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ABSTRACT

“HEY SEXY THING, WHY DON’T YOU COME OVER HERE?” SIMULATED STRANGER HARASSMENT AND ITS EFFECTS ON WOMEN’S EMOTIONS AND COGNITIONS

Rima Hanna
University of Guelph, 2019

Advisor:
Dr. Paula Barata

The primary purpose of the current study is to investigate whether exposure to simulated street harassment in a laboratory setting increases women’s anxiety and fear of rape. Different male voices for the stimuli were randomly assigned to investigate if perceived ethnic identity interacts with the experimental conditions to further elevate negative emotions (anxiety and anger) or fear of rape. Female identified students were recruited \((n = 165)\). There were negative effects of exposure to harassment (complimentary or hostile) regardless of ethnicity of the man (Black/African/Caribbean Canadian or White/European Canadian) with increases in women’s anxiety and anger. Hostile street harassment had the largest negative effect on women’s anxieties and anger. There were small differences found between the groups on the fear of rape measure. Results also showed that participants reported high levels of reacting passively to street harassment. This is a replication study based on a 2014 study by R. Hanna.
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CHAPTER 1  INTRODUCTION

What is Street Harassment

Street harassment, or stranger harassment, is understood to be a type of sexual terrorism that women experience in their everyday lives (Fogg-Davis, 2006). It is such a common occurrence that women come to expect it every time they step into the public sphere (Gardner, 1995; Vera-Gray, 2017). The exact prevalence of street harassment is unknown; however, small and large sample surveys have shown numbers ranging from 62% to 90% of women in North America will have experienced street harassment one or more times by the age of 16 (Lenton, et. al, 1999; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). Street harassment includes a wide range of unwanted sexual attention from strangers that includes catcalls, leering, whistles, comments, homophobic or transphobic slurs, and sexual gestures (Vera-Gray, 2017). The street harassment could be “complimentary”, (i.e., insidiously veiled as positive and affirming), but is in fact still unwanted and inherently sexist (Swim, et al., 2001); or it could be hostile, which is overtly violent and misogynistic (Day, 1994; Hanna & Senn, 2014). The unpredictable nature of each situation, as well as the fleeting anonymity of most encounters, has made street harassment difficult to define, control, and police—unless it leads to a physical assault (Bowman, 1993; Nielson, 2000; Fogg-Davis, 2006). As such, street harassment provides a constant looming reminder to women of their sexual vulnerability to men and acts as an impending threat to their physical safety (Fogg-Davis, 2006).

Understanding street harassment through this anti-oppressive lens comes after decades of research by feminist and social psychology scholars who often explored the theoretical implications as well as the correlations between street harassment and different aspects of women’s mental health and cognitions (Warr, 1985; Bartkey, 1990; Gardner, 1995; Klonoff &
Landrine, 1995; Klonoff, Landrine, & Campbell, 2000; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Davidson, et al., 2016). For example, street harassment has been correlated with decreased feelings of safety, increased fear of rape, increased feelings of frustration and discomfort, and generalized anxiety disorder (Gardner, 1995; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Macmillan, Neirobisz, & Welsh, 2000; Davidson, et al., 2016). Research that explores the causal effects of street harassment has been more limited. The present study will look to add to the sparse literature studying the emotional and cognitive effects of street harassment through experimental methods.

The Impact of Street Harassment

Research on other types of sexism and sexist discrimination (ex. workplace harassment, domestic violence, etc.) that women face has shown a negative effect on women’s mental health and well-being (Klonoff & Landrine, 1997; Gardner, 1995). Since sexual harassment and street harassment are conceptually related, it logically follows that they would produce many of the same harmful consequences (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). Klonoff and Landrine (1997) helped establish this connection with their landmark measure, the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE), which they developed to conceptualize sexist events as “discriminatory acts or events that happen to women because they are women (p. 22).” They found that exposure to these sexist events was directly linked to disproportionately higher levels of depressive and anxiety disorders in women (Klonoff and Landrine, 1997). They argue that these daily stressors are much different from non-gendered stressors (ex. missing the bus) because they are far more demeaning and traumatic in nature (Klonoff and Landrine, 1997). They developed the 23 quantifiable items on the SSE using qualitative descriptions of daily sexisms collected from 120 women in an airport. They found that the majority of the sexist events were subtle, with hints of hostility, rather than
outright hostility and violence. Although items on the scale were not explicitly labeled as street harassment, some contain descriptions that could fit the definition, such as: “How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because you are a woman?”, and “How many times have you heard people making sexist jokes or degrading sexual jokes?” Klonoff and Landrine (1997) also found that the SSE was a better predictor of psychosomatic and psychiatric symptoms than a measure of non-gender related daily stressors. Klonoff, Landrine, and Campbell (2000) found that if women experienced fewer sexist events, they reported similar levels of depressive and anxiety symptoms as men. The explanation for the correlation between sexist events and depressive symptoms is that sexist events are stressful events, and stress has long been shown to contribute to adverse symptoms (O’Leary, 1990).

Other research done by Swim, Hyers, Cohen, and Ferguson (2001) also showed that sexist events, or “everyday sexisms” including street harassment, had a negative effect on women’s psychological well-being. They used daily diaries instead of retrospective surveys in a series of studies in which they asked participants to fill out gender related incidents they experienced every day. The researchers looked at how these responses compared with responses recorded in measures of self-esteem and mood states. They found that sexism and sexist hassles were common to women’s everyday experiences, and that this was negatively related to women’s comfort and positively related to their feelings of depression and anger (Swim, et al., 2001). They also found that the most common emotional response to the sexist events was anger.

Research specifically on street harassment also has suggested that it has an impact on other aspects of women’s perceptions and well-being, such as fear of rape (Hanna, 2014). Fear of
rape is an important factor related to women’s well-being because it has been shown to restrict women’s leisure and employment opportunities and their general quality of life (Stanko, 1987). Women will change their walking patterns, skip out on events if the events are late at night or if the woman will be alone, avoid certain streets if they are not well-lit, etc. (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Stanko, 1987; Senn & Dzinas, 1996). MacMillan, Nierobisz, and Welsh (2000) studied the relation between perceptions of safety and fear of rape. They theorized that, for women, perceptions of safety are closely connected to fears of sexual assault and that street harassment might remind women of this risk (MacMillan et al. 2000). Results from their study showed that experience with stranger harassment might have had a negative effect on women’s perception of safety, which in turn led to higher fears of sexual assault (MacMillan et al. 2000).

Women are far more fearful of being victimized in the public sphere than are men, even though statistics show that men are actually more likely to be victims of crime on the street (Lenton, et al., 1991). Women have been socialized to fear being sexual assaulted by men; extreme messages from the media, advertising, and society as a whole work to reaffirm this socialization (Stanko, 1987). Men do not fear sexual assault (Senn & Dzinas, 1996), which might be why some do not understand why street harassment can act as a trigger for this fear of being sexually victimized. As such, street harassment can be seen by women as a threat of rape.

Street harassment is, by definition, objectifying. Women are reduced to objects by men to be leered at, touched inappropriately, and judged for their appearance (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). This objectification coincides with the North American idea that women’s bodies are sexual objects. These ideas can be seen on display in pornography, advertising, and the mass media (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). Feminist theory has discussed at length the implications of women striving for (and sometimes obsessing over) physical attractiveness that complies with
what it means to be a sexual object as a result of societal pressure (Bartkey, 1990; Gardner, 1995; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Women’s bodies and physical appearances become a spectacle, and they are judged based on how pleasing or pleasurable they are to look at (Bartkey, 1990).

Self-objectification theory was first proposed by Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) and helped with the understanding of the psychological experience and potential consequences of self-objectification. The theory explains how exposure to sexual objectification (which can occur anywhere: at work, at school, on the street), increases the likelihood of women objectifying themselves; this then leads to women experiencing body shame, body policing (a concept that describes when women carefully monitor their appearance), depression and disordered eating (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) highlighted that all women who self-objectify (in any form) have all had multiple experiences with being seen as body parts and pieces to be enjoyed by men. Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) also proposed that self-objectification occurs congruently with sexual objectification; this is when women have been socialized to refer to themselves as sex objects that are the subject of judgments to be made by others (Fredrickson, & Roberts, 1997). Women will see and scrutinize their own bodies from the perceived perspective of others, particularly men (under the male gaze; Mulvey, 1989). This theory is parallel to aforementioned theories proposed by feminists. These feminist theories and Fredrickson and Robert’s Self-Objectification theory (1997) agree that by internalizing and adopting this harmful view of their own bodies, women may consequently perceive stranger harassment as flattery or a validation of their sexual worth, because stranger harassment has become a positive reinforcement that women should expect from men on their bodies (Bartkey,
Sexual objectification and self-objectification most often happen in the public sphere; many if not all types of street harassment are sexually objectifying. Therefore, self-objectification is another possible negative outcome of street harassment. Self-objectification has been linked to higher incidences of present or past exposure to street harassment. Fairchild and Rudman (2008) found that exposure to street harassment could predict women’s self-objectification. They also found that those women who scored higher on self-objectification were more likely to report responding to street harassment in their lives by blaming themselves or reacting passively (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). The researchers concluded their study by stating that viewing stranger harassment as complimentary or harmless is problematic for women and does not protect them from self-objectification but rather amplifies it.

Within the category of sexist events that women face are the aforementioned distinct subcategories of hostile and complimentary or benevolent sexism. Hostile sexism is overtly violent; benevolent sexism is complimentary in nature but still unwanted and inherently misogynist; both are part of ideological belief systems that work to maintain and stabilize the current gender hierarchy that grants men higher status and power (Glick & Fisk, 1996; Becker & Wright, 2011). Hostile sexism is often linked with feelings of fear, anxiety, and inferiority for women (Glick & Fisk, 1996; Glick & Fisk, 2001; Becker & Wright, 2011). Referring to complimentary sexism, Glick and Fisk noted that women tend to accept complimentary sexist comments, and even desire them as a form of validation of their sexual worth (1996; 2001). Other researchers have linked experiencing complimentary or benevolent sexism with self-objectification. Most studies
used correlational methods (e.g. Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Fredrickson, & Roberts, 1997), and one used experimental methods (Calogero & Jost, 2011).

In a landmark three-part study with undergraduates, Calogero and Jost (2011) explored the dynamics and impact of complimentary and hostile sexist statements on men and women’s self-objectification, self-surveillance, and body shame levels using experimental methods. In study one, they randomly assigned 100 men and 100 women to be exposed to hostile sexism or benevolent sexism or neutral statements (no sexism) under the guise of a proofreading activity. The benevolent sexist statements were based on items from Glick and Fiske’s (1996) Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. Sample benevolent sexist statements from the activity include: “Men are incomplete without women,” “Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility,” and “Women should be cherished and protected by men.” They were then given scales that measured state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and body shame. They found significant results on all fronts for women; that is, exposure to benevolent forms of sexism, but not hostile or “no sexism,” increased state self-objectification, self-surveillance, and body shame among women. Scores for the men remained relatively unchanged; the men were unfazed by the exposure to complimentary sexism (Calogero & Jost, 2011). This was the only study to show causal effects of environmental exposure to culturally prevalent, system-justifying sexist beliefs and self-objectification (Calogero & Jost, 2011). In study two, they replicated study one and added three new scales that measured public self-consciousness, general self-esteem, and appearance-management intentions. The results replicated study one, while also showing that public self-consciousness and general self-esteem were unmoved by exposure to benevolent sexism, indicating that these stereotypes increase women’s focus on the self as a central object of male evaluation but do not necessarily affect other forms of self-focus (Calogero & Jost, 2011).
The second study also revealed that as a result of exposure to benevolent sexism, women direct “more attention and energy toward their appearance as a result of their daily encounters with seemingly positive forms of sexism because of the experience of self-surveillance and body shame that is triggered by such sexism exposure.”

The results of Calogero and Jost’s (2011) research provided the first known experimental evidence that mere reminders of complimentary sexism consequently increase incidences of women engaging in a variety of appearance management and self-surveillance behaviors. This extends the correlational work done by Fairchild and Rudman (2008), who found positive relations between street harassment and self-objectification. However, finding causal effects of complimentary harassment on women’s self-objectification levels has been inconsistent as shown with the null results of Fisher, Lindner and Ferguson’s 2017 experimental study that had women view a video clip of 4 women being harassed on the street, then take self-objectification surveys. Despite the null results, Fisher, et al.’s study was important because they used experimental methods, which is unique in this area, and they rightfully suggested that watching a video clip cannot have the same impact as in-person exposure. I suggest that because self-objectification and body shame are something we have internalized throughout the years based on personal experience, a brief lab exposure may not increase self-objectification in all women. To properly test for this, the experimental study design must account for differences in women’s past experiences with street harassment in order to obtain an effect on self-objectification from a brief lab exposure. The design should see past experiences with street harassment as a moderating variable between exposure to complimentary harassment and self-objectification; that is, more experiences in the past could strengthen feelings of self-objectification when
women are exposed to reminders in the form of complimentary harassment. This is a proposal to explore.

Most of the work on the effects of street harassment have been correlational, and most were retrospective, with the exception of Swim et al.’s (2001) study, which used daily diaries to record sexist occurrences and the two experiments reviewed earlier (Calogero & Jost, 2011; Fisher, Lindner & Ferguson, 2017). The use of retrospective survey methods could negatively impact the accuracy of the extent and nature of what women remember and report about their experiences. The only other prospective experimental study in the street harassment literature was conducted by Harmony Sullivan (2011) and appears in her unpublished dissertation. This study attempted to determine whether exposure to street harassment had a direct effect on negative affect, mood, self-objectification, and fear of rape. She used a video clip from the documentary War Zone (1998), which depicted a woman being sexually harassed on a street. Female participants were asked to put themselves in the situation. Aside from increased anger, Sullivan did not find any effects. This may have been due to limitations with the stimuli used. It is possible that because another woman was depicted in the film as being a victim the stimuli did not allow them to become immersed in the harassment, and therefore the situation may not have induced other negative emotions or cognitions (Sullivan, 2011). Also, the woman in the film was accompanied by a film crew, who undoubtedly provided a feeling of safety for the participants viewing the harassment as they knew that the harassers would not attack the woman with the crew present and the cameras rolling (Sullivan, 2011). The documentary type style of the film allowed for a realistic portrayal of street harassment, but it may not have captured the everyday affective experience needed to elicit vulnerability in the participants.
My undergraduate thesis (Hanna, 2014) was based on Sullivan’s methods, but was designed to immerse participants more fully in the experience of sexual harassment in order to evaluate changes to women’s emotions (anxiety, anger, fear of rape) and cognitions (self-objectification) as a direct result of exposure to simulated sexist street harassment. Based on the previous literature and a design largely modelled from Sullivan (2011), the study used a visual stimulus (two pictures of an empty street, one depicting nighttime, and one depicting daytime) and an aural stimulus (a brief recording of a man’s voice in one of three simulated interactions with the participant). Results from this study demonstrated that exposure to street harassment (complimentary or hostile) at any time (day or night) resulted in increases in women’s anxiety, anger, and fear of rape compared to a control condition (inquiry about the location of the library). This study was the first to demonstrate that simulated street harassment could cause a large change in women’s negative emotions and opened the door for further research to address limitations (e.g., faulty NHST analysis, small sample size, etc.), as well as continue to expand our knowledge on the effects of street harassment.

Factors that Influence the Experience of Street Harassment

As already noted, hostile and complimentary street harassment have negative implications for women who experience them. Both types of street harassment come with particular potential consequences that have been explored by researchers to further unpack the impact of this sexist event (e.g., Klonoff & Landrine, 1997; Swim, et al., 2001). This research provides us with some insight as to what makes street harassment more or less threatening, yet there is more to be explored. In particular, there is very little known about what it is regarding the harassers themselves that makes the interaction more or less problematic or frightening for women. Some
work has been done exploring how women perceive interactions with strangers based on their attractiveness, such that harassment by a man who is young (or around the same age as the woman) and conventionally attractive is viewed as less threatening and harassing (Fairchild, 2010). However, the impact of other perpetrator factors (e.g., race or ethnicity) on women’s experiences has not been examined.

In my undergraduate thesis study, the voice that was used as the aural stimulus was of a Black American male that was likely to have been recognizable as a Black American to the women who participated in the study. This brings me to an intriguing potential variable that I did not explore in my thesis and that has not been examined in the literature on street harassment: the race or ethnicity of street harassment perpetrators. Although there was still a difference between the harassment conditions and the control, women’s anxiety also increased in the control condition from pre to post assessment. In other words, the results suggested that it was anxiety inducing for women to have the man simply approach them for directions to the library. Further exploration into the topic of race or ethnicity, the markers of accent and voice, and implicit and explicit racism has suggested that the simulated voice used could affected the results. Some research related to implicit attitudes towards voice and accent, while scarce, tells the tale of social cognitions that are unconscious and affect how individuals categorize, judge, and behave. Pantos and Perkins (2012) examined language attitudes toward foreign and U.S. accented speech. They used an Implicit Association Task (IAT) that incorporated audio cues of an American accent and of a Korean accent. They found that participants exhibited pro-U.S. accent bias on implicit measures, but pro-Korean bias on explicit measures (2012). This supports the concept of aversive racism because these individuals explicitly attempt to show non-racist behaviors, yet unknowingly reveal their internalized racism during implicit measures.
Race versus Ethnicity

A distinction between race and ethnicity is imperative as it shapes the way the current study will proceed. Today most biologists and contemporary scientists agree that framing race as a biological concept is inaccurate, harmful, and problematic (Foster & Sharp, 2002; Helms & Talleyrand, 1997; Krieger, 2000; Pfeffer, 1998; Yudell et al., 2016). Race is largely a social construct based in social realities such as oppressive systems (i.e. slavery, land conquest; Krieger, 2000). The perceived variations amongst “races” also draw on shifting stereotypes surrounding loose genetic variations such as skin color, hair color, and facial features (Foster & Sharp, 2002; Helms & Talleyrand, 1997; Pfeffer, 1998; Yudell et al., 2016). The understanding is that race is not ethnicity (Helms & Talleyrand, 1997); ethnicity refers to similarities of a group of people united by common culture, language, history, and nation (Foster & Sharp, 2002). For the purposes of this study, perceived ethnicity of street harassment perpetrators will be conceptualized and discussed. An emphasis will be made on ethnicity because it includes cultural background such as language and dialectic style. This can be detected in accents rather than race, which normally refers to physical characteristics (e.g., skin color).

Implicit and Explicit Racism

Implicit cognition happens at the unconscious level and is understood to be the knowledge, perception, and memory that influence a person's behavior (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). It has been claimed that a person is not aware when these unconscious cognitions occur, nor when these cognitions affect attitudes or stereotypes (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995). Researchers have branched off into more specific types of implicit cognitions, such as implicit racism. For decades research has been conducted to show that these implicit associations are
used to make quick judgements, which results in negative attitudes and behavior exhibited towards those who are not part of the dominant race (Roefs, et al., 2011; Oswald, et al., 2013). Much of this work has focused on implicit racism toward Black Americans. Some studies employ indirect methods and comparative measures (e.g. implicit association tasks) using faces and their relations to perceived anger, negative traits, or job competency (e.g., Hutchings & Haddock, 2008; Hugenberg & Bodenhausen, 2004; Son Hing, 2012; Stamarski & Son Hing, 2015; Maclin & Malpass, 2001). This work has demonstrated that people perceive or associate Black people as having negative traits such as anger and hostility (Entman, 1990; Winfield, 2007; Hutchings & Haddock, 2008).

Narratives of the Black man as a criminal and of a rapist of White women have existed since the time of slavery in the 1800’s in North America (Bumiller, 1987; Pain, 2001; Patton & Snyder-Yuly, 2007). The myth of the White female victim and the Black male criminal were fabricated and exaggerated in those times as a way of preserving White men’s dominance over Black men, and to also create a notion that the White man is the protector of White women from the sex-hungry Black men criminals (Bumiller, 1987; Patton & Snyder-Yuly, 2007). Generations have passed since these times, yet the narrative persists. This can be seen with well-known legal cases such as the murder of Emmett Till (1955), the Kitty Genovese case (1964), the Kobe Bryant rape case (2003; Patton & Synder-Yuly, 2007), as well as popular media storylines seen in movies, TV shows, and pornography (Cripps, 1993; Cowan & Campbell, 1994). These narratives of Black men as criminals may interact with women’s broader fears of rape and become internalized. Women who are taught to fear the stranger who could kidnap and rape them in the night may be especially fearful of a Black stranger. Because Black men are more often stereotyped as perpetrators of crime, it might be the case that some women fear Black
men more than White men, and therefore, street harassment from a Black man could be more anxiety provoking and frightening. As I have argued, street harassment is a likely contributor to women’s fear of rape, and it increases women’s general anxiety and anger as well. If the perpetrator is a Black man, this fear might be more intense given the internalized historical and social messages that have claimed for generations that Black men are violent and rapists.

*Reactions to Street Harassment*

Most research on women’s reactions to sexual harassment (conceptually similar to street harassment) have found that most women do not respond in an active manner (Fitzgerald, Swan, & Fischer, 1995), nor are they likely to confront sexist events or perpetrators (Gruber, 1989; Magely, 2002; Swim and Hyers, 1999; Woodzicka and LaFrance, 2001). Similarly, research done on women’s reactions to street harassment has found that women tend to respond passively (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Gardner, 1995; Hyers, 2007). The most common reaction reported in these studies was ignoring the harasser (e.g., pretending to not hear him and walking away without interacting back).

Previous literature on the way women respond to street harassment, if they respond, has not explored how the perceived ethnicity of perpetrators or context impacts women. However, there are a few important studies that could provide some insight on these issues. Swim and Hyers (1999) looked at the ways that women publicly and privately respond to sexist remarks. They recruited 108 participants for the first study and measured their attitudes about gender roles and gender equality, their beliefs about sexism, and their attitudes towards activism, and how often they take part in it. Later participants were brought into a group setting in a lab under the impression that they were taking part in a group decision making exercise. Instead, a male
confederate made three separate sexist (or neutral) remarks randomly to the group as a whole, and the participants reactions or lack thereof were recorded on camera and on the other confederate’s secret notes. Participants were then taken individually to complete a questionnaire which measured their impressions of the confederate, including the extent to which they felt the confederate was involved, comfortable, and prejudiced. Results showed that of the 44 women who were in the sexist condition, only 4 confronted all three sexist remarks, 5 confronted two of the remarks, 11 confronted one remark, and 24 made no confrontation. Results of the questionnaire showed that women perceived the confederate to be more prejudiced, less desirable to be around, and less comforting when he made sexist remarks. Although the researchers did not examine the qualities of the confederate that made women more or less likely to confront his sexism, they did note the women themselves were more likely to confront the sexism if they did not feel fear for their physical safety.

A study done by Sui Lau (2015) provides further insight into contextual factors that affect how women react to street harassment. As part of her master’s thesis, Sui Lau (2015) investigated women’s reactions to stranger harassment and the predictors of women’s reactions in Hong Kong. Contrary to other similar studies, Lau’s study found that an active coping strategy was the most common reported reaction to street harassment; however, consistent with Swim and Hyers (2009) study, Lau also found that women were more likely react to stranger harassment in an active way if they did not feel that their life was in danger (Lau, 2015).

All the aforementioned researchers agree that fear of retaliation is an important factor that women grapple with when deciding whether or not to confront the harasser. This is important because deciding to confront the harasser may be beneficial. Studies show that women who
choose to confront a sexist event in their lives will subsequently have a more positive self-image, more self-satisfaction, higher self-esteem, and higher self-affirmation as “they take actions on their own belief instead of being overpowered by others” (Swim & Hyers, 1999; Crosby, 1993). Confronting street harassment specifically can act as a buffer to the negative feelings associated with the fleeting experience. Livingston, Wagner, Diaz, and Liu (2013) studied women’s reactions to stranger harassment and found that women who confronted perpetrators suffered less from negative emotion than those who did not actively respond.

It is likely that women take the context of the situation (e.g., isolation) into consideration when gauging the danger levels; I suggest that they also take in the physical and socio-political qualities they perceive in the perpetrator into consideration. Studies on reactions to street harassment relate indirectly to the implicit and explicit racist attitudes towards Black men. While the ethnicity of the sexist confederate in Swim and Hyers (1999) study, and the hypothetical “stranger harassers” in Lau’s (2015) study were not noted or discussed, knowing what we know about the way women have been socialized to fear Black men, it is probable that women will experience more fear of a street harasser if he is Black. It is also probable that women might be less likely to confront a street harasser if he is Black because of this fear. The fear of rape, the fear of ethnicity, and the fear of retaliation might prove to be too much for a woman to overcome emotionally and cognitively. If a woman fears for her physical safety or her life, she might choose to ignore the man, and walk or run away quickly from the man who is harassing her, rather than confront him. In simpler terms, if the street harasser is Black, the woman might feel more fear, and she may use more passive coping strategies.

Given the research findings on fear of ethnicity, racism, and implicit and explicit attitudes, I believe that fear and racist attitudes of Black men may have had an effect on the
participant’s anxiety and fear of rape in my undergraduate research study. Although this cannot explain the difference between the experimental and control groups (the voice was the same throughout), it may have played a role in the strength of the findings. I believe that there could be a difference between the experimental groups and the control if the voice was of a White man; however, it is likely that there could have been an interaction with ethnicity so that the effects of the experimental manipulation were stronger because the voice was of a Black man. I wish to be clear that I do not want to shift attention away from gender. Street harassment is clearly a gendered experience and the ethnicity of the perpetrator does not make street harassment more or less acceptable. However, understanding how the ethnicity of the perpetrator may impact the experience of street harassment and women’s response to it is important because avoiding confrontation may contribute to negative outcomes such as decreased self-esteem, feelings of shame, and decreased psychological well-being (Livingston, et al., 2013; Lau, 2015).

The present work has a primary purpose of attempting to replicate the findings from my 2014 study with voices from different men (a White man and a Black man) and investigate ethnicity as a possible moderating variable. Additionally, this study will further explore the impact of street harassment on sexual objectification. The study will also measure possible relations between exposure to harassment and reactions to the harassment. The purpose is to explore additional factors and variables that would make women more or less likely to react to street harassment in an active way or passive way.

CHAPTER 2 HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses
1. The mean change score of the combined experimental groups on an anxiety measure (Profile of Mood States; post minus pre) will be greater than the mean change score of the control group. The effect size will be at least $d = 0.8$ (this is the minimum effect size of interest).

2. The mean change score of the hostile group on the anxiety measure (Profile of Mood States; post minus pre) will be higher than the mean change score of the control group. The effect size will be at least $d = 0.8$ (this is the minimum effect size of interest).

3. The mean score of the combined experimental groups on the fear of rape measure (Fear of Rape Scale; administered post simulation) will be higher than the mean score of the control group. The effect size will be at least $d = 0.8$ (this is the minimum effect size of interest).

**Exploration**

1. The voice of the harasser will produce a main effect, such that women exposed to the Black man’s voice (in any condition) will experience higher levels of anxiety than those exposed to the White man’s voice. A possible interaction with ethnicity and harassment condition will also be explored, but no prediction is made.

2. The mean change score of the hostile experimental group on the anger measure (pre and post) will be higher than the mean change score of the control group on the anger
measure (pre and post). There will be a large effect of anger (approximately $0.8 < d < 3.87$).

3. Exposure to past street harassment will act as moderating variable, such that women with higher past exposure to street harassment will score higher on self-objectification in the complimentary condition compared to the control condition.

4. Participants who score higher on measures of anxiety post-simulation will report that they would be more likely to react to the street harassment in a passive way. The three other subscales of the coping with harassment questionnaire will be explored for relationships with anxiety and anger, but no other predictions are proposed.

CHAPTER 3 MANIPULATION CHECK

3.1 METHOD

Method

A manipulation study was conducted to determine the strength of the audio recordings, and the ability of participants to correctly guess the ethnicity of the two voices.

Participants

A G*Power analysis determined that 14 participants, 7 in each group ($n = 14$) based on a point biserial correlation analysis assuming an effect size of $0.7$ ($\rho = 0.7$) and a power of 0.95.

A small sample of university students ($n = 14$) was recruited through participant pool to take part in the manipulation check. Participants who completed the study were awarded 0.5
bonus points, which was used towards their psychology courses that are registered in the pool. All 14 participants identified as female; 8 out of 14 were white, while 4 were South Asian, and 1 was African. Most of the participants were in their first year (\(n = 10\)) and most identified as heterosexual (\(n = 13\)). The average age of the participants was around 19 (\(M = 19.14, SD = 2.62\)).

**Stimuli**

The stimuli were in the form of audio recordings and were presented to participants on a computer station in a computer lab. Participants viewed a photograph of an empty street in Guelph while listening to one of two voices through headsets. There were two types of voices in the recordings: A Black man and a White man. Each recording says the phrase, “Hi. Um, do you know where the nearest public library is? I know that the University library is back that way, but I’m looking specifically for a public library. One that everyone has access to. [Pause] Well thank you for that. Hopefully I don’t get lost. Guelph is a small city, but sometimes I get lost in those side streets. Well anyway, thank you for your help. Take care.”

**Measures**

*Audio Recognition Questionnaire*

The Audio Recognition Questionnaire was designed for the manipulation portion of this study. It presented three questions: “How likely is it that the voice on the audio was of a Black/African/Caribbean Canadian man?” “How likely is it that the voice on the audio was of an Asian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Filipino, etc.) Canadian man?” “How likely is it that the voice on the audio was of a White/European Canadian man?” Following these three questions was a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 “not at all likely” to 5 “extremely likely.” (Appendix A).


Demographics

Participants were asked to fill out a demographics questionnaire, which had questions about age, gender, ethnicity, etc. (Appendix B).

Procedure

Potential participants who identified as female viewed the participant pool advertisement which contained a brief summary and contact info. If they chose to participate, they signed up for a time slot and were given the location of the study. Participants arrived at the computer lab for their appointments and were seated at a computer station equipped with headphones. Participants were handed a consent form to read and complete. They were encouraged to leave without signing the consent form if they did not wish to participate. If they did agree to participate, they were asked to put on the headphones to begin the study on the computer (which had the audio recording of either the Black man or White man ready to be played). After they heard the audio recording, they were asked to complete the Audio Recognition Questionnaire on paper. Next, participants also completed a demographics questionnaire on paper, which had questions about age, gender, ethnicity, etc. Following the completion of demographics, participants were handed a debriefing letter of explanation which provided more information about the study and the topic and were given a verbal explanation. Any questions participants had were answered. Additional information about the participant, such as name and email, were obtained separately from the participant in order to credit their bonus marks. These files were kept separate from any other data to ensure security and confidentiality. The total time to complete this study was no more than 15 minutes. Participants had the option to withdraw from
the study at any time if they wished to do so. All participants stayed through to the end of the study.

3.2 RESULTS

Results

Results showed that the manipulation was successful. Based off of the power analysis that had the expected effect size of $d = 0.7$, a point biserial correlation was conducted between the dichotomous variables (the ethnicity of the man) and on the continuous variable (the scores on the Audio Recognition Survey). Pearson’s correlations yielded strong correlations between condition and scores on questions one and three of the Audio Recognition Survey: respectively, $r = 0.85$, CI [0.58, 0.95] (correctly guessing that the man is Black in condition 1), and $r = 0.98$, CI [0.95, 0.99] (correctly guessing that the man is White in condition 2).

CHAPTER 4 MAIN STUDY

4.1 METHOD

Method

Participants

Based on an expected effect size of Cohen's $d = 0.8$ on a between groups comparison when groups are their smallest, $n = 54$ per group was needed to ensure a 95% confidence interval of the difference that is no wider than the effect size itself (i.e., [0.4, 1.2]).

Female and female identified students age 17 and older ($n = 164$) were recruited through the psychology participant pool, email advertisements, social media advertisements, and poster
advertisements. Participants recruited through the participant pool who completed the study were awarded 0.5 bonus points, which could be used towards their psychology courses that were registered in the pool. Those who were recruited through the aforementioned advertisements were put in a draw for a chance to win one of two gift cards valued at $50 each. Participants who took part in the manipulation study were excluded from participating.

About 80% of participants identified as heterosexual \((n = 132)\), 10% bisexual \((n = 17)\), 4% queer \((n = 6)\), 1% lesbian \((n = 1)\), and 5% were unsure \((n = 8)\). Over half of the participants were in their first year of university. The average age was around 20 years old \((M = 19.97, SD = 3.21)\). A majority of the participants reported an ethnicity of European or Canadian descent; 12% reported Asian descent, 3% reported Indigenous/Aboriginal descent, 2% reported African descent, and 2% reported Latin American descent.

**Stimuli**

The stimuli were presented to participants on computer stations in a computer lab. The visual stimulus was a picture of an empty Guelph street near the University taken at nighttime (see Appendix C) with accompanying text instructions (see Appendix D). The aural stimulus was a brief recording of a man’s voice in one of three simulated interactions with the participant. The control condition was a neutral male voice asking for directions. The two experimental conditions varied the type of harassment, complimentary sexist harassment or hostile sexist harassment (Appendix D). There were two different voices saying the same dialogue: one performed by a Black man and one performed by a White man.

**Measures**

*The Profile of Mood States Brief Form (POMS)* (McNair, et al, 1996)
The POMS contains 30 items measuring shifting feelings and emotions (see Appendix D). Responses are marked on a scale of 0 to 4, with 0 being “not at all” to 4 being “extremely.” The POMS shows superior internal consistency, with reliability scores near .90 or above for all six factors measured in the scale. Two factors were used in this study: tension-anxiety (items 1, 6, 12, 16, and 20; \( \alpha = .80 \)) and anger-hostility (items 2, 9, 14, 25, and 28; \( \alpha = .91 \)). Other factors include depression-dejection, vigor, fatigue, and confusion-bewilderment (McNair, et al, 1996). The POMS also shows good predictive and construct validity, as evidenced by work done by Lorr, Daston, and Smith (1967), who identified eight mood factors, five of which confirm POMS factors (McNair, et al, 1996). Two subscales were analyzed in this study, the anxiety subscale and the anger subscale. Results from this study show good reliability for the anxiety subscale (\( \alpha = .85 \)) and the anger subscale (\( \alpha = .86 \); Appendix E).

*The Fear of Rape Scale (FORS) (Senn & Dzinas, 1996)*

The FORS contains 31 items that measure women’s perceived fear of stranger rape. Responses are marked from 1 to 5, with 1 being “very safe” to 5 being “very unsafe” and also from 0 to 4, with 0 being “never” and 4 being “always.” The FORS shows construct validity, as demonstrated by its ability to predict higher scores if the woman has had recent experiences of sexual coercion (Senn & Dzinas, 1996). The FORS also showed good internal reliability with \( \alpha = .91 \). Results from this study confirm this, yielding excellent reliability with \( \alpha = .93 \) (Appendix F).

*The Objectified Body Consciousness Scale (OBSC): Body Surveillance Subscale* (McKinley & Hyde, 1996)

The Body Surveillance subscale of the OBSC contains eight items that measure states of self-objectification. Responses are marked on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 being “strongly disagree” and 7 being “strongly agree.” The subscale has shown good discriminant and convergent validity (McKinley
& Hyde, 1996). McKinley and Hyde (1996) also reported that the measure had moderate to high reliability, with $\alpha = .76-.89$. Results from this study show moderate reliability with $\alpha = .73$ (Appendix G).

The Modified Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008)

The Coping with Harassment Questionnaire was originally designed by Fitzgerald (1990) to measure women’s reactions to sexual harassment. The modified version by Fairchild and Rudman (2008) was made to measure women’s reactions toward street harassment specifically. The responses were organized into four categories: active coping strategy, passive coping strategy, benign coping strategy and self-blaming coping strategy. The modified version only included items tailored to street harassment. In the modified Coping with Harassment Questionnaire, four items were used to measure active coping strategy, such as ‘I let him know I did not like what he was doing’ and ‘I reported him’. Seven are used for passive coping strategies, for example ‘I just let it go’ and ‘I pretended nothing was happening’. There are five items measuring benign coping strategy, examples being ‘I considered it flattering’ and ‘I treated it as a joke’, and four items adopted for self-blaming coping strategy, such as ‘I realized that I had probably brought it on myself’ and ‘I realized he probably would not have done it if I had dressed differently.’ Participants are asked to recall their usual reactions during stranger harassment and rate the statements on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all descriptive) to 7 (extremely descriptive). The reliability for the subscales of active, passive, benign, and self-blaming coping strategies were 0.59, 0.89, 0.83 and 0.73 respectively. For the purpose of this study, participants were directed to respond according to how they would usually react to street harassment experiences in their lives. Two subscales were analyzed in this study, the passive subscale and the active subscale. Results from this study shows good reliability for
the passive subscale, $\alpha = 0.86$, and moderate reliability for the active scale, $\alpha = 0.70$. (Appendix H)

*The Street Harassment Scale (SHS) (Sullivan, 2011)*

The SHS contains 28 items measuring the frequency of past experiences with street harassment. Responses are marked from 0 to 6, with 0 being “never” and 6 being “multiple times a day. The SHS also contains a sub-scale entitled Responses to Harassment that lists common responses to street harassment and asks participants to rank how often they’ve engaged in the (coping) behavior using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 equal to “never” and 5 equal to “always.” Sullivan developed the SHS using past literature on street violence. She found a strong correlation between negative affect and higher scores on the SHS (Sullivan, 2011). Results from this study show moderate reliability with $\alpha = .78$. (Appendix I)

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited through the Department of Psychology participant pool website. Potential participants who identified as female viewed the participant pool advertisement which contained a brief summary and contact info. If they chose to participate, they signed up for a time slot and were given the location of the study. Participants arrived at a computer lab for their appointments and were seated at a computer station equipped with headphones. Participants were handed a consent form to read and complete. They were encouraged to leave without signing the consent form if they did not wish to participate. If they did agree to participate, they were asked to put on the headphones to begin the study on the computer. Participants were initially presented with a mood measure, the Profile of Mood States Brief Form (POMS) to gauge their present mood before being presented with the stimuli. The computer program (Qualtrics) randomly assigned the participants to one of six conditions
varying ethnicity of the man (Black man vs White man), and type of harassment (control, complimentary sexist, or hostile sexist). Participants were shown a picture of an empty Guelph street at night. Instructions appeared on the screen:

Imagine you just finished class, and you are walking home alone on this street (picture of empty street was shown on screen). Take a moment to put yourself there now. You’re in a rush to get home because you don’t want to miss your favorite show on TV. You walk by a man standing on the corner. He calls out to you for your attention. Click next to hear what the man says to you.

When the participant clicked “Next,” the audio recording played. At the end of the recording, instructions appeared on the screen:

Concentrate for a few moments on how you are feeling and what you are thinking. When you are ready click ‘next’.

When the participant clicked “Next,” they were presented with the POMS again. Following this, they completed the four remaining questionnaires, the Fear of Rape Scale (FORS), Self-Objectification Questionnaire (SOQ), the Modified Coping with Harassment Questionnaire, the Street Harassment Scale (SHS), and a demographics questionnaire.

Following the completion of these questionnaires, the computer screen told participants to call the researcher over to let her know that they have completed the study. Participants were then handed a debriefing letter of explanation that provided more information about the study and the topic and were also be given a verbal explanation, and a resource list with contact information for the Student Counseling Centre, should the study have evoked any negative emotions. Any questions participants had were answered.
After they were debriefed, they were asked for their name and email information for purposes of assigning the bonus marks. Those were written down on a piece of paper. This paper was kept separate from any other data to ensure security and confidentiality. The total time to complete this study was no more than half an hour. All participants stayed through to the end of the study.

Data Analysis

Hypotheses and exploration were preregistered on aspredicted.org and Open Science. The data were first collected on the program Qualtrics, and then saved as an .sav dump file. The data cleaning process was done on the program SPSS version 24.0.0.1. To begin, all variables were renamed for clarity and organizational purposes. For example, a distinction needed to be made between pre and post POMS scores. Value scales of the different surveys were labelled. Multiple lines of syntax were created to aid with re-coding and ease of analysis. As per the preregistered Open Science document, no scores were more than 3 standard deviations from the group mean, and therefore no points of influence were detected (or excluded).

For the confirmatory hypotheses 1-3, confidence intervals and Cohen’s d were calculated by hand, and using SPSS version 24.0.0.1. To begin, mean difference scores were calculated by subtracting pre-POMS scores from post-POMS scores on SPSS version 24.0.0.1. using syntax. Then one-way ANOVA’s with contrast coefficients were conducted for all three hypotheses on SPSS version 24.0.0.1. Using the contrast coefficient results, confidence intervals were calculated by hand using this formula:

\[ CI = c \pm se \times t \]

[CI (confidence interval) equals contrast plus/minus standard error times critical t (set at 1.96)]
Next, to find Cohen’s d, two formulas were used. The SD pooled values were calculated by hand using this formula:

\[ Sd_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{sd_1^2 + sd_2^2}{k}} \]

[SDpooled equals the square root of standard deviation(s) (added together) squared divided by K (the number of groups)]

Cohen’s d were calculated using this formula:

\[ d = \frac{c}{sd_{pooled}} \]

[D equals contrast coefficient divided by SDpooled]

Lastly, confidence intervals around the Cohen’s d were calculated by hand using two formulas:

\[ \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1 n_2} + \frac{d^2}{2(n_1 + n_2)}} \]

[Sigma equals the square root of n (group 1) and n (group 2) divided by n (group 1) and n (group 2) (added together with) cohen’s d squared divided by n (group 1) and n (group 2) multiplied by 2]

Sigma is then used in the second formula:

\[ CI = d \times t \pm t \times \sigma \]

[CI (confidence interval) equals cohen’s d times critical t (set at 1.96) plus/minus critical t (set at 1.96) times sigma]

For the exploration analysis portion, the program SPSS version 24.0.0.1. was used, as well as more confidence intervals and Cohen’s d calculated by hand. For the ethnicity main effect exploration,
a 3 x 2 one-way ANOVA was conducted using SPSS version 24.0.0.1. Using the difference means results, confidence intervals were calculated by hand using this formula:

\[ CI = c \pm se \times t \]

[CI (confidence interval) equals contrast plus/minus standard error times critical t (set at 1.96)]

Next, to find Cohen’s d, two formulas were used. The SD pooled values were calculated by hand using this formula:

\[ Sd_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{sd_1^2 + sd_2^2}{k}} \]

[SDpooled equals the square root of standard deviation(s) (added together) squared divided by K (the number of groups)]

Cohen’s d were calculated using this formula:

\[ d = \frac{c}{sd_{pooled}} \]

[D equals contrast coefficient divided by SDpooled]

Lastly, confidence intervals around the Cohen’s d were calculated by hand using two formulas:

\[ \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1n_2} + \frac{d^2}{2(n_1 + n_2)}} \]

[Sigma equals the square root of n (group 1) and n (group 2) divided by n (group 1) and n (group 2) (added together with) cohen’s d squared divided by n (group 1) and n (group 2) multiplied by 2]

Sigma is then used in the second formula:

\[ CI = d \times t \pm t \times \sigma \]

[CI (confidence interval) equals cohen’s d times critical t (set at 1.96) plus/minus critical t (set at 1.96) times sigma]
For the mean anger difference scores exploration, a one-way ANOVA’s with contrast coefficients was conducted on SPSS version 24.0.0.1. Using the contrast coefficient results, the confidence intervals was calculated by hand using this formula:

\[ CI = c \pm se \times t \]

[CI (confidence interval) equals contrast plus/minus standard error times critical t (set at 1.96)]

Next, to find the Cohen’s d, two formulas were used. The SD pooled value was calculated by hand using this formula:

\[ Sdpooled = \sqrt{sd1^2 + sd2^2 \over k} \]

[SDpooled equals the square root of standard deviation(s) squared divided by K (the number of groups)]

The Cohen’s d was calculated using this formula:

\[ d = {c \over sd_{pooled}} \]

[D equals contrast coefficient divided by SDpooled]

Lastly, confidence intervals around the Cohen’s d were calculated by hand using two formulas:

\[ \sigma = \sqrt{\frac{n1 + n2}{n1n2} + \frac{d^2}{2(n1 + n2)}} \]

[Sigma equals the square root of n (group 1) and n (group 2) divided by n (group 1) and n (group 2) (added together with) cohen’s d squared divided by n (group 1) and n (group 2) multiplied by 2]

Sigma is then used in the second formula:

\[ CI = d \times t \pm t \times \sigma \]
[CI (confidence interval) equals cohen’s d times critical t (set at 1.96) plus/minus critical t (set at 1.96) times sigma]

For the self-objectification, past exposure to street harassment, and complimentary exploration, a moderation analysis using the PROCESS macro in SPSS version 24.0.0.1. was conducted. For the anxiety and anger levels, and methods of coping (passive vs active) exploration, Pearson correlations were conducted in SPSS version 24.0.0.1.

4.2 RESULTS

Results

Confirmatory

For the impact of both types of harassment on anxiety, I hypothesized that the mean change score of the combined experimental groups on the anxiety measure (post minus pre) would be greater than the mean change score of the control group; the minimum effect size of interest was at least $d = 0.8$. The calculated Cohen’s D was large: $d = 1.31$, CI [0.77, 1.85]. Anxiety difference scores were calculated post minus pre simulation. When these difference scores were compared between the average of the two experimental groups ($M = 10.32, SD = 5.28$) and the neutral condition ($M = 3.61, SD = 4.82$), strong evidence led us to believe that those in the experimental group experienced higher levels of anxiety as compared to the neutral group. This can be observed through the confidence intervals which range from 5.04 to 8.35. This is a narrow thus precise interval with a substantial difference from the point of no difference (0). (See Table 1, Figure 1).
For the impact of hostile harassment on anxiety, I hypothesized that the mean change score of the hostile group on the anxiety measure (post minus pre) will be higher than the mean change score of the control group; the minimum effect size of interest was at least $d = 0.8$. Results showed that the difference between the hostile condition ($M = 10.84$, $SD = 5.27$) and the neutral condition ($M = 3.61$, $SD = 4.82$) was large, with a large Cohen’s D, $d = 1.43$, CI $[0.85, 2.01]$ (See Table 1, Figure 1).

For the impact of both types of harassment on fear of rape, we hypothesized that the mean score of the combined experimental groups on the fear of rape measure (administered post simulation) ($M = 69.11$, $SD = 20.24$) will be higher than the mean score of the control group ($M = 68.03$, $SD = 19.38$); the minimum effect size of interest was at least $d = 0.8$. Results showed that there were no differences of interest between the groups, with high scores persistent across conditions, and a low Cohen’s D, $d = 0.05$, CI $[0.03, 0.07]$ (See Table 1, Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Fear of Rape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95% confidence Interval</td>
<td>Effect Size (Cohen’s $d$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental vs Control</td>
<td>$M = 6.72^*$ CI $[5.04, 8.35]$</td>
<td>$D = 1.31$ (large effect) CI $[0.77, 1.85]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile vs Control</td>
<td>$M = 7.23^*$ CI $[5.31, 9.14]$</td>
<td>$D = 1.43$ (large effect) CI $[0.85, 2.01]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

*Results for showing Confidence Intervals & Effect Size for Primary Analysis (Mean Anxiety Difference Scores)*
Figure 1

Effect of complimentary and hostile harassment on anxiety (mean anxiety difference scores).

Note. “Experimental” refers to the hostile and complimentary condition combined
* Contrast coefficient
**Exploration**

To explore if the voice of the harasser would produce a main effect, a 3 (content of interaction: control, complimentary, hostile) X 2 (ethnicity of man; Black/African/Caribbean versus White/European Canadian) two-way ANOVA using mean difference scores (post POMS minus pre POMS) was conducted. This was to examine if the ethnic voice of the harasser produced a main affect, such that women exposed to the Black man’s voice (in any condition) experienced higher levels of anxiety than those exposed to the White man’s voice. Using the
mean differences and estimated 95% confidence intervals around them, a Cohen’s was calculated: \( d = 0.19, \text{CI } [0.15, 0.32] \) (See Table 2, Figure 3). This small Cohen’s \( d \) shows that there was a small effect of ethnicity on anxiety. There was no interaction between ethnicity and condition.

The impact of harassment on anger was explored. Anger difference scores were calculated post minus pre interaction. When these difference scores were compared between the average of the two experimental groups and the neutral condition, strong evidence led us to believe that those in the experimental group (\( M = 7.87, SD = 4.83 \)) experienced higher levels of anxiety as compared to the neutral group (\( M = 0.65, SD = 2.82 \)). This can be observed through the confidence intervals which range from 5.81 to 8.62. This is a narrow thus precise interval with a substantial difference from the point of no difference (0). This can be backed up by a high Cohen’s D, \( d = 1.68, \text{CI } [0.95, 2.41] \). The difference is even greater between the hostile condition and the neutral condition, with a high Cohen’s D, \( d = 1.84, \text{CI } [1.08, 2.60] \) (See Table 3, Figure 4).

Relationships between past exposure to street harassment and self-objectification for those in the complimentary condition were explored. Pearson correlations indicated that levels of past exposure to street harassment were trending towards higher levels of self-objectification for those in the complimentary condition (\( r = .211 \)) as compared to the control condition (\( r = .023 \)).

In order to determine if past frequency of street harassment is a moderating variable between self-objectification and the complimentary condition, a linear process regression was run. Results showed that past frequency is not a moderating variable (See Table 5).

Relationships between anxiety and anger levels, and methods of coping (passive vs active) were explored. Pearson correlations indicated low correlations between anxiety and
passive coping methods ($r = -.024$), anxiety and active coping methods, ($r = .109$), anger and passive coping methods ($r = .008$), and anger and active coping methods ($r = .123$). Given these low correlations, further exploration for moderation was not done. Higher rates of passive coping were consistent across conditions ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 1.33$) as compared to rates of active coping ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.31$).

Table 2

Results for showing Confidence Intervals for Exploration Analysis (Ethnicity * Condition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complimentary</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complimentary</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hostile</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Results for showing Confidence Intervals and Effect Size for Exploration Analysis (Anger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>95% confidence Interval</th>
<th>Effect Size (Cohen’s $d$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anger</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental vs Control</td>
<td>$M = 7.22^*$</td>
<td>$D = 1.68$ (large effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI [5.81, 8.62]</td>
<td>CI [0.95, 2.41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile vs Control</td>
<td>$M = 7.89^*$</td>
<td>$D = 1.84$ (large effect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CI [6.27, 9.46]</td>
<td>CI [1.08, 2.60]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “Experimental” refers to the hostile and complimentary condition combined

* Contrast coefficient
Figure 3

Effect of ethnicity and condition on anxiety (pre/post anxiety scores)
Figure 4

Effect of complimentary and hostile harassment on anger (mean anger difference scores)

![Bar chart showing mean anger scores for neutral, complimentary, and hostile conditions. Error bars represent 95% CI.]

Table 4

Regression model: Past Street Harassment Moderating Self-Objectification (complementary vs neutral conditions)

Y : Self-objectification Score
X : Complimentary Condition
W : Street Harassment Scale Sum
Test of highest order unconditional interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R²-chng</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X*W</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>159.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

----------

Focal prediction: Condition
Moderating variable: Street Harassment Scale Sum

OUTCOME VARIABLE:

Self-Objectification

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>159.00</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>20.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS_Sum_</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int_1</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 DISCUSSION

Discussion

This study was designed largely to be a replication study (while adding and adjusting certain variables, using a larger sample size, and employing non-NHST statistical analysis) of the experimental investigation by Hanna & Senn (2014); the original study and the current study used aural and visual stimuli to simulate the experience of street harassment. Two types of street harassment were identified and simulated: complimentary harassment (which is benevolent sexist comments) and hostile harassment (which is aggressive sexist comments). Both types negatively affected women participants by increasing their anxiety and their anger. This was shown in the past study (Hanna & Senn, 2014), and replicated in the current study. This is also consistent with past work that has shown that both kinds of street harassment are unwanted by women (Swim, et al., 2001; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). These findings also support the literature that says that street harassment has been shown to be indirectly and directly negatively related to women’s psychological well-being (MacMillan, 2000; Klonoff et al., 2000; Swim et al., 2001; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). The literature suggests that these unwanted experiences have come to be everyday stressors in women’s lives (Gardner, 1995). This study shows that street harassment has a negative emotional impact on women’s lives, as demonstrated by the increased anxiety and anger.

The implications of these findings are consequential. Past correlational research has strongly suggested that street harassment is a stressor for women (Klonoff and Landrine, 1997) producing a variety of negative effects (Gardner, 1995; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Macmillan, Neirobisz, & Welsh, 2000; Davidson, et al., 2016), but causality had not yet been demonstrated—until these two studies. High levels of anxiety were expected for those in the
hostile condition; the similarly high levels found in the complimentary condition demonstrate what past research has theorized: even if street harassment is benevolent in nature, it is still an unwanted and anxiety-inducing experience for women. This finding properly refutes the harmful victim-blaming myth that all women want to be complimented by men.

Increases in anger were also experienced by women as a result of both types of street harassment, which replicated findings from the original study. It is interesting to note that the effects of both types of harassment on anger and anxiety are similar. The feelings of anger did not seem to mitigate participants anxiety levels. It could be that participants felt their personal space was intruded on by the hostile or complimentary statements and simultaneously felt anxious and angry as a result. The anger that arose in this study and the original study are similar to the results found by Harmony Sullivan’s (2011) study in which participants were shown a brief video clip of a woman being harassed on the street, and then measured any mood changes. Sullivan found that her participants became angry at the displays of sexism; the participants in the original study and this study undoubtedly felt the same. The anger levels were highest in the hostile harassment conditions (in both the original and current study), which is more sexual and violent in nature. However, the anger levels for those in the complimentary conditions were not far behind. As previously stated, although complimentary harassment is benevolent in nature, it is still derived from sexist patterns of the objectification and degradation of women. As such, complimentary harassment evokes feelings of anger for those experiencing it, a common response across the two experimental conditions. This is consistent with previous research; for example, Swim et al. (2001) found that the most common emotional response to all types of sexist events experienced by women was anger.
The impact of anger is less clear. Feminist theorists often describe anger as both a negative emotion (leading to negative psychological outcomes; Vera-Gray, 2017) and/or a positive emotion (leading to activism, empowerment, positive coping strategies, etc.; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). Fairchild and Rudman’s study found the negative effects of street harassment were reduced when women used active strategies such as confronting the perpetrator or telling family or friends about the behavior with the recognition that it was wrong. Other studies have shown that women who choose to confront a sexist event in their lives will subsequently have a more positive self-image, more self-satisfaction, higher self-esteem, and higher self-affirmation (Crosby, 1993; Swim & Hyers, 1999). This study explored the positive outcomes of anger with the assumption that it could prompt active coping strategies. Results from this study were inconclusive: there were no relations between high levels of anger and active coping strategies. In fact, similar to fear of rape, levels of passive coping strategies were reported high regardless of condition and regardless of anger levels. Looking to the literature, feminist theory could explain this phenomenon: it is more difficult for women to take action in real life (Swim & Hyers, 1999) due to the socialization of girls to be quiet or not make a scene or be polite (especially towards men); active coping in response to street harassment are typically not encouraged (Sullivan, Lord, & McHugh, 2010).

Although results from this study showed that women mostly reported that they reacted passively to past street harassment, this might not have captured the whole story. Perhaps the way that active and passive responses were measured in this study did not allow for other nuanced expressions of active coping (ex., hashtag activism, collaborating with other women, blogging, social media postings, attending rally’s, speaking to others about their experiences, etc.). The survey used in this study to measure reactions to street harassment was worded in a
way to ask how the participant normally responds to street harassment in their lives. The options were reflective of immediate or soon-after reactions. The survey did not capture how the participant would have reacted to the present harasser nor did it capture if the participant would have been moved to engage in activism at a later time. Their anger could have moved them to react later, rather than in the moment. This would make sense given the research aforementioned that explains how it is difficult for women to take action in real time (Swim & Hyers, 1999).

There is a myriad of evidence of women taking action post-experiences, especially outside of formal academic research. Women across the globe have been coming together to channel their anger and frustration into activism. Take Back the Night and Slutwalk are two annual organized street protests that encourage women to join in a rally to reclaim the streets, reclaim the night, and reclaim their bodies. Other forms of activism have emerged online through social media platforms. Women are able to share their experiences and spread awareness through “hashtag activism” (Engles & Hills, 2015); using common hashtags such as “everyday sexism,” “stop street harassment,” “me too,” makes their stories accessible to other women to use as resources to share and circulate. Online activism and hashtag activism work to highlight the importance of starting or continuing a conversation and being heard. Future research could adjust survey questions to capture these other forms of activism and better understand the way women react to street harassment in their lives.

In the original study by Hanna & Senn (2014), the simulated street harassment (complimentary and hostile) increased fear of rape as compared to the control condition ($d = .40$, medium effect); surprisingly, this did not replicate in the current study. The biggest change was reflected in the control condition (neutral mean 2014, $M = 58.36$; neutral mean 2019, $M = 68.04$). The high fear of rape rates were similar to those recorded in the experimental conditions.
in the original study (complimentary mean 2014, $M = 63.93$; complimentary mean 2019, $M = 65.55$; hostile mean 2014, $M = 69.61$; hostile mean 2019, $M = 72.68$; Hanna & Senn, 2014). However, in the current study high levels of fear of rape were reported in this study regardless of condition. A few possibilities could explain this difference in outcomes. For one, perhaps fear of rape does not change after a brief experience of simulated street harassment, and the result from the original study was a Type 1 error. Alternatively, difference between the two studies could explain the different findings. For example, the difference could be due to the different cities in which the data were collected; the original study was conducted in Windsor, Ontario, which is a larger and more urban city than Guelph with potential for more street harassment incidences. Reflecting on the lower fear of rape scores, perhaps those participants were more accustomed to street harassment, and therefore were not as alarmed or reminded of this fear in the control condition. I suggest that future research should ask participants about where they grew up, where they experience the most street harassment (suburban living versus rural living versus urban living), and what their experiences are in their current city.

Another possibility for the difference in results is the fact that more women are aware that they could experience sexual violence due to increased media attention and prevention-focused activism. The message is that street harassment is yet another sexist event that women face. Correlational studies and feminist theory have pegged street harassment to be a threat of sexual violence; they have also intuitively suggested that women’s perceptions of their safety are influenced by the experience of stranger harassment (MacMillan et al., 2000). I suggest that their perceptions of safety are also influenced by knowledge and awareness, and with this brings anxiety. I believe that in the five years that separated this study from the original study, exceptional work has been done to bring awareness to the real impact of street harassment on
women’s lives and well-being. This could explain why even women in the control condition reported higher levels of fear of rape. The survey possibly did not capture a change in fear of rape as an emotion, but rather already existing cognitions.

Fear of rape is a negative emotional consequence that leads to behavioral restrictions and changes (Senn & Dzinas, 1996). A direct consequence of this would be the restriction of women’s leisure activities and quality of life (Senn & Dzinas, 1996; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1997). Women have been shown to restrict their behaviours when they move in the public sphere because of their fear of sexual assault (Krahe, 2005; Warr, 1985; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008). If fear of rape is actually increasing overall as suggested by the differences between the control condition scores in 2014 and now, then it could be suggested that this fear of rape might be consequentially indoctrinated in women’s minds. Anxiety and fear of rape have been related to having a negative impact on women’s psychological well-being, and this could be an unintended outcome of increased awareness. This is interesting and that could be the focus for future research.

The aural stimuli in the original study was that of a Black American man. In order to test whether the results would replicate with a different voice, the current study used two male voices, a Black/African/Caribbean Canadian man and a White/European Canadian man. Given the research findings on fear of ethnicity, racism, and implicit and explicit attitudes, I predicted that rates of anxiety would be higher for those women who heard the Black man’s voice. The results were not clear here; there was only a small effect of ethnicity on anxiety. In fact, women’s anxieties went up regardless of the ethnicity of the man in both complimentary and hostile conditions, and there was no interaction with ethnic voice. Although the highest levels of anxiety were found in the Black man hostile condition, it was not that much higher than the
anxiety levels in the White man hostile condition. These findings suggest that implicit racism did not impact the results and street harassment is frightening for women regardless of the perceived ethnicity of the perpetrator. Perhaps further research could further expand on this method and utilize a wider range of voices from different ethnicities.

Perpetuated self-objectification is another possible consequence of street harassment. Although there was no change in self-objectification in the original study (Hanna & Senn, 2014), here I explored whether exposure to past street harassment would act as moderating variable, such that women with higher past exposure to street harassment would score higher on self-objectification in the complimentary condition compared to the control condition. We reasoned that the body compliments would remind women of their self-objectification patterns, and this would be greater for those who experienced more harassment in the past. Results did show a trend in this direction. For women in the complimentary condition, the higher their past exposure to street harassment was, the higher their levels of self-objectification were; however, results did not show a strong moderation. These results were seemingly inconsistent with previous research. For example, Calogero and Jost (2011) found significant effects of benevolent sexist statements on self-objectification, self-surveillance, and body shame. However, reviewing Calogero and Jost’s methodology revealed that the benevolent sexist statements that their participants were exposed to were not sexual in nature, but rather spoke to common harmful sexist stereotypes about women’s minds and abilities (ex., women seek to gain power by getting control over men). The sexist statements in this study were sexual in nature and spoke to women’s appearances and their bodies. No other study currently exists showing causal effects of complimentary harassment on self-objectification. A correlational study done by Fairchild and Rudman (2008) found positive relations between stranger harassment and self-objectification; however, they did not
differentiate between different types of harassment (ex., hostile versus complimentary). Perhaps another reason for the lack findings in this study is the shortened survey used (only eight questions), and the timing of when the survey was given (towards the end of the study). Future research could use a longer and more detailed survey, and give this survey directly following the simulation.

There are more limitations to this study. The simulated street harassment presented was intended to be realistic; however, it cannot compare to the true experience. The impact of real street harassment could be underestimated or suppressed somewhat in a safe computer laboratory setting with another woman present (the researcher). In real life the participant could be completely alone on the street with no one to help her. This experience can be quite frightening, and it is unethical to simulate. The presence of the researcher and the debriefing period afterwards helps to mitigate these potentially intense emotions. An experimental study such as ours is also limited to studying the effect of a single episode of street harassment. Most women experience multiple occurrences (MacMillan et al., 2000; Sullivan et al., 2010; Vera-Gray, 2017) and so it can be expected that the cumulative effects of street harassment have higher levels of impact including on body objectification (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008) and mental health outcomes such as depression (Swim et al., 2001). This might also speak to the inconclusive results of the effects of the experimental conditions on emotions and cognitions such as fear of rape and self-objectification; these complex emotions and cognitions might require more intense and repeated exposure in order to detect a measurable change.

Another limitation could be that this study lacks an emphasis on cultural differences in the understanding of street harassment. The background research and theories used to guide this study were mostly from a North American perspective. Although some of the participants came
from different cultures and backgrounds, this study did not capture their nuanced experiences or ask about the location of their experiences, as mentioned before (for example, what street harassment is like for them to experience in other countries). Emotions might be understood and felt differently in other cultures (e.g., different gender norms might exist around emotions that women are encouraged to express) which could result in differences in anxiety and anger levels. Language differences might exist as well (e.g., different words for emotions might be used or emotions might be described in complex sentences rather than singular words such that are used in the Profile of Mood States). There also could be differences in the ways that women are able to advocate for themselves or others depending on laws of a country. Protesting against street harassment in small or large ways could result in more dire consequences for those women involved (perhaps without protection of local authorities depending on local laws). Further studies should use or create surveys designed to capture these cultured experiences, differences in language, differences in societal allowance or intolerance to street harassment, and more of a focus on obtaining a culturally diverse sample. Future experimental research should also be conducted to continue this work and to provide evidence that could be used by women worldwide who are fighting to decrease the occurrence of street harassment.

Another limitation is that this was a minimally diverse sample of students; most of the participants were between 19 and 22. Although young women experience the most sexist events (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997) and other forms of sexual violence (Breiding et al., 2014), women across age groups experience street harassment. Perhaps older women, who according to feminist research are no longer seen as sexual or desirable by society, experience street harassment completely differently. It could be more damaging (e.g., not in their recent memory and not seen as relevant for them, so they are unprepared) or less impactful (e.g., with age comes
wisdom and strength to overcome). Future research could measure the emotional effects of street harassment across age groups. This would add to our understanding of the way street harassment impacts women of all ages.

Despite these limitations, there are a number of strengths in this current study. The findings of the original study were replicated while also using a larger sample size, an improved methodology (adding two voices from different ethnicities), and different statistical analysis (ex. moving away from p-values and NHST). Causal links between two types of street harassment, and anxiety and anger were demonstrated. This work is groundbreaking in this field as it opens the door to more experimental research done on this topic to further show causal links while employing creative methods and transparent statistical procedures. The results from this study could be used by activists, lawmakers, stakeholders, or anyone who needs statistical proof that street harassment is unwanted and has detrimental emotional effects.

In conclusion, past research on street harassment, while important, has largely employed correlational methods. The work here adds to this body of literature, and also helps us better understand the causal relationships between street harassment and women’s immediate psychological well-being. Street harassment is a type of everyday sexism that tends to get overlooked because it is fleeting, anonymous, and a less obviously traumatic form of sexist discrimination against women (Landrine & Klonoff, 1997; Swim, Cohen, & Hyers, 1998). Years of overlooking and dismissing this type of harassment has led to it being normalized (Gardner, 1995; Vera-Gray, 2017). Recently we have seen more and more women step forward to challenge this norm. This study demonstrates that street harassment causes an increase in negative emotions and calling attention to these negative effects is a critical first step to fighting this form of sexism.
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CHAPTER 6  APPENDICES

Appendix A: Audio Recognition Survey

1 = Not at all likely  2 = A little   3 = Moderately   4 = Quite a bit  5 = Extremely likely

“How likely is it that the voice on the audio was of a Black man?”

1  2  3  4  5

“How likely is it that the voice on the audio was of an Asian man?”

1  2  3  4  5

“How likely is it that the voice on the audio was of a White man?”

1  2  3  4  5
Appendix B: Demographics

1. What is your age (in years)? ___________

2. What is your current sexual identity?
   _ Heterosexual (straight)
   _ Lesbian/gay
   _ Queer
   _ Bisexual
   _ Not sure

3. What are your present living arrangements?
   _ In a private home/apartment
   _ In a university residence
   _ In a group home
   _ Other, please specify _______________________

4. What is your year of study?
   _ First year
   _ Second year
   _ Third year
   _ Fourth year
   _ Other (e.g. special student), please specify _____________________

5. What is your current major? ______________________________
6. Which ethnic or cultural group do you identify with? (Check all that apply)

_ Central American (El Salvador, Honduras, etc.)

_ Scandinavian (Denmark, Sweden, Norway)

_ French Canadian

_ English Canadian

_ British (Scotland, Wales, England, N. Ireland)

_ W. European (France, Germany, Holland, etc.)

_ E. European (Russia, Poland, Baltic States, Hungary, etc.)

_ S. European (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc.)

_ Far Eastern (Japan, China, India, etc.)

_ African

_ South Asian (Pakistan, India, etc.)

_ Caribbean

_ Middle Eastern (Israel, Lebanon, Iraq, Iran, etc.)

_ Latin American

_ Other (please specify) ____________________________
Appendix C: Photo of empty Guelph street
Appendix D: Script

Imagine you just finished class, and you are walking home alone on this street [picture of empty street will be shown on screen, night or day depending on the group]. Take a moment to put yourself there now.

You’re in a rush to get home because you don’t want to miss your favorite show on TV. You walk by a man standing on the corner. He calls out to you for your attention. Click next to hear what the man says to you [“Next” will be at the bottom of the screen”]

Neutral

[Audio recording will start] Man: Hi. Um, do you know where the nearest public library is? I know that the University library is back that way, but I’m looking specifically for a public library. One that everyone has access to. [Audio recording will stop; the following words will appear]

You give the man directions to the best of your ability, but because you’re in a hurry, you give the directions while you continue to walk. The man follows you for a bit and continues to talk. Click next to hear what he says.

[Audio recording will start] Well thank you for that. Hopefully I don’t get lost. Guelph is a small city, but sometimes I get lost in those side streets. Well anyway, thank you for your help. Take care. [Audio recording will stop]

Complimentary Sexist Harassment
Man: Hey girl. *whistle* You’re so beautiful. Why don’t you smile? You’d be even more beautiful if you smile. You’re so attractive. I love your legs. Mmmm girl wow you look so good in those jeans. You’re so beautiful.

You try to ignore the man and continue to walk along your way. The man follows you for a bit and continues to talk. Click next to hear what he says.

Hey do you have a boyfriend? What’s wrong baby? I’m just complimenting your beauty. You’re just so hot. What’s your name? Can I get your name? What about your number? You’re just so stunning.

Hostile Sexist Harassment


You try to ignore the man and continue to walk along your way. The man follows you for a bit and continues to talk. Click next to hear what he says.

Concentrate for a few moments on how you are feeling and what you are thinking then click next.
Appendix E: Profile of Mood States- Brief Form (POMS)

Below is a list of words that describe feelings people have. Please read each word carefully. Then click the number that best describes how you feel RIGHT NOW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>'Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Worn out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Lively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Shaky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Grouchy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Unworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Uneasy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Fatigued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Discouraged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Lonely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Muddled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Exhausted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Anxious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Gloomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sluggish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Weary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Bewildered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Furious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Efficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Full of pep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Bad-tempered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Forgetful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vigorous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: The Fear of Rape Scale – Senn and Dzinas, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate your answers to the following statements by clicking on the option that BEST represents your thoughts and behaviours</th>
<th>always</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Before I go to bed at night I double check to make sure the doors are securely locked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When someone rings/knocks at my door I ask who it is (or look through the peephole) before I open the door</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I think twice before going out for a walk late at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If I have to take the subway/bus alone at night I feel anxious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I avoid going out alone at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I ask friends to walk me to my car or bus if it is late at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I think about the shoes/clothes I am wearing in terms of my ability to run in a dangerous situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When I am walking alone I think about where I would run if someone came after me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have turned down invitations/opportunities because I didn't want to risk coming home alone afterwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel confident walking alone late at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am especially careful of wearing the &quot;proper&quot; clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If I was waiting for an elevator and it arrived with one man alone inside, I would wait for the next one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I am wary of men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am afraid of being sexually assaulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If I have to walk outside late at night I take precautions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In general, I am suspicious of men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If it was dark and I had to walk to my car or the bus, I would make sure I was accompanied by someone I trusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If I was driving alone and I had to park my car I would try to park on a well lit street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am afraid of men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I carry objects (keys, knife, something sharp) when I walk alone at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. When I'm walking alone at night I am very cautious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. If I heard that someone had been sexually assaulted in my neighbourhood, I wouldn't leave the house unless I really had to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. When I am choosing a seat on the bus or subway I am conscious of who is sitting nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. If I am going out late at night, I avoid certain parts of town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. When I get on the bus or subway I take a seat that allows me to keep on eye on those sitting nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate your answers to the following statements by clicking on the option that BEST represents your thoughts and behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>very safe</th>
<th>safe</th>
<th>neither safe nor unsafe</th>
<th>unsafe</th>
<th>very unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. The possibility of rape affects my freedom of movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In general, how safe do you feel at night?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. How safe would you feel walking to your car alone if it was parked in an underground parking lot?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. How safe do you feel going into public washrooms in subways or malls?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. How safe do you feel in your apartment/house when you are by yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. How safe do you feel being out alone in your neighbourhood at night?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: The Objectified Body Consciousness Scale/Body Surveillance Subscale

Circle the number that corresponds to how much you agree with each of the statements on the following page.

Circle NA only if the statement does not apply to you. Do not circle NA if you don’t agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Strongly Agree or</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I rarely think about how I look.
   
   NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me.
   
   NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks.
   
   NA 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I rarely compare how I look with how other people look.
5. During the day, I think about how I look many times.

6. I worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.

7. I rarely worry about how I look to other people.

8. I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks.
Appendix H: Modified Coping with Harassment Questionnaire

If you have experienced any type of street harassment or were harassed by a stranger in public, please recall how you usually respond to them; if you have never experience any of them, please imagine how you would respond to them; and indicate how descriptive the following statements would be to your responses by clicking the numbers from 1-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I just ‘blew it off’ and acted like I did not care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I assumed he meant well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I felt stupid for letting myself get into the situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I did not do anything</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I reported him</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I assumed he was trying to be funny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I pretended nothing was happening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I talked to someone about what happened</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I realized he probably would not have done it if I had dressed differently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I acted like I did not notice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I let him know how I felt about what he was doing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I considered it flattering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I tried to forget the whole thing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I just let it go</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I blamed myself for what happened.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I treated it as a joke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I let him know I did not like what he was doing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I realized that I had probably brought it on myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I figured he must really like me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I just ignored the whole thing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Sexual Harassment Scale (SHS)

Think about the past year and think only about men you have never met before. For each question, click the number that corresponds to how often you have experienced the event according to the following scale:

0  1  2  3  4  5  6
Never  Once in the past year  A few times  About once  A few times  Almost  Multiple times a day

When you are in public (on-campus or off-campus):

1) How often has a man whistled, yelled, or honked at you from his car while you were walking/waiting for the bus/riding a bike?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

2) How often has a man blown you kisses or made other romantic gestures to you on the street?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

3) How often has a man told you to smile?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

4) How often has a man made negative comments about your appearance as you walk by (e.g. “keep the legs, lose the face”)?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6
5) How often has a man offered you money for sex when you are either walking or standing waiting for someone?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

6) How often has a man asked you for your name?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

7) How often has a man told you how pretty or attractive you are as you walk down the street and then repeated these comments louder, trying to get your attention?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

8) How often has a man slowed down his car so that he can drive beside you as you walk and either watch you or speak to you?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

9) How often has a man made sexually explicit gestures to you as you walk (e.g., pantomiming a blow job, grabbing his crotch)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

10) How often has a man complimented your appearance (e.g. “you have beautiful eyes”, “nice legs”, “you’re beautiful”)?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

11) How often has a man asked if you have a boyfriend or are married?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

12) How often has a man commented on your weight saying that you are either too fat or too skinny?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

13) How often has a man made sexual comments to you and then followed you as you walk?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6
14) How often has a man asked you for your phone number?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

15) How often has a man yelled things like “hey sexy!” or “you’re fine!” from a car while driving past you as you are walking or waiting for someone?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

16) How often has a man walked past you and commented on your weight, saying that he approves of your size?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

17) How have men touched you as you walked past them (e.g., touching your waist, brushing a hand against your breast, grabbing your hand, etc.)?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

18) How often has a man called you insulting names as you walk past (e.g., “whore” or “bitch”)?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

19) How often has a man approached the male person you are walking or sitting with and complimented him on your appearance or on his successful conquest of you?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

20) How often has a man yelled comments about your appearance at you while you are jogging?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

21) How often has a man walked past and directed non-verbal sounds at you (cat calls, wolf whistles, etc.)?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6

22) How often has a man stared at you in a sexual way as he walked past you on the street (e.g. leering, eyeing you up and down)?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6
23) How often have construction workers yelled compliments to you about your appearance as you walked past their work site?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

24) How often has a group of men made gestures and calls for you to come over to where they are standing?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

25) How often has a man pulled his car over as you are walking and asked you to do sexually explicit things with him?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

26) How often has a man called for your attention and when you ignore him begun shouting insults at you?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

27) How often has a man showed you his penis on the street?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

28) How often have men physically assaulted you as you walked past them (e.g. slapping your buttocks, punching you, tripping you, poking you)?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6

What have been some of your responses to these experiences? Please rank each of the following behaviors in terms of how often you have used them in response to harassment. Use a scale of 1 to 5 to indicate how often you have used the behavior (1 = never, 5 = always). Feel free to comment and/or add your own.

___ Ignored the man.
___ Laughed at the man.
___ Yelled something back.

___ Called a friend or family member to tell him/her about the experience.

___ Walked into a store to get away.

___ Glared at the man in an angry way.

___ Notified a police officer or other authority.

___ Asked man to explain himself.

Other:________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________