

---

# ***Sexual Harassment***



|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Source/Primary reference</b> | Bingham, S. G., & Scherer, L. L. (1993). Factors associated with responses to sexual harassment and satisfaction with outcome. <i>Sex Roles</i> , 29(3/4), 239 -269.  |
| <b>Constructs measured</b>      | <p>Three constructs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Work climate regarding sexual harassment</li> <li>2. Responses to sexual harassment</li> <li>3. Satisfaction with the outcome</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Brief description</b>        | <p><i>Work Climate Regarding Sexual Harassment</i> is assessed with a 3-item instrument, rated on a 5-point scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.”</p> <p><i>Responses to Sexual Harassment</i> are assessed with two checklists. First there is a five-item checklist of general responses to a sexual harassment situation. Second, there is a communications strategy checklist to be filled out only by those who reported that they talked to the harasser.</p> <p><i>Satisfaction with Outcome</i> is a one-item measure about the victim’s satisfaction with the outcome, rated on a 4-point scale from “definitely not” to “yes, definitely.”</p>  |
| <b>Sample items</b>             | <p>Work Climate Regarding Sexual Harassment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sexual harassment is clearly discouraged by my supervisors and co-workers.</li> <li>▪ People in my department ignore sexual harassment.</li> <li>▪ The general attitude toward sexual communication in my department actually encourages sexual harassment.</li> </ul> <p><i>Responses to Sexual Harassment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Response checklist included: filing a formal complaint, informally talking to an external authority (e.g., ombudsperson, affirmative action officer), informally talking to an internal authority (e.g., supervisor, chair of the department), talking to co-workers, talking to friends or family members, talking to the harasser.</li> <li>▪ Communication strategies checklist (for the sub-sample who talked to the harasser) included: indirect communication strategies (e.g., ignoring or joking about the person’s behavior, hinting that the behavior was unwelcome), assertive communication strategies (e.g., asking the person to stop, stating objections to the behavior), and</li> </ul> |

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

RESPONSES TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND SATISFACTION WITH THE OUTCOME

aggressive communication strategies (e.g., expressing anger and hostility, using threats to get the person to stop).

## Satisfaction with Outcome

- Did the situation involving unwanted sexual communication get resolved to your satisfaction?

Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)

Adults

Translations & cultural adaptations available

None known

How developed

The study was a part of a larger, ongoing effort by a medium-sized Midwestern university to reduce, if not eliminate, sexual harassment on campus. The questionnaire domains and dimensions were extracted from the literature, and specific items were written by the study authors.

Psychometric properties

### STUDY SAMPLE

| <i>Participants</i> |                                       | <i>Demographics</i>   |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Sample Size</i>  |                                       | <i>n</i> = 105  |
| <i>Description</i>  |                                       | Employees of a Midwestern U.S. university who had reported experiencing unwanted sexual attention from a faculty, staff, or student member of the university. |
| <i>Ethnicity</i>    | <i>Caucasian</i>                      | 94 (89.5%)  |
|                     | <i>Multiethnic/<br/>multicultural</i> | 6 (5.7%)  |
|                     | <i>Not specified</i>                  | 5 (4.8%)  |
| <i>Gender</i>       | <i>Female</i>                         | 68 (65%)  |
|                     | <i>Male</i>                           | 37 (35%)  |
| <i>Position</i>     | <i>Staff members</i>                  | 51 (49%)  |
|                     | <i>Faculty members</i>                | 47 (45%)  |
|                     | <i>Not specified</i>                  | 7 (4%)  |

### RELIABILITY

#### *Internal consistency*

The Cronbach  $\alpha$  reliability for the Work Climate subscale is .78.

Comments

- The measures are brief, user-friendly approaches to assessing elements of the work climate and responses relevant to sexual harassment situations.

- There is limited information available about psychometric properties.
  - The full study uses multiple methods: checklists, open-ended questions, Likert-type items, and trained coders to classify certain responses into different categories.
  - The authors were concerned about the inflation of alpha and type I errors that result when a series of univariate tests are conducted.
- 

## Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

---

### Contact Information

Shereen G. Bingham, Associate Professor  
Communication Faculty and Women's Studies Faculty  
Arts and Science Hall, Rm140  
University of Nebraska at Omaha  
Omaha, NE 68182-0112  
Tel: 402-554-4857

e-mail: [sbingham@mail.unomaha.edu](mailto:sbingham@mail.unomaha.edu)

<http://avalon.unomaha.edu/wwwcomm/Faculty%20pages/sbingham.html>

Lisa L. Scherer, Associate Professor  
Psychology Faculty  
Arts and Sciences Hall, Rm 347-J  
University of Nebraska at Omaha  
Omaha, NE 68182  
Tel: 402-554-2698

e-mail: [lscherer@mail.unomaha.edu](mailto:lscherer@mail.unomaha.edu)

---

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES QUESTIONNAIRE - LATINAS (SEQ-L)

---

**Source/Primary reference**

Cortina, L. M. (2001). Assessing sexual harassment among Latinas: Development of an instrument. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7(2), 164-181.

---

**Construct measured**

Experiences of sexual harassment among Latinas

---

**Brief description**

A variation of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) (Fitzgerald et al., 1995) developed for Latinas. The scale has 20 items rated on a 5-point scale where responses range from 1 = never to 5 = most of the time. There are three subscales:

1. Sexist hostility
  2. Sexual hostility
  3. Unwanted sexual attention
- 

**Sample items**

- Told jokes or stories that described women IN GENERAL negatively?
  - Said things to insult LATINA women specifically (for example saying that Latinas are “hot-blooded” and “loose”)?
  - Made you uncomfortable by staring at you (for example, looking at you too long, or looking at your breasts)?
  - Gave you sexual attention that you did not want?
  - Made you uncomfortable by standing too close?
- 

**Appropriate for whom  
(i.e. which population/s)**

Latina women

---

**Translations & cultural  
adaptations available**

English and Spanish versions available

---

**How developed**

A first study was conducted to understand the experience of sexual harassment of Latinas and to guide the development of a culturally relevant measure. Focus groups were organized with Latina women students in an adult education program. As a result, six items were added to the dimensions of SEQ as developed by Fitzgerald and colleagues. Two of these items referred to specific verbal behaviors and four referred to nonverbal behaviors. Another five items were added to measure sexual racism. In order to avoid the influence of ethnicity and gender in

the responses, these questions about Latinas were paired with the same question asked for women in general. As a result, 16 new questions developed for this study were added to the existing SEQ.

In a second study to validate the scale, the researchers had a sample of women from vocational training programs in San Diego and Chicago. The results showed that two of the newly developed items had a low variance and were thus eliminated. Two other items were dropped because participants could interpret them in more than one way, such that the behavior did not necessarily qualify as sexual harassment. Therefore, not enough items were left to consider a sexual-racism factor.

In the end, nine items were developed for this particular scale and eleven were taken from SEQ, resulting in a 20-item Sexual Experiences Questionnaire for Latinas.

**Psychometric properties**

**STUDY SAMPLE**

| <i>Participants</i>   |                                      | <i>Study 1</i>   |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Sample Size</i>    |                                      | <i>N</i> = 462   |
| <i>Description</i>    |                                      | Latinas from public adult schools, job training centers, or a “swap meet” in the San Diego area and from a public adult school in a Chicago suburb |
| <i>Age</i>            | <i>Range</i>                         | 18-55+   |
| <i>Education</i>      | <i>Graduate School</i>               | <i>n</i> = 22  |
|                       | <i>College</i>                       | <i>n</i> = 74  |
|                       | <i>High School+</i>                  | <i>n</i> = 192   |
|                       | <i>Less than High School Diploma</i> | <i>n</i> = 167   |
| <i>Marital Status</i> | <i>Single</i>                        | <i>n</i> = 215   |
|                       | <i>Married/Living with Partner</i>   | <i>n</i> = 178   |
|                       | <i>Widowed</i>                       | <i>n</i> = 7   |
|                       | <i>Separated/Divorced</i>            | <i>n</i> = 60  |

**RELIABILITY**

The  $\alpha$  reliability for the full scale is .96 for both the English and Spanish versions.

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXUAL EXPERIENCES QUESTIONNAIRE - LATINAS (SEQ-L)

---

| <i>Subscale</i>                  | <i>Spanish</i><br>$\alpha =$ | <i>English</i><br>$\alpha =$ | <i>Overall</i><br>$\alpha =$ |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>Sexist Hostility</i>          | .91                          | .88                          | .90                          |
| <i>Sexual Hostility</i>          | .90                          | .89                          | .90                          |
| <i>Unwanted Sexual Attention</i> | .94                          | .96                          | .95                          |

---

## Comments

The scale builds on a well-validated scale and extends its usefulness with a new population.

- The author used a convenience sample, composed of adult education students. This approach limits reaching immigrants without legal status, very-low-income women, and professional workers.
- Most of the participants in the study were of Mexican origin: for expanded use, the scale should be validated with immigrant groups from other Latin American cultures.

---

## Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)

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

---

## Contact Information

Lilia M. Cortina  
Department of Psychology  
University of Michigan  
525 East University  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1109, USA

---

---

**Source/Primary reference** Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 425-445.

---

**Construct measured** Experiences of sexual harassment in the workplace

---

**Brief description** An original SEQ scale consisted of 28 items. The revised SEQ-W scale contains 20 items and is made up of 3 subscales and a separate item retained as an individual category to measure the participant's subjective perceptions of sexual harassment. The rating scale ranges from 0 = never to 4 = many times. The three subscales measure:

1. Gender Harassment
  2. Unwanted Sexual Attention
  3. Sexual Coercion
- 

**Sample items**

- Have you ever been in a situation where a supervisor or coworker habitually told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?
- Have you ever been in a situation where your coworker made unwanted attempts to stroke or fondle you?
- Have you ever been in a situation where you felt that you were being subtly bribed with some sort of reward to engage in a sexual behavior with a coworker?

---

**Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)** Employed women

---

**Translations & cultural adaptations available** A version designed for students is available as SEQ-E.  
A version designed for Latinas, developed by Cortina (2001) is available as SEQ-L (see previous entry).

---

**How developed** The first version of the scale was developed in 1988 and showed good psychometric properties for research purposes. However, the authors saw the need to improve the scale in order to distinguish between the type and the severity of harassment, change the dimensional structure of the scale, and use more sensitive wording. The authors developed new items and revised the previous ones to fit the three-dimensional model. The SEQ-W was first examined in a large utility company.



# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXUAL EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (SEQ-W)

## Psychometric properties

### STUDY SAMPLES

| <i>Participants</i>   | <i>Regulated Utility</i>                         | <i>Agricultural Organization</i>        | <i>Midwestern University</i>         |
|-----------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Sample Size</i>    | N = 448  | N = 410                                 | N = 299                              |
| <i>Description</i>    | Employees of a West Coast public utility company | Employees of agribusiness factory sites | Employees of a Midwestern university |
| <i>Gender</i>         | 100% women                                       | 100% women                              | 100% women                           |
| <i>Race/Ethnicity</i> | Not reported                                     | Not reported                            | Not reported                         |

### VALIDITY

#### *Concurrent Validity*

Correlations of SEQ-W with other measures, in employees of a regulated utility ( $n = 448$ ), agribusiness factory sites ( $n = 410$ ), and university ( $n = 299$ ).

| <i>Measure</i>  | <i>Regulated Utility</i> | <i>Agricultural Organization</i> | <i>Midwestern University</i> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>OTSHI</i>    | .45**                    | .23**                            | .40**                        |
| <i>SUPSAT</i>   | -.18**                   | -.23**                           | -.36**                       |
| <i>COWSAT</i>   | -.29**                   | -.16**                           | -.26**                       |
| <i>WKSAT</i>    | -.09                     | -.11*                            | -----                        |
| <i>JOBWITH</i>  | .11*                     | .20**                            | -----                        |
| <i>WKWITH</i>   | .19**                    | .32**                            | .19**                        |
| <i>HELSAT</i>   | -.03                     | -.07                             | -----                        |
| <i>HELCOND</i>  | -.09                     | -----                            | -----                        |
| <i>LIFESAT</i>  | -.08                     | -.16**                           | -.20**                       |
| <i>PTSD</i>     | .17**                    | -----                            | .19**                        |
| <i>DISTRESS</i> | .16**                    | .11*                             | -----                        |
| <i>SIG</i>      | .05                      | .17**                            | .20**                        |
| <i>EXTCOM</i>   | .14*                     | -----                            | -----                        |

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

- ◆ OTSHI = Organizational Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory
- ◆ SEQ = Sexual Experiences Questionnaire
- ◆ SUPSAT = JDI Satisfaction with Supervision
- ◆ COWSAT = JDI Satisfaction with Coworkers
- ◆ WKSAT = JDI Satisfaction with Work
- ◆ JOBWITH = Job Withdrawal
- ◆ WKWITH = Work Withdrawal
- ◆ HELSAT = RDI Health Satisfaction
- ◆ HELCOND = Health Conditions Index

- ◆ LIFESAT = Life Satisfaction Scale + Faces Scale
- ◆ PTSD = Crime-Related Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
- ◆ DISTRESS = MHI Distress
- ◆ SIG = Stress in General
- ◆ EXTCOM = Extrinsic Organizational Commitment

**RELIABILITY**

Reliabilities for the SEQ-W in 3 samples

|                                      | <i>Regulated<br/>Utility</i> | <i>Agricultural<br/>Organization</i> | <i>Midwestern<br/>University</i> |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>Subscale</i>                      | $\alpha =$                   | $\alpha =$                           | $\alpha =$                       |
| <i>Gender Harassment</i>             | .81                          | .78                                  | .72                              |
| <i>Unwanted Sexual<br/>Attention</i> | .82                          | .80                                  | .67                              |
| <i>Sexual Coercion</i>               | .41                          | .92                                  | .49                              |
| <i>Overall</i>                       | .86                          | .88                                  | .78                              |

**Comments**

- This is the best validated scale for assessing experiences of sexual harassment and has been used by a wide range of researchers.
- One disadvantage of the scale is its length, and thus some other researchers seem to adopt alternative approaches that are less detailed.
- There are demonstrated relationships to both psychological states (i.e., anxiety and depression) and physical health (Fitzgerald et al., 1997).
- There are versions designed specifically for work settings and alternative versions developed for academic settings.
- Some work has been done to adapt the scale for use with Latinas (see Cortina entry). However, the ethnic/racial make-up of the sample was not reported in the articles we reviewed that describe the development of the initial scale.

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J., & Magley, V. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 28*(4), 578-589.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, A., Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*, 152-175.

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXUAL EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (SEQ-W)

---

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*, 164-177.

---

## Contact Information

Louise F. Fitzgerald  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
603 East Daniel St.  
Champaign, IL 61820, USA

No cost from the author.

---

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

**ORGANIZATIONAL TOLERANCE FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT INVENTORY (OTSHI)**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Source/Primary reference</b>                          | Hulin, C., Fitzgerald, L., & Drasgow, F. (1996). Organizational influences on sexual harassment, in M. Stockdale (Ed.), <i>Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Perspectives, frontiers and response strategies</i> . Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.  |
| <b>Construct measured</b>                                | Perceptions of likelihood of organizational reactions to various forms of harassment   |
| <b>Brief description</b>                                 | <p>The OTSHI instrument consists of six brief vignettes, in which the characteristics of a male harasser (supervisor, or coworker) are crossed with each of three types of sexual harassment: gender harassment, sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention. After each vignette, respondents are asked to make three assessments using 5-point rating scales (18 items total):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The degree of risk to a female victim if she reported such an incident</li> <li>2. The likelihood that her allegations would be taken seriously by the organization</li> <li>3. The likelihood that the harasser would receive meaningful sanctions</li> </ol> |
| <b>Sample items</b>                                      | <p>Gender Harassment x Supervisor Scenario</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A supervisor in your department makes reference to “incompetent women trying to do jobs they were never intended to do and taking jobs away from better qualified workers.” He makes all women in the department feel incompetent and unwanted.</li> </ul> <p>Unwanted Sexual Attention x Coworkers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ An employee in your department continues to pressure the women in the department to go out with him after they have made it clear that they are not interested.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)</b>    | Adult women and men  |
| <b>Translations &amp; cultural adaptations available</b> | None known   |
| <b>How developed</b>                                     | Items for the scale were written based on a facet analysis of harassing incidents that suggested two facets: organizational role of the harasser and type of harassing behavior. The facet analysis generated a six-cell design  |

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

ORGANIZATIONAL TOLERANCE FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT INVENTORY (OTSHI)

that crosses two harasser roles and three types of harassing behavior. The authors included 36 items in the scale to be piloted with a sample of 263 graduate students. The internal consistency of the scale was .96, and since none of the items accounted for a unique variance, the authors decided to shorten the scale by eliminating one item in each cell, leaving a final version with 18 items.

## Psychometric properties

### STUDY SAMPLE

| <i>Participants</i>   |               | <i>Demographics</i> |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| <i>Sample Size</i>    |               | <i>n</i> = 1,156    |
| <i>Gender</i>         | <i>Female</i> | <i>n</i> = 459      |
|                       | <i>Male</i>   | <i>n</i> = 697      |
| <i>Race/Ethnicity</i> |               | Not reported        |

### VALIDITY

#### *Construct Validity*

| <i>Scale</i> | <i>M</i> = | <i>SD</i> = | $\alpha$ = | <i>Measurement model factor loading</i> |          |          |
|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|---|----------|----------|
|              |            |             |            | <i>1</i>                                | <i>2</i> | <i>3</i> |
| <i>OTSHI</i> | 2.25       | 0.86        | .96        | .89                                     | .92      | .94      |

### RELIABILITY

| <i>Subscale</i> | <i>Reliability</i> |             |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|
|                 | <i>Female</i>      | <i>Male</i> |
|                 | $\alpha$ =         | $\alpha$ =  |
| <i>Risk</i>     | .94                | .89         |
| <i>Serious</i>  | .94                | .91         |
| <i>Action</i>   | .93                | .91         |

## Comments

- This is an innovative approach to measuring an aspect of the organizational context.
- The instrument requires a fairly literate study population.
- A simpler but less rigorous approach to assessing organizational tolerance is described in Hesson-McInnis and Fitzgerald (1997).
- The ethnic/racial make-up of the sample was not reported. It would be useful to assess the scale's validity and reliability for multiple ethnic/racial groups.

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

**ORGANIZATIONAL TOLERANCE FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT INVENTORY (OTSHI)**

---

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J., & Magley, V. J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(4), 578-590.

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

---

**Contact Information**

Louise F. Fitzgerald  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
603 East Daniel Street  
Champaign, IL 61820, USA  
  
No cost from the author.

---

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXUAL HARASSMENT INVENTORY (SHI)

---

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Source/Primary reference</b>                          | Murdoch, M., & McGovern, P. G. (1998). Measuring sexual harassment: Development and validation of the Sexual Harassment Inventory. <i>Violence and Victims, 13</i> (3), 203 - 216.   |
| <b>Construct measured</b>                                | Sexual harassment  |
| <b>Brief description</b>                                 | <p>The scale includes a list of 20 behaviors of a sexual nature and one open-ended question. Item responses are “yes” or “no.” The items can also be weighted by severity.</p> <p>After the factor analyses, three SHI subscales emerged: (i) Hostile Environment, (ii) Quid Pro Quo, and (iii) Criminal Sexual Misconduct.</p>  |
| <b>Sample items</b>                                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>■ People with whom I worked made sexual jokes that made me feel uncomfortable.</li><li>■ Coworkers made sexual comments about my body.</li><li>■ I was offered favorable assignments in exchange for sex with my supervisor (or, in the military version, commanding officer).</li><li>■ Some of the people I worked with leered at me in a sexual way.</li><li>■ The people I worked with made catcalls or sexual remarks when I walked by.</li></ul> |
| <b>Appropriate for whom (i.e. which population/s)</b>    | Adults   |
| <b>Translations &amp; cultural adaptations available</b> | Active-duty and veteran military populations.  |
| <b>How developed</b>                                     | Items for inclusion in the SHI were gathered from three focus groups, literature reviews, and court cases involving sexual harassment. A pilot study with 80 male and female students was conducted to solicit feedback to improve wording and clarity. Then the SHI was modified to apply to the military environment.  |
| <b>Psychometric properties</b>                           | <p><u>STUDY SAMPLE</u></p> <p><u>Study 1</u>: The first study sample included female veterans (n = 333) who had obtained medical care at the MVAMC between March 1992 and March 1993. Information about race/ethnicity is not included. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had experienced any of the behaviors listed in the SHI while they were in the military.</p>  |

---

Study 2: A second study involved anonymous surveys of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) officers (n = 160) stationed at Veterans Affairs hospitals throughout the U.S. Officers were asked to provide severity weights to each item on the SHI. The ranks ranged from 1 (least severe) to 20 (most severe). 64% of the respondents were female. Race/ethnicity is not reported.

The author reports that reliability and factor structure is similar for both white persons and non-white persons.

## VALIDITY

### *Content Validity*

Items for inclusion in the SHI were gathered from three focus groups, literature reviews, and court cases involving sexual harassment. The focus group discussion were held with:

- physicians employed at the Minneapolis Veterans Affairs Medical Center (MVAMC) (n = 3),
- sitting members of the MVAMC Sexual Trauma Treatment Team (n = 8), and
- a convenience sample of women who accompanied their husbands to clinic visits at the MVAMC (n = 10).

In a comprehensive sample of Tri-Care and CHAMPUS enrollees who received care at a Midwestern VA medical facility (n = 293 men and 237 women), 85% agreed or strongly agreed that the SHI measured their most important experiences with unwanted sexual attention while they were in the service.

### *Construct Validity*

Factor analysis was conducted using oblique (Oblimin) and orthogonal (varimax) rotations. Items were considered to be salient to their respective factors if factor loadings were greater than or equal to .40. Items were considered to be exclusive to the factor if the difference between their salient factor loading and loadings on other factors was greater than .11.

Three factors accounted for 57% of the variance in the model. Whereas the first two factors appeared to correspond to the latent variables “hostile environment” and “quid pro quo,” the third and



the smallest factor seemed to be related to the most serious forms of sexual harassment, such as rape and attempted rape (called in this study “criminal sexual misconduct”). All SHI items were salient to their factors. With one exception, all were exclusive.

In military populations, the severity-weighted SHI has been shown to correlate in the expected direction with symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety, and somatization; with work, role, social, and physical functioning; and with other trauma experiences.

### ***Concurrent Validity***

The EEO officers’ severity weightings did not differ significantly by gender or by full-time or part-time status. Kruskal’s stress index was .088, and  $r^2$  was .98, indicating that less than 1% of the variance of the model was due to error, and 98% of the variance was explained by a unidimensional model. Therefore, it was highly unlikely that attributes other than the severity accounted for the manner in which respondents ranked the scale items.

The SHI correlates .88 with a modified version of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire.

### ***Criterion-Related Validity***

Three items from the “criminal sexual misconduct” scale plus the open-ended question had sensitivity of 90%, specificity of 100%, and overall accuracy of 91% in identifying in-service sexual assault in a small sample ( $n = 11$ ) of women veterans who filed disability claims for posttraumatic stress disorder. Objective, second-party documentation from the veterans’ claims files (e.g., police reports, hospital reports, testimonials from friends who remembered being told about the assault at the time it occurred) served as the gold standard.

In a randomly selected sample of women veterans applying for posttraumatic stress disorder disability benefits ( $n = 1,682$ ), severity-weighted SHI scores greater than 20.01 were associated with 2-fold greater odds of meeting survey criterion for posttraumatic stress disorder compared to women with lower SHI scores, even after accounting for other adult trauma experiences.

**RELIABILITY**

***Internal Consistency***

The Cronbach  $\alpha$  reliability for the full SHI scale ranges from .90 to .95

The Cronbach  $\alpha$  reliabilities of three SHI subscales

| <i>SHI subscale</i>               | $\alpha =$ |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| <i>Hostile environment</i>        | .89        |
| <i>Quid pro quo</i>               | .86        |
| <i>Criminal sexual misconduct</i> | .86        |

**Comments**

- The SHI content domain is comprehensive. Its internal consistency reliability is high, and it has evidence of factorial validity.
- The behaviors measured in the SHI can be weighted according to relative severity, allowing investigators to examine dose-response relationships and threshold between sexual harassment and various health outcomes - especially mental health outcomes such as anxiety, depression, alcohol misuse, or PTSD.
- Other uses of the severity-weighted SHI might include associations between sexual harassment and measures of well-being such as social adjustment or quality of life.
- The instrument can be easily adapted for use in a general working population by replacing “commanding officer” with “supervisor.”
- The authors allow other investigators to freely reproduce and use the SHI as long as the article and journal are referenced.

**Bibliography (studies that have used the measure)**

Murdoch, M., Hodges, J., Cowper, D., Fortier, L., & vanRyn, M. (2003). Racial disparities in VA service connection for posttraumatic stress disorder disability. *Medical Care, 41*(4), 536-549.

Murdoch, M., Polusny, M. A., Hodges, J., & O’Brien, N. (2004). Prevalence of in-service and post-service sexual assault among combat and noncombat veterans applying for Department of Veterans Affairs posttraumatic stress disorder disability benefits. *Military Medicine, 169*, 392-395.

Halek, K., Murdoch, M., & Fortier, L. (2005). Spontaneous reports of emotional upset and health care utilization among veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) after receiving a potentially upsetting survey. *Journal of American Orthopsychiatry, 75*(1):142-151.

# Sexual Harassment

TITLE OF MEASURE

SEXUAL HARASSMENT INVENTORY (SHI)

---

Murdoch, M., Polusny, M. A., Hodges, J., & Cowper, D. (2006). The association between in-service sexual harassment and posttraumatic stress disorder among Department of Veterans Affairs disability applicants. *Military Medicine* 171(8):166-173.

Murdoch, M., Pryor, J., Hodges, J., Gackstetter, G. D., Cowper, D., & O'Brien, N. Findings from VA HSR&D Project #IIR-96-014, "Antecedents and Consequences of Military Sexual Trauma" Final Report.

---

## Contact Information

Maureen Murdoch  
Associate Professor of Medicine  
Center for Chronic Disease Outcomes Research  
(a VA HSR&D Center of Excellence) and  
Section of General Internal Medicine

Office/Campus address:  
Minneapolis Veterans Affairs Medical Center  
One Veterans Dr. (111-0)  
Minneapolis, MN 55416, USA

e-mail: [Maureen.Murdoch@med.va.gov](mailto:Maureen.Murdoch@med.va.gov)

---