

MEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF AMBIGUOUS SEXUAL HARASSMENT CASES  
UNDER GENDER HIERARCHY THREAT

İLKNUR YURTSEVEN

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2022

MEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF AMBIGUOUS SEXUAL HARASSMENT CASES  
UNDER GENDER HIERARCHY THREAT

Thesis submitted to the  
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences  
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

by

İlknur Yurtseven

Boğaziçi University

2022

## DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, İlknur Yurtseven, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date.....

## ABSTRACT

### Men's Perceptions of Ambiguous Sexual Harassment Cases

#### Under Gender Hierarchy Threat

In the patriarchal system, men's higher status in the gender hierarchy is maintained by various practices and beliefs promoting women's subordination. Previous studies have shown that men especially engage in threat-compensation strategies when their manhood status is threatened either at personal or societal level. Sexual harassment is another form of gender discrimination that reproduces male domination and often prone to be neglected. This thesis aims to investigate men's perceptions of sexual harassment under a threat to their advantaged position. For that aim, I conducted an online experiment with a community sample, including 227 participants. Participants were randomly assigned either to the control condition or to the gender hierarchy threat condition. Participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition read an ostensible news article summarizing that women's power is on the rise both at home and in business, while those in the control condition read an irrelevant article. I expected that men who were exposed to gender hierarchy threat would tend to downplay the ambiguous sexual harassment cases, while the effect of the manipulation would be even greater for participants who had stronger gender identification and were more threatened by the subordination to women. The results have shown that men's perceptions of sexual harassment were not affected by the threat, controlling for participants' age, religiosity, political orientation, hostile and benevolent sexism levels. However, participants' explanations on their sexual harassment judgments provided a rich information. I discussed the study findings and future research directions in light of the literature.

## ÖZET

### Erkeklerin Muğlak Cinsel Taciz Vakalarına İlişkin Algılarının

### Cinsiyet Hiyerarşisi Tehdidi Altında İncelenmesi

Ataerkil sistemde, erkeklerin toplumsal cinsiyet hiyerarşisindeki konumu, kadınların boyun eğmesini teşvik eden çeşitli uygulamalar ve inançlar tarafından sürdürülür. Önceki çalışmalar, erkeklerin özellikle erkeklik statüleri kişisel veya toplumsal düzeyde tehdit edildiğinde telafi stratejilerine başvurduğunu göstermiştir. Cinsel taciz, erkek egemenliğini yeniden üreten ve genellikle ihmal edilen başka bir cinsiyet ayrımcılığı biçimidir. Bu tez, erkeklerin avantajlı konumlarına yönelik bir tehdit altında cinsel taciz algılarının nasıl şekillendiğini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, 227 katılımcıyı içeren çevrimiçi bir deney gerçekleştirilmiştir. Katılımcılar, kontrol veya cinsiyet hiyerarşisi tehdidi koşullarından birine rastgele atandı. Cinsiyet hiyerarşisi tehdidi grubundaki katılımcılar, kadınların hem evde hem de işte gücünün arttığını özetleyen sözde haber makalesi okurken, kontrol grubundaki katılımcılar konu ile alakasız bir makale okudular. Cinsiyet hiyerarşisi tehdidine maruz kalan erkeklerin muğlak cinsel taciz vakalarını küçümseme eğiliminde olmalarını beklenmiştir. Manipülasyonun etkisinin daha güçlü cinsiyet kimliğine sahip ve kadınlara tabi olma durumu altında daha fazla tehdit hissedilen erkekler için daha da büyük olacağı beklenmiştir. Sonuçlar; katılımcıların yaşı, dindarlığı, siyasi yönelimi, düşmanca ve korumacı cinsiyetçilik düzeyleri kontrol edildiğinde, erkeklerin cinsel taciz algılarının tehditten etkilenmediğini göstermiştir. Öte yandan, katılımcıların cinsel taciz kararlarına ilişkin açıklamaları zengin bir bilgi sağlamıştır. Çalışma bulguları ve gelecek araştırma fikirleri, literatür ışığında tartışılmıştır.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My master's journey was full of tears of joy and sadness, and I always imagined myself writing my "acknowledgments". Here I am. Firstly, I would like to express my special thanks and gratitude to my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Nur Soylu Yalçinkaya for providing her endless academic knowledge and emotional support from the very beginning. I wouldn't be able to complete my thesis without her guidance and I am feeling so lucky to find a chance to work with her. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to my thesis jury member Assist. Prof. Beril Türkođlu Demirel for sharing her precious feedbacks, which shaped important part of my thesis. I would also like to thank my thesis jury member Prof. Feyza orapçı for her precious time and contributions. Last but not least, I am extremely grateful to have a chance to work with Prof. Nebi Sümer and Prof. Fatma Umut Beşpınar during my graduate studies.

I would like to thank The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) for supporting me with the graduate scholarship during my studies. I would like to thank graduate and undergraduate students of Bođaziçi University Social Psychology Lab who assisted with this thesis project. I would like to thank my classmates and colleagues for their kind support.

I cannot thank my dear friend Begüm Selici enough for her friendship and encouragement. She always provided her assistance in my thesis whenever I asked. I also would like to thank my circle of friends whom I could not mention one by one, for their stress-buffering existence. I would like to express my gratitude to my beloved partner Barış Bilim for his continuous support and understanding during my most stressful times.

I would like to acknowledge the extraordinary debt I owe to my family, my precious mother Gönül Yurtseven, my father Kürşad Yurtseven, and my one and only sister İrem Yurtseven for their love and support.

Finally, I would like to appreciate every woman who stands up for herself and for all women.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Psychological threats and compensation mechanisms .....	2
1.2 Defining and identifying sexual harassment .....	11
1.3 Present study.....	18
CHAPTER 2: PILOT STUDIES.....	23
2.1 Pilot study 1.....	23
2.2 Pilot study 2.....	36
CHAPTER 3: METHOD .....	45
3.1 Participants .....	45
3.2 Procedure.....	48
3.3 Measures.....	50
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS .....	54
4.1 Hierarchical multiple regression .....	54
4.2 Explanations of sexual harassment judgments .....	58
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	64
APPENDIX A: ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL.....	73
APPENDIX B: EXPERIMENTAL PASSAGES AND QUESTIONS IN PILOT STUDY 1 .....	74
APPENDIX C: SEXUAL HARASSMENT SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONS IN PILOT STUDY 2.....	81

APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT SCENARIOS IN THE PILOT STUDY 2.....	86
APPENDIX E: EXPERIMENTAL PASSAGES AND QUESTIONS IN THE MAIN STUDY .....	88
APPENDIX F: SEXUAL HARASSMENT SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONS IN THE MAIN STUDY .....	95
APPENDIX G: SHORT VERSION OF THE AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY .....	98
APPENDIX H: GENDER IDENTITY STRENGTH SCALE.....	100
APPENDIX I: THREAT FROM SUBORDINATION TO WOMEN SUBSCALE OF THE PERCEIVED THREAT TO MANHOOD SCALE (PTMS) .....	101
APPENDIX J: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM.....	103
REFERENCES.....	106

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants in Pilot Study 1.....	26
Table 2. The Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants in Pilot Study 2.....	38
Table 3. The Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants in the Main Study.....	46
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables.....	55
Table 5. Multiple Regression Analyses for Sexual Harassment Perceptions.....	57
Table 6. Participants' Ratings on Sexual Harassment Scenarios in the Main Study.....	59

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

In the twenty-first century, women still face many challenges due to gender-based discrimination, such as being underrepresented in high-status positions and getting less paid than men for the same job. World Economic Forum (WEF) has been publishing a Global Gender Gap Report in which the Gender Gap Index is calculated to detect the magnitude of ongoing gender inequalities. The calculation is based on statistical data in many areas such as politics, education, and economy. The final report including 156 countries revealed that it will take almost 136 more years to achieve total gender equality at this pace (WEF, 2021). This time even doubles when it comes to closing the gap between men and women in economic power.

Unfortunately, even if women somehow managed to attend in the labor force, they are systematically exposed to forms of oppression at workplaces, one of which is sexual harassment. Then one might ask, as did many feminist psychologists, what makes it so hard to change gender inequality?

One reason may be that people have a tendency to protect the existing systems (Jost & Banaji, 1994), which consequently contributes to the reproduction and maintenance of gender-based unequal power relations. However, men might especially stick to ideologies promoting the current gender system when they receive a threat to their advantaged position by the possibility of social change (Kray et al., 2017). For instance, men tended to legitimize the operation of hierarchical gender system when the status quo promoting male domination is challenged (Morton et al., 2009). In a similar vein, men engage in “overcompensation” strategies such as endorsing ideologies of women’s subordination when their manhood status is

threatened at individual level (Willer et al., 2013, p. 981). Downplaying sexual harassment, which is one of the reflections of gender inequality, is also used by men to restore their power over women (Munsch, & Willer, 2012). This thesis aims to investigate how men react to a progress in gender equality that would advantage women, through their perceptions of sexual harassment. For this purpose, I designed an experimental manipulation that points out the progress in gender equality and transformation of gender roles. I examined its effects on Turkish men's perceptions of ambiguous sexual harassment cases at work context.

### 1.1 Psychological threats and compensation mechanisms

For every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction, says Newton's third law of motion. Similarly, from the psychology perspective, people engage in threat-compensation strategies when they receive a threat. Then, one might reasonably ask what is meant by "threat". Although the concept of threat is widely discussed, it has been differently operationalized by several psychologists (Branscombe et al., 1999). For instance, anything that triggers our ego (Freud, 1970), conflicts with our belief systems (Festinger, 1957), distorts our self (Bem, 1972) or group identities (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) might function as a threat. The complex conceptualization of threat is also due to the definition itself. To put another way, there is no clear-cut definition of threat across studies as researchers infer that the feelings of threat must have arisen based on the responses that people show (Branscombe et al., 1999).

As one of the primary human motivations, people seek consistency and predictability to have control over their surroundings (Festinger, 1957). Therefore, feelings of threat are evoked particularly when people sense power loss either in their personal control or in social relations, leading to attempts of regaining power (Fiske

et al., 1996). Although these attempts varied across individuals and groups, a change in ordinary operation of social structures might be perceived as highly threatening as anything new would be harder to forecast and control (Frie et al., 2019). In the following sections, I will examine the concept of change in gender hierarchy as a threat to men's manhood status both at personal and societal level. Hence, threat-compensation strategies of men upon sexual harassment perceptions will be discussed through system justification theory (SJT) and precarious manhood hypothesis. System justification theory provides insight into how the patriarchal system, maybe one of the greatest systems regulating power relations, is defended by high-status male group members under a change that threatens the patriarchal system (Jost & Banaji, 1994). The literature of precarious manhood discusses, on the other hand, how threats to masculine identity at individual level lead men to engage in compensatory beliefs and behaviors (Vandello et al., 2008).

#### 1.1.1 System justification and system threats

People have a fundamental need to control their surroundings; thus, they aspire to a world composed of predictable events (Landau et al. 2015). Structured social systems (from traditions and belief systems to social, economic, and political institutions) that arrange human interactions might be satisfying this need by giving people a sense of order (Jost & Hunyady, 2005). System justification theory (SJT; Jost & Banaji, 1994) states that people tend to justify the operation of prevalent systems and perceive them fairer than they really are. Parallel to the idea that system justification gives us a sense of control and structure, people's tendencies of system justification are correlated with their levels of uncertainty avoidance, intolerance of ambiguity, and need for order (Jost & Hunyady, 2005).

Nevertheless, this doesn't necessarily mean people always see the systems in a favorable light; indeed, system justification was considered as a motivation that fluctuates across situations (Jost et al., 2010). To illustrate, the signs of system inadequacy might function as a "system threat" which increases the motivation of system justification as people are driven to believe systems that they depend on are reasonable and well-functioning. In response to system threats, people consciously or unconsciously evaluate the prevailing systems more positively in order to satisfy system justification needs (Jost, 2020). A study provided evidence that citizens appraised their national systems more under the reminders of real-life threats such as terrorist attacks (Ullrich, & Cohrs, 2007). Similarly, the need for system justification was awakened through experimental manipulations that challenge systems' legitimacy and fairness (e.g., Jost et al., 2005; Jost et al., 2010). For example, people who read passages by a foreign critic, including negative comments about the operation of their country, assessed existing governmental and economic systems more positively (Kay & Jost, 2003; Kay et al., 2005).

The primary research captured people's tendencies of system justification (SJ) by directly asking their opinions either on the fairness of prevailing social arrangements overall (Diffuse System Justification Scale; Kay & Jost, 2003) or on specific domains such as distribution of wealth among poor and rich (Economic System Justification Scale; Jost & Thompson, 2000) and gender relations (Gender-Specific System Justification Scale; Jost & Kay, 2005). Yet, people do not always have to make a direct evaluation of the system to engage in system justification; indeed, systems can be justified through different beliefs and practices promoting the status quo (Jost et al., 2002). For instance, due to motivation to preserve prevailing order, people might adopt conservative ideologies like right-wing authoritarianism

and political conservatism (Jost & Hunyady, 2005). Opposition to equality and social dominance orientation, which were called “system-justifying ideologies”, also serve as system-justifying tools (Jost & Hunyady, 2005, p. 260). In a similar vein, the denial of the systemic inequality functions as a system guardian. For instance, modern sexism (MSS; Swim et al., 1995) that contains beliefs underestimating gender discrimination (e.g., “Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States.”, “Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement.”) was operationalized as a system justification strategy by researchers (Ståhl et al., 2010). Likewise, ambivalent sexism that is composed of hostile and benevolent sexism includes system justification beliefs trivializing gender inequality (Glick & Fiske, 1996). While hostile sexism justifies dominative paternalism (e.g., “Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for equality.”), benevolent sexism strengthens the aspect of protective paternalism (e.g., “Women should be cherished and protected by men.”; Lee et al., 2010). To summarize, when SJ motivations are activated, people might adhere to existing systems more, perceive them more positively and overlook the systemic problems.

It is reasonable to expect high-status group members to invest in the prevailing system to ensure their advantaged position as proposed by several group theories (Social Dominance Theory; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Social Identity Theory; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). SJT, on the other hand, attempts to explain how social structures are defended by individuals who were put in a disadvantaged position by the system itself (Jost, 2020). System justifying might give system-disadvantaged people a sense of control as well as buffering the adverse effects of being degraded by the systemic obstacles that might not be easily challenged (Jost & Hunyady,

2003). For instance, both male and female participants' higher levels of benevolent sexism predicted more positive evaluations of the status-quo, which in turn predicted greater life satisfaction (Connelly & Heesacker, 2012). Researchers concluded that "privileges" that women gain through benevolent sexism, which portrays women as fragile and in need to be protected by men, might obscure the unfairness of the gender hierarchical system, especially for women.

Although people from the lowest to the highest rungs of the societal hierarchy might be prone to system threats; unlike low-status group, system justification motivation of high-status group members is coherent with their ego ("enhancement of self-esteem") and group justification motivation ("enhancement of ingroup status"; Jost et al., 2001, p. 364). Thus, stimuli that trigger system justification motivation might differ for diverse groups as much as their instrument of system justification differed. To illustrate, reminders of system inescapability (i.e., women's long-lasting disadvantaged position in the gender hierarchy) increase women's system justification motivations, which would eventually soothe the anxiety of being powerless (Jost, 2020). When the glitch in the system is too evident to ignore, on the other hand, there might be no room for exaggeratedly positive judgments on the social arrangements. Thus, people might come up with excuses for systemic problems. Research findings point out the crucial role of gender roles and stereotypes in legitimizing inequalities embedded in the system. In an experimental study, one group of participants read a passage indicating that women earn less money and are less successful than their male counterparts, while a control group read an irrelevant passage (Laurin et al., 2011). The results have shown that women in the experimental group associated themselves with gender-specific traits (e.g., kind, modest, emotional, sensitive) more than those in the control group. Similarly, when

male participants were reminded of women's disadvantaged status in the workplace, they rated themselves as more gender-stereotypical (e.g., aggressive, ambitious, competent, intelligent). The findings might be interpreted that when people face systemic gender inequalities (or privileges), they tend to rearrange their self-perceptions, which consequently facilitated rationalizing their place at the hierarchical gender system. Furthermore, women who were led to believe that they possessed female-stereotypical traits evaluated the system as fairer than those who were told that they had male-stereotypical personality (Laurin et al., 2011). Likewise, when gender stereotypes and roles were highlighted, male participants attributed greater masculinity to themselves which in turn nourished gender-system justifying beliefs (Kray et al., 2017). Especially complementary gender stereotypes reflecting women as communal (warm, caring, moral, etc.) and men as agentic (ambitious, assertive, independent, etc.) might rationalize systemic subjugation of women by the message that men and women are "complementary but equal" (Jost & Kay, 2005; Bem & Bem, 1970, p. 96). To sum up, gender stereotypes are used to satisfy system justification needs both by men and women, giving the sense that the gender-biased structure of the society results from immutable differences between male and female characteristics. However, system justifying has a "palliative function" for women (Jost & Hunyady, 2003, p. 146), while it serves to legitimize their advantaged position in society for men.

### 1.1.2 Men's reactions to threats to the gender hierarchy

System justification might function as a power reaffirming mechanism for men when they perceive a threat to the gender system that favors male domination (Kray et al., 2017). Consistent with above-mentioned line of reasoning, men might be especially

motivated to defend the status quo under an implication of a change in the gender hierarchy (Ståhl et al., 2010). The study conducted by Morton et al. (2009) has shown that women's mobilization to upper status in society worked as a threat for men. They have presented participants with two different articles, one of which indicated that the power status between men and women might change to the advantage of women (*changing condition*), while the other claimed that gender inequality is stable (*stable condition*). Highly sexist male participants in the changing condition embraced gender essentialist beliefs, which consider gender as biologically determined, to greater degree than did those in the stable condition. Gender essentialism might have been used as a system justification strategy since it is similar to gender stereotypes in a way it rationalizes gender inequality by grounding it on inherited sex differences. Even more interestingly, when the experiment was repeated with "changed condition", which declared that a solid progress in gender equality was already achieved, the interaction between sexism and gender essentialism disappeared. This provided evidence that sexist men are strategically using system justifying ideologies rationalizing their power status to oppose and set back the social change.

Many experimental studies have documented that system threats lead men to stick to the system and endorse the hierarchical structure of society to a greater extent. For instance, men who perceived recent alterations in the society as threatening for their status supported male superiority and group-based dominance more (Willer et al., 2013). In addition to that, men who believed that women's economic empowerment might jeopardize male domination were less eager to take an action for gender equality (Kosakowska-Berezecka et al., 2020). Another research showed that the information that gender equality in business life is rising fueled

men's tendency to view women as competitors which in turn decreased their support to women-inclusive workplace policies (Kuchynka et al., 2018). Similarly, men can reassert their dominance over women through gender discriminating practices and beliefs. To illustrate, when men occupied in high status jobs were informed that women outnumbering male counterparts in prestigious positions, they tended to evaluate women in labor force more negatively by underestimating their skills, offering them less salary and fewer job positions (Kricheli-Katz, 2019). Likewise, when men who were already against gender equality perceived a threat to their position in gender hierarchy, they tended to engage in rape victim-blaming (Chapleau & Oswald, 2013) and sexually harassing behavior more (Maass et al., 2003).

### 1.1.3 Precarious manhood and masculinity threats

Men overall evaluate the gender system as fairer than women do (Şahin & Soylu-Yalçinkaya, 2021), yet men's motivation to legitimize the existing system might not only stem from a basic tendency to preserve the status quo. I consider threats to manhood as a distinct type of threat since threats directly target an individual's masculine identity rather than men's group position in social hierarchy structures. In fact, manhood itself is built upon power and hierarchy (Connell, 1995). Connell (1995) argued that among all men, those who have the characteristics and behavioral tendencies of hegemonic masculinity (such as being white, heterosexual, prestigious, and wealthy) get to the biggest slice of the cake in the gendered power relations. There are "standards for men against which other men are measured" and must be successfully met (Kimmel, 1994, p. 124-125). Hence, men tend to engage in compensatory behaviors to reaffirm their manhood, especially when they feel they

are not conforming to those standards, in other words, when their manhood is under threat. Considering the substantial role of gender norms and stereotypes in the concept of male identity, it is reasonable to expect deviations from those will trigger feelings of threat for men. A wide body of research showed that men feel threatened when they were deceived that their personality is predominantly feminine (e.g., Schmitt & Branscombe, 2001; Maass et al., 2003; Glick et al., 2007; Munsch & Willer, 2012) or when they were asked to carry out counter gender-stereotypical (i.e., feminine) activities (Bosson et al., 2005).

Not surprisingly, men who receive a masculinity threat strive to proclaim their manhood by engaging in activities that are attributed to masculinity, such as aggression and risk-taking (Vandello et al., 2008). They also engage in system justifying strategies that legitimize the existing gender hierarchy to handle feelings of threat instead of direct show-offs of masculinity. For example, in response to masculinity threat, men endorsed ideologies of group-based dominance (Willer et al., 2013), gender inequality (Kosakowska-berezecka, et al., 2016), and benevolent sexism (Dahl et al., 2015) more. Men might also reclaim their domination over women through strategies consolidating women's subordination. For example, men who were deceived that a female interaction partner received higher scores than them on a gender-based knowledge task sexualized their ostensible partners more (Dahl et al., 2015). The link between masculinity threat and sexualization of women was due to men's increased levels of public discomfort and anger. Similarly, men who were exposed to masculinity threat were more likely to engage in sexual harassment (Maass et al., 2003). Men also trivialized sexual assault as a compensation strategy when their manhood is threatened, by blaming the female victim in sexual assault

scenarios and evaluating the male harasser in a more favorable light (Munsch & Willer, 2012).

## 1.2 Defining and identifying sexual harassment

Women, men, and LGBTI+ are frequently experiencing sexual harassment at home, schools, workplaces, and streets. However, sexual harassment is generally discussed in the framework of gender discrimination as harassers are usually men (Rudman & Glick, 2008). As a consolidation of their higher position, men may tend to downplay sexual harassment cases in the face of status threats. People's levels of identification of sexual harassment cases are highly varied, especially for some subtle forms of social behavior (Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989). Due to ambiguity surrounding sexual harassment cases, judgments on sexual harassment might be easily affected by threat-compensation motivations. Even the definition of sexual harassment itself is controversial, which result in such a significant public issue to be often neglected. According to the Istanbul Convention (Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence Against Women and Domestic Violence), sexual harassment is defined as “any form of unwanted verbal, non-verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person, in particular when creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment” (Council of Europe, 2011, p. 11).

Sexual harassment was first legally recognized by the USA court under two categories that are *quid-pro-quo* (“the solicitation of sexual cooperation in return for employment benefits”) and *hostile work environment* (“behaviors at work such as joking, derogatory remarks, and unsolicited touching, that may promote an offensive or uncomfortable environment”; Baird et al., 1995, p. 79).

Later on, Till (1980, pp. 8-22) extended this grouping into five, based on the literature and content analyses of female college students' sexual harassment reports as follows: gender harassment ("generalized sexist remarks or behavior"), seductive behavior ("inappropriate and offensive, but essentially sanction-free sexual advances"), sexual bribery ("solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behavior by promise of rewards"), sexual coercion ("coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishments") and sexual assault ("sexual crimes and misdemeanors"). Building on this classification, a scale including incidents exemplifying sexual harassment was developed (Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, SEQ; Fitzgerald et al., 1988). This study also aimed to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment at workplaces and schools. Participants were asked to rate the behavioral items which they might have experienced in terms of frequency (1 = never, 2 = once, 3 = more than once). Although the scale included sexually harassing behaviors, researchers avoided using the word "sexual harassment" since people who have experienced sexual harassment might still fail to label it. Nonetheless, participants' ratings of SEQ were significantly correlated with the additional item "I have been sexually harassed.", providing evidence that SEQ is a valid measure to assess experiences of sexual harassment. Following the SEQ, researchers developed new instruments to better understand perceptions of sexual harassment as well as attitudes towards harassers and victims (e.g., Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory, Lott et al., 1982; The Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale, Mazer & Percival, 1989; Illinois Sexual Harassment Myth Acceptance Scale, Lonsway et al., 2008). Furthermore, factors influencing classification of an incident as sexual harassment have been examined through various vignettes (e.g., Baker et al., 1990; Toker & Sümer, 2010; Shechory-Bitton & Zvi, 2020).

A substantial body of research has shown that people's judgments on sexual harassment are affected by numerous factors such contextual clues (e.g., harasser characteristics, victim characteristics, setting, the severity of behavior) and culture-specific standards (e.g., culturally (in)appropriate behaviors; Colarelli & Haaland, 2002). The initial step to react to sexual harassment is to recognize harassing behaviors; thus, examining the factors influencing perceptions of sexual harassment is vital. Not surprisingly, people have a consensus on construing severe forms of sexual harassment (e.g., *quid-pro-quo*) such as bribing and forcing a woman to have a sexual affair (Terpstra & Baker, 1987). On the other hand, individuals' perceptions of sexual harassment were highly varied for "milder" behaviors exemplifying gender harassment and seductive behaviors (Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989). Likewise, although men define a narrower range of behaviors as sexual harassment than women do (Ford & Donis, 1996; Russell & Trigg, 2004; Bitton & Shaul, 2013), the magnitude of gender difference widened only for moderately harassing behaviors (Rotundo et al., 2001). On the contrary, behaviors that fall into sexist hostility category were not considered as sexual harassment by both men and women (Dinçal, 2019). To summarize, men's and women's evaluations of sexual harassment cases were not significantly distinct from each other when an incident portrayed either a very hostile behavior or a very subtle attempt.

Research has shown that harassing behaviors might fall into different categories of sexual harassment across samples (e.g., Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Fitzgerald et al., 1999). Toker and Sümer (2010) conducted an extensive study to examine perceptions of sexual harassment of women living in Turkey. In the scope of the study, structured interviews were held with 56 working women, focusing on behaviors and attitudes of male coworkers, which might be interpreted as either

disturbing or sexual harassment. Based on the content analysis that was followed by categorization of the items, they developed a 72-item Social Sexual Incidents Questionnaire (SSIQ) including a range of potentially harassing socio-sexual behaviors. In a further study using this scale, they asked a group of participants to indicate the extent to which they'd consider the behavior as sexual harassment (1 = not sexual harassment at all, 2 = not much sexual harassment, 3 = could be considered sexual harassment, 4 = it is sexual harassment, 5 = certainly is sexual harassment). The results revealed five factors of harassment that are insinuation of interest, sexual hostility, sexist hostility, physical sexual offense, sexual bribery, and sexual coercion. Parallel to previous findings, severe behaviors such as attempting to kiss a woman (*physical sexual offense*) and implying a reward or punishment to a woman in work context to have sexual intimacy (*sexual bribery and sexual coercion*) were considered as sexual harassment almost by all participants. On the other hand, behaviors such as making sexual jokes (*sexual hostility*) and repetitive attempts of dating (*insinuation of interest*) were rated moderately harassing while attitudes and behaviors discriminating against women (*sexist hostility*) were not considered as sexual harassment by most of the participants. In addition to that, the factor structure was compared with study results conducted in the USA to explore the culture-specific aspect of sexual harassment perceptions. Results revealed that all four factors corresponded to sexual harassment categories existing in the literature (*unwanted sexual attention, sexual coercion, sexist hostility, sexual hostility*; SEQ-DoD; Fitzgerald et al., 1999) while the factor named insinuation of interest seemed to be more specific to Turkish culture. It is further argued that although behaviors that fall into the category of insinuation of interest do not include an explicit sexual interest, Turkish participants might have interpreted them as sexual harassment due

to specific characteristics of their culture. In other words, showing interest to a woman through complimenting, asking for dates, using terms like “honey” and “sweetheart” might be considered as innocuous attempts of having a decent relationship with a woman in the USA, while these might be considered inappropriate in Turkey. Similarly, Toker (2016) has provided evidence that Turkish and American participants differed in their perceptions of “ambiguous” forms of sexual harassment (sexist hostility, insinuation of interest, sexual hostility). American participants evaluated sexist hostility as harassing to a greater extent than Turkish participants did. On the other hand, behaviors of sexual hostility and insinuation of interest were found more harassing by Turkish participants. In conclusion, people’s conceptualization of sexual harassment may depend on cultural standards, while the difference across cultures becomes even more prominent when the harassing behaviors are in the middle of the sexual harassment continuum.

The studies indicating the severity of behavior is a variable that strongly predicts people’s sexual harassment assessments might also imply that people objectively judge the sexual harassment cases. Nonetheless, recent study findings suggest that this might not be the case. It has been found that participants did not differ in terms of the degree to which they labeled an incident as sexual harassment based on the particular definition of sexual harassment with which they were presented (abstract definition, concrete definition, no definition; Rothgerber et al., 2021). Likewise, another study has shown that lawyers who should have a clearer legal conceptualization of sexual harassment didn’t differ from students in terms of naming an incident as sexual harassment (Shechory-Bitton & Zvi, 2020). That is, I suspect that particularly men might be failing to label an incident as sexual harassment not only due to lack of knowledge; indeed, there is strong evidence that

men's perceptions of sexual harassment are highly related to their attitudes towards gender hierarchy. For example, men who endorsed hostile and benevolent sexist ideologies to a greater extent also tended to trivialize sexual harassment cases (Herrera et al., 2014). Another study investigating university students' attitudes towards sexual harassment under two categories (blaming women for sexual harassment and trivializing sexual harassment) revealed similar results (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2010). Males who scored higher on hostile sexism blamed female victims and underestimated the sexual harassment cases more than those who scored lower on hostile sexism. More interestingly, men who endorsed benevolent sexist ideologies to a greater extent also evaluated sexual harassment as an important social issue to a higher degree. The results are meaningful, considering the conceptualization of hostile sexism as antagonistic attitudes towards women and benevolent sexism as beliefs about women's purity and need to be protected.

#### 1.2.1 Perceptions of sexual harassment under threat

According to McLaughlin et al. (2012, p. 635), "men's harassment of women has more to do with keeping women in their place and marking their own turf than with sexual attraction or arousal". A study based on self-reports of many women has provided evidence that female college students with pre-dominantly masculine identities and women occupied in male-stereotypical jobs were more likely to be harassed by men (Berdahl, 2007). Similarly, female supervisors reported experiences of sexual harassment more frequently than male supervisors and non-supervisor female colleagues (McLaughlin et al., 2012). Men's engagement in sexual harassment as a power-reaffirmation was also shown at experimental settings. The study conducted by Maass and her colleagues (2003) has shown that in comparison

to men who read arguments of a stereotypical woman, male participants who read those of a feminist questioning the superiority of men in the business life tended to sexually harass an ostensible feminist interaction partner more when they were given the chance. In addition to that, men who were exposed to a manhood threat highlighting their femininity also tended to harass a fictitious female partner more. Sexual harassment was not only directed towards the specific feminist target; indeed, men in the feminist group in the first experiment reported a greater likelihood of harassing a female colleague in a hypothetical scenario. As a result, researchers have concluded that sexual harassment do not only reflect the negative feelings towards a woman who is a potential danger to group but target all women as a group.

Men do not necessarily engage in sexual harassment personally, rather trivialization of sexual harassment such as not recognizing the incident as sexual harassment and blaming the female victim might also function as a threat-compensation. Although, no prior study investigated perceptions of sexual harassment under a status threat, there are several studies examining threat-compensation strategies through sexual assault and coercion vignettes. For example, in one study showed that exposure to masculine identity threat increased the justification of the sexual coercion vignettes and led to more negative assessments of female targets (Munsch & Willer, 2012). As much as direct threats to group and masculine identities, gender non-conforming women might trigger men's threat-responses upon sexual harassment. In line with this prediction, an ambiguous sexual harassment scenario was labeled as sexual harassment to less extent when the victim was not gender-stereotypical (either physically or characteristically; Goh et al., 2022). Furthermore, participants evaluated the harassment claim of the non-stereotypical woman as less credible.

### 1.3 Present study

The present study aims to investigate men's perceptions of ambiguous sexual harassment incidents under gender hierarchy threat through experimental methods. In the scope of this study, a novel threat was introduced to literature and its possible consequences were investigated in the context of workplace sexual harassment.

Drawing on previous studies, I believe the possibility of social change that threatens men's high status in the power hierarchy might elicit threat-responses. In the gender hierarchy threat that I designed for this study, the recent progress in women's representation in labor force is briefly mentioned. Although dual-earner families (a relationship in which both partners are occupied) are widespread now, for many men, women's higher representation in the labor force might be equal to their power loss due to increased competition in employment. Thus, women's gains in society might imply that men's advantaged position is in danger at the group level. Moreover, I underlined that this improvement might challenge gender roles prescribing traditional division of labor at families. As I discussed earlier, besides being an efficient tool for legitimizing the inequalities, gender stereotypes are key elements of the individual masculinity of men. Hence, a change in traditional gender roles such as taking care of children and doing housework might pose a more severe threat to manhood status. Given a household's living expenses, it might be unreasonable to expect that women's increased participation in the labor force *per se* would be a direct threat to men. Even men from the low socio-economic status expressed that they would approve of their wives' employment if they needed financial support and the children were not so young (Bolak-Boratav et al., 2018). Nonetheless, even if both man and woman work in a family, the "breadwinner" role is undertaken by man, whereas the woman still handles the domestic duties (Sancar,

2009). Thus, I expected, when women's economic empowerment was accompanied with the expectation of change in traditional gender norms, it would awake feelings of threat for men.

Although there is global progress in achieving gender equality, statistics show that we still are far from the total balance (UN Women, 2020). To expedite the process, men allies are also needed (Vescio & Kosakowska-Berezecka, 2020). Therefore, having a deeper understanding of social change from the perspective of men's threat-compensation is significant to take concrete steps for gender equality. Likewise, understanding their reactance to social change would be helpful to design prevention and intervention programs. Men's willingness to contribute to gender equality diminishes as they view women's achievement at the expense of their benefits (Kosakowska-berezecka, et al., 2016). Hence, it might be essential to deemphasize gender-based conflict of interest through gender equality campaigns.

It is worth noting that not all men might equally feel threatened by the possibility of losing their power in gender hierarchy and reactively engage in threat-compensation strategies. Indeed, individual variables such as the extent to which they are chronically irritated by women's empowerment and situational factors (e.g., the level of threat feelings) would interactively predict their response mechanism (Herrera et al., 2012). For example, it has been shown that only men with high social dominance orientation engaged in system justifying practices when their power is criticized (Maass et al., 2003). Hence, I expected men who are chronically prone to threats to their power, i.e., subordination to women, would be affected by gender hierarchy threat the most. Maass and her colleagues (2003) also found that only men with stronger gender identification attempted regaining their power in the face of gender hierarchy threat. Likewise, there is accumulated evidence from precarious

manhood literature showing men who are highly identified with their gender are more susceptible to masculinity threats (e.g., Schmitt & Branscombe, 2001; Weaver & Vescio, 2015). Therefore, participants' gender identity strengths and perceived threat from subordination of women were used moderator variables.

I have chosen perceptions of sexual harassment as a dependent variable since especially ambiguous forms of sexual harassment vary remarkably depending on situational and individual factors (Toker, 2016a). In addition to that, controversial legal judgments on sexual harassment cases that attract public attention on social media inspired me to investigate men's perceptions of sexual harassment. Denial of sexualization of women through harassment might be a symbolic threat-compensation mechanism to consolidate men's domination over women. That being said, sexual harassment at workplaces also causes serious harm to women's well-being (Sojo et al., 2016) and work performance (Gervais et al., 2011). Thus, it is extremely important to investigate how men conceptualize sexual harassment, especially in the face of feelings of threat. While there is a wide body of research on attitudes towards sexual harassment, to my knowledge, no study investigated this phenomenon under a threat pointing out a systemic change in gender relations. Although there are several studies conducted in Turkey to investigate prevalence rates and perceptions of sexual harassment, they were usually limited to sample of women in professional life (e.g., Celik & Çelik, 2007; Toker & Sümer, 2010; Süral & Kılıçoğlu, 2011) or college students (e.g., Toker, 2016b). As attitudes towards sexual harassment are affected by many personal variables such as age, religiosity, and political orientation (e.g., van der Linden & Panagopoulos, 2019; O'Connor et al., 2021), measuring those among community sample would provide a piece of rich information. Furthermore, previous studies showed that hostile and benevolent

sexism predicted people's attitudes towards sexual harassment (e.g., Russell & Trigg, 2004; Sakallı-Uğurlu, et al., 2010). Thus, participants' levels of hostile and benevolent sexism were measured to be included in the analyses as control variables.

I also aimed to contribute to literature uniquely by examining men's understanding of sexual harassment in Turkey which is a highly patriarchal country (Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., 2010). As perceptions of sexual harassment are shaped by cultural standards (Toker, 2016b) it is important to investigate this phenomenon outside of the Western countries. Furthermore, this study differs from previous studies in examining men's perceptions of sexual harassment through realistic vignettes. Since people usually confront with sexual harassment cases on mass media in the forms of vignettes, using real-life scenarios would increase the generalizability of the study results to daily life (Ståhl et al., 2010).

Finally, it is also surely important to understand which behaviors are perceived as sexual harassment by women since they are one of the most vulnerable groups. Furthermore, I do not overlook that LGBTI+ and cis-hetero men are frequently subject to sexual harassment. Indeed, I believe the study findings might be promising for everyone who struggles with the patriarchal system that authorizes men to exercise power through symbolic or actual ways.

In light of the literature, I expected that the information that women are gaining power in the labor force which in turn increase their egalitarian expectations at home would function as a threat for men. As a result, the threat might urge men to adjust their perceptions of sexual harassment as a means of guarantying male superiority.

The hypotheses for the main study were as follows:

(H1) Men in the gender hierarchy threat condition will score lower in perceptions of sexual harassment, compared to men in the control condition.

(H2) The effects of the manipulation on perceptions of sexual harassment will be greater for participants who report higher levels of a perceived threat to manhood.

(H3) The effects of the manipulation on perceptions of sexual harassment will be greater for participants who report higher levels of identification with gender.

## CHAPTER 2

### PILOT STUDIES

I conducted two pilot studies to assess materials that would be used in the main study. For both studies, all necessary ethical permissions were taken from Ethics Committee for Master and PhD Theses in Social Sciences and Humanities Participants at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul (see Appendix A).

#### 2.1 Pilot study 1

In the main study, I aimed to investigate how men perceive sexual harassment under gender hierarchy threat. To elicit feelings of threat among male participants, I designed a passage indicating women are gaining power both in business life and at home. To assess if passage that would be used in the main study elicit feelings of threat for men, I conducted a pilot study. I expected that, participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition would evaluate the passage more negatively (in comparison to control group) due to increased feelings of threat. Furthermore, I expected that participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition would report higher levels of discomfort and lower levels of contentment.

##### 2.1.1 Method

###### 2.1.1.1 Participants

The participation was based on full voluntariness, and I shared the online study link on my social media accounts. This sample (Group A) was highly distinct from the general population, portraying a young, well-educated and secular group (see Table 1

for sociodemographic characteristics). Thus, I decided to collect another set of data from a different sample that might better represent the whole Turkish population, without using the social media. With the help of volunteer undergraduate assistants working at Boğaziçi University Social Psychology Lab, the study link was distributed among community sample (Group B). They were especially asked not to recruit participants from inner circle of peers like friends and classmates whereas they were able to send the link to random people such as shopkeepers and their distant acquaintances. I initially analyzed the data overall and then examined differences between those two samples.

In total, there were 155 recorded responses; however, only those who stated their gender as “man” were included, remaining 139 participants. Furthermore, 59 participants who did not answer any of the questions were excluded from further analyses. Among 80 men who completed the survey, 6 more participants were excluded from further analyses for not answering any of the attention check questions correctly. Out of the remaining 74 participants, 40 were assigned to gender hierarchy threat condition (54.05%) while 34 were assigned to the control group (45.95%). The age of those who shared their age information ranged from 20 to 66 ( $n = 61$ ,  $M_{Age} = 34.95$ ,  $SD_{Age} = 12.79$ ). Out of 74, 11 participants (14.9%) were graduate students, 32 participants (43.2%) had a bachelor’s degree, three participants (4.1%) were undergraduate students, 10 participants (13.5%) were high school graduates, five participants (6.8%) were primary or secondary school graduates, while seven participants (9.5%) did not answer the question of education level. Among 74 participants, 22 participants (29.7%) were married, 22 participants (29.7%) were not married but was in a relationship, 22 participants (29.7%) were single, and one participant (1.4%) selected the option of other whereas seven participants (9.5%) did

not state their relationship. Out of 74, 48 participants (64.9%) were employed, 19 participants (25.7%) were unemployed, and 7 participants (9.5%) did not answer the question.

As mentioned earlier, the survey link was distributed through two different channels. 38 participants were reached through my social media accounts (Group A) while 36 participants were recruited through connections of volunteer assistants (Group B). Group A were substantially younger than Group B ( $n = 31$ ,  $M_{Age} = 26.10$ ,  $SD_{Age} = 2.70$ ;  $n = 30$ ,  $M_{Age} = 44.10$ ,  $SD_{Age} = 12.68$ ). Furthermore, two groups of participants differed in their other demographics that were provided in Table 1.

#### 2.1.1.2 Procedure

The study was created using Qualtrics software (Version December 2021, Provo, UT). Participants were told that they would be evaluating a news article and answering several questions about themselves. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two groups (Gender Hierarchy Threat vs. Control). Those in the gender hierarchy threat group read an ostensible news article that was written by the me, indicating that women are gaining power and the gender gap in professional life is getting narrower while those in the control condition read an article indicating that gender inequality remains the same. After reading the passage, they were asked to answer attention check questions. Later, they answered few questions about the passage that were followed by the demographic information form. At the end of the study, participants were presented with debriefing form that declared the true aim of the study. Furthermore, they were informed that the news article was written by researchers and provided with real statistics on women in the labor force in Turkey.

It was also highlighted that the problem of gender inequality in Turkey remains unresolved. All materials are provided in Appendix B.

Table 1. The Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants in Pilot Study 1

Characteristic	Group A			Group B		
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M (SD)</i>
Education Level						
Primary or Secondary School Graduate	0	0		5	13.9	
High School Graduate	1	2.6		9	25.0	
Undergraduate Student	2	5.3		1	2.8	
Bachelor's Degree	20	52.6		12	33.3	
Master or PhD Student	10	26.3		1	2.8	
Master's Degree or PhD	3	7.9		3	8.3	
Missing	2	5.3		5	13.9	
City						
Metropolis	32	84.2		25	69.4	
City	4	10.5		6	16.7	
District	0	0		0	0	
Village	0	0		0	0	
Missing	2	5.3		5	13.9	
Marital Status						
Married	2	5.3		20	55.6	
Not married, in a relationship	16	42.1		6	16.7	
Single	17	44.7		5	13.9	
Other	1	2.6		0	0	
Missing	2	5.3		5	13.9	
Employment Status						
Employed	28	73.7		20	55.6	
Unemployed	8	21.1		11	30.6	
Missing	2	5.3		5	13.9	
SES (1 = bottom of the ladder, 10 = top of the ladder)	36	94.7	5.06 (1.59)	31	86.1	5.74 (2.19)
Religiosity (1 = not at all religious, 7 = very religious)	36	94.7	2.22 (1.62)	31	86.1	3.48 (1.67)
Political Orientation (1 = left, 7 = right)	35	92.1	2.91 (1.48)	30	83.3	3.73 (2.05)

### 2.1.1.3 Experimental manipulation

An experimental manipulation (gender hierarchy threat) was designed to evoke feelings of threat for men, implying they might lose their advantaged status in society. The manipulation and control passages which were edited as if they were online news articles only differed in terms of their content. The threat passage was

accompanied by a banner “the gender power relations at work and home are changing to the advantage of women”. It was composed of manipulated statistics providing evidence that women’s representation in the labor force had increased, such that there is a narrower wage gap and greater engagement in leadership positions. On the contrary, the control passage with a banner “the gender power relations at work and home do not change” included more realistic statistics reflecting that gender inequality persists. The passages were inspired from the study of Morton and his colleagues (2009) and revised for the specific purposes of the study. Distinguished from Morton’s passage, it was also emphasized that the young women are prioritizing their careers and have egalitarian expectations on the division of labor at their family more than before. In this way, I aimed to pose a hint of a threat to gender norms that strengthens men’s higher position in the family and society.

#### 2.1.1.4 Measures

##### 2.1.1.4.1 Perceived plausibility of passages

To assess the if the statistics given in the manipulation article is perceived as plausible and realistic, participants were asked one item question (“Considering the content of the news article you have read, had you read a similar article before?”; 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = not sure) following the passages.

##### 2.1.1.4.2 Attention check questions

To test participants’ engagement in passages, they were asked two attention check questions. Firstly, they filled the blank in the heading of the news article (“The

gender power relations at work and home \_\_\_\_\_”; 1 = do not change, 2 = are changing to the advantage of women). Secondly, they were asked to choose between two options that best summarizes the message of the news article (“Considering the content of the news article you have read, which of the following best summarizes the information given?”; 1= the power of women at work and home is increasing, 2 = the power of women at work and home does not increase significantly”). Participants who answered at least one of the questions correctly were included in further analyses.

#### 2.1.1.4.3 Threat perceptions

To assess the extent to which the threat passage poses a threat to men’s advantaged position in society, two questions were asked. Men’s perceptions of threat were operationalized as their interpretations of the mentioned social change for society and for men. I expected that participants would express their feelings of threat indirectly by evaluating the changes more negatively. That being said, as a main dependent variable, participants were asked to evaluate recent changes in gender equality on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) definitely not to (7) definitely (“Might the situation that was summarized in the passage have negative implications for society?; “Might the situation that was summarized in the passage have negative implications for men?”). Two questions were analyzed separately, the higher scores indicating greater levels of perceived status threat.

#### 2.1.1.4.4 Affective reactions

Participants’ affective reactions to passages were evaluated through two items that were originally taken from Bosson et al., (2005) and translated into Turkish by Şahin

and Soylu-Yalçinkaya in 2020 (“To what extent do you feel content about the situation that was summarized in the passage?”, “To what extent do you feel uncomfortable about the situation that was summarized in the passage?”; 1 = not at all, 7 = very much).

#### 2.1.1.4.5 Comments

After passage questions, participants answered an open-ended question, “What do you think about the content of the news article you have read? What did it make you feel?”.

#### 2.1.1.4.6 Demographic information

At the very beginning of the study, participants were asked to indicate their gender since only male participants were going to be able to continue. Through demographic information form that was given at the end of the study, participants’ age, level of education, socio-economic status, employment status, residency background and marital status information were gathered. Furthermore, their levels of religiosity and political orientation were measured.

### 2.1.2 Results

To understand if the manipulation passage would raise men’s concerns about losing their higher place in gender hierarchy, they were asked to assess the implications of gender-egalitarian changes on society and on men. As a response to increased feelings of threat, it was expected that the passage reporting advances in gender equality (gender hierarchy threat group) would be evaluated more negatively than the passage including unchanged statistics of gender inequality (control group).

In addition to that, I expected that participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition would feel more uncomfortable and less content than those in the control condition. Two groups were compared through IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 25). To interpret the findings, I used relaxed confidence intervals (75%) as the sample size was quite small ( $n = 74$ ).

#### 2.1.2.1 Perceived plausibility of passages

Participants were asked if they read a similar news article before, in terms of its content. Out of 34 participants in control condition, 17 (50%) participants answered “yes”, 10 (29.4%) participants answered “no” and seven (20.6%) participants answered, “not sure”. On the other hand, out of 40 participants in threat condition, 24 (60%) participants answered “yes”, 10 (25%) participants answered “no” and six (15%) participants answered, “not sure”.

#### 2.1.2.2 Threat perceptions

Contrary to my expectations, participants who read the control passage ( $M = 4.85$ ,  $SD = 2.23$ ) evaluated the information summarized in the passage as more negative for society than participants who read the gender hierarchy threat passage ( $M = 2.50$ ,  $SD = 1.95$ ), 75% CI [1.79, 2.92]. On the other hand, participants in the control group ( $M = 2.74$ ,  $SD = 1.94$ ) and the gender hierarchy threat group ( $M = 2.85$ ,  $SD = 2.03$ ), 75% CI [-.65, 4.42] did not differ in their ratings on negative implications for men.

#### 2.1.2.3 Affective reactions

In contrast to my hypotheses, participants in the control condition ( $M = 4.82$ ,  $SD = 2.28$ ) reported higher levels of discomfort than those in the gender hierarchy threat

condition ( $M = 2.08$ ,  $SD = 1.99$ ), 75% CI [2.16, 3.33]. Similarly, participants in the control condition ( $M = 2.48$ ,  $SD = 1.73$ ) reported lower levels of contentment than the gender hierarchy threat group ( $M = 5.38$ ,  $SD = 2.03$ ), 75% CI [-3.42, -2.38].

### 2.1.3 Separate analyses

Two groups of participants (Group A and Group B) that were distinguished from each other on demographic characteristics, also differed in their scores on perceived threat questions. Therefore, I also analyzed them separately. Group A represented a better-educated and less religious sample compared to Group B.

#### 2.1.3.1 Results for Group A

##### 2.1.3.1.1 Threat perceptions and affective reactions

Unlike what I expected, participants who read the control passage ( $M = 5.05$ ,  $SD = 1.99$ ) perceived the information summarized in the passage as more negative for society than those who read the gender hierarchy threat passage ( $M = 1.83$ ,  $SD = 1.20$ ), 75% CI [2.59, 3.85]. Likewise, those who read the control passage ( $M = 2.70$ ,  $SD = 1.95$ ) perceived the information summarized in the passage as more negative for men than participants who read the gender hierarchy threat passage ( $M = 2.00$ ,  $SD = 1.37$ ), 75% CI [.05, 1.35]. When it comes to affective reactions, contrary to my expectations, participants in the control condition ( $M = 5.26$ ,  $SD = 1.94$ ) indicated higher levels of discomfort than the gender hierarchy threat group ( $M = 1.56$ ,  $SD = 3.34$ ), 75% CI [3.06, 4.35]. Likewise, they ( $M = 2.32$ ,  $SD = 1.7$ ) reported lower levels of contentment than those in the gender hierarchy threat condition ( $M = 5.83$ ,  $SD = 1.69$ ), 75% CI [-4.14, -2.89].

### 2.1.3.1.2 Comments

Supporting their answers to qualitative questions, most of the participants in threat group stated that they evaluated the recent developments in gender equality positively. Sample answer as follows:

I understand that women stopped being only mothers and housewives and started to play more important roles in society. Thus, it made me believe that we can move towards a more equal life in all areas even more. (Participant 26)

Likewise, participants in control group mostly answered the question parallel to their ratings on qualitative questions, expressing their discomfort with persistence of gender inequality:

The fact that the status of women has never risen in the male-dominated business world worried me and fueled my hopelessness for the future. (Participant 5)

Unfortunately, the unit salary of men and women working in the same position is not the same all around the globe. The current male-dominated system and the employer's worry of "what if she gives a birth?" continues. I am discontent with this situation. (Participant 7)

One participant in control group expressed his concerns about the balance between the work and “motherhood” role of a woman, which was summarized as follows:

Although I am a man who wholeheartedly wants the role of women to increase in society, I have recently become an uncle and witnessed how a mother cannot leave her child alone. After a woman gives birth, if the family’s financial status is not good enough to afford a caregiver it is very difficult for a mother to go to work. In many cases, a woman's salary is either head-to-head with the caregiver's salary, or less, or the difference is not enough to put her back from spending time with the child. When the child starts to kindergarten, the mother is afraid to start working again, and often the second child comes. I believe this result from the fact that our country is economically lag far behind compared to many European countries, as in many other things; thus, I feel sad about this. (Participant 6)

### 2.1.3.2 Results for Group B

#### 2.1.3.2.1 Threat perceptions and affective reactions

Contrary to my expectations, participants who read the control passage ( $M = 4.57$ ,  $SD = 2.59$ ) perceived the information summarized in the passage as more negative for society than those who read the gender hierarchy threat passage ( $M = 3.05$ ,  $SD = 2.28$ ), 75% CI [.56, 2.49]. On the other hand, as I expected, those who read the gender hierarchy threat passage ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = 2.24$ ) evaluated the information more negative for men than those who read the control passage ( $M = 2.79$ ,  $SD = 2.01$ ), 75% CI [-1.62, .010]. Unlike what I expected, participants in the control group ( $M = 4.21$ ,  $SD = 2.64$ ) reported higher levels of discomfort than those in the gender hierarchy threat group ( $M = 2.52$ ,  $SD = 2.36$ ), 75% CI [.69, 2.9]. Furthermore, they ( $M = 2.71$ ,  $SD = 1.98$ ) reported lower levels of contentment than participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition ( $M = 5.00$ ,  $SD = 2.26$ ), 75% CI [-3.16, -1.42].

#### 2.1.3.2.2 Comments

In line with the qualitative results, most of the participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition reported their contentment with the gender equality in business. Nonetheless, one participant criticized women's participation in labor force as I expected:

Women's participation in business life is evaluated by focusing on its positive aspects only. However, apart from its positive aspects, its negative effects on the number of unemployed men and family life should be taken into consideration. (Participant 54)

Participants in control condition usually reflected their discomfort with the gender inequality:

In my opinion, as stated in the article, our women still cannot reach the status they deserve due to pressures of society and family. (Participant 44)

On the other hand, one participant from control group interpreted the passage in which gender inequality is stable as trying to favor women in labor market over men.

Moreover, one participant interpreted the control passage as a threat for men:

Women's participation to labor force narrows down men's job opportunities, which in turn leads to conflict between couples and divorces. Thus, the areas that women work in should be restricted. (Participant 45)

#### 2.1.4 Discussion

The study investigated whether men perceive the manipulation passage as a threat to their advantaged status in society. On the contrary to my hypotheses, women's increased power did not awaken feelings of threat among men, in fact, they tended to evaluate gender inequality issues such as women's low representation in leadership positions and gender-based wage gap very negative for society. Although results are promising, this might also stem from the fact that men do not feel comfortable to oppose gender equality explicitly. Although gender equality and women's rights are now pronounced more than ever, the internalization of egalitarian beliefs and practices is questionable. According to the recent study findings, for instance, four out of five Turkish participants trivialized the problem of gender discrimination in their community even though they were highly young with a mean age of 22 (Kosakowska-Berezecka et al., 2020). Thus, directly asking about their opinions on the latest news about gender (in)equality might have not given us a clue about the perceived level of threat. Indeed, men frequently use symbolic strategies under masculinity threats as shown in the literature of "precarious manhood" (Vandello et

al., 2008). Thus, despite stating they endorsed the progress in gender equality that is in advantage of women, they might still react to reminders of societal change implicitly such as tolerating sexual harassment against women as I predicted for the main study.

Another underlying reason behind why men overall did not rate women's increased power negatively might be the characteristics of the sample. The awareness of gender equality is rising especially among better-educated males (Karakuş, 2015). Parallel to that, the group reflecting profiles of well-educated, left-wing, and secular youngsters viewed gender inequality as highly negative not only for society but also for men. On the other hand, in line with my hypotheses, only the Group B (more representative sample) considered gender equality as a threat for men. This is worth noting that this was the most direct measure of perceived threat levels as participants evaluated the negative implications for men. Hereby, I planned to reach broader spectrum of participants from the community members for the main study.

Although the results were not coherent with the predictions, considering the threat perceptions of community sample and participants answers to open-ended questions, the gender hierarchy threat passage functioned for some participants just as I expected. Therefore, for the main study I kept a brief information that women are gaining power in the labor force in the manipulation passage, without any statistics. Furthermore, I modified the passage in a way that it emphasized the implications of young women's gender egalitarian ideologies and expectations on families more. In addition to that, rather than leaving the interpretation to the participants, I designed a passage that directly pointed out the potential negative outcomes of women's empowerment for men, such as changing gender-based division of labor and male unemployment.

Finally, control passage might have not functioned as a proper baseline. Turkey is one of the countries that are low in gender equality according to extensive measures such as the Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI, World Economic Forum, 2018). Therefore, I predicted that the control passage explaining male dominance over women would function as a baseline, reflecting the status-quo. Moreover, ostensible articles summarizing existing gender inequality was also used as a control passage in the literature (e.g., Morton et al., 2009). However, the results of the pilot study have shown that men reported that they were more discontent with gender inequality than they were with gender equality and social change. On the contrary, several participants who read the control passage that was supposed to remind them of existing gender inequality criticized it for trying to favor women against men. To put simply, even mere exposure to claims on gender inequality functioned as a threat to few participants. Given the pattern observed in both participants' ratings on scales and answers to the open-ended question, I decided to use an irrelevant article in the control group for the main study.

## 2.2 Pilot study 2

In the main study, I aimed to investigate if participants' decision on classifying an incident as sexual harassment and levels of agreement with female victims would change under the experimental manipulation. Hence, I conducted another pilot study to select the most ambiguous sexual harassment cases from a bunch of scenarios.

## 2.2.1 Method

### 2.2.1.1 Participants

I recruited a sample from community members through personal connections of me and undergraduate assistants of Boğaziçi University Social Psychology Lab, without using social media. The participation to the online study was based on full voluntariness. There were 50 recorded answers for the study. Out of 50, two participants who indicated their gender as woman and five participants who did not answer the question were excluded from the analyses. Furthermore, 12 participants who completed the study were removed for not answering any questions. Finally, 31 men who at least evaluated one of the sexual harassment scenarios remained.

The same seven participants did not answer any of the demographic information questions, whereas there were two more participants who did not answer the age question. The age of 22 participants who answered the question ranged from 23 to 60 ( $M_{Age} = 35.09$ ,  $SD_{Age} = 12.65$ ). The rest of the demographic information of the participants is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. The Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants in Pilot Study 2

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M (SD)</i>
Education Level			
Primary or Secondary School Graduate	0	0	
High School Graduate	4	12.9	
Undergraduate Student	2	6.5	
Bachelor's Degree	10	32.3	
Master or PhD Student	6	19.4	
Master's Degree or PhD	2	6.5	
Missing	7	22.6	
City			
Metropolis	20	64.5	
City	3	9.7	
District	0	0	
Village	1	3.2	
Missing	7	22.6	
Marital Status			
Married	8	25.8	
Not married, in a relationship	3	9.7	
Single	12	38.7	
Other	1	3.2	
Missing	7	22.6	
Employment Status			
Employed	20	64.5	
Unemployed	4	12.9	
Missing	7	22.6	
SES (1 = bottom of the ladder, 10 = top of the ladder)	24	77.4	5.21 (1.62)
Religiosity (1 = not at all religious, 7 = very religious)	24	77.4	3.46 (1.89)
Political Orientation (1 = left, 7 = right)	24	77.4	3.67 (1.97)

### 2.2.1.2 Procedure

The online study was designed via Qualtrics software (Version December 2021, Provo, UT). Participants were informed that they would be attending a pilot study that aimed to assess materials that will be used in another study. They were told that they would be reading some short scenarios from daily life and then answering the questions related to these scenarios.

At the very beginning of the study, participants were asked to indicate their gender since only male participants were going to be included. Before reading the scenarios, participants were given the information that every single incident takes

place between a male and a female colleague who doesn't have a close relationship. It was also emphasized that each scenario is independent of one another. Each participant was presented with 13 scenarios in a random order. Each scenario was followed by two questions about participants' perceptions of the sexual harassment cases and an open-ended question asking them to explain their ratings. Finally, participants were asked to fill out the demographic information form. All materials are provided in Appendix C.

### 2.2.1.3 Measures

#### 2.2.1.3.1 Sexual harassment scenarios

To assess participants' perceptions of sexual harassment, I adapted the ambiguous sexual harassment scenarios that were used in previous studies (Terpstra & Baker, 1987; Toker, 2003). For example, in her study Toker (2003) only included the descriptions of behaviors; however, I turned them into vignettes for this study. In a similar vein, while Terpstra and Baker (1987) named characters in their vignettes as "Ms. X and Mrs. X", I identified victims and perpetrators with random Turkish male and female names (e.g., Ali and Ayşe; Can and Büşra). All scenarios take place between a female and a male coworker at the work context.

Although the vignettes were composed of a continuum of behaviors that changed in severity, the frequency of behaviors was held constant by describing them with adverbs such as "constantly" and "frequently". Besides, the reactions of the females were not explicitly told to make the scenarios as ambiguous as possible. Participants were only informed that although women involved in the incidents implied that they feel uncomfortable, male perpetrators didn't cease the behavior.

The explanation was included to avoid participants' over-justification of the behaviors, arguing that the perpetrator didn't know the behavior was "unwanted".

#### 2.2.1.3.2 Perceptions of sexual harassment

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they consider each case as sexual harassment (on a 7-point Likert-type scale; 1 = definitely not harassment, 4 = unsure, 7 = definitely harassment). Instead of "sexual harassment", the "harassment" term was used to avoid participants from focusing on the sexual nature of behavior only. <sup>1</sup>

#### 2.2.1.3.3 Agreement with victims

Participants were asked to indicate extent to which they think the woman is right to feel uncomfortable in her situation (1 = definitely not right, 4 = unsure, 7 = definitely right).

#### 2.2.1.3.4 Explanations of sexual harassment judgments

Participants were asked to provide justifications of their ratings with one open-ended question at the end of each scenario.

---

<sup>1</sup> Researchers defined sexual harassment as "a verbal or physical behavior of sexual nature that is unwelcome by the victim and that tends to interfere with the recipient's work" (Dall'Ara, & Maass, 2000, p. 682). Harassment, on the other hand, is used as an umbrella term that includes any behavior "related to the sex of a person" that is unwanted and violating. (European Parliament and of the Council, 2002, "Article 1," para. 4). Nonetheless, these terms are often used interchangeably in the literature on sexual harassment (e.g., Dall'Ara, & Maass, 2000; Maass et al., 2003).

## 2.2.2 Results

### 2.2.2.1 Perceptions of sexual harassment

The overall mean score on this item (across all scenarios) have shown that participants perceived the incidents as highly sexually harassing ( $min = 1$ ,  $max = 7$ ,  $M = 5.85$ ,  $SD = 1.23$ ). Furthermore, separate scores for each scenario were also higher than 4 (see Appendix D for separate mean scores for each scenario in descending order).

### 2.2.2.2 Agreement with victims

Participants highly agreed with women in scenarios to feel uncomfortable ( $min = 1$ ,  $max = 7$ ,  $M = 6.30$ ,  $SD = .67$ ). This applied to all scenarios as separate scores for each scenario were also higher than 4.

### 2.2.2.3 Explanations of sexual harassment judgments

Most of the participants gave answers that were parallel to their ratings on sexual harassment questions, providing explanations why they labeled the case as sexual harassment. A large majority of participants stated that as the woman implied her discomfort, the case should be considered as sexual harassment. Some of the reasonings behind participants' judgments are as follows:

Zeynep may be right to feel uncomfortable, she may not want such intimate behaviors, but Selim might be doing this as a sign of sincerity. However, I think it is harassment since Selim knows Zeynep's discomfort and he continues. (Participant 5, Scenario 6)

Regardless of the severity of the incident, even if I wouldn't consider this behavior as harassment at first when Ali commits it, I think it is harassment as he continues after Ayşe showed her discomfort. (Participant 14, Scenario 1)

Furthermore, for every single scenario, there was a few participants who did not perceive the behavior as harassment and provided justifications.

### 2.2.3 Discussion

Through pilot study 2, I aimed to choose the ambiguous sexual harassment incidents that resembles real-life cases by focusing on Turkish context. However, the scenarios were not distinguished from each other in terms of being perceived as harassment. In fact, all of them were classified as harassment by most of the participants. Therefore, the scores of participants on each scenario were inconsequential to choose the subtle forms of sexual harassment. Given the participants' answers to the open-ended question, this might result from the fact that in all scenarios the behavior was obviously unwanted such that the woman revealed her discomfort. Therefore, I modified the scenarios that would be used in the main study in a way it would be harder for participants to interpret if the behavior was undesirable and opposed by female characters. The phrase "she shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation" was replaced with more implicit forms of rejection for all scenarios. For example, in Scenario 8 where the woman receives unwanted calls, it was re-written that "although she doesn't answer the calls". As I changed this expression, the following question that assessed agreement with the victim to feel uncomfortable was also revised. The new question asked if she would be right to report the situation to her boss. This question was applicable to all scenarios since incidents occur at work context.

Parallel to literature, scenarios including physical contact and explicit sexual interest ("sexual hostility") were rated as sexual harassment to a greater extent. Interestingly, participants rated the scenario in which a male calls his female

colleague with intimate words such as “my baby” and “my dear” as the most harassing. This might be due to the Turkish word “*yavrum*” which has a similar meaning to “my baby”; however, “*yavrum*” has more negative connotations in a way it implies sexuality, and it is more disrespectful. Thus, this scenario (Scenario 13) was removed from the main study.

Providing evidence for previous cultural explanation, a similar scenario (Scenario 9) in which a male calls a female colleague “sweetheart” and underestimates her work-related ideas, was perceived as sexual harassment the least. This might be also interpreted that Turkish men do not classify forms of gender discrimination as sexual harassment. Likewise, a former study has shown that Turkish women did not put sexist behaviors under the category of sexual harassment while those from the USA did (Toker, 2016b). Thus, I excluded Scenario 9 from the main study as it might be perceived as a form of discrimination rather than sexual harassment. The results of pilot study 2 also point out the need for culture-specific sexual harassment scenarios to investigate people’s perceptions of sexual harassment.

It is also worth noting that, as it was shown in a former study of Toker (2003), although people do not label the sexist hostility as harassment, they might still find it highly disturbing. Consistent with this finding, in this study, participants’ mean scores on perceptions of sexual harassment for each scenario were always lower than their scores on agreement with victims. In other words, even if participants did not perceive the situation as harassment, they still evaluated the woman in the scenario as right to feel uncomfortable. To sum up, people might occasionally decide to not to call an incident as harassment regardless of the disturbance it might cause.

Finally, I excluded scenarios that are corresponding to one another in terms of their contents to decrease the number of scenarios. Scenario 7, for instance, was similar to Scenario 4, describing disturbing gazes of a man to a female colleague while Scenario 6 and Scenario 1 were both portraying an unwelcomed physical contact. Thus, I eliminated the ones with higher means (Scenario 6 and Scenario 7). Finally, the remaining 9 scenarios were included in the main study with above-mentioned revisions.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHOD

#### 3.1 Participants

While there were 422 answers recorded for this study, the final sample consisted of 227 participants after omitting participants who do not meet the inclusion criteria.

The data exclusion procedure followed is explained below. Whereas 42 participants did not indicate their ages, the age of those who answered the question ranged between 19 to 77 ( $M_{Age} = 36.03$ ,  $SD_{Age} = 13.71$ ). The sociodemographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 3.

Participation to this study was based on full voluntariness. The online study link was distributed on different Facebook groups which were devoted to cities, neighborhoods, hobbies and so on. In addition to that, I recruited participants through my personal contacts, asking them to share the link with potential participants. Likewise, volunteer undergraduate assistants working at Boğaziçi University Social Psychology Lab spread the study link by posting it on Facebook or WhatsApp groups and distributing study posters in their neighborhoods. Critically, the study link was not sent to circle of friends and to specific groups which might be already sensitive to gender equality (e.g., WhatsApp groups of universities, LGBTI+ groups, feminist groups etc.) to reach community sample. As an incentive, people were told that they would have a chance to participate in a lottery where three participants would receive 100 TL worth coupon from Migros supermarket. They were also informed that to be able to attend to lottery they had to fill in the e-mail question.

Table 3. The Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants in the Main Study

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M (SD)</i>
Education Level			
Primary or Secondary School Graduate	5	2.2	
High School Graduate	19	8.4	
Undergraduate Student	35	15.4	
Bachelor's Degree	101	44.5	
Master or PhD Student	27	11.9	
Master's Degree or PhD	12	5.3	
Missing	28	12.3	
City			
Metropolis	139	61.2	
City	31	13.7	
District	24	10.6	
Village	5	2.2	
Missing	28	12.3	
Marital Status			
Married	80	35.2	
Not married, in a relationship	49	21.6	
Single	64	28.2	
Other	6	2.6	
Missing	28	12.3	
Employment Status			
Employed	127	55.9	
Unemployed	72	31.7	
Missing	28	12.3	
SES (1 = bottom of the ladder, 10 = top of the ladder)	199	87.7	5.62 (1.77)
Religiosity (1 = not at all religious, 7 = very religious)	199	87.7	3.01 (1.83)
Political Orientation (1 = left, 7 = right)	199	87.7	2.96 (1.75)

### 3.1.1 Data exclusion criteria

#### 3.1.1.1 Gender

During the distribution of the study link, it was emphasized that only men would be able to participate in the study. In the beginning of the study, participants were required to indicate their gender. Out of 422, 21 participants who indicated their gender as woman, four participants who indicated their gender as another gender identity<sup>2</sup> and three participants who preferred not to answer this question were

<sup>2</sup> Four participants who have chosen "other gender identity" option was also provided with an open-ended question to indicate their gender identity; nonetheless, none of them answered to this question.

thanked and directed to the end of the survey. Furthermore, 16 people left the study without answering to this question. Remaining 378 male participants continued to the survey.

#### 3.1.1.2 Survey completion rate

Participants were asked to indicate their e-mail to be able to participate in the lottery and to receive the debriefing form in case of leaving the study. Out of 378 male participants remaining, 76 participants left the survey without answering this question. After this stage, 102 participants left the study in different parts of the survey. Out of 102 participants who did not fully complete the survey 30 participants were included in further analyses as they answered at least one question of sexual harassment, leaving 230 cases.

#### 3.1.1.3 Attention checks

After manipulation and control passages, participants were given two questions to determine if they had carefully read the texts. Similar to pilot study 1, they were asked to choose the sentence best summarizes the passage and fill in the blank in the heading of the passage. Out of 110 participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition, 12 participants answered one of the attention check questions inaccurately. While one participant answered both questions wrong, one participant did not answer none of them. Out of 120 participants in the control group, seven participants answered one of the attention check questions inaccurately while two participants did not answer one of the questions. Only one participant did not answer any of them. In total, one participant who couldn't answer any of the questions correctly and two

participants who did not provide any answers at all were excluded from the further analyses, leaving 227 cases.

### 3.2 Procedure

The study was developed through Qualtrics software (Version December 2021, Provo, UT) and distributed online. Before the study, necessary ethical permissions were taken from Ethics Committee for Master and PhD Theses in Social Sciences and Humanities Participants at Boğaziçi University, Istanbul (see Appendix A). The study consisted of two groups (gender hierarchy threat group vs. control group) with a between-subjects design. Participants were randomly assigned either to the gender hierarchy threat condition ( $n_{\text{threat}} = 108$ ) or to the control condition ( $n_{\text{control}} = 119$ ).

Participants were required to read and accept the informed consent form that provided information about the nature of the study. Participation was voluntary and confidentiality was guaranteed. Information about the aim of the study was withheld from the participants until the end of the study in order not to affect participants' answers. Participants were told the cover story that the study aimed to investigate the link between people's perceptions of different news articles and their evaluations on some social issues. At the very beginning of the study participants indicated their gender. Following this question, participants were asked to indicate their e-mail addresses to participate in the lottery or to receive the debriefing form in case of not completing the study. After providing their e-mail addresses, they were asked to choose a random number from one to five following the procedure used by Şahin (2021). Parallel to the cover story, they were informed that the topic of the following articles and questions would be assigned based on the number they had selected. In fact, they were randomly assigned either to the gender hierarchy threat

group or to the control group. Participants in the gender hierarchy threat group read an experimental manipulation passage about increasing gender equality whereas those in the control group read an irrelevant control passage on a methane gas emission. Following the experimental passages, they were instructed to answer attention check questions. As main dependent measure, participants were presented with nine ambiguous sexual harassment scenarios, and asked questions about those. The scenarios were given in a random order to each participant. Then, they were given the questionnaire package including control variables (hostile sexism, benevolent sexism) and moderator variables (perceived threat to manhood, gender identity strength). The order of presentation of scales was counter-balanced and scale items were randomized. Finally, they were asked to fill the demographic information form at the end of the study, and they were fully debriefed about the true nature of the study through debriefing form that were explained in pilot study 1.

### 3.2.1 Experimental manipulation

Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions that are gender hierarchy threat and control. Both manipulation and control passages were designed to look as if they were taken from a newspaper website. Those who were assigned to gender hierarchy threat group read the revised version of the passage that was explained in pilot study 1 (see Appendix E for the passages and the questions). The passage that was presented with the banner “women are gaining power at business world” summarized the results of an ostensible survey that investigated the ideals of young people living in Turkey. The manipulated statistics stated that, parallel to increased female representation in labor force, young women’s future expectations were transformed in a way that they prioritize their career and independency over

marriage. Furthermore, the potential consequences of this transformation were conveyed as if these were responses of random Turkish citizens to street interviews. The ostensible quotations highlighted negative implications of women's empowerment on family structure such as women's reluctance to get married and increased rates of divorce as well as the need for men's engagement in counter-stereotypical gender roles at home. On the other hand, those in the control group read an irrelevant news article about methane gas emission. The article which was taken from a news website (Aktan, 2021) was shortened and simplified for the study. After reading passages, participants in both conditions answered two attention check questions about the content of the passage. Finally, they were asked one-item question to rate negative implications of the advances summarized in the passage for society.

### 3.3 Measures

The survey was administered in Turkish, and the adapted versions were already available for all scales.

#### 3.3.1 Perceptions of sexual harassment

Participants' perceptions of sexual harassment were measured through nine ambiguous short scenarios of sexual harassment including a female victim and a male harasser (see Appendix F for the scenarios and the questions). Most of the scenarios were taken from previous studies (Terpstra & Baker, 1987; Toker, 2003), and revised as explained in pilot study 2. After reading each scenario, participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they consider the case as sexual harassment (on a 7-point Likert-type scale; 1= definitely not harassment, 4= unsure,

7= definitely harassment). Similarly, they rated the extent to which they think woman is right to report the situation to their boss (1 = definitely not right, 4 = unsure, 7 = definitely right). Participants' scores on these questions for each scenario was averaged to achieve two final scores: perceptions of sexual harassment and agreement with victims. As the scores on those two items were highly correlated ( $r = .78, p < .001$ ) mean score of these two questions were used as a composite score of sexual harassment perceptions ( $\alpha = .89$ ). Finally, participants provided explanations for their ratings on an open-ended question.

### 3.3.2 Hostile and benevolent sexism

I measured participants' levels of hostile and benevolent sexism as control variables. I used the short version of Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) that was originally developed by Glick and Fiske (1996), focusing on two subscales of hostile and benevolent sexism separately. The short version 12-item scale (originally 22 items) was formed by Glick and Whitehead (2010) by selecting high-loading items from an extensive study that included thousands of participants living in 19 different countries (Glick, P. et al., 2000). In a further study, it was shown that the short version of ASI is highly reliable (Rollero et al., 2014). The scale was adopted to Turkish by Sakallı-Uğurlu in 2002. The scale consists of two subscales that are hostile sexism ( $\alpha = .81$ ) and benevolent sexism ( $\alpha = .78$ , see Appendix G), including 6 items each. Higher scores on each 7-point subscale indicated higher levels of benevolent or hostile sexism.

### 3.3.3 Gender identity strength (GIS)

I used four-item identity subscale of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) to measure participants' identification levels with male identity as a moderator variable ( $\alpha = .61$ , Appendix H). The scale was adapted to Turkish in order to assess gender identity by Şahin and Soylu-Yalçinkaya (2020). The 7-point Likert type scale ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. The first and third items were reverse coded (e.g., "Overall, being a man has very little to do with how I feel about myself"). Higher scores on this scale showed greater levels of identification with gender identity.

### 3.3.4 Perceived threat to manhood (PTM)

I used The Threat from Subordination to Women subscale of Perceived Threat to Manhood Scale (PTMS) that developed by Türkoğlu (2013) to measure men's perceptions of masculinity threat as a moderator variable ( $\alpha = .82$ , Appendix I). The scale consists of 15 hypothetical situations that might pose threat to manhood and participants are asked to indicate their level of discomfort for each (on a 7-point Likert-type scale; 1 = not uncomfortable at all, 4 = not sure, 7 = extremely uncomfortable). Higher scores on this scale indicated greater levels of perceived threat to manhood from subordination to women.

### 3.3.5 Demographic information

Through demographic information form, which was given at the end of the study, participants' information of age, education level, employment status, residency background, and relationship status were gathered (see Appendix J for all demographic questions). To determine their socio-economic status, they were asked

to choose a point on 10-point ladder that best represents their socio-economic status (1 = bottom of the ladder, 10 = top of the ladder; Adler et al., 2000). Their religiosity (1 = not at all religious, 7 = very religious) and political orientation (1 = left, 7 = right) were assessed through a single item question.

### 3.3.6 Comments

At the end of the survey, participants were asked to share their comments about the study (“While you were filling out the questionnaire, was there anything that bothered you or strange about our study?”). The question was also used to assess if participants were suspicious about the true aim of the study.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

Descriptive statistics and correlations for study variables are shown in Table 4.

#### 4.1 Hierarchical multiple regression

To test study hypotheses, I conducted hierarchical multiple regression by using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 25). The analyses were held in two steps. In the first step, I entered the control variables which were shown to be related to sexual harassment perceptions in the literature (age, religiosity, political orientation, hostile and benevolent sexism), while in the second step I assessed the effects of the manipulation and moderator variables (GIS and PTMS) on SH perceptions, controlling for other variables.

Before the main analyses, I have conducted independent-samples t-tests using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 25) to examine if participants' scores on HS, BS, GIS, and PTMS were affected by the manipulation. Thus, firstly I checked assumptions of t-test. The assumption of normality was violated as values for Shapiro-Wilk's test were significant for all scales ( $p < .05$ ). Furthermore, I checked normality histograms, normal G-G plots, skewness, and kurtosis statistics for each scale. Participants' scores on HS, BS and GIS were slightly right-skewed while those on PTMS were highly right-skewed. On the other hand, the score distribution on SH perceptions were moderately left-skewed. Nonetheless, as the sample size was large enough for two conditions, the violation of normality might be tolerated (Field, 2009). When influential cases are checked, no outliers were spotted for scores on HS, BS, and GIS ( $|Z \text{ scores}| < 3.29$ ).

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Sexual Harassment Perceptions	227	5.88	.97									
2. Hostile Sexism	201	3.46	1.40	-.19**	--							
3. Benevolent Sexism	201	3.45	1.52	-.02	.46	--						
4. Ambivalent Sexism	201	3.45	1.25	-.12	.84	.87	--					
5. Gender Identity Strength	201	3.85	1.39	-.11	.28	.21	.29	--				
6. Perceived Threat to Manhood	204	1.73	.74	-.15*	.32	.15*	.27	.24	--			
7. Age	185	36.03	13.71	-.13	.18*	.28	.27	-.05	-.04	--		
8. Religiosity	199	3.01	1.83	.03	.34	.37	.41	.26	.30	.07	--	
9. Political Orientation	199	2.96	1.75	-.01	.18*	.21	.26	.18	.20	-.08	.56	--

\*\*\* $p < .001$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \* $p < .05$ .

On the contrary, there was an outlier on SH perceptions and were four outliers on PTMS ( $|Z \text{ scores}| > 3.29$ ). In addition to that, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met as Levene's test for all variables were insignificant.

The analyses indicated that manipulation did not have an effect on participants' scores on BS ( $t(199) = -.15, p = .88, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.46, .39]$ ), HS ( $t(199) = 1.19, p = .24, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.16, .63]$ ), GIS ( $t(199) = -.88, p = .38, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.56, .22]$ ) and PTMS ( $t(202) = -.12, p = .91, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.22, .19]$ ). On the other hand, the manipulation had a significant effect on participants' scores on the one-item question ("Might the situation summarized in the passage have negative implications for society?"); ( $t(225) = 7.75, p < .001, 95\% \text{ CI } [1.56, 2.60]$ ). Participants in the control condition ( $M = 4.62, SD = 2.15$ ) scored higher than those in the gender hierarchy threat condition ( $M = 2.55, SD = 1.86$ ). Finally, participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition did not differ from those in the control condition on their in sexual harassment perceptions,  $t(225) = -.19, p = .94, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.28, .23]$ .

Prior to the main analyses, I also checked assumptions of multiple regression based on Field (2009). The scatterplots showed that the assumption of linearity between the study variables and dependent variable was met. There was no multicollinearity between study variables according to collinearity diagnostics (VIF  $< 10$ , Tolerance  $> .100$ ). The values of residuals were independent from each other as it was interpreted by Durbin-Watson statistics. The scatterplots of residuals and P-P plots showed that the assumption of homoscedasticity and residual normality was met. Finally, no multivariate outliers were spotted by the calculation of Mahalanobis distance.

I employed the procedure recommended by Aiken and West (1991) to test research hypotheses through hierarchical multiple regression. I centered the continuous study variables (HS, BS, GIS, PTMS). Then, I multiplied moderator variables with experimental condition to receive interaction terms. To Model 1, I entered the control variables that are participants' age, religiosity, political orientation, hostile and benevolent sexism. In Model 2, I added independent variable, experimental condition (gender hierarchy threat = 1, control = 0), moderator variables (PTMS and GIS) and possible two-way interactions between these variables and the manipulation. Model statistics are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Analyses for Sexual Harassment Perceptions

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> Adj
Model 1						
Constant	6.12	.25		24.24	.05	.03
Age	-.01	.01	-.12	-1.57		
Religiosity	.04	.05	.08	.88		
Political Orientation	-.01	.05	-.01	-.14		
Hostile Sexism [HS]	.14	.06	.22	2.60		
Benevolent Sexism [BS]	-.06	.05	-.09	-1.09		
Model 2						
Constant	6.14	.26		23.56	.08	.03
Age	-.01	.01	-.14	-1.84		
Religiosity	.06	.05	.11	1.20		
Political Orientation	-.01	.05	-.01	-.14		
Hostile Sexism [HS]	.11	.06	.16	1.84		
Benevolent Sexism [BS]	-.06	.05	-.10	-1.18		
Gender Hierarchy Threat	-.04	.13	-.02	-.27		
Gender Identity Strength [GIS]	.11	.07	.17	1.48		
Perceived Threat to Manhood [PTM]	.07	.14	.06	.50		
Gender Hierarchy Threat x PTM	.15	.19	.08	.78		
Gender Hierarchy Threat x GIS	-.09	.10	-.10	-.95		

The results showed that Model 1 did not explain significant variance in perceptions of sexual harassment,  $F(5, 179) = 2.03, p = .08, R^2 = .05, R^2_{Adj} = .03$ . Furthermore, group of study variables added to Model 2 did not significantly contribute to the variance explained,  $F_{Change}(5, 174) = 1.02, p = .41, R^2 = .08, R^2_{Adj} = .03$ . In the first model, only participants' levels of hostile sexism positively predicted their scores on perceptions of sexual harassment ( $p = .01$ ). None of the other predictors in models significantly predicted perceptions of sexual harassment ( $ps > .05$ ).

To sum up, contrary to Hypothesis 1, controlling for other study variables, participants in the gender hierarchy threat condition did not score lower in perceptions of sexual harassment than those in the control condition ( $p > .05$ ). Furthermore, to the contrary to Hypothesis 2, the effect of manipulation was not larger for participants' who scored higher in PTMS ( $p > .05$ ). Likewise, the results did not support the Hypothesis 3 as the manipulation did not affect sexual harassment judgments of participants who scored higher on GIS ( $p > .05$ ).

#### 4.2 Explanations of sexual harassment judgments

Participants scale ratings on sexual harassment perceptions were followed by a short open-ended question to understand how people explain their judgments on the ambiguous sexual harassment cases. The above-mentioned findings of qualitative measures showed that participants overall did not tolerate the sexual harassment cases. In other words, most of the participants' means for both labeling sexual harassment and agreement with victim were higher than midpoint of the 7-interval scale (1 = definitely not harassment, 4 = unsure, 7 = definitely harassment; 1 = definitely not right, 4 = unsure, 7 = definitely right; see Table 6 for ratings on each scenario).

Table 6. Participants' Ratings on Sexual Harassment Scenarios in the Main Study

Number	Scenarios	SH Perceptions	
		<i>n</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>
1	Burak often makes suggestive remarks to his colleague Kübra, which shows his personal interest (For example, "I would like to be with a nice woman like you"). Although Kübra ignores these words, Burak continues his behavior.	215	5.72(1.65)
2	Kemal stares at Ayla, who sits at a work desk opposite of him, while she is working. Although Ayla averts her eyes, Kemal continues this behavior.	216	5.65(1.60)
3	Murat often makes sexual jokes to Zehra when they came across during lunch break at work. Although Zehra does not laugh at these jokes, Murat continues this behavior.	212	6.29(1.22)
4	Ali brings coffee to his colleague Ayşe's desk almost every morning and pats her shoulder sincerely. Although Ayşe draws herself back, Ali continues this behavior.	217	6.41(1.11)
5	Ahmet finds the social media profile of his colleague Fatma and often texts her to meet outside of work. Although Fatma does not answer those messages, Ahmet continues to text her.	218	5.92(1.46)
6	Mustafa frequently calls Leyla late in the evening, using work as an excuse, and tries to open a chat. Although Leyla does not answer his calls situation, Mustafa continues his behavior.	216	6.22(1.18)
7	Can often insists on driving Büşra home after work. Although Büşra rejects Can's offer, Can continues his behavior.	211	5.71(1.52)
8	Especially on the days when Elif wears a dress, Ömer goes to her after work to say that such feminine clothes suit her very well and that she should dress like this more often. Although Elif ignores these comments, Ömer continues his comments.	215	5.20(1.93)
9	Mehmet often implies to Selin that by using her femininity, she can gain some privileges at work, for example, that she can get rid of the jobs she doesn't want to do. Although Selin ignores these comments, and do not respond him, Mehmet continues his comments.	213	5.98(1.51)

Therefore, I grouped participants into two, according to their ratings on two sexual harassment questions as follows: low tolerance for sexual harassment (mean score on sexual harassment questions is higher than 4), high tolerance for sexual harassment (mean score on sexual harassment questions is equal to or lower than 4).<sup>3</sup> Themes emerged in participants responses did not differ as a function of their experimental condition; thus, the conditions were collapsed while reporting subsequent results. Participants in low tolerance group mostly reported that making a woman uncomfortable with unreciprocated interest is more than enough to call the case harassment and she is right to report to a supervisor. For example, one participant explained his ratings as follows:

Burak may be interested in Kübra as a woman and show this to her. However, if the woman is not interested and ignoring him, the relationship should be terminated. These behaviors of Burak will constitute harassment after a while. Such situations encountered in business life should also be reported to the relevant authority. (Participant 66, Scenario 1, Q1 = 6, Q2 = 7)

Of course, he can send a message stating that he wants to meet once. This is very normal. However, if these messages continue even though one (she) has made it clear that she does not want it, then it is harassment. She does not necessarily have to say “no” to indicate that she does not want it. (Participant 54, Scenario 5, Q1 = 7, Q2 = 6)

Although participants in low tolerance group perceived the incident as sexual harassment overall, they sometimes scored lower on Question 2, in which the woman reports the situation to her boss. They argued that the woman should have talked to the male colleague about the situation rather than directly making a complaint.

---

<sup>3</sup> Mean scores were calculated by averaging participants scores on sexual harassment questions (Q1 and Q2). High tolerance and low tolerance groups differed across scenarios as grouping was made based on participants' scores on each scenario separately. Middle point of scale (4 = unsure) was grouped as high tolerance based on participants' answers to open-ended questions.

The reason why I gave 5 points to the first question is that maybe Ali could not notice her discomfort. However, persistently continuing the same behavior is, of course, harassment. The reason why I answered question as 2 is that Ayşe should have talked about this situation with Ali first and stated that she did not like such contact and gestures. If she thinks it will backfire, she could have asked a mutual friend. If the situation does not change, of course, she should call the higher authorities.

(Participant 42, Scenario 4, Q1 = 5, Q2 = 2)

Finally, participants in low tolerance group sometimes described the events as humiliating, abusive, and labeled them as verbal harassment, psychological harassment, or gender discrimination. Sample answers as follows:

These comments that commodify women and emphasize that they are sexual objects are definitely forms of verbal and psychological harassment. Thus, they should be reported to the boss.

(Participant 54, Scenario 9, Q1 = 6, Q2 = 7)

It is a type of gender discrimination at the workplace, suggesting the use of femininity in the described incident cannot be morally tolerated, and the suggestion that femininity is used to have privileges at work should also be considered as harassment.

(Participant 208, Scenario 9, Q1 = 7, Q2 = 7)

Later, I focused on the answers of high tolerance participants to understand justifications of sexual harassment cases for each scenario. Although answers differed for separate scenarios regarding the nature of the event, some themes became prominent while men reasoning why incident should not be labeled as harassment and the woman has no right to inform their boss. Participants in the high tolerance group, for example, indicated that the response of the woman were not explicit enough for man to understand her discomfort. Although most of the high-tolerance participants agreed with the fact that behaviors might be disturbing, they still refrained from labeling them as harassment by reading the intentions of male perpetrator positively. Especially in scenarios that included insinuation of interest

(e.g., Scenario 1, Scenario 5, Scenario 8), participants in high tolerance group evaluated the behavior as attempts of flirting and complimenting. Sample answers as follows:

If Fatma is disturbed by the texts that Ahmet sent her, she should have blocked him. She did nothing to prevent it but didn't reply. If he continues although Fatma states that she doesn't like the texts, then it would be a harassment.

(Participant 106, Scenario 5, Q1 = 1, Q2 = 1)

Burak reveals his feelings. Kübra does not signal any discomfort. Even if Kübra was offended, Burak does not have to understand this, as she does not take any action against it. For example, for this specific case, Burak might have thought Kübra is too shy to give any response to his compliments. With this assumption, it is not possible to say that Burak is a harasser.

(Participant 123, Scenario 1, Q1 = 1, Q2 = 1)

Where in the world is it harassment to say that the dress suits you? The reason why he said it especially on the days when she wore a dress is that Ömer really thinks that the dress suits Elif.

(Participant 148, Scenario 8, Q1 = 1, Q2 = 1)

He may have really wanted to compliment, or he may have an intention of marriage.

(Participant 126, Scenario 8, Q1 = 4, Q2 = 4)

Participants who hesitated to call the incident as harassment reported that they need more information such as the relationship status of the parties, the relationship between parties (e.g., if they were close), the frequency of behavior and so on. However, even for the same scenario, lack of information led some participants to consider the case as harassment that must be reported while for others it was the opposite.

It's clearly harassment. This is a masculine act based on causing discomfort to the other person. Moreover, its persistence shows that the situation has become serious.

(Participant 150, Scenario 2, Q1 = 7, Q2 = 7)

To describe it as harassment, a higher potential danger or physical harm is necessary. Otherwise, behaviors that might be labeled as harassment would be too extensive and this assessment would not be meaningful and significant.

(Participant 128, Scenario 2, Q1 = 3, Q2 = 4)

Finally, some participants' ratings on sexual harassment questions and their answers to open-ended questions were inconsistent. For instance, participants who stated their indecisiveness during the rating were found to score higher on qualitative questions.

It is difficult to comment as under which conditions the behavior has occurred is uncertain. Maybe Ayla didn't want to look at that moment or couldn't focus. Maybe she is shy. Just because she's looking away doesn't mean she's uncomfortable. The phrase "often" does not clearly indicate frequency. Does he do this in every 15 minutes, once in a day or every day?

(Participant 197, Scenario 2, Q1 = 5, Q2 = 6)

I think it might mean different things depending on the situation. If joke is made in a group setting, I'm not so sure it could be labeled as harassment. However, if the joke was targeting Zehra this can be classified as harassment. Likewise, if this happens only within a private conversation between them, the case might be harassment. Before Zehra tells this situation to her boss, she can openly state that she does not like these jokes and wants him to not to make them again. If Murat is still making these jokes, Zehra is right to bring the situation to her boss. (Participant 92, Scenario 3, Q1 = 6, Q2 = 6)

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

In the scope of my thesis, I examined men's perceptions of sexual harassment in the face of gender hierarchy threat. I predicted that although men do not directly report their negative feelings towards advances in gender equality, they might engage in threat-compensation through underrating sexual harassment cases. For that purpose, participants were randomly assigned either to the control or the gender hierarchy group. Gender hierarchy threat was composed of an implication of social change that threatens men's advantaged status in hierarchical gender relations. This threat especially pointed out a shift in gender norms through which male dominance is maintained and reproduced.

The current study results showed that men's perceptions of sexual harassment were not influenced by the experimental manipulation of social change. Moreover, the effect of manipulation did not differ for those who were more prone to threats from subordination of women and had a stronger gender identity. Likewise, contrary to previous literature, men's perceptions of sexual harassment were not predicted by their age, levels of religiosity, benevolent sexism and political orientation. Only the level of hostile sexism predicted men's perceptions of sexual harassment, controlling for other study variables. However, participants who adopted hostile sexist beliefs to a greater extent showed less tolerance for sexual harassment, which was inconsistent with the existing literature. Participants' perceptions of sexual harassment were measured through nine scenarios. The results have shown that participants interpreted most of the incidents as harassment and approved women's complaint to the superior. Although mean scores were quite high, there was some variability

across scenarios regarding harassment perceptions. Hence, I also conducted multiple regression analyses separately for each scenario to explore if the most and the least harassing scenarios cancel out the effect of manipulation on harassment perceptions, yet I found no significant results.

One reason why participants' sexual harassment perceptions did not differ as a function of their experimental condition might be the overall high ratings on sexual harassment questions. The previous findings showed that the classification of an incident as sexual harassment depends on many factors such as the relationship between the harasser and harassed, the job status (whether the harasser is a colleague or a supervisor), the context where the incident happened, and so on (Dougherty et al., 1996). In this study, however, I kept those variables constant across scenarios and did not mention too many specific details about victims and harassers to make it more open to interpretation. Parallel to that, participants' answers to open-ended questions showed that they had a hard time evaluating sexual harassment cases due to a lack of contextual information. However, this did not lead them to tolerate sexual harassment, even in response to the gender hierarchy threat. There might be several reasons why most of the participants' perceived scenarios as harassment. Firstly, I might have failed to compose sexual harassment scenarios ambiguous enough to be affected by the manipulation. Despite the modifications made based on results of the pilot study 2, the overall ratings on sexual harassment questions were again higher than midpoint of the scale. As all the scenarios given in the study represented an example of sexual harassment, men's sensitivity to behaviors might have increased. Secondly, the words chosen in sexual harassment questions might have affected participants' ratings. Participants were asked the extent to which they labeled the case as "harassment" rather than "sexual harassment" to prevent them

from focusing on the sexual aspect of behavior alone. Turkish Language Institute (*Türk Dil Kurumu*, TDK) defines harassment (*taciz*) as “to disturb, to distress”. Therefore, this word choice might have led participants to classify any undesired behavior as harassment, by considering women’s signs of uncomfortableness. Finally, participants’ evaluations might have been affected by cultural codes organizing interactions between men and women. Some participants indicated that they need to know whether the woman is married or in a relationship to be able to interpret sexual harassment cases appropriately. Turkey is characterized as an honor culture in which women’s honor and chastity are seen under the responsibility of men (Özgür & Sunar, 1982). This might have led men to consider the relationship status of women before making sexual harassment judgments. In a similar vein, participants in this study might have highly disapproved behaviors of the male employees since harassing a woman also means disrespecting another men’s (e.g., woman’s husband, brother, etc.) honor. Further studies should investigate the socio-cultural aspects of sexual harassment in honor cultures as well as the relationship between masculine honor beliefs and perceptions of sexual harassment. Especially, men’s perceptions may be investigated in a scenario where an ex-boyfriend or husband commits a sexual harassment, which might contain greater ambiguity.

I selected perceptions of sexual harassment as an outcome variable, being inspired by ongoing debates on social media. Whenever an accusation of sexual harassment is publicly made, there are always two groups of people with opposite views arguing whether the behavior constitutes of sexual harassment. Women are usually blamed for being “too sensitive” and misunderstanding men’s innocuous behaviors (Quinn, 2002, p. 386).

I especially focused on sexual harassment at work context since it is not only a symbolic reaction to women in power but also seriously undermines women's job performance (Chan et al., 2008). In this study, participants' sexual harassment perceptions were composed of two dimensions that are classification of the incident as sexual harassment and agreement with the female victim. In the second question, participants were asked if the female colleague would be right to report the male perpetrator to their boss. This question might have differed from the first question, including a serious threat to man in the scenario, such as getting a penalty or being fired. One study, for example, documented that participants tended to blame the female victim more when the perpetrator of sexual assault was at the risk of being arrested (Chapleau & Oswald, 2013). On the contrary, experimental manipulation did not affect participants' ratings on this question either. Nonetheless, some participants differed in their ratings on two sexual harassment items. When their answers to the open-ended question were examined, despite acknowledging the behavior constitutes harassment, they indicated that it is not severe enough to report to the superior or the woman needs to talk to the male coworker first. I also examined participants' explanations for each scenario to gain a deeper understanding of how the same incident might have been perceived differently. Interestingly, several participants for each scenario justified the behavior to not label the case as harassment. Although these findings weakened my suspicion that failing to find a significant effect of manipulation on sexual harassment ratings was due to unambiguity of the scenarios, I should note that even the least harassing scenario was perceived as harassment by most participants.

Another reason why participants' harassment judgments were not affected by the manipulation might be that the gender hierarchy threat passage was not effective

enough to raise feelings of threat. I switched the control passage to an irrelevant article and modified the threat passage based on pilot study 1. However, I was not able to pilot the new passages. Moreover, as another restriction of the study which is in common with other threat-compensation studies (Branscombe et al., 1999), I was not able to explicitly ask participants the extent to which they feel threatened by the transformation summarized in the threat passage. Rather, I asked them if they would consider the implications of progress in the gender equality harmful for men or for society. I assumed that men would more easily reflect their threat feelings by justifying their irritation through negative aspects of women's empowerment. Similarly, in the main study, I did not include any precise measure to compare participants' threat perceptions between the control and the gender hierarchy conditions as I used an irrelevant control passage.<sup>4</sup> Similar to results of the pilot study 1, participants did not evaluate the developments in gender equality negatively. Although I did not aim to compare threat perceptions of participants across experimental conditions, results showed that control passage was perceived as highly negative for society. However, since the control passage illustrated the information about methane gas emission and global warming, participants' negative ratings cannot be conceptualized as feelings of threat resulting from status threat. Lastly, participants did not comment on the content of the passages on the final open-ended question.

Finally, the gender hierarchy threat passage summarizing significant progress in gender equality and its implications might have worked differently than I expected. To put simply, participants in this study might have acknowledged and complied to new gender dynamics and social norms rather than perceiving them as a

---

<sup>4</sup> In the main study, I asked participants to rate the negative implications of advances summarized in the passage only for society, not for men.

threat to the system. Although system justification theory posits that people are motivated to preserve the status quo, current systems are also subjected to constant change (Friesen et al., 2018). Thus, people might rearrange their perceptions of “what things should be” (injunctive norms) according to changing social norms displaying “the way things are” (descriptive norms; Friesen et al., 2018, p. 10). The process of accepting descriptive norms as injunctive norms was named injunctification in the literature (Kay et al., 2009). In one study for example, participants read either an experimental manipulation passage indicating that there are many women politicians in their country now (*many women condition*) or a passage reporting that women are still underrepresented in politics (*few women condition*). The results showed that participants in the many women condition supported women’s participation to politics more than those in the few women condition on relevant questions (e.g., “To what extent do you believe that it is ideal to have women Members of Parliament?”), especially when they were reminded of the fact that they are highly dependent on the governmental systems. In other words, they evaluated the situation which matches the norm they were given more positively. However, it is worth noting that all participants in this study were female. In another study, the information of women’s increased participation in high-status occupations led to increased positive ratings of other women who occupied in these positions among female participants, while it was the opposite for male participants. To sum up, although previous findings illustrated that changing gender norms might be especially empowering for women, their effects on men’s adaptation to the system still call for further research.

Apart from these, the study had several more limitations. First of all, the socio-demographic characteristic of the sample might have been too restricted to

capture the effect of manipulation on participants' perceptions of sexual harassment. Participants' mean scores were 3.01 on religiosity question (1 = not at all religious, 7 = very religious), and 2.96 on political orientation item (1 = left, 7 = right). Moreover, only 10.6% of the participants received degree lower than bachelor's and only 12.8% of them indicated they grew up in a district or a village. As the participants were well-educated, politically close to left-wing, and less conservative, they might not have perceived the implications of changing gender power dynamics negatively. Even though the true aim of the study was hidden, considering the sample is composed of people who voluntarily choose to participate in a scientific study, they might already be sensitive to gender equality issues. Supporting this claim, the scores on gender-ideology measures such as hostile sexism, perceived threat to manhood and gender identity strength were quite low among participants in both conditions. Furthermore, those variables, religiosity and political orientation, which have been documented to be linked to perceptions of sexual harassment, did not predict harassment ratings in this study. This might also be due to the low scores of participants on those measures. Future studies should include socio-demographically unrepresented groups of men by using different research methods such as focus-group interviews. Secondly, I had a limited time to recruit enough number of participants to achieve desired power. Previous studies examining men's threat responses in the face of social change reported small effect sizes (e.g., Morton et al., 2009). A post-hoc power analysis conducted using G\*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007) has shown that the study achieved .68 power to detect a small effect size ( $f^2 = .02$ ). The power analysis might be interpreted that the study was underpowered, considering the conventional value of high power is .80 (Cohen, 1988). In addition to that, the experimental manipulation might have worked better in a laboratory setting;

however, the study was designed online because of the pandemic conditions. Although I checked participants' engagement in passages through attention check questions, they might still have failed to think about and digest the information given. Finally, men might have hesitated not to call the incident harassment because of social desirability concerns. Especially for the last decade, gender equality and the feminist movement in Turkey have been drawing greater public attention due to the increased number of femicides and withdrawal from the İstanbul Convention (Mwaba et al., 2021). Furthermore, men might be already familiar with behaviors exemplifying sexual harassment thanks to massive campaigns such as the #MeToo movement held around the globe (Rothgerber et al., 2021) and "Susma Bitsin" in Turkey (Öztürk, 2020). Due to increased public awareness, besides being harassment perpetrator, failing to label a sexual harassment case might be equally forbidding. Further studies might measure the social desirability levels of male participants.

To conclude, results showed that none of the study hypotheses were supported. However, the study contributes to literature uniquely by investigating men's reactance to social change upon their perceptions of sexual harassment, which may hopefully inspire future studies. Furthermore, the manipulation was distinguished from the passages used in the literature as it illustrated not only women's rise in business life but also changing gender norm expectations at home. In precarious manhood literature, threats were conceptualized as the gender identity threat which usually included giving false feedback to male participants that they do not meet the standards of the ideal man, or they are dominantly feminine. On the other hand, I aimed to pose a threat that undermines men's power at systemic level. Although progress in gender equality was used as an experimental manipulation in a few studies (e.g., Maass et al., 2003, Morton et al., 2009), those threats were also

framed as gender identity threats. Likewise, manipulation articles used in the literature of system justification usually targeted country-level structures while the implications of threatening gender system were unaddressed. Furthermore, to my knowledge, no experimental study investigated perceptions of sexual harassment from threat-compensation perspective while there were only few studies from precarious manhood, focusing on sexual coercion and rape (e.g., Munsch & Willer, 2012; Chapleau & Oswald, 2013). The current study might urge researchers to investigate gender equality and its' possible consequences from the threat perspective. Although the study findings were inconclusive, participants' positive ratings of gender equality and higher perceptions of sexual harassment might be promising. Moreover, unlike the previous studies focusing on college students, my study's strength was to reach out community sample (only %15.4 undergraduate students). The study provided a piece of rich information about men's perspectives on sexual harassment as participants' answers to open-ended questions shed light on how reasonings are made. Furthermore, statistically insignificant findings reminded us of the multifaced nature of sexual harassment and the need to use both qualitative and quantitative methods to untangle how interpretations of sexual harassment are constructed.

## APPENDIX A

### ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

T.C.  
BOĞAZİÇİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER YÜKSEK LİSANS VE DOKTORA TEZLERİ ETİK İNCELEME  
KOMİSYONU  
TOPLANTI TUTANAĞI

Toplantı Sayısı : 17  
Toplantı Tarihi : 27.05.2021  
Toplantı Saati : 13:00  
Toplantı Yeri : Zoom Sanal Toplantı  
Bulunanlar : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yasemin Sohtorik İlkmen, Prof. Dr. Ebru Kaya, Prof. Dr. Fatma Nevra Seggie  
Bulunmayanlar :

Ilknur Yurtseven

Psikoloji

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Men's Perceptions of Ambiguous Sexual Harassment Cases Under Gender Hierarchy Threat Erkeklerin Taciz Algılarının Cinsiyet Hiyerarşisi Tehditi Altında İncelenmesi" başlıklı projeniz ile ilgili olarak yaptığımız SBB-EAK 2021/34 sayılı başvuru komisyonumuz tarafından 27 Mayıs 2021 tarihli toplantıda incelenmiş ve uygun bulunmuştur.

Bu karar tüm üyelerin toplantıya çevrimiçi olarak katılımı ve oybirliği ile alınmıştır. COVID-19 önlemleri kapsamında kurul üyelerinden ıslak imza alınmadığı için bu onam mektubu üye ve raportör olarak Ebru Kaya tarafından bütün üyeler adına e-imzalanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla, bilgilerinizi rica ederiz.

Prof. Dr. Ebru KAYA  
ÜYE

e-imzalıdır  
Prof. Dr.Ebru KAYA  
Raportör

SOBETİK 17 27.05.2021

Bu belge 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununun 5. Maddesi gereğince güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

## APPENDIX B

### EXPERIMENTAL PASSAGES AND QUESTIONS IN PILOT STUDY 1

#### Gender Hierarchy Threat Passage

İş Dünyasında ve Evde Cinsiyetler Arası Dengeler Kadınların Avantajına Değişiyor

*(The Gender Power Relations at Work and Home Are Changing to the Advantage of Women)*

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu'nun (TÜİK) düzenli olarak yayınladığı istihdam verileri, kadın ve erkeklerin iş gücüne katılım, kazanç ve statü açısından yıllar içinde konumlarının nasıl değiştiğini incelemeye olanak sağlıyor. TÜİK, 2020 istatistiklerini Ocak ayında yayınladı.

*(Employment data published regularly by the Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) allows to examine how the positions of women and men have changed over the years in terms of labor force participation, earnings, and status. TURKSTAT published its 2020 statistics in January.)*

Kadınların iş dünyasındaki gücü artıyor

*(The power of women at work is increasing)*

Rakamlar incelendiğinde 2000 yılında yüzde 23,1 olarak hesaplanan kadınların işgücüne katılım oranı 2020'de önemli ölçüde artarak yüzde 35'e ulaşmış durumda. Hanehalkı işgücü verilerine göre, 15 ve daha ileri yaştaki kadınların aktif çalışma süresi 2010 yılında 16 yıl iken 2020 yılında 19 yıla kadar yükseldi. 2000 ile 2020 yılları arasında maaşlardaki cinsiyete dayalı farkın azaldığı, bunun da liderlik pozisyonlarındaki kadın sayısındaki %14,3'lük artış ile ilintili olduğu saptandı.

*(When the figures are examined, the labor force participation rate of women, which was calculated as 23.1 percent in 2000, has increased significantly and reached 35 percent in 2020. According to household labor force data, the active working time of women aged 15 and over increased from 16 years in 2010 to 19 years in 2020. It was found that between 2000 and 2020, the gender gap in salaries decreased, which was associated with a 14.3% increase in the number of women in leadership positions.)*

Peki aile içi dengeler nasıl değişiyor?

*(So, how are the balances within families changing?)*

İstatistiksel veriler, kadınların iş dünyasındaki gücünün ve görünürlüğünün giderek arttığına işaret ediyor. Buna paralel olarak gençlerin gelecek planları ve beklentileri de dönüşmekte. KONDA'nın düzenli olarak üniversiteli gençlere uyguladığı "Türkiye'nin Gençleri" anketi, özellikle son on yıldır genç kadınların evlilik ve anne olmak gibi istekleri önceki nesillere kıyasla gittikçe daha az dile getirdiklerini

göstermişti. Genç kadınlar “iyi bir iş sahibi olmak” ve “kendi ayakları üstünde durmak” gibi hedefleri önceliklendiriyor; bununla birlikte aile yaşantısı ve ev içi sorumluluklarla ilgili beklentiler de hızla değişiyor. Ev işi ve çocuk bakımı gibi sorumlulukları eşleriyle eşit olarak paylaşabilecekleri bir düzen kurma yönünde beklentiler ifade eden genç kadınların yüzdesinde her yıl bir artış olduğu göze çarpıyor.

*(Statistical data point to the increasing power and visibility of women in the business world. In parallel with this, the future plans and expectations of young people are also transforming. The “Youth of Turkey” survey, regularly administered by KONDA to university students, showed that especially in the last ten years, young women have been less and less expressing their desires such as marriage and becoming a mother compared to previous generations. Young women prioritize goals such as “having a good job” and “standing on their own feet”; in addition to that, expectations regarding family life and domestic responsibilities are changing rapidly. The percentage of young women who express expectations of establishing an order in which they can share responsibilities such as housework and childcare equally with their spouses is increasing every year.)*

Bundan sonra ne olacak?

*(What will happen next?)*

Özellikle 2000’li yılların başından itibaren dünya genelinde olduğu gibi Türkiye’de de toplumsal düzen dönüşmekte. Kadınların iş hayatında aktif yer alışı ve liderlik pozisyonlarında temsilinin artmasıyla birlikte aile yaşantısında eşitlikçi beklentiler artacak ve dengeler değişmeye devam edecek gibi görünüyor.

*(Especially since the beginning of the 2000s, the social order has been transforming in Turkey as well as in the rest of the world. With the active participation of women in business life and the increase in their representation in leadership positions, it seems that egalitarian expectations in family life will increase, and the balances will continue to change.)*

## Control Passage

### İş Dünyasında Ve Evde Cinsiyetler Arası Dengeler Değişiyor

*(The Gender Power Relations at Work and Home Do Not Change)*

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu'nun (TÜİK) düzenli olarak yayınladığı istihdam verileri, kadın ve erkeklerin iş gücüne katılım, kazanç ve statü açısından yıllar içinde konumlarının nasıl değiştiğini incelemeye olanak sağlıyor. TÜİK, 2020 istatistiklerini Ocak ayında yayınladı.

*(Employment data published regularly by the Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) allows to examine how the positions of women and men have changed over the years in terms of labor force participation, earnings and status. TURKSTAT published its 2020 statistics in January.)*

### Erkekler iş dünyasında daha güçlü

*(Men are stronger in business)*

Rakamlar incelendiğinde 2000 yılında yüzde 23,1 olarak hesaplanan kadınların işgücüne katılım oranı 2020'de sadece yüzde 4'lük bir artışla yüzde 27,1'e ulaşmış durumda. Hanehalkı işgücü verilerine göre, 15 ve daha ileri yaştaki kadınların aktif çalışma süresi 2010 yılında 16 yıl iken 2020 yılında da sabit kaldı. 2000 ile 2020 yılları arasında maaşlardaki cinsiyete dayalı farkta ciddi bir değişme gerçekleşmediği, bunun da liderlik pozisyonlarındaki erkek sayısının kadınlara göre çok daha fazla olması ile ilintili olduğu saptandı.

*(When the figures are examined, the labor force participation rate of women, which was calculated as 23.1 percent in 2000, has reached 27.1 percent in 2020 with an increase of only 4 percent. According to household labor force data, the active working time of women aged 15 and over remained stable in 2020, while it was 16 years in 2010. It was determined that there was no significant change in the gender gap in salaries between 2000 and 2020, which is related to the fact that the number of men in leadership positions is much higher than that of women.)*

### Peki aile içi dengeler değişiyor mu?

*(So, how are the balances within families changing?)*

İstatistiksel veriler, kadınların iş dünyasındaki gücünün ve görünürlüğünün yıllar içerisinde önemli miktarda değişmediğine işaret ediyor. Gençlerin gelecek planları ve beklentileri de buna paralel olarak şekillenmekte. KONDA'nın düzenli olarak üniversiteli gençlere uyguladığı 'Türkiye'nin Gençleri' anketi, son on yıldır genç kadınların evlilik ve anne olmak gibi istekleri önceki nesiller kadar sık dile getirmeye devam ettiklerini göstermişti. Genç kadınların çoğu "iyi bir iş sahibi olmak" ve "kendi ayakları üstünde durmak" gibi hedefleri sonraki sıralarda dile getirirken ev işi ve çocuk bakımı gibi sorumlulukların büyük ölçüde kadınlar tarafından üstlenilmesi gerektiğini dile getirenler de çoğunluğu oluşturuyor.

*(Statistical data indicate that the power and visibility of women in the business world has not changed significantly over the years. The future plans and expectations of young people are shaped in parallel with this. The 'Youth of Turkey' survey, regularly administered by KONDA to university students, showed that for the last ten years, young women have continued to express their desires such as marriage and becoming a mother as frequently as previous generations. While most of the young women put goals such as "having a good job" and "standing on one's own feet" later, the majority of women stated that responsibilities such as housework and childcare should be undertaken by women to a large extent.*

Bundan sonra ne olacak?

*(What will happen next?)*

Özellikle 2000’li yılların başından itibaren dünya genelinde toplumsal düzen dönüşse de bazı dengeler süregeliyor. Türkiye’de de kadınların iş hayatına katılımı ve liderlik pozisyonlardaki temsili az miktarda değişme gösterse de aile yaşantısında kadın ve erkeklerin temel rollerinin nesilden nesle büyük ölçüde sabit kaldığı görülüyor.

*(Even though the social order has been transformed around the world, especially since the beginning of the 2000s, some balances continue. Although women's participation in business life and their representation in leadership positions in Turkey underwent a little change, it seems that the basic roles of women and men in family life have remained largely stable from generation to generation.)*

### Passage Questions

Lütfen okumuş olduğunuz haber metnini göz önünde bulundurarak aşağıdaki soruları cevaplandırınız.

*(Please answer the following questions, according to the news article you have read.)*

### Perceived plausibility of passages

1. Okumuş olduğunuz haberin içeriğini göz önünde bulundurduğunuzda, daha önce buna benzer bir haber okumuş muydunuz?

*(Considering the content of the news you have read, had you read a similar article before?)*

1) Evet (Yes) 2) Hayır (No) 3) Emin Değilim (Not Sure)

Attention check questions

2. Okumuş olduğunuz haberin başlığındaki boşluğu uygun şekilde tamamlayınız.

*(Fill in the blank in the title of the news article you have read.)*

İş Dünyasında ve Evde Cinsiyetler Arası Dengeler \_\_\_\_\_

*(The Gender Power Relations at Work and Home \_\_\_\_\_)*

1) Değişmiyor (*Do Not Change*)

2) Kadınların Avantajına Değişiyor (*Are Changing to The Advantage of Women*)

3. Okumuş olduğunuz haberin genel içeriği ve istatistikler göz önünde

bulundurulduğunda aşağıdakilerden hangisi verilen bilgileri en iyi şekilde özetler?

*(Considering the content of the news article you have read, which of the following best summarizes the information given?)*

1) Kadınların iş dünyasında ve evdeki gücü artıyor.

*(The power of women at work and home is increasing.)*

2) Kadınların iş dünyasında ve evdeki gücü kayda değer bir artış gösteremiyor.

*(The power of women at work and home does not increase significantly.)*

Questions of Threat Perceptions

1. Bu haberde özetlenen durumun toplumsal açıdan herhangi bir olumsuz sonucu olabilir mi?

*(Might the situation that was summarized in the passage have negative implications for society?)*

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Kesinlikle  
yok

Kararsızım

Kesinlikle  
var

*(Definitely not)*

*(Unsure)*

*(Definitely)*

2. Bu haberde özetlenen durumun erkekler için herhangi bir olumsuz sonucu olabilir mi?

*(Might the situation that was summarized in the passage have negative implications for men?)*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle yok			Kararsızım			Kesinlikle var
<i>(Definitely not)</i>			<i>(Unsure)</i>			<i>(Definitely)</i>

#### Questions of Affective Reactions

3. Bu haberde özetlenen durumdan ne derece hoşnutsunuz?

*(To what extent do you feel content about the situation that was summarized in the passage?)*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Çok az veya hiç			Kararsızım			Çok fazla
<i>(Not at all)</i>			<i>(Unsure)</i>			<i>(Very much)</i>

4. Bu haberde özetlenen durumdan ne derece rahatsızsınız?

*(To what extent do you feel uncomfortable about the situation that was summarized in the passage?)*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Çok az veya hiç			Kararsızım			Çok fazla
<i>(Not at all)</i>			<i>(Unsure)</i>			<i>(Very much)</i>

5. Okumuş olduğunuz haberin içeriği hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz? Size neler hissettirdi?

*(What do you think about the content of the news article you have read? What did it make you feel?)*

## APPENDIX C

### SEXUAL HARASSMENT SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONS IN PILOT STUDY 2

#### Sexual Harassment Scenarios

1. Ali neredeyse her sabah iş arkadaşı Ayşe'nin masasına kahve getiriyor ve omzunu samimi bir şekilde okşuyor. Ayşe bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse bile Ali bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Ali brings coffee to his colleague Ayşe's desk almost every morning and pats her shoulder sincerely. Even though Ayşe shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Ali continues this behavior.)*

2. Ahmet, iş arkadaşı Fatma'nın sosyal medya profilini buluyor ve kendisine iş dışında görüşmek için sıklıkla mesaj atıyor. Bu durumdan rahatsız olan Fatma, Ahmet'in mesajlarını cevapsız bıraksa da Ahmet kendisine mesaj atmaya devam ediyor.

*(Ahmet finds the social media profile of his colleague Fatma and often texts her to meet outside of work. Although Fatma, who is disturbed by this situation, leaves Ahmet's messages unanswered, Ahmet continues to text her.)*

3. Özellikle Elif'in elbise giydiği günlerde iş çıkışı yanına gelen Ömer, kendisine bu tarz kadınsı kıyafetlerin çok yakıştığını ve sık sık böyle giyinmesi gerektiğini söylüyor. Elif bu yorumlardan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Ömer yorumlarına devam ediyor.

*(Especially on the days when Elif is wearing a dress, Ömer goes to her after work to say that such feminine clothes suit her very well and that she should dress like this more often. Although Elif shows that she is uncomfortable with these comments, Ömer continues his comments.)*

4. Kemal iş yerinde karşı masasında oturan Ayla'ya çalışırken gözlerini dikerek uzun uzun bakıyor. Ayla bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse bile Kemal bu davranışı sık sık yapmaya devam ediyor.

*(Kemal stares at Ayla, who sits at a work desk opposite of him, for a long time while she is working. Even if Ayla shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Kemal continues to do this behavior frequently.)*

5. Murat, iş yerinde öğle arasında karşılaştıklarında Zehra'ya sık sık cinsel içerikli şakalar yapıyor. Zehra bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Murat bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Murat often makes sexual jokes to Zehra when they came across during lunch break at work. Although Zehra shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Murat continues this behavior.)*

6. Selim işle ilgili bazı bilgiler paylaşmak üzere Zeynep'in masasına geldiği zamanlarda kolunu Zeynep'in omzuna atarak konuşuyor. Zeynep bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Selim bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(When Selim comes to Zeynep's desk to share some information about the work, he puts his arm around Zeynep's shoulder during the talk. Although Zeynep shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Selim continues this behavior.)*

7. İş ile ilgili görüşmek üzere Kerem'in odasına giden Aslı, konuşurken Kerem'in bakışlarının sık sık vücuduna kaydığını fark ediyor. Aslı bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Kerem bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Aslı, who goes to Kerem's room to talk about the work, realizes that Kerem's gaze often shifts to her body while talking. Although Aslı shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Kerem continues this behavior.)*

8. Mustafa, Leyla'yı akşam geç saatlerde işi bahane ederek sık sık arayıp sohbet açmaya çalışıyor. Leyla bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Mustafa bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Mustafa calls Leyla late in the evening, using work as an excuse, and tries to open a chat. Although Leyla shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Mustafa continues this behavior.)*

9. Pelin iş yerinde bazı fikirler öne sürdüğünde Mert ona 'tatlım' diye hitap edip fikirlerini hafife alan ifadeler kullanıyor. Pelin bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Mert bu davranışa devam ediyor.

*(When Pelin comes up with some ideas at work, Mert calls her 'sweetie' and uses expressions underestimating her ideas. Although Pelin shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Mert continues this behavior.)*

10. Mehmet, Selin'e sık sık kadınlığını kullanarak iş yerinde yükselebileceğine ve daha başarılı olabileceğine dair imalarda bulunuyor. Selin bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Mehmet bu imalarına devam ediyor.

*(Mehmet often implies Selin that she can rise and become more successful at work by using her femininity. Although Selin shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Mehmet continues his insinuations.)*

11. Can, iş çıkışında Büşra'ya kendisini eve bırakmak için sık sık ısrar ediyor. Büşra, Can'ın bu teklifini reddetse de Can bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Can often insists on driving Büşra home after work. Although Büşra rejects Can's offer, Can continues this behavior.)*

12. Burak, iş arkadaşı Kübra'ya sıklıkla kişisel ilgisini belli eden imalı laflar ediyor (Örneğin; "Senin gibi hoş bir kadınla birlikte olmak isterdim" gibi). Kübra bu laflardan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Burak bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Burak often makes suggestive remarks to his colleague Kübra, which shows his personal interest (For example, "I would like to be with a nice woman like you").*

*Although Kübra shows that she is uncomfortable with these words, Burak continues this behavior.)*

13. Berke, Merve'ye iş yerinde sıklıkla "canım", "güzelim", "yavrum" gibi hitaplarda bulunuyor. Merve bu durumdan rahatsız olduğunu belli etse de Berke bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Berke often addresses Merve at work, such as "my dear", "my sweetheart", "my baby". Although Merve shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Berke continues this behavior.)*

#### Perceptions of Sexual Harassment Questions

1. Yukarıda belirtilen olayı taciz olarak değerlendirir misiniz?

*(Do you consider the above-mentioned incident as harassment?)*

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

Kesinlikle  
taciz değil

Kararsızım

Kesinlikle  
taciz

*(Definitely not harassment)*

*(Unsure)*

*(Definitely harassment)*

2. Ayşe (*senaryodaki kadının ismi*)'yi bu durumdan rahatsız olmakta haklı buluyor musunuz?

*(Do you think Ayşe is right to feel uncomfortable in this situation?)*

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7

Kesinlikle  
haksız

Kararsızım

Kesinlikle  
haklı

*(Definitely not right)*

*(Unsure)*

*(Definitely right)*

3. Ltfen cevaplarınızın nedenini kısaca aıklayınız.

*(Please briefly explain reasons for your answers.)*

## APPENDIX D

### PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT SCENARIOS IN THE PILOT STUDY 2

Number	Scenarios	Perceptions		Agreement	
		<i>n</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>	<i>M(SD)</i>
13	Berke often addresses Merve at work, such as "my dear", "my sweetheart", "my baby". Although Merve shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Berke continues this behavior.	28	6.36 (.99)	6.64 (.62)	
12	Burak often makes suggestive remarks to his colleague Kübra, which shows his personal interest (For example, "I would like to be with a nice woman like you"). Although Kübra shows that she is uncomfortable with these words, Burak continues this behavior.	25	6.32 (1.22)	6.48 (1.16)	
7	Aslı, who goes to Kerem's room to talk about the work, realizes that Kerem's gaze often shifts to her body while talking. Although Aslı shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Kerem continues this behavior.	24	6.29 (.10)	6.46 (1.10)	
6	When Selim comes to Zeynep's desk to share some information about the work, he puts his arm around Zeynep's shoulder during the talk. Although Zeynep shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Selim continues this behavior.	26	6.23 (1.11)	6.58 (.81)	
5	Murat often makes sexual jokes to Zehra when they came across during lunch break at work. Although Zehra shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Murat continues this behavior.	25	6.20 (1.50)	6.64 (.81)	
10	Mehmet often implies Selin that she can rise and become more successful at work by using her femininity. Although Selin shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Mehmet continues his insinuations.	25	6.12 (1.39)	6.52 (.92)	
2	Ahmet finds the social media profile of his colleague Fatma and often texts her to meet outside of work. Although Fatma, who is disturbed by this situation, leaves Ahmet's messages unanswered, Ahmet continues to text her.	27	6.07 (1.57)	6.19 (1.55)	

4	Kemal stares at Ayla, who sits at a work desk opposite of him, while she is working. Even if Ayla shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Kemal continues to do this behavior frequently.	25	6.04 (1.34)	6.20 (1.50)
8	Mustafa frequently calls Leyla late in the evening, using work as an excuse, and tries to open a chat. Although Leyla shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Mustafa continues this behavior.	27	6.00 (1.44)	6.19 (1.44)
1	Ali brings coffee to his colleague Ayşe's desk almost every morning and pats her shoulder sincerely. Even though Ayşe shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Ali continues this behavior.	27	6.00 (1.62)	6.22 (1.37)
11	Can often insists on driving Büşra home after work. Although Büşra rejects Can's offer, Can continues this behavior.	27	5.44 (2.01)	6.26 (1.48)
3	Especially on the days when Elif wears a dress, Ömer goes to her after work to say that such feminine clothes suit her very well and that she should dress like this more often. Although Elif shows that she is uncomfortable with these comments, Ömer continues his comments.	24	5.25 (1.75)	5.71 (1.81)
9	When Pelin comes up with some ideas at work, Mert calls her “sweetheart” and uses expressions underestimating her ideas. Although Pelin shows that she is uncomfortable with this situation, Mert continues this behavior.	25	4.28 (1.99)	5.24 (1.76)

## APPENDIX E

### EXPERIMENTAL PASSAGES AND QUESTIONS IN THE MAIN STUDY

#### Gender Hierarchy Threat Passage

##### Kadınlar İş Dünyasında Güçleniyor

*(Women Are Gaining Power at Business World)*

TÜİK verileri kadınların iş dünyasındaki gücünün ve görünürlüğünün her on yılda giderek yükselen bir hızla arttığına işaret ediyor. Buna paralel olarak gençlerin gelecek planları ve beklentileri de dönüşmekte. KONDA'nın üniversiteli gençlerle iki yılda bir gerçekleştirdiği "Türkiye'nin Gençleri" anketi çerçevesinde gençlere gelecek idealleri soruluyor. 2021 yılı anket sonuçları, özellikle genç kadınların ideallerinde bir değişime işaret ediyor. Genç kadınlar, evlilik ve anne olmak gibi istekleri önceki nesillere kıyasla gittikçe daha az dile getiriyor. Genç kadınlar arasında "iyi bir iş sahibi olmak" ve "kendi ayakları üstünde durmak" gibi hedefleri ifade edenlerin oranı ise son yıllara göre ciddi bir yükseliş göstererek %66'ya ulaşmış durumda. Bununla birlikte aile yaşantısı ve ev içi sorumluluklarla ilgili beklentiler de hızla değişiyor. Genç erkeklerin büyük bir kısmı ev idaresi ve çocuk bakımıyla ilgili sorumlulukları eşlerinden beklediklerini ifade ederken, genç kadınlar arasında ise eşlerin sorumlulukları eşit olarak paylaşması gerektiğine dair görüşlerdeki artış dikkat çekiyor.

*(TURKSTAT data indicate that the power and visibility of women in the business world is increasing rapidly every decade. In parallel with this, the future plans and expectations of young people are also transforming. Young people are asked about their future ideals within the scope of the "Youth of Turkey" survey that KONDA conducts biennially with university students. The results of the 2021 survey point to a shift in ideals, especially for young women. Young women are less and less expressing their wishes for marriage and motherhood than in previous generations. The rate of young women who express goals such as "having a good job" and "standing on their own feet" has reached 66%, showing a significant increase compared to recent years. However, expectations regarding family life and domestic responsibilities are also changing rapidly. While a large majority of young men state that they expect their spouses to take responsibility for housekeeping and childcare, the increase in views among young women that spouses should share responsibilities equally draws attention.)*

Toplumsal dönüşümle ilgili görüşlerini vatandaşa sorduk.

(We asked the citizens about their opinions on social transformation.)

"Boşanmalar arttı"

*(Divorce rates are increased)*

66 yaşındaki esnaf Ahmet Yıldız istatistikler ile ilgili görüşünü dile getirdi: “Kadınlar çalışsın tabii ama, zaten işsizlik var, erkekler bile iş bulup evlerini geçindiremiyor. Etrafımızda boşanmalar da çok arttı. Sanki aile düzeni bozuluyor. Gençler anlaşamayınca hemen ayrılıyor, olan çocuklara oluyor.”

*(Ahmet Yıldız, a 66-year-old tradesman, expressed his opinion on statistics: “Women should work, of course, but there is already unemployment, even men cannot find a job and maintain their household. Divorces have also increased a lot. It's like the family order is breaking down. When the young people do not get along, they leave immediately, it affects the children.”)*

“Çocuk büyütme en zor iş”

*(“Raising a child is the hardest job”)*

54 yaşındaki ev hanımı Hanife Gül, “Çalışmak güzel tabii ama çocukları annenin büyütmesi lazım. Biz çocuklarımızı kendimiz büyüttük, her şeyleriyle ilgilendik. Bundan daha önemli bir şey var mı, bakıcıyla anne bir olur mu? Evi çekip çevirmek, çocukları büyütme en zor iş.” şeklinde konuştu.

*(54-year-old housewife Hanife Gul said, “Working is good, but the mother has to raise the children. We raised our children ourselves, we took care of everything. Is there anything more important than that, baby-sitter and the mother are not the same. Taking care of the house and raising the children is the hardest job.” she said.)*

“Önce kariyer sonra evlilik”

*(“Career first, then marriage”)*

33 yaşındaki avukat Selin Kocatepe anket sonuçları ile ilgili düşüncelerini: “Artık evlenip çocuk bakmak kadınların tek ideali değil. Çevremdeki kadınlar kariyer sahibi olmak, bağımsız olmak için çalışıyor. Evlenmek, evde oturup çocuk bakmak... Bunlar bana çok uzak geliyor. Ancak sorumluluklar eşit bölüşülecekse evlilik olabilir.” şeklinde ifade etti.

*(Selin Kocatepe, a 33-year-old lawyer, expressed her opinions on the results of the survey: “Marriage and childcare are no longer the only ideal of women. The women around me are working to have a career, to be independent. Getting married, staying at home and taking care of children... These seem very distant to me. But marriage can be acceptable if the responsibilities are shared equally.”)*

## Control Passage

İki milyar inekten çıkan metan gazı nasıl önlenecek?

*(How will methane gas from two billion cows be prevented?)*

İnekler yemyeşil bir merada çimleri yerken huzurlu ve zararsız görünebilir. Ancak durum böyle değil. Her inek her gün küresel iklim değişikliğine neden olan en güçlü sera gazlarından biri olan metan salıyor. Hem geçirdiklerinde hem de gaz çıkardıklarında karbondioksit molekülünden yaklaşık 25 kat daha zararlı metan molekülleri atmosfere salınıyor. Hayvancılık, küresel insan kaynaklı sera gazı emisyonlarının %12'sinden sorumlu ve bu nedenle metan karbondioksitten sonra en çok salınan ikinci sera gazı. Ancak metan, atmosferde sadece 12 yıl kaldığı için önlem alındığı takdirde değişimin olumlu etkileri çok hızlı görülmeye başlanabilir. Dolayısıyla, metan emisyonlarını büyük ölçüde azaltmak, önümüzdeki on yıllarda küresel ısınmadan beklenen zararı azaltmada büyük bir etkiye sahip olabilir.

*(Cows can seem peaceful and harmless while eating grass in a lush pasture. However, this is not the case. Every day, every cow release methane, one of the most potent greenhouse gases causing global climate change. Both when they burp and gasp, about 25 times more harmful methane molecules than carbon dioxide molecules are released into the atmosphere. Livestock is responsible for 12% of global anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions, and therefore methane is the second most emitted greenhouse gas after carbon dioxide. However, since methane stays in the atmosphere for only 12 years, positive effects of change can begin to be seen very quickly if precautions are taken. Thus, drastically reducing methane emissions could have a major impact in reducing the expected damage from global warming in the coming decades.)*

Alınabilecek tedbirlerle ilgili bilim insanlarının görüşleri şu şekilde:

*(The opinions of scientists about the measures that can be taken are as follows)*

“Maske metan emisyonunu yarı yarıya azaltıyor”

*(“The mask reduces methane emission by half”)*

Bir İngiliz firması ile ortak olan ABD tarım devi Cargill, ineklerin burun deliklerini kapatan bir maske formu geliştirdi. Cihaz, metanı filtreleyerek karbondioksite dönüştürüyor. Firma başkanı Ghislain Boucher, ilk sonuçların "ilginç" olduğunu söyledi ve verdiği demeçte, "Metan emisyonları yarı yarıya azaldı" dedi.

*(In partnership with a British firm, US agriculture giant Cargill has developed a form of mask that covers cows' nostrils. The device filters methane into carbon dioxide. "Methane emissions have been cut in half," said firm president Ghislain Boucher, who said the initial results were "interesting".)*

Deniz yosunu işe yarar mı?

*(Does sea algae work?)*

Tartışılan bir başka yöntem de ineklere deniz yosunu yedirmek. Bu yılın başlarında yayınlanan ve metan emisyonlarını yüzde 80'den fazla azaltabileceğini belirten bir ABD çalışmasına göre, inek yemine kırmızı deniz yosunu eklemek emisyonları azaltmak adına ciddi potansiyele sahip. California Davis Üniversitesi'ndeki araştırmacılar, sonuçların tekrarlanabilmesi durumunda, kırmızı deniz yosununun büyük miktarlarda, tercihen tarım alanlarının yakınında yetiştirilmesi gerektiğini söylüyor.

*(Another method being discussed is to feed the cows seaweed. Adding red seaweed to cow feed has significant potential to reduce emissions, according to a US study published earlier this year that said it could reduce methane emissions by more than 80 percent. Researchers at the University of California Davis say red seaweed should be grown in large quantities, preferably near farmland, if the results are to be replicated.)*

“Davranış ve diyet değişikliği daha etkili”

*(“Behavior and diet change are more effective”)*

Mayıs ayında Birleşmiş Milletler Çevre Programı tarafından hazırlanan bir raporda şu ifadeler yer alıyor: "Davranış değişikliği, gıda israfını ve kaybını azaltmak, hayvancılık yönetimini iyileştirmek ve sağlıklı diyetlerin (vejetaryen veya daha düşük et ve süt içeriğine sahip) benimsenmesi, önümüzdeki birkaç on yılda metan emisyonlarını yılda 65-80 milyon ton azaltabilir."

*(A report by the United Nations Environment Program prepared in May states: "Behavior change, reduction of food waste and loss, improving livestock management and adopting healthy diets (vegetarian or with low meat and dairy content) can reduce 65-80 million tons methane emissions per year over the next few decades.")*

## Gender Hierarchy Threat Passage Questions

Lütfen okumuş olduğunuz haber metnini göz önünde bulundurarak aşağıdaki soruları cevaplandırınız.

*(Please answer the following questions, according to the news article you have read.)*

1. Okumuş olduğunuz haberin başlığındaki boşluğu uygun şekilde tamamlayınız.

*(Fill in the blank in the title of the news article you have read.)*

Kadınlar iş dünyasında \_\_\_\_\_

*(Women are \_\_\_\_\_ power at business world)*

1) güçleniyor (*gaining*) 2) zayıflıyor (*losing*)

2. Aşağıdakilerden hangisi okuduğunuz haberde verilen bilgileri en iyi şekilde özetler?

*(Considering the content of the news article you have read, which of the following best summarizes the information given?)*

1) Kadınların iş dünyasında gücü arttıkça evdeki kadın-erkek rolleri değişiyor.

*(As women's power in the business world increases, the roles of men and women at home are changing.)*

2) Evdeki kadın-erkek rolleri yıllar içinde pek değişmiyor.

*(The roles of men and women at home do not change much over the years.)*

3. Bu haberde özetlenen durumun toplumsal açıdan herhangi bir olumsuz sonucu olabilir mi?

*(Might the situation that was summarized in the passage have negative implications for society?)*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle yok			Kararsızım			Kesinlikle var
<i>(Definitely not)</i>			<i>(Unsure)</i>			<i>(Definitely)</i>

### Control Passage Questions

1. Okumuş olduğunuz haberin başlığındaki boşluğu uygun şekilde tamamlayınız.

*(Fill in the blank in the title of the news article you have read.)*

İki milyar inekten çıkan metan gazı nasıl \_\_\_\_\_

*(How will methane gas from two billion cows be \_\_\_\_\_)*

1) önlenecek? *(prevented)* 2) arttırılacak? *(increased)*

2. Aşağıdakilerden hangisi okuduğunuz haberde verilen bilgileri en iyi şekilde özetler?

*(Considering the content of the news article you had read, which of the following best summarizes the information given?)*

1) Küresel ısınma göz önünde bulundurulduğunda ineklerden çıkan metan gazının tehlikeli sonuçları olabilir.

*(Considering global warming, methane gas from cows can have detrimental consequences.)*

2) Küresel ısınmaya yol açan diğer faktörler değerlendirildiğinde, ineklerden çıkan metan gazına karşı önlem almaya gerek yoktur.

*(Considering other factors that cause global warming, there is no need to take precautions against methane gas from cows.)*

3. Bu haberde özetlenen durumun toplumsal açıdan herhangi bir olumsuz sonucu olabilir mi?

*(Might the situation that was summarized in the passage have negative implications for society?)*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle yok			Kararsızım			Kesinlikle var
<i>(Definitely not)</i>			<i>(Unsure)</i>			<i>(Definitely)</i>

## APPENDIX F

### SEXUAL HARASSMENT SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONS IN THE MAIN STUDY

#### Sexual Harassment Scenarios

1. Burak, iş arkadaşı Kübra'ya sıklıkla kişisel ilgisini belli eden imalı laflar ediyor. (Örneğin; "Senin gibi hoş bir kadınla birlikte olmak isterdim" gibi). Kübra bu sözleri duymazlıktan gelse de Burak davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Burak often makes suggestive remarks to his colleague Kübra, which shows his personal interest (For example, "I would like to be with a nice woman like you").*

*Although Kübra ignores these words, Burak continues his behavior)*

2. Kemal iş yerinde karşı masasında oturan Ayla'ya sık sık gözlerini dikerek uzun uzun bakıyor. Ayla gözlerini kaçırsa da Kemal bu davranışa devam ediyor.

*(Kemal stares at Ayla, who sits at a work desk opposite of him, while she is working.*

*Although Ayla averts her eyes, Kemal continues this behavior)*

3. Murat, iş yerinde öğle arasında her karşılaştıklarında Zehra'ya cinsel içerikli şakalar yapıyor. Zehra bu şakalara gülmese de Murat bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Murat often makes sexual jokes to Zehra when they came across during lunch break at work. Although Zehra does not laugh at these jokes, Murat continues this*

*behavior.)*

4. Ali neredeyse her sabah iş arkadaşı Ayşe'nin masasına kahve getiriyor ve omzunu samimi bir şekilde okşuyor. Ayşe kendini geri çekse de Ali bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Ali brings coffee to his colleague Ayşe's desk almost every morning and pats her shoulder sincerely. Although Ayşe draws herself back, Ali continues this behavior.)*

5. Ahmet, iş arkadaşı Fatma'nın sosyal medya profilini buluyor ve kendisine iş dışında görüşmek için mesaj atmaya başlıyor. Fatma, Ahmet'in mesajlarını cevapsız bıraksa da Ahmet kendisine mesaj atmaya devam ediyor.

*(Ahmet finds the social media profile of his colleague Fatma and often texts her to meet outside of work. Although Fatma does not answer those messages, Ahmet continues to text her.)*

6. Mustafa, Leyla'yı akşam geç saatlerde işi bahane ederek sık sık arayıp sohbet açmaya çalışıyor. Leyla telefonlara cevap vermese de Mustafa bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Mustafa frequently calls Leyla late in the evening, using work as an excuse, and tries to open a chat. Although Leyla does not answer his calls situation, Mustafa continues his behavior.)*

7. Can, iş çıkışında Büşra'ya kendisini eve bırakmak için teklifte bulunup ısrar ediyor. Büşra, Can'ın teklifini reddetse de Can bu davranışına devam ediyor.

*(Can often insists on driving Büşra home after work. Although Büşra rejects Can's offer, Can continues his behavior.)*

8. Özellikle Elif'in elbise giydiği günlerde iş çıkışı yanına gelen Ömer, kendisine bu tarz kadınsı kıyafetlerin çok yakıştığını ve sık sık böyle giyinmesi gerektiğini söylüyor. Elif bu yorumları duymazlıktan gelse de Ömer yorumlarına devam ediyor.

*(Especially on the days when Elif wears a dress, Ömer goes to her after work to say that such feminine clothes suit her very well and that she should dress like this more often. Although Elif ignores these comments, Ömer continues his comments.)*

9. Mehmet, Selin'e sık sık kadınlığını kullanarak iş yerinde bazı ayrıcalıklar elde edebileceğine, mesela yapmak istemediği işlerden sıyrılabileceğine dair imalarda

bulunuyor. Selin bu yorumları duymazlıktan gelip cevap vermese de Mehmet bu imalarına devam ediyor.

*(Mehmet often implies to Selin that by using her femininity, she can gain some privileges at work, for example, that she can get rid of the jobs she doesn't want to do. Although Selin ignores these comments and do not respond him, Mehmet continues his comments.)*

### Perceptions of Sexual Harassment Questions

1. Yukarıda belirtilen olayı taciz olarak değerlendirir misiniz?

*(Do you consider the above-mentioned incident as harassment?)*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle taciz değil			Kararsızım			Kesinlikle taciz
<i>(Definitely not harassment)</i>			<i>(Unsure)</i>			<i>(Definitely harassment)</i>

2. Ayşe (*senaryodaki kadının ismi*) bu durumu patronuna bildirmiş olsaydı kendisini haklı bulur muydunuz?

*(If Ayşe had reported this to her boss, would you think she is right?)*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle haksız			Kararsızım			Kesinlikle haklı
<i>(Definitely not right)</i>			<i>(Unsure)</i>			<i>(Definitely right)</i>

3. Lütfen cevaplarınızın nedenini kısaca açıklayınız.

*(Please briefly explain the reason for your answers.)*

## APPENDIX G

### SHORT VERSION OF THE AMBIVALENT SEXISM INVENTORY

#### Hostile Sexism

1. Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindedir.

*(Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.)*

2. Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar.

*(Women exaggerate problems they have at work.)*

3. Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.

*(Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.)*

4. Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkeklere karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınır.

*(When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.)*

5. Erkeklerle cinsel yönden yaklaşılabılır olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.

*(Many women get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.)*

6. Feministler erkeklere makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.

*(Feminists are making unreasonable demands of men.)*

#### Benevolent Sexism

1. Birçok kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.

*(Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.)*

2. Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.

*(Women should be cherished and protected by men.)*

3. Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.

*(Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.)*

4. Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler.

*(Men are incomplete without women.)*

5. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.

*(Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.)*

6. Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.

*(Men should be willing to sacrifice their own wellbeing in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.)*

## APPENDIX H

### GENDER IDENTITY STRENGTH SCALE

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz ve her bir ifadeye katılma düzeyinizi 1 (Kesinlikle katılmıyorum) ve 7 (Kesinlikle katılıyorum) arasında bir rakam işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

*(Please read the following statements carefully and indicate to what extent you agree with each item by marking a number between 1 (Strongly disagree) and 7 (Strongly agree).)*

Not: Ters kodlanan maddeler R ile gösterilmiştir.

*(Note: The reverse coded items are indicated with R.)*

1. Genel olarak, erkek olmanın kendime dair hislerime çok az etkisi var (R).

*(Overall, being a man has very little to do with how I feel about myself.)*

2. Erkek olmak kimliğimin önemli bir parçasıdır.

*(Being a man is an important reflection of who I am.)*

3. Erkek olmak nasıl bir insan olduğumla ilgili fikrim açısından önemsizdir (R).

*(Being a man is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am.)*

4. Genel olarak, erkek olmak benlik algımın önemli bir parçasıdır.

*(In general, being a man is an important part of my self-image.)*

## APPENDIX I

### THREAT FROM SUBORDINATION TO WOMEN SUBSCALE OF THE PERCEIVED THREAT TO MANHOOD SCALE (PTMS)

Aşağıda yaşantınız boyunca kendinizi içinde bulabileceğiniz bazı durumlar sıralanmıştır. Bu durumlar tarafınızdan yaşanmış veya yaşanmamış olabilir. Lütfen belirtilen durumların size ne ölçüde rahatsızlık verebileceğini düşünüp, 1'den (Hiç rahatsız hissetmem) 7'ye (Çok rahatsız hissederim) kadar verilmiş ölçekte her bir madde için size uygun numarayı işaretleyiniz.

*(There are some situations listed below that you may find yourself in throughout your life. These situations may or may not be experienced by you. Please indicate the extent to which the stated situations may cause you discomfort, by choosing appropriate number for each item on a scale from 1 [extremely comfortable] to 7 [extremely uncomfortable]).*

1. Eşinizin/sevgilinizin sizden daha iyi bir statüde çalışıyor olması

*(Having a wife/girlfriend who works in a higher status-job than you)*

2. Eşinizin/sevgilinizin sizden daha eğitilmiş olması

*(Having a wife/girlfriend who is educated better than you)*

3. Bir konuda başarısız olunca yardım istemek

*(Asking for help when you fail at something)*

4. Yakın çevrenizden bir kadının sizden daha zeki olduğunu göstermesi

*(A woman from your close circle showing that she is smarter than you)*

5. İş yerinde, bir kadının sizden daha başarılı olması

*(A woman being more successful than you at work)*

6. Hesabı eşinizin/sevgilinizin ödemesi  
*(Having your wife/girlfriend pay)*
7. Sizden daha başarılı biriyle beraber olmak  
*(Being with someone more successful than you)*
8. Karşı cinsten birinin durumu kontrol altına almasına izin vermek  
*(Letting someone of the opposite sex take control of the situation)*
9. Dikiş dikmek  
*(Sewing)*
10. Eve sizden sonra gelen eşinize yemeği hazırlamak  
*(Preparing the meal for your wife who comes home after you)*
11. Oyunda bir kadına mağlup olmak  
*(Being defeated by a woman in a game)*
12. Eşinizin/sevgilinizin sizden fazla kazanıyor olması  
*(Having a wife/girlfriend who earns more than you)*
13. Bir şeylerden korktuğunuzu dile getirmek durumunda kalmak  
*(To have to express that you are afraid of something)*
14. Ailenizi geçindirmek için eşinizin de çalışmasına ihtiyaç duymak  
*(Needing your wife to work to support your family)*
15. Eşiniz çalışırken çocuklara bakmak  
*(Taking care of the children while your wife is working)*

## APPENDIX J

### DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

1. Lütfen cinsiyetinizi belirtiniz.<sup>5</sup> (*Please indicate your gender identity.*) -
  - Kadın (*Woman*)
  - Erkek (*Man*)
  - Başka Bir Cinsiyet Kimliği (*Other gender identity (Please indicate)*)
  - Yanıtlamak istemiyorum (*I do not want to answer*)
2. Lütfen yaşınızı belirtiniz. (*Please indicate your age.*)
3. Lütfen ilişki durumunuzu belirtiniz. (*Please indicate your relationship status.*)
  - Evli (*Married*)
  - İlişkim var, evli değilim (*In a relationship, not married*)
  - Bekar (*Single*)
4. Lütfen eğitim durumunuzu belirtiniz. (*Please indicate your education level.*)
  - İlkokul/ortaokul mezunu (*Primary/secondary school graduate*)
  - Lise mezunu (*High school graduate*)
  - Lisans öğrencisi (*Undergraduate student*)
  - Lisans mezunu (*Bachelor's degree*)
  - Yüksek lisans/Doktora öğrencisi (*Master or PhD student*)
  - Yüksek lisans/Doktora mezunu (*Master degree or PhD*)

---

<sup>5</sup> Gender question was asked in the beginning of the study as only male participants were recruited.

5. Lütfen yaşamınızın büyük çoğunluğunu geçirdiğiniz yeri belirtiniz. (*Please indicate where you spent most of your life.*)

-Büyükşehir (*Metropol*)

-İl (*City*)

-İlçe (*District*)

-Köy (*Village*)

6. Ücretli bir işte çalışıyor musunuz? (*Are you working in a paid job?*)

-Evet

-Hayır

7. Türkiye'deki insanların sosyoekonomik düzeylerini temsil eden 10 basamaklı bir merdiven düşünün. Merdivenin en üst basamağında en yüksek sosyoekonomik düzeye; en yüksek maaşa, en iyi eğitim ve işe sahip kişiler var. Merdivenin en alt basamağında ise en düşük sosyoekonomik düzeye; en düşük maaşa, en kötü eğitim ve işe sahip kişiler var. Kendi sosyoekonomik düzeyinizi düşünürseniz, kendinizi bu merdivenin hangi basamağına yerleştirirsiniz?

*(Imagine a 10-step ladder that represents people's socioeconomic status in Turkey.*

*At the top of the ladder, there are people who have the highest socioeconomic status.*

*At the bottom of the ladder, there are people who have the lowest socioeconomic*

*status. When you consider your socioeconomic status, on which step of the ladder*

*would you place yourself?)*

-10 En üst basamak (*Best off*)

-9

-8

-7

-6

-5

-4

-3

-2

-1 En alt basamak (*Worst off*)

8. Kendinizi ne kadar dindar/inanan biri olarak tanımladığınızı belirtiniz.

*(Please indicate how religious you describe yourself as.)*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç dindar  
değilim

Çok  
dindarım

*(Not at all religious)*

*(Very religious)*

9. Lütfen politik olarak hangi ideolojiye daha yakın olduğunuzu belirtiniz.

*(Please indicate which political ideology you are closest to.)*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Sol

Sağ

*(Left)*

*(Right)*

## REFERENCES

- Adler, N. E., Epel, E. S., Castellazzo, G., & Ickovics, J. R. (2000). Relationship of subjective and objective social status with psychological and physiological functioning: Preliminary data in healthy, White women. *Health Psychology, 19*(6), 586-592. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.19.6.586>
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Aktan, S. (2021, November 7). İki milyar inekten çıkan metan gazı nasıl önlenecek tartışması: Maske mi takalım yosun mu yedirelim? *euronews*. <https://tr.euronews.com/2021/11/07/iki-milyar-inekten-c-kan-metan-gaz-nas-l-onlenecek-tart-smas-maske-mi-takal-m-yosun-mu-yed>
- Baird, C. L., Bensko, N. L., Bell, P. A., Viney, W., & Woody, W. D. (1995). Gender influence on perceptions of hostile environment sexual harassment. *Psychological Reports, 77*(1), 79-82.
- Baker, D. D., Terpstra, D. E., & Larntz, K. (1990). The influence of individual characteristics and severity of harassing behavior on reactions to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 22*(5-6), 305-325.
- Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threat. *Social identity: Context, commitment, content, 35-58*.
- Bem, D. J. (1972). Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 1-62). New York: Academic Press
- Bem, S. L., & Bem, D. J. (1970). Case study of a nonconscious ideology: Training the woman to know her place. In D. J. Bem (Ed.), *Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs* (pp. 89 -99). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(2), 425-437. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.425>

- Bitton, M. S., & Shaul, D. B. (2013). Perceptions and attitudes to sexual harassment: An examination of sex differences and the sex composition of the harasser-target dyad. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*(10), 2136-2145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12166>.
- Bolak-Boratav, H., Okman-Fişek, G., & Eslen-Ziya, H. (2018). Erkekliğe ve erkek kimliğine ilişkin algı ve deneyimler. *Erkekliğin Türkiye halleri* (2. baskı) içinde (s. 383-384). İstanbul, Türkiye: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Bosson, J. K., Prewitt-Freilino, J. L., & Taylor, J. N. (2005). Role rigidity: A problem of identity misclassification?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89*(4), 552.
- Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R. M., Weaver, J. R., & Arzu Wasti, S. (2009). Precarious Manhood and Displays of Physical Aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(5), 623–634. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208331161>
- Chan, D. K., Chow, S. Y., Lam, C. B., & Cheung, S. F. (2008). Examining the job-related, psychological, and physical outcomes of workplace sexual harassment: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*(4), 362-376.
- Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. L. (2013). Status, threat, and stereotypes: Understanding the function of rape myth acceptance. *Social Justice Research, 26*(1), 18-41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-013-0177-z>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd Edition)* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Colarelli, S. M., & Haaland, S. (2002). Perceptions of sexual harassment: An evolutionary perspective. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender, 4*(3), 243-264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616661.2002.10383127>
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connelly, K., & Heesacker, M. (2012). Why is benevolent sexism appealing? Associations with system justification and life satisfaction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 36*(4), 432-443.

- Council of Europe. *Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence*. 2011. C.E.T.S. No. 210
- Celik, Y., & Çelik, S. Ş. (2007). Sexual harassment against nurses in Turkey. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 39(2), 200-206.
- Dall'Ara, E., & Maass, A. (1999). Studying sexual harassment in the laboratory: Are egalitarian women at higher risk? *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 41(9-10), 681-704. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018816025988>
- Dahl, J., Vescio, T., & Weaver, K. (2015). How threats to masculinity sequentially cause public discomfort, anger, and ideological dominance over women. *Social Psychology*, 46(4), 242-254. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000248>
- Dinçal, D. (2019). *Cultural Factors as Associates of Workplace Sexual Harassment Perceptions and Coping Preferences*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Dirilen-Gumus, O. (2011). Differences in system justification with respect to gender, political conservatism, socio-economic status and religious fundamentalism. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 2607-2611.
- Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., Olson, D. E., Dwyer, P. D., & Lapreze, M. W. (1996). Factors affecting perceptions of workplace sexual harassment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(5), 489-501.
- European Parliament and of the Council, 2002, *Directive 2002/73/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 September 2002 amending Council Directive 76/207/EEC on the implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women as regards access to employment, vocational training and promotion, and working conditions*. <https://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32002L0073:EN:HTML>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2). Stanford university press.

- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS, 3rd Edition (Introducing Statistical Methods)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fiske, S. T., Morling, B., & Stevens, L. E. (1996). Controlling self and others: A theory of anxiety, mental control, and social control. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(2), 115-123.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(88\)90012-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(88)90012-7)
- Fitzgerald, L.F., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (1989). The dimensions of sexual harassment: A structural analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35, 309-326.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ—DoD). *Military Psychology*, 11(3), 243-263. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327876mp1103\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327876mp1103_3)
- Ford, C. A., & Donis, F. J. (1996). The relationship between age and gender in workers' attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Journal of Psychology*, 130, 627-634.
- Freud, S. (1970). *Civilization and its discontents*. (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York: Norton. (Original work published 1940).
- Frie, E., Kohl, T., & Meier, M. (2019). *Dynamics of social change and perceptions of threat*. Mohr Siebeck.
- Friesen, J. P., Laurin, K., Shepherd, S., Gaucher, D., & Kay, A. C. (2018). System justification: Experimental evidence, its contextual nature, and implications for social change. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 58(2), 315–339. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12278>
- Gervais, S. J., Vescio, T. K., & Allen, J. (2011). When what you see is what you get: The consequences of the objectifying gaze for women and men. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 35, 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684310386121>

- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491>
- Glick, P., Gangl, C., Gibb, S., Klumpner, S., & Weinberg, E. (2007). Defensive reactions to masculinity threat: More negative affect toward effeminate (but not masculine) gay men. *Sex Roles*, 57, 55-59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9195-3>
- Goh, J. X., Bandt-Law, B., Cheek, N. N., Sinclair, S., & Kaiser, C. R. (2022). Narrow prototypes and neglected victims: Understanding perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 122(5), 873–893. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000260>
- Gravelin, C. R., Biernat, M., & Baldwin, M. (2017). The impact of power and powerlessness on blaming the victim of sexual assault. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 22(1), 98-115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217706741>
- Herrera, M. C., Expósito, F., & Moya, M. (2012). Negative reactions of men to the loss of power in gender relations: Lilith vs. Eve. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 4(1), 17.
- Herrera, M. C., Herrera, A., & Expósito, F. (2014). Stop Harassment! Men's reactions to victims' confrontation. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 6(2), 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpal.2014.06.006>
- Jost, J. T. (2011). *System justification theory as compliment, complement, and corrective to theories of social identification and social dominance*. In D. Dunning (Ed.), *Social motivation* (pp. 223-263). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Jost, J. T. (2020). *A Theory of System Justification*. Harvard University Press.
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(1), 1-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x>

- Jost, J. T., Burgess, D., & Mosso, C. (2001). Conflicts of legitimation among self, group, and system: The integrative potential of system justification theory. In J. T. Jost & B. Major (Eds.), *The psychology of legitimacy: Emerging perspectives on ideology, justice, and intergroup relations* (pp. 363-388). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2003). The psychology of system justification and the palliative function of ideology. *European Review of Social Psychology, 13*(1), 111-153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280240000046>
- Jost, J. T., & Hunyady, O. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of system justifying ideologies. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*(5), 260-265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00377.x>
- Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 498-509. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.498>
- Jost, J. T., Kay, A. C., & Thorisdottir, H. (2009). *Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification*. Oxford University Press.
- Jost, J. T., Kivetz, Y., Rubini, M., Guermandi, G., & Mosso, C. (2005). System-justifying functions of complementary regional and ethnic stereotypes: Cross-national evidence. *Social Justice Research, 18*, 305-333.
- Jost, J. T., Liviatan, I., van der Toorn, J., Ledgerwood, A., Mandisodza, A., & Nosek, B. A. (2010). System justification: How do we know it's motivated?. In *The Eleventh Ontario Symposium on Personality and Social Psychology, Aug, 2007, University of Waterloo, ON, Canada; An earlier version of this chapter was presented at the aforementioned conference*. Psychology Press.
- Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., & Carvallo, M. R. (2002). Non-conscious forms of system justification: Cognitive, affective, and behavioral preferences for higher status groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*, 586-602. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031\(02\)00505-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00505-X)
- Jost, J. T., Pelham, B. W., Sheldon, O., & Ni Sullivan, B. (2003). Social inequality and the reduction of ideological dissonance on behalf of the system: Evidence of enhanced system justification among the disadvantaged. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(1), 13-36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.127>

- Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36(3), 209-232. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1999.1403>
- Karakuş, Ö. (2015). Modernization, gender equality and attitudes toward violence against women in Turkey: gender-based contrasts '. *The Global A Journal of Policy and Strategy*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Kay, A. C., & Jost, J. T. (2003). Complementary justice: effects of "poor but happy" and "poor but honest" stereotype exemplars on system justification and implicit activation of the justice motive. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(5), 823. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.823>
- Kay, A. C., Jost, J. T., & Young, S. (2005). Victim derogation and victim enhancement as alternate routes to system justification. *Psychological Science*, 16(3), 240-246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00810.x>
- Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Peach, J. M., Laurin, K., Friesen, J., Zanna, M. P., & Spencer, S. J. (2009). Inequality, discrimination, and the power of the status quo: Direct evidence for a motivation to see the way things are as the way they should be. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(3), 421–434. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015997>
- Kimmel, M. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 119-141). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Besta, T., Adamska, K., Jaśkiewicz, M., & Vandello, J. (2016). If my masculinity is threatened I won't support gender equality? The role of agentic self-stereotyping in relations. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 17(3), 274-284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000016>
- Kosakowska-Berezecka, N., Besta, T., Bosson, J. K., Jurek, P., Vandello, J. A., Best, D. L., ... Žukauskienė, R. (2020). Country-level and individual-level predictors of men's support for gender equality in 42 countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(6), 1276-1291. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2696>

- Kray, L. J., Howland, L., Russell, A. G., & Jackman, L. M. (2017). The effects of implicit gender role theories on gender system justification: Fixed beliefs strengthen masculinity to preserve the status quo. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 112*(1), 98-115. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000124>
- Kricheli-Katz, T. (2019). US versus them: The responses of managers to the feminization of high-status occupations. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World, 5*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023119878301>
- Kuchynka, S. L., Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., & Puryear, C. (2018). Zero-sum thinking and the masculinity contest: Perceived intergroup competition and workplace gender bias. *Journal of Social Issues, 74*(3), 529-550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12281>
- Landau, M. J., Kay, A. C., & Whitson, J. A. (2015). Compensatory control and the appeal of a structured world. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*(3), 694-722. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038703>
- Laurin, K., Kay, A. C., & Shepherd, S. (2011). Self-stereotyping as a route to system justification. *Social Cognition, 29*(3), 360-375. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2011.29.3.360>
- Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., Glick, P., & Chen, Z. (2010). Ambivalent sexism in close relationships:(Hostile) power and (benevolent) romance shape relationship ideals. *Sex Roles, 62*(7), 583-601. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9770-x>
- Lerner, M.J. (1980). *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York: Plenum.
- Lonsway, K.A., Cortina, L.M. & Magley, V.J. (2008). Sexual harassment mythology: Definition, conceptualization, and measurement. *Sex Roles, 58*, 599-615.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M.E., & Howard, D.R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment A campus community case study. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8*, 296-319.
- Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(5), 853. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.853>

- Mwaba, K., Senyurek, G., Ulman, Y. I., Minckas, N., Hughes, P., Paphitis, S., ... & Mannell, J. (2021). 'My story is like a magic wand': a qualitative study of personal storytelling and activism to stop violence against women in Turkey. *Global Health Action*, 14(1), 1927331. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2021.1927331>
- Mazer, D. B., & Percival, E. F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. *Sex Roles*, 20, 135-147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287987>
- McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review*, 77(4), 625-647.
- Morton, T. A., Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Hornsey, M. J. (2009). Theorizing gender in the face of social change: Is there anything essential about essentialism?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(3), 653. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012966>
- Munsch, C. L., & Willer, R. (2012). The role of gender identity threat in perceptions of date rape and sexual coercion. *Violence Against Women*, 18(10), 1125-1146. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801212465151>
- O'Connor, K. W., Drouin, M., & Niedermeyer, T. (2021). How Do Age, Sex, Political Orientation, Religiosity, and Sexism Affect Perceptions of Sex Assault/Harassment Allegations? *Sexuality & Culture*, 25(5), 1605-1619. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-021-09837-6>
- Özgür, S., & Sunar, D. (1982). Social psychological patterns of homicide in Turkey: A comparison of male and female convicted murderers. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), *Sex roles, family and community in Turkey* (pp. 349-382). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- Öztürk, F. (2020, December 11). *Susma Bitsin Hareketi: 'Kadınlar Dayanışmayla Kendilerini Daha Güçlü Hissediyor'*. BBC News Türkçe. Retrieved March 26, 2022, from <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-turkiye-55279569>
- Quinn, B. A. (2002). Sexual harassment and masculinity: The power and meaning of "girl watching." *Gender & Society*, 16(3), 386-402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243202016003007>

- Rollero, C., Glick, P., & Tartaglia, S. (2014). Psychometric properties of short versions of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and Ambivalence Toward Men Inventory. *TPM-Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 21(2), 149–159.
- Rothgerber, H., Kaufling, K., Incorvati, C., Andrew, C. B., & Farmer, A. (2021). Is a reasonable woman different from a reasonable person? Gender differences in perceived sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 84(3), 208-220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01156-8>
- Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D. H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 914-922. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.914>
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York, NY: Guilford Press
- Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 50, 565-573. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000023075.32252.fd>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2002). Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 17(49), 47-58.
- Sakallı -Uğurlu, N., Yalçın, Z. S., & Glick, P. (2007). Ambivalent sexism, belief in a just world, and empathy as predictors of Turkish students' attitudes toward rape victims. *Sex Roles*, 57(11-12), 889-895. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9313-2>
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Salman, S., & Turgut, S. (2010). Predictors of Turkish women's and men's attitudes toward sexual harassment: Ambivalent sexism, and ambivalence toward men. *Sex Roles*, 63(11-12), 871-881. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9847-6>
- Schmitt, M. T., & Branscombe, N. R. (2001). The good, the bad, and the manly: Threats to one's prototypicality and evaluations of fellow in-group members. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37(6), 510-517. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2001.1476>

- Sancar, S. (2009). Erkekliğin toplumsal inşasını anlamak. *Erkeklik: İmkansız iktidar. Ailede, piyasada ve sokakta erkekler* (s. 67-73). İstanbul, Türkiye: Metis.
- Shechory-Bitton, M., & Zvi, L. (2020). Is it harassment? Perceptions of sexual harassment among lawyers and undergraduate students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1793. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01793>
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ståhl, T., Eek, D., & Kazemi, A. (2010). Rape victim blaming as system justification: The role of gender and activation of complementary stereotypes. *Social Justice Research*, 23(4), 239-258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-010-0117-0>
- Süral, N., & Kılıçoğlu, M. (2011). Prohibiting sexual harassment in the workplace in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 47(4), 655-662. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2011.590064>
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(2), 199. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.2.199>
- Sojo, V. E., Wood, R. E., & Genat, A. E. (2016). Harmful workplace experiences and women's occupational well-being: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(1), 10-40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684315599346>
- Şahin, Ö., & Soylu-Yalçınkaya, N. S. (2020). The gendered brain: Implications of exposure to neuroscience research for gender essentialist beliefs. *Sex Roles*, 84, 522-535. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01181-7>
- Şahin, Ö. (2021). *Implications of femininity threat for support for transgender rights and gender-specific system justification* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of inter-group relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1987). A hierarchy of sexual harassment. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 121(6), 599-605. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1987.9712689>
- Till, F. J. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students*. US Department of Education.
- Turgut, S., & Salman, S. (2006). *Development and validation of a scale measuring attitudes toward sexual harassment*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Türkoğlu, B. (2013). *Violence as a way of reconstructing manhood: The role of threatened manhood and masculinity ideology on violence against women* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Toker, Y. (2003). *Individual differences factors affecting workplace sexual harassment perceptions* (Doctoral dissertation, METU).
- Toker, Y. (2016a). İşyerlerinde cinsel taciz: kapsamı, öncülleri, sonuçları, kurumsal baş etme yöntemleri. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 19(38), 1-19.
- Toker, Y. (2016b). Perception differences in ambiguous forms of workplace sexual harassment: A comparison between the United States and Turkey. *The Journal of Psychology*, 150(5), 625-643.
- Toker, Y., & Sümer, H. C. (2010). Workplace sexual harassment perceptions in the Turkish context and the role of individual differences. *Applied Psychology*, 59(4), 616-646.
- Ullrich, J., & Cohrs, J. C. (2007). Terrorism salience increases system justification: Experimental evidence. *Social Justice Research*, 20, 117- 139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-007-0035-y>
- UN Women. (2020). *The world for women and girls: Annual report 2019-2020*. New York: UN Women. [https://issuu.com/carlotta.aiello/docs/unw\\_annual\\_report\\_2019-2020\\_sngl\\_rnd22-bd](https://issuu.com/carlotta.aiello/docs/unw_annual_report_2019-2020_sngl_rnd22-bd)
- van der Linden, S., & Panagopoulos, C. (2019). The O'Reilly factor: An ideological bias in judgments about sexual harassment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 139, 198-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.11.022>

- Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R., & Weaver, J. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 1325-1339. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012453>
- Vescio, T., & Kosakowska-Berezecka, N. (2020). The not so subtle and status quo maintaining nature of every-day sexism. In F. Cheung & D. Halpern (Eds.), *Cambridge International Handbook on Psychology of Women*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Weaver, K. S., Vescio, T. K. (2015). The justification of social inequality in response to masculinity threats. *Sex Roles*, 72, 521-535. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0484-y>
- Willer, R., Rogalin, C. L., Conlon, B., & Wojnowicz, M. T. (2013). Overdoing gender: A test of the masculine overcompensation thesis. *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(4), 980-1022. <https://doi.org/10.1086/668417>
- World Economic Forum. (2021). *The global gender gap report*. Geneva: WEF.