (Wayne, 2001) | Reviewed sex role theory and sexual harassment, assault, and coercion literatures to make predictions about mock juror decisions in cross- and same-gender cases. | Sex role theory<br>Assault<br>Coercion | Firm | None |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **17. Coping strategies on experiences of harassment over time** (Munson et al., 2000) | Findings suggested that sexual harassment has important effects on job-related and psychological outcomes that operate independently of dispositional influences or response biases. | Coping strategies | Victim | None |
| **18. Remedial accounts** (Tata, 2000) | Understanding the effect of remedial accounts on judgments of harassment, organizations can ensure that this influence is taken into consideration when enacting harassment policies and implementing training. | Remedial accounts | Firm | None |
| **19. Cross-cultural generalizability** (Wasti et al., 2000) | We propose that this model represents etic (universal) antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment experiences and thus generalizes to various organizational settings across cultures. | Cross-cultural Sexual harassment | Firm | None |
| **20. Questions about sexual harassment law and completed the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory** (Wiener & Hurt, 2000) | The authors tested a psycho-legal model of how people evaluate social sexual conduct at work with videotaped reenactments of interviews with alleged complainants, perpetrators, and other workers. | Reasonable woman perspective Reasonable person perspective | Firm | Participants who took the reasonable woman perspective, as compared with those who took the reasonable person perspective, were more likely to find the conduct harassing. |
| **21. Longitudinal models of harassment** (Glomb et al., 1999) | Results indicated that sexual harassment influences both proximal and distal work-related variables (e.g., job satisfaction, work withdrawal, and job withdrawal) and psychological outcomes (e.g., life satisfaction, psychological well-being, and distress). | Job satisfaction Job withdrawal Work withdrawal | Victim | None |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **22. The experts testimony varied the presence of heuristic cues and evidence quality** (Kovera, 1999) | Examined whether participants were sensitive to variations in the quality of an experiment discussed by an expert witness and whether they used heuristic cues when evaluating the expert's evidence. | Expert validity<br>Heuristic cues | Victim | Determining the impact of evidence presented by experts in lawsuits. |
| **23. Job gender context is a critical antecedent of sexual harassment** (Fitzgerald et al., 1997) | Harassment influenced work-related variables (e.g., job satisfaction); psychological states (e.g., anxiety and depression); and physical health. | Organizational climate<br>Job gender context<br>Sexual harassment | Victim | Which legal standard has the most impact on sexual harassment complaints? |
| **24. Harassment experiences negatively affect satisfaction with life and psychological well-being and lead to symptoms of posttraumatic stress** (Schneider, 1997) | Hypothesized that women who experience harassment in the workplace may exhibit similarly negative psychological effects as other victims of trauma, given that harassment is often unexpected and women's beliefs about a supportive and non-hostile work environment may be threatened. | Workplace harassment<br>Psychological well- being | Victim | None |
| **25. Vulnerable victims' theory** (Akande, 1992) | Harassment can be rampant when women, especially women with multiple compounding statuses, are in low positions of power with large distance between them and other workers. | Vulnerable victims<br>Sexual harassment | Victim | None |

**Table 2: Theories of Human Resources Related to Sexual Harassment.**

| Theoretical framework | Description | Key constructs | Perspective | Any legal implications? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. Theory of Planned Behavior** (Foster & Fullagar, 2018) | Presented model for predicting a victim's intent to report an incident of hostile environment of sexual harassment finding no gender difference in reporting. This model will help create reporting policies and procedures. | Sexual Harassment<br>US EEOC<br>Reporting policies | Firm | None |
| **2. Institutional Theory of Moral Collapse** (Lawrence, 2011) | Demonstrated that morality in organizations is embedded in the nested systems of individuals, organizations, and moral communities such that ideology and regulation flow down from moral communities through organizations to individuals and moral ideas and influence flow up from individuals through organizations to moral communities. | Moral collapse<br>Organizational misconduct | Firm | None |
| **3. Human Capital Theory** (Nafukho et al., 2004) | Demonstrated people's learning capabilities are of comparable value to other resources involved in the production of goods and services, so when people are effectively utilized it adds value for the individual, the organization, and society. | Capital | Individual and the Firm | None |
| **4. Behavioral theory of the firm** (Argote & Greve, 2007) | Focused on a small number of a firm's key economic decisions and the development process-oriented models of the firm. The models are then linked as closely as possible to the empirical observations of both the decision output and the process structure of actual business organizations to develop a theory that can be applied beyond the firm. | Behavioral theory<br>Bounded reality<br>Organizational learning | Firm | None |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5. Institutional theory** (Scott, 2008) | Posited that formal organizational structure includes technology imperatives, resource dependencies, and institutional forces. Theory has progressed to include the reconstruction of the organization into new configurations. | Institutional theory<br>Maturing | Firm | None |
| **6. Resource-based view of the firm, Human capital theory, and Transaction cost economics** (Snell, 1999) | Developed a human resources architecture of internal development, acquisition, contracting, and alliance to study relationships and determine a criterion for a competitive advantage. | Human Resource Architecture<br>Human Capital<br>Resource-based<br>Transaction cost | Firm | None |
| **7. Resource-based view of the firm** (Wernerfelt, 1984) | Investigated firms in terms of resources leading to identifying resources with higher profits, exploiting resources, and new resource development, and valuing the business based on what the company can sell the resources for. | Resources<br>Profitability | Firm | None |

**Table 3. The Relationship Between Job Attitudes and the Reporting of Sexual Harassment.**

| Variable | *k* | *N* | $\bar{r}$ | $SD_r$ | $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ | $SD_\rho$ | $CV_{LL}$ | $CV_{UL}$ | $CI_{LL}$ | $CI_{UL}$ | %Var |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sexual Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Job satisfaction | 50 | 44,404 | -.15 | .10 | -.17 | .12 | -.33 | -.01 | -.20 | -.13 | .15 |
| Published | 44 | 43,606 | -.18 | .08 | -.21 | .10 | -.33 | -.09 | -.24 | -.18 | .32 |
| Unpublished | 6 | 798 | -.33 | .09 | -.35 | .09 | -.47 | -.24 | -.45 | -.26 | .70 |
| Organizational commitment | 24 | 70,978 | -.04 | .30 | -.05 | .34 | -.49 | .39 | -.19 | .09 | .04 |
| Work satisfaction | 31 | 128,913 | .03 | .25 | .03 | .28 | -.33 | .40 | -.07 | .13 | .03 |
| SEQ | 19 | 102,406 | -.05 | .21 | -.06 | .23 | -.35 | .24 | -.16 | .05 | .02 |
| Other measures | 12 | 26,507 | .32 | .18 | .37 | .19 | .12 | .62 | .27 | .48 | .05 |
| Co-worker satisfaction | 19 | 100,296 | -.06 | .21 | -.07 | .25 | -.39 | .24 | -.18 | .04 | .03 |
| Supervisor satisfaction | 12 | 97,834 | -.02 | .24 | -.03 | .26 | -.36 | .31 | -.18 | .12 | .02 |
| **Sexual Assault** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Job satisfaction | 3 | 424 | .10 | .00 | .10 | .00 | .10 | .10 | .01 | .20 | .81 |
| **Gender Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Job satisfaction | 12 | 12,212 | -.25 | .07 | -.30 | .10 | -.42 | -.17 | -.36 | -.24 | .13 |
| SEQ | 3 | 925 | -.17 | .00 | -.20 | .00 | -.20 | -.20 | -.26 | -.13 | .42 |
| Other measures | 9 | 11,287 | -.26 | .08 | -.31 | .10 | -.43 | -.18 | -.37 | -.24 | .10 |
| Organizational commitment | 6 | 41,262 | -.15 | .01 | -.17 | .01 | -.18 | -.15 | -.18 | -.15 | .02 |
| Work satisfaction | 8 | 90,036 | .05 | .24 | .06 | .27 | -.28 | .40 | -.13 | .25 | .01 |
| Co-worker satisfaction | 7 | 89,993 | -.02 | .27 | -.02 | .31 | -.41 | .38 | -.25 | .21 | .01 |
| Supervisor satisfaction | 5 | 50,074 | .34 | .08 | .38 | .09 | .27 | .49 | .30 | .45 | .01 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sexual Coercion** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Organizational commitment | 3 | 20,341 | -.10 | .01 | -.15 | .00 | -.15 | -.15 | -.16 | -.14 | .03 |
| Work satisfaction | 4 | 20,602 | -.11 | .00 | -.13 | .00 | -.13 | -.13 | -.15 | -.12 | .03 |
| Supervisor satisfaction | 3 | 732 | -.22 | .14 | -1.65 | 1.06 | -3 | -.30 | -2.84 | -.45 | .21 |
| **Unwanted Sexual Attention** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Job satisfaction | 7 | 10,266 | -.15 | .07 | -.17 | .09 | -.29 | -.06 | -.24 | -.11 | .10 |
| SEQ | 3 | 1,066 | -.03 | .13 | -.04 | .17 | -.25 | .17 | -.23 | .16 | .45 |
| Other measures | 4 | 9,200 | -.16 | .04 | -.19 | .05 | -.26 | -.13 | -.25 | -.14 | .06 |
| Organizational commitment | 3 | 20,341 | -.13 | .00 | -.15 | .00 | -.15 | -.15 | -.17 | -.14 | .02 |
| Work satisfaction | 4 | 20,602 | -.15 | .00 | -.19 | .00 | -.19 | -.18 | -.20 | -.17 | .03 |
| Co-worker satisfaction | 4 | 21,026 | -.19 | .01 | -.24 | .01 | -.25 | -.22 | -.26 | -.22 | .03 |
| Supervisor satisfaction | 3 | 1,068 | -.30 | .05 | -.38 | .07 | -.47 | -.29 | -.48 | -.29 | .37 |
| **Work-related Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work satisfaction | 4 | 7,581 | -.14 | .11 | -.15 | .13 | -.32 | .01 | -.28 | -.02 | .07 |
| **SH climate** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Job satisfaction | 11 | 2,191 | .04 | .29 | .04 | .33 | -.38 | .47 | -.15 | .24 | .65 |
| SEQ | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Other measures | 12 | 2,502 | .07 | .28 | .07 | .32 | -.34 | .50 | -.11 | .26 | .63 |
| Organizational commitment | 6 | 1,988 | .18 | .18 | .21 | .23 | -.08 | .50 | .02 | .40 | .42 |
| Work satisfaction | 9 | 51,587 | .34 | .12 | .38 | .13 | .21 | .55 | .30 | .47 | .02 |
| Co-worker satisfaction | 7 | 50,840 | .18 | .17 | .22 | .19 | -.02 | .46 | .08 | .36 | .02 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Supervisor satisfaction | 7 | 50,840 | .45 | .12 | .50 | .14 | .32 | .67 | .39 | .60 | .01 |
| **Perceived Severity** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Job satisfaction | 4 | 1,294 | -.06 | .06 | -.07 | .06 | -.15 | .02 | -.14 | .02 | .39 |
| Work satisfaction | 4 | 3,872 | .04 | .04 | .05 | .05 | -.01 | .12 | -.01 | .12 | .13 |

*Note*. *k* = number of independent samples; *N* = total sample size; $\bar{r}$ = sample-size-weighted mean observed correlation; $SD_r$= sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ = mean true-score correlation (corrected for unreliability for both variables); $SD_\rho$= standard deviation of corrected correlations; $CV_{LL}$ and $CV_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 80% credibility interval; $CI_{LL}$ and $CI_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 95% confidence interval around the mean true-score correlation; %Var = percentage of variance attributable to statistical artifacts. Male = 0 and female = 1.

**Table 4. The Relationship Between the Perceptions of the Global Organizational Environment and the Reporting of Sexual Harassment**

| Variable | *k* | *N* | $\bar{r}$ | $SD_r$ | $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ | $SD_\rho$ | $CV_{LL}$ | $CV_{UL}$ | $CI_{LL}$ | $CI_{UL}$ | %Var |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sexual Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Justice climate | 41 | 106,771 | .05 | .31 | .06 | .35 | -.38 | .51 | -.04 | .17 | .05 |
| Published | 31 | 99,405 | .04 | .31 | .04 | .35 | -.40 | .49 | -.07 | .16 | .04 |
| Unpublished | 10 | 7,540 | .22 | .20 | .24 | .22 | -.04 | .52 | .10 | .37 | .15 |
| **Sexual Assault** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Justice climate | 8 | 92,930 | -.15 | .16 | -.18 | .15 | -.37 | .01 | -.28 | -.08 | .01 |
| **Gender Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Justice climate | 10 | 127,541 | .01 | .37 | .03 | .43 | -.52 | .59 | -.23 | .30 | .01 |
| Organizational sanctions | 3 | 642 | -.30 | .00 | -.37 | .00 | -.37 | -.37 | -.44 | -.30 | .59 |
| **Sexual Coercion** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Organizational sanctions | 3 | 642 | -.07 | .00 | -.08 | .00 | -.08 | -.08 | -.16 | -.01 | .71 |
| **Work-related Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Justice climate | 5 | 24,107 | .35 | .01 | .43 | .02 | .40 | .45 | .41 | .45 | .02 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **SH Climate** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Justice climate | 5 | 33,253 | .48 | .17 | .66 | .15 | .47 | .85 | .53 | .79 | .02 |
| **Perceived severity** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Justice climate | 7 | 3,052 | .40 | .29 | .44 | .34 | .01 | .87 | .19 | .69 | .20 |
| SEQ | 2 | 497 | -.05 | .19 | -.05 | .20 | -.30 | .21 | -.34 | .25 | .44 |
| Other measures | 5 | 2,555 | .49 | .21 | .55 | .25 | .22 | .87 | .32 | .77 | .14 |

*Note*. *k* = number of independent samples; *N* = total sample size; $\bar{r}$ = sample-size-weighted mean observed correlation; $SD_r$= sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ = mean true-score correlation (corrected for unreliability for both variables); $SD_\rho$= standard deviation of corrected correlations; $CV_{LL}$ and $CV_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 80% credibility interval; $CI_{LL}$ and $CI_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 95% confidence interval around the mean true-score correlation; %Var = percentage of variance attributable to statistical artifacts. Male = 0 and female = 1.

**Table 5. The Relationship Between the Individual Difference Variables, the Perception of the Global Organizational Environment, and the Reporting of Sexual Harassment**

| Variable | *k* | *N* | $\bar{r}$ | $SD_r$ | $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ | $SD_\rho$ | $CV_{LL}$ | $CV_{UL}$ | $CI_{LL}$ | $CI_{UL}$ | %Var |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sexual Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 53 | 97,512 | .23 | .13 | .25 | .14 | .06 | .43 | .21 | .29 | .06 |
| Tenure | 13 | 29,703 | -.19 | .08 | -.20 | .09 | -.31 | -.09 | -.25 | -.15 | .04 |
| Age | 48 | 55,113 | -.12 | .08 | -.13 | .09 | -.24 | -.02 | -.16 | -.11 | .09 |
| Published | 39 | 52,276 | -.13 | .08 | -.14 | .09 | -.25 | -.03 | -.17 | -.11 | .08 |
| Unpublished | 9 | 2,837 | -.11 | .03 | -.12 | .02 | -.15 | -.09 | -.16 | -.08 | .34 |
| Justice climate | 41 | 106,771 | .05 | .31 | .06 | .35 | -.38 | .51 | -.04 | .17 | .05 |
| **Sexual Assault** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 18 | 60,785 | .26 | .18 | .26 | -.18 | .04 | .49 | .18 | .35 | .03 |
| SEQ | 5 | 52,905 | .22 | .08 | .23 | .08 | .12 | .33 | .15 | .30 | .01 |
| Other measures | 13 | 7,880 | .07 | .05 | .07 | .06 | -.01 | .14 | .01 | .12 | .27 |
| Tenure | 12 | 15,495 | -.02 | .03 | -.02 | .04 | -.07 | .03 | -.05 | .01 | .10 |
| Age | 19 | 8,168 | -.13 | .07 | -.14 | .07 | -.24 | -.05 | -.18 | -.10 | .26 |
| Justice climate | 8 | 92,930 | -.15 | .16 | -.18 | .15 | -.37 | .01 | -.28 | -.08 | .01 |
| **Gender Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 10 | 27,916 | .26 | .11 | .28 | .11 | .14 | .42 | .21 | .35 | 1.15 |
| Tenure | 14 | 21,437 | -.04 | .04 | -.04 | .04 | -.10 | .01 | -.07 | -.02 | .18 |
| Age | 25 | 8,964 | -.06 | .11 | -.07 | .12 | -.22 | .09 | -.12 | -.01 | .32 |
| Justice climate | 10 | 127,541 | .01 | .37 | .03 | .43 | -.52 | .59 | -.23 | .30 | .01 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational sanctions | 3 | 642 | -.30 | .00 | -.37 | .00 | -.37 | -.37 | -.44 | -.30 | .59 |
| **Sexual Coercion** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 4 | 30,129 | .09 | .02 | .10 | .02 | .07 | .12 | .07 | .12 | .05 |
| Tenure | 4 | 774 | -.06 | .00 | -.08 | .00 | -.08 | -.08 | -.15 | -.01 | .75 |
| Age | 8 | 3,901 | -.01 | .09 | -.02 | .10 | -.14 | .11 | -.09 | .06 | .26 |
| SEQ | 7 | 2,606 | .01 | .10 | .01 | .11 | -.13 | .15 | -.08 | .10 | .32 |
| Other measures | 1 | 1,295 | -.06 | .00 | -.07 | .00 | -.07 | -.07 | -.13 | -.02 | .11 |
| Organizational sanctions | 3 | 642 | -.07 | .00 | -.08 | .00 | -.08 | -.08 | -.16 | -.01 | .71 |
| **Work-related Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 3 | 528 | -.27 | .16 | -.29 | .15 | -.49 | -.09 | -.48 | -.10 | .53 |
| Age | 5 | 1,286 | -.18 | .07 | -.19 | .10 | -.31 | -.06 | -.29 | -.09 | .45 |
| Justice climate | 5 | 24,107 | .35 | .01 | .43 | .02 | .40 | .45 | .41 | .45 | .02 |
| **SH Climate** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 8 | 24,459 | -.03 | .09 | -.03 | .09 | -.15 | .09 | -.10 | .03 | .04 |
| Tenure | 6 | 25,813 | .09 | .10 | .09 | .12 | -.05 | .24 | .00 | .19 | .03 |
| Age | 4 | 5,131 | -.09 | .00 | -.09 | .00 | -.09 | -.09 | -.12 | -.07 | .08 |
| Justice climate | 5 | 33,253 | .48 | .17 | .66 | .15 | .47 | .85 | .53 | .79 | .02 |
| **Perceived Severity** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gender | 12 | 3,683 | .13 | .07 | .14 | .07 | .04 | .23 | .08 | .19 | .33 |
| Age | 3 | 2,000 | -.10 | .00 | -.11 | .00 | -.11 | -.11 | -.16 | -.07 | .18 |
| Justice climate | 7 | 3,052 | .40 | .29 | .44 | .34 | .01 | .87 | .19 | .69 | .20 |

*Note*. $k$ = number of independent samples; $N$ = total sample size; $\bar{r}$ = sample-size-weighted mean observed correlation; $SD_r$= sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ = mean true-score correlation (corrected for unreliability for both variables); $SD_\rho$= standard deviation of corrected correlations; $CV_{LL}$ and $CV_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 80% credibility interval; $CI_{LL}$ and $CI_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 95% confidence interval around the mean true-score correlation; %Var = percentage of variance attributable to statistical artifacts. Male = 0 and female = 1.

**Table 6. The Relative Importance of the Perceptions of the Global Organizational Environment and Individual Difference Variables**

| | Sexual Harassment | | Gender Harassment | | Sexual Assault | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Raw relative weights | Relative weights as a % of $R^2$ | Raw relative weights | Relative weights as a % of $R^2$ | Raw relative weights | Relative weights as a % of $R^2$ |
| Justice Climate | 0.03 | 20% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.03 | 33% |
| Age | 0.01 | 8% | 0.00 | 2% | 0.03 | 26% |
| Gender | 0.06 | 42% | 0.16 | 96% | 0.04 | 40% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tenure | 0.04 | 30% | 0.00 | 1% | 0.01 | 1% |
| | $R^2$= 0.14 | | $R^2$=0.16 | | $R^2$=0.11 | |

**Table 7. The Relationship Between the Perceptions of the Global Organizational Environment and The Reporting of Sexual Harassment Moderated by Industry**

| Variable | *k* | *N* | $\bar{r}$ | $SD_r$ | $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ | $SD_\rho$ | $CV_{LL}$ | $CV_{UL}$ | $CI_{LL}$ | $CI_{UL}$ | %Var |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sexual harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Professional | 10 | 3,820 | .48 | .15 | .53 | .16 | .33 | .74 | .44 | .63 | .14 |
| Published | 9 | 3,439 | .50 | .17 | .55 | .17 | .33 | .77 | .43 | .66 | .18 |
| Unpublished | 1 | 381 | .22 | .00 | .24 | .00 | .23 | .23 | .14 | .33 | .28 |
| Industrial | 4 | 1,581 | .41 | .00 | .45 | .00 | .45 | .45 | .41 | .49 | .20 |
| Military | 9 | 95,848 | .03 | .31 | .03 | .34 | -.41 | .48 | -.19 | .26 | .01 |
| Miscellaneous | 5 | 5,890 | .10 | .19 | .11 | .24 | -.20 | .42 | .00 | .22 | .48 |
| **Sexual Assault** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Military | 8 | 115,845 | -.15 | .10 | -.02 | .04 | -.07 | .02 | -.05 | .00 | .00 |
| **Gender harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Professional | 3 | 642 | -.30 | .00 | -.37 | .00 | -.37 | -.37 | -.44 | -.30 | .59 |
| Military | 9 | 150,214 | -.02 | .35 | -.01 | .40 | -.52 | .50 | -.27 | .25 | .01 |
| **Sexual coercion** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Professional | 3 | 642 | -.07 | .00 | -.08 | .00 | -.08 | -.08 | -.16 | -.01 | .71 |
| **Work-related harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Industrial | 3 | 489 | .27 | .00 | .29 | .00 | .29 | .29 | .21 | .38 | .65 |
| Military | 8 | 78,786 | .38 | .14 | .47 | .20 | .22 | .72 | .33 | .61 | .01 |
| SEQ | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Other measures | 8 | 78,786 | .38 | .14 | .47 | .20 | .22 | .72 | .33 | .61 | .01 |

*Note*. *k* = number of independent samples; *N* = total sample size; $\bar{r}$ = sample-size-weighted mean observed correlation; $SD_r$= sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ = mean true-score correlation (corrected for unreliability for both variables); $SD_\rho$= standard deviation of corrected correlations; $CV_{LL}$ and $CV_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 80% credibility interval; $CI_{LL}$ and $CI_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 95% confidence interval around the mean true-score correlation; %Var = percentage of variance attributable to statistical artifacts. Male = 0 and female = 1.

**Table 8. The Moderating Role of National Culture Impact on the Perceptions of the Global Organizational Environment and the Reporting of Sexual Harassment**

| Variable | *k* | *N* | $\bar{r}$ | $SD_r$ | $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ | $SD_\rho$ | $CV_{LL}$ | $CV_{UL}$ | $CI_{LL}$ | $CI_{UL}$ | %Var |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sexual Harassment** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Power distance (h) | 3 | 836 | .21 | .00 | .24 | .00 | .24 | .24 | .17 | .30 | .41 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Power distance (us) | 16 | 42,530 | -.21 | .29 | -.23 | .33 | -.65 | .19 | -.39 | -.07 | .04 |
| Published | 14 | 36,292 | -.29 | .22 | -.33 | .25 | -.65 | .00 | -.46 | -.19 | .04 |
| Unpublished | 2 | 6,238 | .28 | .07 | .31 | .09 | .19 | .42 | .18 | .43 | .03 |
| Power distance (l) | 3 | 854 | -.16 | .24 | -.17 | .26 | -.50 | .16 | -.47 | .13 | .37 |
| Masculinity norms (us) | 16 | 42,530 | -.21 | .29 | -.23 | .33 | -.65 | .19 | -.39 | -.07 | .04 |
| Masculinity norms (l) | 4 | 1,159 | .04 | .29 | .04 | .32 | -.37 | .45 | -.28 | .36 | .42 |

*Note*. *k* = number of independent samples; *N* = total sample size; $\bar{r}$ = sample-size-weighted mean observed correlation; $SD_r$= sample-size-weighted observed standard deviation of correlations; $\hat{\bar{\rho}}$ = mean true-score correlation (corrected for unreliability for both variables); $SD_\rho$= standard deviation of corrected correlations; $CV_{LL}$ and $CV_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 80% credibility interval; $CI_{LL}$ and $CI_{UL}$ = lower and upper bounds, respectively, of the 95% confidence interval around the mean true-score correlation; %Var = percentage of variance attributable to statistical artifacts. Male = 0 and female = 1.

# APPENDIX B

Fig. 1 Model