CATCALLS OR COMPLIMENTS: MEN'S ATTITUDES ON STREET AND
SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN RELATION TO THEIR PERSONALITY

by

Zeinab F. B. Ramadan

A thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology

In conformity with the requirements for

the degree of Master of Science

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

(February, 2018)

Abstract

Street harassment, also known as public harassment, sexual harassment in the public, and stranger harassment, is defined as physical and verbal unwanted behaviours done by a stranger in the public sphere. Sexual harassment in the workplace is defined as unwanted verbal or physical sexual advances and requests for sexual favours that impact an individual's employment or academic performance and create a hostile or offensive environment. Street harassment stands apart from sexual harassment in the workplace because street harassment is usually done in the public sphere by a stranger. In addition, the general public has normalized street harassment where some men perceive it as positive and complimentary. Yet, sexual harassment is perceived as socially unacceptable and illegal. How can these two types of harassment be seen so differently? Moreover, there is limited knowledge on the impact of personality traits on one's attitudes to street harassment. The current study aimed to investigate the definition of street harassment and create an empirical street harassment measure, which currently does not exist in the literature. Furthermore, the relationship of normal personality traits, measured by the HEXACO personality inventory, and of sub-clinical Dark Triad personality traits to men's attitudes of street harassment and sexual harassment was examined. The pilot studies illustrated that a unique set of street harassment behaviours characterized by perpetrator identity and context could not be created; however, a range of harassing behavioural items was created. The main study revealed that Conscientiousness, Openness, Agreeableness, Machiavellianism and Psychopathy personality traits are significant predictors of men's attitudes on a range of harassing behaviours. The findings

of this research give rise to some conceptual questions about the street harassment

construct and how to better measure the construct. Furthermore, the study informs the

discourse surrounding men's attitudes on a range of harassing behaviours by situating the

behaviours within the context of both normal personality and a set of socially malevolent

traits. These findings provide a greater understanding of the psychological profile of men

at risk for engaging in a range of harassing behaviours.

Keywords: street harassment, sexual harassment, personality, HEXACO, dark

triad

Acknowledgements

بِسْـــــــمِ اللهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِيمِ

I would like to thank Dr. G. Cynthia Fekken for her endless patience and guidance as well as the Personality Assessment Lab for their invaluable support throughout these two years.

Furthermore, I would not be able to thank my family enough for their motivational encouragement, their love, and their unwavering emotional support despite being separated by two provinces.

I would like to dedicate my thesis to my grandmother, Fatma Abu-Amud, one of the strongest women I have ever had the pleasure of knowing and who was the first to encourage me to pursue my graduate studies at Queen's University.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

"When I was walking out of the ferry terminal, this random adult guy began yelling out to me. But I kept on walking (I'm 14 years old). He kept yelling out "Hey miss! You have a fat a**!" I got disgusted after he said that and he kept trying to "get me". As I was walking past the block he began running after me and that's when I turned around and said "Get the f*ck away from me!" He then got a little surprised and yelled "But you are a beautiful woman!" then I told him that I was 14 and he said "Damn! That's too young!" And I kept flipping him off. Then after that he kept yelling "F*ck you! You fat a** white b*tch!" as he was walking away." – New York City, US

"I was on my way walking to work and I had to cross the street at George and McDonnel towards the church and a car full of students pulled up too far onto the crosswalk and I had to walk around in front of their car. They then proceeded to drive up behind me and began screaming at me something about how I needed new clothing and how ugly I was and some other things I don't have it in me to repeat. They then flipped me off and drove off." – Peterborough, Canada

"My best friend and I decided to take a walk one evening around the colony I live in, which was relatively 'safer' than the rest of Delhi. This was around 7pm, so it wasn't that late or unsafe to be outside (or so we thought). As we walked along the street talking to each other, a man on a bicycle passed us and sent some pathetic 'hey baby' comments our way. We tried to ignore him, and figured he would just go along his way. Unfortunately, he changed his route and started to circle around the area we were walking in, saying more and more. We began to walk faster, hoping to get home quickly because he was really starting to annoy us. Then, out of the blue- he rode his cycle really close to me, held my chin and asked me for a 'kissie'. I was absolutely FURIOUS that he had the balls to do that and I decided I had to do something." – Delhi, India

"It was rush hour in the evening. I was heading home after getting off the Tube and was waiting for the traffic lights to change so I could cross the road when a guy driving by shouted "Whore" at me from his car window. I was the only person standing on that side of the road." – London, UK

The term "street harassment" has emerged in the last few years as a popular term among researchers, activists, and journalists alike (Logan, 2015). The above excerpts, taken from *Hollerback*!, an online global social movement led by a network of grassroots activists to end street harassment, represent just a few of the thousands of stories from

across the globe of women's experiences of street harassment. The term street harassment has gained recognition as a real worldwide phenomenon. With the aid of the research by *Hollerback!* and by Cornell University, which ran a large-scale online survey collecting data on street harassment in 22 countries, street harassment has been identified as a global social problem (Kearl, 2015). Emerging research has shown that street harassment is a global issue that has been disregarded for many years. According to the research, 88% of women in Canada and 85% of women in the United States report being street harassed for the first time before the age of 17 (Livingston, Grillo, & Paluch, 2015). In the United States, 65% of women and 25% of men, mostly men who identify as LGBTQ, have experienced some form of street harassment in their lifetime (Kearl, 2014). Another study reports that 77% of Canadian women have experienced street harassment in their lifetime (Lenton, Smith, Fox, & Morra, 1999).

Street harassment is a pandemic and is associated with a host of complications and consequences. Victims of street harassment experience negative emotional and psychological consequences, such as depression, anxiety, stress, self-objectification, shame, and increased body surveillance (Davidson, Butchko, Robbins, Sherd, & Gervais, 2016; Davidson, Gervais, & Sherd, 2013; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Kearl, 2010; MacMillan, Nierobisz, & Welsh, 2000). Furthermore, street harassment has been argued to have other implications which include maintaining of gender segregation, acting as a form of social control that perpetuates male dominance at the expense of women, preventing women from attaining positions of authority, and challenging the legitimacy of women's status (Hand & Sanchez, 2000; Logan, 2015; Vera-Gray, 2016). Street harassment makes it more difficult for women to have a presence in the public sphere and

2

debilitates their ability to independently conduct their daily activities (Ramakrishnan, 2011). Thus, the literature clearly points towards street harassment as a global phenomenon worthy of further research to understand street harassment as a theoretical construct and to educate the public to decrease its prevalence. The current research will specifically explore the definition of street harassment and will compare it with other forms of harassment such as sexual harassment and aggression in order to create a unique street harassment measure. Furthermore, the current study will investigate the presence of specific characteristics to profile individuals with particular attitudes towards street harassment.

Defining Street Harassment: The Person and the Place

The exact definition of street harassment has yet to be clarified in the literature. In various places, it has been termed "stranger harassment" (Fairchild & Rodman, 2008; Davidson, Gervais, & Sherd, 2013)," public harassment" (Gardner, 1995), "men's intrusions" (Vera-Gray, 2016), and "sexual harassment in public places" (Lenton, Smith, Fox, & Morra, 1999) as well as "street harassment" (Bowman, 1993; Kissling, 1991, Darnell & Cook, 2009). The various terms and labels make it difficult for researchers to study and consistently measure this phenomenon. These separate terms have different definitions but share a common focus on unwanted, verbal or non-verbal, behaviour or attention forced on one by a stranger that creates an uncomfortable, hostile, or offensive public environment. Verbal street harassment includes a range of catcalls, slurs, vulgarity, and profanity whereas non-verbal street harassment includes whistling, stalking, slapping, pinching, and groping. Nonetheless, the degree to which street

harassment can be separated from terms more commonly seen in the psychological literature such as sexual harassment and from general aggression remains unexplored.

Street harassment can be distinguished from sexual harassment in terms of the nature of the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim as well as the location in which the harassment takes place. When reviewing the literature on sexual harassment, the research tends to assess sexual harassment in achievement settings (e.g., in the workplace or academic institutions). Sexual harassment is defined as unwanted verbal or physical sexual advances and requests for sexual favours, differing from street harassment in that it impacts an individual's employment or academic performance, creating a hostile or offensive work environment leading to poor work productivity (Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, 2016). The measurement of sexual harassment is frequently contextualized as occurring in the workplace or school setting. However, sexual harassment can occur in multiple settings. Context is one of the characteristics that is highlighted in the street harassment definition. Street harassment deals more specifically with the public sphere or public space. The sexual harassment definition does not specify who the perpetrator is in relation to the victim unlike the street harassment definition where the perpetrator is a stranger.

A key part of the definition of street harassment is the anonymity of the perpetrator. This is a critical distinction between street harassment and sexual harassment. The anonymity of stranger harassers grants them the freedom to feel little consequence for their actions whereas the perpetrator in the workplace or educational setting is usually known to the women they harass. Non-strangers' behaviour is bound by the sexual misconduct and abuse laws and is also known to be inappropriate and against

codes of professional conduct. Although extreme forms of street harassment such as sexual assault are arguably explicitly known to be wrong and illegal, some specific forms of street harassment conducted by strangers (e.g., catcalling, whistling) are still seen by some as complimentary, harmless, and normal gendered interactions in some contexts (Quinn, 2002). MacMillan and colleagues' (2000) work points to the importance of the stranger distinction between sexual and street harassment that makes street harassment particularly worthy of focus. They used vignettes to research the difference between unwanted sexual attention from strangers and non-strangers and found women reported more negative affect and greater attempts to cope with the unwanted attention from strangers than from non-strangers. Specific items measuring stranger and non-stranger harassment from the Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS) data were analyzed to differentiate between stranger and non-stranger harassment. They concluded that stranger harassment is a more pervasive and consistent problem, with stronger effects on women's perceptions of safety, more so than non-stranger harassment (MacMillan, Nierobisz, & Welsh, 2000). Thus, it is important to distinguish between stranger and non-stranger harassment for two reasons. First, harassment by strangers versus non-strangers may have different impact on the victims. Second, there may be individual differences between perpetrators of stranger versus non-stranger harassment that may help to elucidate the street harassment phenomenon.

There is some overlap between the definitions of street and sexual harassment. This overlap can be explained by breaking down the definition of sexual harassment into its three types. The three types of sexual harassment include: sexual coercion, also known as *quid pro quo* sexual harassment (e.g., request or requirement of sexual acts for work

related rewards); gender harassment (e.g., degradation of women as a gender such as sexist jokes); and unwanted sexual attention (e.g., degradation of women at the individual level by sending dirty emails, grabbing, or leering; Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). The prevalence rates for these three sexual harassment components differ: sexual coercion is a rare occurrence with only 5-10% of survey respondents experiencing this type of sexual harassment (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008); gender harassment is experienced by 50% or more of women; and unwanted sexual attention is experienced by 20-25% of women (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). Gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention have been grouped together under the legal category of hostile environment sexual harassment (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). Street harassment can be linked to sexual harassment via the category of hostile environment sexual harassment. Street harassment is defined as unwanted sexual attention from strangers (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008), which means it shares a conceptualization of "unwanted sexual attention" with the sexual harassment definition (Gardner, 1995). Thus, street harassment can be grouped under the umbrella term of hostile environment sexual harassment - the main difference concerns where the unwanted attention takes place and who is giving the attention as explained earlier.

A complete understanding of street harassment also requires that we differentiate it from aggression, a multi-faceted behaviour that is defined in the literature as an action done with the intention to inflict pain or suffering on another individual (Baron & Richardson, 1994; Anderson & Bushman, 2002). Although aggression can be directed towards strangers or non-strangers (Wilson, Mouilso, Gentile, Calhoun, & Zeichner, 2015), the difference between aggression and street harassment is the clear intention to

harm. In Bernard and Schlaffer's sample (*n*=60), only 15% of street harassers had the intention of humiliating or angering their victims when street harassing (1984). The majority of street harassers do not believe they are harming their victims; in fact, some believe their actions to be complimentary and that women are too sensitive and they misinterpret men's intentions (Quinn, 2002).

The literature lacks a strong uniform definition or identification of street harassment and as a result, one of the objectives of this paper is to examine the definition of street harassment, to explore whether street harassment behaviours can be differentiated from sexual harassment and aggression, and to determine whether an independent measure of unique street harassment behaviours can be constructed.

Street Harassment: A New Measure

Based on the literature review, there are only a few street harassment measures and none are a self-report measure that embodies the definition of street harassment that this current study has adopted. Fairchild and Rudman (2008) modified a version of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire and created a stranger harassment measure that asks participants if they have ever experienced nine different behaviours by strangers (e.g., ''Have you ever experienced catcalls, whistles, or stares from a stranger?''). Fairchild and Rudman's measure does not contextualize where the behaviour takes place although it does identify the perpetrator as a stranger. There is only one street harassment measure that assesses men's acceptance of street harassment. Darnell and Cook (2009) developed an Acceptance of Street Harassment questionnaire and Peer Acceptance of Street Harassment questionnaire that were adapted from Goodchilds and Zellman's (1984) measure of the acceptability of sexual aggression. The Acceptance of Street Harassment

measure asked men about the acceptability of a man making unsolicited comments (e.g., "hey baby" or "nice ass") towards an unknown woman on the street whereas the Peer Acceptance of Street Harassment asked how acceptable would a friend find the behaviour (Darnell & Cook, 2009). The measures asked about the acceptability of conducting this behaviour in 11 situations (e.g., when she's attractive, dressed in sexy clothes, makes eye contact with him, when she's alone, when she's with friends, when she's with a man, when she's with children, when he is alone, when he is with friends, and when he's in an unfamiliar neighborhood; Darnell & Cook, 2009). The use of this measure would be inappropriate for this study because the measure includes only one type of street harassment behaviour. Thus, one of the goals of this research is to create a list of various behavioural items that encompass the street harassment definition in order to assess the degree to which men would consider the behaviours acceptable and the likelihood that they would commit those behaviours.

Street Harassment: The Perpetrator and Their Personality

Research indicates that the majority of street harassment is perpetrated by men (Wesselmann & Kelly, 2010); however, little is known about the personality characteristics of men who participant in street harassment. Researchers have theorized that men harass to bond with other males and to showcase their control while simultaneously rationalizing their harassment as harmless, part of human nature, and as complimentary (Logan, 2015). Male bonding suggests that street harassers possess traits of sociability or social boldness whereas a need for control could be an indication of those men possessing manipulative traits. Beth Quinn sought to explore men's understanding of "girl-watching" and how it relates to their interpretation of sexual

harassment in the workplace (2002). Quinn conducted in-depth interviews and discovered that "girl watching" allows men to exert their power as well as a way for them to "play" (2002). Men's perception of "girl watching" not only produces an environment of harassment but their rationalization prevents them from acknowledging their harassing behaviour (Quinn, 2002). A study by Eric Wesselmann and Janice Kelly found that men believed other men would more likely engage in street harassment in a group of men rather than individually. They also found that men reported they were prompted to harass by the sheer anonymity of their behaviour as well as by the opportunity for male group bonding (2010). Furthermore, research shows men may be motivated to street harass to establish power and dominance over their targets (Grubbs, Exline, & Twenge, 2014; Hitlan, Pryor, Hesson-McInnis, & Olson, 2009). Despite various reasons illustrating why men participate in street harassment, little is known about the characteristics of the men who engage in street harassment. Thus, the second objective of the current research is to relate the personality of men to their ratings of the acceptability and likelihood of committing street harassment.

Men's attitudes towards street and sexual harassment could relate to different personality traits. The literature was reviewed using the following keywords: street harassment, stranger harassment, and personality – no predictive studies, no intervention studies and no correlational studies were found. This result shows a lack of empirical psychological research on street harassment and the personality traits of men who engage in street harassment. Researchers have theorized that the majority of men who engage in street harassment are high functioning, "ordinary" males who are contributing to society

(Laniya, 2005). Thus, a robust measure of normal personality traits appears ideal for situating street harassment in the context of normal personality traits.

The two common models of normal personality traits are the HEXACO model of personality and the Five Factor Model (FFM). The HEXACO model of personality identifies six normal personality traits: honesty/humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Ashton & Lee, 2009a). The HEXACO measures some of the same traits as the well-known FFM of personality; nevertheless, it differs with the addition of the sixth honesty/humility factor in the HEXACO model (Lee, Ogunfowora, & Ashton, 2005). The HEXACO model has become preferred over the FFM when assessing normal personality traits and is deemed more transdiagnostic, replicable, and culturally sensitive than the FFM (Ashton & Lee, 2007). Furthermore, the HEXACO model described to be advantageous over the FFM when assessing more socially undesirable behaviours (Gaughan, Miller, & Lynam, 2012). Thus, using the HEXACO model of personality would be ideal when seeking to predict harassing behaviours.

Although there are no direct evaluations of the role of normal personality traits in men's tendencies to engage in street harassment, there is limited research on the personality of sexual harassers. Pina, Gannon, and Saunders (2009) give an overview of research that assessed the characteristics of men who sexually harass including sociodemographic characteristics, sexual harassment proclivity, personality characteristics, and typological descriptions. In terms of personality characteristics, agreeableness, consciousness, and openness to experience from the FFM of personality were all negatively associated with self-reported likelihood to engage in sexual

harassment (Larrimer-Scherbaum, & Popovich, 2001; Menard, Shoss, & Pincus, 2010, Pryor & Meyers, 2000). The honesty-humility trait from the HEXACO model was significantly negatively correlated with men's likelihood to sexually harass and was the strongest correlate of any of the traits (Lee, Gizzarone, Ashton, 2003). Whether these findings generalize to street harassment, where there is some argument that men set out to be "complimentary and engaging" with the women they approach, remains to be seen.

The "ordinary" man can be seen as a common perpetrator of street harassment although not all men harass and not all do so to the same degree. It is likely that other factors are in play that lead to street harassment behaviour. Personality, particularly subclinical personality, has been identified as a factor for predicting bullying and victimization (Sehar & Fatima, 2016) and could be useful when assessing the tendency to engage in street harassment. The Dark Triad of personality consists of three subclinical traits: psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism (Jakobwitz, & Egan, 2006). The behaviours that characterize psychopathy are likely driven by two facets which Levenson, Kiehl, and Fitzpatrick (1995) have described as deficiency of affect (e.g., callousness, lack of interpersonal affect, superficial charm, remorselessness) and a lack of self-control (e.g., impulsivity, irresponsible, anti-social lifestyle). Cooke and Michie (2001) describe a third facet of psychopathy, namely, a deceitful interpersonal style. Machiavellianism characterizes those who are manipulative, insincere, cynical, and lack morality (Christie & Geis, 1970; Fehr, Samsom, & Paulhus, 1992). Narcissism, widely understood as a personality disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), comprises feelings of grandiosity, entitlement, and superiority as well as being domineering (Raskin & Terry, 1988). Despite their different definitions, researchers have identified overlapping features

among the three Dark Triad traits (Fehr, Samsom, & Paulhus, 1992; Gustafson & Ritzer, 1995; McHoskey, 1995). As well, correlations have been identified between the HEXACO personality traits and the Dark Triad traits. Honesty/humility was negatively correlated with narcissism ($r = -0.53$), Machiavellianism ($r = 0.57$) and psychopathy ($r = -0.72$); extraversion was positively correlated with narcissism ($r = 0.49$; Lee & Ashton, 2005). Men who engage in street harassment feel entitled to assert their power and dominance in the public sphere and may possess the impoverished emotional connectedness, disregard for moral codes, and lack of empathy for their behavioural impact on their victims as embodied in the Dark Triad traits.

Although some research on the Dark Triad traits has involved forensic populations, these three subclinical characteristics have shown great applicability to the general population (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Therefore, it would be appropriate to use the Dark Triad in this study because our population will be men from the general public. In addition, the Dark Triad traits have been positively associated with sexual harassment proclivity (Zeigler-Hill, Besser, Morag, & Campbell, 2016). Thus, the Dark Triad may have associations with street harassment that may offer explanatory power for understanding the psychological profile of the street harasser. Given the majority of men who street harass claim to do it with the intention of being complimentary or playful, it can be hypothesized that the Dark Triad traits should have less explanatory power for predicting the tendency to street harass versus the tendency to engage in sexual harassment. Personality research can shed light on the personality traits involved in shaping men's attitudes towards street and sexual harassment as well as add to the growing street harassment literature. Thus, investigating men's attitudes to street

harassment is well warranted and comparing the personality profiles of those likely to street harass versus sexually harass might shed light on why street harassment is perceived differently than sexual harassment.

Objectives

The current study seeks to make the following novel contributions to the literature on street harassment:

1. The pilot studies are meant to differentiate empirically among behaviours of street harassment and sexual harassment and aggression to gather a unique set of street harassment behavioural items to create a street harassment measure.

2. The main study is meant to use the newly created street harassment measure to profile normal and subclinical personality traits of men who have favourable and unfavourable attitudes towards street harassment.

Chapter 2

Pilot Studies

The purpose of the pilot studies was to create a street harassment measure by identifying a set of items related to street harassment. Study 1 was focused on differentiating between street harassment and sexual harassment in the workplace or school setting using a sorting task. Studies 2 and 3 moved to differentiating core elements of the behavioural items: the behaviours that illicit uncomfortable and unpleasant feelings versus sexually advancing behaviours versus aggressive behaviours using ratings generated by women and men, respectively. For reasons described below, these approaches met limited success in creating a new street harassment measure.

Study 1

The purpose of Study 1 was to create a set of preliminary behavioural items that would reflect street harassment behaviours. The objective was to examine whether women would distinguish behaviours defined as street harassment from behaviours intended to represent sexual harassment or acceptable behaviour. It is important to illustrate this differentiation in order to examine whether the theoretical definition of street harassment behaviours matches the public understanding and perception of street harassment behaviour. Women were chosen to participate in this study because the majority of victims of street harassment are female and it was believed that the potential victims' opinions should be asked to determine what behaviours are classified as "street harassment." It was hypothesized that items written for the street harassment, sexual harassment and acceptable definitions could be reliably classified as such by the judges.

Participants and Procedure

14

Fifty-eight female participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk to participate in the pilot judgement study. Amazon Mechanical Turk is a crowdsourcing site that allows individuals and businesses to post tasks for people to complete (Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2016). People can browse among existing tasks and complete them in exchange for a monetary payment set by the individual or business that posted the task. The participants were compensated with three dollars for 30 minutes of their time. The participants were between the ages of 20 and 64, with an average age of 27.88 years ($SD = 8.54$). Once recruited, the participants were redirected to SurveyMonkey to complete the actual research protocol. The participants voluntarily and anonymously completed demographic information as well as a judgement study that asked them to classify different behavioural items as either acceptable behaviour; street harassment behaviour; sexual harassment behaviour; or an "other" behaviour category.

Materials

First, the classification headings were defined for the participants as follows. Street harassment was defined as "an unwanted, one off, verbal or non-verbal, behaviour or attention forced on by a stranger that creates a hostile or offensive public environment." Sexual harassment was defined as "an unwanted verbal or physical sexual advance and/or request for sexual favours that creates a hostile or offensive work or school environment". Acceptable behaviour was defined as behaviour that is socially acceptable. An "other" category was defined as "behaviour that is not consistent with any of the three definitions".

Second, a table of specifications was derived by analyzing theoretical definitions (Logan, 2015), the literature (Kearl, 2014), and women's reports of harassment

15

behaviours that they experienced (Chundi & Corbet, 2012). The table of specifications varied along three dimensions: perpetrator identity (stranger versus acquaintance, a known individual to the victim), context (public environment versus private environment, comprising of work/school/home environments), and behaviour type (verbal behaviour versus nonverbal behaviour). Thus, a total of eight groups were created and these eight classification groups were used throughout all studies (see Table 1).

Table 1

Groups Created from the Table of Specifications

Group Types	
Stranger/Public/Verbal	Known/Public/Verbal
Stranger/Public/Nonverbal	Known/Public/Nonverbal
Stranger/Private/Verbal	Known/Private/Verbal
Stranger/Private/Nonverbal	Known/Private/Nonverbal

Third, a total of 124 behavioural items were written that varied systematically along these dimensions (e.g., "A random person winks at you as you walk on the sidewalk." – stranger/public/nonverbal; "A person you do not know winks at you while you are in your office." – stranger/private/nonverbal; A supervisor winks at you in a restaurant." – known/public/nonverbal; "A professor winks at you during a lecture." – known/private/nonverbal). It was hypothesized that the stranger/public/verbal and nonverbal items would be categorized under the street harassment definition; the known/private/verbal and nonverbal items would be categorized under the sexual harassment definition; the stranger/private/verbal and nonverbal as well as the known/public/ verbal and nonverbal items would be categorized as the "other" behavioural category.

Results and Discussion

The hypotheses were not fully met – there was little consensus in categorizing groups of items under a single definition by the female participants. For example, stranger/public/verbal behavioural items where not overwhelming sorted under the street harassment definition. We were looking to make categorical decisions and after reviewing the empirical data, it was obvious that we could force the behavioural items into one of four categories if we set a 10% limit. Thus, in order for an item to be considered categorized under street harassment, sexual harassment or acceptable behaviour, a criterion was set that at least 10% or more of the respondents would place the item in one category than in the other two categories. Of the 124 items, a total of 109 items were categorized under one of the definitions of street harassment, sexual harassment, or acceptable behaviour as per this criterion (see Table 2). There were no behavioural items categorized under the "other" category. The other 15 items did not have a consensus as to which definition they belonged under. There were six behavioural items that were leaning towards being categorized under street harassment behaviour; eight behavioural items that were leaning towards being categorized sexual harassment behaviour; and one behavioural item that was categorized under both acceptable behaviour and sexual harassment behaviour.

Contrary to the hypothesized organization of the behavioural items, 109 items were not systematically categorized in a manner that flowed from the Table of Specifications. For example, theoretically, most of the stranger/public/verbal and stranger/public/nonverbal items should have been categorized under street harassment definition because of who was conducting the behaviour and where the behaviour was taking place. However, sexual behaviours done by a stranger in a public place were

categorized under the sexual harassment definition which was expressly defined as behaviour conducted in the work or school environment.

Table 2

Study 1: Number of Items Sorted Under Each Definition and the Group Membership of those Items

Group Type	Number of Items Categorized Under Each Definition		
	Street Harassment	Sexual Harassment	Acceptable Behaviour
Stranger/Public/Verbal	7	3	4
Stranger/Public/Nonverbal	5	4	2
Stranger/Private/Verbal	5	6	3
Stranger/Private/Nonverbal	3	9	1
Known/Public/Verbal	6	5	3
Known/Public/Nonverbal	3	11	0
Known/Private/Verbal	4	9	1
Known/Private/Nonverbal	2	11	2
Total Items Categorized	35	58	16

As seen in Table 2, the classifications of behavioural items did not coincide with the definitions or with original hypotheses outlined. The reason for the participants' categorization could be that the definitions were not clear in terms of context: "public environments" in the street harassment definition could have been understood as the same as "work/school environments" in the sexual harassment definition by the participants. When looking more closely at the item categorization, the items classified under the sexual harassment definition seemed to include most of the sexually extreme items (e.g., "A colleague slaps your behind at a pub") whereas items assigned to the street harassment definition captured less extreme sexual behaviours (e.g., "A classmate tells you to 'cover yourself' in a bar") and more aggressive behaviour (e.g., "A random person swears at you in the cafeteria line"). The sexual harassment definition captured the

majority of the nonverbal behaviour whereas the street harassment definition was more likely to be associated with items reflecting verbal behaviour. When categorizing items under street or sexual harassment definitions, participants seemed to focus less on context and perpetrator type and more on the behaviours in the item. However, behavioural items categorized under acceptable behaviour appeared to be influenced more by context and perpetrator type. For example, the item "A random person beside you on the bus says that you are 'cute'" was sorted as an acceptable behaviour whereas the item "A teacher during class says you are 'stunning'" was sorted under sexual harassment. Both behaviours are commenting on the woman's appearance but done by different people in different contexts. Another example is "A lab mate blocks your path in the hallway at work", which was categorized as acceptable behaviour whereas "A random person blocks your path on the sidewalk" was sorted under the street harassment definition. Both items illustrate an individual blocking a person's path but the behaviour is done by different people in different places. In summary, it appears that the participants were influenced the most by the behaviour type within each item when sorting rather than the context or perpetrator. The participants did not categorize the items according to the specifics of the definitions outlined, overlooking context and perpetrator. The information conveyed by the behaviour when it is negative may have a greater value than the context or perpetrator information. Perhaps, the behaviour depicted in the behavioural items elicited an emotional reaction that made the participants focus more on the behaviour than the context or perpetrator. That is, the behaviours involved socially undesirable activities and sometimes threatening and illegal activities. By contrast, the contexts and the perpetrators were in and of themselves quite ordinary, for example, a classmate in a lecture hall or a

friend in a car. Emotionally significant and negative behaviours can stimulate an empathetic impact (Balconi & Bortolotti, 2014), maybe prompting individuals to focus more on the behaviour.

In order to make sense of the categorical data found in Study 1, we had to add a 10% limit in order to force categorization. The findings from this pilot study led us to question the following assumptions. It was clear from the first study that people did not see the behavioural items as falling into particular categories. Therefore, the definitions were altered to create broader, simpler classifications because the same behaviours might relate to different dimensions of the street harassment construct. Instead of having participants categorize items into different construct definitions, the street harassment definition was refined so that it would not capture behaviours that overlap with sexual harassment and aggression. Therefore, the three definitions were modified to clarify distinctions among aggressive behaviours, behaviours perceived as sexual advances, and uncomfortable and unpleasant behaviours. Furthermore, to focus on the components of street harassment that might be distinctive from sexual assault or extreme aggression, we made the following changes. The wording and language of some of the items were changed to be less extreme in social undesirability (e.g., from "An unknown bartender tells you to take your clothes off at a club" to "An unknown bartender tells you to unbutton your top at a club") and some of the extreme items were removed (e.g., "A co-worker exposes their genital briefly (i.e., flashing) at a bar").

Study 2 and Study 3

The purpose of Study 2 and Study 3 was to examine the characteristics of street harassment that overlap with sexual harassment and aggression in an attempt to extract

20

unique street harassment behaviours. Street and sexual harassment share a common thread of "unwanted sexual attention". However, street harassment does not necessarily mean that the harassment is only sexual in nature. In Study 1, the majority of the sexually explicit behaviours were categorized under the sexual harassment definition by the participants. Study 2 and Study 3 investigated whether participants, both women and men, could distinguish potential street harassment items that reflected a "grey" area of behaviours eliciting an unpleasantness or uncomfortable feeling from the more explicitly sexual items. Behavioural items viewed as more sexual in nature, more aggressive, and behaviours that illicit uncomfortable and unpleasant feelings will be teased apart. The reason for focusing on the "grey" area of behaviours is because such behaviours could possibly be identified as "complimentary" or "harmless" by men when they were the less sexual and less aggressive behavioural items. The context and perpetrator type characteristics were removed from the definition and participants were asked to rate the items according to each of the four new definitions. Furthermore, Study 2 and Study 3 was to investigate any sex differences in the ratings of the behavioural items within each definition.

Participants and Procedure

Sixty-eight female participants in Study 2 and sixty-one male participants in Study 3 were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk. Participants were compensated with three dollars for 30 minutes of their time. The female participants were between the ages of 20 and 60, with an average age of 28.60 years ($SD = 9.57$) and the male participants were between the ages of 18 and 60, with an average age of 27.48 years ($SD = 7.87$). Once recruited, the participants were redirected to SurveyMonkey to complete

21

the actual research protocols. The participants voluntarily and anonymously completed demographic information as well as a judgement study that asked them to rate the 109 items on each of four definitions.

Materials

The participants were presented with a set of revised behavioural items that were again written to reflect the eight categories reflected in the Table of Specifications. Study 2 had 108 items and Study 3 had 109 items (one item was added in category known/private/verbal; see Appendix A for a list of all behavioural items). The first definition was "comments, gestures, or actions creating an uncomfortable or unpleasant feeling"; the second definition was "comments, gestures, or actions creating an unwanted sexual advance"; the third definition was "comments, gestures, or actions that feel aggressive"; and the fourth definition was "comments, gestures, or actions that are socially acceptable." The participants rated each of the behavioural items' relationship to each of the four different definitions using a rating scale from 1 (*not at all related*) to 5 (*very related*) to allow for direct assessment of whether items were multidimensional.

Results

First, mean scores for each of the eight categories for each of the four definitions were calculated, resulting in 32 subscales. Internal consistencies were calculated for each of the eight categories, once for each definition, to assess whether the items within the eight categories reflected a common construct. As shown in Table 3, internal consistencies within a definition were high, ranging from 0.72 to 0.92 for males and from 0.77 to 0.93 for females. These values could be interpreted to mean that there is little random error in the measures and that the range of values are acceptable. Secondly, the

22

subscales within each definition were inter-correlated. The correlations among the

subscales were positive and generally high among the first three definitions ($r = 0.32$ to

0.62); these three in turn were negatively correlated with aggregated item ratings on the

"socially acceptable" fourth definition ($r = -0.06$ to -0.50).

Table 3

Study 2 (Females) and Study 3 (Males): Reliability Analyses for Each Definition Within
Each Group

Groups	Definitions	N		Cronbach's Alpha	
		Males	Females	Males	Females
Known/Public/Nonverbal	D1	51	47	.92	.87
	D2	49	47	.72	.82
	D3	49	46	.87	.88
	D4	47	45	.93	.93
Known/Public/Verbal	D1	50	43	.86	.84
	D2	51	44	.86	.83
	D3	49	44	.87	.87
	D4	49	45	.85	.84
Known/Private/Nonverbal	D1	51	47	.91	.80
	D2	51	46	.78	.77
	D3	50	42	.85	.85
	D4	44	45	.93	.91
Known/Private/Verbal	D1	51	47	.87	.90
	D2	51	47	.83	.83
	D3	52	46	.88	.89
	D4	51	47	.89	.92
Stranger/Public/Nonverbal	D1	50	47	.92	.88
	D2	49	45	.77	.82
	D3	50	45	.84	.85
	D4	49	44	.92	.92
Stranger/Public/Verbal	D1	50	48	.87	.85
	D2	50	47	.88	.84
	D3	47	43	.83	.88
	D4	48	47	.84	.87
Stranger/Private/Nonverbal	D1	49	46	.91	.87
	D2	48	44	.72	.76
	D3	51	46	.82	.87

	D4	50	47	.92	.92
Stranger/Private/Verbal	D1	52	48	.89	.87
	D2	52	48	.87	.84
	D3	50	48	.88	.89
	D4	48	46	.91	.88

Thirdly, the structure of the ratings for each of the four definitions was assessed. We took an exploratory approach in assessing the behavioural items and because of the restricted sample size relative to the number of behavioural items, the data for Study 2 and 3 were combined, removing one of the items in Study 3 so the items were identical in both data sets. Four principal component analyses (PCAs) were run on the 108 behavioural items to assess each of the four definitions. In order to balance the small sample size and the large number of items, we decided to look at stability and structure of the items across the four analyses. The first PCA was run using the ratings of the 108 behavioural items to Definition 1 which was "comments, gestures, or actions creating an uncomfortable or unpleasant feeling", the second PCA was run using the ratings of the 108 behavioural items to Definition 2 which was "comments, gestures, or actions creating an unwanted sexual advance", the third PCA was run using the ratings of the 108 behavioural items to Definition 3 which was "comments, gestures, or actions that feel aggressive", and the fourth PCA was run using the ratings of the 108 behavioural items to Definition 4 which was "comments, gestures, or actions that are socially acceptable."

Two components were extracted for each of the four definitions. For the PCA for Definition 1, the two components had eigenvalues greater than one and explained 43.8% and 11.0% of the total variance, respectively. For the PCA for Definition 2, the two components had eigenvalues greater than one and explained 25.8% and 24.5% of the total variance, respectively. For the PCA for Definition 3, the two components had

eigenvalues greater than one and explained 36.6% and 16.2% of the total variance, respectively. For the PCA for Definition 4, the two components had eigenvalues greater than one and explained 59.1% and 7.7% of the total variance, respectively. A two-component solution explained 54.7%, 50.3%, 52.8%, and 66.8% of the total variance for Definition 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. A varimax orthogonal rotation was employed to aid interpretability of each two-component solution (Pallant, 2010).

The two-component solution which best described the data were not consistent with the table of specifications which would have predicted a four component solution. The four components would have organized the behavioural items by perpetrator type and context: stranger/public, stranger/private, known/public, known/private. From assessing the behavioural items that loaded on each component, Component 1 seemed to illustrate sexually advancing and aggressive behaviours and Component 2 reflected more unwanted sexual attention. It should be noted that every one of the 108 items had a loading of at least 0.30 on one of the components. These component loadings for the rotated solutions are presented in Appendix B, C, D, and E. Moreover, the patterns of relationships among items did not differ as a function of the nature of the definition of against which the items were being rated. The behavioural items seem to lie on a continuum and cannot be sorted into separate categories as previously intended. We were not ready to eliminate any items because we still had not found the right response format – in the first study, respondents did not categorize behavioural items as we had anticipated and in the second and third study, we also questioned whether the dimensions along which we have the items rated were optimal. Thus, continuing to try to achieve the right response format, we kept the behavioural items consistent.

Discussion

The aim of the pilot studies was to compile a list of behaviours reflecting the street harassment construct in order to create a street harassment questionnaire measuring acceptability of the behaviours and their likelihood to commit the behaviours. However, when assessing the definition of street harassment, participants did not differentiate at the psychological level between either behaviours based on perpetrator identity or on the context of where the behaviour was taking place. The four principal components analyses of the 108 behavioural items were essentially replicated across ratings based on socially acceptable behaviour, sexual advances, aggression, and uncomfortable or unpleasant behaviours. The behavioural items seemed to have grouped together into two components: one group highlighted more sexual advances and aggressive behaviours whereas the other emphasized more unwanted sexual attention behaviours. The difficulty in labeling the components stemmed from the various items that loaded into each component. Within the sexual advances and aggressive group, there were many aggressive, nonsexual behaviours from cursing to spitting as well as sexual advances like touching body parts. The unwanted sexual attention group contained behavioural items typical of "catcalling" behaviours such as commenting on a women's appearance. The behavioural items sorted based on the behaviours rather than who was committing the behaviour and where it was being committed. Whereas the pilot studies were not able to gather behavioural items based on perpetrator identity and context, the PCA illustrated the similarities of street harassment and workplace sexual harassment behaviours, drawing from the underlining unwanted sexual attention component that listed items irrespective of perpetrator and context.

26

The pilot studies illustrate that neither women nor men rate the behavioural items in a manner that supports our table of specifications. They also do not rate the behaviours in a manner that represents our proposed distinction among the four definitions outlined in Study 1 nor among the four characteristics outlined in Study 2 and 3. Taken together, these studies supply no empirical evidence for the importance of perpetrator identity and context at the psychological level for individuals when thinking about harassment. However, one limitation of these pilot studies is that we have relied on participants' reports about their own behaviours. Respondents' recognize the inherent undesirability of the behaviours and are aware of what the socially acceptable response would be. There is evidence to suggest that when people report on their own behaviour, they are motivated to give the socially desirable response (Krumpal, 2013). In the next phase of the research, we will keep the same set of behaviours and examine whether distinctions can be elicited by asking whether the behaviour is equally unacceptable when the participants themselves engage in the behaviour versus someone else, such as a "friend". Presumably, individuals are more likely to have a self-positivity bias when evaluating themselves versus a third party (Leary, 2007).

The objectives of the main study are to assess differences in men's attitudes of the behavioural items used in the pilot studies and to profile normal and subclinical personality traits of men according to their ratings of acceptability of the behaviour, likelihood to commit the behaviour, and how upset they would be if a friend committed the behaviour.

People tend to possess a positive self-view of themselves and have a desire to maintain or increase the positivity of their self-concept and self-esteem (Leary, 2007). The assessment of undesirable behaviours can leave individuals susceptible to responding in terms of social desirability and impression management (Duhr & Bono, 2006) in order to maintain their positive self-image. The majority of behavioural items used in this study are undesirable; thus, the items are subject to eliciting a favourable response bias. The positive self-view of oneself reduces the ability to recognize ethical challenges and individuals are more likely to accept unethical behaviours of others if the behaviour is done gradually (Gino & Bazzerman, 2009). In our research, there is a range of behavioural items - some are more explicitly undesirable than others. Moreover, questions about the acceptability of the self versus others engaging in the behaviour will be asked in order to elicit differences between the behavioural items ratings.

The evaluation of acceptability of the behavioural items if done by others was assessed by asking participants to rate how upset they would be if the behaviour was done by a friend. The self-reporting of acceptability was done by directly asking how acceptable the participants believed the behaviours were for them to do themselves. It

was hypothesized that the mean acceptability ratings and the mean ratings of how upset the participant would be if a friend committed the behaviour would differ significantly because individuals possess a self-positivity bias when evaluating themselves versus evaluating others. Since the pilot studies were unable to produce a unique set of street harassment behaviours, the current purpose of the main study is to relate personality traits to self and ratings of others on the behavioural items. The importance of profiling men's personality is to further understand the personality of men who have favourable or unfavourable opinions on items related to harassing women.

Participants, Procedures, and Materials

Two hundred twenty-nine male participants were recruited via Mechanical Turk to participate in this study – one participant identified as female and her data was removed from the analysis. Participants were compensated with three dollars for 30 minutes of their time. The participants were between the ages of 18 and 66, with an average age of 33.84 years ($SD = 8.98$). The participants voluntarily and anonymously completed demographic information, they answered three questions for each of 107 behavioural items, and they filled out two personality questionnaires. The participants were asked to answer these three questions about the behavioural items: "How upset would you feel if your friend did this behaviour?", "How likely would you be to do this behaviour?" and "How acceptable would you consider this behaviour to be?" The participants rated each of these questions on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*) in relation to each of the behaviour items. The two personality questionnaires were: The HEXACO Personality Inventory and the Short Dark Triad, which respectively assess normal and sub-clinical personality traits.

The HEXACO Personality Inventory – 60 item scale (HEXACO–60; Ashton & Lee, 2009b). The HEXACO-60 is a self-report measure that corresponds to the six personality dimensions identified in the HEXACO model: honesty/humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, consciousness, and openness (Lee & Ashton, 2004). Items such as "People often call me a perfectionist" are ranked on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scale. The internal consistency reliabilities are reported to range from .89 (conscientiousness) to .92 (honesty-humility; Lee & Ashton, 2004).

Dark Triad of Personality – 27 item scale (D3-Short; Paulhus, 2013). The D3-Short is a self-report measure that corresponds to the three personality traits identified in the Dark Triad model: Machiavellianism, Psychopathy, and Narcissism. Items such as "It's not wise to tell your secrets" are ranked on a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) scale. The internal consistency reliabilities are reported as .77 (narcissism), .78 (Machiavellianism), and .80 (psychopathy) based on a sample of undergraduate students (Paulhus & Jones, 2011).

Results

As done previously, the structure of the ratings for each of the three questions surrounding the behavioural item was assessed. Three principal component analyses (PCAs) were run. The first PCA was run using the responses to the question "How upset would you feel if your friend did this behaviour?" (The Upset Question) across the 107 behavioural items, the second PCA was run using the responses to the question "How likely would you be to do this behaviour?" (the Likelihood Question) across the 107 behavioural items, and the third PCA was run using the responses to the question "How acceptable would you consider this behaviour to be?" (the Acceptability Question) across

the 107 behavioural items. The suitability of PCA was assessed prior to analyses.

Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that all behavioural items in all three PCAs

had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. The Kaiser Meyer-Olkin (KMO)

measure is an index indicating whether there is a linear relationship between the

behavioural items. All of the KMO measures were above 0.8 indicating the sampling

adequacy as 'meritorious' according to Kaiser (1974). The overall KMO measure for the

Upset Question was 0.89, for the Likelihood Question the KMO was 0.85, and for

Acceptability Question the KMO was 0.81. All three Bartlett's Tests of Sphericity were

statistically significant ($p < .001$), illustrating that the data sets were likely factorizable.

We extracted two and three components because the solutions accounted for at

least 50% of the overall variance. Then we compared the two component and three

component solutions for interpretability and found that a two-component solution was

substantially more interpretable. Thus, we present the two components extracted for each

of the three questions. For the PCA for the Upset Question, the two components had

eigenvalues greater than one and explained 43.8% and 11.6% of the total variance,

respectively. For the PCA for the Likelihood Question, the two components had

eigenvalues greater than one and explained 48.5% and 10.1% of the total variance,

respectively. For the PCA for the Acceptability Question, the two components had

eigenvalues greater than one and explained 39.1% and 12.1% of the total variance,

respectively. A two-component solution explained 55.4%, 58.7% and 51.2% of the total

variance for the Upset Question, the Likelihood Question, and the Acceptability

Question, respectively. A varimax orthogonal rotation was employed to aid

interpretability of the two-component solutions (Pallant, 2010).

Similar to the pilot studies, the two-component solution which best described the data was not consistent with the table of specifications which would have predicted a four-component solution. For the PCA to provide evidence supportive of the table of specifications, four components would have been expected and the behavioural items would have been organized by perpetrator type and context: stranger/public, stranger/private, known/public, known/private. Had the behavioural items organized by perpetrator type and context, it would have given empirical support to the theoretical distinction of the street harassment definition. Moreover, the same two-component solution emerged for the 107 behavioural items for each of the three questions. The items that had the highest loadings on Component 1 reflected highly undesirable behaviours that were aggressive and sexually advancing. Component 2 was loaded by behaviours reflecting unwanted sexual attention. Component loadings of the rotated solutions are presented in Appendix F, G, and H.

In order to make sure that the two-component solution across the questions were similar, a correlation analysis was run. The behavioural items loadings on each component across the three questions were correlated in order to assess the relationship between all six components. There were high positive correlations between the aggressive and the sexually advancing behavioural items across all three questions. There were high positive correlations between the unwanted sexual attention behavioural items across all three questions. There were high negative correlations between the aggressive and the sexually advancing behavioural items and the unwanted sexual attention behavioural items across the three questions (see Table 4). These correlations indicate

that the components across the three questions are similar, illustrating that there were no differences in behavioural item ratings across the three questions.

Table 4

A Pearson Correlation of the Components Across the Three Questions

	Q1 – C1	Q1 – C2	Q2 – C1	Q2 – C2	Q3 – C1
Q1 – C2	.689*				
Q2 – C1	.975*	.660*			
Q2 – C2	.728*	.878*	.762*		
Q3 – C1	.975*	.687*	.969*	.751*	
Q3 – C2	.739*	.917*	.734*	.927*	.777*

Note: Q1 = "How upset would you feel if your friend did this behaviour?", Q2 = "How likely would you be to do this behaviour?", Q3 = "How acceptable would you consider this behaviour to be?", C1 = Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behaviours, C2 = Unwanted Sexual Attention Behaviours
*$p < 0.001$

For each of the 202 participants, component scores were calculated on both components for each of the three PCAs – namely, the Upset Question, the Likelihood Question, and the Acceptability Question resulting in six component scores. Six paired t-tests were conducted in order to compare the component means. The Upset Question was reversed coded in order to align with the other two questions. For the sexual advances and aggressive behavioural items, there were significant differences in mean responses ($p < 0.001$) between the Upset Question, the Acceptability Question, and the Likelihood Question. The participants reported the sexual advances and aggressive behavioural items as very unacceptable ($M = 1.56$, $SD = 0.75$), moderately upsetting if a friend committed the behaviours ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 1.10$), and they would be very unlikely to engage in such behaviours ($M = 1.37$, $SD = 0.78$). The component mean frequency distribution for the Upset Question was positively distributed and mesokurtic, the Acceptability Question

was positively skewed and platykurtic, and the Likelihood Question was positively skewed and platykurtic.

For the unwanted sexual attention behavioural items, there were significant differences in mean responses ($p < 0.001$) between the Upset Question, the Acceptability Question, and the Likelihood Question. The participants reported the unwanted sexual attention behavioural items as slightly unacceptable ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 1.00$), probably unlikely to commit ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.02$), and indifferent if a friend committed the behaviours ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.13$). The participants' ratings were below the midpoint of the rating scale across all questions for the unwanted sexual attention behaviours, implying borderline impartiality to unwanted sexual attention behavioural items. The component mean frequency distributions for all three questions were normally distributed.

Six multiple regressions were run using the component scores calculated previously as the dependent variables and the personality traits as the independent variables to predict the ratings of the three questions on the personality traits. There was an inspection of the correlation matrix and there seemed to be no evidence of multicollinearity. The multiple regression for ratings on being upset with their friend if they committed the sexual advances and aggressive behaviours was statistically significant, $F(9, 145) = 6.246$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.279$; specifically, scores were predicted by positive Openness, Agreeableness, and Machiavellianism and negative Psychopathy (see Table 5). The multiple regression for ratings on being upset with their friend if they committed the unwanted sexual attention behaviours was statistically significant, $F(9, 145) = 3.864$, $p < 0.001$, $R^2 = 0.193$; specifically, scores were predicted by positive

Psychopathy and negative Machiavellianism (see Table 6). The multiple regression for ratings on likelihood of committing the sexual advances and aggressive behaviours was statistically significant, $F(9, 149) = 5.748, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.258$; specifically, scores were predicted by positive Psychopathy and negative Openness, Conscientiousness, and Machiavellianism (see Table 7). The multiple regression for ratings on likelihood of committing the unwanted sexual attention behaviours was statistically significant, $F(9, 149) = 5.609, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.253$; however, there were no significant personality trait predictors (see Table 8). The multiple regression for ratings on acceptability of sexual advances and aggressive behaviours was statistically significant, $F(9, 134) = 5.601, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.273$; specifically, scores were predicted by positive Psychopathy and negative Openness and Conscientiousness (see Table 9). The multiple regression ratings on acceptability of unwanted sexual attention behaviours was statistically significant, $F(9, 134) = 4.914, p < 0.001, R^2 = 0.248$; specifically, scores were predicted by positive Machiavellianism (see Table 10).

Table 5

Multiple Regression of the Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behavioural Items Ratings of the Upset Question on the Personality Traits

Personality Traits	*B*	*SE B*	ß	*t*	*p*
Openness	0.032	0.010	0.251	3.181	0.002
Conscientiousness	0.026	0.013	0.171	1.954	0.053
Agreeableness	0.023	0.011	0.176	1.983	0.049
Extraversion	-0.006	0.012	-0.053	-0.487	0.627
Emotionality	0.001	0.011	0.007	0.075	0.940
Honesty/Humility	-0.004	0.013	-0.029	-0.288	0.774
Machiavellianism	0.029	0.013	0.209	2.130	0.035
Narcissism	-0.005	0.015	-0.034	-0.314	0.754
Psychopathy	-0.044	0.016	-0.282	-2.835	0.005

Table 6

Multiple Regression of the Unwanted Sexual Attention Behavioural Items Ratings of the

Upset Question on the Personality Traits

Personality Traits	*B*	*SE B*	ß	*t*	*p*
Openness	0.003	0.011	0.025	0.300	0.765
Conscientiousness	-0.026	0.015	-0.161	-1.733	0.085
Agreeableness	0.015	0.013	0.104	1.108	0.270
Extraversion	-0.008	0.014	-0.065	-0.555	0.579
Emotionality	0.001	0.013	0.006	0.062	0.951
Honesty/Humility	0.017	0.015	0.119	1.111	0.268
Machiavellianism	-0.048	0.015	-0.323	-3.120	0.002
Narcissism	-0.013	0.017	-0.088	-0.781	0.436
Psychopathy	0.045	0.018	0.269	2.550	0.012

Table 7

Multiple Regression of the Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behavioural Items Ratings of

the Likelihood Question on the Personality Trait

Personality Traits	*B*	*SE B*	ß	*t*	*p*
Openness	-0.028	0.01	-0.209	-2.696	0.008
Conscientiousness	-0.036	0.014	-0.222	-2.604	0.010
Agreeableness	0.002	0.012	0.017	0.196	0.845
Extraversion	0.009	0.013	0.076	0.686	0.494
Emotionality	0.004	0.011	0.034	0.396	0.693
Honesty/Humility	0.002	0.014	0.018	0.182	0.856
Machiavellianism	-0.029	0.014	-0.201	-2.056	0.041
Narcissism	-0.008	0.016	-0.053	-0.483	0.630
Psychopathy	0.065	0.015	0.396	4.186	0.001

Table 8

Multiple Regression of the Unwanted Sexual Attention Behavioural Items Ratings of the

Likelihood Question on the Personality Traits

Personality Traits	*B*	*SE B*	ß	*t*	*p*
Openness	-0.016	0.010	-0.118	-1.514	0.132
Conscientiousness	0.008	0.014	0.048	0.566	0.572
Agreeableness	0.008	0.012	0.059	0.667	0.506

Extraversion	0.025	0.013	0.216	1.943	0.054
Emotionality	0.007	0.011	0.057	0.653	0.515
Honesty/Humility	-0.016	0.013	-0.122	-1.206	0.230
Machiavellianism	0.027	0.014	0.187	1.902	0.059
Narcissism	0.029	0.016	0.202	1.841	0.068
Psychopathy	0.001	0.015	0.006	0.066	0.947

Table 9

Multiple Regression of the Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behavioural Items Ratings of

the Acceptable Question on the Personality Traits

Personality Traits	*B*	*SE B*	*ß*	*t*	*p*
Openness	-0.026	0.011	-0.186	-2.344	0.021
Conscientiousness	-0.052	0.015	-0.314	-3.467	0.001
Agreeableness	0.006	0.012	0.043	0.478	0.634
Extraversion	0.023	0.013	0.187	1.705	0.091
Emotionality	0.014	0.012	0.105	1.194	0.235
Honesty/Humility	0.024	0.014	0.177	1.750	0.082
Machiavellianism	-0.001	0.015	-0.005	-0.045	0.964
Narcissism	0.004	0.016	0.029	0.264	0.792
Psychopathy	0.057	0.017	0.340	3.302	0.001

Table 10

Multiple Regression of the Unwanted Sexual Attention Behavioural Items Ratings of the

Acceptable Question on the Personality Traits

Personality Traits	*B*	*SE B*	*ß*	*t*	*p*
Openness	-0.016	0.011	-0.120	-1.490	0.139
Conscientiousness	0.014	0.015	0.089	0.964	0.337
Agreeableness	0.003	0.012	0.023	0.250	0.803
Extraversion	0.008	0.013	0.069	0.620	0.536
Emotionality	0.009	0.012	0.067	0.747	0.456
Honesty/Humility	-0.007	0.014	-0.054	-0.523	0.602
Machiavellianism	0.058	0.015	0.402	3.827	0.001
Narcissism	0.022	0.016	0.152	1.385	0.168
Psychopathy	-0.012	0.017	-0.076	-0.721	0.472

Discussion

      The objectives of the main study are to assess differences in attitudes on the list of behavioural items and to profile normal and subclinical personality traits of men who have favourable and unfavourable ratings towards the behavioural items. The first hypothesis anticipated there to be differences between the ratings of others (The Upset Question) and self-ratings (The Acceptability and Likelihood Questions) questions across the behavioural items. Mean comparisons illustrated that there were significant differences between the ratings of others and self-rating questions for both unwanted sexual attention behaviours and for sexual advances and aggressive behaviours. Men seem to be less strict with their friends than they are with themselves, indicating that they would be unlikely to commit the behaviours and perceive them as unacceptable but are a bit more tolerant if their friend committed those same behaviours. The differences between the ratings of others and self-ratings could imply differences in the perception of harassment. This finding could be the reason why men are more likely to harass women in groups, being more tolerant of the harassment if a friend commits it. Men reported the sexual advances and aggressive behaviours as very unacceptable, moderately upsetting if a friend committed the behaviours, and they would be very unlikely to engage in such behaviours. However, men reported the unwanted sexual attention behaviours as slightly unacceptable, probably unlikely to commit, and indifferent if a friend committed the behaviours. The lenience on unwanted sexual behaviour could stem from the type of behaviours the men were rating. Research has outlined that there are larger differences in the way men and women perceive hostile environment sexual harassment (e.g., gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention) relative to quid pro quo sexual harassment

(Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001). Unwanted sexual attention is a common behaviour that links sexual harassment and street harassment together; and this lenience on unwanted sexual behaviour could be understood as why some men view street harassment behaviours as harmless and "complimentary" (Quinn, 2002).

The second objective was to assess men's personality traits in relation to their attitudes on the behavioural items. From the HEXACO personality traits, Openness and Conscientiousness traits were negatively related to the acceptability ratings, the likelihood of committing sexually advancing and aggressive behaviours, and Openness and Agreeableness traits were positively related to how upset the respondent would be if a friend engaged in the sexually advancing and aggressive behaviour. The finding that individuals who were low in Openness reported they were likely to commit the sexual advances and aggressive behavioural items is consistent with the Larrimer-Scherbaum and Popovich (2001) finding of the Openness trait of the Five Factor Model being negatively related with the likelihood to sexually harass scale. The rationalization for this finding was related to the authoritarian facet of the Openness personality trait – authoritarian men presumably feel more dominant over women and consider it is more acceptable to harass and are more likely to harass (Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003; Pryor 1987). Furthermore, the finding that Conscientiousness was negatively related to the likelihood to commit sexual advances and aggressive behaviour is consistent with Pryor and Meyers' (2000) finding of Conscientiousness trait of the Five Factor Model is a significant negative predictor of the likelihood to sexually harass scale.

For the subclinical personality traits, Psychopathy and Machiavellianism were significant predictors of the likelihood to commit the behaviour and of being upset with a

friend if a friend committed the sexual advance or aggressive behavioural items. Only Psychopathy was a significant predictor of acceptability attitudes towards the sexual advance or aggressive behavioural items. Psychopathy and Machiavellianism traits were also significant predictors of reporting being upset with a friend who committed the unwanted sexual attention behaviours. Furthermore, only the Machiavellianism trait was a significant predictor of those who found unwanted sexual attention behaviours to be acceptable. These findings were similar to Zeigler-Hill, Besser, Morag, and Campbell (2016) who found Psychopathy, Machiavellianism as well as Narcissism had positive associations with sexual harassment proclivity in men. These findings illustrate how those likely to engage and find sexual advances and aggressive behaviours acceptable are also reporting deficiencies in affect, are impulsive, and manipulative. Narcissism not being a significant predictor for the sexual advances and aggressive behaviours makes sense because narcissists are more concerned with themselves and tend to put other people down. Since majority of street harassment is not done with the intent to humiliate their victims, narcissism would not be characteristic of a typical street harasser.

In summary, the main study found that both elements of Dark Traits and the HEXACO personality traits can be used to shed light on characteristics of men holding certain attitudes about sexual advances, aggressive, and unwanted sexual attention behavioural items. The current research could not develop a specific street harassment measure based on perpetrator identity and context although the behavioural items did load the components in a predictable and interpretable fashion. The findings suggest that psychologically, individuals do not define street harassment behaviour based on not knowing who the perpetrator is and whether the behaviour is taking place in the public

realm.

Chapter 4

General Discussion

Hollerback!, an online, grass-roots organization fighting for the rights of women to walk down the street safely, has published hundreds of thousands of women's reports of street harassment from all over the world. Street harassment is a global phenomenon seen in such varied places as Australia, where 91% of women (n = 1426) reported experiencing physical or verbal harassment (Johnson & Bennett, 2015), Afghanistan, where 93% of women (n = 321) reported experiencing street harassment (WCLRF, 2015), and Egypt, where 85% of women report experiencing some type of street harassment in the past year (Shoukry, Hassan, & Komsan, 2008). When reading about women's experiences, one can sense the everyday struggle, and at times the horror, of simply being present in the public sphere. However, not all women's experiences of street harassment are the same, with social markers such as racialization and sexuality manifesting street harassment in different ways, thus, creating difference experiences and different types of harassment (Chubin, 2014). Women's various experiences of street harassment is one of the issues adding difficulty in defining the concept of street harassment.

The literature has not produced a single street harassment definition, with researchers using various terms such as "stranger harassment" (Davidson, Gervais, & Sherd, 2013), "sexual harassment in public" (Lenton, Smith, Fox, & Morra, 1999), and "street hassling" (Kelly, 1988) to refer to the same phenomenon. Nonetheless, the general defining characteristics of the various terms involve the identity of the perpetrator and the location of where the harassment takes place – strangers harassing other strangers in the

public sphere (Bowman, 1993; Kissling, 1991; Darnell & Cook, 2009). The broadness of the definition opens the door for various types of behaviours to be considered street harassment. Researchers have described street harassment behaviours that range on a broad continuum of severity, from catcalling to sexual assault (Kelly, 1988; Gardner, 1995). Women's various experiences, the lack of a definitive term, and vague definitions have made it difficult for researchers to measure the phenomenon and there is currently no empirically supported measure to measure street harassment. Thus, the first objective of the study was to examine whether there were specific behaviours, perpetrated by certain people, in certain contexts, that would be more likely identified as street harassment for use in the creation of a street harassment measure.

Objective 1: Creation of Street Harassment Measure

The first objective of my research was to list behavioural items to create a street harassment measure and to distinguish street harassment behaviours from sexual harassment in the workplace and from aggressive behaviours. However, I was unsuccessful in developing the street harassment measure I had conceptualized and in identifying consensus on which behavioural items are street harassment behaviours. The behavioural items were written based on a table of specifications that varied across three dimensions: perpetrator identity, context, and behavioural type. The behavioural items thought to be labeled under street harassment were hypothesized to be done by a stranger in the public sphere, based on the theoretical definition of street harassment. However, the behavioural items did not group together based on perpetrator identity or context. In the first study, participants did not focus on the context or perpetrator when categorizing the behavioural items. Anything relating to a sexual act was categorized as sexual

harassment even if the behaviour was done by a stranger in public. When multiple principal component analyses were conducted in the pilot studies and main study, the behavioural items seemed to group together based on the behaviours' severity. Two components consistently emerged: various types of ratings of the behavioural items emerged with orthogonal components that were defined as "sexual advances and aggressive behaviours" and "unwanted sexual attention behaviour". These findings illustrate that our samples of individuals do not think about harassing behaviours depending on context or who is doing the harassing – the majority of attention is specific to the behaviour being done.

The difficulty in identifying behavioural items that reflect street harassment as commonly understood in the literature could stem from the very conceptualization of street harassment. The literature has outlined the importance of perpetrator identity and the context of harassing behaviour (MacMillan, Nierobisz, & Welsh, 2000); however, the current data does not support this argument. From this, a table of specifications was explicitly organized for harassing behaviours based on distinctions between stranger versus non-stranger and whether the harassment occurred in the public sphere or in an achievement setting (e.g., work or school; Logan, 2015). Yet, across the pilot studies and the main study using various types of ratings, the two principal components were interpreted as a group of sexual advances and aggressive behaviours and a group of unwanted sexual attention behaviours. There are multiple complex theoretical conceptualizations of sexual violence, with different conceptual classifications of behaviours (Brown & Walklate, 2012) underscoring the difficulty in organizing and defining sexual and street harassment behaviours. Moreover, the difficulty in

44

differentiating the behavioural items reflecting street harassment and reflecting sexual harassment is because street harassment maybe a type of sexual harassment. Street harassment relates to the definition of unwanted sexual attention (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Gardner, 1995) which is a category of sexual harassment; thus, it's difficult distinguish the behaviours because they are essentially the same types of behaviours occurring in different settings by different perpetrators. This overlap in definition could be the reason why some behavioural items loaded on an "unwanted sexual attention behaviours" component.

The failure to meet the first objective could also stem from a practical problem related to how the items were written. A substantial number of sexual harassment measures are written in a scenario style questionnaire, with a workplace or school scenario setting the scene for the follow up questions (Fisher, Davis, Yarber, & Davis, 2010). The current study's behavioural items were written as one sentence items, explaining the type of behaviour done, by whom, and where the behaviour takes place. Perhaps this item style does not give enough information on the context or on the relationship of the perpetrator to the victim; thus, participants only focus on the behaviour conducted. Other street harassment measures are written by asking participants if they have experienced a list of behaviours perpetrated by a stranger (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008) or if it's acceptable to make an unsolicited, unreciprocated, and unnecessary comment to a woman in various situations (Darnell & Cook, 2009). In future research, perhaps street harassment items could be written in a way to highlight context or emphasize the difference between stranger or non-stranger.

When assessing the principal component analyses, there were multiple items that double loaded on both the sexually advancing and aggressive behaviours component and on the unwanted sexual attention component. Specifically, setting a criterion of .30 as the minimum size for a loading, we determined that 51% of the items double loaded on the Upset Question ratings, 36% of the items double loaded on the Likelihood Question ratings, and 30% of the items double loaded on the Acceptability Question ratings (see Appendix F, G, and H). Arguably, the double loadings of many items on both factors could be indicative of a one component model illustrating a single, underlying continuum of harassing behaviour. We performed an interpretive exercise where we removed the double loaded items and examined the content of those items that clearly loaded the first or the second component. However, the items that loaded only Component 1 still reflected largely sexually advancing and aggressive behaviour; the items that loaded only Component 2 were still unwanted sexual attention behaviours. There was a hint that one or the other component might reflect a method factor, that is, the highest loadings were associated with the actor "saying," "telling" or otherwise verbalizing something to the woman. However, this was not consistent across the three principal components analyses and ultimately, we abandoned further interpretation. The empirical evidence showing an organization of the behavioural items into sexual advancements and aggressive behaviours and into unwanted sexual attention behaviours illustrate that men view behaviours differently than in terms of perpetrator type and context, as we had expected. Of particular interest, the unwanted sexual attention behaviours that loaded onto the second component may represent the intersection between street and sexual harassment and may provide empirical support for the conceptualization of a continuum when

speaking about street and sexual harassment. Furthermore, the second component was retained because it explained more variance than 5% to 10% of the total variance which has been suggested as a minimum criterion (Lund & Lund, 2013); and the content of the behavioural items in each of the components describe distinguishably different behaviours. Therefore, the two-component model of harassment was deemed acceptable to be used to explore the research's second objective.

Objective 2: Personality Traits and Harassment Attitudes

The second objective of the study aimed to relate men's attitudes on the two-component model of harassment to their normal and subclinical personality traits. The importance of relating men's personality traits to harassment attitudes is to be able to profile the characteristics of men who hold favourable or unfavourable harassment attitudes to better understand who is more likely to harass. Exploring subclinical and normal personality traits is essential because harassment behaviour is deemed socially unacceptable relative to normal social interactions even though harassment is prevalent among everyday relations in most areas of life. Thus, it is important to assess whether distinctive personality traits relate differently to various attitudes held for differing harassment behaviours.

The current study found the same pattern of personality relationships across all three indices of the propensity to consider sexual advancement and aggressive behaviour acceptable: tolerance of sexual advancements and aggressive behaviours was related to a lack of Conscientious and of Openness and the presence of Psychopathic tendencies. These findings mean men who are unreliable, conventional and ignore usual moral codes are more likely to approve of, to engage in, and to not be upset when others engage in

harassing behaviours. Although there were no normal personality traits that were significant predictors of men's acceptance of unwanted sexual attention attitudes, there were two significant subclinical traits. The personality relationships across the tendency to accept and not to be upset when observing others engage in unwanted sexual behaviours was related to a presence of Psychopathic and Machiavellian tendencies. These findings suggest that men who lack empathy and believe in interpersonal manipulation find unwanted sexual attention behaviours acceptable and are untroubled when others engage in such behaviours. There were some similarities and differences between current study's results and other personality studies.

Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Honesty/Humility traits were found to have positive associations with sexual harassment proclivity (Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003; Zeigler-Hill, Besser, Morag, & Campbell, 2016) and Machiavellianism has been associated with sexually coercive behaviour (McHoskey, 1995). Furthermore, in terms of aggression, Psychopathy was positively associated with physical aggression, Machiavellianism was positively associated with hostility, Narcissism was negatively associated with hostility and all three Dark triad traits are associated with dispositional aggression and were positive predictors of proactive relational aggression (Barlett, 2016; Knight, 2016). There has been little research done relating the HEXACO model of personality to aggression; however, one study found that low levels of Honesty/Humility and Agreeableness were predictive of utilization of proactive and reactive relational aggression (Knight, 2016). The similar findings illustrate that the behavioural items written for the present study share overlapping similarities to other measures of sexual harassment and different types of aggression. Furthermore, the differences in findings

with other personality studies, specifically Honesty/Humility and Narcissism not being significant predictors in the current study, could be because of the way the items were written in a recurrent and not a contextual style.

The Dark Triad traits are aversive characteristics; however, they still pertain to individuals within the normal range of functioning (Furnham, Richards, & Paulhus, 2013). Males consistently tend to be higher scorers on the Dark Triad (Furnham & Trickey, 2011), which could be one of the reasons why men are more likely to engage in different types of harassment than women. Individuals who are high on the Dark Triad tend to use more short-term mating strategies (Jonason, Li, Webster, & Schmitt, 2009) and sexual harassment could be another mating strategy that males employ to allow them to exploit particular niches in society (Furnham, Richards, & Paulhus, 2013; Zeigler-Hill, Besser, Morag, & Campbell, 2016). The Honesty/Humility factor is highly correlated with the Dark Triad traits (Lee & Ashton, 2005); yet in the current study, Honesty/Humility was interestingly not a significant predictor of sexual harassment tendency. The reason for this could be because the significance of Honesty/Humility found in other studies was specific to sexual harassment in the workplace, especially quid pro quo sexual harassment (Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003). The behavioural items in the current study did not highlight quid pro quo sexual harassment but more unwanted sexual attention behaviours. Therefore, there could be personality trait differences when it comes to assessing distinct types of sexual harassment, including street harassment.

Personality studies of men's attitudes to harassment are important because personality profiling can help to characterize men who are high risk for participating in harassment and may have relevance to intervention and to preventing toxic environments

49

in achievement settings and in the public sphere. It is crucial to develop a culture, whether within an organization or within society at large, that is intolerant of harassment. Preventative and interventional models in workplace or educational settings outline multi-level proactive steps in preventing and intervening with sexual harassment: implementing proper policies and procedures, educating employees, monitoring complaints, rehabilitating, and following-up when harassment occurs (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2010). Moreover, identifying men who are at high risk of harassment is important in terms of educational training. Sexual harassment prevention workshops are beneficial in increasing knowledge about sexual harassment (Campbell, Kramer, Woolman, Staecker, Visker, & Cox, 2013) and men who are more likely to sexually harass benefit more from prevention training than men who are not likely to sexually harass (Perry, Kulik, & Schmidtke, 1998). Thus, it is important to target those who are more likely to commit sexual harassment and using personality traits could be a means of identifying those men (Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003). Furthermore, intervention by bystanders in the workplace has been shown to prevent further harassment and redress harm (McDonald, Charlesworth, & Graham, 2016). Whereas implementing complicated preventative and intervention models in the public sphere is difficult, bystanders' intervention is more achievable. Thus, it is important to encourage individuals to speak up when witnessing harassment. Bystander intervention illustrates that the harassment behaviour is not acceptable and not tolerated within society.

Another objective of the main study was to investigate whether there were differences in men's attitudes of harassing behaviours that pertain to the self versus to others. The harassment behavioural items in the current study are mostly socially

undesirable behaviours and it was believed that men might respond in a socially desirable manner. The present results showed that there were differences between acceptability of oneself conducting the behaviour versus when a friend conducted the behaviour. Social desirability bias could be influencing the differences in self-ratings and ratings of others – with individuals being more biased with themselves versus with a friend. Furthermore, self-positivity bias could be influencing the rating differences (Leary, 2007), in that the self-positivity literature indicates that we are predisposed to see ourselves as "better than average" and hence, less likely to engage in undesirable behaviour than others. Studying the factors that influence acceptability attitudes is important because this could lead to a better understanding of why men engage in harassment behaviours and do not intervene when other men engage in harassment. If there is a better understanding of where lenient attitudes towards harassment stems from, then education can be implemented in order to change those attitudes and thus encouraging more men to step in and stop harassment when witnessed.

Limitations and Future Research

Similar to all research studies, the current work has limitations that need to be noted. This study implemented self-report methodology which has limitations, particularly when asking about socially undesirable behaviours. Social desirability bias could have influenced participants' ratings on all constructs resulting in higher observed relationships driven by a response bias and not by the content of the constructs themselves. Alternatively, social desirability may have only affected some of the measures that we were using, obscuring the relationships of the constructs of interest. In future research, in order to better draw associations between personality traits and

51

harassing attitudes, social desirability should be assessed directly and be statistically controlled for. In future research, perhaps assessing actual perpetrators of harassment would be beneficial in drawing associations between personality traits and harassing attitudes. Furthermore, Mechanical Turk was used to collect the data which has its advantages as well as disadvantages. Mechanical Turk limits experimenter influence and can lessen social desirability bias due to lack of direct person contact and can gather a more diverse sample in terms of age and socioeconomic status than a university sample (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2012; Paolacci, Chandler, & Ipeirotis, 2010). However, there is lack of environmental control and participants can be multitasking while filling out a survey. The positives of Mechanical Turk seem to out weight the consequences of using such a medium for collecting data for the current research. The correlational nature of the data prevents a causal understanding between tendency to engage in harassment behaviours and personality traits. The data cannot infer causality in terms of suggesting that certain personality variables cause individuals to harass or that harassment causes certain personality traits. There could also be other variables that are moderating the relationship between personality traits and harassment proclivity that the current study does not assess. Future research should assess potential mediators, for example, misogynistic attitudes and hyper-masculinity, in relating personality traits to harassing tendencies.

The failure to develop a street harassment questionnaire raises some significant questions related to defining and measuring the street harassment construct. The literature suggests the theoretical uniqueness of street harassment, namely, that it is stranger harassment in the public sphere. However, empirically through this study, there is no

evidence to support that context or perpetrator identity matters, at least at the psychological level, to individuals assessing harassing behaviours. The behavioural valence, that is, the built in or intrinsic aversiveness of the behaviour, seems to be of most importance in determining the underlying factor structure of the items. The definitions and categorizations of harassment perhaps should solely be based on behavioural valence. Alternatively, perhaps our study failed to operationalize the concepts of perpetrator or context correctly. Previous research questionnaires have expressly embodied perpetrator identity and context in the question format. Future studies could attempt a different questionnaire style that could be better suited for a street harassment measure, for example, more scenario type questions verses individual items, in order to better contextualize the situation and give more information on the perpetrators identity.

Finally, although the phenomenon of people being harassed in a public space by a stranger is substantial, defining this construct continues to be a challenge given the blurry line between harassment and acceptable behaviour is subjective. The subjectivity in determining harassing behaviour became apparent when we tried to label the behavioural components. The first component had a lot of physical harassing behaviours with some obvious offensive speech and the second component had some verbal harassment but also what appeared to be "complimenting" behaviours, like calling a woman beautiful or saying she has a nice body. The difficulty with labeling these behaviours reflects the subjective nature of assessing what is considered harassment. This definitional issue is problematic for researchers and is also complicated for the general public, where certain behaviours can appear like compliments, perhaps to the one "complimenting", but can be taken as harassment at the receiving end. Future studies should strive for a better

understanding about what individuals consider acceptable social interactions, especially

in the public sphere.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 27-51. Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.proxy.queensu.ca/docview/205753750?accountid=6180

Ashton, M., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11*, 150-166. doi: 10.1177/1088868306294907

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009a). An investigation of personality types within the HEXACO personality framework. *Journal of Individual Differences, 30*, 181-187. doi: 10.1027/1614-0001.30.4.181

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009b). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340-345. doi: 10.1080/00223890902935878

Balconi, M., & Bortolotti, A. (2014). Self-report, personality and autonomic system modulation in response to empathic conflictual versus non conflictual situation. *Cognition & Emotion, 28*(1), 153-162. doi:10.1080/02699931.2013.805685

Barlett, C. P. (2016). Exploring the correlations between emerging adulthood, dark triad traits, and aggressive behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences, 101*, 293-298. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.05.061

Baron, R. A., & Richardson, D. R. (1994). *Human aggression* (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum Press.

Bernard, C., & Schlaffer, E. (1984). The man in the streets: Why he harasses. In A. M. Jaggar & P. S. Rothenberg (Eds.), *Feminist Frameworks* (pp. 70-72). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical turk. *Political Analysis, 20*(3), 351–368. doi:10.1093/pan/mpr057.

Bowman, C. G. (1993). Street harassment and the informal ghettoization of women. *Harvard Law Review, 106*(3), 517-580.

Brown, J., & Walklate, S. (2012). *Handbook on sexual violence*. New York; London: Routledge.

Campbell, C., Kramer, A., Woolman, K., Staecker, E., Visker, J., & Cox, C. (2013). Effects of a brief pilot sexual harassment prevention workshop on employees' knowledge. *Workplace Health & Safety, 61*(10), 425-428. doi:10.3928/21650799-20130925-26

Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in machiavellianism*. New York: Academic 502 Press.

Chubin, F. (2014). You may smother my voice, but you will hear my silence: An autoethnography on street sexual harassment, the discourse of shame and women's resistance in Iran. *Sexualities, 17*(1-2), 176-193.

Chundi, P., & Corbet, A. (2012). Analyzing sentiments from street harassment stories. Paper presented at the 35-36. doi:10.1145/2390131.2390146

Cooke, D. J., & Michie, C. (2001). Refining the construct of psychopath: Towards a hierarchical model. *Psychological Assessment, 13*(2), 171-188. doi:10.1037//1040-3590.13.2.171

Darnell, D. A., & Cook, S. L. (2009). Investigating the utility of the film war zone in the prevention of street harassment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33*(3), 266. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2009.01499.x

Davidson, M. M., Butchko, M. S., Robbins, K., Sherd, L. W., & Gervais, S. J. (2016). The mediating role of perceived safety on street harassment and anxiety. *Psychology of Violence.* doi:10.1037/a0039970

Davidson, M. M., Gervais, S. J., & Sherd, L. W. (2013). The ripple effects of stranger harassment on objectification of self and others. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 39*(1), 53-66. doi:10.1177/0361684313514371

Duhr, E. E., & Bono, J. E. (2006). Men, women, and managers: Are stereotypes finally changing? *Personnel Psychology, 59*(4), 815-846. doi:10.111/j.1744-6570.2006.00055.x

Fairchild, K., & Rudman, L. (2008). Everyday stranger harassment and women's objectification. *Social Justice Research, 21*(3), 338-357. doi:10.1007/s11211-008-0073-0

Fehr, B. A., Samsom, D., & Paulhus, D. L. (1992). The construct of Machiavellianism: Twenty years later. In C. D. Spielberger & J. N. Butcher (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 9, pp. 77-116). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Fisher, T. D., Davis, C. M., Yarber, W. L., & Davis, S. L. (2010). *Handbook of Sexuality-Related Measures.* New York: Routledge.

Furnham, A., Richards, S. C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2013). The dark triad of personality: A 10 year review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 7*(3), 199-216. doi:10.1111/spc3.12018

Furnham, A., & Trickey, G. (2011). Sex differences in the dark side traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(4), 517-522. 10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.021

Gardner, C. B. (1995). *Passing by: Gender and public harassment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gaughan, E. T., Miller, J. D., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). Examining the utility of general models of personality in the study of psychopathy: A comparison of the HEXACO-PI-R and NEO-PI-R. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 26*(4), 513-523. doi: 10.1521/pedi.2012.26.4.513

Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 47*(2), 164-177. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1995.1033

Gino, F., & Bazerman, M. H. (2009). When misconduct goes unnoticed: The acceptability of gradual erosion in others' unethical behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(4), 708-719. 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.03.013

Goodchilds, J. D., & Zellman, G. (1984). Sexual signaling and sexual aggression in adolescents and their perceptions of sexual interaction. In N. Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Pornography and sexual aggression* (pp. 234-243). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Grubbs, J. B., Exline, J. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2014). Psychological entitlement and ambivalent sexism: Understanding the role of entitlement in predicting two forms

of sexism. *Sex Roles, 70*(5), 209-220. doi:10.1007/s11199-014-0360-1

Gustafson, S. B., & Ritzer, D. R. (1995). The dark side of normal: A psychopathy-linked pattern called aberrant self-promotion. *European Journal of Personality, 9*(3), 147-183. doi:10.1002/per.2410090302

Hand, J. Z., & Sanchez, L. (2000). Badgering or bantering: Gender differences in experience of, and reactions to, sexual harassment among U.S. high school students. *Gender and Society, 14*(6), 718-746. doi:10.1177/089124300014006002

Hitlan, R. T., Pryor, J. B., Hesson-McInnis, M. S., & Olson, M. (2009). Antecedents of gender harassment: An analysis of person and situation factors. *Sex Roles, 61*(11-12), 794. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9689-2

Hunt, C. M., Davidson, M. J., Fielden, S. L., & Hoel, H. (2010). Reviewing sexual harassment in the workplace - an intervention model. *Personnel Review, 39*(5), 655-673. doi:10.1108/00483481011064190

Jakobwitz, S., & Egan, V. (2006). The dark triad and normal personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*(2), 331-339. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.07.006

Johnson, M., & Bennett, E. (2015). *Everyday sexism: Australian women's experiences of street harassment.* Melbourne, AU: The Australia Institute.

Jonason, P., Li, N., Webster, G., & Schmitt, D. (2009). The dark triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy in men. *European Journal of Personality, 23*(1), 5-18. doi:10.1002/per.698Link

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*(1), 31-36. doi:10.1007/BF02291575

Kearl, H. (2010). *Stop street harassment: Making public places safe and welcoming for women*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Kearl, H. (2014). *Unsafe and harassed in public spaces: A national street harassment Report* (Rep.). Retrieved http://www.stopstreetharassment.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/National-Street-Harassment-Report-November-29-20151.pdf

Kearl, H. (2015). *Stop global street harassment: Growing activism around the world*. Beaverton, OR: Ringgold Inc.

Kelly, L. (1988). *Surviving sexual violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kissling, E. A. (1991). Street harassment: The language of sexual terrorism. *Discourse & Society, 2*(4), 451-460. doi:10.1177/0957926591002004006

Knight, N. M. (2016). *The dark triad and HEXACO personality model in relational aggression* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1606811)

Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity, 47*(4), 2025-2047. doi:10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9

Laniya, O. O. (2005). Street smut: Gender, media, and the legal power dynamics of street harassment, or "hey sexy" and other verbal ejaculations. *Columbia Journal of Gender and Law, 14*(1), 91.

Larrimer-Scherbaum, K., & Popovich, P. (2001). The relationship between personality and the proclivity to sexually harass. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Leary, M. R. (2007). Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*(1), 317-344. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085658

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*, 329–358. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the five-factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*(7), 1571-1582. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2004.09.016

Lee, K., Gizzarone, M., & Ashton, M. C. (2003). Personality and the likelihood to sexually harass. *Sex Roles, 49*(1), 59-69. doi:10.1023/A:1023961603479

Lee, K., Ogunfowora, B., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Personality traits beyond the big five: Are they within the HEXACO space? *Journal of Personality, 75*, 1437-1463. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00354.x

Lenton, R., Smith, M. D., Fox, J., & Morra, N. (1999). Sexual harassment in public places: Experiences of Canadian women. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne De Sociologie, 36*(4), 517-540. doi:10.1111/j.1755-618X.1999.tb00962.x

Levenson, M. R., Kiehl, K. A., & Fitzpatrick, C. M. (1995). Assessing psychopathic attributes in a noninstitutionalized population. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(1), 151-158. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.68.1.151

Litman, L., Robinson, J., & Abberbock, T. (2016). TurkPrime.com: A versatile crowdsourcing data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 1 - 10.

Livingston, B., Grillo, M., & Paluch, R. (2015, May). Cornell International Survey on

      Street Harassment. Retrieved June 28, 2017, from

      https://www.ihollaback.org/cornell-international-survey-on-street-harassment/

Logan, L. S. (2015). Street harassment: Current and promising avenues for researchers

      and activists: Street harassment. *Sociology Compass, 9*(3), 196-211.

      doi:10.1111/soc4.12248

Lund, A., & Lund, M. (2013). Principal component analysis (PCA): Extracting

      components. Retrieved December 09, 2017, from

      https://statistics.laerd.com/premium/spss/pca/pca-in-spss-10.php

MacMillan, R., Nierobisz, A., & Welsh, S. (2000). Experiencing the streets: Harassment

      and perceptions of safety among women. *Journal of Research in Crime and*

      Delinquency, 37, 306–322.

McDonald, P., Charlesworth, S., & Graham, T. (2016). Action or inaction: Bystander

      intervention in workplace sexual harassment. *The International Journal of Human*

      Resource Management, 27(5), 548-566. doi:10.1080/09585192.2015.1023331

McHoskey, J. (1995). Narcissism and machiavellianism. *Psychological Reports, 77*(3),

      755.

Menard, K., Shoss, N., & Pincus, A. (2010). Attachment and personality predicts

      engagement in sexual harassment by male and female college students. *Violence*

      and Victims, 25(6), 770-786. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.25.6.770

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using*

      SPSS (4th ed.). New York City, NY: Open University Press.

Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on Amazon
Mechanical Turk. *Judgment and Decision Making, 5(5),* 411–419.

Paulhus, D. L. (2013). Dark Triad of Personality (D3-Short). Measurement Instrument
Database for the Social Science. Retrieved from www.midss.ie.

Paulhus, D. L., & Jones, D. N. (2011). Introducing a short measure of the Dark Triad.
Poster presented at the meeting of the Society for Personality and Social
Psychology, San Antonio.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism,
Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36(6),*
556-563. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6

Perry, E. L., Kulik, C. T., & Schmidtke, J. M. (1998). Individual differences in the
effectiveness of sexual harassment awareness training. *Journal of Applied Social
Psychology, 28(8),* 698-723.

Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual
harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues. *Aggression and Violent
Behavior, 14*(2), 126-138. 10.1016/j.avb.2009.01.002

Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles, 17(5-6),* 269-290.
doi:10.1007/BF00288453

Pryor, J. B., & Meyers, A. B. (2000). Men who sexually harass women. In L. B.
Schlesinger (Ed.), *Serial offenders: Current thought, recent findings, unusual
syndromes* (pp. 207-228). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Quinn, B. A. (2002). Sexual harassment and masculinity: The power and meaning of "girl watching". *Gender and Society, 16*(3), 386-402. doi:10.1177/0891243202016003007

Ramakrishnan, K. B. (2011). Inconsistent legal treatment of unwanted sexual advances: A study of the homosexual advance defense, street harassment, and sexual harassment in the workplace. *Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice, 26*(2), 291.

Raskin, R.N., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 890-902. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890

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

Sehar, G. E. & Fatima, I. (2016). Dark triad personality traits as predictors of bullying and victimization in adolescents. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 26*(1), 51.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center. (2016). Retrieved August 1, 2016, from https://sapac.umich.edu/article/63

Shoukry, A., Hassan, R. M., & Komsan, N. A. (2008). "Clouds in Egypt's sky", sexual harassment: From verbal harassment to rape. Cairo: Egyptian Center for Women's Rights (ECWR). Retrieved from: http://www.endvawnow.org/uploads/browser/files/ecrw_sexual_harassment_study_english.pdf.pdf

Vera-Gray, F. (2016). Men's stranger intrusions: Rethinking street harassment. *Women's Studies International Forum, 58*, 9-17. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2016.04.001

WCLRF. (2015). Research on sexual harassment against women in public places, workplace and educational institutions of Afghanistan. Kabul, AF: Women and Children Legal Research Foundation. Retrieved from: http://www.wclrf.org.af/wp-content/uploads/final%20EN.pdf

Wesselmann, E. D., & Kelly, J. R. (2010). Cat-calls and culpability: Investigating the frequency and functions of stranger harassment. *Sex Roles, 63*(7), 451-462. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9830-2

Wilson, L., Mouilso, E., Gentile, B., Calhoun, K., & Zeichner, A. (2015). How is sexual aggression related to nonsexual aggression? A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 24*, 199-213. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2015.04.010

Zeigler-Hill, V., Besser, A., Morag, J., & Campbell, W. (2016). The dark triad and sexual harassment proclivity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 89*, 47-54. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.048

Appendix A
Behavioural Items

1. A stranger says "hi" to a woman on the street. (SBCV)
2. An unknown person says "good morning" to a woman at work. (SRTV)
3. A woman's co-worker says "good evening" to her on the bus. (KBCV)
4. A woman's professor says "hello" to her in class. (KRTV)
5. A random person says "hey baby" to a woman in a restaurant. (SBCV)
6. An unknown person says "hey sweetie" to a woman in the office. (SRTV)
7. A woman's boss says "hey sugar" to her during a business meeting. (KRTV)
8. A random person calls a woman "cutie" on the bus. (SBCV)
9. A woman's classmate says calls her "beautiful" at the bus stop. (KBCV)
10. A stranger at the workplace calls a woman "gorgeous." (SRTV)
11. A woman's teacher during class says that she is "stunning." (KRTV)
12. A stranger says "nice legs" to a woman outside a library. (SBCV)
13. A unknown person says "nice rack" to a woman in the hallway. (SRTV)
14. A woman's lab mate says "nice ass" to her in the lab. (KRTV)
15. A woman's professor says "nice curves" to her at a café. (KBCV)
16. An unknown bartender says "wow" as a woman walk by the bar. (SBCV)
17. A woman's lab mate says "huba huba" as she walks in front of their desk in the lab where she works. (KRTV)
18. A construction worker says "hot damn" as a woman walks by a construction site on campus. (SRTV)
19. A woman's co-worker says "woof woof" as she walks by en route to a food truck. (KBCV)
20. A stranger tells a woman to smile on a train. (SBCV)
21. A woman's supervisor tells her to smile at a restaurant. (KBCV)
22. A random person tells a woman to smile while standing at the copy machine at work. (SRTV)
23. A woman's lab mate tells her to smile while she sits in her desk. (KRTV)
24. At the mall, an unknown person asks for a woman's number. (SBCV)
25. A woman's boss asks for her number after an office meeting at work. (KRTV)
26. A woman's acquaintance asks for her number while she is walking to her car. (KBCV)
27. An unknown person asks for a woman's number in the hallway of her apartment building. (SRTV)
28. A woman's classmate calls her "fat" as she tries to sit down in a lecture hall before class. (KRTV)

29. A stranger makes "oink, oink" noises while a woman is at an ATM outside her bank. (SBCV)
30. A woman's co-worker asks if she has gained weight as she walks out of a fast food restaurant. (KBCV)
31. A random person says "aren't you fat enough?" to a woman in the cafeteria at work. (SRTV)
32. A stranger calls a woman a "slut" on the sidewalk. (SBCV)
33. A woman's classmate says her clothes make her look slutty at the mall. (KBCV)
34. An unknown person calls a woman a "whore" in the school library. (SRTV)
35. A woman's lab mate tells her that she dresses like a whore in the washroom of her department building. (KRTV)
36. An unknown person tells a woman to "put some clothes on" at school. (SRTV)
37. A woman's supervisor tells her to "put some clothes on" during a meeting at work. (KRTV)
38. An unknown waiter tells a woman to "cover up" on in a restaurant. (SBCV)
39. A woman's classmate tells her to "cover yourself" in a bar. (KBCV)
40. An unknown bartender tells a woman to unbutton her top at a club. (SBCV)
41. A co-worker tells a woman to show some cleavage at a restaurant. (KBCV)
42. An unknown person tells a woman to dress in sexier clothing in her office building. (SRTV)
43. A woman's boss tells her to hike up her skirt during an evaluation meeting at work. (KRTV)
44. A woman's boss makes a comment on her race in the workplace. (KRTV)
45. A stranger a woman asks, "what race are you?" at school. (SRTV)
46. An unknown waiter says, "go back to where you came from" to a woman in a restaurant. (SBCV)
47. A woman's co-worker describes "why white people are the best" while driving with her in a car. (KBCV)
48. A random person is spewing hate speech towards a woman on the street. (SBCV)
49. A woman's office mate is spewing hate speech towards her at the bus stop. (KBCV)
50. A stranger is spewing hate speech towards a woman by her locker at school. (SRTV)
51. A woman's classmate is spewing hate speech towards her outside a lecture hall. (KRTV)
52. An unknown store clerk swears at a woman in a supermarket. (SBCV)
53. A woman's teacher swears at her on school property. (KRTV)
54. A random person swears at a woman in the cafeteria line at work. (SRTV)
55. A woman's co-worker swears at her on the street. (KBCV)
56. An unknown store clerk smiles at a woman in the grocery store. (SBCNV)

57. An unknown person smiles at a woman in the university. (SRTNV)
58. A woman's classmate smiles at her in class. (KRTNV)
59. A woman's boss smiles at her in the train station. (KBCNV)
60. An unknown person whistles at a woman at an ATM. (SBCNV)
61. A woman's lab mate whistles at her while she is walking to her car. (KBCNV)
62. A woman's boss whistles at her in the workplace. (KRTNV)
63. A stranger whistles at a woman in her apartment building. (SRTNV)
64. A woman's professor winks at her during a lecture. (KRTNV)
65. A woman's supervisor winks at her at a restaurant. (KBCNV)
66. An unknown person winks at a woman while she is in her office. (SRTNV)
67. A random person winks at a woman as she walks on the sidewalk. (SBCNV)
68. A random person stares at a woman's body at a swimming pool. (SBCNV)
69. A woman's classmate leers at her body in a restaurant. (KBCNV)
70. An unknown person stares at a woman's body in her office. (SRTNV)
71. A woman's co-worker leers at her body during a business meeting. (KRTNV)
72. A random person blocks a woman's path on the sidewalk. (SBCNV)
73. A woman's lab mate blocks her path in the hallway at work. (KRTNV)
74. A stranger blocks a woman's path when she tries to get her mail in the mailroom. (SRTNV)
75. A woman's supervisor blocks her path when she tries to get out of a café. (KBCNV)
76. An unknown person honks at a woman and follows her for a couple of blocks in their car. (SBCNV)
77. A woman's classmate honks at her and follows her for a couple of blocks in their car. (KBCNV)
78. A random person throws things at a woman (e.g., cans, coins) at a gas station. (SBCNV)
79. A classmate throws things at a woman (e.g., cans, coins) on the street. (KBCNV)
80. A lab mate throws things at a woman (e.g., cans, coins) in the hallway outside of the lab. (KRTNV)
81. An unknown person throws things at a woman (e.g., cans, coins) in the cafeteria at work. (SRTNV)
82. A stranger spits on a woman in the elevator at her workplace. (SRTNV)
83. A woman's classmate spits on her in class. (KRTNV)
84. An unknown person spits on a woman at the beach. (SBCNV)
85. A woman's colleague spits on her on the street. (KBCNV)
86. A random person has their hand down their pants while looking at a woman outside a café (SBCNV)
87. A woman's co-worker has their hand down their pants while looking at her in her

office building. (KRTNV)

88. An unknown person has their hand down their pants while looking at a woman in her apartment building. (SRTNV)
89. A woman's office mate has their hand down their pants while looking at her outside a bar. (KBCNV)
90. A random person slaps a woman's behind on the subway. (SBCNV)
91. A woman's co-worker slaps her behind at a pub. (KBCNV)
92. An unknown person slaps a woman's behind in her office building. (SRTNV)
93. A woman's colleague slaps her behind in a meeting. (KRTNV)
94. An unknown bartender tries to kiss a woman across the bar. (SBCNV)
95. A woman's classmate tries to kiss her at a concert. (KBCNV)
96. A woman's lab mate tries to kiss her on her patio. (KRTNV)
97. A random person tries to kiss a woman at school. (SRTNV)
98. An unknown person rubs up against a woman on public transport. (SBCNV)
99. A woman's classmate rubs up against her outside a classroom. (KRTNV)
100. A random person rubs up against a woman in the workplace. (SRTNV)
101. A woman's lab mate rubs up against her on the subway. (KBCNV)
102. An unknown waiter touches a woman's hair while taking her order in a restaurant. (SBCNV)
103. A random person touches a woman's hair while she is filling her coffee cup in the office kitchen. (SRTNV)
104. A woman's lab mate touches her hair in a café. (KBCNV)
105. A woman's office mate touches her hair in her office. (KRTNV)
106. An unknown person tries to fondle a woman's breast on the subway. (SBCNV)
107. A woman's co-worker tries to fondle her breast in a bar. (KBCNV)
108. A random person tries to fondle a woman's breast in her workplace. (SRTNV)
109. A woman's professor tries to fondle her breast in their office. (KRTNV)

Appendix B

Rotated Structure Matrix for Definition 1 of Study 2 and 3

Behavioural Items	Rotated Component Coefficients	
	C1	C2
A person you do not know slaps your behind in your office building.	**0.831**	0.129
A random person is spewing hate speech towards you on the street.	**0.819**	0.177
A random person tries to fondle your breast in your workplace.	**0.807**	0.070
A professor tries to fondle your breast in their office.	**0.789**	0.055
An office mate is spewing hate speech towards you at the bus stop.	**0.783**	0.154
A random person has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a café.	**0.779**	0.286
An unknown waiter says, "go back to where you came from" in a restaurant.	**0.778**	0.277
A stranger makes "oink, oink" noises while you are at an ATM outside your bank.	**0.771**	0.199
A co-worker says "good evening" you on the bus.	**-0.764**	0.190

An office mate has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a bar.	**0.762**	0.100
An co-worker tries to fondle your breast in a bar.	**0.762**	0.115
A person you do not know has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your apartment building.	**0.761**	0.205
A person you do not know tries to fondle your breast on the subway.	**0.749**	0.134
A stranger spits on you in the elevator at your workplace.	**0.745**	0.273
A stranger is spewing hate speech towards you by your locker at school.	**0.741**	0.246
A classmate spits on you in class.	**0.727**	0.217
A colleague spits on you on the street.	**0.724**	0.274
A stranger calls you a "slut" on the sidewalk.	**0.721**	0.221
A random person says "aren't you fat enough?" in the cafeteria at work.	**0.718**	0.313
Your boss smiles at you in the train station.	**-0.715**	0.217
A classmate smiles at you in class.	**-0.709**	0.223
A classmate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) on the street.	**0.708**	0.363
A person you do not know throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the cafeteria at work.	**0.705**	0.324
A colleague slaps your behind in a meeting.	**0.700**	0.350

Your boss tells you to hike up your skirt during an evaluation meeting at work.	**0.694**	0.372
A person you do not know calls you a "whore" in the school library.	**0.686**	0.240
A co-worker has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your office building.	**0.686**	0.343
A lab mate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the hallway outside of the lab.	**0.681**	0.372
A random person slaps your behind on the subway.	**0.670**	0.390
A classmate is spewing hate speech towards you outside a lecture hall.	**0.667**	0.254
Someone you do not know spits on you at the beach.	**0.665**	0.339
A co-worker swears at you on the street.	**0.655**	0.393
An unknown bartender tries to kiss you across the bar.	**0.652**	0.421
A teacher swears at you on school property.	**0.648**	0.317
A random person swears at you in the cafeteria line at work.	**0.647**	0.369
A lab mate tells you that you dress like a whore in the washroom of your department building.	**0.645**	0.333
A co-worker slaps your behind at a pub.	**0.643**	0.428
A random person throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) at a gas station.	**0.643**	0.340

Someone you do not know honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	**0.643**	0.339
A classmate calls you "fat" as you try to sit down in a lecture hall before class.	**0.627**	0.417
An unknown bartender tells you to unbutton your top at a club	**0.613**	0.458
Your boss makes a comment on your race in the workplace.	**0.613**	0.384
A stranger blocks your path when you try to get your mail in the mailroom.	**0.610**	0.295
Your boss whistles at you in the workplace.	**0.609**	0.506
A random person tries to kiss you at school.	**0.601**	0.442
A co-worker tells you to show some cleavage at a restaurant.	**0.588**	0.432
A random person you do not know rubs up against you in the workplace.	**0.567**	0.512
A person you do not know says "nice rack" to you in the hallway.	**0.564**	0.561
A co-worker asks if you have gained weight as you walk out of a fast food restaurant.	**0.561**	0.509
An unknown store clerk swears at you in a supermarket.	**0.560**	0.414
A classmate honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	**0.558**	0.441
A co-worker says "woof woof" as you walk by en route to a food truck.	**0.555**	0.458

An unknown store clerk smiles at you in the grocery store.	**-0.555**	0.336
A stranger says "hi" to you on the street.	**-0.553**	0.383
A random person blocks your path on the sidewalk.	**0.552**	0.397
Someone you do not know smiles at you in the university.	**-0.540**	0.329
A person you do not know says "good morning" you at work.	**-0.517**	0.343
Someone you do not know stares at your body in your office.	**0.499**	0.493
A lab mate tells you to smile while you are sitting in your desk.	-0.003	**0.824**
A random person tells you to smile at the copy machine at work.	0.013	**0.811**
A person you do not know winks at you while you are in your office.	0.225	**0.779**
A classmate says that you are "beautiful" at the bus stop.	-0.013	**0.776**
A random person winks at you as you walk on the sidewalk.	0.070	**0.765**
A construction worker says "hot damn" as you walk by a construction site on campus.	0.314	**0.763**
A stranger at your workplace says that you are "gorgeous."	0.062	**0.755**
An office mate touches your hair in your office.	0.202	**0.754**
A stranger tells you to smile on a train.	0.065	**0.747**
An unknown bartender says "wow" as you walk by the bar.	0.085	**0.740**
A person you do not know says "hey sweetie" to you in the office.	-0.065	**0.730**
Your boss says "hey sugar" to you during a business meeting.	0.326	**0.730**

A lab mate whistles at you while you are walking to your car.	0.380	**0.708**
A random person beside you on the bus says that you are "cute".	0.055	**0.707**
An unknown waiter tells you to "cover up" on in a restaurant.	0.313	**0.704**
A lab mate touches your hair in a café.	0.308	**0.699**
A stranger whistles at you in your apartment building.	0.332	**0.698**
A classmate tells you to "cover yourself" in a bar.	0.285	**0.689**
An unknown waiter touches your hair while taking your order in a restaurant.	0.391	**0.683**
A lab mate says "huba huba" as you walk in front of their desk in the lab where you work.	0.390	**0.681**
A person you do not know asks for your number in the hallway of your apartment building.	0.092	**0.664**
A person you do not know whistles at you at an ATM.	0.351	**0.660**
A classmate leers at your body in a restaurant.	0.477	**0.658**
A stranger says "nice legs" to you outside a library.	0.300	**0.658**
A person you do not know tells you to "put some clothes on" at school.	0.408	**0.656**
A supervisor tells you to smile at a restaurant.	0.119	**0.630**
Your supervisor tells you to "put some clothes on" during a meeting at work.	0.389	**0.627**

A person you do not know stares at your body at a swimming pool.	0.364	**0.622**
A lab mate rubs up against you on the subway.	0.427	**0.622**
A lab mate says "nice ass" to you in the lab	0.470	**0.620**
At the mall, someone you do not know asks for your number.	-0.118	**0.620**
An acquaintance asks for your number while you are walking to your car.	-0.113	**0.614**
A teacher during class says that you are "stunning."	0.280	**0.609**
A random person you do not know touches your hair while you are filling your coffee cup in the office kitchen.	0.421	**0.604**
A professor winks at you during a lecture.	0.294	**0.599**
A co-worker describes why white people are the best in a car.	0.213	**0.587**
A supervisor winks at you at a restaurant.	0.404	**0.585**
Your boss asks for your number after an office meeting at work.	0.250	**0.577**
A co-worker leers at your body in during a business meeting.	0.535	**0.571**
A classmate tries to kiss you at a concert.	0.171	**0.551**
A person you do not know tells you to dress in sexier clothing in your office building.	0.545	**0.549**
A classmate rubs up against you outside a classroom.	0.483	**0.547**
Someone you do not know rubs up against you on public transport.	0.514	**0.535**
A professor says "nice curves" to you at a café	0.398	**0.512**

A classmate says your clothes make you look slutty at the mall.	0.426	**0.486**
A stranger asks, "what race are you?" at school.	0.112	**0.479**
A lab mate blocks your path in the hallway at work.	0.450	**0.455**
A lab mate tries to kiss you on your patio.	0.430	**0.449**
A supervisor blocks your path when you try to get out of a café.	0.373	**0.440**
A random person says "hey baby" to you in a restaurant.	0.133	**0.374**

Note: C1 = Component 1/Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behaviours; C2 = Component 2/Unwanted Sexual Attention Behaviours

Appendix C

A Rotated Structure Matrix for Definition 2 of Study 2 and 3

Behavioural Items	Rotated Component Coefficients	
	C1	C2
A classmate calls you "fat" as you try to sit down in a lecture hall before class.	**0.88**	-0.104
An unknown store clerk swears at you in a supermarket.	**0.861**	-0.074
A stranger asks, "what race are you?" at school.	**0.858**	-0.017
A person you do not know throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the cafeteria at work.	**0.850**	-0.130
A stranger is spewing hate speech towards you by your locker at school.	**0.842**	-0.060
Your boss makes a comment on your race in the workplace.	**0.841**	-0.038
A co-worker asks if you have gained weight as you walk out of a fast food restaurant.	**0.841**	-0.050
A teacher swears at you on school property.	**0.823**	0.007
A random person swears at you in the cafeteria line at work.	**0.820**	-0.124
A stranger says "hi" to you on the street.	**0.814**	0.014
Someone you do not know spits on you at the beach.	**0.810**	0.010

A random person throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) at a gas station.	**0.808**	-0.078
A classmate is spewing hate speech towards you outside a lecture hall.	**0.805**	-0.025
A co-worker describes why white people are the best in a car.	**0.797**	-0.187
An unknown waiter says, "go back to where you came from" in a restaurant.	**0.780**	-0.047
A co-worker swears at you on the street.	**0.767**	0.018
An office mate is spewing hate speech towards you at the bus stop.	**0.763**	-0.170
A classmate tells you to "cover yourself" in a bar.	**0.759**	0.148
A stranger spits on you in the elevator at your workplace.	**0.755**	0.103
A lab mate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the hallway outside of the lab.	**0.737**	-0.128
A random person tries to fondle your breast in your workplace.	**-0.736**	0.344
An unknown store clerk smiles at you in the grocery store.	**0.733**	-0.078
A classmate spits on you in class.	**0.732**	-0.033
A random person says "aren't you fat enough?" in the cafeteria at work.	**0.732**	0.044
A colleague spits on you on the street.	**0.725**	-0.023
A random person is spewing hate speech towards you on the street.	**0.722**	-0.171

A co-worker says "good evening" you on the bus.	**0.721**	-0.157
A stranger makes "oink, oink" noises while you are at an ATM outside your bank.	**0.718**	0.039
A person you do not know says "good morning" you at work.	**0.705**	-0.068
A classmate smiles at you in class.	**0.702**	-0.152
Someone you do not know smiles at you in the university.	**0.702**	-0.057
A classmate says your clothes make you look slutty at the mall.	**0.674**	0.271
An unknown waiter tells you to "cover up" on in a restaurant.	**0.665**	0.327
A lab mate tells you that you dress like a whore in the washroom of your department building.	**0.648**	0.335
A person you do not know tries to fondle your breast on the subway.	**-0.645**	0.380
A professor tries to fondle your breast in their office.	**-0.630**	0.369
A classmate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) on the street.	**0.621**	-0.121
A person you do not know tells you to "put some clothes on" at school.	**0.615**	0.268
A lab mate tells you to smile while you are sitting in your desk.	**0.595**	0.354
An co-worker tries to fondle your breast in a bar.	**-0.586**	0.484
A random person tells you to smile at the copy machine at work.	**0.581**	0.402
A supervisor tells you to smile at a restaurant.	**0.576**	0.418

A person you do not know calls you a "whore" in the school library.	**0.575**	0.261
Your boss smiles at you in the train station.	**0.571**	-0.131
Your supervisor tells you to "put some clothes on" during a meeting at work.	**0.542**	0.362
A stranger tells you to smile on a train.	**0.538**	0.447
A supervisor blocks your path when you try to get out of a café.	**0.491**	0.268
A stranger calls you a "slut" on the sidewalk.	**0.485**	0.341
A lab mate blocks your path in the hallway at work.	**0.452**	0.396
A stranger blocks your path when you try to get your mail in the mailroom.	**0.436**	0.316
A co-worker leers at your body in during a business meeting.	0.020	**0.823**
A construction worker says "hot damn" as you walk by a construction site on campus.	0.065	**0.784**
Your boss says "hey sugar" to you during a business meeting.	0.083	**0.767**
A stranger whistles at you in your apartment building.	0.040	**0.757**
Your boss whistles at you in the workplace.	-0.081	**0.749**
A stranger says "nice legs" to you outside a library.	0.024	**0.749**
An office mate touches your hair in your office.	0.035	**0.737**
A person you do not know whistles at you at an ATM.	0.040	**0.731**
A lab mate whistles at you while you are walking to your car.	0.158	**0.726**
A lab mate says "nice ass" to you in the lab	-0.304	**0.709**

A person you do not know tells you to dress in sexier clothing in your office building.	-0.028	**0.707**
A random person you do not know rubs up against you in the workplace.	-0.212	**0.701**
A classmate leers at your body in a restaurant.	-0.054	**0.698**
A professor winks at you during a lecture.	0.012	**0.694**
A professor says "nice curves" to you at a café	-0.139	**0.687**
A co-worker tells you to show some cleavage at a restaurant.	-0.174	**0.686**
A classmate rubs up against you outside a classroom.	-0.170	**0.678**
Someone you do not know rubs up against you on public transport.	-0.171	**0.674**
A classmate says that you are "beautiful" at the bus stop.	0.295	**0.674**
A person you do not know says "nice rack" to you in the hallway.	-0.226	**0.673**
An unknown bartender says "wow" as you walk by the bar.	0.336	**0.666**
A teacher during class says that you are "stunning."	0.268	**0.666**
A lab mate says "huba huba" as you walk in front of their desk in the lab where you work.	0.027	**0.665**
Someone you do not know stares at your body in your office.	-0.015	**0.657**
A stranger at your workplace says that you are "gorgeous."	0.215	**0.655**
A person you do not know says "hey sweetie" to you in the office.	0.327	**0.651**

A classmate honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	0.114	**0.65**
A random person you do not know touches your hair while you are filling your coffee cup in the office kitchen.	0.080	**0.640**
A lab mate rubs up against you on the subway.	-0.098	**0.639**
A random person winks at you as you walk on the sidewalk.	0.258	**0.638**
An unknown waiter touches your hair while taking your order in a restaurant.	0.026	**0.637**
A co-worker has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your office building.	-0.288	**0.637**
A supervisor winks at you at a restaurant.	0.017	**0.633**
A person you do not know stares at your body at a swimming pool.	0.066	**0.632**
A person you do not know winks at you while you are in your office.	0.136	**0.624**
Someone you do not know honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	0.041	**0.624**
A classmate tries to kiss you at a concert.	-0.133	**0.623**
A random person beside you on the bus says that you are "cute".	0.245	**0.617**
Your boss asks for your number after an office meeting at work.	0.171	**0.615**
A colleague slaps your behind in a meeting.	-0.108	**0.603**

A random person slaps your behind on the subway.	-0.215	**0.602**
At the mall, someone you do not know asks for your number.	0.317	**0.595**
A person you do not know asks for your number in the hallway of your apartment building.	0.336	**0.594**
Your boss tells you to hike up your skirt during an evaluation meeting at work.	-0.227	**0.592**
A lab mate touches your hair in a café.	0.136	**0.591**
A lab mate tries to kiss you on your patio.	-0.193	**0.568**
An unknown bartender tells you to unbutton your top at a club	-0.280	**0.568**
A random person tries to kiss you at school.	-0.430	**0.559**
A person you do not know has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your apartment building.	-0.282	**0.558**
A person you do not know slaps your behind in your office building.	-0.348	**0.555**
An acquaintance asks for your number while you are walking to your car.	0.248	**0.542**
An unknown bartender tries to kiss you across the bar.	-0.389	**0.539**
A random person has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a café.	-0.234	**0.539**
A co-worker slaps your behind at a pub.	-0.201	**0.538**
A random person blocks your path on the sidewalk.	0.361	**0.496**

	C1	C2
An office mate has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a bar.	-0.288	**0.484**
A co-worker says "woof woof" as you walk by en route to a food truck.	0.376	**0.421**
A random person says "hey baby" to you in a restaurant.	0.177	**0.380**

Note: C1 = Component 1/Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behaviours; C2 = Component 2/Unwanted Sexual Attention Behaviours

Appendix D

A Rotated Structure Matrix for Definition 3 with a of Study 2 and 3

Behavioural Items	Rotated Component Coefficients	
	C1	C2
A random person beside you on the bus says that you are "cute".	**0.872**	-0.151
A professor says "nice curves" to you at a café	**0.864**	0.105
A random person tells you to smile at the copy machine at work.	**0.859**	-0.102
A stranger says "nice legs" to you outside a library.	**0.853**	0.052
A lab mate says "huba huba" as you walk in front of their desk in the lab where you work.	**0.849**	0.147
A random person winks at you as you walk on the sidewalk.	**0.843**	-0.030
A lab mate says "nice ass" to you in the lab	**0.842**	0.180
Your boss says "hey sugar" to you during a business meeting.	**0.838**	0.011
A person you do not know says "hey sweetie" to you in the office.	**0.836**	-0.099
A construction worker says "hot damn" as you walk by a construction site on campus.	**0.831**	0.090
An unknown bartender says "wow" as you walk by the bar.	**0.830**	-0.092

A supervisor winks at you at a restaurant.	**0.817**	0.041
A stranger at your workplace says that you are "gorgeous."	**0.814**	-0.165
A stranger whistles at you in your apartment building.	**0.812**	0.045
A classmate says that you are "beautiful" at the bus stop.	**0.808**	-0.187
A person you do not know whistles at you at an ATM.	**0.795**	0.032
A professor winks at you during a lecture.	**0.794**	-0.013
A person you do not know says "nice rack" to you in the hallway.	**0.791**	0.240
At the mall, someone you do not know asks for your number.	**0.784**	-0.093
A lab mate tells you to smile while you are sitting in your desk.	**0.783**	0.062
A lab mate whistles at you while you are walking to your car.	**0.781**	0.106
A person you do not know winks at you while you are in your office.	**0.781**	0.055
A classmate leers at your body in a restaurant.	**0.780**	0.269
Your boss asks for your number after an office meeting at work.	**0.78**	-0.071
A supervisor tells you to smile at a restaurant.	**0.767**	-0.155
A co-worker leers at your body in during a business meeting.	**0.764**	0.242
A classmate tries to kiss you at a concert.	**0.758**	0.234
Someone you do not know stares at your body in your office.	**0.758**	0.182
A person you do not know asks for your number in the hallway of your apartment building.	**0.756**	0.050

A person you do not know tells you to dress in sexier clothing in your office building.	**0.755**	0.330
An unknown waiter touches your hair while taking your order in a restaurant.	**0.749**	0.161
Your boss whistles at you in the workplace.	**0.748**	0.164
A stranger tells you to smile on a train.	**0.746**	-0.058
An office mate touches your hair in your office.	**0.736**	0.221
A random person you do not know touches your hair while you are filling your coffee cup in the office kitchen.	**0.726**	0.314
A person you do not know stares at your body at a swimming pool.	**0.709**	0.152
An acquaintance asks for your number while you are walking to your car.	**0.701**	-0.075
An unknown bartender tells you to unbutton your top at a club	**0.700**	0.161
A lab mate touches your hair in a café.	**0.699**	0.115
A co-worker tells you to show some cleavage at a restaurant.	**0.693**	0.197
Your supervisor tells you to "put some clothes on" during a meeting at work.	**0.665**	0.334
A teacher during class says that you are "stunning."	**0.665**	-0.029
An unknown waiter tells you to "cover up" on in a restaurant.	**0.650**	0.304
A stranger asks, "what race are you?" at school.	**0.648**	-0.017

A co-worker has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your office building.	**0.641**	0.382
A random person tries to kiss you at school.	**0.632**	0.292
A random person has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a café.	**0.628**	0.435
A co-worker asks if you have gained weight as you walk out of a fast food restaurant.	**0.624**	0.312
An office mate has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a bar.	**0.621**	0.311
A co-worker says "woof woof" as you walk by en route to a food truck.	**0.621**	0.374
A lab mate tries to kiss you on your patio.	**0.606**	0.305
Your boss tells you to hike up your skirt during an evaluation meeting at work.	**0.605**	0.375
A co-worker describes why white people are the best in a car.	**0.584**	0.107
A classmate says your clothes make you look slutty at the mall.	**0.580**	0.294
A lab mate rubs up against you on the subway.	**0.574**	0.417
A classmate tells you to "cover yourself" in a bar.	**0.568**	0.325
A stranger says "hi" to you on the street.	**0.567**	-0.461
A random person says "hey baby" to you in a restaurant.	**0.546**	-0.007
A person you do not know has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your apartment building.	**0.542**	0.467

An unknown bartender tries to kiss you across the bar.	**0.537**	0.393
A person you do not know tells you to "put some clothes on" at school.	**0.519**	0.394
A random person you do not know rubs up against you in the workplace.	**0.518**	0.410
A person you do not know says "good morning" you at work.	**0.513**	-0.502
A classmate rubs up against you outside a classroom.	**0.505**	0.403
Your boss makes a comment on your race in the workplace.	**0.499**	0.401
Someone you do not know rubs up against you on public transport.	**0.468**	0.445
A stranger makes "oink, oink" noises while you are at an ATM outside your bank.	**0.406**	0.354
A stranger spits on you in the elevator at your workplace.	-0.197	**0.834**
A lab mate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the hallway outside of the lab.	-0.138	**0.777**
A classmate spits on you in class.	-0.218	**0.734**
An office mate is spewing hate speech towards you at the bus stop.	0.009	**0.722**
A classmate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) on the street.	-0.103	**0.717**
A classmate is spewing hate speech towards you outside a lecture hall.	-0.023	**0.716**

A lab mate tells you that you dress like a whore in the washroom of your department building.	0.213	**0.715**
An unknown waiter says, "go back to where you came from" in a restaurant.	0.040	**0.710**
A stranger is spewing hate speech towards you by your locker at school.	0.055	**0.709**
A person you do not know throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the cafeteria at work.	-0.079	**0.707**
A random person says "aren't you fat enough?" in the cafeteria at work.	0.269	**0.705**
A person you do not know calls you a "whore" in the school library.	0.241	**0.697**
A colleague spits on you on the street.	-0.137	**0.695**
Someone you do not know spits on you at the beach.	0.001	**0.695**
A supervisor blocks your path when you try to get out of a café.	0.248	**0.657**
An unknown store clerk smiles at you in the grocery store.	0.452	**-0.652**
A classmate smiles at you in class.	0.447	**-0.647**
Someone you do not know smiles at you in the university.	0.498	**-0.643**
A random person throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) at a gas station.	-0.038	**0.642**
A random person blocks your path on the sidewalk.	0.165	**0.639**

A random person is spewing hate speech towards you on the street.	0.073	**0.629**
A random person swears at you in the cafeteria line at work.	0.147	**0.627**
A stranger blocks your path when you try to get your mail in the mailroom.	0.176	**0.625**
A stranger calls you a "slut" on the sidewalk.	0.299	**0.619**
A co-worker swears at you on the street.	0.108	**0.613**
Your boss smiles at you in the train station.	0.406	**-0.602**
A classmate honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	0.328	**0.585**
Someone you do not know honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	0.268	**0.549**
A co-worker says "good evening" you on the bus.	0.387	**-0.535**
A classmate calls you "fat" as you try to sit down in a lecture hall before class.	0.352	**0.529**
A teacher swears at you on school property.	0.170	**0.524**
An unknown store clerk swears at you in a supermarket.	0.225	**0.521**
A colleague slaps your behind in a meeting.	0.353	**0.514**
A person you do not know tries to fondle your breast on the subway.	0.290	**0.509**
A random person tries to fondle your breast in your workplace.	0.342	**0.492**
A lab mate blocks your path in the hallway at work.	0.160	**0.484**

A random person slaps your behind on the subway.	0.390	**0.475**
A person you do not know slaps your behind in your office building.	0.381	**0.460**
A co-worker slaps your behind at a pub.	0.372	**0.453**
An co-worker tries to fondle your breast in a bar.	0.374	**0.436**
A professor tries to fondle your breast in their office.	0.347	**0.372**

Note: C1 = Component 1/Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behaviours; C2 = Component 2/Unwanted Sexual Attention Behaviours

A Rotated Structure Matrix for Definition 4 of Study 2 and 3

Behavioural Items	Rotated Component Coefficients	
	C1	C2
A professor tries to fondle your breast in their office.	**0.924**	0.223
A random person throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) at a gas station.	**0.920**	0.227
An office mate is spewing hate speech towards you at the bus stop.	**0.918**	0.271
A random person is spewing hate speech towards you on the street.	**0.917**	0.247
An unknown waiter says, "go back to where you came from" in a restaurant.	**0.914**	0.196
A random person has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a café.	**0.904**	0.231
Someone you do not know spits on you at the beach.	**0.898**	0.243
A person you do not know throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the cafeteria at work.	**0.895**	0.259
An co-worker tries to fondle your breast in a bar.	**0.894**	0.230

An office mate has their hand down their pants while looking at you outside a bar.	**0.893**	0.174
A stranger is spewing hate speech towards you by your locker at school.	**0.892**	0.263
A person you do not know slaps your behind in your office building.	**0.892**	0.185
A classmate is spewing hate speech towards you outside a lecture hall.	**0.889**	0.239
Your boss tells you to hike up your skirt during an evaluation meeting at work.	**0.879**	0.151
A colleague spits on you on the street.	**0.878**	0.223
A co-worker has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your office building.	**0.877**	0.200
A random person slaps your behind on the subway.	**0.875**	0.259
A classmate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) on the street.	**0.874**	0.294
A stranger makes "oink, oink" noises while you are at an ATM outside your bank.	**0.870**	0.309
A person you do not know has their hand down their pants while looking at you in your apartment building.	**0.869**	0.215
A person you do not know calls you a "whore" in the school library.	**0.866**	0.293

Your boss makes a comment on your race in the workplace.	**0.863**	0.254
A lab mate blocks your path in the hallway at work.	**0.861**	0.315
A teacher swears at you on school property.	**0.860**	0.352
A random person you do not know rubs up against you in the workplace.	**0.859**	0.328
A stranger spits on you in the elevator at your workplace.	**0.855**	0.216
An unknown bartender tells you to unbutton your top at a club	**0.851**	0.286
A random person tries to fondle your breast in your workplace.	**0.849**	0.214
A co-worker tells you to show some cleavage at a restaurant.	**0.843**	0.293
A stranger blocks your path when you try to get your mail in the mailroom.	**0.835**	0.224
A classmate spits on you in class.	**0.832**	0.225
A random person says "aren't you fat enough?" in the cafeteria at work.	**0.830**	0.361
A person you do not know tries to fondle your breast on the subway.	**0.830**	0.218
A lab mate tells you that you dress like a whore in the washroom of your department building.	**0.829**	0.280
A random person blocks your path on the sidewalk.	**0.829**	0.223
A colleague slaps your behind in a meeting.	**0.827**	0.361
A classmate calls you "fat" as you try to sit down in a lecture hall before class.	**0.821**	0.323

A supervisor blocks your path when you try to get out of a café.	**0.818**	0.313
An unknown bartender tries to kiss you across the bar.	**0.816**	0.319
A co-worker says "woof woof" as you walk by en route to a food truck.	**0.813**	0.395
Someone you do not know honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	**0.811**	0.350
Your boss whistles at you in the workplace.	**0.802**	0.387
A lab mate throws things at you (e.g., cans, coins) in the hallway outside of the lab.	**0.799**	0.285
A lab mate says "nice ass" to you in the lab	**0.799**	0.342
A stranger calls you a "slut" on the sidewalk.	**0.792**	0.374
A co-worker describes why white people are the best in a car.	**0.784**	0.388
A classmate honks at you and follows you for a couple of blocks in their car.	**0.778**	0.323
A co-worker swears at you on the street.	**0.773**	0.384
A co-worker leers at your body in during a business meeting.	**0.771**	0.383
Someone you do not know rubs up against you on public transport.	**0.771**	0.394
A random person swears at you in the cafeteria line at work.	**0.762**	0.460
An unknown store clerk swears at you in a supermarket.	**0.758**	0.435
A random person tries to kiss you at school.	**0.751**	0.450

An unknown waiter touches your hair while taking your order in a restaurant.	**0.743**	0.336
A lab mate rubs up against you on the subway.	**0.738**	0.307
A co-worker slaps your behind at a pub.	**0.735**	0.356
A classmate leers at your body in a restaurant.	**0.735**	0.513
A person you do not know tells you to dress in sexier clothing in your office building.	**0.732**	0.378
A classmate rubs up against you outside a classroom.	**0.726**	0.366
A random person you do not know touches your hair while you are filling your coffee cup in the office kitchen.	**0.708**	0.321
A co-worker says "good evening" you on the bus.	**-0.703**	-0.152
A person you do not know says "nice rack" to you in the hallway.	**0.698**	0.487
A classmate says your clothes make you look slutty at the mall.	**0.685**	0.499
A professor says "nice curves" to you at a café	**0.677**	0.442
An unknown store clerk smiles at you in the grocery store.	**-0.676**	0.187
A person you do not know tells you to "put some clothes on" at school.	**0.661**	0.560
A person you do not know whistles at you at an ATM.	**0.657**	0.543
A lab mate says "huba huba" as you walk in front of their desk in the lab where you work.	**0.647**	0.409
Someone you do not know stares at your body in your office.	**0.646**	0.531

A person you do not know says "good morning" you at work.	**-0.642**	0.116
Someone you do not know smiles at you in the university.	**-0.640**	0.234
Your boss says "hey sugar" to you during a business meeting.	**0.639**	0.420
A co-worker asks if you have gained weight as you walk out of a fast food restaurant.	**0.624**	0.480
A classmate smiles at you in class.	**-0.622**	0.176
An office mate touches your hair in your office.	**0.621**	0.497
A lab mate touches your hair in a café.	**0.611**	0.312
Your boss smiles at you in the train station.	**-0.597**	0.169
An unknown waiter tells you to "cover up" on in a restaurant.	**0.549**	0.456
A stranger says "hi" to you on the street.	**-0.539**	0.218
A classmate tells you to "cover yourself" in a bar.	**0.503**	0.486
A professor winks at you during a lecture.	**0.501**	0.439
Your boss asks for your number after an office meeting at work.	**0.479**	0.298
A lab mate tells you to smile while you are sitting in your desk.	0.048	**0.842**
A random person tells you to smile at the copy machine at work.	0.133	**0.788**
A person you do not know says "hey sweetie" to you in the office.	0.012	**0.782**
A stranger at your workplace says that you are "gorgeous."	0.243	**0.773**
An unknown bartender says "wow" as you walk by the bar.	0.204	**0.724**
A stranger tells you to smile on a train.	0.084	**0.699**

A classmate says that you are "beautiful" at the bus stop.	-0.052	**0.685**
A construction worker says "hot damn" as you walk by a construction site on campus.	0.479	**0.684**
A person you do not know winks at you while you are in your office.	0.290	**0.673**
A random person beside you on the bus says that you are "cute".	0.087	**0.662**
A supervisor tells you to smile at a restaurant.	-0.024	**0.648**
A stranger says "nice legs" to you outside a library.	0.496	**0.646**
A stranger whistles at you in your apartment building.	0.549	**0.627**
A random person winks at you as you walk on the sidewalk.	0.236	**0.614**
A supervisor winks at you at a restaurant.	0.371	**0.589**
A person you do not know stares at your body at a swimming pool.	0.500	**0.580**
A lab mate whistles at you while you are walking to your car.	0.524	**0.568**
A lab mate tries to kiss you on your patio.	0.482	**0.559**
An acquaintance asks for your number while you are walking to your car.	-0.156	**0.554**
A person you do not know asks for your number in the hallway of your apartment building.	0.218	**0.552**
A teacher during class says that you are "stunning."	0.342	**0.544**
A stranger asks, "what race are you?" at school.	0.406	**0.543**

	C1	C2
Your supervisor tells you to "put some clothes on" during a meeting at work.	0.350	**0.462**
At the mall, someone you do not know asks for your number.	0.152	**0.446**
A classmate tries to kiss you at a concert.	0.329	**0.407**
A random person says "hey baby" to you in a restaurant.	0.001	**0.304**

Note: C1 = Component 1/Sexual Advances and Aggressive Behaviours; C2 = Component 2/Unwanted Sexual Attention Behaviours

Appendix F

A Rotated Structure Matrix for Question 1 of the Main Study

Items	Rotated Component Coefficients	
	Component 1	Component 2
UClassmateSpitsClass	**0.848**	-0.107
UUnknownSpitsBeach	**0.837**	-0.096
URandomFondleWorkplace	**0.815**	-0.077
UProfFondleOffice	**0.812**	-0.014
UStrangerSpitsWork	**0.810**	-0.133
URandomHateSpeechStreet	**0.809**	0.052
UUnknownThrowsCafeteria	**0.801**	0.036
UStrangerOinkBank	**0.801**	0.245
URandomSlapsBehindSubway	**0.799**	0.166
URandomThrowsGasStation	**0.789**	0.128
UCoworkerHandsinPantsOffice	**0.786**	0.149
UStrangerHateSpeechSchool	**0.782**	0.004
UUnknownFondleSubway	**0.778**	-0.107
UUnknownHandsinPantsApt	**0.775**	0.128
UBossHikeUpSkirtWork	**0.759**	0.233
UUnknownRubUpPublicTransport	**0.756**	0.218
UClassmateThrowsStreet	**0.754**	0.090
UUnknownWhoreLibrary	**0.753**	0.315

UUnknownSlapsBehindOffice	**0.750**	0.252
UStrangerSlutSidewalk	**0.748**	0.286
UClassmateHateSpeechLecture	**0.733**	0.137
UUnknownDressSexierOffice	**0.732**	0.437
UUnknownGoBackRestaurant	**0.728**	0.161
ULabmateThrowsHall	**0.728**	0.011
UCoworkerFondleBar	**0.727**	0.077
UCoWorkerHateSpeechBusStop	**0.723**	0.053
ULabmateWhoreDept	**0.721**	0.316
UColleagueSpitsStreet	**0.716**	-0.018
UClassmateRubUpClassroom	**0.714**	0.311
UColleagueSlapsBehindMeeting	**0.709**	0.323
URandomRubUpWorkplace	**0.707**	0.253
UOfficemateHandsinPantsBar	**0.707**	0.298
UUnknownTouchHairRestaurant	**0.703**	0.322
URandomFatCafeteria	**0.697**	0.251
URandomTouchHairOffice	**0.695**	0.382
URandomHandsinPantsCafe	**0.687**	0.247
UUnknownFollowsCar	**0.684**	0.201
UBossWhistleWork	**0.682**	0.481
UUnknownRackHall	**0.677**	0.520
UCoWorkerCleavageRestaurant	**0.676**	0.494

URandomBlockSidewalk	**0.676**	0.226
UCoworkerSlapsBehindPub	**0.660**	0.361
UClassmateFatLectureHall	**0.655**	0.424
USupervisorBlockCafe	**0.650**	0.360
UStrangerBlockMailroom	**0.641**	0.253
URandomKissSchool	**0.624**	0.378
UCoWorkerWoofFoodTruck	**0.609**	0.491
URandomSwearWork	**0.603**	0.408
UProfCurvesCafe	**0.601**	0.575
ULabmate AssLab	**0.600**	0.479
UCoWorkerSwearStreet	**0.597**	0.352
UUnknownUnbuttonBar	**0.589**	0.454
UUnknownKissBar	**0.588**	0.404
UBossRaceWork	**0.586**	0.324
ULabmateHubaDesk	**0.584**	0.570
UCoworkerLeerMeeting	**0.582**	0.541
UClassmateSluttyMall	**0.565**	0.447
UCoWorkerWhiteBestCar	**0.561**	0.372
UUnknownClerkSwearStore	**0.559**	0.301
UBossSugarMeeting	**0.558**	0.552
ULabmateBlockHallway	**0.540**	0.340
UOfficeMateHairOffice	**0.533**	0.419

UCoWorkerWeight Restaurant	**0.515**	0.435
UClassmateFollowsCar	**0.500**	0.414
UWaiterCoverUpRestaurant	**0.468**	0.409
UTeacherSwearSchool	**0.407**	0.380
URandomWinkSidewalk	0.258	**0.777**
UStrangerWorkGorgeous	0.161	**0.740**
UClassmateBeautifulBus	0.065	**0.734**
UUnknownWinkOffice	0.207	**0.725**
URandomStarePool	0.148	**0.712**
UUnknownMallPhNumber	0.074	**0.709**
URandomSmileWork	0.262	**0.706**
UStrangerLegsLibrary	0.449	**0.701**
URandomCutieBus	0.339	**0.699**
UUnknownHallPhNumber	0.143	**0.698**
UBartenderWowBar	0.169	**0.693**
UBossSmileTrain	-0.294	**0.689**
UAcquaintCarPhNumber	-0.057	**0.686**
UConstrWorkerHotDamnSite	0.376	**0.679**
ULabmateSmileDesk	0.212	**0.663**
UUnknownWhistleATM	0.491	**0.660**
UClassmateLeerRestaurant	0.442	**0.657**
UClassmateCoverSelfBar	0.329	**0.651**

UUnknownSweetieOffice	0.329	**0.649**
ULabmateWhistleCar	0.479	**0.645**
UStrangerWhistleApt	0.453	**0.644**
UTeacherClassStunning	0.377	**0.636**
UClassmateSmileClass	-0.320	**0.631**
USupervisorWink Restaurant	0.345	**0.627**
UStrangerSmileTrain	0.262	**0.623**
UUnknownStareBodyOffice	0.400	**0.612**
UStrangerRaceSchool	0.192	**0.602**
UBossWorkPhNumber	0.397	**0.594**
UUnknownSmileStore	-0.283	**0.589**
USupervisorSmileRestaurant	0.258	**0.589**
UUnknownSmileUni	-0.247	**0.581**
UProfWinkLecture	0.424	**0.564**
UClassmateKissConcert	0.261	**0.561**
ULabmateHairCafe	0.478	**0.547**
ULabmateKissPatio	0.364	**0.541**
UStrangerHiStreet	-0.190	**0.535**
UUnknownGoodMornWork	-0.307	**0.532**
USupervisorClothesOnMeeting	0.424	**0.506**
UUnknownClothesOnSchool	0.479	**0.505**
UProfHelloClass	-0.440	**0.477**

UCoworkGoodEveBus	-0.428	**0.471**

Appendix G

A Rotated Structure Matrix for Question 2 of the Main Study

Items	Rotated Component Coefficients	
	Component 1	Component 2
LUnknownSlapsBehindOffice	**0.919**	0.118
LLabmateThrowsHall	**0.917**	0.085
LStrangerSpitsWork	**0.911**	0.093
LLabmateWhoreDept	**0.909**	0.100
LUnknownWhoreLibrary	**0.904**	0.085
LUnknownDressSexierOffice	**0.899**	0.220
LRandomThrowsGasStation	**0.898**	0.031
LOfficemateHandsinPantsBar	**0.898**	0.111
LCoWorkerHateSpeechBusStop	**0.896**	0.013
LBossHikeUpSkirtWork	**0.893**	0.071
LRandomHateSpeechStreet	**0.893**	0.096
LUnknownThrowsCafeteria	**0.889**	0.002
LUnknownFollowsCar	**0.888**	0.119
LUnknownHandsinPantsApt	**0.873**	0.065
LRandomHandsinPantsCafe	**0.873**	0.131
LStrangerOinkBank	**0.870**	0.150
LStrangerBlockMailroom	**0.863**	0.116
LRandomRubUpWorkplace	**0.849**	0.122

LCoworkerHandsinPantsOffice	**0.843**	0.130
LClassmateSpitsClass	**0.843**	-0.001
LColleagueSlapsBehindMeeting	**0.840**	0.249
LUnknownRubUpPublicTransport	**0.839**	0.130
LStrangerHateSpeechSchool	**0.839**	0.126
LUnknownSpitsBeach	**0.838**	0.068
LClassmateHateSpeechLecture	**0.831**	0.179
LRandomTouchHairOffice	**0.817**	0.090
LRandomBlockSidewalk	**0.807**	0.211
LClassmateRubUpClassroom	**0.807**	0.108
LUnknownTouchHairRestaurant	**0.802**	0.203
LRandomKissSchool	**0.800**	0.128
LBossWhistleWork	**0.791**	0.292
LRandomFondleWorkplace	**0.783**	0.011
LProfFondleOffice	**0.780**	0.055
LRandomSwearWork	**0.774**	0.102
LUnknownClerkSwearStore	**0.771**	0.088
LUnknownFondleSubway	**0.767**	0.068
LCoWorkerCleavageRestaurant	**0.763**	0.329
LClassmateFatLectureHall	**0.756**	0.205
LClassmateThrowsStreet	**0.755**	0.096
LProfCurvesCafe	**0.752**	0.392

LColleagueSpitsStreet	**0.748**	0.107
LClassmateFollowsCar	**0.745**	0.126
LRandomSlapsBehindSubway	**0.737**	0.199
LSupervisorBlockCafe	**0.735**	0.249
LUnknownRackHall	**0.729**	0.401
LLabmateBlockHallway	**0.726**	0.355
LUnknownGoBackRestaurant	**0.726**	0.194
LStrangerSlutSidewalk	**0.721**	0.267
LRandomFatCafeteria	**0.719**	0.224
LCoworkerFondleBar	**0.717**	0.212
LCoWorkerWoofFoodTruck	**0.699**	0.371
LUnknownUnbuttonBar	**0.699**	0.319
LLabmateHubaDesk	**0.689**	0.400
LBossSugarMeeting	**0.687**	0.239
LLabmateWhistleCar	**0.671**	0.481
LUnknownKissBar	**0.662**	0.343
LLabmate AssLab	**0.658**	0.383
LCoworkerSlapsBehindPub	**0.653**	0.425
LCoWorkerSwearStreet	**0.638**	0.313
LUnknownWhistleATM	**0.629**	0.470
LCoWorkerWeight Restaurant	**0.629**	0.458
LCoworkerLeerMeeting	**0.623**	0.493

LWaiterCoverUpRestaurant	**0.609**	0.297
LBossRaceWork	**0.585**	0.265
LTeacherSwearSchool	**0.583**	0.060
LStrangerWhistleApt	**0.580**	0.526
LClassmateSluttyMall	**0.576**	0.395
LProfWinkLecture	**0.568**	0.350
LOfficeMateHairOffice	**0.565**	0.321
LLabmateHairCafe	**0.548**	0.350
LSupervisorClothesOnMeeting	**0.495**	0.248
LCoWorkerWhiteBestCar	**0.494**	0.406
LUnknownClothesOnSchool	**0.493**	0.405
LClassmateCoverSelfBar	**0.467**	0.427
LRandomCutieBus	0.338	**0.786**
LClassmateBeautifulBus	0.056	**0.771**
LStrangerWorkGorgeous	0.269	**0.744**
LRandomWinkSidewalk	0.322	**0.730**
LRandomSmileWork	0.266	**0.711**
LLabmateSmileDesk	0.245	**0.710**
LUnknownMallPhNumber	0.221	**0.705**
LUnknownHallPhNumber	0.169	**0.685**
LTeacherClassStunning	0.337	**0.675**
LBartenderWowBar	0.216	**0.673**

LStrangerSmileTrain	0.304	**0.657**
LStrangerLegsLibrary	0.478	**0.643**
LUnknownWinkOffice	0.391	**0.619**
LConstrWorkerHotDamnSite	0.490	**0.614**
LAcquaintCarPhNumber	0.075	**0.606**
LUnknownStareBodyOffice	0.353	**0.600**
LRandomStarePool	0.183	**0.583**
LClassmateKissConcert	0.231	**0.578**
LSupervisorSmileRestaurant	0.254	**0.571**
LUnknownSmileUni	-0.218	**0.569**
LUnknownSweetieOffice	0.429	**0.557**
LStrangerRaceSchool	0.296	**0.555**
LUnknownSmileStore	-0.231	**0.553**
LStrangerHiStreet	-0.188	**0.547**
LClassmateSmileClass	-0.211	**0.539**
LClassmateLeerRestaurant	0.476	**0.531**
LSupervisorWink Restaurant	0.387	**0.499**
LBossSmileTrain	-0.229	**0.485**
LCoworkGoodEveBus	-0.308	**0.469**
LProfHelloClass	-0.326	**0.468**
LUnknownGoodMornWork	-0.255	**0.452**
LLabmateKissPatio	0.356	**0.451**

LBossWorkPhNumber	0.397	**0.422**

Appendix H

A Rotated Structure Matrix for Question 3 of the Main Study

Items	Rotated Component Coefficients	
	Component 1	Component 2
ACoworkerHandsinPantsOffice	**0.906**	0.027
AUnknownThrowsCafeteria	**0.890**	-0.015
AClassmateThrowsStreet	**0.889**	0.007
ARandomThrowsGasStation	**0.888**	-0.029
AOfficemateHandsinPantsBar	**0.876**	0.029
AStrangerSpitsWork	**0.860**	-0.052
ARandomFondleWorkplace	**0.847**	-0.073
AClassmateSpitsClass	**0.846**	-0.062
AUnknownSpitsBeach	**0.833**	-0.011
ARandomHandsinPantsCafe	**0.830**	0.116
AUnknownWhoreLibrary	**0.819**	0.069
AStrangerSlutSidewalk	**0.819**	0.131
AColleagueSlapsBehindMeeting	**0.817**	0.156
AProfFondleOffice	**0.808**	-0.064
ALabmateThrowsHall	**0.791**	0.061
ACoWorkerHateSpeechBusStop	**0.779**	0.086
ARandomSlapsBehindSubway	**0.778**	0.138
ABossHikeUpSkirtWork	**0.773**	0.083

AStrangerHateSpeechSchool	**0.764**	0.146
AUnknownSlapsBehindOffice	**0.756**	0.113
ACoworkerSlapsBehindPub	**0.755**	0.230
AUnknownDressSexierOffice	**0.751**	0.206
ACoWorkerCleavageRestaurant	**0.751**	0.222
ARandomRubUpWorkplace	**0.744**	0.109
AUnknownFondleSubway	**0.742**	-0.078
ACoworkerFondleBar	**0.736**	0.100
AClassmateRubUpClassroom	**0.732**	0.140
AUnknownFollowsCar	**0.730**	0.215
ARandomHateSpeechStreet	**0.728**	0.158
ABossWhistleWork	**0.725**	0.261
ARandomBlockSidewalk	**0.725**	0.169
AProfCurvesCafe	**0.712**	0.270
AUnknownHandsinPantsApt	**0.709**	0.121
AStrangerBlockMailroom	**0.709**	0.107
ARandomFatCafeteria	**0.703**	0.254
ALabmateWhoreDept	**0.702**	0.250
AUnknownUnbuttonBar	**0.700**	0.159
AUnknownTouchHairRestaurant	**0.689**	0.260
AUnknownRackHall	**0.671**	0.381
AUnknownClerkSwearStore	**0.656**	0.200

ARandomKissSchool	**0.655**	0.188
AColleagueSpitsStreet	**0.652**	0.017
ARandomSwearWork	**0.652**	0.145
AUnknownRubUpPublicTransport	**0.646**	0.112
ARandomTouchHairOffice	**0.645**	0.276
AClassmateFatLectureHall	**0.645**	0.309
AStrangerOinkBank	**0.638**	0.268
AClassmateHateSpeechLecture	**0.635**	0.227
ALabmate AssLab	**0.628**	0.257
ACoworkerLeerMeeting	**0.613**	0.397
AUnknownGoBackRestaurant	**0.605**	0.202
ACoWorkerWoofFoodTruck	**0.593**	0.440
ASupervisorBlockCafe	**0.590**	0.255
ABossSugarMeeting	**0.587**	0.378
ACoWorkerWeight Restaurant	**0.585**	0.369
ALabmateHubaDesk	**0.583**	0.527
AClassmateFollowsCar	**0.571**	0.364
ACoWorkerSwearStreet	**0.569**	0.365
ALabmateBlockHallway	**0.547**	0.290
AUnknownKissBar	**0.544**	0.265
AUnknownClothesOnSchool	**0.535**	0.389
ATeacherSwearSchool	**0.528**	0.182

AOfficeMateHairOffice	**0.504**	0.273
ABossRaceWork	**0.501**	0.240
ALabmateHairCafe	**0.492**	0.372
ACoworkGoodEveBus	**-0.460**	0.427
AWaiterCoverUpRestaurant	**0.412**	0.395
ARandomCutieBus	0.215	**0.772**
AClassmateBeautifulBus	-0.075	**0.720**
ARandomWinkSidewalk	0.143	**0.712**
AConstrWorkerHotDamnSite	0.370	**0.700**
AStrangerWorkGorgeous	0.157	**0.696**
AUnknownMallPhNumber	-0.033	**0.691**
AStrangerWhistleApt	0.337	**0.672**
ARandomStarePool	0.303	**0.660**
AStrangerSmileTrain	0.285	**0.659**
AUnknownWhistleATM	0.431	**0.656**
ABartenderWowBar	0.094	**0.651**
ALabmateWhistleCar	0.399	**0.648**
AUnknownHallPhNumber	0.001	**0.646**
ARandomSmileWork	0.234	**0.643**
ALabmateSmileDesk	0.179	**0.642**
AStrangerLegsLibrary	0.423	**0.634**
AUnknownSweetieOffice	0.291	**0.633**

ASupervisorSmileRestaurant	0.112	**0.631**
AUnknownWinkOffice	0.311	**0.625**
AUnknownStareBodyOffice	0.416	**0.622**
AUnknownSmileStore	-0.371	**0.612**
AUnknownSmileUni	-0.269	**0.598**
AClassmateSmileClass	-0.392	**0.591**
AAcquaintCarPhNumber	-0.067	**0.575**
ASupervisorWink Restaurant	0.209	**0.565**
AClassmateCoverSelfBar	0.276	**0.562**
AClassmateLeerRestaurant	0.528	**0.561**
AStrangerHiStreet	-0.294	**0.557**
ATeacherClassStunning	0.260	**0.546**
ABossSmileTrain	-0.326	**0.530**
AUnknownGoodMornWork	-0.353	**0.511**
AStrangerRaceSchool	0.155	**0.507**
AProfHelloClass	-0.398	**0.501**
ACoWorkerWhiteBestCar	0.402	**0.477**
AClassmateSluttyMall	0.409	**0.475**
AProfWinkLecture	0.369	**0.457**
ABossWorkPhNumber	0.342	**0.449**
AClassmateKissConcert	0.183	**0.424**
ASupervisorClothesOnMeeting	0.317	**0.375**

ALabmateKissPatio	0.246	**0.360**

Appendix I

General Research Ethics Board Letter Approvals

December 15, 2016

Ms. Zeinab Ramadan
Master's Student
Department of Psychology
Queen's University
Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6

GREB Ref #: GPSYC-791-16; TRAQ # 6019821
Title: "GPSYC-791-16 Catcalls or Compliments: Men's Attitudes of Street and Sexual Harassment in Relation to their Personality"

Dear Ms. Ramadan:

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled **"GPSYC-791-16 Catcalls or Compliments: Men's Attitudes of Street and Sexual Harassment in Relation to their Personality"** for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS 2 (2014)) and Queen's ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (Article 6.14) and Standard Operating Procedures (405.001), your project has been cleared for one year. You are reminded of your obligation to submit an annual renewal form prior to the annual renewal due date (access this form at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html/; click on "Events"; under "Create New Event" click on "General Research Ethics Board Annual Renewal/Closure Form for Cleared Studies"). Please note that when your research project is completed, you need to submit an Annual Renewal/Closure Form in Romeo/traq indicating that the project is 'completed' so that the file can be closed. This should be submitted at the time of completion; there is no need to wait until the annual renewal due date.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html/; click on "Events"; under "Create New Event" click on "General Research Ethics Board Adverse Event Form"). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example, you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To submit an amendment form, access the application by at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html; click on "Events"; under "Create New Event" click on "General Research Ethics Board Request for the Amendment of Approved Studies". Once submitted, these changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Ms. Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Sincerely,

John D. Freeman

John Freeman, Ph.D.
Chair
General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. Cynthia Fekkon, Supervisor
        Dr. Li-Jun Ji, Chair, Unit REB
        Ms. Cheryl Hamilton, Dept. Admin.

December 12, 2017

Ms. Zeinab Ramadan
Master's Student
Department of Psychology
Queen's University
Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6

Dear Ms. Ramadan:

GREB TRAQ #: 6019821
Title: "GPSYC-791-16 Catcalls or Compliments: Men's Attitudes of Street and Sexual Harassment in Relation to their Personality"

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB) has reviewed and cleared your request for renewal of ethics clearance for the above-named study. This renewal is valid for one year from December 15, 2017. Prior to the next renewal date you will be sent a reminder memo and the link to ROMEO to renew for another year. You are reminded of your obligation to submit an Annual Renewal/Closure Form prior to the annual renewal due date (access this form at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html/; click on "Events"; under "Create New Event" click on "General Research Ethics Board Annual Renewal/Closure Form for Cleared Studies"). Please note that when your research project is completed, you need to submit an Annual Renewal/Completed Form in Romeo/traq indicating that the project is 'completed' so that the file can be closed. This should be submitted at the time of completion; there is no need to wait until the annual renewal due date.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period. An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours. To submit an adverse event report, access the application at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html/; click on "Events"; under "Create New Event" click on "General Research Ethics Board Adverse Event Form".

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example, you must report changes in study procedures or implementation of new aspects into the study procedures. Your request for protocol changes will be forwarded to the appropriate GREB reviewers and/or the GREB Chair. To submit an amendment form, access the application at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html; click on "Events"; under "Create New Event" click on "General Research Ethics Board Request for the Amendment of Approved Studies".

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Interim Chair, General Research Ethics Board

c.:   Dr. Cynthia Fekken, Supervisor
          Dr. Leandre Fabrigar, Chair, Unit REB