University of Central Florida

STARS

2022

Addressing Sexual Harassment (SH) at Work: Examining the Role of Social Identity on Observer Intervention Behavior

Tisnue Jean-Baptiste
University of Central Florida

ADRESSING SEXUAL HARASSMENT (SH) AT WORK:
EXAMINING THE ROLE OF SOCIAL IDENTITY ON OBSERVER
INTERVENTION BEHAVIOR

by

TISNUE JEAN-BAPTISTE
B.A., B.S. The State University at Binghamton, 2020

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science of Industrial Organizational Psychology
in the Department of Psychology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2022

ABSTRACT

Sexual Harassment (SH) has been a prevalent issue within the workplace. Observer behavior is when employees are trained to identify and intervene in situations of SH. The traditional SH framework has focused on the legal compliance of employees rather than appealing to their moral reasoning. Furthermore, in most SH training typically depicts an SH situation with a white man who identifies as heterosexual as the perpetrator and a white woman as the victim. The Sex-Based Harassment (SBH) framework aims to address various intersections of racial, sexual, and gender identity within the context of SH. The current study examined the role of social identity on observer intervention behavior using the Observer Intervention in Sexual Harassment (OISH) measure informed by the SBH framework. It is hypothesized that participants who have past SH experience and/or identify as people of color, women, or sexual minorities are more likely to engage in observer behavior. Our original hypotheses had null findings and further analysis provided limited significant findings. These findings show that observer intervention behavior is not dependent on experiencing/witnessing SH. This study is important to improve the effectiveness of training to equip employees with the tools to better identify and intervene in situations of SH in the workplace.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Sexual Harassment (SH)

SH is a form of sexual victimization rooted in sexism. Despite attempts to reduce the prevalence of SH it continues to be one of the most common forms of workplace mistreatment (Buchanan et al., 2014) and represents a form of sexual discrimination. SH in the workplace is either a quid pro quo situation, which involves coercion of sexual acts in exchange for benefits at the organizational level, or a hostile work environment that influences one's job performance. The hostile work environment can involve unwanted sexual attention or gender-based harassment, such as using gendered derogatory language. The coercion of sexual acts is a more precisely targeted action towards an individual while a hostile work environment might not be. Ultimately a hostile work environment less identifiable as SH behavior than the direct experience of sexual advancement or coercion (Hayes et al., 2020).

SH at Work

SH is costly for both organizations and their employees. When dealing with SH claims, organizations often must invest in litigation fees and afterward rebranding their reputations. Nearly half of all working women experience SH over the course of their careers (Buchanan et al., 2014). Approximately $56.6 million dollars in fines were awarded to organizations who had not resolved their SH cases prior to trial in 2018 (Hayes et al., 2020). Employees who are victims of SH tend to experience decreased job satisfaction, increased absences to work, and are more likely to leave their job/be fired. Employees who are victims of SH in the workplace have higher turnover rates within organizations than employees who have not experienced SH. There are

both financial costs to the organization and emotional consequences for employees (Hayes et al., 2020).

Defining Bystander Intervention

Bystander intervention has been used to effectively change bystander behaviors and attitudes in order to prevent SH (Mujal et al., 2021). Bystander Intervention is essential to create a work culture that is inclusive and safe for all employees. The traditional bystander intervention training regarding SH typically occurs in-person in group settings with one main facilitator relating information to participants. The traditional format of SH bystander intervention training fails to assess in an active way how participants may react in SH instances given the passive format. There are several reasons why the bystander role is critical in an SH situation. Bystanders are vital because they are usually less compromised and relatively safer than a victim of SH. Furthermore, the bystander can be witnessing an SH incident that can influence the victim's claim afterward. The process of reporting SH claims can be overwhelming and shared between both the victim and the bystander. The bystander can provide the victim with moral support and encouragement. Another way that the bystander is essential is that their intervention could alter the course of an SH incident by mitigating negative consequences (Khanna & Shyamsunder, 2020).

The History of Bystander Intervention

In 1936 the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) was formed. Prior to the establishment of SPSSI the field of psychology did not study and apply psychological principles to social issues. The reason for this gap being that many previous psychologists did not believe that psychology could remain a scientific discipline while simultaneously addressing social issues. By the 1930's with the rise of the Great Depression and Nazi Germany many found

it crucial that psychology be applied to address social conflicts in the United States and aboard (Cieciura, 2016).

Kurt Lewin conducted pioneering work regarding social change and action and acted as a key figure head in the development of SPSSI. Lewin's work focused how group functioning influences individual members of the group. Lewin felt that understanding group dynamics was an important component in addressing social issues. More specifically Lewin was interested in the situational factors that contribute to one's behavior in other words the motivational influences of behavior which informed the work of other social psychologists during this period in time. In the 1960s interests of social psychologist shifted to what factors influence one to not intervene to help a victim in emergency situations. This shift was prompted by the murder of Kitty Genovese in 1964 (Cieciura, 2016).

The Basis of Bystander Intervention

The murder of Katherine "Kitty" Genovese was a catalyst for empirical research regarding bystander helping behavior. On March 13th, 1964, around 3:00 am Ms. Genovese was stabbed and sexually assaulted while several bystanders overheard yet none intervened. This disturbing incident spoke to how people react in emergency situations (Jhangiani et al., 2014). Some stipulated that indifference and apathy were the reasons for inaction by bystanders witnessing the murder. Darley and Latané focused on social conditions that effect bystander reactions, specifically the number of bystanders in a given situation. Darley and Latané found diffusion of blame, diffusion of responsibility and the belief that someone else will intervene to help as the three main reasons why the individuals are less likely to help in an emergency if other bystanders are present (Cieciura, 2016).

Latané and Darley (1970) outlined the theory for bystander helping behavior. The approach identified five essential steps intervening bystanders must take.

1. *Noticing* the situation happening

2. *Assessing* the situation to determine whether intervening is necessary

3. *Taking* the responsibility to intervene in the situation

4. *Deciding* to intervene in the situation

5. *Acting* to intervene in the situation

The previously outlined bystander helping behavior steps could also identify potential obstacles that prevent bystanders from participating in helping behavior while witnessing a situation. The first challenge being if the bystander fails to notice the situation happening. For example, if a man employee is unable to recognize a sexist comment like "You should smile more you look better when you do" stated by his manager towards a woman coworker. As well as the obstacle if the bystander fails to determine a problem as high risk. Such as an employee unable to determine a manager making sexual advances at their coworker who is visibly uncomfortable.

A third obstacle is when a bystander fails to take on the responsibility to intervene in a situation. For instance, a worker may determine that a situation of SH has occurred but decides to not intervene due to their own personal discomfort regarding the situation. Additionally, the bystander may fail to intervene due to a lack of skill to cope with the situation. In particular, an employee who identifies SH behavior but doesn't feel equipped to approach the perpetrator fearing they will end up in a dangerous situation. Lastly, the bystander may fail to intervene out of fear of embarrassment. For example, a woman worker who identifies SH in her predominantly man identifying department, but fears addressing the issue with higher administration, will result

4

in her work contributions being minimized and her gender difference from the majority of the department further emphasized (Latané and Darley,1970).

Obstacles to Bystander Intervention

Lee et al. (2019) outlined ways in which bystander intervention training programs may remove bystander intervention behavior obstacles. The first obstacle was the lack of attention regarding the potentially harmful situation addressed by increasing the participant's awareness during the training. The modules should have participants view ambiguous situations and must determine whether the occurrence is potentially dangerous or not. The researchers did not directly address the second obstacle. The third obstacle emphasized the lack of responsibility regarding the potentially hazardous situation addressed by demonstrating one is responsible for their surroundings during the training. The modules should have participants practice intervening within a dangerous situation where other individuals are present.

The fourth obstacle highlighted the lack of skill necessary to deal with the potentially harmful situation addressed by ensuring participants become competent in essential skills during the training. The modules should have participants repeatedly practice the skills necessary to become automatic to perform the skills. The fifth obstacle focused on being negatively judged by peers for intervening in a potentially harmful situation is addressed by demonstrating support from peers. The modules should allow participants to receive feedback from peers to feel their actions are acknowledged and supported by others (Lee et al., 2019).

Expanding beyond a legal lens

Khanna & Shyamsunder (2020) outlined how SH bystander intervention programs should be used within organizations to encourage more bystander helping behavior. The researchers' first point is that SH should be a "collective responsibility" which speaks to the perspective of

bystander training being focused on the process of development based in social responsibility and collaboration. Traditionally, SH training in organizations focuses on compliance with legal rules. A comprehensive study looking at SH training from 1980 to 2016 found that training within organizations rarely significantly changed over this time period. The changes made over time were minor additions to legal terminology. Most of the SH training observed in the study was an authoritative figure disseminating a summary of the employees' legal terms. After giving the definitions to legal terms, the administrator then instructs how employees can report SH. The focus is on employees' legal compliance rather than the detrimental impact that SH has on victims (Tippett, 2018).

An interdisciplinary study conducted by Roehling & Huang (2018) reviewed SH training to uncover the criteria for legally effective SH training. The researchers found that SH training was legally defensible when it meets the minimum standard for organization-based SH training. Also, when the SH legal claims directed towards the company decreased. Additionally, when the company's success defending against allegations directed towards the theme increases. Lastly, when the money paid to successful claims against the company decreases (Roehling & Huang, 2018). This examination explains why organizations advocate for legal compliance from their employees rather than focusing on collective responsibility. Khanna & Shyamsunder (2020) find that collective responsibility can fill in the gaps' legal compliance efforts. An emphasis on collective responsibility within SH training of organizations better encourages bystanders to report without fear of retaliation.

Creating a realistic program

Khanna & Shyamsunder (2020) mentioned the importance of having a bystander intervention program design that is more engaging and effective. The traditional SH training is

one instructor who talks most of the training session. This framework doesn't allow for interaction between the instructor and trainees and doesn't allow for the information being presented to participants to be applied.

A practice-based approach to bystander intervention training design has been shown to produce a more significant transfer of bystander helping behaviors by participants in the workplace setting. Some examples of a practice-based approach are role-played case-studies/vignettes and theater-based methods. The practice-based approach is more engaging and allows participants to receive feedback and reflect on their potential intervention behavior. A notable approach that allows participants to envision realistic events and experience the process of decision making taken by bystanders is a situational judgement tool (Khanna & Shyamsunder, 2020).

CHAPTER TWO: HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The Observer Intervention in Sexual Harassment (OISH)

The purpose of the proposed study is to build upon the previously established Observer Intervention in Sexual Harassment (OISH) tool of the Shyamsunder et al. (2020) study which had two parts, the initial research stage and the field-testing stage. The research stage consisted of a literature review, interviewing Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), generating potential items and conducting a pilot study. The field-testing stage was carried out in two organizations in which the developed tool was administered to employees to demonstrate the effectiveness of the measure (Shyamsunder et al., 2020)

The researchers use the term "observer" rather than "bystander" to indicate the potential for the individual to participate in the situation actively. OISH aims to identify appropriate observer behaviors that can lead to further insights and practical recommendations for observers. The OISH tool is presented in a situational judgment (SJ) format with a single response option proven to be cost and time effective. This structure is ideal when using judgment when one should intervene in ambiguous or difficult SH situations. The participants are showed a series of realistic situations in the form of a text-based vignette. In each scenario, the context for the perpetrators, victims, and observers' actions is presented and explained. At the end of the vignette, the participant is asked how likely they are to act as the observer did (Shyamsunder et al., 2020).

OISH is a measure that can be used as a training tool for observer intervention. The aim of the measure is to increase bystander awareness and knowledge regarding their role in situations of SH and provide observers with a supply of effective and suitable behaviors for

future SH issues. The OISH tool is formatted in a way that the items are worded in a manner that is vivid and descriptive to enhance the realism of the situation being outlined. The realistic depiction of the OISH items allows the measure to be utilized as a training tool highlighting key strategies of observer intervention across differing scenarios (Shyamsunder et al., 2020).

Sex-Based Harassment (SBH) Framework

The traditional SH framework frequently depicts a white man heterosexual perpetrator and a white woman victim. This narrative is limited to portraying SH as a problem for only white women. Ultimately, women are not the only gender to experience harassment. The intersection of one's gender and other social identities, such as racial and sexual identity, can significantly shape one's experience with harassment. SH frames harassment as an action prompted by sexual desire. Berdahl (2007) has created a more inclusive term for this issue called Sex-Based Harassment (SBH). The SBH framework broadens the definition of harassment as an action to display power. SBH addresses a more extensive set of situations involving potential harassment that affect racial minority women, sexual minority individuals, and men.

Past SH History at Work

Shyamsunder et al. (2020) found that participants' previous experience with SH, being a target or observer, will inform their responses to the OISH tool. Participants who had experience with SH in the past were more likely to engage in observer intervention. Researchers have also found that women are more likely to experience and report situations of SH. Furthermore, they found that participants who had been an indirect observer in the past were more likely to prefer indirect/passive broader dimension items. These individuals would score highly on observer behaviors that defused the situation through humor or appealed to authoritative figures for support. In contrast, they found that participants who had been a direct observer were more likely

9

to prefer direct/active broader dimension items. These individuals would score highly on observer behaviors that confronted the harasser or broke up the situation (Shyamsunder et al., 2020).

Previous studies have identified how employees who hold marginalized social identities are possibly at higher risk for experiencing SH at work. Shyamsunder et al. (2020) identified a significant positive association between past SH experience and observer behavior engagement. The current study aims to replicate this finding from prior research and conduct further observation to identify whether one's social categorization moderates this relationship.

Women at Work

Men are frequently portrayed as the perpetrator in situations involving sexual harassment but rarely as victims. SBH, in which men are the victims is minimized as "horseplay" rather than being characterized as abuse (Alonso, 2018). Furthermore, men who are victims of SBH by a man perpetrator versus a woman perpetrator experience more extreme adverse effects if they report harassment. Men who experience same-sex SBH tend to be more embarrassed, being that the experience of same-sex SBH doesn't align with the societal expectations of heterosexual hypermasculinity (DuBois et al., 1998).

Kabat-Farr & Cortina (2014) found that the underrepresentation of men in a workplace setting lead to a decrease in gender-based harassment experienced by men meanwhile the opposite is true for women employees as it leads to an increase in the gender harassment experienced. Despite the prevalence of SBH experienced by men the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) noted in their 2011 report 83.7 percent of SH claims in the workplace were made by women (Danna et al., 2020).

Racial Minorities at Work

Racial minority women experience a "double jeopardy" as they simultaneously possess two marginalized identities. Racial minority women are members of both the gender and racial minority communities, which in turn creates an overlapping and interdependent system of discrimination or disadvantage (Crenshaw, 1991). The limited research that has been conducted to highlight the SBH experiences of racial minority women in the workplace has mainly focused on black women.

Employees who are women of color are at higher risk of having to engage in emotional labor due to their workplace experiences. Emotional labor refers to the suppression of authentic feelings to express emotions that may be seen as more palatable. An increase in emotional labor has been linked to an increase in negative health outcomes. Women of color in the workplace receive limited power that enables them to be vulnerable to emotional labor that results in negative health problems (Kabat-Farr& Cortina, 2012). Buchanan et al. (2009) found that black woman employees experience SBH at higher rates than white women employees. Furthermore, black women perceive SBH to be less threatening between a black man perpetrator and a black woman victim than a white man perpetrator and a black woman victim (Berdahl & Moore, 2006).

Sexual Minorities at Work

The term sexual minority refers to a variety of gender and sexual identities that have been historically marginalized in society (Cochat Costa Rodrigues et al., 2017). Sexual minority employees cope with the higher rates of fear concerning the retaliation and stigmatization related to harassment. Quick & McFadyen (2017) found that sexual minority employees experience SBH at higher rates than heterosexual employees. Rabelo & Cortina (2014) more

specifically identified the harassment of sexual minority employees occurred more likely on both the basis of gender and sexual orientation meaning rarely did heterosexist harassment occur without gender-based harassment. Furthermore, the frequency of harassment did not worsen the increase of job stress for sexual minority employees rather the experience of harassment generally had a large effect on stress levels.

Sexual minority employees deal with issues of discrimination and disclosure specific to their sexual identity. The specific harassment workplace concerns of sexual minority employees have significant adverse effects on their job satisfaction, mental health, and workplace productivity (Sears & Mallory, 2011). Despite the higher frequency of harassment towards sexual minority employees, they infrequently report incidents of assault in the workplace due to the stigmatization they had already experienced due to their marginalized sexual identity.

Purpose and Hypotheses

The purpose of the current study is to examine predictors of observer intervention. First, identify four variables (SH history, racial identity, sexual identity and gender identity) are examined as predictors of observer intervention behavior. Previous studies have demonstrated a significant positive relationship between past SH history and observer intervention behavior (Shyamsunder et al., 2020). Further analysis is conducted to identify the moderating effects that social categorization variables of racial, sexual and gender identity have on the relationship between past SH history and observer intervention behavior.

Hypothesis 1 Participants who have past SH history will be more likely to engage in observer intervention behaviors compared to those who have not had past SH history

Hypothesis 2 Participants who identify as a women will be more likely to engage in observer intervention behaviors compared to those who identify as a man.

Hypothesis 3 Participants who identify as racial minorities will be more likely to engage in observer intervention behaviors compared to those who identify as white.

Hypothesis 4 Participants who identify as sexual minorities will be more likely to engage in observer intervention behaviors compared to those who identify as heterosexual.

Hypothesis 5 Participants who have a past SH history and/or marginalized social identity interaction will demonstrate a positive relationship with observer intervention behavior. Specifically, the relationships proposed in Hypotheses 2-4 were expected to be stronger among those who have an SH history.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Participants

The study's exclusion criteria were that participants must be at least 18 years old and work a minimum of ten hours a week at an additional part-time job. Information regarding the current study was first advertised by the Principal Investigators weekly in groups on following social media platforms: Reddit, Facebook and LinkedIn. Additionally the survey was sent to the Psychology Department Listserv for students and alumni of the University of Central Florida. The data collection process was over the span of four weeks and all participation was on a voluntary basis.

Measures

The OISH measure contains 28 items categorized into five dimensions. The first four scales are the "ABCD" of observer intervention: Appeal to Authority, Buffer/Break, Callout/Confront, Defuse, and the last additional scale being Red Flags/ Ineffective. Participants are asked to answer on a five-point Likert scale (1- not at all likely to 5- extremely likely) to show how willing they would be to engage in observer behavior. The Cronbach's alpha of a very similar version of this measure was .83 (Shyamsunder et al., 2020). This scale is provided in Appendix A.

The first dimension, "Appeal to authority," refers to the observer's proactive behaviors that involve support from the work organization. The observer will use formal mechanisms to address the harassment situation. The second dimension, "Buffer/Break," refers to the observer's active effort to insert themselves into the situation of harassment. The observer may insert themselves into the situation of harassment physically to halt the escalation and prevent harm.

The third dimension, "Call Out/Confront," refers to directly addressing the harassment situation through verbal confrontation. The observer confronting harassment does so without waiting for the support of the work organization and acts at the moment (Shyamsunder et al., 2020).

The fourth dimension, "Defuse," refers to the indirect manner of addressing the harassment situation through verbal communication. The observer employs less risky and subtle methods to deescalate the seriousness of the harassment situation through humor or questioning. The last dimension being the "Red Flag/Ineffective," refers to observer behavior that does not appropriately address harassment in a way that helps prevent or stop the situation. The observer demonstrates ineffective actions and should be flagged for participants not to utilize in the future. The ABCD dimensions are categorized into two broader categories of Indirect/Passive with the sub-dimensions of Appeal to Authority, Defuse, and Direct/Active with Call-out/Confront sub-dimensions Buffer/Break (Shyamsunder et al., 2020).

The original OISH measure was created for the context of the workplace environment in India. In this proposed study an altered version of the items in the initial OISH construct will be used. The names presented in the established OISH tool are familiar in the Hindi language. In creating the adapted OISH measure, the researchers maintained the gender identity in the initial OSIH tool but altered the names used to fit the United States' cultural context. The proposed study will use common English names when being administered. The researchers used the same first letter of the initial Hindi names to inform the English names selected. For example, in Item 1 in the established OISH measure, the Hindi name Moushmi is altered to the English name Mikala. Furthermore, two terms are changed among the items to fit the American workplace context better. The clothing item saree is changed to a blouse, and WhatsApp's application is changed to GroupMe (Shyamsunder et al., 2020).

Prior to the presentation of the adapted OISH measure participants are presented a three-question multiple choice survey regarding their past history with SH. The first question asks participants if they ever experienced SH in the workplace, the second question asks participants if they ever witnessed SH in the workplace and the third question asks participants if they have ever reported the SH, they either experienced or witnessed in the workplace. Participants who responded to having an experience or witnessing any of the three items will be considered to have past SH history (Shyamsunder et al., 2020). The survey is found in Appendix A.

The last pre-study survey was a demographics questionnaire. The first question asked the participants to report their age, while the next three questions asking for specific social categorization information of the participants regarding racial, sexual and gender identity. For statistical analysis, historically under-represented groups regarding SH will have their bystander intervention behavior responses were compared to that of greater-represented groups. Racial identity asked in item 1 all non-white racial identities were compared to white. Sexual identity asked in item 2 all non-heterosexual identities were compared to heterosexual. Gender identity asked in item 3 all participants identifying as men were compared to woman. Participants who did not identify with the categories listed above were excluded from the current analysis in this study. The fifth and sixth questions focus on the participants frequency of time spent at work to ensure enough time was spent. All survey items can be found in Appendix A.

Procedure

All the measures within this study were completed online via Qualtrics by the participants. Qualtrics was utilized to stratify the sample across social categorizations. Participants accessed the survey t via an email sent out by the Principal Investigators. Once participants accessed the online study link they were directed to a page describing the study's

purpose. They were then provided a general outline of the procedure to complete the study. Within this description, participants were informed that sexual assault, harassment, and violence scenarios would be presented and were advised not proceed with the study if they felt the content would lead to emotional distress. At the bottom of this page, participants indicated agreement with the terms of the informed consent by clicking "Agree."

Participants were then guided to a questionnaire survey asking their demographic information such as their age, gender identity, racial identity, sexual identity and work status. Additionally, a three-item survey asking participants to described their experience being a target, observer, and/or a reporting SH experience to their work organization. Afterward, the adapted OISH tool was administered, which contained all the items presented in a counterbalanced order to participants before completing the survey.

Data Analysis

Consistent with previous studies, the current findings aim to demonstrate a correlation between past SH history and observer behavior engagement. The researchers in the study observed mean level differences in observer behavior engagement based on social identity. Hypotheses 1, 2, 3 and 4 were tested through independent samples t-test for the preliminary analysis.

Three multiple regression moderation analyses were conducted to test the moderating effect of certain social identities on the relationship between SH history and engagement in observer behavior. The three interaction terms being SH History x Gender Identity, SH History x Racial Identity and SH History x Sexual Identity. Hypothesis 5 will be tested through multiple regression analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Sample Information and Data Cleaning

Upon completion of data collection, the complete dataset was exported from Qualtrics onto the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 28) for analysis. The initial dataset contained 183 responses, however, responses that met specific exclusion criteria were removed from the dataset to ensure validity of the results. Bowling et al. (in press) found that insufficient effort responding correlates with the amount of time participants spend on a question. In the current study timing exclusively was used as the basis to identify careless responding and no additional check items were presented to participants. These criteria included: participants who completed the survey in less than 8 minutes ($N = 8$) and participants who completed the survey in more than 60 minutes ($N = 13$).

After data cleaning, responses from 162 participants were retained. Participants worked on average 35.63 hours per week ($SD = 2.07$). All participants within the current sample reported a minimum of 10 hours per week of work and a significant portion (26.4%) reported working 40 + hours per week. The majority (60.5%) of participants were 25 years old or younger. The age range reported for the sample was a minimum value of 18 years old and maximum value of 80 years old.

Descriptive and Correlations

A summary of Descriptive Statistics can be found in Table 1 Appendix B. As shown for most variables the observed ranges were close to possible ranges, which suggests that range restriction was not a major issue within this study. Furthermore, as displayed all the alpha values

fell within an acceptable range. Taber (2017) notes generally 0.7 as an acceptable cutoff. Yet a large number of items can inflate Cronbach's alpha, a smaller set of items can deflate the value. The dimensions in this study contained relatively few items.

The lowest alpha value of .68 on the Defuse Dimension is described by Taber (2017) as "slightly low". The alpha levels of the subscales ranged from .68 to .83. The alpha level of the composite measure is .85. Alpha values that were lowest on the Defuse and Red Flag/Ineffective Dimension which contained five items while the other dimensions (Appeal to Authority, Buffer/Break, Call out/Confront) contained six items. The mean levels displayed show slight differences between the dimensions. Comparing mean levels on two indirect/passive observer intervention types, it was found Appeal to authority (*M*=4.12) was higher than Defuse (*M*=3.50). Comparing mean levels on two direct/active observer intervention types, it was found Call out/Confront (*M*=4.11) was higher than Buffer/Break (*M*=4.01).

A summary of Correlations between the OISH scale dimensions as well as the composite OISH measure can be found in Table 2 Appendix B. The composite measure was used for the main analyses since the sub-dimensions are highly intercorrelated with one another and the coefficient alpha for the composite measure was very high. The Red Flag/Ineffective Dimension was reverse coded to reflect higher values to correspond to higher rates of observer intervention behavior. All the dimensions were totaled together to create a composite OISH measure. All the correlations between the dimensions are shown to have a positive and statistically significant relationship with the exception between Red Flag/Ineffective and Defuse as well as Red Flag/Ineffective and OISH Measure. A non-significant relationship was observed between Red

Flag/Ineffective and Defuse ($r(160) = -.02$, $p = .85$). A non-significant relationship was observed between Red Flag/Ineffective and OISH measure ($r(160) = .088$, $p = .25$).

Hypothesis Testing

Summaries of all hypothesis tests can be found in Appendix B. Table 3 demonstrates the findings of the proposed first hypothesis of this study stating that individuals who have past direct experience with SH would have a significantly greater mean level of observer intervention behavior compared to individuals who have no past direct SH experience. There was no significant effect for SH experience, $t(160) = 1.80$, $p = .07$, despite participants with SH experience ($M = 3.52$, $SD = .41$) reporting slightly higher levels of observer behavior than participants without SH experience ($M = 3.38$, $SD = .52$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Table 4 contains the findings of the proposed second hypothesis of this study stating that those who identify as a woman will have a significantly greater mean level of observer behavior compared to those who identify a man. There was no significant effect for gender identity, $t(152)$ $=.50$, $p = .62$, despite participants who identify as a woman ($M = 3.48$, $SD =.47$) reporting higher levels of observer behavior than participants who identify as a man ($M = 3.43$, $SD = .45$). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Table 5 contains the findings of the proposed third hypothesis of this study stating that racial minorities will have a significantly greater mean level of observer behavior compared to white individuals. There was no significant effect for racial identity, $t(155) = -.57$, $p = .57$, despite participants who identify as white ($M = 3.49$, $SD =.42$) reporting higher levels of

observer behavior than participants who identify as a racial minority ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .56$).

Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Table 6 contains the findings of the proposed fourth hypothesis of this study stating that sexual minorities will have a significantly greater mean level of observer behavior compared to heterosexual individuals. There was no significant effect for sexual identity, $t(160) = 1.56$, $p = .12$, despite participants who identify as sexual minority ($M = 3.55$, $SD =.31$) reporting higher levels of observer behavior than participants who identify as heterosexual ($M = 3.43$, $SD = .51$). Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Table 7 demonstrates the findings of the proposed first part of the fifth hypothesis of this study stating that Gender Identity will moderate the relationship between SH History and observer behavior, such that there will be a stronger relationship between SH history and observer behavior for women. The overall regression had no statistical significance ($R^2 = .00$, $F(3,150) = 1.06$, p = .37). The current study fails to support the first part of the fifth hypothesis proposed as the interaction term was non-significant.

Table 8 demonstrates the findings of the proposed second part of the fifth hypothesis of this study stating that Racial Identity will moderate the relationship between SH History and observer behavior, such that there will be a stronger relationship between SH history and observer behavior for racial minorities. The overall regression had no statistical significance ($R^2 = .01$, $F(3,153) = 1.46$, p = .23).The current study fails to support the second part of the fifth hypothesis proposed as the interaction term was non-significant.

Table 9 demonstrates the findings of the proposed third part of the fifth hypothesis of this study stating that Sexual Identity will moderate the relationship between SH History and observer behavior, such that there will be a stronger relationship between SH history and observer behavior for sexual minorities. The overall regression had no statistical significance ($R^2 = .02$, $F(3,158) = 2.22$, $p = .09$). The current study fails to support the third part of the fifth hypothesis proposed as the interaction term was non-significant.

Further Analysis

After completing the initial hypothesis testing and finding no support for the proposed hypotheses it was decided further analysis would be beneficial. Our initial hypotheses may have been too broad having a dependent variable of a total composite measure of observer intervention behavior given the specific independent variables involving identity. Therefore, separate dimensions of observer behavior measure were tested. To provide further context of the 20 additional statistical tests only four tests produced significant findings. All further statistical testing can be found Appendix B. The statistically significant results are described below.

As shown in Table 11 an independent samples t-test was performed to compare defuse observer behavior between participants with SH Experience and No SH Experience. The 107 participants who have SH experience ($M = 3.61$, $SD = .80$) compared to the 55 participants who don't have SH experience ($M = 3.29$, $SD = .82$) demonstrated significantly higher levels of defuse observer behavior, $t(160) = 2.40$, $p = .02$.

As shown in Table 12 an independent samples t-test was performed to compare buffer/break observer behavior between participants with SH Experience and No SH Experience. The 107 participants who have SH experience ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .71$) compared to the 55

participants who did not have SH experience ($M = 3.84$, $SD = .82$) demonstrated significantly higher levels of buffer/break observer behavior , $t(160) = 2.08$ $p = .04$.

As shown in Table 19 an independent samples t-test was performed to compare red flag/ ineffective observer behavior between participants who identify as a man and those who identify as a woman. The 55 participants who identify as a man ($M = 1.82$, $SD =.84$) compared to the 107 participants who identify as a woman ($M = 1.57$, $SD = .53$) demonstrated significantly higher levels of red flag/ineffective observer behavior , $t(152) = -2.10$, $p = .04$.

As shown in Table 27 an independent samples t-test was performed to compare buffer/break observer behavior between participants who identify as heterosexual and those who identify as a sexual minority. The 55 participants who identify as a sexual minority ($M = 4.18$, $SD =.62$) compared to the 107 participants who identify as a heterosexual ($M = 3.93$, $SD = .81$) demonstrated significantly higher levels of buffer/break observer behavior , $t(152) = 1.97$, $p = 0.5$.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to replicate the Shyamsunder et al.(2020) study in which the OISH measure was created. The OISH measure is a tool to demonstrate potential observer intervention behavior in the context of workplace SH. The format of the OISH measure is direct with a single response option as participants are presented with difficult SH scenarios. Furthermore, the situations outlined are detailed and vivid to enhance fidelity of the OISH measure. The direct and detailed nature of the OISH measure can be a beneficial resource for bystander intervention training as the traditional lecture based and legal compliance focus has proven not be effective in preventing SH at work.

The current study focused on observing differences in observer intervention behavior of participants based upon social identity. Previous research has supported the finding that previous experience with SH will increase one's observer intervention behavior (Shyamsunder et al., 2020). Additionally prior literature identifying marginalized groups based on gender, race, and sexuality experience higher rates of SH at work (Danna et al., 2020). We proposed that women, racial minorities and sexual minorities may have an increased likelihood in performing by observer intervention behaviors when witnessing SH at work. Furthermore, researchers postulated that social identity would have a moderating effect on the relationship between SH History and observer behavior.

The current study found null findings for the initial hypotheses and significant findings for only 4 out of 20 statistical tests during further analysis. We found that participants with past SH experience demonstrated higher rates of defuse and buffer/break observer intervention behavior compared to participants without past SH experience . As well participants who identify

as men demonstrated higher rates of red flag/ineffective observer intervention behavior comparatively to participants who identify as women. This is consistent with our initial hypotheses given ineffective/red flag observer intervention is not categorized as helpful behavior unlike the other dimensions of the OISH measure. Lastly, sexual minority identifying participants demonstrated higher rates of buffer/break observer intervention behavior compared to participants who identified as heterosexual. Despite these significant findings, the overall the findings of the study suggest that observer intervention behavior is not dependent on experiencing/witnessing of SH or other forms of discrimination based on gender, racial or sexual minority status.

Theoretical Implications

Shyamsunder et al. (2020) created the OISH tool for measuring observer behavior engagement. The OISH measure contains five dimensions (Appeal to authority, Buffer/Break, Call Out/Confront, Defuse, Red Flag/Ineffective) based on five different types of action as an observer of SH. The OISH tool only addresses the last section of the Latané and Darley (1970) bystander helping behavior theory. Researchers are provided with knowledge on participants behavior as they act to intervene in a situation. The OISH measure fails to address the four previous sections (Noticing a situation of SH, Assessing the situation of SH, Taking responsibility to intervene and Deciding to intervene) of the Latané and Darley (1970) bystander helping behavior theory. Yet the OISH tool expands upon the theoretical basis providing differing types of intervening behavior beyond just stating the presence or lack of intervening behavior. The OISH measure aims to address the behavior of participants but to we should address decision-making processes that come prior to best understand individuals' behavior.

A line of research counters the effectiveness of social empowerment interventions specifically with to vulnerable populations. Stark et al. (2018) found that social empowerment interventions had no effect on participants outcome behavior. The participants in this study were extremely vulnerable given their positionality living in a developing nation, identifying as women, adolescent aged and possessing a refugee status. The social empowerment program was multi-faceted providing mentoring, parental involvement and safe spaces. The researchers had two groups within the study, one containing women who were given access to social empowerment intervention services and the other containing women who were not.

Ultimately women in both groups experienced the same rates of school enrollment, working for pay and transactional sexual exploitation. In conclusion the researchers identified that social empowerment interventions are not enough to influence behavioral changes in vulnerable populations. It was found that additional measures such as economic empowerment opportunities and broader structural changes must be enacted in to supplement social empowerment interventions (Stark et al., 2018).

The current study draws from Shyamsunder et al. (2020) in which past SH history was found to have a positive association with observer intervention behavior. The null findings within the present study may be attributed to compounded effect of multiple marginalized identities held by some participants. The OISH measure assesses how likely one is to intervene in a observed situation of SH at work but we should address the how the intersection of multiple marginalized identities can possibly prevent individuals in displaying observer intervention behavior.

Practical Implications

The OISH tool can be distributed online, allowing it to be cost-effective for the organization to implement on a larger scale. Our study supports the OISH measure as beneficial to be used across various demographics of employees within an organization given the lack of moderating effect based on social categorization between the relationship of past SH history and observer intervention behavior. The online format will enable participants to view the program at their convenience, and the issues that arise in mixed-gender peer groups in-person bystander interventions are avoided. Additionally, the OISH tool has benefits for both the individual and employee well-being and at a larger scale for the organization. OISH implemented in organizations will raise the level of moral intensity regarding SH and raising awareness regarding potential perpetrator behavior.

Potential Limitations

One limitation is that the sample in the current study completed the OISH measure remotely online. The participants were not interacting with lab personnel during the completion of this study. This particular limitation addresses the more general idea that the study asks participants what they *would* do not observing what they actually did. Within a lab setting, participants' phones are put away or collected for the study duration. The lack of laboratory time in this study may lead to variation among participants' attention during completion.

A second potential limitation is that the sample in the current study consisted mainly of those who identified as a woman (73.5 percent) and white (69.3 percent). The lack of diversity within the sample may have made the findings of this study less generalizable. Furthermore, the OISH tool only uses women as targets in the situations depicted. The OISH measure's future

adaptations should expand the current scope to include targets and harassers from various

genders. It is also the case that the voluntarily nature of participation, as well as the sensitive

subject matter may have attracted participants who were more responsive to the intervention

scenarios as they may already perceive the content presented as necessary. Participants who

don't perceive the program's content as critically important may have been less likely to

participate in the current study. Finally, the present study only observed participants at one

period in time and, the measures did not consider the danger levels present in potential SH

situations or the likelihood of sexual violence.

A third limitation is the OISH measure being self-report given the common method

variance (CMV) concerns associated. Spector (2006) stipulate that CMV oversimplifies the

variables being measured and can inflate correlations by a significant degree. The current study

fails to support the findings of Shyamsunder et al. (2020) in which past SH history had a positive

association with observer intervention behavior. The lack of a significant correlation in the

current study could be due to CMV. Yet many researchers have found that the issue of CMV is

overstated within organizational research (Spector, 2006).

A fourth limitation is the lack of detail regarding past SH history in the survey. The

participants were asked whether they witnessed or experienced to be identified as having past SH

history. The experience of those who were victims versus observers of SH harassment greatly

differs regarding emotional distresses and should not be conflated. Furthermore the past SH

history identified in Shyamsunder et al. (2020) notes that observers who had experience being a

indirect/direct observer in the past are more likely to engage in observer behavior aligned with

their past handlings. The experience of those who are direct versus indirect observer of SH

harassment greatly differs regarding fear of relation and should not be conflated.

Future Research

The OISH measure should be revised to create various versions depicting other possible dynamics involved in SH at work. One prominent area being the limited lens of the vignettes including exclusively man perpetrators and woman targets. Future versions of OISH should include vignettes in which woman perpetrators and man targets are shown. The racial and sexual minority of the targets and perpetrators should also be assorted in future versions of the OISH measure. The increase in representation of social categorization may lead participants to report higher rates of bystander intervention if they share a social identity with the target.

The lack of significant findings of this study, while somewhat disappointing, do demonstrate that the OISH measure is a valid tool to be utilized across various demographics. The social identity of participants demonstrated had little to no effect on one's observer intervention behavior. Meanwhile past SH experience as shown in previous studies does have a significant effect on one's observer intervention behavior. The OISH tool is efficient and effective for organizations as it can be highly generalizable across all employees.

APPENDIX A: MEASURES

Please respond to the following items using the five-point likert scale outlined below:

1- not likely at all
2- unlikely
3- neutral
4- likely
5- extremely likely

In the following items the edited parts of the original OISH measure are noted below. The new replaced text is indicated in bold while the initial text is indicated within paratheses in italics.** *Only the new replaced text will be presented to participants during the study as the aim is to refine the measure to fit a different context than initial intended.* The presentation of both texts is for the purposes of this proposal to demonstrate specifically what changes are being made to the initial OISH measure**

Intervention Type: Indirect/Passive

Dimension	Item
Appeal to Authority	**Mikala** (*Moushmi*) was at a training session with 14 of her male colleagues. **Patrick** (*Pratik*), the trainer, kept inserting sexist jokes into the content. While most of her male colleagues laughed along, she was feeling so uncomfortable that she wanted to leave the training session. During the break, **Mikala** (*Moushmi*) shared her feelings with **Adam** (*Arnav*), a colleague from her team. 'I agree, this guy was out of line! I see the trainer manager there. Let's tell him.' How likely are you to do what **ADAM** (*ARNAV*) did?
	Delilah (*Deepa*), an accounts manager at an ad agency, had worked with John, her main client, for a while. Overtime, John (a married man with children) started to flirt with **Delilah** (*Deepa*), on text. She ignored him and kept bringing his attention back to the task at hand. However, he persisted, until one day he said he loved her and

	would not talk about work until she told him she loved him too. **Delilah** (*Deepa*), confused, confided in her boss **Victor** (*Vivek*). **Victor** (*Vivek*) said, 'You should not have to deal with such a client. I'll speak with John's manager right now.' How likely are you to do what **VICTOR** (*VIVEK*) did?
	Kylie (*Karina*) was excited at having completed her probation period on her first job. Her manager **Nathan** (*Nitesh*) gave her a gift on this occasion that was obviously expensive and customized for her. In it was a note telling her he was in love with her and hoped that she and the company would give him all he was hoping for. **Kylie** (*Karina*) showed this to her colleague **Demetria** (*Dimple*), who said, 'That's horrible. He's your manager. Tell him immediately that this won't do - your relationship is strictly professional.' How likely are you to do what **DEMETRIA** (*DIMPLE*) did?
	Sophie (*Supreeti*) worked at a small startup. One day she received an email from **Peter** (*Paresh*), one of the co-founders, saying he was in love with her and wanted their love and their success on the job to keep growing. **Sophie** (*Supreeti*) was disturbed enough to show this to her colleague **Anna** (*Anila*), who said, 'That's completely out of line! He's your manager. If he says or does anything like this again, why don't you talk to **Sam** (*Sailesh*)? After all, he's also a co-founder.' How likely are you to do what **ANNA** (*ANILA*) did?

	Michael (*Manav*) worked at a startup where the workforce was predominantly young men. Apart from **Sarah** (*Shikha*), a coder, and the receptionist, there were 18 men. One day, he overhead two of his colleagues pass lewd comments about a film actress and noticed that **Sarah's** (*Shikha's*) face had gone red. He kept quiet, but later told **Sarah** (*Shikha*). 'If these guys make you uncomfortable, you should talk to the boss; he'll make sure they behave.' How likely are you to do what **MICHEAL** (*MANAV*) did?
	Polly (*Purvi*) was looking forward to converting her internship to a job offer when she graduated from college. Two days before her final interview for this transition, she received a long message on Facebook from **Ken** (*Ketan*), the hiring manager, telling her he had fallen for her and that he was hoping she felt this way too. Confused and nervous, **Polly** (*Purvi*) showed this message to **Ken's** (*Ketan's*) peer, **Regina** (*Ruhi*). **Regina** (*Ruhi*) said, 'This is not okay, **Polly** (*Purvi*). I know **Ken's** (*Ketan's*) manager. I'll set up a meeting with him to discuss this.' How likely are you to do what **REGINA** (*RUHI*) did?

| Defuse | **Philip** (*Pradeep*) always found unique ways to praise his team's work. Mary found it irritating that while he praised the men on their work, he praised the women using terms like 'Princess', 'Lovely' and |

	'Darling', focusing on their looks or presentation style. She grumbled about this to **Adian** (*Ajit*). The next time **Philip** (*Pradeep*) said something like this, **Adian** (*Ajit*) remarked, '**Philip** (*Pradeep*), how come us guys are never your darlings or dearies? What sir, show us some love too!' How likely are you to do what **ADIAN** (*AJIT*) did?
	Amy (*Amita*), wearing her new blouse, walked into office one Friday and wished the team good morning. **Simon** (*Sagar*), a very senior executive who was walking by, stopped, looked at **Amy** (*Amita*) and said, 'What is this you are wearing today? It doesn't suit you.' **Ryan** (*Ram*), **Amy's** (*Amita's*) teammate, had seen **Simon** (*Sagar*) do this many times before. This time, **Ryan** (*Ram*) laughed and said, 'Sir, why don't you take an interest in my clothes also? I never know what to wear to work.' How likely are you to do what **RYAN** (*RAM*) did?
	Sally (*Sheetal*) had started a **Groupme** (*WhatsApp*) with her team and the client team to help their project move smoothly. However, ever since **Robert** (*Rajat*) took over the client team, he started sending lewd jokes on the group. **Sally** (*Sheetal*) told her colleague **Sean** (*Siddharth*) that she was very uncomfortable with this behavior, but no one else in the group had objected yet, and some actually responded with laughter. **Sean** (*Siddharth*) said, 'Hmm... Can you send him a private message if it gets too bad? Just tell him that someone has complained about these

	jokes.' How likely are you to do what **SEAN** (*SIDDHARTH*) did?
	Stella (*Sulekha*) came back in tears from her meeting with **Marcus** (*Mitesh*), who was a senior leader at the organization. She tearfully confided in her colleague Natasha that **Marcus** (*Mitesh*) had told her she could really go far in the organization, provided she was 'friendlier.' Then he said, 'C'mon, you know what I mean,' while covering her hand with his and leering at her. Natasha said, 'Many people have complained about him, but nothing has been done. Next time you have to meet him alone, tell me or one of the women in the team; we'll come in and interrupt the meeting.' How likely are you to do what NATASHA did?
	Grace's (*Garima's*) workplace had a casual culture so she, like many others, used to wear T-shirts with funny messages or images on them. One day she wore one that read 'Need Hugs'. **Vance** (*Vikram*) an older male colleague, said, 'Come here, let me give you one. You look like you need one, and I've been waiting for an opportunity to hug you.' He leaned in for a hug with a laugh. **Grace** (*Garima*) passed a desperate look to her co-worker **Richard** (*Riaz*), who was watching. **Richard** (*Riaz*) exclaimed 'It's just a T-shirt, man. Don't push your luck!' How likely are you to do what **RICHARD** (*RIAZ*) did?

Buffer/Break	**Meghan** (*Mala*) recently joined a team of journalists at a reputed newspaper, of which **Roman** (*Ravi*) was a member. **Meghan** (*Mala*) mentioned to **Roman** (*Ravi*) that she had an idea for a story she had tried pitching to her editor twice. But each time she brought it up, the editor had told her he'd listen to her idea if she met him after work for a drink**. Roman** (*Ravi*) had heard similar stories about this editor before, and told **Meghan** (*Mala*), 'I've heard similar stories before. Let me get my things...I'll come along with you casually, so he can't try anything funny.' How likely are you to do what **ROMAN** (*RAVI*) did?
	At a holiday party last year, Lily (Latika) was dancing with her team when she noticed that her manager Daniel (Dhruv) was dancing very close to a young intern, trying to hold her around her waist. Even though the intern was laughing, she repeatedly tried to get away. Lily (Latika) joined them immediately, and got in between them, pretending to show the intern a dance move. How likely are you to do what LILY (LATIKA) did?
	Spencer (*Sujoy*), working late one evening, stepped out for a smoke break when he saw **Andrew** (*Anil*), a coworker, with a young woman in the car park. **Andrew** (*Anil*) seemed to be asking her to get into his car, but she looked worried and hesitant. **Spencer** (*Sujoy*) knew she worked in the same company but didn't know her. **Spencer** (*Sujoy*) walked up to

	them and asked **Andrew** (*Anil*) to introduce his new friend to him, looking at her to check if she was okay. How likely are you to do what **SPENCER** (*SUJOY*)? did?
	The morning after an offsite planning weekend, four or five employees were recounting events from the weekend. Two of the senior managers - **Harry and Noah** (*Hari and Nemath*) - were laughing about an incident where they had apparently told an intern that her short skirt was distracting the kitchen staff and delaying their dinner. **Ruby** (*Rinki*), who reported to **Noah** (Nemath) and was not present at the offsite, said 'Excuse me, sir, but what is funny about this?' How likely are you to do what **RUBY** (*RINKI*) did?
	On her way home, **Pierce** (*Pavitra*) noticed the team lead **Austin** (*Atul*) leaning close to **Rose** (*Radha*) and constantly saying something while she seemed backed into a corner. When she got closer, **Pierce** (*Pavitra*) overheard **Austin** (*Atul*) repeatedly insisting on dropping **Rose** (Radha) home, and **Rose** (*Radha*) was feebly but politely refusing, with her eyes averted from **Austin** (*Atul*). **Pierce** (*Pavitra*) quickly walked up to them and said 'Hey **Rose** (*Radha*), I'm going to my aunt's place today and it's in your locality. We can go together.' How likely are you to do what **PIERCE** (*PAVITRA*) did?
	At an awards function, **Vincent** (*Vishal*), a senior executive who had drunk too much,

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>started talking to **Vivian** (*Varsha*), a junior colleague. **Vincent** (*Vishal*) sat next to her, put his hand on her knee, and started moving it upward. **Vivian** (*Varsha*) was shocked and just froze. Her friend **Scarlett** (*Sarita*), passing by, saw what was happening. She immediately went to **Vivian** (*Varsha*) and **Vincent** (*Vishal*), glared at **Vincent** (*Vishal*) as she sat between them and started talking to them about the function. How likely are you to do what **SCARLETT** (*SARITA*) did?</td>
</tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>Call Out/ Confront</td>
<td>As part of her job at a publishing company, **Francesca** (*Fatima*) was told to work with **Seth** (*Shenoy*), an artist who works out of his home studio. **Francesca** (*Fatima*) had been working with him at his studio for just two days when he insisted on showing her his collection of nude paintings, despite her protests. At the end he smirked and told her, 'I'd love to add you to this collection.' Shaken, Francesca (*Fatima*) left immediately and called her boss **Natalie** (*Nandini*). **Natalie** (*Nandini*) said, 'That's awful. Don't go back there. I'll have him blacklisted at our company and complain to the State Artists Association.' How likely are you to do what **NATALIE** (*NANDINI*) did?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Karen** (Kavita) was part of the worker's union. **Rowan** (Raju), **Karen's** (Kavita's) manager, began to use the pretext of security checks during a union dispute to</td>
</tr>
</table>

	touch her inappropriately. **Stephanie** (Sangeeta), who worked with **Karen** (Kavita), saw this happening and physically slid between **Karen and Rowan** (Kavita and Raju). **Stephanie** (Sangeeta) said, glaring at **Rowan** (Raju), 'A union dispute does not give men the right to touch us. Come away now, **Karen** (Kavita)!' How likely are you to do what **STEPHANIE** (SANGEETA) did?
	In a huge conference room filled with people, **Parker** (*Pulkit*) called his employee **Rebecca** (*Raina*) to sit next to him. When the presentation started and the lights were dimmed, he took **Rebecca's** (*Raina's*) hand under the table and placed it on his crotch. **Rebecca** (*Raina*) was stunned and embarrassed and began to sob. Within seconds, her coworker **Bella** (*Bidisha*), who was sitting next to **Rebecca** (*Raina*), said very loudly, 'What the hell do you think you're doing, **Parker** (*Pulkit*)?' and physically pulled **Rebecca** (*Raina*) towards her. How likely are you to do what **BELLA** (*BIDISHA*) did?
	Jada (*Jaya*) was trying to show her small team a presentation on her laptop. Under the pretext of trying to see the presentation clearly, **Yousef** (*Yash*) stood right behind her and leaned in very close over her, massaging her shoulder, commenting on how nice her hair smelled, making her visibly uncomfortable. **Ryder** (*Raghu*), their colleague, noticed this and said 'Come on **Yousef** (*Yash*), stop that! We are not here to discuss **Jada's** (*Jaya's*)

	hair, are we?' How likely are you to do what **RYDER** (*RAGHU*) did?
	At a team meeting, **Lisa** (*Leena*) made a suggestion to her co-worker **Rhett** (*Rishabh*), who said 'Sorry, can you repeat that? I was distracted by that blouse! Damn, you look good today! You should really wear blouses more often!' Their co-worker **Nina** (*Nalini*) heard this. After the meeting, **Nina** (*Nalini*) spoke to **Rhett** (*Rishabh*), '**Rhett** (*Rishabh*), come on, what was that remark to **Lisa** (*Leena*) about? It made me uncomfortable; imagine how she felt! It's like you were dismissing her intelligence; that's really disrespectful!' How likely are you to do what **NINA** (*NALINI*) did?
	Gabe (*Gopal*), the external facilitator at the annual business planning meeting, was getting on **Hannah's** (*Harshita's*) nerves. He was continuously making sexist jokes and comments. Most of **Hannah's** (*Harshita's*) male colleagues seemed to find **Gabe** (*Gopal*) funny, but she just wanted to leave the meeting. During a break, **Hannah** (*Harshita*) shared her feelings with her teammate **Russell** (*Rajesh*). Once they got back from the meeting, **Russell** (*Rajesh*) told the Director what had happened and suggested not inviting **Gabe** (*Gopal*) back for any other work due to his unacceptable behavior. How likely are you to do what **RUSSELL** (*RAJESH*) did?

Red Flag/Ineffective	**Penelope** (*Priya*) was one of a group of six fresh graduates hired as interns in an accounting firm. She noticed that **Ross and Adrian** (*Rohit and Abhijit*) kept asking her (but not the others, who were all men) to hang out and go for drinks after work. She was uncomfortable and told **Frank** (*Faizan*), a senior auditor at the firm. **Frank** (*Faizan*) said, 'Hmm...what's the big deal? If you want to go, go out with them! After all, it will be as a group in a public place. Why are you bothering me with this?' How likely are you to do what **FRANK** (*FAIZAN*) did?
	Coworkers **Rachel and Asher** (*Reena and Aman*) used to date but broke up a few months ago. **Asher** (*Aman*) decided he wanted to win back **Rachel's** (*Reena's*) affection and started staging grand gestures in-office, pestering her in the elevator, and not taking no for an answer. **Rachel** (*Reena*) decided to bring it up with her boss, **Roger** (*Rustom*), who knew them both. **Roger** (*Rustom*) told **Rachel** (*Reena*), 'This is between the two of you. Try to resolve it among yourselves.' How likely are you to do what **ROGER** (*RUSTOM*) did?
	A few months after **Mia** (*Mamta*) had joined her first job straight out of college, she received a letter from her manager **Kyle** (*Kishore*), who was 15 years older than her, telling her he loved her and that he saw a bright future for her at work and also with him. A coworker, **Remy** (*Rakhi*), happened to be passing by and saw **Mia** (*Mamta*) shaken up. When **Mia**

	(*Mamta*) showed her the letter, **Remy** (*Rakhi*) said, 'Aha! At least this explains why you've been getting all the good projects at such a young age! Just kidding! Ignore this, **Mia** (*Mamta*)!' How likely are you to do what **REMY** (*RAKHI*) did?
	Kevin and Nora (*Kabir and Neha*) worked at a co-working space. **Kevin** (*Kabir*) would follow **Nora** (*Neha*) wherever she decided to sit in the office, although he would never talk to her. Somehow, he found her on social media and repeatedly sent her requests, though she declined them each time. **Nora** (*Neha*) felt frustrated and unsafe and decided to speak with **Porter** (*Paro*), another member who used the co-working space. **Porter** (*Paro*) advised **Nora** (*Neha*), 'Can't do much **Nora** (*Neha*)...just block his number and ignore him. Eventually, he will give up!' How likely are you to do what **PORTER** (*PARO*) did?
	Jason (Jignesh) worked in a specialties store with 20 men and only 3 women. One day, he overheard two of his colleagues exchanging dirty jokes about women and noticed that **Kayla** (Kanika), his female colleague was visibly upset. He kept quiet, but later told **Kayla** (Kanika), 'I know these guys make you uncomfortable... I don't know how you tolerate it! If I, were you, I'd look for another job?' How likely are you to do what **JASON** (JIGNESH) did?

Figure 1. OISH Measure

1) How old are you?
   a. 17
   b. 18
   c. 19
   d. 20
   e. 21
   f. 22
   g. None of the above, please specify

2) What is your racial identity?
   a. White
   b. Black
   c. American Indian
   d. Asian
   e. Pacific Islander
   f. Multi-racial
   g. None of the above, please specify

3) What is your sexual identity?
   a. Asexual
   b. Bisexual
   c. Gay
   d. Heterosexual
   e. Lesbian
   f. Pansexual
   g. Queer
   h. None of the above, please specify

4) What is your gender identity?
   a. Man
   b. Non-binary
   c. Woman
   d. None of the above, please specify

5) Do you work part-time?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6) How many hours do you work in an average week?
   a. 10-15 hours a week
   b. 15-20 hours a week
   c. 20-25 hours a week
   d. 25+ hours a week
   e. None of the above, please specify

Figure 2. Demographic Survey

1. Which of the following have you **experienced** in a workplace or work context? For the purposes of this question, include experiences that occurred at any time in your work experience or career. (Check all that apply.)

❏ Sexual coercion, which includes sexual advances that make the conditions of employment contingent on sexual cooperation

❏ Unwanted sexual attention, which may include sexual advances, unwelcome expressions of sexual or romantic interest, unwanted touching, or persistent requests for dates or sexual contact

❏ Sex-based harassment, which includes verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes, including demeaning comments that are based on gender, but need not be sexual in nature

2. Which of the following have you **witnessed** in a workplace or work context? For the purposes of this question, include experiences that occurred at any time in your work experience or career. (Check all that apply.)

❏ Sexual coercion, which includes sexual advances that make the conditions of employment contingent on sexual cooperation

❏ Unwanted sexual attention, which may include sexual advances, unwelcome expressions of sexual or romantic interest, unwanted touching, or persistent requests for dates or sexual contact

❏ Sex-based harassment, which includes verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes, including demeaning comments that are based on gender, but need not be sexual in nature

3. At any point in your career, did you report the harassment you **experienced/witnessed**? (Check all that apply.)

❏ Yes, to your supervisor, a human relations department, or another internal entity

❏ Yes, to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or to another fair employment practices agency

❏ Yes, to the police or media

❏ No

Figure 3. SH History Survey

APPENDIX B: TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive and Reliability Statistics

Variables	Mean	SD	Possible Range	Observed Range	Internal Consistency
Appeal to Authority Dimension	4.12	.68	1-5	1-5	.78
Defuse Dimension	3.50	.82	1-5	1-5	.68
Buffer/Break Dimension	4.01	.76	1-5	1-5	.83
Call out/Confront Dimension	4.11	.78	1-5	1-5	.83
Red Flag/Ineffective Dimension	1.61	.62	1-5	1-4.20	.74
OISH Measure Composite	3.47	.46	1-5	1.21-4.38	.85

Note: n=162, Internal consistency measured using Cronbach's α.

Table 2. Correlations

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Appeal to Authority Dimension	-					
2	Defuse Dimension	**.31****	-				
3	Buffer/Break Dimension	**.65****	**.40****	-			
4	Call out/Confront Dimension	**.59****	**.41****	**.71****	-		
5	Red Flag/Ineffective Dimension	**.39****	-.02	**.42****	**.32****	-	
6	OISH Measure Composite	**.73****	**.73****	**.80****	**.81****	.088	-

Note: n=162, ** : Correlation is significant at $p < .01$ (2-tailed), Red Flag/Ineffective items were reverse coded, Significant correlations are noted in bold-face font.

Table 3. Mean Level Differences of Observer Behavior between participants with SH Experience and those with No SH Experience

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.80	160	.07
1	No Direct SH Experience	55	3.38	.52			
2	Direct SH Experience	107	3.52	.41			

Note: n=162, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH History was treatment-coded as No=0, Yes=1,t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 4. Mean Level Differences of Observer Behavior between participants who identify as a man and those who identify as a woman

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					.50	152	.62
1	Identify as a Man	35	3.43	.45			
2	Identify as a Woman	119	3.48	.47			

Note: n=154, Gender was treatment-coded as Man=0, Woman=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 5. Mean Level Differences of Observer Behavior between participants who identify as white and those who identify as racial minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-.57	155	.57
1	White	113	3.49	.42			
2	Racial Minority	44	3.44	.56			

Note: n=157, Race was treatment-coded as White=0, Racial Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 6. Mean Level Differences of Observer Behavior between participants who identify as heterosexual and those who identify as sexual minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.56	160	.12
1	Heterosexual	107	3.43	.51			
2	Sexual Minority	55	3.55	.31			

Note: n=162, Sexual Identity was treatment-coded as Heterosexual=0, Sexual Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 7. Regression Analysis for Moderating Effects of Gender Identity on SH History to Observer Intervention Behavior

Variables	t	B	β (SE)	R-square	ΔR-square	F	ΔSig. F
				.00	.02	1.06	.37
SH History	1.17	.19	.19 (.16)				
Gender Identity	.30	.04	.04 (.13)				
SH History x Gender Identity	-.37	-.07	-.07 (.18)				

Note: n=154, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH is the predictor, Gender Identity is the moderator, OISH Measure is outcome, R-square value reported is adjusted, Standardized Beta Coefficients reported alongside Standard error noted in parentheses, Sig < .001.

Table 8. Regression Analysis for Moderating Effects of Racial Identity on SH History to Observer Intervention Behavior

Variables	t	B	β (SE)	R-square	ΔR-square	F	ΔSig. F
				.01	.03	1.46	.23
SH History	.96	.09	.09 (.09)				
Racial Identity	-1.01	-.14	-.14 (.14)				
SH History x Racial Identity	.95	.16	.13 (.17)				

Note: n=157, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH is the predictor, Racial Identity is the moderator, OISH Measure is outcome, R-square value reported is adjusted, Standardized Beta Coefficients reported alongside Standard error noted in parentheses, Sig < .001
Table 9.

Table 9. Regression Analysis for Moderating Effects of Sexual Identity on SH History to Observer Intervention Behavior

Variables	t	B	β (SE)	R-squared	ΔR-square	F	ΔSig. F
				.02	.04	2.22	.09
SH History	2.05	.19	.19(.09)				
Sexual Identity	1.76	.24	.25(.13)				
SH History x Gender Identity	-1.15	-.19	-.18 (.16)				

Note: n=162, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH is the predictor, Sexual Identity is the moderator, OISH Measure is outcome, R-square value reported is adjusted, Standardized Beta Coefficients reported alongside Standard error noted in parentheses, Sig < .001.

Table 10. Mean Level Differences of Appeal to Authority between participants with SH Experience and those with No SH Experience

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.71	160	.09
1	No Direct SH Experience	55	3.99	.73			
2	Direct SH Experience	107	4.19	.65			

Note: n=162, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH History was treatment-coded as No=0, Yes=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 11. Mean Level Differences of Defuse between participants with SH Experience and those with No SH Experience

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					2.40	160	.02
1	No Direct SH Experience	55	3.29	.82			
2	Direct SH Experience	107	3.61	.80			

Note: n=162, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH History was dummy-coded as No=0, Yes=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 12. Mean Level Differences of Buffer/Break between participants with SH Experience and those with No SH Experience

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					2.08	160	.04
1	No Direct SH Experience	55	3.84	.82			
2	Direct SH Experience	107	4.10	.71			

Note: n=162, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH History was dummy-coded as No=0, Yes=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 13. Mean Level Differences of Callout/Confront between participants with SH Experience and those with No SH Experience

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					.65	160	.52
1	No Direct SH Experience	55	4.05	.83			
2	Direct SH Experience	107	4.14	.75			

Note: n=162, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH History was dummy-coded as No=0, Yes=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 14. Mean Level Differences of Red Flag/Ineffective between participants with SH Experience and those with No SH Experience

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-1.8	160	.07
1	No Direct SH Experience	55	1.73	.65			
2	Direct SH Experience	107	1.55	.59			

Note: n=162, SH (Sexual Harassment), SH History was treatment-coded as No=0, Yes=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 15. Mean Level Differences of Appeal to Authority between participants who identify as a man and those who identify as a woman

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.00	152	.32
1	Identify as a Man	35	4.01	.86			
2	Identify as a Woman	119	4.14	.64			

Note: n=154, Gender was treatment-coded as Man=0, Woman=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 16. Mean Level Differences of Defuse between participants who identify as a man and those who identify as a woman

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					.87	152	.39
1	Identify as a Man	35	3.39	.85			
2	Identify as a Woman	119	3.53	.82			

Note: n=154, Gender was treatment-coded as Man=0, Woman=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 17. Mean Level Differences of Buffer/Break between participants who identify as a man and those who identify as a woman

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.92	152	.06
1	Identify as a Man	35	3.79	.86			
2	Identify as a Woman	119	4.06	.72			

Note: n=154, Gender was treatment-coded as Man=0, Woman=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 18. Mean Level Differences of Callout/Confront between participants who identify as a man and those who identify as a woman

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-.52	152	.60
1	Identify as a Man	35	4.16	.82			
2	Identify as a Woman	119	4.08	.77			

Note: n=154, Gender was treatment-coded as Man=0, Woman=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 19. Mean Level Differences of Red Flag/Ineffective between participants who identify as a man and those who identify as a woman

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-2.10	152	.04
1	Identify as a Man	35	1.82	.84			
2	Identify as a Woman	119	1.57	.53			

Note: n=154, Gender was treatment-coded as Man=0, Woman=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 20. Mean Level Differences of Appeal to Authority between participants who identify as white and those who identify as racial minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-.52	155	.60
1	White	113	4.15	.63			
2	Racial Minority	44	4.08	.85			

Note: n=157, Race was treatment-coded as White=0, Racial Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 21. Mean Level Differences of Defuse between participants who identify as white and those who identify as racial minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-.93	155	.35
1	White	113	3.55	.85			
2	Racial Minority	44	3.41	.78			

Note: n=157, Race was treatment-coded as White=0, Racial Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 22. Mean Level Differences of Buffer/Break between participants who identify as white and those who identify as racial minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-.64	155	.53
1	White	113	4.03	.69			
2	Racial Minority	44	3.95	.95			

Note: n=157, Race was treatment-coded as White=0, Racial Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 23. Mean Level Differences of Callout/Confront between participants who identify as white and those who identify as racial minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-.19	155	.85
1	White	113	4.11	.71			
2	Racial Minority	44	4.09	.96			

Note: n=157, Race was treatment-coded as White=0, Racial Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 24. Mean Level Differences of Red Flag/Ineffective between participants who identify as white and those who identify as racial minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					.73	155	.47
1	White	113	1.59	.56			
2	Racial Minority	44	1.67	.76			

Note: n=157, Race was treatment-coded as White=0, Racial Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 25. Mean Level Differences of Appeal to Authority between participants who identify as heterosexual and those who identify as sexual minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					.93	160	.36
1	Heterosexual	107	4.09	.75			
2	Sexual Minority	55	4.19	.53			

Note: n=162, Sexual Identity was treatment-coded as Heterosexual=0, Sexual Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 26. Mean Level Differences of Defuse between participants who identify as heterosexual and those who identify as sexual minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.77	160	.08
1	Heterosexual	107	3.42	.86			
2	Sexual Minority	55	3.66	.71			

Note: n=162, Sexual Identity was treatment-coded as Heterosexual=0, Sexual Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 27. Mean Level Differences of Buffer/Break between participants who identify as heterosexual and those who identify as sexual minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.97	160	.05
1	Heterosexual	107	3.93	.81			
2	Sexual Minority	55	4.18	.62			

Note: n=162, Sexual Identity was treatment-coded as Heterosexual=0, Sexual Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 28. Mean Level Differences of Callout/Confront between participants who identify as heterosexual and those who identify as sexual minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					1.02	160	.31
1	Heterosexual	107	4.07	.83			
2	Sexual Minority	55	4.20	.65			

Note: n=162, Sexual Identity was treatment-coded as Heterosexual=0, Sexual Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

Table 29. Mean Level Differences of Red Flag/Ineffective between participants who identify as heterosexual and those who identify as sexual minorities

	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
					-1.33	160	.19
1	Heterosexual	107	1.66	.67			
2	Sexual Minority	55	1.52	.49			

Note: n=162, Sexual Identity was treatment-coded as Heterosexual=0, Sexual Minority=1, t-value and df reported for equal variances assumed, significance reported is two-tailed p-value.

APPENDIX C: FIGURES

UCF

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

EXEMPTION DETERMINATION

September 2, 2021

Dear Tisnue Jean-Baptiste:

On 9/2/2021, the IRB determined the following submission to be human subjects research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Initial Study, Category 2(i)
Title:	Examining the role of social identity on observer intervention behavior
Investigator:	Tisnue Jean-Baptiste
IRB ID:	STUDY00003250
Funding:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• HRP-251-FORM , Category: Faculty Research Approval; • Attention Checks_Thesis Project_TJB.docx, Category: Survey / Questionnaire; • Demographic Information_Thesis Project TJB.docx, Category: Survey / Questionnaire; • HRP-254-FORM , Category: Consent Form; • HRP-255-FORM , Category: IRB Protocol; • OISH Measure_Thesis Project_TJB.docx, Category: Survey / Questionnaire; • Reddit Posting Message_Thesis Project_TJB.docx, Category: Recruitment Materials; • Sensitive Subject Matter Warning_Thesis Project_TJB.pdf, Category: Debriefing Form; • Sexual Harassment History_Thesis Project_TJB.docx, Category: Survey / Questionnaire

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made, and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please submit a modification request to the IRB. Guidance on submitting Modifications and Administrative Check-in are detailed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103), which can be found by navigating to the IRB Library within the IRB system.   When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request so that IRB records will be accurate.

If you have any questions, please contact the UCF IRB at 407-823-2901 or irb@ucf.edu. Please include your project title and IRB number in all correspondence with this office.

Sincerely,

Katie Kilgore
Designated Reviewer

Page 1 of 1

Figure 4. IRB Approval Letter

REFERENCES

Alonso, N. (2018). Playing to win: Male–male sex-based harassment and the masculinity

   contest. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(3), 477–499

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through

   bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology,*

   35(4), 463–481.

Banyard, V.L., Plante, E.G., Moynihan, V.L. (2005) Rape prevention through bystander

   education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. U.S.

   Department of Justice.

Berdahl, J. L. (2007). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender

   hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 641–658

Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: Double jeopardy for minority

   women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(2), 426–436.

Bowling, N. A., Huang, J. L., Bragg, C. B., & Brower, C. K. (in press). The Quick and the

   Careless: The Construct Validity of Page Time as a Measure of Insufficient Effort

   Responding to Surveys.

Buchanan, N. T., Bergman, M. E., Bruce, T. A., Woods, K. C., & Lichty, L. L. (2009). Unique

   and joint effects of sexual and racial harassment on college students' well-being. *Basic*

   and Applied Social Psychology, 31(3), 267–285.

Buchanan, N.T., Settles, I.H., Hall, A.T., & O'connor, R. (2014). A Review of Organizational

   Strategies for Reducing Sexual Harassment: Insights from the U. S. Military. *Journal of*

   Social Issues, 70 (4)*,* 687-702.

Cieciura, J. (2016). A summary of the bystander Effect: Historical development and relevance in

    the digital age. Retrieved from http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/1493/a-

    summary-of-the-bystander-effect-historical-development-and-relevance-in-the-digital-

    age

Clay, R. A. (2017). Women outnumber men in psychology, but not in the field's to

    echelons. Monitor on Psychology, 48(7). http://www.apa.org/monitor/2017/07-

    08/women-psychology

Cochat Costa Rodrigues, M., Leite, F., & Queirós, M. (2017). Sexual minorities: The

    terminology. *European Psychiatry, 41*(1),848-910.

Coker, A. L., Cook-Craig, P. G., Williams, C. M., Fisher, B. S., Clear, E. R., Garcia, L. S., &

    Hegge, L. M. (2011). Evaluation of Green Dot: an active bystander intervention to reduce

    sexual violence on college campuses. *Violence against women, 17*(6), 777–796.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique

    of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. In D. K. Weisbert

    (Ed.), Feminist legal theory: Foundations (pp. 383–395). Philadelphia, PA: Temple

    University Press.

Crenshaw, K.W. (1991) Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, Identity politics, and violence

    against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299.

Curran-Everett, D. (2020). Evolution in statistics: P values, statistical significance, kayaks, and

    walking trees. Advances in Physiology Education, 44(2), 221–224.

Danna, G., Hernandez, J., Mahabir, B., Nandigama, D., & Cheung, H. (2020) Who else besides

    (white) women: The need for representation in harassment training. *The Industrial and

    Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 13*(2), 208-212.

Dubois, C. L., Knapp, D. E., Faley, R. H., & Kustis, G. A. (1998). An empirical examination of same-and other-gender sexual harassment in the workplace. *Sex Roles, 39*(9–10), 731–749.

Foubert, J.D., Langhirichsen-Rohling, J., Brasfield, H., & Hill, B (2010). Effects of a Rape Awareness Program on College Women: Increasing Bystander Efficacy and Willingness to Intervene. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38* (7), 813-827

Hayes, T., Kaylor, L., & Oltman, K. (2020). Coffee and controversy: How applied psychology can revitalize sexual harassment and racial discrimination training. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 13(*2), 117-136.

Jhangiani, D., Tarry, D., & Stangor, D. (2014, September 26). How the social context influences helping. Retrieved from https://opentextbc.ca/socialpsychology/chapter/how-the-social-context-influences-helping

Kabat-Farr, D. & Cortina, L.M. (2012). Selective incivility: Gender, race, and the discriminatory workplace. In S. Fox & T. Lituchy (Eds.), *Gender and the Dysfunctional Workplace*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

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

Kleinsasser, A., Jouriles, E. N., McDonald, R., & Rosenfield, D. (2015). An Online Bystander Intervention Program for the Prevention of Sexual Violence. *Psychology of Violence*, *5*(3), 227–235.

Khanna, C., & Shyamsunder, A. (2020). Observer intervention training—filling an important

    gap. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 13*(2), 154-158.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help? New

    York, NY: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Lee, S. Y., Hanson, M. D., & Cheung, H. (2019). Incorporating bystanders intervention into

    sexual harassment training. *Industrial-Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on*

    Science and Practice, 12(1), 52-57.

Leung, R., & Williams, R. (2019). #MeToo and Intersectionality: An Examination of the

    #MeToo Movement Through the R. Kelly Scandal. *Journal of Communication Inquiry,*

    43(4), 349–371.

Mujal, G. N., Taylor, M. E., Fry, J. L., Gochez-Kerr, T. H., & Weaver, N. L. (2021). A

    review of bystander interventions for the prevention of sexual violence. *Trauma,*

    Violence, & Abuse, *22*(2), 381–396.

O'Reilly D. J. (2013). Third Parties Morally Motivated Responses to Mistreatment in

    organizations. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of British Columbia,

    Vancouver.

Sawyer, K., Salter, N., & Thoroughgood, C. (2013). Studying Individual Identities Is Good, But

    Examining Intersectionality Is Better. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 6*(1),

    80-84.

Sears, B., & Mallory, C. (2011). Documented evidence of employment discrimination & its

    effects on LGBT people. UCLA: The Williams Institute. Retrieved from

    https://escholarship.org/uc/item/03m1g5sg

Shyamsunder, A., and Khanna, C., Sharma, A., D'Souza, P (2020). Development of the Observer

Intervention in Sexual Harassment at Work (OISH) Measure, Using a Situational Judgment Approach for Assessment. *South Asian Journal of Law, Policy, and Social Research, 1*(1). 133-179.

Spector, P. E. (2006). Method Variance in Organizational Research: Truth or Urban Legend? *Organizational Research Methods*, *9*(2), 221–232.

Stark, L., Seff, I., Assezenew, A., Eoomkham, J., Falb, K., & Ssewamala, F. M. (2018). Effects of a Social Empowerment Intervention on Economic Vulnerability for Adolescent Refugee Girls in Ethiopia. *The Journal of adolescent health : official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine*, *62*(1S), S15–S20.

Roehling, M. V., & Huang, J. (2018). Sexual harassment training effectiveness: An interdisciplinary review and call for research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(2), 134–150.

Rabelo, V.C. & Cortina, L.M. (2016). Two sides of the same coin: Gender harassment and heterosexist harassment in LGBQ work lives. *Law & Human Behavior, 38*(4), 378-391.

Taber, K. S. (2017). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and Reporting Research Instruments in science education. Research in Science Education, 48(6), 1273-1296.

Tippett, E. C. (2018). Harassment Trainings: A Content Analysis. *Berkeley Journal of Employment & Labor Law, 39*(2), 481–526.

Quick, J. C., & McFadyen, M. (2017). Sexual harassment: Have we made any progress? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 286–298.