Chapter 1: Introduction

Globalization of garment manufacturing has led to a shift of power and control from few of the largest retail players and has encouraged outsourcing production to factories in the developing countries. Though this has led to growth in terms of availability of jobs, it has also encouraged demeaning working conditions, unhealthy competition leading to exploitation of the workers. Women have monopolized the textile sector, representing two thirds of the global workforces employed in the third world and advanced countries (Delhanty, 1999).

The Indian garment industry is the main source of employment after agronomy. It adds 14% to the industrial production, 4% to gross domestic production (GDP), and 17% to the export income. In Karnataka, the majority of the garment factories are situated in Bangalore and they provide employment to around five lakh women workers, employed in roughly 1200 huge production/buying houses and contract based moderate and mini setups (Lyimo, 2010). The women garment workers hold low job status and are from vulnerable backgrounds that are economically dependent on their jobs. They constantly work under high pressure of meeting unreasonable targets and are placed under male supervisors who subjugate and harass them. Economic dependence on the job for their livelihood, the social perception of obeying their superiors and spillover of patriarchal biases into the work environment make the women garment workers victims of physical, verbal and sexual harassment. Absence of job security and institutional mechanisms create a sexually intimidating environment for the women garment workers and they silently endure sexual harassment (Lyimo, 2010; Siddique, 2003).

Women workers especially from vulnerable circumstances are at the risk of twofold harassment originating from the interaction among three factors- promiscuity, poverty and
The predicament of those in the garment sector is exemplary (Jahan, 2012). The work environment gives an unspoken freedom to display intolerable behaviour, making women workers in the garment factories vulnerable, targets to male attention inside the workplace as well as outside. Belonging to the lower economic strata, absence of social insulation together with unpredictable hours of work and scarce transport services expose women workers to all kinds of harassment and insecurity.

Due to lack of legal protection and lack of job security women garment workers are in fear to file complaints against their colleagues or superiors. Hence, it is challenging to precisely measure the extent of sexual violence occurring in the workplace (Begum, 2010). Whatsoever the statistics, the cruelty and the prevalent nature of sexual harassment challenge the rights of women to the pursue a dream of a secure environment.

Sexual harassment cannot be considered a private issue and not a matter that only affects women. It is an issue of human resource management, human rights, and labour rights. Harassment leads to a wide array of concerns, from the economic to social, to psychological and physical (Glomb et al., 1997). From a larger outlook, harassment serves as a grave barricade to women’s participation in the labour market. Logically, it obstructs the accomplishment of gender parity and financial growth. Victims of sexual harassment experience depression, anxiety, emotional stress, fatigue, anger, embarrassment.

Followed by the lowering of the performance at work significantly, hostility, tension, and fear in the place of work, negative impact on teamwork and cooperation, which leads not only to reduced efficiency but also non-attendance, lack of job involvement (Buchanan & Fitzgerald, 2008).

**Defining Sexual Harassment**
The dialects of sexual harassment are comparatively new, though the numerous behaviours it encompasses are not. A socially recognized vocabulary was first given by the American feminists in 1970’s to categorize specific gender based discrimination as sexual harassment. Catherine MacKinnon and feminist legal scholar was the pioneer in defining sexual harassment inters of male domination and an act reflecting gender discrimination. Based on the Civil Rights legislation, Mackinnon drew on Title VII of the 1964 act, forbidding discrimination on the basis of race, religion, and sex. In the last twenty years, sexual harassment has gained momentum as a legal and social issue (Cortina & Jennifer, 2008).

Globally, rights groups have organized over the issue, compelling individual states and global organizations to act. The United Nations Convention in 1979 for the Elimination of All forms of Violence against Women recognised sexual harassment as a form of violence. In 1986, the Women’s Bureau of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions issued a Trade Union recommendation with regard to sexual harassment and in1992; sexual harassment was distinguished as a valid trade union concern. Though there is a lack of agreement on what comprises sexual harassment, the widely accepted definition suggests that the behaviour is undesirable, unreciprocated, and considered humiliating by the receiver, irrespective of the intentions behind the behaviour. Most of the conduct that represents sexual harassment are socially accepted and are readily assumed as approved by the harassers.

More precisely, sexually intimidating verbal conduct is considered as a compliment by the harasser but it is intimidating for the victim.

Obviously, it is not criminal to make compliments but the tone, context and the dialect used convey to the victim that the remarks made under the pretext of a compliment is sexually explicit. Previous findings reflect, though some victims refute the occurrence completely, there are a few who assert it strongly (Fiedler & Blanco, 2006).
Organisational culture may create a hostile and intimidating environment for the workers. Organisational power, hierarchy plays a vital role for growth and endurance of such culture. As the environment within the workplace deteriorates, it is more likely for definite inappropriate conduct to occur and be accepted as inevitable which leads to a spiral of incivility. This uncivil conduct becomes regular and is considered normal by the workers and the organisation (Hunt, Davidson, Fielded, & Hole, 2007).

Empirical definitions of sexual harassment were arrived through compiling responses of women who have experienced harassment. This qualitative data was classified; catalogued, analyzed and categorical schemes were arrived at, to describe sexual harassing behaviour (Hulling, Fitzgerald, & Dragon, 1996).

The most comprehensive work on this is the report of till (1980) who categorized sexual harassment into five broad classifications encompassing an extensive range of conducts including rape to chauvinist remarks. Some of these conducts were initially named as generalized sexist remarks and behaviour (gender harassment) which form the first category.

Such conduct is not intended towards sexual cooperation, but expresses sexist attitudes aimed towards degrading and insulting women (Plaudit, 1990).

The second category comprises of derogatory, insulting sexual provocations, but fundamentally devoid of punitive actions. This conduct is unsolicited, undesirable but no punishments involved if the woman denies. The third classification comprises of soliciting for sexual favours by assurance of incentive.
The **fourth classification includes pressure/coercion for sexual involvement by intimidation of reprimand**. Lastly, the **fifth classification includes sexual crimes and misdemeanours including rape and sexual assault** (Dey, Koran, & Sax, 1996).

Majority of the testified events include several types, where the victim experiences unwanted sexual attention and also is assured something in lieu for sexual favours and concurrently warned about non-co-operation (Paludi, 1990). In spite of such classification hitches, Till’s (1980) report has been tremendously significant and offers basis for additional exploration (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995).

To establish what constitutes sexual harassment, a dissimilar but theoretically linked definition has been developed to represent a succession of conducts, differing in type, severity, and setting by analyzing the responses of the victims. Such an approach hence changes the locus of the definition (i.e., to observer from the victim). Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen (1983) described one of the first and furthermost significant reports of such kind (Paludi, 1990). Their investigation included a population of 218 psychology major undergraduates who were given an array of circumstances/situations depicting socio-sexual conduct at work.

The situations methodically changed the sex of the perpetrator, the status of the perpetrator (colleague, supervisor, subordinates) and her/his conduct (suggestive sexual touch was portrayed in some situations also supplemented by an individual or a work connected remark). The students ranked the episodes on a scale of five points.
Their responses were scrutinised to yield three dimensions. The quality of relationship between the perpetrator and the victim (the extent of friendship, liking one another); the qualitative facets of the event (insulting, inviting the perpetrator’s conduct; the likelihood of the event); and lastly, the possibility of such an event happening with the reversed roles. Overall, the women found the events far more negative, mainly when it included touching (Fiedler & Blanco, 2006; Kamal, 1997; Langley, 2007; Paludi, 1990; Pina & Gannon, 2012; Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001). The association was interpreted with much more negativity by the participants when the perpetrator was a male, or occupied a higher position in the organisation.

This was mainly true if the harasser occupying a higher position was depicted as touching and making comments related to work (Paludi, 2003). The outcomes stated in the study found significant constructs which can impact perceptions of sexual harassment: sex of harasser, status of harasser, explicitness of the conduct, and level of association with the work scenario, differences in gender sensitivities. A correspondingly reliable outcome has been that conducts originating from managers or others with a advantage of considerable power, are more probable to be arbitrated as harassment. Not astonishingly, females are steadily more probable to see such conduct as both (Weber-Burdin & Rossi, 1982) harassment (Kenig & Ryan, 1986) and being aggressive (Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986).

This equates to Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen's (1983) study that the participants saw events more damagingly when they were perpetrated by the superior (Kamal & Tariq, 1997; Knapp, Faley, Ekeberg, & Dubois, 1997; Gutek & Dunwoody, 1987).

A closely related variable to the perpetrator status is the level of coercion characterized by the conduct. Participants greatly agree that associating sexual demands to intimidations of reprisal for nonfulfillment constitute sexual harassment; the same is true of conducts that associate sex
to assurances of incentives. 98% of the women and 94% of the men in Konrad and Gutek’s (1986) population of study accepted that requested for developing sexual relations on the premise that if declined may hurt one’s job position or helped in case one agreed was sexual harassment (Paludi, 2003) In Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt's (1983) study sexual bribery came to be labelled as harassment by 99% of women and 97% of males. Therefore, both empirical and a priori definitions obviously came to the consensus that quid pro quo (sexual compliance is bartered, or traded for employment benefits) must be defined as sexual harassment (Fitzgerald, 1990).

At the other end of the spectrum, lies the more vague conducts and those that are more sexist in nature (in contrast to sexual ones). Conducts observed in Till's (1980) gender harassment classification incurred least sexual harassment scores from the participants, where merely 30% men but 47% of female pupils measured by Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983) demarcated sexist remarks as sexual harassment.

Gutek et al., (1980) classification includes a wide range of socio sexual conducts. Socio sexual behaviours are well-defined as non-work connected gestures, looks, remarks, or physical touching that bear sexual content (Dekker & Barling, 1998).

Gutek et al., (1980) found a key difference between give-and-take and attention seeking conducts. Behaviours of reciprocal nature are which that elicit a reaction from the victim in question. Two types of conducts which seek exchange may be considered for sexual harassment (Gutek, Murphy, & Douma, 2004; Leskinen, 2012).

One which requires sexual activity and the other is request for dating. An individual who is anticipated to involve in sexual activities to get employment must eventually either say no or yes. That is, an answer is obligatory from the receiver. Likewise the other give-and-take classification of conduct, dating, similarly entails a reply (Wasti & Cortina, 2002).
An individual either does not agree or agrees to mingle as a condition of employment. Additionally, it is typically intolerable for the victim to ignore the harasser’s demand. Also, denial does not stop the antisocial conduct. Lastly, the harasser may intensify either the incentives which are assured for submission or the reprimands that are threatened for no fulfillment to coerce the victim to submit (Blakely & Moorman, 1998).

The second classification of conduct is termed attentional. These conducts comprise of gestures, looks and remarks that do not need a reaction from the victim. These conducts create threatening atmosphere for employees (Kamal & Tariq, 1998). In the attentional category in Gutek et al.’s (1980) classification, a division is made between the non-touch and touch (Pina & Gannon, 2012). The participants of the three surveys stated that the incursion of their private spaces, being touched by somebody (when it is unwelcome) differs from getting targeted with remarks or gestures. One of the concerns that have to be looked into is where physical touch is seen as sensual and not platonic (Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen, 1983).

Platonic touching is seldom seen as sexual harassment, as per the participants in the key surveys. Less than 8% of the female and 7% of the males consider platonic touching or non sexual touching.

A discrepancy within the attentional classification is amongst nonverbal and verbal conduct. Verbal conduct, like remarks or whistling are typically clear; while nonverbal conduct such as gestures and looks might be more covert and subtle (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007). Using rudimentary sexual expressions to degrade someone is obviously different from creating remarks that are intended to praise or to compliment. Sometimes, the comments or remarks can be positive but it will have the consequence of
distracting attention from the woman’s performance at her work to her bodily looks (Kanter, 1977).

Sexual harassment is predominant in definite work circumstances, for instance, in employments having gender disparity, power disparity among the male and female employees, through phases of job uncertainty, or when a new superior or supervisor is hired (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007).

Two kinds of leadership styles are mainly though not wholly connected with bullying and harassment: a dictatorial style, which involves restricted discussions with employees; and a laissez faire type when administration does not intervene (Einarsen, 2005; Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009; Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007). Individuals who belong to an advantaged class socially, the in-group, favour members of their own class and are more likely to harbour prejudice for those belonging to socially / economically underprivileged out-group. This notion implies higher the division among perceived internal, external group in an organisation higher the occurrence of sexual harassment (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007).

Sexual harassment, is deceptive and subtle in nature. Like other types of harassment, sexual harassment reflects abuse of administrative power and it exemplifies gender inequality or gender discrimination (Akthar & Métraux, 2013).

Fitzgerald et al. (1997) defined sexual harassment as comprising of three hypothetically distinct but connected classifications of conduct. Gender harassment involves instances of disapproving behavior not envisioned towards sexual collaboration rather, these are rudimentary, physical, verbal conducts that bear intimidating and aggressive outlooks about a particular gender—usually women. By distinction, unsolicited attention includes instances
of sexually inappropriate conducts which is unwelcome. This consists of such physical and verbal activities as sexually provocative remarks, unwelcome touching.

The third classification is sexual coercion or in legal terminology quid pro quo which is overt bribes or subtle intimidations to make the working situations liable on sexual conduct (Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997; Kamal & Tariq, 1997). Legally sexual harassment is represented as two distinct classifications–quid pro quo and hostile work environment (Welsh, 1999).

Research studies indicate that women are the victims and the perpetrators are men. Women face vertical harassment i.e. harassment from superiors more than harassment from coworkers or subordinates. This reflects social norms that condition patriarchal attitudes and also misuse of power by men who majorly occupy higher positions than women (Di Martino et al., 2003).

Male supervisors may be tempted to generalize the aggression and control expected out of them on the job, to sexual aggression. The socially constructed gender roles dictate men to demonstrate dominance and women to be subservient and to cater to the needs of men which in turn encourage women being victimized by men (Gutek & Nakamura, 1982). Gutek (1985) described that the victims were often younger than the regular employees (Coles, 1986; Gutek & Dunwoody, 1987).

Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) reported that marital status is also related with sexual harassment; women who are single more frequently experience sexual harassment than other married women (Coles, 1986; Kamal, Hassan, Khalil, 2002; Schneider, 1982).

Establishing legitimate institutional mandates, proactive commitment of the employers or the stake holders, not allowing patriarchal biases to influence work culture, time bound
redressing of sexual harassment complaints instils confidence in the working women (Gruber, 1998). Absence of policies and procedures or just mere adherence to the mandatory procedures is ineffective and it may in turn create hostile working environments reflecting organisational acceptance of sexually offensive or discriminative conducts (Hulin, Fitzgerald & Drasgow, 1996; Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1993).

Most of the victims who have experienced an instance of sexual harassment do not report the episode due to a lack of confidence that they would be considered earnestly and the harasser would be reprimanded and the reason being fear of reprisal and/or anxieties about losing their employment (Pierce et al., 1997).

Sexual harassment is usually a series of incidents, than just a single remote occurrence. Victims do not challenge the harasser till numerous harassing occurrences have already been typically overlooked (Benson & Thomson, 1982; Dunwoody-Miller & Gutek, 1985; Lindsey, 1977; Loy & Stewart, 1984).

Gruber and Bjorn (1982) found that victims in their study responded by either ignoring the harasser or making light of the harassment (Kamal & Tariq, 1997).

The victims usually used the indirect strategy of avoiding the harasser or situations where they would encounter the harasser (Culbertson et al., 1992; Loy & Stewart, 1984). As the frequency of the harassment increases there are more chances of the victim to demonstrate assertion or confront the harasser or use institutional sanctions to cope up with the situation (Gruber & Bjorn, 1986; Kamal, 1998; Livingston, 1982).

Marin and Guadagno (1999), reported that when a victim testified harassing conduct, the victim is labelled as least feminine, unreliable, least approved of than the one who refused to testify (Gruber & Bjorn, 1982). These findings are reinforced by Stockdale (1998), who
emphasized that victims employing confrontation as an approach when dealing with sexual harassment are vulnerable when compared to victims employing passive approaches, of being negatively perceived and suffer negative consequences (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007).

**Theoretical Orientation to Sexual Harassment**

Tangri and Hayes (1997) after analysing diverse models they concluded that there is a definite structure that explains the concept of sexual harassment. There are many facets or layers to it. The deep structure or inner most layer depicts behavioural adaptations evolution wise, the sub sequent layer depicts the socio-cultural customs, the outer most layer depicting institutional structures and provisions (Kamal, 1998).

**Environmental, individual, and organizational predictors of sexual harassment**

Studies of 1980’s and 1990’s provide insights into abundant concepts, models in relation to sexual harassment. An overall criticism concerning these theories is its plainness. Inclination towards over emphasis on main impacts of sexual harassment led to ignorance of newer impacts emerging out of the exclusive amalgamations of causative factors (Campbell, Dworkin, & Cabral, 2009).

Tangri, Burt &Johnson (1982) proposed three models to explain sexual harassment-natural/biological model, institutional model, socio cultural model.

**Biological/ Natural model**
Biological/Natural model (proposed by Tangri et al., 1982) explains sexual conduct as a natural human instinct. This construes sexual harassment as natural sexual pull between individuals which comprises of mutual, fascination among males and females, strong masculine sex drive propelling males to be sexual initiators (Gutek & Dunwoody, 1987). Here, the intention behind the conduct does not imply aggressiveness or bias, rather just the outcome of natural impulses.

The theory fails to reflect effects; victims have to face in terms of physical and mental wellbeing, employment security, job ambitions. In case the above theory is acceptable in elucidating sexual harassment, then there needs to be definite circumstances or criteria like the harassed must be alike to their perpetrators with regard to social dimensions like race, age, single and suitable as spouses; conducts displayed must bear a resemblance to characteristic courtship, the perpetrator must cease if the female expresses unacceptance.

**Institutional model**

According to the institutional model (proposed by Tangri et al., 1982) organizational and environmental situations nurture gender prejudice, unequal power relationships between male employees and female employees which will in turn lead to creation of an hostile work environment. Sexual harassment is a consequence of opportunities offered by authority/power that stem from institutionally ranked structures. It is a reflection of institutional power. As the workplace is characterized by vertical stratification it allows utilization of position and power to extract sexual favors from workers occupying subordinate positions. Formal administrative authority results as a consequence of hierarchical ranking present in the institution. There is an association between hierarchy present in an organization and sexual harassment which gives
rise to asymmetrical/unequal relations between superiors and subordinates. Women who have comparatively lower ranking in the structural hierarchy and have a vulnerable job situation are more probable to be the targets. While on the other hand, harassers are the ones who occupy higher positions hence defeating the idea of being testified.

Authority considered as a distinctive facet of the workplace is fundamental to sexual harassment and is measurable in Hofstede's power distance (Hofstede, 1991). Power distance is defined as the conditioning where members possessing less social/economic power in organisations within a nation expect and accept that power is distributed unequally. While Hofstede measured power distance as being a social facet of a nation, same notion can be applied here at a structural level (Bochner & Hesketh, 1994; Whaley, 2001).

Sexual coercion is a result of higher power distance culture where the individual in authority barters sexual favours with employment opportunities with individuals in subordinate’s positions. This occurs as the superior possesses control over subordinate who is conditioned to be docile and who will deny testifying misuse of authority. The harasser justifies his conduct as within his authority and the aggrieved is likely to see the circumstance as unfortunate (Whaley, 2001).

**Socio cultural model**

According to socio cultural model (proposed by Tangri et al., 1982) men and women differ while analyzing/perceiving conducts defined as sexual harassment. Women tend to identify sexual harassment as an issue but males have a greater edge to judge specific harassing conduct as sexual harassment. Gender is evaluated as a key predictor for the variation in perceptions of men and women with respect to defining sexual harassment. Traditionally societal and cultural values dictate that men demonstrate supremacy upon women essentially because of economic dominance and sexual harassment is an index of the patriarchal system.
where in males claim to be a dominant group. Hence, sexual harassment can be viewed as an instance where males assuming individual influence and personal power are harassers and while due to inherent physical feebleness and submissive conduct, women are most likely the victims.

When conventionally male categorized occupations or professions are occupied by women, they become vulnerable to victimization (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Males hold conventional attitudes towards females which are influenced by culturally dominated societal role expectations that bracket women into the nurturing role, being a sex-object and a helper. What has been traditionally seen as a woman’s occupation is essentially coloured by these conventional attitudes. Females working in these traditional zones are more susceptible of being identified based on gender role rather than work role. The debate is males working in conventionally male dominated occupations might depend on such inappropriate gender based role expectations. The consequence of this is sexually explicit inappropriate behaviour at work place.

The theories discussed above fail to measure how diverse issues interrelate to cause diverse forms of sexual harassment (Chen & Sethi, 2011; Whaley, 2001). Presented below are theories emphasizing amalgamation of specific organisational and environmental features forecasting sexual harassment.

**Person by Situation model**

Individual situation interaction was proposed by Pryor et al., (1993) who found that males who are highly prone to harass sexually will act in a harassing way when they understand that sexual harassment can happen devoid of adverse outcomes (Pryor et al., 1993; Dekker & Barling, 1998). The social norms in institutions may permit certain individuals possessing procivilities for sexual harassment to display sexually harassing behaviour. Organisations
having lenient social norms breed a hostile and unsafe environment which allows harassing conducts. (Pryor et al., 1993).

**Illinois Model**

Illinois model proposed by Fitzgerald et al (1995) focuses on antecedents and outcomes of sexual harassment at workplace. According to Illinois model, hostile working environment and unequal gender ratio are institutional stressors (Willness et al., 2007; Fitzgerald et al., 1995). Institutional stress is a psychological state that takes place when a person perceives a possible danger of losing something they value, as they feel returns on performance might not be as noteworthy as expected which will subsequently give rise to negative job attitudes, negative workplace conducts and impact on job satisfaction, physiological and psychological consequences, nonattendance, turnover, strain, anxiety, tardiness, depression, boredom and burnout (Sullivan and Bhagat, 1992).

**Figure 1 showing Illinois model of sexual harassment**
Illinois model of sexual harassment

(Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997).

Institutional power configuration is utilized to forecast incidences of sexual harassment that aren’t gender specific and equally important antecedent is workforce composition or gender ratio (Gutek & Koss; 1993, Gutek & Morasch, 1982).

Institutional internal parameters like lenience in administration, sex ratio absence of institutional ethics and absence of policies/norms leads to harassing conducts. Internal
atmosphere of the institution is a significant antecedent to sexual harassment. Hulin, Fitzgerald and Drasgow (1997) reported three significant features of institutional climate i.e. reprisal the victim has to experience after testifying, job status of the aggrieved hindering institutional intervention, and importance given by the institution to the complaint (Pryor et al., 1993; Tangri et al., 1982; Fitzgerald et al., 1997).

**Four Factors Model**

O’ Hare and O’ Donohue (1998) combined social and cultural dimensions, institutional facets with discrete features relative to both the perpetrator and the harassed and put forth the theory of four factors. The four factors that need to be present for sexual harassment and its redressal to occur:

- Factors such as physical attractiveness, control and power
- Overpowering inner drive of resistivity such as seeing sexual harassment as unlawful, dangerous and having compassion for the sufferer
- Overpowering external resistive forces i.e. institutional system for tackling sexual harassment grievances, job gender ratio, privacy at work and variables of socio cultural nature
- Overpowering the confrontation by the victim for instance, emotional stability of the victim, and job status of the victim acquaintance of the victim with complaint mechanisms.

These four factors reveal amalgamation of institutional and socio cultural models giving rise to a broad structure. The theory was empirically tested by O’Hare and O’Donohue (1998) who conducted a survey using a tool which measures sexual harassment experiences, traits of personality, and facets of institutional climate (Fitzgerald et al.,
1997). Their findings significantly associated all the above mentioned factors with sexual harassment.

**The Chappell – Di Martino model**

This model is an interface which bridges discrete institutional aspects which explains workplace harassment that includes psychological, physical and sexual harassment with idiosyncratic features of the harasser and harassed. Mostly the perpetrator is a male co-worker or a superior. Typically perpetrators are inclined to assume or understand the victim’s friendly behaviour as having sexual interest (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007; Pina & Gannon, 2012). The victims are usually women, young (20-40 years), divorced or single, with lower levels of education, lower self-esteem and are submissive (Di Martino, 2003).

Events of sexual harassment frequently occur in male dominated occupations inverse to gender proportionate or women-monopolized occupations (European Commission, 1998). Though, women workers who are part of this atmosphere are cognizant about the circumstances, they are less likely to label their experience as sexual harassment because there is an inclination to accept these experiences as normal or they fear that confrontation may result in job loss or secondary harassment (Di Martino, 2003).

**Harassers/Perpetrators Characteristics**

The previous interpretations sufficiently reveal that mostly men are the perpetrators and women are the victims. As MacKinnon (1979) has stated, women have been socialized to be docile, obedient, and passive in relation to men. At the workplace men are in leading
positions in comparison to women. Hence there is more probability for men to perpetrate harassment than women. (Gutek et al., 1993)

Though, superiors are the most probable perpetrators (Farley, 1978) a wider definition of sexual harassment, suggests that individuals at almost all positions within the workplace could be perpetrators of sexual harassment. To exemplify, if harassment comprises of being a target to indecent jokes, then workers at all positions could be perpetrators (Gutek & Morasch, 1982).

**Characteristics of the Victim**

**Gender**

Most of the previous work on sexual harassment focussed on examining antecedents to sexual harassment i.e. factors that place individuals at risk. Though these studies are perplexing as well as inconsistent, they precisely stated that sexual harassment was mainly a woman’s problem (Kamal, 1998). Fitzgerald et al. (1988) established that excluding gender harassment (chauvinist remarks, jokes) almost every other harassment stated by 3000 college students was stated by females. The articles do not provide a clear picture of whether gender harassment expressed by males is aimed at them individually or was really focussed at females and perceived by males (Ramsaroop, A., & Parumasur, S. B., 2007, Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders., 2009).

However, when converse harassment occurs it is very upsetting to the males in question but this is an extremely rare occurrence (because culture explicitly conditions females to be submissive not assertive and nonconforming with the standard is unusual) (Pina & Gannon, 2012).

Saal, Johnson, and Weber (1989) found that men see more sexiness in a woman’s conduct but women view the same conduct as being friendly (Lindgren, Shoda, & George, 2007). This
alteration in social insights is the reason behind few instances of sexual harassment, where men misread a woman’s conduct as being a sexual invite. It is likewise rational to propose that this propensity to sexualize woman’s conduct can also be the explanation for occurrences in which men report being sexually harassed by women.

As per Gutek and Nakamura (1982) in an organisation men are more frequently in powerful positions than women. Male managers may be drawn to generalize that the hostility and control anticipated of them on the occupation to sexual violence, and women subordinates may carry their passivity too far. Some women, considering that sexual harassment is inevitable may allow men to exploit them sexually (Gutek & Dunwoody, 1987).

As long as the usual male gender role imparts men to obscure sexuality with power, men are found to be sexual perpetrators and women to be sexual victims. Gender socialization alone cannot holistically explain employee’s experience of unwanted advances. Job roles, (the level of power men have on the work vis-a-vis women) must also be measured. Together, work roles and gender roles interrelate to present men and women with very diverse prospects. Men are in an exceptional position to harass women sexually owing to both male conditioning of demonstrating sexual fierceness and the control they possess over women. Women conversely possess diminutive opportunities to harass male colleagues as they are neither sexually aggressive nor in a situation to overpower men (Kamal,1998).

**Age**

Gutek (1985) stated that the women victims she reported were often younger than the regular employees. Of the women victims in Gutek's population, who had been through sexual harassment, over half were less than 35 years of age. Other studies too report

A few reports, though, do report rather different outcomes. For instance, Brooks and Perot (1991) in their findings revealed older women reported a higher incidence of sexual harassment than did younger women (Crouch, 2001; Pyke, 1996).

As per Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) findings which represent younger women being at higher risk can only characterize an over simplification, as there are counter findings that indicate sexual harassment cannot be restricted only to younger women. Perhaps there are hardly any studies that correlate type of harassment and clusters of victims (McLaughlin, Uggen, & Blackstone, 2012, Cortina, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 2002, Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997, Kamal & Tariq, 1997). Therefore, though the probability of younger women being harassed sexually is high, to arrive at such a conclusion of it affecting only a particular age group is flawed.

Education

Findings indicate that women who are highly qualified tend to report sexual harassment, seek redressal in comparison to women with lesser qualification (Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987). Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993) attribute this to the role of cognizance as well as awareness that comes with education.

Gutek (1985) stated women possessing higher education are inclined to have liberal attitudes about social conduct at work.

It is highly probable that such women report being outraged by sexual suggestions at places of work (Pina & Gannon, 2012).
Marital Status

Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) found marital status of the victim to be linked to the experience of sexual harassment. Single (not married, separated, divorced) women are likely to experience harassment in comparison to other (married) women (Coles, 1986; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Fain & Anderson, 1987; Schneider, 1982). Factors such as apparent accessibility, lack of sheltered status of a wife, or instance where spouse or partner is an influential man play a crucial role in deciding whether a woman may be victimized. Gutek and Nakamura (1982) state married females and widows have fewer experiences of sexual harassment in comparison to divorced, separated or unmarried women.

Physical attractiveness

Gutek and Nakamura (1982) state that individuals considered to be physically attractive reported to have been asked for a date, pressurized to involve sexually as a part of their employment in comparison to individuals not attributed to be physically attractive. They also reported flattering remarks which are sexual in nature in comparison to females who are less attractive. 73% stated at least one socio-sexual occurrence, in comparison to 33% of the other participants. As per Farley (1978) though these associations may be reliable, they are not factual as it is based on the general opinion which advocates, sexual harassment is an issue that impacts only young and attractive women (Shupe, Cortina, Ramos, Fitzgerald, & Salisbury, 2002).

Job position

Tangri et al., (1982) stated that normally in organisations women are hired in lower positions in comparison to men. Due to this they are more susceptible to experience sexual harassment. The
males misuse their institutional power to compel or intimidate females (Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979).

However, this comprehension has been tested by alternate studies that peers or colleagues instead of managers can be the regular harassers (Gutek, 1985; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) and occasionally the harassment of seniors by employees working under them have also happened (McKinney, 1992). While explaining about job status, Cleveland and Kerst (1993) have utilized the term organizational power, and state that formal institutional power is resultant of rank the employees occupy within the establishment in which females are typically in lower positions (see also Little-Bishop, Seidler-Feller, & Opaluch, 1982; Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Schneider, 1982) and they have no access to formal and informal structure of influence, information, and opportunities. Findings also suggest that females occupying similar positions as males often lack same degree of power, impact and control (Canter, 1977). Thus sexual harassment from co-workers is an expression of disrespecting, underestimating and disgracing the women worker (LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986). At workplace when women occupying higher positions experience sexual harassment from their juniors the interpretation of this would be that sexual harassment is used as a tool to weaken the power of the superior (Carothers & Crull, 1984; Di Tomaso, 1989).

**Job security**

Findings reveal that victim’s denial to comply with sexual requests or what can be called as nonconformity put them at risk of being dismissed from their workplace. Carothers and Crull (1984) report that, females who do not comply or yield to the pressure exerted by the perpetrator face job disruption, admonishments eventually may lose their job which in turn forces them to give in. Ellis (1981) has branded these conducts as exploitation harassment clearly indicating misuse of power. Sexual coercion generally happens when the victim is
working because of economic issues, she is dependent on the job for sustenance of her household and is not in a position to quit (Bamberger, Kohn, & Nahum, 2008).

As per the U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981), females who have been victimized or females highly prone to be victimized are the ones who are very reliant on their professions.

It is remarkable that females who had experienced rape or sexual attack were utmost dependant on their job at the time of harassment (Tang, & Mc Collum, 1996).

Victims Responses to Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment cannot be understood in totality unless we state the coping conduct of the victims of sexual harassment. The responses of the victims are impacted by the extent of backing and understanding they receive from significant others and the management of the organisation. Similarly, the magnitude of physical, emotional and psychological injury experienced also depends on the sensitivity of other individuals and the organisation for which the victim works (Woods, Buchanan, & Settles, 2009).

Obstacles to reporting sexual harassment

In spite of the magnitude of reports, court cases, policies and measures, and other persuasive measures, sexual harassment remains an imperceptible and indefinable problem because the victims are tremendously cautious to report the incidence. Adams, Kottke and Padgitt (1983) state that none of the victims they interviewed had testified their experiences (Blumenthal, 1998, Anila, & Tariq, 1997).

As per many studies, victims were more eager to talk about their experiences to their friends than to any other group. Very few victims would complain to their section head or chief mentor than to friends, but they chose these three groups significantly more than any other sources (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1987). Goldman et al. (1989) stated
that victims were considerably more expected to endorse more emphatic approaches to others than they would utilize themselves (Pina, & Gannon, 2012).

Meek and Lynch (1983) found the reasons behind non-reporting conduct. They stated that females asked themselves numerous questions after experiencing sexual harassment (Did the individual actually have something sexual in mind? Did I provoke the conduct? If I were to testify the conduct, will I be believed? Will I experience retaliation if I complain?). The initial two questions explain the victim’s inclination towards guilt or self-blame. But fundamentally all questions are proof of the disparity between the harasser and the harassed that unquestionably is a main issue that hinders filing complaints (Anila & Tariq, 1997).

Crocker (1983) declared that anxiety about retaliation continuously exists if a grievance is filed and thus the fear of endangering one's future is prime for the aggrieved.

Seeking institutional relief or redressal would call attention to their sex instead of their job (Till, 1980). Dziech and Weiner (1984) perceive that three other variables act as hindrances to seeking redressal- misperception as to what defines sexual harassment and reluctance to be identified with what a lot consider to be a feminist issue (Vohlídalová, 2011).

A scrutiny of the reports on responses to harassment reveals that they fit into a two-by-two table—one axis contains specific efforts towards problem solving (seeking redressal, confrontation) and handling reactions of other parties such as a superior, colleague, or an external agency or establishment. The second axis comprises of indirect approaches (disregarding, evading, avoiding) as opposed to direct approaches (confronting) (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007; Wasti, & Cortina, 2002).

**Strategies employed to cope with sexual harassment on one’s own**
Victims preliminary efforts to cope with sexual harassment are seldom direct. Mostly perpetrators are more influential-tangibly and institutionally than the harassed. The initial numerous harassing events are usually overlooked (Benson & Thomson, 1982; MacKinnon, 1979). Findings of studies reveal trivial forms of sexual harassment (jokes or sexually coloured remarks) are ignored by the victims (Gruber, 1998; McKinney, 1990). In their investigation of female automobile workers, Gruber and Bjorn (1982) reported that 23% of females replied they overlooked the harassments and 22% replied mildly (by telling the harasser, I have heard all that in the past, or I am not your kind). The victim is expected to overlook the conduct or respond mildly if she can attribute the harassers conduct to some mitigating situation (Gutek, 1987). She may also reinterpret the circumstance so that the occurrence is not demarcated as sexual harassment (Rabinowitz, 1990). Understanding the circumstance as horse-play or laughing it off is common (Gutek, 1985; Ragins & Scandura, 1992). Gruber and Bjorn (1982) also reported that making light of the situation was the general reaction reported by 10% of the female autoworkers who participated in the study (Gutek, 1985).

Occasionally the victim tries to evade the harasser, an indirect approach reported by 51% of women officers and 68% of the enlisted employees in a U.S. Navy study (Culbertson et al., 1992; Loy & Stewart, 1984). Benson and Thomson (1982) reported that female students try to evade taking classes from male lecturers who have the reputation of harassing their pupils sexually. They also encouraged peers to evade interacting with harassers on their study projects or having them on boards, they changed guides, provisionally dropped out of college, and altered majors (Loy & Stewart, 1984; Zalk, 1990).

As the frequency and extent of harassment increases, it is more likely for the victims to confront the perpetrator or use the institutional mechanisms / sanctions to report the
perpetrator (Baker, Terpstra, & Lamtz, 1990; Dunwoody-Miller & Gutek, 1985; Brooks & Perot, 1988; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982).

Many men and women are of the opinion that women are supposed to cope with sexual harassment on their own (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Gutek, 1985).

Jennings and Metha (as cited in Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1992) stated that victims whose response to harassment was anger, pursued direct action, harassed who responded initially with fear overlooked the conduct, or held themselves responsible. Dzich and Weiner (1984) state that to cope with sexual harassment, females dress themselves in a way to give the idea of being asexual or unappealing (thus acting on self-blame), to evade the perpetrator. (Benson & Thomson, 1982). Very few studies have explored the association between specific types or degrees of harassment with the victims coping behaviour.

Direct approaches (confronting the harasser) are less often used but are reported to be effective. Rowe (1981) finds the following direct responses to be quite effective-writing a letter to the harasser, describing explicitly what is objectionable and delivering the letter in hand to the harasser and waiting while he reads it. A letter has several advantages over a verbal request. A written response shows that the victim feels strongly about the matter to write the letter, and allows her to deliberate in choice of words. Perhaps most importantly, the letter serves as a record that the victim confronted the perpetrator, copies of which can be shown in the court of law, if the harassment continues or if the perpetrator retaliates (Paludi & Paludi, 2003).

Other forms of direct strategies comprise of beating or insulting the perpetrator- strategies that are not normally tried. In their findings, Gruber and Bjorn (1982) reported that 15% of
female autoworkers vocally "confronted" the perpetrator and 7% physically pounced on or stopped the perpetrator (Paludi & Paludi, 2003).

**Strategies used to cope with sexual harassment which involves (seeking help from) external resources.**

Direct strategies involving seeking help from external resources are used by a marginal section of the harassed and seeking redressal (filing a complaint or litigation) is less common. Gruber and Bjorn (1982) reported that only 7% of the harassed automobile employees in their study sought redressal (Loy & Stewart, 1984).

In general, the women who have experienced harassment do not seek redressal for numerous motives. They are apprehensive about secondary harassment or reprisal for complaining (Culbertson et al., 1992; Gutek, 1985). Victims blaming their own selves for being sexually harassed are particularly anxious about reporting the incident or are too ashamed that it happened to them; therefore they try to defend the perpetrator (Culbertson et al., 1992).

Victims with less organizational power would react vigorously and directly than females with some institutional power (here control refers to higher job expertise, high job rank, not being subordinate to the perpetrator). Victims having limited personal resources (low self-esteem, fewer economic resources, feeling of being stuck to the job, low personal control) use implicit strategies more frequently in comparison to victims with resources (Wasti & Cortina, 2002, Shrier, 1996).
Jensen and Gutek (1982) established victims who hold themselves responsible for being victimized (self blame) are less probable to report harassment. Victims with conventional sex role beliefs are less expected to seek institutional relief (Cortina, & Wasti, 2005, Knapp, Faley, Ekeberg, & Dubois, 1997).

The efficiency of diverse responses/coping approaches

The existing research proposes that the indirect approaches of coping with harassment - ignoring, relabeling, evading are usually adopted, but not predominantly effective (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1987). Quitting work may be effective in ending direct harassment from the harasser but it has other penalties for the victim and it is improbable to stop the perpetrator from harassing other women workers.

If they are not predominantly effective, why then are the indirect approaches so frequently tried? Gruber and Bjorn (1982) propose three motives to explain the reason behind frequently adopting indirect methods of coping. Firstly, relabeling the circumstances or evading the offender will permit the victim to manage the situation without upsetting the job setting or her association with other individuals at the place of work (Benson & Thomson, 1982; Gutek, 1985).

Next, victims recognize that the direct approaches are perilous, uncertain with regard to consequences, in comparison to indirect approaches. Evading the harasser seems more secure than opposing him or filing a grievance. By compelling the harasser and/or the establishment to deal with the concern, the victim making the grievance may be regarded as unsettling the place of work and she may well produce antagonistic reactions (DiTomaso, 1989). A victim of sexual harassment usually utilizes a direct retort if she has a supportive superior and works in an establishment having sexual harassment committee or importantly exhibited posters forbidding sexual harassment. Subsequently Gruber and Bjorn (1982) recommended
harassment occasionally can be vague because the offensive conduct is accompanied by sexual interest. This vagueness may lessen a woman's ability to respond in a confrontative or direct manner (Gutek, 1985).

**Stages of response to sexual harassment**

Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, and Stringer (1986) studied how victims respond to sexual harassment (which is not a onetime occurrence rather represents a series of events). Initially the victim may respond by ignoring, dodging or joking and as the harassment becomes continuing, escalating, becomes more aggressive or intimidating, the victim’s perception about oneself, her colleagues, and her work gradually changes (Ellis, Barak, & Pinto, 1991, Dekker, & Barling, 1998).

**Four phases of responses are recognized**

**Misperception/Self-blame**- Sexual harassment is a succession of occurrences. Consequent to every episode, the victim assumes that the harassment is going to level off or finally stop. As the perpetrators conduct increases, likely to happen in almost every instance reported, the victim feels miserable as well as abandoned.

**Anxiety**: The perpetrators conduct leads to the victim feeling ensnared and becoming distrustful. Victim is fearful of possible reprisal at work, dreads to answer the telephone, and suspects that her household is being observed, experiences decreased job involvement and most importantly self worth is weakened.

**Depression/Rage**: Gradually anxiety turns into anger and most of the victims have thoughts of quitting their job or fearful of being dismissed. This anger about being treated unlawfully
is a major reason to file charges. While filing charges is a positive step it often leads to worsening of the work situation.

**Disappointment:** The institutional response to sexual harassment is usually upsetting as well as unacceptable. Due to being vocal, the aggrieved faces secondary institutional harassment. The victim gradually understands her own folly of receiving support from the organization. Later she examines her prospects with regard to justice and righteousness. Her naive views progressively get substituted by the understanding that justice does not always triumph.

**Organization of responses to sexual harassment**

Responding to harassment was categorized from denying the occurrence to being confrontative or assertive. Gruber ranked responses from the least confrontational to the most. Terpstra and Baker (1989) projected more or less the same outline. Though useful as an initial point for the model, such frameworks lack accuracy as they are not formulated from the responses of actual victims. These were grounded on rational derivation (Gutek & Koss, 1993; Gruber, 1998) or were written responses of research participants to hypothetical circumstances. Actual victims differ in the way they behave in comparison to subjects of the study (Gutek & Koss, 1993).

Keeping in line with the arising contemplations, Fitzgerald (1990) projected a structure devised by categorizing responses incurred from actual victims who participated in sexual harassment prevalence study (Fitzgerald et al., 1997). This structure incorporates ten approaches, categorized as internal focused strategies -endurance, denial, detachment, reattribution/relabeling, and illusory control and external focused strategies-avoidance, appeasement, assertion/confrontation, seeking institutional/organizational relief, and seeking social support. Internal approaches aims at managing the emotions with regard to the occurrence (e.g., trying to forget about it, telling oneself he did not mean to distraught me),
while external approaches are focussed on problem resolving (e.g., victim asking the harasser to leave her alone, testifying the harasser to the superior) (Fitzgerald et al., 1997).

**Internally Focused Strategies/approaches**

A common reaction to less severe harassing instances would be merely to deny the occurrence and not take any action, pretend as if things are just the way they are or the harassing event has no impact (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Gutek, 1985; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Gutek & Koss, 1993; U. S. Merit Systems protection Board, 1981, 1987; Loy & Stewart, 1984). It is hard to determine precisely what doing nothing means – it may mean cautious choice to disregard the condition, to pretend or to show that one does not care. These approaches are branded as denial. Otherwise, doing nothing may suggest endurance that is enduring the situation as it is inevitable or because one is in fear or one does not know what else to do (Park & Folkman, 1997).

Gruber and Bjorn (1982) reported that 10% of their participants utilized relabeling as an approach ie relabeling the harassing behaviour as nonthreatening (Gutek, 1985). As per Rabinowitz (1990) illusory control or self-blame is also prevalent. Jensen and Gutek (1982) revealed 25% of the aggrieved women ascribed harassment to their own conduct (Wright, & Fitzgerald, 2007, Kyu & Kanai, 2003).

**Externally focussed Strategies/Approaches**

The most widely utilized problem-solving approach is avoidance. Findings of similar studies indicate that victims actively use avoidance (evading the perpetrator) as a way to cope (McKinney, Olson, & Satterfield, 1988; Gutek, 1985; Fitzgerald et al., 1997). Likewise, the
other widely used is appeasement, an effort where the perpetrator is put off without direct opposition (humour, pretexts, adjourning, etc.). Gruber and Bjorn (1982) classify such approach as masking (Fitzgerald, Swan, & Fischer, 1995).

Additionally, 10% of the participants in their study used procrastinating strategies in the hope that the perpetrator will take the clue of them not being interested (Grossman, 2003).

Most of the victims look for social support from either colleagues or family and friends. They also utilize an array of assertive approaches to stop the conduct; 44% of the female sufferers of U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1987) asserted for the behaviour to stop. Additionally, 14% threatened to uncover harassment to fellow workers. Gruber and Bjorn (1982) stated 15% of the victims vocally condemned their offenders and 7% physically attacked them (Grossman, 2003).

Usually, most uncommon approach is to seek institutional relief (informing a superior, seeking redressal). Victims seemingly utilize these approaches as a final option while all others have been unsuccessful. The least used approach is confrontation of the harasser, usually the victims may approach their immediate superior rather than file a formal grievance or legal suit which is by far the least common approach.

**Effects of Sexual Harassment**

Victims of sexual harassment suffer long and short term consequences. Individuals experiencing harassment can inturn experience sickness, shame, annoyance, loss of self-confidence and psychological harm. Sexual harassment results in vocational issues such as lowered performance, lower job satisfaction and high rates of absence. In some circumstances, it may lead to resignation and higher employee turnover (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007).
Perceiving fellow workers experience sexual harassment has a damaging influence on workers, impacting their outlook about their jobs which will eventually result in psychosomatic issues.

The incidences of sexual harassment in the workplace can lead to loss of business output, productivity, harm to the organisation’s reputation, social image and credibility. It might also have an influence on staff turnover, specifically that of woman employees (Rutherford, Schneider, & Walmsley, 2006).

Given its possible influence on the health of those who have been victimized causing work-related trauma for those involved and those who witness (bystanders). Sexual harassment is also a safety and health concern and has been documented as a potential health risk or danger at work (Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007; Sauter, Murphy, Hurrell, & Levi, 1998).

Sexual harassment results in sickness, non-involvement, poor execution of work, non-attendance and an increase in turnover. Additionally, outcomes of sexual harassment comprise of shame, annoyance, and devaluation, reduced job fulfilment, diminished morale, harm to interpersonal relationships at work and numerous financial losses (Frazier and Cohen, 1992).

Moreover sexual harassment just does not impact the harasser and harassed. Studies reveal adverse vocational, psychological, physical impact of sexual harassment spread across fellow workers as well (Glomb et. al., 1997). Sexual harassment at workplace creates a traumatic atmosphere for the rest of the workforce and has a damaging impact on the organisational culture. Other workers observing sexual harassment might come to a conclusion that the organisation is not concerned about safety of the employees which will eventually give way to negative suppositions about institutional standards/practices, especially with regard to
equality/rightfulness. This perceived incivility may lead to pessimism, dwindling job fulfillment and job turnover (Lamertz, 2002).

Sexual harassment has a profound influence on the interactions and relationships at work, increases turnover, absenteeism, job-related stress and stress-related responses such as nervousness and despair, lowered self-esteem and health-related outcomes which include gastrointestinal disorders, headaches (Kyu & Kanai, 2003, Gutek & Koss, 1993; Di Martino, 2003).

**Redressal Mechanism**

Globally, there are three types of legal mechanisms for redressal. Criminal laws are the utmost inclusive as they make the suspect accountable, irrespective of place or context of harassment. The drawback of this method is it involves no recompense for the aggrieved, no firm accountability, contemplation with regard to prejudiced facets concerning sexual harassment at workplace. Labour laws are often utilized in quid pro quo circumstances, dealing with prejudiced hiring practices also including prejudiced dismissals (Blanchard, 1988). The key drawback of labour laws is they do not incorporate circumstances outside the place of work.

Finally, tort laws or non-contractual verdicts and civil laws are occasionally utilized in sexual harassment cases based on neglect, and psychological trauma. Sexual harassment may not be confined to just unwanted physical touching but could include gender harassment where a worker is targeted because of being a woman (individual identity) who transcends socially approved gender norms, role expectations (basically a spill over of patriarchy/reflection of patriarchy into the workplace). This emphasises an individual’s right to self-dignity – not just defamation of the woman’s modesty. It thus evades culturally endorsed masculinist ideas about women.
In India, sexual harassment of women in the workplace (Prohibition, Prevention & Redressal) Act 2013 recognises that, with India’s ratification of CEDAW it is obligated to protect women against sexual harassment. The Act considers sexual harassment to be a violation of the fundamental rights of a woman to equality as guaranteed under Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India and her right to live with dignity free from violence as per Article 21 of the Constitution.

Sexual harassment at the workplace has also been considered as a violation of a woman’s right to practice or to carry out any occupation, trade or business under Article 19(1) (g) of the Constitution, which includes the right to a safe environment free from harassment. This act also takes into its ambit the judgments made by the courts of India while trying the various cases of sexual harassment at workplace as defined by the Vishakha Directives (refer Appendix H for the provisions of the Sexual harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013).

**Need for the Study**

India can still be characterized as a male dominated society where patriarchal traditions prevail which makes women vulnerable to discrimination and abuse. Sexual harassment at work place is a manifestation of deep rooted patriarchy prevailing in the larger society encouraging power based discriminatory practices against women and in turn creating hostile work environments where women workers are vulnerable to experience harassment and abuse. Reflecting on the garment sector, globalization encouraged large retailers to outsource their manufacturing to garment factories in the developing countries. Though this set up increased availability of jobs, it at the same time increased competition for poorer countries to offer the cheapest workers under the most unregulated conditions. In Karnataka, the majority of the garment factories are located in Bangalore and they provide employment to
Research studies show majority of the workers in the garment factories are women and are dependent on their jobs for their livelihood. They work under the most disadvantageous conditions including unreasonably high production targets, low wages, long hours of work and environment of harassment and abuse with a focus to extract higher productivity. Often under the pretext of getting work done, demeaning sexist remarks, derogatory language is directed towards the worker (Lyimo 2010, Siddique 2003, Absar 2001). Research studies also reveal that absence of job security and institutional mechanisms to protect women create a sexually intimidating environment for the women garment workers indirectly reflecting tolerance of such behavior by the employers (Siddique 2003, Lyimo 2010). Economic dependence on the job for their livelihood, social perception of obeying the superiors, job insecurity and spilt over patriarchal biases into the work environment make the women garment workers more vulnerable to become victims of sexual harassment.

This chapter discusses in detail the concept of sexual harassment, antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment, models and theories surrounding sexual harassment and provides a deep insight into the coping behaviour demonstrated by victims. In the next chapter, different empirical studies will be reviewed in detail which emphasizes the association between the nature of sexual harassment, organisational antecedents to sexual harassment, the effects it has on the victims, response strategies of the victims to cope with sexual harassment.