The Influence of Social Dominance, Ambivalent Sexism and Organizational Climate Towards Sexual Harassment Tolerance

Ahmad Shazeer Mohamed Thaheer[1*], Azurin Sani[2], Abdul Rahman Abdul Rahim[3], Mohammad Hakimy Abdullah[4], Noorfaiz Purhanudin[5] and Nor Amizatul Akma Zamaruddin[6]

[1,3,4,5,6]Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA,
42300Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
ahmadshazeer@uitm.edu.my*

[2]Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA,
42300Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
nurzan7884@uitm.edu.my

(*) Corresponding author

Abstract

As the participation of women in the workforce has grown over time, sexual harassment at the workplace has received much attention among scholars. Even though this topic is famous, the study about tolerance level among women is still lacking and needs more discussions nowadays. There have been some changes from several aspects such as social, economic, culture, and legislation for the last ten years. Several factors could affect the level of tolerance towards sexual harassment among women. Therefore, this paper aims to examine the effects of social dominance, ambivalent sexism, and organizational climate regarding women's tolerance towards sexual harassment at the workplace. The finding revealed that women's tolerance for sexual harassment is positively related to ambivalent sexism, workplace atmosphere, and social dominance. Additionally, aggressive sexism is the strongest predictor of women's tolerance for sexual harassment. This study implies that creating awareness on tolerance and removing harassment from the workplace requires action against individual incidents and existing practices and attitudes that foster sexual harassment.

Keywords: Sexual Harassment, Ambivalent Sexism, Organizational Climate, Social Dominance.

1.   Introduction

Workplace sexual harassment has been highlighted as a key issue for female employees. The Employees age, job experience, attitudes and how the employees' job are potentially facilitating sexual harassment in an organization (Hobbs, Klachky and Cooper, 2021). Sexual harassment in the workplace is a problem for all. In detail, sexual harassment can damage employees' prospects for career development and salary increments. In addition, harassment can create an offensive, hostile, and intimidating work environment that interferes with one's performance and job success.

Sexual harassment of women is one of the most prominent and detrimental barriers to women's career development and satisfaction. Sexual harassment covers a range of behaviors usually placed on a continuum of severity. One common typology assigns behaviors into three categories is that gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion (Hobbs, Klachky and Cooper, 2021). Sexual harassment remains an occupational hazard for workers in an

organization. The issue of sexual harassment has been the subject of recent debate in many countries. For example, in Africa, women's rights are minor, if not nonexistent. Where the laws are inadequately drawn to address the issue, sexual harassment is not usually paid much attention. Most women victims of sexual harassment do not dare to report it because they have little chance to be believed, and more so, they do not see how the perpetrator would be prosecuted (Azenui, 2006). The same cases happened when sexual harassment was outlawed in China, establishing gender equality as their national policy due to the growing problem of sexual harassment in the workplace.

A similar trend in Malaysia has been emerging as women have entered the workforce in increasing numbers (Ismail & Chee, 2005). By the year 2000, almost half of the Malaysian women were economically active. This, coupled with the simultaneous upward trend of women in traditionally male-dominated occupations, has set the stage for the sexual harassment threat. Consequently, sexual harassment has also become a widespread problem in Malaysia, as shown by recent studies.

The rates of occurrences do not differ too much from the situation found in the United States. Between 35 percent and 53 percent of women have experienced sexual harassment at work (Ng, Zanariah & Maria, 2003). Recently, the Malaysian government has indeed recognized sexual harassment as an unruly and demoralizing organizational problem. The issue regarding sexual harassment caught the public eye when the Ministry of Human Resources in Malaysia came up with a Guideline for Sexual Harassment in the Workplace 1999. This guideline has given the view that sexual harassment remains an occupational hazard for workers in an organization. Furthermore, surveys of two government departments in Penang and Perlis in Malaysia also found that 83 percent and 88 percent of women respondents had experienced some form of sexual harassment (Haspels, Zaitun, Thomas & McCann, 2001).

The issues of sexual harassment have also attracted Malaysian researchers in such studies, for instance, sexual harassment incidence (Ismail & Chee, 2005), job context (Muzaffar & Samirah, 1999), sexual harassment code of conduct (Ng et al., 2003) and sexual harassment training (Sabitha & Mohd Na'eim, 2006). In addition, due to the detrimental effect of sexual harassment on organizations and individuals, issues related to sexual harassment need to further investigation (Russel & Trigg, 2004). Yet, researchers have chosen to focus on tolerance towards sexual harassment. Based on the researcher's limited literature review, no local researcher had investigated the relationship between social dominance, ambivalent sexism, organizational climate, and tolerance. For example, in Malaysia, the most interested scholar who was always touched on sexual harassment, Sabitha (1999), had researched sexual harassment. Still, the study mostly touched on how people perceived sexual harassment. Thus, the researchers gain interest to study women's tolerance towards sexual harassment based on these three factors; social dominance, ambivalent sexism, organizational climate

2.   Tolerance in Sexual Harassment

The concept of sexual harassment was coined in the 1960s (Gutek, Murphy, & Douma, 1994). Though sexual harassment existed before the sixties, people had no way to talk about it since there was no term to name the experience. Sexual harassment is of particular interest to feminist or women's studies scholars, legal experts, and social scientists. Unfortunately, there is no clear and consistent definition of what sexual harassment is that all researchers can readily agree on as being

definite and complete. However, it is vital to briefly review the history of the term sexual harassment, what it has meant in the past, and what it is understood to mean today to provide a framework for this investigator and explain what will be considered sexual harassment for this study. Sexual harassment refers to the unwelcome or uninvited behavior or sexual nature, which is offensive, embarrassing, intimidating, or humiliating and may affect an employee's work performance, health, career, or livelihood (Sabitha & Mohd Na'eim, 2006). Sexual harassment refers to a request for sex together with an implied or overt promise of preferential treatment or a threat of detrimental treatment. Second sexual harassment refers to sexual behavior, language, or visual material which is unwelcome or offensive and either repeated or significant enough to harm the person subjected to it.

On the other hand, according to the Code of Practice and Eradication of Sexual Harassment (1999), they refer to unspoken such as inappropriate facial expressions, including blowing kisses and winking. Next is by spoke such as inappropriate sounds and comments, e.g., kissing sounds, comments about an employee's body or dress, and physical such as purposely touching any part of the body.

In Malaysia, the Code of Practice and Eradication of Sexual Harassment in the workplace, established by the Human Resources Ministry in 1999 and implemented voluntarily, is a practical guide for employers to develop an internal mechanism to handle problems of sexual harassment at the workplace.

Over the last few years, researchers have attempted to understand why women are less tolerant of sexual harassment than men are (Angelone, Mitchell & Carola, 2009). In addition, tolerance for behaviors consistent with sexual harassment increased when observers were exposed to a female victim employed in a traditionally male occupation than a female victim working in a traditionally female occupation (Golden, Johnson & Lopez, 2001). Based on McHugh and Malone (2021) have found that females will perceive more instances of sexual harassment than males; increased femininity will lead to higher rates of perceiving sexual harassment in both males and females.

Further, male employees appear to consider the workplace norms while women think the perpetrator's intent when determining the extent to which a behavior is sexual harassment (Hurt, Wiener, Russell, & Mannen, 1999). Other than that. increased masculinity will lead to reduced rates of perceiving sexual harassment in males, and higher rates in females; higher social dominance orientation will be associated with lower rates of perceiving sexual harassment. Besides that, an internal locus of control will lead to lower rates of perceiving sexual harassment while an external locus of control will lead to higher rates (McHugh and Malone, 2021). In the present study, the researchers will focus on women's perspectives toward tolerance of sexual harassment. This is because women are very sensitive and have many opinions about this issue. In addition, another reason was that women's perceptions are broader and more specific than men about tolerance of sexual harassment. Thus, perception is one of the key factors of intolerance in this issue in the workplace. This has been supported by (Riger, 1991) who found that one major problem in dealing with sexual harassment in organizations is its perceptual nature because men and women generally differ in what they perceive to be sexual harassment.

2.1   Social Dominance

Social dominance theory was developed as an attempt to synthesize many of the theoretical approaches to understanding prejudice and discrimination and to answer two primary questions of

concern to social scientists. First, why do members of social groups oppress and discriminate against members of other social groups, and second, why is this oppression entrenched in human societies and difficult to dislodge. Moreover, there are three forms of group-based systems which are an aging system, a gender system, and an empty-set system (race, ethnicity, or social class) that consists of arbitrary, socially constructed group distinctions contingent upon situational and historical factors (Sidanius, 1993).

Social dominance theory argues that every complex society is organized by systems of social group-based hierarchies in which at least one social group dominates others, and at least one group occupies a subordinate position. They explicitly argue for a group-based social hierarchy rather than an individual-based social hierarchy. In the individual-based version, certain individuals may have a disproportionate share of wealth, resources, status, and power, but they do so under highly valued individual characteristics (such as artistry, high intellectual ability, athleticism). In a group-based hierarchical system, individuals may still experience disproportionate privilege and power, but it is not necessarily due to their characteristics or accomplishments, but rather due to their membership in a social group that has high social status within that society. These are typically social groups based on characteristics such as gender, race, lineage, ethnicity, and age.

Concerning sexual harassment, finding from the previous study shows that social dominance was related to tolerance of sexual harassment and hostile and benevolent sexism toward women (Russell & Trigg, 2004). According to this finding, sexual harassment is about gaining power or retaining power over subordinates by those in positions of authority. In fact, according to the gender dominance perspective, sexual harassment is a means by which men in privileged positions have reinforced their privilege and maintained dominance over women at work and in society more generally (Padavic, Irene & Orcutt, 1997). In this way, sexual harassment in the workplace may be seen as a direct derivative of the power differences attributed to males and females in the labor market, and in the larger society overall. The predictable result of this type of societal arrangement is that men are the most powerful actors in the labor market and, as such, women hold less power than men hold. Moreover, most harassment has little to do with erotic concerns and is not signed to elicit cooperation but to insult, deride, and degrade women (Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1993). Moreover, due to the concept of dominated-based, it proposes that high domination could create high power. Therefore, given that attitudes and relation to sexual harassment, women are more likely to be targets of sexual harassment because of this lack of power. According to McHugh and Malone (2021) there was a significant direct effect of social dominance orientation on the perception of sexual harassment with individuals who measured high in social dominance orientation interpreting less scenarios as sexually harassing while those exhibiting low social dominance orientation were more likely to perceive sexual harassment

2.2   Ambivalent Sexism

Ambivalent sexism is an ideology or sexist beliefs and prejudices toward women. Sexist beliefs fall along two dimensions, one of which reflects antipathy toward women who challenge conventional gender roles and the other of which reflects chivalrous attitudes toward women who embrace such roles (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Ambivalent sexism has three sources of protective paternalism (wanting to protect women), complementary gender differentiation (viewing women as different and better), and heterosexual intimacy (worshiping women) (Nagihan & Nuray, 2009). Additionally, ambivalent sexism is comprised of both positive (benevolent) and negative (hostile)

components (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Benevolent sexism is defined as the positive attitudes toward women in terms of being a complement to men, persons needing protection, and targets for sexual and psychological closeness. On the other hand, hostile sexism is an adversarial view of gender relations in which women are perceived as seeking to control men, whether through sexuality or feminist ideology (Glick & Fiske, 2001).

Benevolent sexism is a part of a model of ambivalent sexism developed by Glick & Fiske (1996). Benevolent sexism often seems to be a favorable view towards females, despite being grounded in gender stereotypes. For example, the beliefs that women are more nurturing, the men should always pay for a date, and that women should be rescued first from a sinking ship. Benevolent sexism toward women serves to justify the conventional system and gender inequality. More specifically, benevolent sexism might have negative effects on gender roles ascribed to men and women in society (Silván-Ferrero, María & Bustillos, Antonio.,2007).

Hostile sexism is another part of a model of sexism developed by Glick & Fiske in 1996. Hostile sexism is a negative emotion directed specifically towards women, such as anger, resentment, etc. Hostile sexism is the type that results in men believing that women are inferior. Women are far more likely to be opposed to hostile sexism than men are. Hostility has been examined concerning men's violence against women (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes & Acker, 1995). In their investigation of rape myth acceptance, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) found that hostility toward women was a shared characteristic among both women and men. This was related to the acceptance of interpersonal violence and adversarial sexual beliefs. Furthermore, a previous study showed that the more men endorsed either hostile sexism or benevolent sexism, the more women endorsed benevolent sexism (Glick & Hilt., 2000).

Concerning sexual harassment, previous studies have shown that individual differences in ambivalent sexism also predict tendencies toward wife abuse, tolerance for sexual harassment, attitudes about rapes, and body dissatisfaction among other things (Forbes et al., 2004). The literature on stereotype ambivalence suggests that attitudes toward different social groups usually combine a negative and positive dimension. Glick & Fiske (1996) observed that sexism is a multidimensional construct that encompasses two forms of sexist attitudes of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism that are positively correlated. On the other hand, Glick & Fiske (1996) have argued that sexism cannot be defined merely by hostility toward women, and they suggested that it is more likely that individuals harbor both positive and negative attitudes toward women. They also found that both types of sexism can, and generally do, coexist.

Here, it is being stated that together, high hostility and high benevolence can produce ambivalent sexism Glick & Fiske (1997). Moreover, Russell & Trigg (2004), emphasize that, although women are less tolerant than men of sexual harassment, both men and women who tolerate sexual harassment are likely to harbor ambivalence and hostility toward women (Russell & Trigg, 2004). Ambivalent sexism and hostile sexism are important factors in the identification of tolerance of sexual harassment. These findings are consistent with previous researchers who found that hostility toward women plays a significant role in the identification of attitudes toward harassment in men (Pryor, Giedd & Williams, 1995) and women (Cowan, 2000).

These results (Russell & Trigg, 2004) also reveal that ambivalent sexist beliefs and/or hostile sexist beliefs about women are a shared characteristic among men and women who tolerate sexual harassment. The lack of interaction effects associated with participant sex and ambivalent sexism further indicate that these variables are independent concerning tolerance of sexual harassment (Russell & Trigg, 2004).

2.3   Organizational Climate

Distinctively, a climate for sexual harassment differs from other types of climates (e.g., safety climate, service climate) in that it is not immediately obvious whether higher levels of a climate for sexual harassment are desirable or not (Rudman, Borgida & Robertson, 1995). There are three aspects of organizational climate that are of particular importance, including perceived risk to victims for complaining, a lack of sanctions against offenders, and the perception that one's complaints will not be taken seriously (Hulin, Fitzgerald & Drasgow, 1996). This finding was supported by William et al. (1999) when they outline the important organizational practices as including formal practical guidelines for behavior, procedures for filing grievances and investigating complaints, and education and training programs as well as implementation, prevention, and enforcement practices.

Additionally, the climate for sexual harassment could be related to procedural justice, as climate perceptions explicitly stem from policies and procedures of the organization.   Their measure included items that could be argued to be a measure of an organization's climate for sexual harassment: fear of retaliation, concerns about the fairness of the procedure, skepticism about the efficacy of filing a grievance, and doubts about the credibility of the complaint (Rudman, Borgida & Robertson, 1995).

Other studies have identified perceptions of specific organizational policies and procedures for dealing with sexual harassment as being directly related to negative employee consequences including psychological such as tension, anger, and anxiety, health-related such as headaches, problems with sleeping and gastric problems, and job-related outcomes such as decreased job satisfaction and decreased organizational commitment (William, Fitzgerald & Drasgow, 1999). Additionally, perceptions of organizations as tolerant among the sexual harassment of women were associated with reports of lower overall work satisfaction as well as decreased satisfaction with coworkers and supervisors (Fitzgerald, Drasgow & Magley, 1999; Hesson & Fitzgerald, 1997). Further, Hulin et al. (1996) found that tolerance for sexual harassment was a better predictor of job withdrawal and several measures of psychological well-being than personal experiences of sexual harassment. Thus, sexist climates and those permissive of sexual harassment have negative implications for individuals' workplace perceptions and outcomes. Hesson & Fitzgerald (1997) have suggested that sexual harassment may be more easily reduced through changes in the organizational climate than through changes in individual harassers. This also suggests that improving the organizational climate may promote positive work outcomes directly, as well as indirectly, by reducing women's experience of negative events such as sexual harassment.

From the discussion above, this study developed the following hypotheses:

H1:   Social Dominance positively influences women's tolerance towards sexual harassment.

H2:   Hostile Sexism positively influences women's tolerance towards sexual harassment.

H3:   Benevolent Sexism positively influences women's tolerance towards sexual harassment.

H4:   Organizational Climate positively influences women's tolerance towards sexual harassment.

3.   Methodology

This is an exploratory study, which aims to understand the impact of social dominance, ambivalent sexism, and organizational climate on women's tolerance towards sexual harassment at the workplace. The target of respondents in this study is to cover 200 employees who were working in various organizations. Selecting of working students to be the respondent of the study based on the previous studies (Russell & Trigg, 2004; Richard et. al., 1997; Anne et. al., 2003) that also utilized students as their respondents. In addition, the different types of organizations in which the students were employed are expected to demonstrate the overall situation of this study. In this study, the source of primary data is from the questionnaires developed. Variables that were measured in this study are social dominance (Social Dominance Orientation Scale, SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle., 1994.), ambivalent sexism (Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996), organizational climate (Organizational Tolerance of Sexual Harassment Inventory, OTSHI; Hulin, Fitzgerald and Drasgow, 1996) and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment (Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale, SHAS; Mazer and Percival, 1989).

Out of 200 respondents, the highest number of respondents is 132 respondents (66%) who are aged in the range of 24 to 29 years old. While there are 41 respondents (20.5%) are aged in the range of 30 to 35 years old. Follow by 16 respondents (8%) who are aged in the range 36 to 40 years old and 7 respondents (3.5%) who are aged in the range of 41 and above. The lowest number is 4 respondents (2%) aged between 18 to 23 years old. Among those 200 respondents, 98 respondents (49%) are doing management and 37 respondents (18.5%) are currently taking engineering. The balance of 65 respondents (32.5%), are from others, which include accounting, information technology, and science. In addition, 97 of them (48.5%) are government servants and 81 respondents (40.5%) are working with a private company. While, only 22 respondents (11%), are self-employed. Moreover, in analyzing women's tolerance towards sexual harassment at the workplace, it is important to know the duration of work among the respondents.

Out of 200 respondents, 134 of them (67%) already work with the company for about 1 to 5 years. The rest of 45 respondents (22.5%) include in the range of 6 to 10 working years, 14 respondents (7%) are working in the range 11 to 15 years and only 7 respondents (3.5%) are working in the range 16 to 20 years. In terms of job tenure, out of 200 respondents, the highest number is 158 respondents (79%) who are involved in the job in the range of 1 to 5 years. While there are 35 respondents (17.5%) who are already in the job for 6 to 10 years. Follow by 4 respondents (2%) who are in the range of 11 to 15 years. The lowest number is only 3 respondents (1.5%) who are engaged in the job between 6 to 20 years.

4.   Result and Discussion

4.1   Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis indicates how well the items measuring a concept hang together as a set. Each of the variables has been segregated and analyzed. The value of Cronbach's alpha is a reliability coefficient that indicates how well the items in a set are positively correlated to one another. The closer the reliability coefficient gets to 1.0, the better (Sekaran, 2006). From the analysis, the 48 items of independent variables social dominance, ambivalent sexism (hostile and benevolent sexism), and organizational climate used to test the dependent variable of women's tolerance

towards sexual harassment are good because the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.800. The first independent variable, social dominance, which consists of 16 items were used to test the dependent variable women's tolerance towards sexual harassment. It is considered acceptable because Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.713.

The second independent variable, ambivalent sexism which consists of 22 items were used to test the dependent variable of women's tolerance towards sexual harassment. However, this variable consists of two dimensions of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. For hostile sexism, the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.797 which is considered acceptable. Whereas, for benevolent sexism, the result is considered acceptable for the exploratory study since the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.585 (Nunnally, 1967). Furthermore, for the third independent variable, the organizational climate that consists of 10 items used to test the dependent variable of women's tolerance towards sexual harassment is considered good because the Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.881. Thus, the internal consistency reliability of the items used in this study can be considered to be acceptable.

4.2   Descriptive Analysis

From Table 1, the total mean for social dominance was 3.94 indicated at moderate values which can be explained that the respondents in this study moderately agree on the social dominance practice as their workplace. Next is hostile sexism which indicates the mean value was 3.67 at moderate values which demonstrated that the respondents in this study moderately agree on all the items in this variable. For benevolent sexism, the mean value was 3.97 also remained to explain that the respondents moderately agreed on current practices. Moreover, the total mean for the organizational climate was 3.99 is moderate agree on which can be said that most of the respondents in this study are disagree on the organizational climate practice by their organization. Intolerance towards sexual harassment found the mean value was 3.74 which explained to moderately disagree among the respondents.

4.3   Linear Correlation

A Pearson correlation measures the strength of the association between two continuous variables. The value of the correlation provides information both about the nature and the strength of the association. Correlations range between -1.0 and 1.0. In this analysis, the correlations between age, marital status, organizational tenure, job tenure, social dominance, ambivalent sexism, organizational climate, and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment are significant (<.000). The closer the value to zero, the weaker the association would be. The sign of the correlation describes the direction of the association. A positive sign indicates that as one variable gets larger, the other also tend to get larger. While a negative sign indicates that, as one variable gets larger, the other tends to get smaller.

The analysis reveals that there is an association between those variables. In terms of the strength of the association towards women's tolerance of sexual harassment, it is shown that the demographic profile of organizational tenure (-.053) has the strongest negative association as compared to job tenure (-.034), age (-.021), and marital status (-.011). In addition, this analysis also clarifies that there is a positive correlation between the variables of social dominance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, organizational climate, and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment. Here, it is shown that hostile sexism and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment

has the strongest positive correlation (.564) compared to benevolent sexism and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment (.448). Besides, organizational climate and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment also indicates a positive correlation (.342) follow by social dominance (.331). The magnitude of the correlation describes the strength of the association. The further that a correlation from zero, the stronger the association between the two variables. However, a zero correlation would indicate that the two variables are not associates with each other at all. Noted here that, all the associations between the variables are significant (p<0.000) which means that each variable is interrelated with each other.

Table 1: Linear Correlation

Variables	Mean	1	2	3	4	5
1 Social Dominance (SD)	3.94	1.00				
2. Hostile Sexism (HS)	3.67	.212(**)				
3. Benevolent Sexism (BS)	3.97	.234(**)	.501(**)			
4. Organizational Climate (OC)	3.99	.088	.201(**)	.126		
5. Tolerance Sexual Harassment (TSH)	3.74	.331(**)	.564(**)	.488(**)	.342(**)	1.00

4.4 Regression Analysis

Based on Table 2 above, the regression analysis resulted in the R Square (R^2) is 0.682 which indicates that 68.2% of women's tolerance towards sexual harassment has been significantly explained by the three independent variables of social dominance, ambivalent sexism (hostile and benevolent sexism) and organizational climate.

Hence, 31.8% are explained by the other factors. The result has shown that which among the independent variables influences most of the dependent variables. The strength of each relationship is noted in the column Beta under standardized Coefficients with the value of .192 for social dominance, .419 for hostile sexism, .168 for benevolent sexism, and .262 for the organizational climate. Moreover, the t value is explained in the direction of the relationship among the variables. Therefore, from the finding, it shows that the higher social dominance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and organizational climate, the higher women's tolerance towards sexual harassment will be. Concisely, the highest number in the Beta is .419 for hostile sexism, which is significant at the 0.0001 level.

The analysis of the coefficient also shows the relationship between some of the items in the demographic profile and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment. These consist of age, marital status, employment, education level, organizational tenure, and job tenure.

From the analysis, the positive Beta weight indicates that age (.062) and marital status (.062) have a positive relationship with the dependent variable. While the rest items of employment (–.073), an education level (-.089), organizational tenure (-.037), and job tenure (-.052) show the negative relationship towards the dependent variable. However, none of the items in the demographic profile is significant at the p<0.0001 level. In addition, the P-value indicates whether the equation is significant or not in the other way round. It tells whether the independent variables can be accepted to explain the variation of the dependent variables.

The regression is based on the 95% confidence level. Therefore, the significant level cannot exceed 5% to ensure that the variable is significant. To explain the confidence level of 95% and the significance at 0.05 the P value must not exceed 0.05. Based on the coefficient table, it is noted the variables of social dominance, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and organizational climate is significant (p< 0.00).

These findings are consistent with previous researchers who found that hostility toward women plays a significant role in the recognition of attitudes toward harassment (Pryor et al., 1995) in women (Cowan, 2000). Researchers' results also reveal ambivalent sexism (i.e., high hostility and high benevolence) or hostile sexism (i.e., high hostility and low benevolence) may be greater predictors of tolerance of sexual harassment than social dominance alone (Stockdale, Dewey & Saal, 1992). From the current study, benevolent sexism was positively associated with tolerance of sexual harassment, but it was a significant predictor in the regression equation. Thus, this finding support by Glick and Fiske (1996) which they found that benevolent sexism connotes subjectively positive attitudes toward women. It makes sense that benevolence toward women will conduct to condone behaviors such as harassment, as they tend to endorse benevolent attitudes and behaviors and ultimately become more tolerant.

The result revealed that organizational climate for women's tolerance towards sexual harassment has shown a positive relationship (.342) confirming that it is important as an antecedent of tolerance towards sexual harassment. Indeed, there is a strong research foundation in the literature regarding respondents' perceptions toward sexual harassment, policies and procedures, and implementation practices, and it is quite clear that the organizational climate and workplace environment are central to understanding the conditions under which harassment is more likely to occur and how victims affected (Fitzgerald, Dresgow et at, 1997). In addition, social dominance was a significant (.001), although minor predictor of tolerance of sexual harassment.

This finding was supported by the past researcher who said that social dominance was related to tolerance of sexual harassment and hostile and benevolent sexism towards women (Russel & Trigg, 2004). Social dominance is often thought of within the context of sexism and discrimination, therefore the social dominance scale may be more sensitive to measuring discriminatory attitudes toward ethnic groups and social status rather than toward gender. However, the researchers found little evidence in the sample that masculinity or social dominance is predictive of tolerance of harassment. Possibly, as men and women become more alike in their views of harassment, hostility arises to bring back one's self-identity in the middle.

Table 2 Regression Analysis

Variables	Beta Value	Significant Values	Result
1. Social Dominance (SD)	.192	.001	H1: Supported
2. Hostile Sexism (HS)	.419	.000	H2: Supported
3. Benevolent Sexism (BS)	.168	.009	H3: Supported
4. Organizational Climate (OC)	.262	.000	H4: Supported

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, the ambivalent sexism, organizational climate, and social dominance have a positive relationship with women's tolerance towards sexual harassment. In addition, the most significant predictor influencing women's tolerance toward sexual harassment is hostile sexism. Therefore, the researchers have met the objectives of this research. the consequences will be the level of tolerance no matter from women and men's perspectives is assumed high because the formal practices and regulations are clear and well known among employees. Hence, it is not also the sole responsibility of the management but also the employee's responsibility to speak up and not allow them to be victimized. The correlation studies revealed that social dominance positively correlates with women's tolerance towards sexual harassment at the workplace. Thus, due to the

increasing workforce among women, the management has to promote social equalities in the company among the superior and inferior. Given that attitudes, it could eliminate or reduce women from being the targets of sexual harassment because of this lack of power.

When there is an equal chance in life, seems that women are at the same level as men and it leads to heighten the women's tolerance towards sexual harassment. Furthermore, organizational climate and women's tolerance towards sexual harassment at the workplace, this study found that the higher the organizational climate (an organization's tolerance, policy, procedure, training) the more tolerance would be. Therefore, the researchers suggest that the company needs to adopt sexual harassment policies, providing appropriate training sessions, and establishing formal complaint processes. For example, in the development of training strategies module for sexual harassment should be reexamined, perhaps by having participants first recognize their levels of sexism and hostility toward women and also mix the participant gender by having both women and men. To add, the organization that has actual mechanisms in place for dealing with sexual harassment, such as an officer to specifically deal with sexual harassment or language in the collective bargaining contract, have a shielding effect on the influence of women's tolerance even when the employing organization is perceived as tolerant of sexual harassment. Furthermore, an organization should have practice formal written guidelines for behavior, procedures for filing grievances and investigating complaints, and education and training programs, as well as implementation, prevention, and enforcement practices regarding sexual harassment. Last but not least, there should be a concerted effort by governments, employers, employees, and women's organizations to help in creating high tolerance towards sexual harassment in the workplace.

Acknowledgments

References

Angelone, Mitchell, D. & Carola, K. (2009). Tolerance of sexual harassment: A laboratory paradigm. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 949-958.

Azenui, N., (2006). What is sexual harassment? Retrieved 23 March 2010 from http://news.bbc.co.uk.

Cowan, G., (2000). Women's hostility toward women and rape and sexual harassment myths. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 238–246.

Fitzgerald, L.F. & Shullman, S. L., (1993). Sexual Harassment: A Research Analysis and Agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 5-27.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491–512.

Glick, P., & Hilt, L. (2000). In T. Eckes, & H. Trautner (Eds.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. *The developmental social psychology of gender*, 243–272.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist*, 56, 109–118.

Golden, J.H., Johnson, C.A., & Lopez, R.A. (2001). Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Exploring the Effects of Attractiveness on Perception of Harassment, *Sex Roles*, 45, 767-784.

Gutek, B.A., Murphy, R.O. & Douma, B. (1994). A review and critique of the sexual experiences questionnaire (SEQ). *Law and Human Behavior*, 28(4), 457-82.

Haspels, N., Zaitun M. K., Thomas, C. & McCann, D. (2001). Action against Sexual Multidisciplinary Advisory Team.

Hulin, C. L., Fitzgerald, L. F. & Drasgow, F. (1996). Organizational influences on sexual harassment. In M. S. Stockdale (Ed.), Sexual harassment in the workplace: Perspectives, frontiers, and response strategies, 127–150. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hurt, L., Wiener, R.L., Russell, B.L., & Mannen, R.K., (1999). Gender differences in evaluating social-sexual conduct in the workplace. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law,* 17, 413-433.

Hobbs M, Klachky E, Cooper M. 2021. Addressing organizational climate can potentially reduce sexual harassment of female agricultural workers in California. Calif Agr. https://doi.org/10.3733/ca.2021a0014.

Ismail, M.N. & Chee, L.K. (2005). An empirical investigation of sexual harassment incidences in the Malaysian workplace. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 7(1), 202-7.

Kennedy, M.A. & Gorzalka, B.B. (2002). Asian and non-Asian attitudes toward rape, sexual harassment, and sexuality. *Sex Roles*, 46(7-8), 227-38.

Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1995). Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical reexamination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 704–711.

Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 353–367.

Malone, D., & McHugh, C. (2021, May 2). Individual Differences in Perception of Sexual Harassment in University Students. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/mxtr8

Mazer, D.B. & Perceival, E.F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationship among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. *Sex Roles*, 20, 135-147.

Muzaffar & Samirah, (1999). Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: A Working Woman's Woe, Project Paper for the Degree of Law, University of Malaya.

Nagihan, T. & Nuray, S. U., (2009). The Relationships between Ambivalent Sexism and Religiosity among Turkish University Students. *Sex Roles*, 57, 889–895.

Ng, Zanariah M., N. & Maria, C., A. (2003). Sexual Harassment & the Code of Practice in Malaysia. Women's Development Collective, Petaling Jaya.

Nunnally, J.C. (1967). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Padavic, Irene & Orcutt, J.D., (1997). Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in the Florida System: A Comparison of Dominance and Spillover Explanations. *Gender and Society,* 11(5), 682-698.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.

Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). A social psychological model for predicting sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 69–84.

Rigers, J.L., (1991). Sexual harassment and attitudes in rural community care workers. *Health values*, 16, 40-45.

Rudman, L.A., Borgida, E., & Robertson, B. (1995). Suffering in silence: Procedural justice versus gender socialization issues in University sexual harassment grievance procedures. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 519-541.

Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender. *Sex Roles*, 50, 565–573.

Sabitha, M., (1999). The Perception of Sexual Harassment Among Public Sector Administrators. Unpublished report, Universiti Utara Malaysia.

Sabitha, M. & Mohd. Na'eim, A. (2006). Improving Delivery System in Organization through Training: A Case of Sexual Harassment. Proceedings of the International Conference on Local Government: Enhancing Service Delivery by Local Authorities, 22nd - 23rd August, Sabah.

Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamic of oppression: A social dominance perspective. In W. McGuire & S. Iyengar (Eds), *Current approaches to political psychology* (pp. 183-219). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Silván-Ferrero, María & Bustillos, Antonio. (2007). Benevolent Sexism Toward Men and Women: Justification of the Traditional System and Conventional Gender Roles in Spain. Sex Roles. 57. 607-614. 10.1007/s11199-007-9271-8.