Legal Consciousness and Responses to Sexual Harassment

Amy Blackstone
Christopher Uggen
Heather McLaughlin

Studies of legal mobilization often focus on people who have perceived some wrong, but these studies rarely consider the process that selects them into the pool of potential "mobilizers." Similarly, studies of victimization or targeting rarely go on to consider what people do about the wrong, or why some targets come forward and others remain silent. We here integrate sociolegal, feminist, and criminological theories in a conceptual model that treats experiencing sexual harassment and mobilizing in response as interrelated processes. We then link these two processes by modeling them as jointly determined outcomes and examine their connections using interviews with a subset of our survey respondents. Our results suggest that targets of harassment are selected, in part, because they are least likely to tell others about the experience. We also discuss strategies that workers employ to cope with and confront harassment. We find that traditional formal/informal dichotomies of mobilization responses may not fully account for the range of ways that individuals respond to harassment, and we propose a preliminary typology of responses.

How do individuals respond when they feel their rights have been violated? Do those who perceive a wrong simply tell the wrongdoer, do they tell others, or do they ignore it? Following Ewick and Silbey's (1998) groundbreaking work on the common place of law, a growing body of literature has taken up these and

related questions of legal consciousness and mobilization (e.g., Albiston 2005; Connolly 2002; Fleury-Steiner 2003; Hoffman 2005; Litowitz 2000; Lovell 2006; Marshall 2005; Marshall & Barclay 2003; Richman 2001). Central to these studies are the interrelated processes by which individuals first come to experience or perceive some wrong and then do something about it. In this study of sexual harassment, we attempt to link these two processes—in this case, subjectively experiencing sexual harassment and then going on to tell a supervisor or government agency that it has occurred. We also examine how individuals respond to harassment and why they employ particular response strategies. We find multidimensional responses to harassment, such that traditional formal/informal dichotomies may not adequately account for the diversity of strategies that individuals employ. We therefore propose a preliminary multidimensional typology of mobilization responses.

We first describe legal consciousness, targeting, and mobilization within the context of sexual harassment. Next we outline a general model of sexual harassment and legal mobilization based on the sociology of law, feminist scholarship, and criminology. Using survey data, we then test predictions from the model and consider harassment and mobilization as jointly determined outcomes. In the selection portion of the model, we ask who experiences a behavior or behaviors that person defines as sexual harassment. In the substantive portion, we model the likelihood that individuals will notify a supervisor or government agency about these experiences, before and after adjusting for the nonrandom selection of targets using a bivariate probit technique. We contextualize quantitative findings using data from interviews with a subset of the survey respondents. The interview data show the multiple, varied forms that mobilization takes. Finally, we consider our results in the context of mobilization and legal consciousness more generally.

Targeting, Mobilization, and the Context of Sexual Harassment

Legal Consciousness and Mobilization

Individuals' perceptions of legality affect whether and how they mobilize the law. Ewick and Silbey's (1998) work on legal consciousness has been a catalyst for a line of research on the relationship between formal institutions and everyday perceptions of law (see also Merry 1990). Legal consciousness concerns individuals' awareness and understanding of the law and legal rights, a process whereby people experience and understand "meanings, sources of authority, and cultural practices that are commonly recognized as legal" (Ewick & Silbey 1998:22). Legal consciousness thus drives how individuals understand, experience, and respond to the law and legality.

Cultural schemas as well as individual resources shape understandings of law. Theories of legal consciousness therefore identify cultural and social-psychological factors in shaping perceptions of justice and responses to perceived injustices (Bumiller 1988; Ewick & Silbey 1998; Felstiner et al. 1980–81; Gallagher 2006; Kritzer et al. 1991). Together, socioeconomic and political power affect individuals' purposes, stakes, and constraints, which in turn affect legal consciousness. At the individual level, these theories emphasize qualities such as self-efficacy or self-esteem in understanding the subjective processes through which experiences become grievances and grievances become disputes (Felstiner et al. 1980–81). A more recent study adds to these theories, suggesting that perceptions and expressions of grievances are linked not only to individuals' self-esteem but to their emotions, such as anger or sadness, about their experience (Cormier 2007). While most studies of legal consciousness focus on those in less privileged social positions, such as the working class, people of color, and women (Munkres 2008; for exceptions see Nielsen 2000; Quinn 2000), our study includes women and men from a variety of social backgrounds and whose relative positions of power therefore vary.

It is important to note that the concept of legal consciousness allows for the expression and examination of legality in ways not officially recognized by the law. Apart from formal mobilization such as lawsuits, law can also be invoked informally, creating a conceptual distinction between "the law" and "legality" (Hull 2003). The law represents a set of formal institutions, whereas legality refers to how those formal institutions shape and are shaped by everyday beliefs and actions. We can thus observe the "imprint of law" (Ewick & Silbey 1998:20) in social interactions and in individuals' perceptions of and responses to those interactions. Of course, prior to mobilization some precipitating event must occur, such as being burglarized, experiencing discrimination, or disputing with one's neighbor. Legal consciousness is thus a dynamic process wherein people experience events in their lives, make sense of those events, and respond to them. In doing so, individuals not only express a perspective on legality, but they also shape its meaning and boundaries. The same forces are likely to drive both a mobilizing response *and* the perception that an event or dispute warrants such a response.

Legal consciousness refers to how people perceive the law and how such perceptions are translated into action. One study distinguishes two categories of such actions: either they qualify as "formal" actions, such as filing complaints, or as "informal" actions, such as directly confronting those with whom a worker has a complaint (Hoffman 2003). Actions falling outside of either category include tolerating grievances and leaving a position. In this article, we too distinguish the multiple ways individuals invoke the law in response to grievances at work. We examine workers' experiences

with sexually harassing behaviors, asking how legal consciousness shapes mobilization in response to those behaviors. In our statistical models, we measure "formal" responses, predicting the probability of reporting the harassment to a supervisor or government authority. In our qualitative analysis, we consider forms of mobilization that may fall outside traditional formal/informal dichotomies. Before proceeding, however, we describe sexual harassment as a site for examining consciousness and mobilization.

The Context of Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment became recognized as a form of sex discrimination in the 1970s, with scholarly research on the topic flourishing since publication of MacKinnon's (1979) influential *Sexual Harassment of Working Women*. As legal and scholarly understandings of sexual harassment developed, so too did informal public understandings. In particular, public awareness increased dramatically during the 1991 televised hearings of Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas. Although working adults may have difficulty reciting formal legal definitions of sexual harassment, many have a strong abstract comprehension of the concept (Quinn 2000). The abundance of popular films (e.g., *Working Girl* in 1988, *Disclosure* in 1994, and *North Country* in 2005) and advice publications (e.g., Bravo & Cassedy 1999; Rutter 1997; Webb 1999) addressing sexual harassment further suggest its pervasiveness in the public consciousness. The strong public association of sexual harassment with legality make it an apt site for analyzing the relationships between targeting, legal consciousness, and mobilization.

Bringing together sociolegal and social movements literatures, Marshall (2003) employs the social movements concept of "framing" to describe how women workers construct sexual harassment from within an injustice, management, or sexual freedom frame (see also Pedriana 2006). In other work focused on legal consciousness and harassment policies, Marshall (2001) suggests that even the slightest amount of "oppositional consciousness" on the part of targets can generate policy changes. Other sexual harassment research suggests that consciousness about harassment varies with social and demographic characteristics such as gender and race (Nielsen 2000; Quinn 2000; Welsh et al. 2006). Most typically, however, studies linking legal consciousness and sexual harassment do not go on to consider why some targets come forward while others remain silent. Those that do consider mobilization are often limited to samples of people who have experienced harassment, not considering the process of targeting or victimization that selects these individuals into the pool of potential "mobilizers." Because legal consciousness is linked to multiple processes—experiencing a

wrong, framing it for oneself and others, and formulating a response—a more comprehensive analysis would consider both the predictors of sexual harassment and individuals' understandings of and responses to harassment.

Exclusive focus on the predictors of sexual harassment targeting has been controversial, in part because of an understandable reluctance to "blame the victims." Further, as Quinn rightly argues, victim-focused research can lead to "an incomplete, and potentially distorted, understanding of sexual harassment perpetration" (2005:27). Without denying the need for more research on perpetrators and the cultural contexts in which harassment thrives, information about who is targeted remains critical to assessing risks, crafting policy interventions, and understanding why some targets come forward while others remain silent.

Gender, age, and organizational culture are among the few well-established correlates of sexual harassment (Morgan 1999; Welsh 1999). Harassment is especially salient in certain occupations and industry sectors, particularly sales (Collinson & Collinson 1996; Morgan & Martin 2006) and restaurant work (Giuffre & Williams 1994; Lerum 2004). Moreover, supportive work cultures, such as those with high coworker solidarity and sympathetic supervisors, have been linked to lower incidences of harassment (Chamberlain et al. 2008; DeCoster et al. 1999). The effect of work friendships on reactions to harassment, however, may vary by gender. Morrison (2009) reports that women are more likely to describe the social and emotional support gained from work friends while men describe the career-related benefits of friends, suggesting that close work friends may facilitate mobilization for women to a greater extent than for men. The detailed accounts of harassment experiences provided in qualitative studies also suggest that work friendships affect mobilization choices (Morgan 1999; Stambaugh 1997). For example, while close friendships with co-workers may prevent sexual harassment from occurring at all, individuals in supportive work settings may seek support and advice from work friends if and when harassment does occur.

Toward a General Model of Harassment and Mobilization

Despite recent advances, there is "no unified theoretical framework" of sexual harassment (Welsh 1999:186). As one study concludes, "[d]ata have far outstripped theory, in both quantity and quality" in this area of research (Gelfand et al. 1995:176), and most extant theories have focused only on the occurrence of sexual harassment. What we do know about outcomes remains unconnected to the structural and social-psychological contexts of disputants'

lives (Felstiner et al. 1980–81). We view harassment and mobiliza-
tion as interrelated processes, drawing on sociocultural, routine
activities and sociolegal theories. We do not attempt a critical test of
competing hypotheses because, in general, these frameworks are
logically consistent and mutually compatible.

Sociocultural models stress gender-based power differentials as
the primary predictor of targeting (Barr 1993) and suggest that
factors such as workplace authority determine who will experience
harassment. Some argue that women supervisors are more likely to
be harassed, others that power makes them less likely to experience
harassment (see, e.g., Gruber 1998; Rospenda et al. 1998; Simpson
& Ellis 1996). Sociocultural models emphasize macro-level cultural
understandings of gender and sexuality that determine how indi-
vidual characteristics shape harassment experiences, the meaning
of these experiences to targets, and the choices targets make about
mobilization. In light of existing gender and power relations, and
prior research (Baker et al. 1990), we expect women to perceive
more harassment than men and to be more likely to mobilize in
response to it. When presented with a series of sexual harassment
scenarios, women are more likely than men to react—either phys-
ically or verbally, or by reporting the behavior—to more serious
scenarios such as fondling or sexual propositions (Baker et al.
1990). At the same time, however, women are more likely than men
to ignore less threatening behaviors, such as directed gestures or
wolf-whistling. Gender may thus interact with situational factors to
affect mobilization choices. Baker and colleagues also find that re-
ligiosity significantly affects mobilization, as those with high levels
of religiosity are more likely to report particular behaviors than to
directly confront harassers (Baker et al. 1990).

Routine activities theory attributes targeting to the presence of
motivated offenders, the proximity of vulnerable targets, and the
absence of solidaristic work groups (DeCoster et al. 1999). Based on
this theory, we would expect those who work more hours to be more
vulnerable to harassment because of greater opportunity or expo-
sure to risk. Close friendships at work could also increase targeting
opportunity, though such friendships may also provide guardianship
that reduces harassment. Further, based on routine activities theory
we expect a supportive supervisor—one who is willing to listen to
problems—to provide guardianship that prevents harassment and
encouragement for those who come forward with complaints.

Theories of legal consciousness (Ewick & Silbey 1998) and dis-
pute transformation (Felstiner et al. 1980–81) underscore social
position and social psychological factors, suggesting that efficacy,
socioeconomic resources, and workplace relationships shape
perceptions of having been wronged and subsequent responses.
For example, Baker et al. (1990) find that self-efficacy predicts

mobilization in a rape scenario, such that individuals with an internal locus of control are more likely to react physically or verbally. We expect self-efficacy to be negatively related to harassment and positively related to mobilization. Similarly, we expect education to influence mobilization, as more educated individuals may be more knowledgeable about their rights and the process of filing a formal complaint, and therefore more capable of taking formal action in response to harassment. Furthermore, workers of lower status may be disproportionately targeted, in part because their financial vulnerability and unwillingness to jeopardize their positions may have a chilling effect on mobilization options. Workplace training and knowledge of harassment policies also affect how individuals define sexual harassment and make sense of their own work experiences (Tinkler 2008). Workers with extensive on-the-job training may be more aware of sexual harassment policies and therefore more likely to perceive it and mobilize in response to it. Because legal consciousness theories emphasize that experience with the law shapes consciousness, we would also expect prior experience with discrimination to alter perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment.

Drawing from the above perspectives, we propose a statistical and theoretical model of sexual harassment that considers both targeting and mobilization. Organization-level characteristics and routine work activities, such as work hours and interactions with supervisors and coworkers, structure the opportunities to experience and to report harassment. Individual-level resources, such as self-efficacy, education, and religiosity (Terpstra & Baker 1986) also shape a target's willingness to name and protest harassment when it occurs.

As the preceding discussion makes clear, similar factors are likely to affect the probability of perceiving harassment and the probability of notifying others in response to the experience. We conceptualize and measure these processes using a two-step sample selection approach. In the selection portion of the model, we ask who experiences sexual harassment or becomes the target of harassing experiences. In the substantive portion, we model the likelihood that individuals will notify others about these experiences, before and after adjusting for the nonrandom selection of targets. We then draw upon in-depth interview evidence to contextualize and extend the findings from our statistical models. Our qualitative interviews help answer questions about how and why harassment and mobilization occur.

Data, Measures, and Methodology

We analyze data from the Youth Development Study (YDS), a prospective longitudinal investigation of adolescents in St. Paul, Minnesota. Beginning with a random sample of 1,010 ninth graders in St.

Paul in 1988, the YDS has since been administered annually to the same respondents each year. With about 74 percent of the panel identifying as white, 10 percent as African American, 5 percent as Hispanic, and 4 percent as Asian, the sample well represents the St. Paul community (Finch et al. 1991; Mortimer 2003). Sexual harassment items were placed on the survey in 1999, when respondents were 25–26 years old. We conducted intensive interviews with a subset of the survey respondents in 2002 and 2003. In previous research using these data, we found significant levels of sexually harassing behaviors reported by both men and women (Uggen & Blackstone 2004). We therefore examine the entire sample but also test for interactions between gender and key independent variables. To our knowledge, no other longitudinal data set contains a set of behavioral sexual harassment items to indicate targeting and broad measures of mobilization.

Measurement

To measure sexual harassment we use a facet-free global item, asking whether respondents considered any of the behaviors they experienced to be sexual harassment.[1] To measure mobilization, we asked respondents whether they notified supervisors or government agencies about these behaviors. To predict this form of formal mobilization, we include a measure of informal mobilization (reporting a harassing behavior to a coworker) and a lag for past formal mobilization (reporting harassing workplace behavior experienced during high school to a supervisor or government authority). Descriptive statistics for these and other measures are provided in Table 1.

We include six individual-level measures in our models predicting harassment and mobilization: gender, self-efficacy, education, financial problems, religiosity, and discrimination (see Table 1 for coding and basic descriptive statistics). Gender was self-reported by respondents. Self-efficacy is measured with a three-item scale based on respondents' beliefs that the future depends on them, that they can do anything, and that they control their own destiny. Higher scores indicate greater self-efficacy. Education is an ordered categorical variable representing respondents' highest level of education completed. Financial problems is a dummy variable for whether individuals reported experiencing any financial difficulties in the past five years (spanning the same period of young adulthood as the harassment and mobilization measures), and religiosity measures the importance of religion in respondents' lives. Last, the discrimination measure indexes experiences of discrimination in either

---

[1] Our quantitative models also include six behavioral measures of sexual harassment, yet these items are not equivalent to the harassment outcome. While the majority of respondents (59 percent) experienced at least one of the behaviors during young adulthood, most did not label their experiences as sexual harassment.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Description	Coding	Mean	SD
Subjective Harassment				
Perceived Harassment	% that consider their experiences to be sexual harassment	0 = No 1 = Yes	24.69%	
Objective Measures of Sexual Harassment				
Offensive Joking	% experiencing offensive jokes/remarks about themselves during adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	36.12%	
Personal Questions	% experiencing questions about their private life during adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	41.78%	
Invasion of Space	% experiencing staring or invasion of space during adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	23.89%	
Unwanted Touching	% experiencing unwanted touching during adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	9.83%	
Offensive Materials	% experiencing exposure to offensive material during adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	7.55%	
Physical Assault	% experiencing physical assault during adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	2.84%	
Total Adulthood Harassment	Number of objective measures experienced during adulthood	0 = Low 6 = High	1.20	1.32
Total High School Harassment	Number of objective measures experienced during high school	0 = Low 6 = High	.75	1.22
Mobilization				
Formal Mobilization During Young Adulthood	% who reported harassment to supervisor or government authority	0 = No 1 = Yes	35.00% of harassed	
Informal Mobilization in Young Adulthood	% who reported harassment to a coworker during young adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	35.36% of harassed	
Formal Mobilization During High School	% who reported harassment to supervisor or government authority	0 = No 1 = Yes	14.36% of harassed	
Individual-level				
Male	Self-reported gender of respondent	0 = Female 1 = Male	48.02%	
Self-efficacy	Index measuring respondents' beliefs that the future depends on them, that they can do anything, and that they control their own destiny	7.73 = Low 21.29 = High	16.26	2.61

Table 1. Continued

Variable	Description	Coding	Mean	SD
Education	Highest level of education completed	1 = elementary or junior high 6 = bachelor's degree (4 yrs)	3.49	1.50
Financial Problems	Any financial difficulties in the past 5 years	0 = No 1 = Yes	43.79%	
Religiosity	How important is religion in your life?	1 = not at all 5 = extremely	2.16	0.92
Discrimination	% reporting discrimination in education or housing	0 = No 1 = Yes	16.53%	
Work Characteristics				
Work Hours	Number of weekly hours worked	0 = Low 80 = High	24.86	17.37
Work Friends	How close do you feel to your best friend at work?	0 = Not at all 4 = Extremely	1.68	1.41
Workplace Training	Received on-the-job training	0 = No 1 = Yes	79.81%	
Supervisor Listens	How often is your supervisor willing to listen to your problems and help find solutions?	1 = Never 5 = Almost always	4.20	1.00
Supervise Others	Supervise others in primary workplace	0 = No 1 = Yes	23.74%	
Restaurant Industry	% employed in the restaurant industry during high school or young adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	34.18%	0.47
Sales Industry	% employed in the sales industry during high school or young adulthood	0 = No 1 = Yes	39.23%	

schooling or housing. Because we expect women to experience more sexual harassment and discrimination in other realms, we test for a gender interaction term for this measure.

We also employ seven measures of work characteristics, described in detail in Table 1: work hours, work friends, workplace training, the extent to which supervisors listen, supervisory status, and restaurant and sales industry occupations. Work hours is a continuous measure of weekly self-reported work hours, ranging from zero to 80. Work friends measures how close individuals feel to their best friend at work. Because work friendships may function differently for men and women, the effect of work friends on mobilization may vary substantially by gender; therefore, we also include a gender interaction in our models measuring mobilization. Workplace training is a dummy variable indicating whether workers receive on-the-job training at their current job. Supervisor listens assesses the extent to which respondents' supervisors are willing to listen to their problems and help find solutions. Supervisory status indicates whether the respondent supervises others at work. Because our harassment and mobilization measures span five years during young adulthood, we are unable to connect these measures to a specific workplace or occupational industry. For this reason, our restaurant and sales industry measures are not mutually exclusive, reflecting only whether respondents held these positions at any point in young adulthood. Because of the gendered nature of restaurant and sales work, we include gender interaction terms for these measures.[2]

To understand mobilization from the research participants' perspectives, we needed to hear their stories in their own words. We selected 33 survey respondents for intensive interviews, based on whether they had told others about their harassment or remained silent. Fourteen men and 19 women participated in the interviews, responding to open-ended questions about rapport with coworkers, experiences with offensive behaviors in the workplace, and their responses to those behaviors. Some of the interview excerpts presented here underscore patterns that emerge from the quantitative analysis, while others demonstrate the complexity of participants' experiences in a way that cannot be easily quantified.

Harassment and Mobilization as Interrelated Processes

We first present simple univariate probit models to identify the predictors of perceiving harassment in young adulthood. We then

---

[2] For all the individual-level and work characteristics, we use imputed means with dummy variables for missing variables (not shown, available by request). These results are consistent with those obtained using listwise deletion, although our models are less stable when the sample is reduced in the latter case. For all measures of harassment (including the six behavioral indicators) and mobilization, of course, we use listwise deletion.

estimate a separate model, in which we use individual and work-place characteristics, past harassment, and mobilization experiences to predict legal mobilization among those who are harassed. To examine harassment and mobilization simultaneously, we then use a generalization of Heckman's (1976) technique for modeling selective samples. Our sample is selective because we only observe mobilization among those subject to harassment, yet our model suggests that factors related to targeting will also be tied to the propensity to notify others about the harassment.

The most direct, and typical, way to assess mobilization of harassment complaints is to simply exclude respondents who did not experience harassment from the analysis. Because mobilization information is only available for those who have experienced some form of harassment, however, there is no assurance that the effects found among targets would hold among those who were not targeted. Moreover, if targets are characterized by some unmeasured trait associated with both harassment and mobilization, such as legal consciousness, any estimates based on this subsample could be seriously biased. We therefore estimate two-equation probit models that allow for *interdependence* in the processes leading to harassment and mobilization.

The first equation models the selection process predicting harassment, hence entry into the pool of targets or potential mobilizers, while the second equation predicts the likelihood of mobilization. To the extent that the unmeasured factors driving mobilization also affect harassment, the error terms for the mobilization and harassment equations are correlated. For example, if targets have low legal consciousness and legal consciousness is positively associated with mobilization, this would be reflected in a negative correlation (denoted by the Greek *rho* (ρ)) between the error terms of the harassment and mobilization equations. By introducing unmeasured characteristics associated with harassment into the mobilization equation, *rho* adjusts the estimates observed among the subsample of harassed persons for the unmeasured factors affecting the propensity to be harassed.

In this bivariate probit selectivity model, Y_{1i}, representing the harassment experience of person *i*, determines whether the effects of our predictors on Y_{2i} (mobilization), are observed (Winship & Mare 1992; Liao 1995). This model takes the form:

1. Harassment:

$$Y^*_{1i} = \beta_1 \mathbf{X}_{1i} + \varepsilon_{1i}$$
$$Y_{1i} = 1 \text{ if } Y^*_{1i} > 0; \ 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

2. Mobilization:

$$Y^*_{2i} = \beta_2 \mathbf{X}_{2i} + \varepsilon_{2i}$$
$$Y_{2i} = 1 \text{ if } Y^*_{2i} > 0; \ 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

where, for the *i*th observation, Y^*_1 is the latent propensity to become a target of harassment (an unobserved continuous latent variable) and Y_1 is a dichotomous self-reported indicator of harassment; Y^*_2 represents the propensity to mobilize the law and Y_2 represents observed self-reported mobilization; $\mathbf{X}_1$ is a vector of values on the independent variables in the harassment equation and $\mathbf{X}_2$ represents values on the independent variables that are observed when $Y_1 = 1$; β_1 and β_2 are vectors of coefficients, and ε_1 and ε_2 are error terms with correlation $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = \rho$ (see Liao 1995:91). This correlation represents the interrelatedness of the two processes, or the association between the probabilities of harassment and mobilization net of the effects of the independent variables in the model. We use the same basic set of individual and workplace predictors in each equation, with two primary identifying restrictions. We include a past measure of high school harassment experiences in the adult harassment (but not mobilization) equation and a past measure of high school mobilization experiences in the mobilization (but not harassment) equation. We also include a different set of gender interactions in each equation, such as the hypothesized gender interaction with work friendships in predicting mobilization, corresponding to extant research on gender, harassment, and legal consciousness.

We further explore the interrelation between processes of targeting and mobilization through interviews with a subset of the survey respondents. Our interview guide was designed to elicit information from participants about their harassment and mobilization experiences. All questions were open-ended and presented to participants in the context of related topics that arose naturally in the course of each interview. Thus, as is characteristic of intensive interviewing, we covered the same topics with all participants but did not necessarily present them the same order (Lofland & Lofland 1995).

We recorded each 60- to 90-minute interview with respondents' consent, and then transcribed and analyzed them using NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software program. Once we imported them into the program, we first coded the data according to the themes outlined in our interview guide. Those themes include workplace history, problems in the workplace, sexual harassment, reflections on past workplace experiences, and experiences with other forms of harassment or discrimination. Following this initial coding, we then closely reviewed each transcript again, looking for

common themes across interviews and coding like categories of data together. We then labeled these passages, referred to as codes or "meaning units" (Weiss 2004), and gave them a name intended to portray the themes present in the code. Our second round of coding was similar to a grounded theory approach (Charmaz 2005; Glaser & Strauss 1967) in that the analysis emerged inductively. To maintain interview participants' confidentiality, we use pseudonyms and, in some cases, have changed minor but potentially identifying details (e.g., company names and locations).

Results

Results of the Selection or Targeting Model

The first step in the quantitative analysis was to estimate the harassment targeting equation. The probit estimates in Table 2 considered the effects of individual and workplace factors, along with specific behavioral measures of harassment. As shown in Model A, four of the six behavioral indicators were significant predictors of self-reporting that one was sexually harassed at work. Those who experienced offensive joking, invasion of personal space, unwanted touching, or physical assault were more likely to label their experience as sexual harassment, net of other indicators. Note that this model does not take into account the severity of each indicator, so we were unable to determine whether the women in our sample experienced more severe or intentionally derogatory behaviors (though prior analysis of these data show that women are more likely to experience such "classic" indicators of sexual harassment as invasion of personal space and unwanted touching). Model A also included a measure of the number of objective harassment indicators experienced during high school to net out person-specific differences in the propensity to experience targeting. Those experiencing a higher number of prior indicators were also more likely to self-report sexual harassment.

We also included individual and work characteristics as predictors of subjective harassment. First, gender was a strong predictor, as men were significantly less likely than women to understand a workplace experience as sexual harassment. Because our model includes behavioral indicators of harassment, this effect indicates that even when men and women are exposed to the same behaviors, such as offensive joking or unwanted touching, women are more likely to consider their experiences to be sexual harassment. Individuals who reported past discrimination in education and housing were also more likely to report workplace sexual harassment. Several other estimates were suggestive, though they did not exceed standard significance levels: respondents with more education and on-the-job training, and those

Table 2. Univariate Probit Estimation of Perceived Harassment

Variable	Model A	Model B
Objective Harassment		
Offensive Joking	0.352**	0.348**
	(0.138)	(0.138)
Personal Questions	− 0.061	− 0.063
	(0.141)	(0.141)
Invasion of Space	0.443***	0.453***
	(0.147)	(0.147)
Unwanted Touching	0.625***	0.620***
	(0.197)	(0.198)
Offensive Materials	0.140	0.140
	(0.214)	(0.215)
Physical Assault	0.751**	0.793**
	(0.369)	(0.380)
Total High School Harassment	0.127**	0.131**
	(0.053)	(0.053)
Individual-level		
Male	− 0.577***	− 0.654***
	(0.127)	(0.195)
Self-efficacy	0.021	0.018
	(0.026)	(0.026)
Education	0.081*	0.074*
	(0.043)	(0.044)
Religiosity	0.098	0.091
	(0.067)	(0.067)
Financial Problems	− 0.028	− 0.037
	(0.128)	(0.129)
Other Discrimination	0.425***	0.488**
	(0.156)	(0.198)
Other Discrimination ∗ Male		− 0.136
		(0.316)
Work Characteristics		
Work Hours	0.004	0.004
	(0.005)	(0.005)
Work Friends	− 0.082	− 0.085
	(0.057)	(0.057)
Workplace Training	0.302*	0.315*
	(0.182)	(0.183)
Supervisor Listens	0.073	0.075
	(0.072)	(0.073)
Supervise Others	− 0.132	− 0.133
	(0.171)	(0.171)
Restaurant Industry	− 0.126	− 0.058
	(0.124)	(0.151)
Restaurant ∗ Male		− 0.196
		(0.262)
Sales Industry	− 0.207*	− 0.346**
	(0.120)	(0.145)
Sales ∗ Male		0.426*
		(0.251)
Intercept	− 2.169***	− 2.077***
	(0.593)	(0.580)
Number of cases	705	705
Log-Likelihood	− 311.770	− 309.869
Chi-Squared	153.02***	156.82***

*p<0.10; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

lacking sales experience all appeared more likely to report harassment ($p<0.10$).

    We anticipated that gender would interact with a number of workplace characteristics in structuring harassment. In Model B,

we included gender interactions for three variables: discrimination in education or housing, and restaurant and sales occupations. Although the inclusion of these three product terms did not significantly improve the overall fit of the model, the sales interaction term was statistically significant. Under the interaction coding, the main effect of discrimination, restaurant, and sales represented their effects among women (effects for men were computed using both the main effects and the interaction terms). While we found no significant gender interactions for discrimination in education or housing or for restaurant workers, women in sales positions were significantly less likely to be harassed than women in non-sales positions. For men, however, sales work may increase the likelihood of harassment (at $p < 0.10$). In general, the results in Model B paralleled those in Model A.

As previous researchers (Quinn 2005) suggest, focusing on targets to the exclusion of the harassers provides only a partial understanding of harassment. When asked in our interview why she thought she was targeted, Pam, a white woman, said, "I just don't understand it. Maybe they thought I wouldn't care. But I don't believe that either, you know? I think it has to do more with the person that is giving it more than the person receiving it." Although our data did not allow us to analyze harassers' motivations, we could ask whether a harasser's choice of target was linked to the propensity to mobilize by modeling harassment and mobilization as interrelated processes.

Mobilization Models

Turning from harassment to mobilization, we first present univariate probit estimations in Table 3 and then include selectivity corrections in Table 4. As shown in Table 3, Model A, few individual characteristics and work activities were significant predictors of mobilization. While women were more likely to experience harassment in Table 2, Table 3 shows that men and women were equally likely to formally mobilize in response. The presence of close work friends, however, was a strong and consistent predictor of mobilization. The closer one felt to friends at work, the more likely s/he was to report sexual harassment to a supervisor or government agency.

In Model B, we also controlled for six objective sexual harassment indicators experienced in young adulthood, individuals' past mobilization in response to sexual harassment, and their informal mobilization in young adulthood. Of the six measures of harassment, those who experienced invasion of space were significantly more likely to report the harassment to a supervisor or government authority. Moreover, informal mobilization (i.e., reporting

Table 3. Univariate Probit Estimation of Formal Mobilization

Variable	Model A	Model B	Model C
Objective Harassment			
Offensive Joking		− 0.234	− 0.295
		(0.323)	(0.337)
Personal Questions		− 0.015	− 0.040
		(0.317)	(0.329)
Invasion of Space		0.662**	0.644**
		(0.283)	(0.292)
Unwanted Touching		0.376	0.355
		(0.327)	(0.334)
Offensive Materials		0.489	0.422
		(0.385)	(0.392)
Physical Assault		0.811*	0.796
		(0.480)	(0.512)
Individual-level			
Male	− 0.431	− 0.339	− 1.209
	(0.275)	(0.344)	(0.781)
Self-efficacy	− 0.065	− 0.042	− 0.069
	(0.052)	(0.062)	(0.065)
Education	0.131	0.150	0.180*
	(0.086)	(0.105)	(0.109)
Religiosity	− 0.162	− 0.207	− 0.240
	(0.125)	(0.148)	(0.153)
Financial Problems	0.481*	0.375	0.488
	(0.252)	(0.297)	(0.305)
Other Discrimination	0.278	0.314	0.237
	(0.264)	(0.303)	(0.315)
Work Characteristics			
Work Hours	0.004	− 0.005	− 0.005
	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Work Friends	0.240**	0.284**	0.315**
	(0.111)	(0.133)	(0.144)
Work Friends * Male			0.088
			(0.291)
Workplace Training	0.757*	0.910*	0.807
	(0.438)	(0.549)	(0.555)
Supervisor Listens	0.034	− 0.028	0.043
	(0.135)	(0.174)	(0.188)
Supervise Others	− 0.443	− 0.281	− 0.437
	(0.339)	(0.390)	(0.413)
Restaurant Industry	− 0.192	− 0.574**	− 0.597*
	(0.228)	(0.288)	(0.316)
Restaurant * Male			0.170
			(0.795)
Sales Industry	0.121	0.179	0.069
	(0.228)	(0.277)	(0.287)
Mobilization			
High School Formal Mobilization		1.208***	.994***
		(0.351)	(0.361)
Young Adult Informal Mobilization		0.576**	0.325**
		(0.292)	(0.317)
Adult Informal Mobilization * Male			1.713**
			(0.828)
Intercept	− 1.000	− 1.824	− 1.421
	(1.156)	(1.422)	(1.491)
Number of cases	171	171	171
Log-Likelihood	− 92.159	− 71.261	− 68.561
Chi-Squared	33.37**	75.17***	80.56***

*$p < 0.10$; **$p < 0.05$; ***$p < 0.01$
Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

the harassment to a coworker) and past formal mobilization were also strong and significant predictors of formal mobilization. The inclusion of these independent variables in Model B significantly improved the overall fit of the model, yet the effect of close work friends remained significant.

Model C of Table 3 includes gender interactions for closeness to work friends, restaurant work, and informal mobilization. As in the harassment equation in Table 2, the inclusion of these interactions did not significantly improve the overall model fit, yet one important interaction is worth noting. As shown in Model C, informal mobilization was a predictor of formal mobilization for both men and women, yet men who reported the harassment to a coworker were significantly more likely to also report the harassment to a supervisor or government authority. This suggests that women may talk about the harassment with others but not file a formal complaint, whereas men are more likely to keep the harassment to themselves unless they are prepared to mobilize more formally. This finding does not reflect women's greater subjective closeness to work friends, as the gender interaction term for work friends was not significant.

Table 4 reports estimates for models predicting mobilization among respondents who experienced harassment, and two-equation models that adjusted these estimates using a selectivity correction. Probit coefficients can be interpreted as the effects of a unit change in the independent variable on the cumulative normal probability of the dependent variable, or as effects on z-scores. Model A fit only a constant, indicating that the probability of mobilization relative to non-mobilization was 0.34, which is the probability associated with a z-score of -0.415 (see, e.g., Hardy 1989). Therefore, only 34 percent of individuals who reported they were sexually harassed elected to notify a supervisor or government agency of their mistreatment.

The bivariate probit selection models, B, C, D, and E, tested whether unmeasured factors that increase the probability of harassment also affect the likelihood of mobilization. These "substantive" models were jointly estimated with a "selection" equation predicting targeting (based on estimates from Model B of Table 2). If the unmeasured propensity to mobilize was lower among harassment targets than non-targets, for example, this would be manifest in a negative correlation between the error terms of the harassment and mobilization equations. Alternatively, if targets had a higher unmeasured propensity to mobilize, then the correlation between the error terms would be positive. Model B, which simply fit a constant in the substantive equation, gauged the effects of unmeasured traits that increased the likelihood of harassment on the probability of mobilization. Here, the correlation was negative in direction and statistically significant (rho $= -0.841$). This means that unmeasured

Table 4. Probit Estimation of Mobilization With and Without Selectivity Correction

Variable	Probit A	B	Bivariate Probit With Selectivity		
			C	D	E
Objective Harassment					
Invasion of Space				0.652	0.724**
				(0.415)	(0.363)
Physical Assault				0.672	0.746
				(0.579)	(0.578)
Individual-level					
Male			0.196	−0.313	−1.223
			(0.250)	(0.421)	(0.784)
Self-efficacy			−0.028	−0.020	−0.045
			(0.038)	(0.059)	(0.062)
Education			0.038	0.131	0.168
			(0.070)	(0.105)	(0.104)
Religiosity			−0.179*	−0.235*	−0.274*
			(0.094)	(0.143)	(0.152)
Financial Problems			0.133	0.369	0.507*
			(0.226)	(0.301)	(0.306)
Other Discrimination			−0.132	0.246	0.222
			(0.211)	(0.267)	(0.373)
Work Characteristics					
Work Hours			−0.009	−0.013	−0.015
			(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Work Friends			0.271***	0.261**	0.293*
			(0.086)	(0.132)	(0.152)
Work Friends＊Male					0.047
					(0.284)
Workplace Training			0.483	0.835	0.749
			(0.351)	(0.526)	(0.529)
Supervisor Listens			−0.049	0.021	0.107
			(0.106)	(0.168)	(0.179)
Supervise Others			−0.157	−0.301	−0.481
			(0.258)	(0.366)	(0.390)
Restaurant Industry			−0.220	−0.527*	−0.566*
			(0.182)	(0.271)	(0.303)

Table 4. Continued

Variable	Probit A	Bivariate Probit With Selectivity			
		B	C	D	E
Restaurant*Male					0.158
					(0.793)
Sales Industry			0.198	0.226	0.074
			(0.174)	(0.290)	(0.323)
Mobilization					
High School Formal Mobilization				0.999***	0.819**
				(0.362)	(0.355)
Young Adult Informal Mobilization				0.572*	0.337
				(0.301)	(0.298)
Adult Informal Mobilization*Male					1.788**
					(0.820)
Intercept	−0.415***	0.513***	0.772	−1.626	−1.671
	(0.099)	(0.151)	(0.877)	(1.873)	(1.810)
Rho (ρ)		−0.841***	−0.929***	−0.176	0.075
		(0.089)	(0.093)	(0.633)	(0.648)
Objective Harassment					
Offensive Joking		0.338***	0.293**	0.342***	0.345***
		(0.118)	(0.116)	(0.132)	(0.132)
Invasion of Space		0.509***	0.525***	0.450***	0.448***
		(0.127)	(0.121)	(0.144)	(0.144)
Unwanted Touching		0.517***	0.483***	0.614***	0.608***
		(0.183)	(0.184)	(0.197)	(0.120)
Physical Assault		0.957***	0.937***	0.806**	0.791**
		(0.350)	(0.341)	(0.384)	(0.382)
Total High School Harassment		0.111**	0.117**	0.126**	0.128**
		(0.047)	(0.046)	(0.052)	(0.051)
Individual-level					
Male		−0.689***	−0.675***	−0.670***	−0.669***
		(0.179)	(0.181)	(0.195)	(0.196)
Self-efficacy		0.012	0.018	0.018	0.017
		(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.026)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Education	0.072*	0.067	0.070	0.071
	(0.040)	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.044)
Religiosity	0.054	0.096	0.091	0.091
	(0.061)	(0.066)	(0.067)	(0.067)
Financial Problems	-0.056	-0.090	-0.052	-0.047
	(0.118)	(0.128)	(0.129)	(0.129)
Other Discrimination	0.467***	0.537***	0.506***	0.498**
	(0.176)	(0.190)	(0.197)	(0.198)
Other Discrimination*Male	-0.047	-0.140	-0.126	-0.123
	(0.284)	(0.279)	(0.314)	(0.315)
Work Characteristics				
Work Hours	0.002	0.005	0.004	0.004
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Work Friends	-0.024	-0.081	-0.087	-0.087
	(0.054)	(0.056)	(0.057)	(0.057)
Workplace Training	0.365**	0.335*	0.324*	0.318*
	(0.173)	(0.181)	(0.183)	(0.183)
Supervisor Listens	0.080	0.090	0.077	0.077
	(0.066)	(0.071)	(0.072)	(0.072)
Supervise Others	-0.133	-0.087	-0.126	-0.129
	(0.154)	(0.169)	(0.170)	(0.169)
Restaurant Industry	-0.194	-0.101	-0.068	-0.061
	(0.136)	(0.143)	(0.152)	(0.151)
Restaurant*Male	-0.035	-0.030	-0.189	-0.196
	(0.241)	(0.235)	(0.263)	(0.261)
Sales Industry	-0.290**	-0.332**	-0.359**	-0.358**
	(0.134)	(0.143)	(0.145)	(0.145)
Sales*Male	0.380*	0.343	0.434*	0.437*
	(0.233)	(0.242)	(0.250)	(0.252)
Intercept	-1.973***	-2.117***	-2.043***	-2.034***
	(0.554)	(0.594)	(0.598)	(0.599)
Number of cases	171	171, 536	171, 536	171, 536
Log-Likelihood	-109.524	-394.080	-385.503	-382.548

*$p < 0.10$; **$p < 0.05$; ***$p < 0.01$
Note: Standard errors in parentheses.

factors associated with sexual harassment decreased the probability of mobilization. Note that the intercept term in Model B was no longer negative as in the uncorrected model (Model A). The probability of mobilization net of unmeasured factors related to harassment was approximately 0.70, the probability associated with a z-score of 0.513. Because the correlation was negative, the overall probability of mobilization would thus have been *higher* had harassment targets represented a random draw from the sample, rather than a selected subgroup. This suggests that perpetrators may select potential targets, in part, because they are those least likely to mobilize the law or notify others of the harassment.

Model C includes individual-level and work characteristics in the mobilization model, along with the selection equation. Closeness to work friends was the only significant predictor of formal mobilization, which paralleled the univariate probit estimation of formal mobilization in Table 3 (see Model A). Selection again played a significant role in this model, however, as the correlation remained strong and significant ($rho = -0.929$).

We next include the two behavioral indicators of harassment that were significant in the univariate probit estimation (see Table 3), informal mobilization, and past formal mobilization. As shown in Model D, measures of invasion of space and physical assault were no longer associated with mobilization, net of selection. By contrast, past formal mobilization and informal mobilization in young adulthood were statistically significant. Those who reported sexual harassment to a supervisor or government authority in the past, and those who reported harassment to a coworker in young adulthood, were more likely to formally mobilize in response to harassment. The effect of work friends on mobilization remained significant despite the inclusion of these additional measures, which significantly improved the overall model fit. The addition of these controls, however, dramatically reduced *rho*'s magnitude and significance. This reduction suggests that the effects of unmeasured factors related to both harassment and mobilization were captured in large part by these strongly predictive independent variables.

Last, we included gender interaction terms for work friends, restaurant workers, and informal mobilization in Model E. While the inclusion of these interactions did not significantly improve the overall model fit, we report three noteworthy findings. First, one of the behavioral measures of harassment, invasion of space, re-emerged as an important predictor of mobilization. Net of other independent variables, individuals who experienced invasion of space were more likely to formally mobilize than those who did not experience this measure of harassment. Second, the effect of close work friends remained strong in magnitude, though the standard error increased slightly in size so that the statistical significance

dropped slightly below the 95 percent confidence interval ($p = 0.054$). Lastly, the inclusion of a gender interaction for informal mobilization revealed a significant difference between men and women. Men, but not women, who reported harassment to a coworker were more likely to also report the harassment to a supervisor or government authority. As in Model D, *rho* remained small and was not statistically significant.

We found one other important difference between the selection-corrected models and the univariate probit presented in Table 3. In Models C, D, and E, religiosity emerged as a marginal negative predictor of mobilization ($p < 0.10$). In all three models, the likelihood of reporting harassment to a supervisor or government authority decreased as religiosity increased. Relying solely on uncorrected models could cause researchers to overlook the potential role of religiosity in suppressing formal mobilization.

In some ways, our interview results affirmed these findings. In particular, having close relationships with coworkers was important for several interview participants. Laurie, a white woman who worked as a waitress in high school, said she and her coworkers warned one another about customers known to be harassers. Describing the content of such discussions, Laurie said:

> [We'd say] like, "Oh, careful, he's a jerk," or, "He's slimy," or "He's a creep," whatever. . . . So then you track records . . . . It would go back and forth, and people would say, "Watch yourself." So you just want to stand further away, or whatever, to safeguard [against being harassed].

Laurie's experience shows how coworkers may collaborate to protect one another from harassment, and it may help explain the low rates of formal mobilization we observed for women in restaurant work. Dan, on the other hand, did not have the sort of supportive workplace relationships Laurie described. A white man who worked for the postal service as a young adult, Dan said he felt discomfort after being "hit on" by several older female coworkers:

> A few older women said stuff like, I don't know if it would be considered harassment but asking, "Hey would you go out" type thing. Stuff like that. I don't know if that would be considered harassment. It did cause me to have kind of an uncomfortable feeling working with them in the future.

When asked whether he talked about those experiences with anyone, Dan said, "No, no. You know, it wasn't anything that I wanted to confide with anyone else. I just kind of kept it underground." Our quantitative results suggest that without confiding in workplace friends, men such as Dan may have been even less likely to report his experience to a supervisor.

Finally, consistent with our quantitative results, the story from Lisa, a white woman, shows how relationships with coworkers might shape participants' legal consciousness. Upon hearing that her coworkers believed she did not object to a vendor's offensive remarks, her own consciousness changed:

> At the convenience store where I worked in high school we had a vendor who was pretty sexist and would make comments on the customers walking in. About their boobs. It didn't occur to me that he *shouldn't* be saying that stuff. I just naturally expected him, because he was such a sleazy guy, to be saying stuff like that. Then some of the other employees filed a complaint about him and he got fired. Later I asked them why they hadn't asked me to join the complaint and there was a comment like, "We thought you didn't have a problem with it." And, you know, I can see why they would have thought that just 'cuz I wasn't complaining about him to anybody else. [The experience] changed my feelings since I *can* speak up if something like this happens, "Oh wait a minute, there's something I can do about this!" I can say, "Hey! This is not right or appropriate and knock it off" (emphasis in original).

Our quantitative analysis suggests that workers such as Lisa may be targeted for harassment, in part, because they are perceived as unlikely or unwilling to mobilize. Lisa's story suggests a more dynamic process, in which legal consciousness develops in response to social relationships.

Our interview data may also help explain why workplace training, at least sexual harassment training, was nonsignificant in the quantitative models that adjusted for selectivity. Several interview participants noted that an increasing number of companies are beginning to require their employees to attend some form of sexual harassment training. Yet few participants put much stock in the training. Angela recalled how she and her coworkers rarely connected their everyday retail work to the sexual harassment training they had received:

> There were times when [men] coworkers would comment on a woman coming into the department, make really explicit comments about her breasts or body parts. That always made me feel uncomfortable. And they had posters in the warehouse, actual posters of women in bikinis and stuff. ... There were a few women that I spoke with [about it]. I think we all just kind of dismissed it as "well, that's just guy behavior," not really ever acknowledging that maybe we can have a different expectation, or that if we're uncomfortable with it that we could really do anything about it. It was funny—we had the little sexual harassment lectures and we'd go through the sexual harassment training and we'd just all laugh and then we'd walk away.

While our interview data complement the quantitative findings in some ways, they also go beyond our quantitative models, revealing additional forms of mobilization and factors that may play a role in individuals' mobilization decisions.

The Complexity of Mobilization: Evidence From Our Interviews

Our interviews also raise new questions about the complexities of legal consciousness and mobilization. We first discuss factors not considered in the statistical models that affected participants' consciousness regarding harassment, such as the nature or quality of personal relationships. We then offer a preliminary multidimensional typology of mobilization to describe the range of possible responses to harassment.

Consciousness and Sexual Harassment

Consciousness about sexual harassment involves how people understand harassment, how they define it, and how their own views develop over time. In describing the processes by which they come to understand and respond to sexual harassment, we observe "the imprint of law" (Ewick & Silbey 1998) reflected in and reflective of those processes. In many ways, our interview data echoed the quantitative results, suggesting that participants' relationships with coworkers shaped their conceptions of and responses to harassment. Beyond our quantitative results, interview participants indicated that their understandings of harassment changed as they gained life experience. In addition, they described how factors such as their family's attitude toward harassment, which was not included in our statistical models, may impact consciousness.

Our interview data showed that relationships outside of the workplace may be just as important in shaping consciousness as those within the workplace. For example, Pam's survey responses indicated that she mobilized by telling her coworkers and bosses about offensive questions, jokes, and invasion of her personal space. In our interview, however, Pam revealed an additional form of mobilization that she perceived as even more important. Discussions with friends and family, according to Pam, transformed how she perceived the "constant sex jokes" at one of her first workplaces. In thinking about the joking, Pam said, "This was sort of before sexual harassment really came into the limelight so a lot of those things that happened were just considered acceptable. Looking back on it now, there's just no way it would have flown today. [If the diner were still in business] it would have had to have a major overhaul." Pam still remembered some of the jokes, recalling the following in her interview:

> One time one of the waitresses was kneeling on the floor. She was
> trying to get something that had fallen under the jukebox and the
> manager said, "Hey Sally, while you're down there . . ." [speaking
> in a suggestive tone]. And he just started laughing.

Pam told some of the jokes to her friends and family because she
thought they were funny. But the reactions of people she respected
caused her to reconsider her perception of the joking:

> I told my girlfriends about some of the stuff that was said and they
> didn't like it. And I remember telling a family member and she
> especially didn't like it. I don't remember exactly what was said, but
> I remember that they didn't see it in the same light that I did.

Pam's consciousness about her own experiences thus shifted after
discussing them with others outside of work. This important aspect
of how Pam's consciousness developed could not have been cap-
tured using our survey methodology.

Pam's job at the diner was one of her first jobs, and she was
relatively young at the time. But more experienced workers also re-
lied on personal relationships to understand and cope with harass-
ment. Like Pam, Marie, a white woman, told supportive people in her
life about harassing workplace experiences. Marie, one of the few
female managers in the construction industry, said she discussed her
workplace experiences with her husband, who works in the same
industry:

> If something is borderline, I talk to him about it. I don't think it's
> good to keep things hidden. Just being a female in management
> is difficult, and guys don't like it.

Marie went on to describe how discussions with her husband
helped her face men in the industry who were resistant, sometimes
even hostile, to a woman manager. Thus it was in the hours after
work and in the company of her spouse rather than colleagues that
Marie's consciousness about harassment developed. In addition to
relationships outside of work, our interview data suggested one
more way that relationships with others may impact consciousness.

While our survey results indicated that having close work
friends increases mobilization, the interview data showed that co-
workers may sometimes inhibit mobilization decisions. In fact, co-
workers led some interviewees to believe they may have
overreacted to a situation. Though she reported no mobilization
in the survey, Angela later described her response to a customer's
proposition while at her high school waitressing job:

> I was sitting at a table wrapping the silverware in cloth napkins
> and he came and sat down and was talking to me for a long time.
> I really didn't want to be rude and ask him to leave but I was
> becoming more and more uncomfortable and he was becoming

> more and more intimate and forward with his questions. Finally
> he said "I'm staying at this hotel across the highway" and he
> invited me to join him. At that point I asked him to leave.

After "loitering for a bit," the man did leave the restaurant. Angela
described the experience as "a turning point in my view of that
job" and said "that was really the first time where I experienced
that blatant sexual propositioning. I was pretty innocent and a
naive Catholic girl, so I really felt unsafe for a while after that."
Angela then told an older waitress about the experience:

> I told another waitress. She was a lot older. Basically I just shared
> it with her to find out if she knew him—was he someone in the
> community or was he just traveling through. She had seen him
> before but he wasn't in the community. She basically just said that
> it was a pattern he had, that when he came in he would talk to
> other waitresses that way. She was kind of nonchalant. She had
> worked there for probably 15 years. I think it was just part of
> daily life for her in a sense.

As Angela's remarks indicate, coworkers might sometimes discour-
age mobilization. It is also worth noting that Angela's background
as a "naive Catholic girl" shaped her perception of the experience.
Angela's own observation about the possible impact of her religious
background on her perception of appropriate and inappropriate
behavior echoed the finding from our survey data that religiosity
seemed to play a role in responses to sexual harassment.

Relationships impacted not only how participants perceived
their experiences but also how they responded to them. In Pam's
interview, she described not wanting to disrupt the family-like at-
mosphere at her workplace. She did not like the sexual joking,
remarks about her body, and intrusive questions by her male co-
workers at a radio station, but she also felt some responsibility for
wanting to maintain the existing atmosphere. In Pam's words,
"The atmosphere there was so much like a family that it was really
hard to [speak up]. Most people just got along there. That may be
one of the reasons why I never, you know, put up a fuss about it."
For Pam, having close friends at work may have actually discour-
aged her from mobilizing. Without the interview data, we would
not have observed this aspect of participants' experiences.

Across our interviews, routine activities at work, social rela-
tionships, and individual characteristics seemed to work together in
shaping consciousness about and responses to sexual harassment.
These data also showed how responses to harassment are inter-
twined with individuals' unique understandings of the concept. In
the following section, we describe participants' responses in greater
depth, analyzing the variety of mobilization strategies employed.

Responding to Harassment: A Typology of Mobilization?

Participants employed many strategies to deal with workplace sexual harassment, from ignoring it to reporting it up the chain of command. Our interview results suggested that a multidimensional typology best represents participants' diverse mobilization strategies. Moving beyond traditional formal/informal mobilization dichotomies allows us to more closely examine the complexities of mobilization. In general, we found multiple forms of "informal" mobilization. Many of those who were classified as "non-mobilizers" from the survey data spent time during their interviews describing response strategies that were empowering and effective for themselves—strategies that should not be overlooked. Our preliminary typology of mobilization is represented by the figure below, followed by interview data bearing on the proposed typology.

Mobilization Continuum:
Ignore → Avoid → Self help → Tell friends/family → Tell equals → Tell superiors → Tell attorney/agency

---

Some participants ignored harassment as a strategy for coping with it. Both women and men described ignoring harassment, though women's descriptions more clearly identified this as a conscious strategy. Like Dan, the postal worker described previously, Cam, an Asian American man who worked in a factory during high school, tried to keep "uncomfortable" experiences with female coworkers under wraps. In one of the few instances of female-on-male harassment in our sample, Cam says he felt uncomfortable when female coworkers came on to him:

> There were girls who approached me that I didn't know. They tended to grab on you, like on the elbows or shoulders. They tended to stand really close to you, and they smiled a lot, and they offered help, and they also asked for help. Those [kinds of] things. I didn't know how to react to the situation. So it was hard for me and it was uncomfortable. I usually pretended there was nothing happening.

Like Dan and Cam, several women participants also talked about attempting to ignore harassment, though they did so less out of embarrassment that it had occurred and more as a strategy to avoid further harassment. Women seemed to hold out hope that if they avoided directly confronting harassment, it would eventually stop. Hannah, a white woman, did not formally mobilize because she observed her harassers' responses to another woman whom they teased regularly:

> Basically I watched this one woman get really upset all the time, which would always really goad the guys on more to tease her. So

> I would just let them tease me, and I wouldn't react, or try not to. I was hoping they would have gotten tired of it.

Other women did not ignore harassment per se but employed "passive" strategies to deal with it. At the retail store where she worked during high school, Marie faced coworkers who made unwanted passes at her: "Most of the time my response was [to tell them] that I had a boyfriend, even if I didn't. Sometimes I [really] did [have a boyfriend] and sometimes I didn't." Pam used a similar strategy to avoid harassment from customers while working at a bakery:

> I remember actually buying a fake wedding ring and putting it on my ring finger so men wouldn't bother me. [I started doing it] after men started bothering me. Because of it. I just didn't want to mess with it. I just wanted to protect myself.

Angela avoided areas at work where she would encounter certain groups of male coworkers:

> I remember a manager who made a lot of disparaging comments about sexual frustration like "I'm not serviced by my wife at home." And he would make those comments around me and that really made me uncomfortable. If I saw this manager standing around talking to guys I definitely wouldn't walk past and I wouldn't be around it. I would avoid [certain] places around the store, and sometimes alter my work habits to avoid it.

Finally, April, a white woman, described making strategic wardrobe choices to avoid harassment by male coworkers in an automotive repair shop:

> I would have to watch what I wore. I wouldn't wear anything too tight. If I did, well, I have, this is so stupid, but my nipples stick out, they always stick out. So I would have to put band-aids over them because I felt like they'd be staring at me if I didn't. A couple times [they said things to me about it]. They would just say, "You cold?" or, "Your headlights are sticking out!" or something like that. It's embarrassing. It embarrasses me.

Marie, Angela, and April did not ignore the harassment, nor did they take any steps toward formal mobilization. Instead, they each came up with creative strategies to deal with or avoid it. When ignoring or avoiding harassment proved ineffective, some participants actually quit their jobs or transferred to new locations. Marie tried to avoid harassment but eventually moved to a different store when her strategy of pretending to have a boyfriend did not work. Like Marie, Liz, a white woman, removed herself from a harassing situation by literally leaving her workplace. Liz said, "I took personal leave for the last two months of my pregnancy, and I truly took personal leave because I was so emotionally distressed." Marie and Liz's actions might be viewed as avoidance, but the act of

leaving a job *is* a form of action. Traditional dichotomies of mobilization may omit such actions, overlooking a response that some participants perceived as both satisfying and effective.

When not avoiding harassment, participants sometimes used self-help by taking matters into their own hands, especially in cases where the harassment was isolated or rare. While working as a waitress, Laurie employed self-help in the following way:

> One [experience] that sticks out the best is when a male customer put up two fingers and motioned for me to come over, and he asked me if I always came with two fingers. And then I did pour coffee in his lap, and then went down and said to my manager, "I have to tell you, I just did something that you might be angry, but this is what I did." My manager said the customer had it coming.

In addition to the above experience, one might also understand Laurie's previously described experience (in which coworkers warned each other about potential harassers) as a form of self-help. In that instance, rather than reporting harassment up the chain of command or demanding an improved workplace culture, these restaurant workers relied upon each other for protection and upon a strategy of standing "further away" from known harassers.

As Laurie did with her coffee, Jerry, who is of mixed race, engaged in self-help when he directly confronted his harasser, a male coworker who groped him while on the job as a prison guard. Jerry immediately told the man to stop but did not report any mobilization in our survey. He explained, "I never did anything about it. You know, I felt like I dealt with it right there. You know [I said] 'Don't ever touch me again,' basically." Jerry's harasser was eventually fired after word got around about his experience. Even though Jerry did not formally mobilize, several coworkers witnessed the incident and he also discussed it with a few coworker friends. In addition, several others with whom Jerry worked later reported their own harassment experiences with the same man.

Having coworkers know about his experience may have influenced Jerry's mobilization decisions. Interview participants also described the importance of relationships outside of work in shaping their consciousness and responses to harassment (see, e.g., Marie's discussions with her husband, described in the previous section). Relationships with coworkers and friends, and discussions with them about their experiences, mattered even for adolescents in informal jobs. Janice's friends helped her deal with the father in a family for whom she and her friends babysat.

> We called him "horn-man" because he was just icky. He was really icky. He would come out and just have shorts and a t-shirt on but

> he wouldn't have anything under his shorts and he'd sit across from us and have his legs up and be talking to us. We'd be like, "OK we have to go," and he'd say, "No, you can't leave yet." And if his wife wasn't home he'd say, "No, you can't leave until you give me a hug."

When asked whether she or her friends ever hugged the man, Janice, a white woman, said:

> Yeah. We wanted to leave. We were afraid of him. I never went there alone because I was seriously afraid of him. [I always brought someone with me.] Always. Because he scared me too much. He was just so icky. I just can't [pauses] I mean, he was just icky. Trying to be close to us, [saying things] like "Let me just hug you. Let me just squish you. You're a really good girl." Icky. And no. We didn't [tell any adults at the time].

Although Janice and her friends did not report the "icky" man to any adults, and she reported no mobilization in her survey responses, their reliance on one another to cope with the situation could in fact be viewed as a form of informal mobilization.

For most of the interviewees, mobilization in response to harassment was not one-dimensional. That is, participants typically tried a response represented early on the continuum, perhaps ignoring harassment or more actively avoiding it, before talking with others about the experience or reporting it up the chain of command. Erin's story, below, describes how her own mobilization progressed from avoidance to self-help to discussions with friends outside of and at work and finally to reporting the harassment to her boss. Erin, a white school custodian, first tried to deflect the sexually suggestive remarks made by a male coworker. For example:

> He said something about how he'd been looking in the Victoria's Secret catalogue and was wondering what I'd look like in a pair of thong underwear and I said, "Why don't you buy your girlfriend a pair of thong underwear. I don't wear thong underwear." You know, just trying to avoid the subject. I always tried to keep it at a joking manner.

Eventually the coworker's remarks went too far, and he began grabbing and touching her without her consent, so Erin confronted him more directly:

> I was like, "Don't do that. You can't be doing that at work," and, "There's kids around," or, "Just don't touch me. I don't want you to touch me." That kind of thing. He'd [stop] for a day or two and then go back to trying to jokingly touch me and all that crap again.

Despite her repeated requests for him to stop, and then enlisting the help of her coworkers who tried to get him to stop, Erin's

harasser continued to touch her and make sexually suggestive re-
marks, so she eventually mobilized more formally by reporting the
harassment to her boss:

> I told my boss about it and my boss told him the same day, within
> minutes, not to ever touch me again at work. That was uncom-
> fortable but he came up and apologized to me the first time and
> said, "Oh I'm sorry. I won't do it again." But he did. So I told [my
> boss] again. He said he was sorry and all that and then a couple
> weeks later he touched me again and I was like, all right. So I told
> [my boss] again. There was two occasions where he actually un-
> snapped my bra while we were at work. I was like, all right, that's
> it, no more! He would laugh and say, "Ha ha, lookit, I can unsnap
> your bra with one finger." I said, "I don't care how many fingers
> it takes, don't do it. Don't ever do it again."

Although Erin did report the harassment to her supervisor, she
initially pursued several other strategies to deal with it. Simply
labeling Erin as a formal mobilizer because she reported the ha-
rassment to her supervisor overlooks these previous attempts and
her multidimensional mobilization strategy.

Hannah's experience in an office setting provides another ex-
ample of how individuals might progress along the mobilization
continuum. Like Erin, Hannah first attempted to respond to ha-
rassment by taking care of it on her own. Later, she reported the
incident to her human resources department:

> This sales guy [walked up behind me]. I was standing in the
> doorway, and I think I probably had my arms up on my [gestures,
> standing with hands on hips], and one of the slimiest sales guys
> came up, and went like this [slides hands up and down ribs], and
> tickled me, and I was like "Ew!" I was just so wigged out. I turned
> around, and I think I said pretty loud, that that was *not* an OK
> touch, which made everyone come out of their cubes. And then I
> did talk to [Human Resources] about it.

As described with Hannah and Erin above, other participants also
recalled first attempting self-help techniques in order to stop ha-
rassment but then moving on to more formal mobilization.

Holly, who is white and the only woman manager at her company,
formally mobilized after being harassed by a client at a company event
but only after trying to deal with the situation on her own.

> It was the VP of their company, and he would get really touchy-
> feely. And I'm like, uh, you know he's kind of from that old boys'
> school and him and [the owner of my company] have known each
> other for a lot of years and so I'm like whatever. He'd put his arm
> around me and say, "Oh I love her. She's beautiful." And I'm just

> sitting next to him and I'm the only girl at the table and I'm just
> like, oh OK this is fun [sarcastically].

The harassment continued, even escalated, in spite of Holly's attempts to get him to stop.

> And he'd put his arm around me and pull me towards him and,
> kind of uncomfortable, and I'd push away. And he just kept going
> on and touching me and put his hand on my leg very forcefully
> and then he was playing the game of trying to unhook my bra
> with two fingers which he did after I tried to get up and get away
> once. I went to get up and he put his arm on my shoulders and
> said, "Stay." And the whole nine yards, and I was really shaking
> and he kept being excessively persistent with his hand on the leg
> thing and I sat with my leg crossed away from him, my arms
> across my body kind of protecting me.

Holly had attended the event alone, was the only woman present at the table, and did not have any close work friends. Holly thus lacked the coworker support that other respondents described. Eventually, others at the table began to notice what was happening and the client's harassment finally ended, but only after he was physically separated from her.

> It was just really awkward and people started to notice the different things that were going on and finally the regional guy just
> kind of [made a gesture indicating someone calling someone
> over]. So I got up and then I said, "You need to move, physically
> move your butt into my chair because I'm not sitting there." So,
> we sat down at about six and he was touchy-feely for maybe an
> hour or so and then he started the leg and everything else and I'd
> push his hand off and it just progressed. I think I left about nine.

Holly formally mobilized by contacting her attorney the next morning. At the time of our interview, she and her attorney were negotiating a satisfactory response to the incident with the two companies involved. Holly found the experience of reporting the incident and contacting an attorney empowering. She described feeling emotional turmoil and difficulty at work following the incident, but she was also proud of her swift response. When asked to describe her feelings about how things had proceeded to that point, and whether she had any regrets about having reported it, she said simply, in a proud and matter-of-fact tone, "Nope, none."

However targets respond, experiencing harassment alters their perceptions of the workplace and of themselves. As our interviews show, the process of mobilizing in response to harassment is dynamic, with every incident and response shaping how subsequent incidents are managed and how previous incidents are perceived.

What Is Mobilization? Discussion and Conclusion

Together, our quantitative and qualitative results show how the personal and social contexts that structure sexual harassment also shape mobilization choices. Although our sample is limited to younger workers in a single community, we can offer generalizations based on our longitudinal survey and intensive interview data. Our quantitative results suggest that having close work friends may provide guardianship that promotes mobilization. While much of the academic and policy literature on sexual harassment concerns hierarchical relationships, our findings suggest that horizontal worker-to-worker relationships are crucial for understanding both harassment and mobilization. Though close work friends may facilitate mobilization, others at work, such as mentors or those with whom participants are not personally close, may have a different influence. Angela's experience, in which an older colleague caused her to doubt her interpretation of a customer's proposition as harassing, shows how coworkers may sometimes squelch mobilization. The process by which Angela's experience transformed into a grievance was not linear. Instead, her understanding of her experience was shaped by her initial gut response, by the fact that she felt "unsafe for a while" following the experience, and by the discussion with her "unimpressed" coworker. The dynamic nature of Angela's account reflects Ewick and Silbey's (1998) conceptualization of legal consciousness as a process and as a sort of cultural practice. For Angela as well as our other interview participants, mobilization was not simply a question of doing it or not, nor of formal versus informal mobilization. Instead, consciousness and mobilization unfolded dynamically, developing in response to conversations with others and their own varied attempts to cope with and confront harassment, from active avoidance to talking it over with coworkers.

The effects of self-efficacy in our quantitative models were nonsignificant, though the interview data suggest that efficacy may be worth investigating further. Jerry, the prison guard, and Laurie, the waitress, whose survey responses indicated higher than average scores on self-efficacy, both took matters into their own hands rather than pursuing formal remedies. To a greater extent than the survey analysis, the interviews highlight the dynamic nature of the relationships between targeting, mobilization, and perceptions. Participants' legal consciousness was shaped by their harassment experiences and by other social interactions, and these in turn shaped their feelings about subsequent experiences. We believe this article underscores the need for multimethod work that allows for both breadth and depth in terms of research methodology.

Consistent with previous work (Hoffman 2003, 2006; Jacobs 2007), we find that legal consciousness and mobilization take several forms. Filing lawsuits and consulting attorneys represent formal responses, but even the seemingly simple act of telling others about one's experiences represents a form of mobilization. Our interview data reveal great diversity in mobilization strategies, beyond the classic formal/informal dichotomy. Some individuals opted to confront their harassers directly, others engaged in strategies to avoid or deflect harassment, and still others sought out alternative employment. While each approach has benefits and drawbacks, individuals facing workplace harassment clearly employ a great range of strategies in response. Future researchers might examine the extent to which our proposed mobilization typology applies not only to sexual harassment responses but to other mobilization processes as well. Does the sexual harassment mobilization continuum apply to workers who have greater experience than the adolescent and young adult workers in our study? Do individual mobilization responses to other forms of discrimination resemble the responses outlined in our preliminary typology?

Taken as a whole, our findings suggest that sexual harassment targeting and mobilization are best understood as interrelated processes. Targets appear to be selected, in part, because they are less likely to mobilize the law in response. While results from our selectivity-corrected models were generally consistent with those from uncorrected models, we were fortunate to have strong longitudinal data on past harassment and mobilization experiences in this study. Before adding these variables to our mobilization models, the harassment and mobilization equations were quite strongly correlated. Our interview data, including Lisa's story about not being asked by coworkers to participate in a joint complaint about a vendor, further support this finding. Moreover, those who are targeted respond in part based on their prior harassment experiences and their suppositions about future experiences, such that reflections on past events shape subsequent mobilization strategies. Just as Lisa or others may respond differently should they face offensive workplace behavior in the future, Janice, who told us about the "icky" man who harassed her while she worked as a young babysitter, carries these harassment experiences with her into adulthood. Harassment targeting and mobilization are thus intertwined at any given time, and individual responses and strategies evolve over time.

References

Albiston, Catherine R. (2005) "Bargaining in the Shadow of Social Institutions: Competing Discourses and Social Change in Workplace Mobilization of Civil Rights," 39 *Law & Society Rev.* 11–49.

Baker, Douglas D., et al. (1990) "The Influence of Individual Characteristics and Severity of Harassing Behavior on Reactions to Sexual Harassment," 22 *Sex Roles* 305–25.

Barr, Paula A. (1993) "Perceptions of Sexual Harassment," 63 *Sociological Inquiry* 460–70.

Bravo, Ellen, & Ellen Cassedy (1999) *The Updated and Expanded 9to5 Guide to Combating Sexual Harassment*. Milwaukee, WI: 9to5 Working Women Education Fund.

Bumiller, Kristin (1988) *The Civil Rights Society: The Social Construction of Victims*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Chamberlain, Lindsey Joyce, et al. (2008) "Sexual Harassment in Organizational Context," 35 *Work and Occupations* 262–95.

Charmaz, Kathy (2005) "Grounded Theory in the 21st Century: Applications for Advancing Social Justice Studies," in N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, eds., *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3d ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collinson, Margaret, & David Collinson (1996) "It's Only Dick: The Sexual Harassment of Women Managers in Insurance Sales," 10 *Work, Employment and Society* 29–56.

Connolly, Catherine (2002) "The Voice of the Petitioner: The Experiences of Gay and Lesbian Parents in Successful Second-Parent Adoption Proceedings," 36 *Law & Society Rev.* 325–46.

Cormier, Kelley E. (2007) "Grievance Practices in Post-Soviet Kyrgyz Agriculture," 32 *Law & Social Inquiry* 435–66.

DeCoster, Stacy, et al. (1999) "Routine Activities and Sexual Harassment in the Workplace," 26 *Work and Occupations* 21–49.

Ewick, Patricia, & Susan S. Silbey (1998) *The Common Place of Law*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Felstiner, William L., et al. (1980–81) "The Emergence and Transformation of Disputes: Naming, Blaming, Claiming. . .," 15 *Law & Society Rev.* 631–54.

Finch, Michael, et al. (1991) "Work Experience and Control Orientation in Adolescence," 56 *American Sociological Rev.* 597–611.

Fleury-Steiner, Benjamin (2003) "Before or Against the Law? Citizens' Legal Beliefs and Experiences as Death Penalty Jurors," 27 *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society* 115–37.

Gallagher, Mary E. (2006) "Mobilizing the Law in China: 'Informed Disenchantment' and the Development of Legal Consciousness," 40 *Law & Society Rev.* 783–816.

Gelfand, Michele J., et al. (1995) "The Structure of Sexual Harassment: A Confirmatory Analysis across Cultures and Settings," 47 *J. of Vocational Behavior* 164–77.

Giuffre, Patti A., & Christine L. Williams (1994) "Labeling Sexual Harassment in Restaurants," 8 *Gender & Society* 378–401.

Glaser, Barney G., & Anselm L. Strauss (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Transaction.

Gruber, James E. (1998) "The Impact of Male Work Environments and Organizational Policies on Women's Experiences of Sexual Harassment," 12 *Gender & Society* 301–20.

Hardy, Melissa A. (1989) "Estimating Selection Effects in Occupational Mobility in a 19th-Century City," 54 *American Sociological Rev.* 834–43.

Heckman, James J. (1976) "The Common Structure of Statistical Models of Truncation, Sample Selection and Limited Dependent Variables and a Simple Estimator for Such Models," 5 *Annals of Economic and Social Measurement* 475–92.

Hoffman, Elizabeth A. (2003) "Legal Consciousness and Dispute Resolution: Different Disputing Behavior at Two Similar Taxicab Companies," 28 *Law & Social Inquiry* 691–716.

—— (2005) "Dispute Resolution in a Worker Cooperative: Formal Procedures and Procedural Justice," 39 *Law & Society Rev.* 51–82.

—— (2006) "Exit and Voice: Organizational Loyalty and Dispute Resolution Strategies," 84 *Social Forces* 2313–30.

Hull, Kathleen E. (2003) "The Cultural Power of Law and the Cultural Enactment of Legality: The Case of Same-Sex Marriage," 28 *Law & Social Inquiry* 629–57.

Jacobs, Lesley A. (2007) "Rights and Quarantine During the SARS Global Health Crisis: Differentiated Legal Consciousness in Hong Kong, Shanghai, and Toronto," 41 *Law & Society Rev.* 511–51.

Kritzer, Herbert M., et al. (1991) "To Confront or Not to Confront: Measuring Claiming Rates in Discrimination," 25 *Law & Society Rev.* 875–87.

Lerum, Kari (2004) "Sexuality, Power, and Camaraderie in Service Work," 18 *Gender & Society* 756–76.

Liao, Tim Futing (1995) "The Nonrandom Selection of Don't Knows in Binary and Ordinal Responses: Correction with the Bivariate Probit Model with Sample Selection," 29 *Quality and Quantity* 87–110.

Litowitz, Douglas (2000) "The Social Construction of Law: Explanations and Implications," 21 *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society* 215–42.

Lofland, John, & Lyn H. Lofland (1995) *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lovell, George I. (2006) "Justice Excused: The Deployment of Law in Everyday Political Encounters," 40 *Law & Society Rev.* 283–324.

MacKinnon, Catharine (1979) *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.

Marshall, Anna-Maria (2001) "A Spectrum of Oppositional Consciousness: Sexual Harassment Plaintiffs and Their Lawyers," in J. Mansbridge & A. Morris, eds., *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

——— (2003) "Injustice Frames, Legality, and the Everyday Construction of Sexual Harassment," 28 *Law & Social Inquiry* 659–89.

——— (2005) "Idle Rights: Employees' Rights Consciousness and the Construction of Sexual Harassment," 39 *Law & Society Rev.* 83–123.

Marshall, Anna-Maria, & Scott Barclay (2003) "In Their Own Words: How Ordinary People Construct the Legal World," 28 *Law & Social Inquiry* 617–28.

Merry, Sally Engle (1990) *Getting Justice and Getting Even: Legal Consciousness among Working Class Americans*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Morgan, Laurie A., & Karin A. Martin (2006) "Taking Women Professions Out of the Office: The Case of Women in Sales," 20 *Gender & Society* 108–28.

Morgan, Phoebe A. (1999) "Risking Relationships: Understanding the Litigation Choices of Sexually Harassed Women," 33 *Law & Society Rev.* 201–26.

Morrison, Rachel L. (2009) "Are Women Tending and Befriending in the Workplace? Gender Differences in the Relationship Between Workplace Friendships and Organizational Outcomes," 60 *Sex Roles* 1–13.

Mortimer, Jeylan (2003) *Working and Growing Up in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Munkres, Susan A. (2008) "Claiming 'Victim' to Harassment Law: Legal Consciousness of the Privileged," 33 *Law & Social Inquiry* 447–72.

Nielsen, Laura Beth (2000) "Situating Legal Consciousness: Experiences and Attitudes of Ordinary Citizens about Law and Street Harassment," 34 *Law & Society Rev.* 1055–90.

Pedriana, Nicholas (2006) "From Protective to Equal Treatment: Legal Framing Processes and Transformation of the Women's Movement in the 1960s," 111 *American J. of Sociology* 1718–61.

Quinn, Beth A. (2000) "The Paradox of Complaining: Law, Humor, and Harassment in the Everyday Work World," 25 *Law & Social Inquiry* 1151–85.

——— (2005) "Toward a Criminology of Sexual Harassment," in J. E. Gruber & P. Morgan, eds., *In the Company of Men: Male Dominance and Sexual Harassment*. Boston: Northeastern Univ. Press.

Richman, Kimberly D. (2001) "In Times of Need: Abused Women's Sources of Support and Changes in Legal Consciousness," 22 *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society* 171–94.

Rospenda, Kathleen M., et al. (1998) "Doing Power: The Confluence of Gender, Race, and Class in Contrapower Sexual Harassment," 12 *Gender & Society* 40–60.

Rutter, Peter (1997) *Understanding and Preventing Sexual Harassment*. New York: Bantam.

Simpson, Sally & Lori Ellis (1996) "Theoretical Perspectives on the Corporate Victimization of Women," in E. Szockyj & J. Fox, eds., *Corporate Victimization of Women*. Boston: Northeastern Univ. Press.

Stambaugh, Phoebe Morgan (1997) "The Power of Law and the Sexual Harassment Complaints of Women," 9 *National Women's Studies Association J.* 23–42.

Terpstra, David E., & Douglas D. Baker (1986) "Psychological and Demographic Correlates of Perceptions of Sexual Harassment," 112 *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 461–78.

Tinkler, Justine E. (2008) "People Are Too Quick to Take Offense: The Effects of Legal Information and Beliefs on Definitions of Sexual Harassment," 33 *Law & Social Inquiry* 417–45.

Uggen, Christopher, & Amy Blackstone (2004) "Sexual Harassment as a Gendered Expression of Power," 69 *American Sociological Rev.* 64–92.

Webb, Susan L. (1999) *Sexual Harassment, Shades of Gray: Guidelines for Managers, Supervisors & Employees*. Shoreline, WA: Pacific Resource Development.

Weiss, Robert S. (2004) "In Their Own Words: Making the Most of Qualitative Interviews," 3 *Contexts* 44–51.

Welsh, Sandy (1999) "Gender and Sexual Harassment," 25 *Annual Rev. of Sociology* 169–90.

Welsh, Sandy, et al. (2006) "I'm Not Thinking of It as Sexual Harassment: Understanding Harassment across Race and Citizenship," 20 *Gender & Society* 87–107.

Welsh, Sandy, et al. (2002) "Legal Factors, Extra-Legal Factors, or Changes in the Law? Using Criminal Justice Research to Understand the Resolution of Sexual Harassment Complaints," 49 *Social Problems* 605–23.

Winship, Christopher, & Robert D. Mare (1992) "Models for Sample Selection Bias," 18 *Annual Rev. of Sociology* 327–50.

Amy Blackstone is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Maine. In addition to her current ongoing research on workplace harassment, she studies the experiences of and social responses to child-free adults. Her prior research on activism in the breast cancer and anti-rape movements has appeared in journals such as Gender & Society *and* Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.

Christopher Uggen is Distinguished McKnight Professor and Chair of Sociology at the University of Minnesota. His work on crime, discrimination, and inequality appears in journals such as American Sociological Review *and* American Journal of Sociology, *as well as the* New York Times, The Economist, *and NPR. With Jeff Manza, he wrote* Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement and American Democracy *(2006, Oxford). He is currently having fun editing* Contexts *magazine with Doug Hartmann.*

Heather McLaughlin is a sociology Ph.D. student at the University of Minnesota. She received her bachelor's degree in sociology and psychology from the University of Maine. Aside from sexual harassment, her research interests include gender and law, adolescence, and the family. Her dissertation work focuses on gender and youth sport.