
A Response to Sexual Harassment as Target: An Experimental Evaluation of Locus of Control, Gender and the Category of Sexual Harassment.

Dr.M.R.Prakash¹, Mrs.G.Madhuri², Ms.K.Agilandeswari.³

¹MA.,M.Com.,B.Ed.,MBA.,M.Phil.,Ph.D., FSIESRP(Malaysia), HOD & Assistant Professor, PG Department Of Commerce-Bank Management, Mohamed Sathak College Of Arts &Science, Sholingallur, Chennai-600119, India

²MBA.,M.Phil, Assistant Professor, PG Department Of Commerce-Bank Management, Mohamed Sathak College Of Arts &Science, Sholingallur, Chennai-600119, India

³M.A.,M.Phil.,B.Ed., Assistant Professor, PG Department Of Commerce-Bank Management, Mohamed Sathak College Of Arts &Science, Sholingallur, Chennai-600119, India

Email: ¹Prof.prakash2020@gmail.com, ²madhuris2271@gmail.com

Received: 17 June 2022 **Accepted:** 02 September 2022 **Published:** 30 September 2022

Abstract: *According to research, the link of force the initiator experiences as a result of their propensity for improper activity is related. In order to determine if responses to lewd conduct are influenced by the initiator's sex, the type of inappropriate behaviour, and the locus of control, the ebb and flow research examines people's reactions to 10 improper behaviour situations. Results show that the respondent's sex, the harasser's sex, same-sex vs inverse-sex provocation, and whether the badgering was compensation or unpleasant workplace all had an impact on responses and their magnitude to sexually harassing behaviour.*

Keywords: *Equal Employment Opportunity, sexual harassment, the work environment cultivate.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Inappropriate behavior is a standout amongst the most hurtful and affecting types of counterproductive practices in the work environment. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2007) characterizes it as "Unwelcome lewd gestures, demands for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical behavior of a sexual nature constitute inappropriate behavior when this behavior unequivocally or certainly influences an individual's vocation, absurdly meddles with an individual's work execution, or makes a scary, threatening, or hostile workplace (1)." Informally, or maybe prototypically, it is considered as an unwelcome physical or verbal act made by an assailant (man) against an objective (lady) that meddles with the target's work. Lewd behavior ought to never again be considered exclusively a



demonstration made by men against ladies rather as Stockdale (2004) talks about, inappropriate behavior can likewise be lady versus man or same-sex.

In actuality, males were accused of 16% of inappropriate conduct by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 2007, compared to 11.6% in 1997. (2007). In earlier studies, it has been discussed how men and women have become more sophisticated in how they perceive improper behaviour (Gruber, 1992; O'Connor, Gutek, Stockdale, and Geer, 2004; Williams and Cyr, 1992). However, the same social standards that fuel men's inappropriate behaviour toward women have moved to wind up making it all the more tolerable for men to admit they are targets themselves. It's possible that men are being bugged more as women attest their role in the workplace, or it's possible that these demonstrations have been happening for quite a while. Berdahl (2007) observed that ladies experienced more lewd behavior than men, not in view of the recurrence of the practices toward ladies, but since ladies assessed the practices all the more contrarily. Besides, Stockdale, O'Connor, Gutek, and Geer (2002) demonstrated that ladies had higher earlier inappropriate behavior and sexual misuse scores, which in this way associated with higher evaluations of presently being sexually bugged.

The exploration directed here is situated to gauge ones response to inappropriate behavior. In particular, I hope to check whether ones responses to lewd behavior are molded by the sex of the initiator, the kind of inappropriate behavior, and ones locus of control. All things considered the paper is separated into the accompanying four segments. The primary segment audits the lewd behavior writing, particularly, individual/circumstance components. The second segment surveys the locus of control writing and starts to sort out its pertinence with lewd behavior. The third area presents the hypothetical system and consequent experimental examination of the aforementioned variables. The last area talks about the down to earth and experimental ramifications later on.

2. Personal and conditional factors

According to Bandura's social learning model of hostility from 1978, forceful behaviour depends on a number of factors, including the social norms that support the demonstration (Situation), the individual's preferences (Person), and the proximity of the target (Situation). According to Pryor (1995), there are two factors—individual and environmental—that affect the frequency and severity of improper behaviour in the workplace. What are their customs and defining characteristics? Pryor (1987) developed a scale to determine the likelihood that someone may sexually irritate you.

The Likelihood to Sexually Harass (LSH) scale includes ten hypothetical circumstances that depict various interactions between men and women when the man is in charge of a seductive female. The male responder is asked to assess their likelihood of engaging in improper behaviour (such as giving in to a female subordinate's desire for sexual support) in the future. One scenario asks the respondent to imagine themselves as a Hollywood producer casting a little role that calls for a stunning performer with lots of sex advance.

The inquiries request that the respondent rate the probability they would give the part to the on-screen character they discovered sexiest, would give the part for sexual supports, or would ask the performer to supper keeping in mind the end goal to examine it. Previous research (Pryor and Meyers, 2000; Lee, Gizzarone, and Ashton, 2003) has used the Big Five measures of good faith, appropriateness, openness to experience, extraversion, and neuroticism to build up a connection amongst identity and the forceful conduct. Lee, Gizzarone, and Ashton



(2003) found that Honesty-Humility, characterized by modifiers that recognize truthfulness and dependability from trickery, avarice, and pride, have a more grounded connection with LSH than any of the Big Five measures. Since this new quality can be seen as the propensity to take point of interest or endeavor others, and inappropriate behavior could be seen as a grievous demonstration of abuse, the down to earth significance of this finding is noteworthy. This doesn't mean a survey ought to be produced to evaluate this measure and those low in Honesty-Humility ought to be quickly disposed of. Doing as such would be silly with respect to the association since there is a second component that may impact inappropriate behavior more than the proclivity of man which will be examined in the following segment. Or maybe the association may utilize this as a device to recognize potential issues and actualize concentrated lewd behavior preparing.

The situational element is by all accounts the impetus behind the demonstration of lewd behavior. A study from Pryor (1987) observed that men high in LSH abused a reason gave by the undertaking environment of instructing a confederate how to putt a golf ball keeping in mind the end goal to touch a lady sexually, though in a condition in which the male member was to educate a female confederate how to play poker, which had no standards for touching, no touching, sexual or something else, occurred. Those men with a low LSH did not use the open door in either circumstance to touch the female confederates sexually.

This backings the declaration of the Person X Situation model (Pryor, LaVite, and Stoller, 1993) that specific auras may make the potential for sexually bugging conduct to happen in a few men, yet men are still unrealistic to finish unless the standards of the circumstance underwrites or approves the conduct. As it were, he will control his proclivity in the event that he feels the expense of sexually pestering a colleague is excessively amazing (i.e. getting got and restrained). Social standards in the work environment cultivate this conduct when administration does not uphold inappropriate behavior strategies. This shows to the initiator that it is socially reasonable to sexually annoy a colleague.

3.Object of sexual harassment

It is crucial to continue the process of better understanding what causes sexual harassment in the workplace or perhaps what makes it so pervasive now that a foundation has been set to demonstrate the seriousness of the issue. I'll make the argument that the locus of control of the victim of sexual harassment affects how they respond in the parts that follow.

Once harassed, a victim of sexual harassment has two choices: to ignore the harassment or to resist it. The majority of victims choose to disregard what has been done to them. Why? Do they worry about reprisals? Does it follow established societal standards that it won't be punished? Management can have a "don't bother me" mentality. Or it could be because the initiator stripped the target of their dignity and control in their own life. All but the latter will be discussed in the next section when we look at the behaviors of management. For now, the focus is on the loss of control by the target.

Because of the harassing behaviour, the target may lose the will to fight. Even though they possessed an external locus of control before to the horrific conduct, they could have switched to an internal locus as a result. They may not believe they can defend themselves now since they were unable to do so when it was happening. In essence, the target feels that they lack the cognitive skills necessary to anticipate, prevent, and defend against sexually harassing behaviour. In fact, Phares (1976) discovered that internals tend to perform better in certain circumstances where information management is important for problem-solving.



The target may feel worry and anxiety if they think the act will probably happen again. This can lead to a feeling of powerlessness and a retreat from the environment or the company (Klein & Seligman, 1976). The target may also choose to disregard what transpired if they want to be accepted. For instance, many incidences of sexual harassment go unreported in the military, police, and manufacturing industries because the women wish to affirm their place among "the guys" (O'Leary-Kelly, Paetzold, & Griffin, 2000).

They believe that in order to be accepted, they must put up with these behaviours. In essence, they'll "tough it out," let the harassment go on for the time being, and ultimately the males will either become bored or the women will show their worth, which will stop the harassment.

4. CONCLUSION

Inappropriate behavior doubtlessly will never be dispensed with. It appears as much a part of the working environment as an individual's pulse. A few discoveries merit nothing. To start with, current discoveries give further backing to the idea that ladies have more negative responses to being sexually bothered than men. Secondly, the inappropriate behavior impacted the greatness of the response to being sexually irritated, and this finding was not dependent upon sex. As such, both men and ladies had more grounded responses to being sexually hassled when it was as compensation instead of threatening workplace.

This finding may originate from the way that both genders feel that lewd behavior, to a specific degree, is a necessity of the working environment. Certain levels of inappropriate behavior (i.e. stripped pin-ups and/or sexually unequivocal jokes) may serve as a kind of semi start process for newcomers into the association. Put in an unexpected way, representatives may use this sort of lewd behavior to culturally assimilate and/or weed out the attractive versus less alluring laborers. This kind of provocation is normally gone for more ladylike laborers, whether ones sex is female or not.

Third, the harasser's sex was interesting. When the harasser was a man, men were less likely to be complicit and more likely to challenge, which is consistent with findings from several studies in the field (Goldberg and Zhang, 2004; Herek, 1988; Waldo, Berdahl, and Fitzgerald, 1998).

5. REFERENCES

1. Muhonen, T. & Torkelson, E. (2004). Work locus of control and its relationship to health and job satisfaction from a gender perspective, *Stress and Health*, 20, 21-28
2. O'Connor, M.O., Gutek, B.A., Stockdale, M.S., Geer, T.M., & Melancon, J.D.R. (2004). Explaining sexual harassment judgments: Looking beyond gender of the rater. *Law and Human Behavior*, 28, 69-95
3. O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Paetzold, R. L., & Griffin, R. W. (2000). Sexual harassment as aggressive behavior: An actor-based perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 372-388.
4. Orpen, C. (1992). The work locus of control scale as a predictor of employees attitudes and behaviour: a validity study. *Psychology, A Journal of Human Behavior*, 2, 35-37