Sexualities and Conflicting Moralities at Work: An Empirical Test of

Black's Theory of Moral Time

Angela M. Barlow

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Sociology

James E. Hawdon, Chair
Theodore D. Fuller
Carol A. Bailey
John W. Ryan

April 22, 2012
Blacksburg, VA

Keywords: Moral Time; Deviance; Conflict; Intimacy; Sexuality

Sexualities and Conflicting Moralities at Work: An Empirical Test of

Black's Theory of Moral Time

Angela M. Barlow

ABSTRACT

This dissertation provides an empirical test of the relational dimension of Donald Black's theory of moral time. In *Moral Time*, Black (2011) aims to explain the causal mechanism of conflict within and across cultures, over time, and within macro, meso, and micro level interactions. According to Black (2011), the movement of social time within three dimensions of social life, relational, vertical, and cultural, is the root of all conflict. In this study, I test the relationship between movements of intimacy, the relational dimension of social life, and conflict, using judgments of offensiveness of sexualized interaction between coworkers depicted in vignettes. An online survey was administered to 1,936 undergraduate and graduate students at a large, public university in the Southeastern United States, who judged the offensiveness of movements of intimacy between coworkers. Findings provide strong support for the relational dimension of Black's theory at the aggregate level, but also indicate that the theory provides a less robust explanation of interpersonal conflict when contextual factors, such as the level of previous intimacy, occupational rank, gender, and sexual orientation of the people involved, are included in analyses.

DEDICATION

My parents, Burley Henley and Donna Mobley, left this world early in my adult life and never had the opportunity to see me graduate with my undergraduate degree, much less earn a doctorate. I know without a doubt, however, they would be bursting with pride and would have provided me with love and support throughout this process had they had the opportunity. In their absence, four people have been my family, and it is to them that I dedicate this dissertation:

Kelsea Juliana, my daughter, I love you so much, and thank you for your patience during my years of studying. I was a student throughout most of your life, and am so thankful that, in spite of my busy schedule over the years, you developed into a lovely, warm, and compassionate woman. I am proud of you, my daughter.

Caitlin Teaster, my dear friend, my sister, I couldn't have done this without your support. You have been unwavering in offering love, encouragement, and laughter throughout the years. You alone possess the power to redirect me—to help me see the positive side of even the worst situation. I look forward to offering you the same type of support when you write your own dissertation.

Leslie McCallister—who knew all those years ago when you were my professor in undergraduate school we would grow to be such close friends? I am certain your friendship and mentoring (and skiing breaks) are largely responsible for the development of my new identity as an academic. I admire you in so many ways and am grateful to have you and Jacob in my life.

Most of all, though, this dissertation is dedicated to my brother, Mark Henley. Mark, you've been my biggest cheerleader throughout this process. Your encouragement, and the friendship we have developed over the last few years, has pushed me to strive for greatness. It is such a wonderful feeling to know that you are proud of me, just as I am of you. I love you brother.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Figures

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Conflict is an ever-present fact of social life. Occurring between individuals, groups, and even nations, humans are consumed with conflict (Black 2011). While we spend a great deal of time attempting to eliminate conflict, we also devote a considerable amount of time to creating or maintaining conflict, as evidenced, for example, by Americans' obsession with representations of conflict in 'reality' television shows (Godard 2003). Because conflict can result in violence, much sociological and criminological research has focused on aspects of conflict, including who engages in conflict and for what reasons, as well as assessing the resulting consequences of conflict.

Classic criminological and sociological theories of conflict focus on individual level characteristics, such as psychological and biosocial development, inequality, opportunity, and childhood conditions of offenders. While these theories illuminate various characteristics of people who engage in conflict or some unspecified, or grossly underspecified, opportunity to commit crime and violence, Black (2011) suggests these types of theories fail to adequately explain the fundamental cause of conflict, including explaining the pivotal moment when an escalating social interaction becomes an act conflict (often leading to violence). In response to this deficit, Black offers a purely sociological theory of conflict that attempts to explain when conflict is likely to occur, why some conflicts are worse than others, and even how some conflicts might be prevented (Black 2011:xi). I will extend this intellectual tradition of trying to explain conflict. Building on the work of Donald Black (2011), I explore the relationship between "movements of intimacy" in a work setting and conflict. That is, I address questions such as does the same behavior, such as rubbing shoulders, create the same amount of social concern if the behavior is between two intimates compared to two acquaintances or two

1

strangers? This research therefore touches on and has implications for several strands of sociological literature, including the sociology of morality, the sociology of conflict, criminology, and workplace deviance. The findings reported in this dissertation offer valuable insights for both social theorists and those trying to manage conflict in a work setting.

The fundamental concept in Black's (2011) theory of moral time is "social time," which is the "dynamic dimension of social space" (p. 3-4). Black (2011) describes social space as the multidimensional geometry of social reality, comprised of relational, vertical, and cultural dimensions. Any movement of social space between actors, such as an insult or an act of violence, creates a dynamic change in that space, which Black (2011) labels social *time* (p. 4). The movement of social time, writes Black (2011), "is the cause of all conflict" (p. 5).

Black purports his theory of moral time explains all conflict within and across cultures and throughout history (2011). As such, testing the theory in its entirety presents unique methodological challenges and, since the theory is new, it has not been empirically tested with tests explicitly designed to do so. Focusing specifically on one of the three primary movements of social time described in the theory, relational time, I designed a survey instrument operationalizing and testing relational aspects of the theory using judgments of inoffensive or offensive sexualized interactions among coworkers.

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine how Black's theory of moral time adds to the existing crime, deviance, and conflict literature, as well as assessing the validity of his addition to the larger body of work on conflict. This dissertation begins with situating Black's theory (2011) within current criminological theories of conflict, followed by a detailed outline of Black's theory of moral time in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 describes my unique methodological approach, utilizing vignettes to test Black's theory, along with describing my research instrument

and sample. Chapters 5 through 7 present my research findings and discussion of those findings. While the results of this empirical test provide support for Black's theory at the aggregate level, further investigation reveals the relational dimension of moral time overlooks important nuances of gendered and sexualized interaction. In the final chapters I build on Black's conception of intimacy and offer suggestions for expanding the explanatory power of Black's theory by integrating moral time with strain theory.

CHAPTER TWO: WHAT IS CONFLICT?

Explaining conflict from a social constructionist view begins with defining behaviors as deviant. Deviance, from this perspective, is any behavior that violates normatively accepted rules or behavioral "norms" within a society or subculture (Goode 1990, p. 291). Violating these norms, which challenges the status quo, causes conflict. Black explains that conflict is rooted in clashes of right and wrong; it involves both morality and justice, and conflict "occurs whenever anyone provokes or expresses a grievance [and] whenever someone engages in conduct that someone else defines as deviant or whenever someone subjects someone else to social control" (1998, p. xiii). Not only do deviant behaviors cause conflict, but reactions to those behaviors, such as aggression, avoidance, gossiping, and punishing, cause conflict as well, and are often behaviors deemed deviant themselves. In this sense, deviance *is* conflict, and conflict *is* deviance.

Deviance as Conflict

Defining behaviors as deviant is a complicated task, because what is deemed deviant is relative: it changes over time within societies and varies across cultures. Deviance is, in other words, relative (Clinard and Meier 2004; Goode 1990). The central idea of a social constructionism is that the power of collective human decision has an unnoticed but profound effect on social norms within a culture (Mallon 2007; see also Foucault 1977, 1984, 1995; and Goffman). Rather than deviant behaviors consisting of some innately wrong property, behaviors are only deviant when societies agree that a particular behavior is unacceptable (Akers 1985; Goode and Ben Yehuda 2009; Jensen 2000).

Studies of the social construction of deviance, and the role of morality in that construction, date back to Howard Becker's seminal work, *Outsiders* (1963), in which he described the

process of learning deviance and being labeled as deviant, delineating the approach used by "moral entrepreneurs" to establish and reinforce acceptable moral behavior within a culture. Becker asserts rules reflect widely held social norms within a society: rather than deviance being a quality of an individual, deviance is actually defined and created by processes of social groups creating the rules whose violation constitutes deviance. In other words, as widely quoted, the deviant "is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label" (p. 9). He uses the term "outsider," a label applied to individuals engaging in deviant behavior, to describe rule-breakers who often view their own beliefs as morally opposite to the rule abiders and rule creators within society. For Becker, the enforcement of social rules within society is an enterprise: rules are created by moral entrepreneurs, individuals who take it upon themselves to crusade for the creation of a rule that would correct a social evil which violates their own sense of morality. They approach social reform as a personal mission, often with the intention of helping those who are less fortunate. Moral entrepreneurs recruit rule enforcers, experts, such as police, lawyers, policymakers, and doctors, to join their crusade and to enforce the newly redefined morality. The enforcers often are not concerned with the content of the rule, but with enforcing the rule as part of their job. As new rules develop, new forms of deviance are identified, thus justifying the existence and expansion of the enforcement agency. The success of the moral crusade determines whether a moral entrepreneur pursues other crusades and becomes a professional rule creator. Socially sanctioned rules, then, whether formally or informally enforced, create moral 'boundaries' that allow groups to identify acceptable and unacceptable behavior within a society. Pushing and violating those boundaries results in conflict between the desires of the individual and the pressures of group conformity.

The socially constructed nature of deviance, as well as the resulting conflict, is evidenced through the varying reactions to the same "problems" over time and across context. Sexual boundaries are an excellent example of differences in context. The labels applied to homosexuals over the years range from criminal and demonic, to pathological, to largely tolerated, if not accepted (Clark 2011; Foucault 1990; Herek 2009; Weeks 2010). Depending with which sub-group of a population one inquires, any one of the previous labels might be applied and sanctioned informally or formally depending on context and time. Sodomy laws in the U.S., while supposedly applied uniformly, were generally only enforced in situations where control of men's homosexuality was of moral concern (Herdt 2009). Similarly, sexual psychopath laws during the 1950's emerged as a result of a moral panic over potential sex-crimes, but were most commonly enforced in cases of suspected homosexuality (Sutherland 1950).

Women's sexuality was also of concern throughout the first half of the twentieth century; however, this concern over women's sexual behavior and reproductive activity was differentially applied. While white women's reproduction went largely unnoticed, minority women's sexuality and reproduction was deviantized due to the high number of poor *unwed* black women having children. Similarly, women's sexual behavior was policed through prostitution laws and statutory rape laws (Baumeister and Twenge 2002). Girl's behavior was monitored and controlled through diagnoses of "wayward girl syndrome," applied to girls charged with running away, sexual promiscuity, and alcohol offenses during the 1950's, but was disproportionately applied to non-white girls (Shoemaker 2010). Applying *moral* boundaries to women's and gay men's sexual activity served as a form of social control, meant to deviantize those behaving outside of white, middle-class, heterosexual norms.

The application of both informal and formal social control to "deviant" behaviors results in conflict. Black (2011) explains maintaining the status quo is essential for remaining conflict-free. Any change in the social realm, as in the enactment of unsavory, deviant, or criminal behavior by some members, which causes conflict in and of itself, upsets the status quo resulting in the application of social control to some members, which causes more conflict. When behavior conflicts with normatively proscribed behaviors within a culture, it often causes a reaction from those whose normative assumptions have been challenged. Not every behavior that challenges expectations causes conflict, however. It is the reaction by those *with the power to define a behavior as deviant* that causes any behavior to be labeled as deviant. Since institutions are generally designed to maintain the status quo of the system, deviance is behavior that *conflicts* with the status quo. Thus, at the heart of all deviance is the conflict of right and wrong. Therefore, investigating theories of deviance allows for a deeper understanding of the mechanisms involved with labeling behaviors as unacceptable, and provides an overview of theoretical approaches most commonly used to explain behaviors conflicting with the status quo.

Numerous theories of deviance attempt to explain conflict, but each of these theories fall short of explaining the pivotal moment when social interaction creates or results in an event of conflict. We can think of these theories as attempting to explain the contents of a "black box," the causal mechanism of conflict. Every social interaction does not result in conflict, nor does every push against the status quo result in a specific reaction. So what, then, explains *when* and *why* acts of deviance become conflictual? And why are some forms of deviance more offensive than others? The black box represents some specific occurrence or interaction, some combination of factors that represents the pivotal moment when interaction results in conflict. But none of the popular theories of deviance actually explain this causal mechanism. Instead, these theories

explain the structural conditions in which conflict is likely to flourish; they explain the mechanisms through which people learn what it means to be deviant, or how to enact deviance; and they explain social-psychological conditions of the people most likely to engage in deviant behavior. The black box and the processes that occur in it, however, remain unspecified or largely *under*specified.

Black (2011) argues his theory of moral time does what these theories fail to do: it specifies what happens in that black box, and in so doing explains the causal mechanism of conflict. The remainder of this chapter begins with describing theories of deviance, and then moves into a description of Black's approach to explaining social phenomena with his "pure sociological" method. The chapter concludes with a description of Black's (2011) new theory of conflict.

Theories of Deviance

Many disciplines attempt to explain conflict. Political scientists focus on conditions leading to war and international disputes (see Fearson 1994,1995; Key and Ramsay 2011; Powell 2006; Schelling 1960, 1966; Sutter 2000). Psychologists and biosocial theorists investigate links between personal characteristics such as intelligence, cognition, and neurological impairments, with the propensity to commit deviant or violent acts (see Bartol 2002; Kohlberg 1969; Hernstein and Murray 1996; Seigel and McCormick 2006; Wilson and Hernstein 1985). Conflict Sociologist often cite "social change" as the cause of conflict, but these theorists largely focus on broad societal transformations, such as technology, industrialization, or urbanization, rather than on interactional causes of conflict.

Since deviance is conflict, existing theories of deviance come closest to explaining the fundamental cause of conflict. Theories of deviance tend to focus on conflict at two different levels: the macro-level, exploring the effects of societal factors on deviance, such as poverty, and

at the micro-level, which focuses on factors in the individual's immediate environment as being responsible for occurrences of deviance, as well as individual-level responses to those factors. In addition, one theory in particular, Merton's strain theory, provides a Meso level explanation of deviance, attempting to bridge both macro and micro level factors.

Macro-Level Theories

Social disorganization theory and other ecological theories that stem from social disorganization represent one type of macro-level explanation of deviance. In general, these types of theories posit that deviance is a result of a combination of broad social factors, including changes in industrialization, immigration, urbanization, and internal migration (Traub and Little 1999). These factors contribute to instability within a community, resulting in poverty, lack of close interpersonal relationships, and ineffective social controls. This instability breaks down consensus about the normative expectations of people residing in the area, creating conflict between traditional norms and values and the newly developing norms and values within the disorganized area. As a result, these factors create conditions for deviance to flourish (Bursik 1988; Hawdon and Ryan 2009; Sampson and Groves 1989; Sampson et al. 2002; Shaw and McKay 1942).

Subcultural theories, another macro-level explanation, take a similar approach, explaining conflict as resulting from contradictory values and norms between the dominant culture and a subculture. Marvin Wolfgang and Franco Ferracuti (1967) suggest sub-groups, usually in non-white disadvantaged neighborhoods, develop norms and values contradictory to those of the dominant culture, emphasizing the use of physical force beyond what normative culture views as acceptable. Street violence, for example, is viewed as an acceptable means of settling disputes within the sub-culture but when the behavior is removed from the normative environment, it

becomes an unacceptable means of dispute settlement in mainstream culture and usually results in the application of formal social control (Anderson 1999; Bourgois 2002).

While greater levels of deviance and crime are found in disorganized environments and subcultures, the environment itself is not criminal. There are distal factors that influence the people who live within the environment, creating circumstances in which crime or deviance may be one of only a few options for their survival, or, at the least, the one that is the most rational for those living in the environment. Poverty in a disorganized area, for example, is not the causal factor of deviance. Certainly not all people residing in impoverished areas engage in deviance. Poverty is, however, a common condition found in violent subcultures, and is a condition that combines with other factors to increase the possibility that an individual might engage in crime or deviance. As such, rather than explaining the causal mechanisms of conflict, subcultural theories tend to predict *where conflict is likely to occur*. However, social disorganization or an oppositional culture does not cause conflict, per se. The "disorganization" of a neighborhood is relatively stable, almost a constant, and the neighborhoods social control mechanisms are always compromised. If these conditions caused conflict, there should be constant or near-constant conflict in such areas. We know, however, that this is not the case. The overwhelming majority of most interactions are non-conflictual, even in the most violent neighborhoods. Therefore, while conflict occurs in "disorganized neighborhoods" more than it does in more socially organized neighborhoods; the level of social organization is not the cause of the conflict that occurs in these neighborhoods.

Meso-Level Theories

Building on Durkheim's macro-level concept of anomie, Robert Merton ([1938] 2006) developed a meso-level explanation of deviance. Merton's "anomie-strain" theory is developed

by focusing on two phases of social structure: culturally accepted goals, and institutionally defined means of attainment, which define, regulate, and control the approved behaviors to achieving cultural goals. To avoid anomie there must be a balance between these culturally expected goals and legal institutional means through which to achieve them. Cultural goals may include attaining education, status, and honor, but are most often expressed in terms of economic success, at least in American society, and this is the primary focus of Merton's application. A deficiency of legitimate economic opportunities puts pressures or "strain" on individuals, leading to prime conditions for anomie and, potentially, deviance. Merton proposed that, based on an individual's attitude toward goals and institutions, when faced with anomic conditions they will adapt in one of five ways. If they accept both the cultural goals (economic success) and the institutional means (legitimate activities) to achieve them then that individual will *conform*; those who accept the cultural goals but reject achieving them through legitimate means are *innovators*; *ritualists* abandon goal attainment but still conform to institutional means, and *retreatists,* such as alcoholics and drug addicts, reject both cultural goals and means. Merton explains that this is true alienation ([1938] 2006) and deviance is most likely to occur under these conditions. A final mode of adaptation, *rebellion*, occurs when one creates their own non-culturally approved goals and means such as living a nomadic lifestyle, but can also result in revolutionary action calling for "a new world order" ([1938] 2006, p. 175). Merton explains as individuals engage in various social activities, they may shift from one mode of adaptation to another.

While Merton's strain theory offers an explanation for why individuals choose to engage in non-normative forms of behavior, the causal mechanism of conflict is not addressed in this theory. Certainly economic strain is one of the many precipitating factors to engaging in deviance, but a lack of resources is a static condition rather than an interaction. Resorting to any

of the four non-normative adaptations may not, in and of themselves, lead to conflict. Additional factors must be considered, including who witnesses the non-normative behaviors, the amount of power these witnesses possess, and whether or not social control is applied to those utilizing adaptations.

Micro-Level Theories

Although subcultural and anomie theories of deviance explain the broad social structure contributing to environments where deviance is likely to occur, conflict usually happens in micro level interaction—often between two people or between small groups. Several theories of deviance focus on the individual level factors that often work in tandem with the broad social factors described in social disorganization and subcultural theories to increase ones' likelihood of engaging in deviance.

General Strain Theory (GST) - In his anomie-strain theory, Merton ([1938] 2006) asserts that while societal and cultural pressures force individuals into behaviors, personality also affects the type of response invoked. Building on this underdeveloped aspect of Merton's theory, Agnew (1992) expands Merton's approach to include individual-level strains and considers the impact of attitudes, personality, and individual coping mechanisms on the likelihood of engaging in deviance. While Merton's classical theory relies on the relationship between aspirations and expectations, Agnew focuses on actual achievements. He asserts that the disjunction one experiences between expectations and achievements will be more emotionally compelling in producing strain rather than focusing on general "societal expectations" as Merton proposed (Agnew1992, p. 48). Additionally, he believes negative relationships with others can cause anger (strain), which may result in turning to deviance as a method of alleviating that strain.

Agnew (1992) asserts conflict arises from strain, or negative emotions, which, in turn, creates more conflict. Strain develops due to conflict between desired and actual outcomes, creating negative emotions that can lead to anger and retaliation, increasing the possibility of resorting to crime or violence in an attempt to alleviate strain. The three primary types of strain discussed in this theory are: failure to achieve positively valued goals (including money, status and respect, and autonomy), loss of positively valued stimuli (death of loved one, loss of a relationship, or even theft of valued object), and the presentation of negative stimuli (including abuse, neglect, adverse/negative experiences). Agnew (1992) identifies specific conditions under which strain may lead to conflict, when strains are: seen as unjust, high in magnitude, associated with low self-control, and create an incentive to result to deviant coping. The negative emotions experienced as a result of various types of strain necessitate engaging in coping mechanisms to relieve the internal pressure. Non-criminal coping strategies may include reassessing goals, or engaging in exercise or creativity to relieve strain. Individuals with few alternative goals and lower self-esteem may be more likely to engage in deviant strategies to relieve strain (e.g., truancy, drug use, revenge, or violence).

Control Theories- Two types of control theories offer individual-level explanations for occurrences of deviance, social control and self-control theories. In *Causes of Delinquency,* Hirschi (1969) takes a different approach to crime and deviance, asking what makes people conform to societal expectations rather than what makes them deviate. In this social control, or social *bond* theory, Hirschi (1969) views deviance as intrinsic to human nature. It is conforming behavior, rather than deviant behavior, that must be explained. The type and strength of bond that one has to society determines whether or not one will conform to dominant cultural norms or satisfy their own needs and desires regardless of social expectations. Hirschi (1969:203) outlines

four elements of socialization through which conformity is achieved: attachment (to significant others, such as family), commitment to positive goals (such as education and a non-delinquent lifestyle), involvement in conventional activities, and belief in the moral validity of the dominant value system. Delinquency is most likely to occur when one or more of the four bonds is weak or absent, or when an individuals' strongest bonds are with others embracing negative or criminal ideals. Adolescence, according to Hirschi (1969), is a critical time: the strength of attachment to family, school, and activities can determine one's path. Family, close friends, and social networks have an especially strong impact whether or not an individual conforms; we are most likely to avoid deviance when our strongest ties are with positive role models. If our strongest bonds are with others embracing negative or criminal ideals, then we will have a stronger stake in conforming to and sharing those delinquent values.

Rather than weakened *social* controls, Gottrefdson and Hirschi (1990) identify low *self-control* as the fundamental cause of deviant behavior. Self-control, according to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), enables individuals to refrain from risk-taking, impulsive, and aggressive behaviors associated with deviance. Rather than being an innate characteristic of an individual's personality, self-control is a developed trait established through parental supervision and discipline. The major cause of low self-control is "ineffective child-rearing" according to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990:97). Proper parenting involves monitoring a child's behavior, recognizing inappropriate behavior when it occurs, and swiftly punishing deviant behaviors (1990:97). An absence of effective parenting fosters low self-control, which is characterized by impulsivity, the need for immediate gratification, and shortsighted risk-taking behaviors associated with criminality.

While self-control theory is general in nature, intending to explain all criminal and deviant behaviors, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) tend to focus more on continued patterns of crime and deviance, and the role of *opportunity* for deviance, rather than explaining the involvement in a certain act at one particular point in time. Gottfredson and Hirschi specifically address the role of opportunity in their General Theory of Crime (1990), asserting the low-self-control trait is a constant, remaining stable throughout the lifecourse. This trait, *in combination with* opportunity, the variable factor, is the ultimate cause of criminality (see also Grasmick et al. 1993; Evans et al. 1997).

Social Learning Theories - In contrast to control theories of deviance, social learning theories suggest deviant behavior is learned through association with family and peers. Central to social learning theories is the idea that criminal behavior is learned in the same context as any other type of learning (Akers and Sellars 2004; Sutherland 1947). The key to adopting deviant behaviors over conforming behaviors is dependent upon whether an individual is exposed to an excess of definitions favorable to delinquency relative to definitions favoring conformity. Whether one engages in criminality is further impacted by learning the skills and techniques required to commit deviant acts, and having the opportunity to commit those acts (Sutherland and Cressey 1978). The frequency, duration, priority, and intensity of exposure to associations favorable or unfavorable to violating the law impact the likelihood of deviance due to reinforcement of criminal motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes. For social learning theorists the cause of deviant behavior, given other factors and conditions, is essentially *exposure to* deviant behavior.

Critique of Existing Theories of Deviance

While each of these theories increases our ability to understand and explain criminality in

some manner, the problem with each approach, for Black, is a causal one. That is, social structural theories explain some condition that affects behavior, rather than explaining the fundamental cause of deviance. Greater *levels* of deviance and crime are found in disorganized environments and subcultures, but the environment itself is not criminal. There are distal factors that influence the people who live within the environment, creating circumstances in which crime or deviance may be one of only a few options for their survival. Poverty, then, disorganized areas do not cause deviance, but is a condition that influences the behaviors of people residing within those areas. Social structural and subcultural theories consistently predict where conflict is likely to occur (i.e. within violent, impoverished subcultures), but they fail to address the causal mechanisms of conflict.

Individual level theories of deviance also fall short in specifying causal mechanism of conflict. Each of these theories rely on social-psychological perspectives, explaining behavior as the result of the various characteristics of individuals (e.g. under strain, lack of social support, exposed to definitions favorable to violating the law, low self-control, differential association with violent peers), and individuals with these characteristics are more likely to respond to some type of unspecified *opportunity* to engage in crime. Additionally, they each focus on static states of being. Gottredson and Hirschi specifically state that the low-self-control trait is a constant. As Black (2011) explains, constants cannot *cause* variation; it is the dynamic change in circumstance that causes variation. In this sense, while low-self-control may describe a condition common to those engaging in deviance, it cannot be the causal explanation of conflict. Variation, or social change in circumstance, is the key to causal explanations.

A few theories of deviance come closer than others at specifying the "black box." Agnew's strain theory, for example, attempts to address the causal mechanism of conflict.

Agnew specifies an action, or trigger: the addition or subtraction of some stimuli. While Agnew does get at some temporal change over time that potentially influences behavior, the stimuli is vague and underspecified. Agnew (1992) identifies specific *conditions or incentives* that influence whether strain will lead to conflict, when strains are: seen as unjust, high in magnitude, associated with low self-control, and create an incentive to result to deviant coping. Incentives, however, do not cause deviance. The addition of financial strain, for example, may result in deviance as a mechanism to relieve that strain, but it also may *not* result in deviance, nor may the removal of something positive, a job for example, result in retaliation. Anger, for example, has been identified as a key coping mechanism for dealing with strain because anger "increases the individual's level of felt injury [creating] a desire for retaliation/revenge" (Agnew 1992:60). Agnew asserts that increases in strain can lead to increased anger, which may lead to an increase in crime and violence. While empirical tests of Agnew's strain theory have found anger and violence are often used to cope with strain (see Agnew 1985; Mazerolle and Piquero 1997) the theory focuses on explaining the conditions which may lead an individual to behave in criminal/violent ways rather than on the causal mechanisms triggering a violent or conflictual interaction.

Two additional theories of conflict that focus on the role of opportunity and action as opposed to static states or conditions should be discussed briefly. Routine activity theories specifically address opportunity as an essential mechanism for why deviance occurs. According to the routine activities perspective, crime is the result of an availability of suitable targets, motivated offenders, and lack of guardianship (Cohen and Felson 1979; Hindelang et al. 1978). These three conditions create the opportunity for crime. Because motivation to commit crime and suitable targets are relatively constant, it is the lack of guardianship that leads to variation. The

routine activity approach explains variability of opportunity but it, again, fails to address *why* motivated offenders respond to those opportunities.

One final theory, coined by Luckenbill (1977) as "situated transaction" theory, comes closest to theorizing a causal explanation of conflict. Luckenbill (1977) argued violence, specifically homicide, is an *event* in which a social exchange occurs between a victim and an offender. This theory is more specified than Agnew's strain theory, explaining how an action and its corresponding *reaction* work together to explain why conflict occurs. More specifically, a situated transaction begins with a sequence of events that lead to escalating conflict, beginning with an initial interaction and then ending with homicide, as actors compete in a "character contest" (p. 177). The individuals engaging in the interaction, as well as any audience and the presence or type of weapon involved, all play a role in determining the outcome, including whom, ultimately, becomes the offender and victim. As with each of the previous theories, situated transaction theory falls short of explaining the causal mechanism of conflict, focusing instead on some underspecified *escalation* leading to conflict.

Given the deficit of causal explanations of conflict in each of the above theories, what, specifically, is the pivotal mechanism of conflict given the opportunity? Black (2011) argues it is the movement of social time that explains all conflict. Social time is a purely sociological approach to explaining conflict in human relationships (Black 2011). According to Black (2011), conflict, ranging from minor disagreements between friends to sexual harassment, to violence, to war, can be explained by movements of social time. Social time also answers questions such as 'what explains conflict,' and 'why is some conflict worse than others,' and explains social *change* occurring in relationships or between social actors at micro, meso, or macro levels (Black 2011). In the following section I provide an overview of Black's work in pure sociology, the

foundation on which his theory of social time was developed, and offer a detailed look at the theory of moral time as an explanation of conflict.

Black's Pure Sociology

Black's (2011) *Moral Time* extends his earlier work in what he terms "pure sociology" (cite), and a review of this earlier work permits a richer understanding of the arguments in Moral Time. Pure sociology, according to Black (2000), is a paradigm used to investigate "the behavior of social life" (p. 347). Unlike "classical" approaches to sociology, pure sociology eliminates subjectivity from explanations of social reality (Black 1995; 2000). Black asserts his pure sociological approach "avoids several shortcomings of earlier sociology [including] (1) psychology, (2) one- dimensionality, (3) units of analysis, (4) anthropocentrism, and (5) teleology" (1995, p. 847). As such, social behavior is explained with the geometry of social life and utilizes concepts such as relational distance, fluidity, location, and direction (Black 1976).

Black first applies pure sociological concepts to his investigation of law, arguing that the social institution of law "behaves" because it varies across time and space. Black (1976) defines law as "governmental social control" occurring in any of four styles: penal, compensatory, therapeutic, and conciliatory (1976:2). Law is also quantifiable, according to Black (1976) and can be measured as the amount of law applied or consumed in any legal situation. Calling the police, for example, is more law than not calling the police, and an arrest is more law than no arrest. Likewise, a conviction with a long sentence is more law than a conviction with a shorter sentence, and so on.

Black describes five independent social-structural variables across which law varies: stratification, morphology, culture, organization, and social control. Constructing 29

propositions, Black predicts the way law behaves across space and time, including location and direction, for each of the five social structural conditions. Stratification is the vertical location in the social universe (p. 11), and the relative positions of the victim and offender within the stratification system affects the quantity of law. Black (1976) asserts, "law varies directly with rank" (p. 17) and "downward law is greater than upward law,"(p. 21). If the victim of an assault is a CEO and the perpetrator a taxi driver, the taxi driver will likely experience more law than if the victim and offender were reversed in status. Similarly, Black explains the reporting of crime is more likely by someone higher in the stratification system rather than someone lower in the stratification system.

Morphology is defined as "the horizontal aspect of social life, the distribution of people in relation to one another" (1976:37). Relational distance, or intimacy, the component of Black's (2011) theory of moral time that I empirically test in this dissertation, is first introduced in this section of *The Behavior of Law*. Black describes intimacy, one of the horizontal aspects of social life, as "the degree to which [people] participate in one another's lives" (1976:40). Just as stratification can predict and explain the quantity of law, so can relational distance. Black (1976) asserts, "the relationship between law and relational distance is curvilinear" (p. 41), meaning there is less law in situations in which people are similar and relationally close, more where they are less intimate, and then less again where their social worlds diverge. Black uses the example that a person is least likely to sue a spouse, but the likelihood increases as their level of intimacy with an offending person decreases. A friend is more likely to be sued than is a family member, but less likely to be sued than a general acquaintance. This positive relationship between law and relational distance begins to wane as people become less familiar with each other; one might be less motivated to sue someone in another country or from a different culture, for example. And,

eventually, for those whose lives do not intermingle at all, the likelihood of a suit between them approaches zero.

Culture, the expressive nature of social life, varies in quantity between settings (Black 1976, p. 63). Some societies develop more ideas than others, have more artisans, more books, more movies; culture, in this sense, is quantifiable. Black (1976) asserts law varies with culture: "where culture is sparse, so is law; where it is rich, law flourishes" (p. 63). During times of cultural growth, new legislation comes into being. Digital technology, along with a growth in information, ideas, and art, has brought with it a significant increase in the types of law applied to consumers of this technology. Laws controlling the digital downloading of music, for example, affect artists, corporations, websites, and even individual consumers.

An example of the way law varies by location and direction in culture is with conventionality. Black argues that some types of culture happen more frequently than other and are thus more conventional (p. 67). Persons conforming to conventional culture are more likely to maintain the status quo and less likely to be deemed as deviant. Black explains, just as law varies with stratification, it also varies with conventionality asserting, "law is greater in a direction toward less conventionality than toward more conventionality" (1976:69-70). Since heterosexuality is considered the conventional sexual arrangement, homosexuality is considered less conventional, a deviation from widely held social norms. A homosexual, then, would receive more law than a heterosexual for the same crime, all else being equal. Law also varies with respectability, or normative status. Respectability determines the amount of social control an individual receives. More respectable individuals receive less social control, but more social control is applied to less respectable individuals

Black defines organization, the corporate feature of social life, as the capacity for

collective action (1976:85). The more organized are individuals and groups, the less law they are likely to experience. Lawsuits by corporations against individuals, for example, are more likely to be won than if an individual sues a corporation. This varies, however, according to the amount of organization within the corporation and the level of organization of the plaintiffs. An individual is less likely to bring a sexual harassment suit against an independently owned grocery store than against a highly organized corporately owned chain store. Likewise, the more organized the plaintiff, a class-action suit rather than an individual, for example, the more likely the possibility of settlement and the greater the settlement is likely to be.

Finally, social control, according to Black, is "the normative aspect of social life" (1976:5). Social control includes formal law as well informal social controls, such as bureaucracy, etiquette, or customs. Black asserts law varies inversely with other forms of social control (1976: 107). Families, for example, have more social control within their group, and are less likely to involve law in disputes. In situations where the family unit is becoming weaker, as in the present day United States, deviant individuals with loose family ties, and thus less informal social control, are more likely to find themselves subjected to law. This proposition can explain why children from broken homes typically receive more severe punishments than do children from two-parent families who commit the same legal infraction.

In spite of being hailed an important contribution to the sociology of law (Nader, n.d.; Sherman 1978), Black's (1978) theory has received considerable criticism (Eder 1977; Greenberg1983a, 1983b; Griffith1984; Michaels1978; Yngvesson1984). Greenberg (1983), for example, described Black's theory as "logically incoherent" (p. 337) and remarked that any positive interest in his theory may be rooted in the general "theoretical malaise" of the historical condition of the sociology of law (p. 364). Michaels (1978), in her critique of Black's theory,

claimed his logic was "airtight but circular" (p. 3), and claims *The Behavior of Law* is a "dichotomous system of classification" rather than an actual theory of law (p. 11).

The Behavior of Law has received considerable empirical attention, although support for the theory is decidedly mixed (see Felson and Pare 2005; Chappell and Maggard 2007; Clay-Warner and McMahon-Howard 2009; Caudill 2010). In their early test of Black's theory, Gottfredson and Hindelang (1979) found the likelihood of reporting crimes increased as the number of victims increased but provided little other support. Smith (1987) found Black's propositions beneficial in explaining police responses to violence based on race and gender status characteristics of the victims. In two studies focusing on differential criminal-court disposition in cases with female defendants, Kruttschnitt, (1980-1981; 1982) found support for Black's propositions. Hypotheses focusing on relational and radial distance from law have also received strong support (see Avakame et al., 1999; Copes et al., 2001; Gottfredson & Hindelang, 1979). Additional support was also found in Chappell and Maggards (2007) study of crack and cocaine disposition, citing support for Black's assertion that less conventional individuals are subject to more law than conventional individuals.

Other studies, such as those investigating police mobilization to rape and domestic disputes, find mixed support for Black's theory of law as well. Clay-Warner and McMahon-Howard (2009) found mixed support for both the stratification and morphology aspects on reporting rape. Felson and Pare (2005), in their test of reporting domestic violence to the police, found mixed support for the relationship between law and relational distance. While relational distance is linked to reporting decisions, the study revealed a stronger relationship for third-party reporting than for victim reporting. Finally, in an analysis of respondents' judgments of the seriousness of acts embedded in various social contexts, Hembroff (1987) found strong support

23

for the morphology and culture aspects of Black's theory, and moderate support for the social control dimension of his theory.

Although less prevalent, recent applications of *The Behavior of Law* in international contexts show mixed to no support. Lu and Miethe (2007) examined provincial laws constructed to protect women in China, but found results of the relationship between law and stratification to contradict Black's claims. Kuo et al., (2010), in their investigation of prosecutorial decision making in Taiwan, found organization in the form of marital law, and culture, measured by educational attainment, impacted change in prosecutors' behavior. Other aspects of social life, measured by divorce rate, participation in mediation, and civic involvement, had no significant impact on prosecutorial outcomes. Similarly, utilizing a large victimization survey in Taiwan, Kuo et al. (2011) found strong support for Black's theory at the aggregate level but little support when analyzing individual level behavior. However, in defense of Black's theory, Hembroff (1987) remarked that many non-supportive studies are often logically and methodologically flawed, and in general Black's theory of the Behavior of Law has been empirically validated.

In later works, Black extends many of the concepts introduced in *The Behavior Of Law*, applying a pure sociological approach to explaining other aspects of formal and informal social control. In these studies, he attempts to demonstrate the generality of the pure sociological approach for explaining conflict and conflict management. Black (1980) applies the "sociological theory of law" to police behavior, as well as non-legal styles of social control, in *The Manners and Customs of the Police*. Utilizing data collected on police calls and interventions, Black demonstrates how factors of the people involved in disputes, such as race, age, class, level of intimacy, and location in organizational groups, affects the outcomes of police intervention. The type of police response can be predicted according to the location in social

24

space of the people involved in the dispute. For example, Black argues that as relational distance between disputants increases, so does the likelihood of police intervening with punitive legal action.

Black (1989) describes the impact of social characteristics on case outcomes in *Sociological Justice.* Jurisprudential methods of practicing law in the U.S., that is, those focusing on rules applied to the case, overlook and indeed perpetuate discrimination within cases and in the criminal justice system. Black asserts lawyers who fail to practice law using sociological approaches are disadvantaged, as are their clients, and offers an alternative sociological model of law using the social factors of the people involved to determine their location in social/legal space, which can be used to predict the outcome of the case. The two models vary in purpose: the practicality of reaching decisions about a case is the purpose of the jurisprudent model, while the sociological model is concerned with scientifically explaining behaviors (and with it *cases*) (p. 21).

Black further elaborates on earlier discussions of the advantages of organization over individualization in the eyes of the law in *Sociological Justice* (1989). Black writes, "It is widely recognized that legislation often favors interest groups and organizations […] similar patterns occur in the handling of legal cases. One of the most extreme forms of social bias in modern law, it could be regarded as organizational discrimination" (p. 44). The lack of organization could be considered the single most deleterious factor for those involved in the justice system. As an alternative, Black envisions the construction of legal cooperative associations in which individuals of small businesses would pool resources and transform the legal order, leading to a reduction in organizational discrimination in punitive punishment (1989, p. 50-55). Black concludes *Sociological Justice* with a discussion of the potential benefits of decreasing "legal

overdependency" and increasing alternative methods of conflict management, including self-help, avoidance, negotiation, settlement by a third party, or toleration (p. 74-77).

In *The Social Structure of Right and Wrong* (1993, 1998), Black broadens his discussion of governmental social control to cover all forms of social control across social life. Black defines social control in this context as "any behavior by which people define and respond to deviance behavior" (p. 21 n.1). He offers a more detailed application of pure sociology to the study of morality in general. Black focuses on two general themes in the essays that comprise *The Social Structure of Right and Wrong*: alternative forms of social control and the impact of moralism on social control. Among alternative forms of social control, Black elaborates on two types of self-imposed social control: committing crime or deviance as self-help (as the moralistic pursuit of justice), and applying social control to the self. Black describes how traditional societies often took advantage of self-help in the form of beating or even killing others as punishment for harms committed against them. While these behaviors would be deemed criminal in the present-day Unites States, they were effective methods of self-help social control in the past.

Applying social control to the self occurs when individuals apply their own personal moral judgments to their own behaviors. Confessions, pleading guilty, apologizing, seeking penance, and intentionally putting oneself in harm's way, are all ways one might punish, or apply social-control, to their own behavior. Black provides several cross-cultural examples in which self-execution (suicide) represents self-application of social control. Self-execution as a result of dishonoring ones' family, was common in traditional Japan, for example, and self-execution is an uncommon form of atonement in the U.S., as is evidenced by the number of people leaving confession notes, or taking their own life after committing murder (p. 66; 72, n.3). Black asserts

that applications of self-help may be responsible for many current day crimes, and offers a radically different explanation of "criminal" behavior than those usually offered by criminological theories.

Black concludes *The Social Structure of Right and Wrong* with a theory of "partisanship and moralism" meant to explain partisan behavior in varying contexts (p.xxv-xxvi). Using pure sociological strategies, Black explains how social location and distance between adversaries and among adversaries predicts variation in settlement behavior. In the final essay, Black discusses how social remoteness and inferiority affect the likelihood of dispute settlement. Adversaries who are more socially and morally distant, as well occupying far different levels of status, are more likely to remain enemies, suffering wrath and vengeful reactions, than those who are more intimate and more equal in status.

In the years following Black's (1976) initial application of pure sociology to legal behavior, numerous other researchers have applied pure sociological strategies to explain various areas of social life, including: terrorism, genocide, lynching, killing, violence, culture, research methods, ideas, science, morality, organizations, reality TV, mental illness, drugs, suicide, courts, peace, employee theft, workplace intimacy, cults, and religion (Barlow 2012; Baumgartner 1984, 1998, 2002; Black 1995, 1998, 2000, 2004; Borg 1998, 2000; Campbell 2009, 2010; Cooney 1998, 2002, 2009, 2009a; Hawdon and Ryan 2009; Horowitz 1982, 2002; Jacques and Wright 2008, 2009, 2010a, 2010b; Manning 2012; Morrill 1995; Phillips 2003; Senechal de la Roche 1996, 2001; and Tucker 1999, 2002).

In his most recent work, *Moral Time,* Black (2011) further refines pure sociological concepts to explain all conflict with generic movements in three dimensions of social space: relational, vertical, and cultural. Black's theory of moral time is new and, as such, has yet to be

empirically validated. After a detailed overview of Black's theory of moral time, I will conclude

with an empirical test of the relational dimension of Black's theory of conflict.

CHAPTER THREE: BLACK'S THEORY OF MORAL TIME

The theory of moral time begins with a description of numerous types of conflicts, from minor disputes between spouses, to sexual assault, to cultural conflicts. Each of these conflicts, Black explains, is a clash of right and wrong, as is all conflict (p.3); this theory explains why conflict occurs, why some conflicts are worse than others, and what is defined as right and wrong (p. 3). Black presents the broad concept of *social time*, asserting it is the "fundamental cause of all conflict" (p. 4). Conflict is always social because it involves interaction, and conflict is always moral because it involves disagreements based on beliefs of right and wrong. Black provides less detail, however, on the origin of the term "moral time" other than stating, "every conflict is itself a movement of social time, and conflict therefore causes more conflict. Social time is *moral time*" (p. 4).

The concept of social time builds from a discussion of social *space*. Just as space is the multidimensional, geometric measurement of reality, social space is the multidimensional geometric measurement of social reality (p.4). Every actor maintains a position in social space, which is based on three dimensions: relational, vertical, and cultural space. Black explains that ones' position in social space depends on their distance from others in each of these dimensions. The relational dimension is based on intimacy, or the degree of participation in the life of someone else. A person is more relationally distant, less intimate, with a new coworker than with a best friend. The vertical dimension of social space refers to the degree of stratification or inequality between people (or groups or nations). Vertical distance in both wealth and authority would be greater between a CEO and a bank teller than between two similarly situated CEO's. The cultural dimension encompasses the degree of diversity between oneself and others, or between groups, such as differences in religion or ethnicity (p. 4). Based on our relative distance

to others in each of these three dimensions, everyone occupies a position of social space.

Black specifically notes that unlike physical space, where the distance from Los Angeles to Boston is the same in both directions, social space is constantly changing. The movement of social time, explains Black, is a "zero-sum game," meaning there is a finite amount of social space one can occupy (p. 44). A movement closer to a new spouse (decrease in relational distance) means a movement away from an existing friend (or coworkers, or siblings, etc.). "Increasing closeness with one person decreases it with others," writes Black, "and causes conflict in its own right" (p. 44). It is these fluctuations in relational, vertical, or cultural distance, these social changes, that comprise social *time.*

How, then, does "space" become "time"? Black explains, just as "time is the dynamic dimension of reality, social time is the dynamic dimension of social reality" (p. 4). Drawing on work from philosophy and physics to support his argument that movements of social space represent time, Black quotes Hume: "[physical time is] a perceivable succession of changeable objects," and argues *social* time is as well (p.5). Black points to physicist Harmann Minowski's argument that physical space and time occupy the same reality, and quotes Amrit Sorli, who said, rather than change "happening" over time, "change itself is physical time" (p. 5). Black concludes, if physical time is inseparable from physical space, then social time is inseparable from social space.

Changes in social time in each of the three dimensions are measured by "over" or "under" movements of each. Relational time is measured by movements of *overintimacy* and *underintimacy*; vertical time is measured by movements of *overstratification* and *understratification*; and cultural time is measured by movements of *overdiversity* and *underdiversity*. Black's use of the terms "over" and "under" are not meant to imply any type of

30

moral judgment about a situation (p. 6). That is, these relative positions are not with respect to some *desired* condition or position. They have to do with expectations governing the interactions as they currently exist. Thus, when a subordinate disobeys a superior's orders, this is undersuperiority in the sense that social patterns hold that subordinates should obey superior's orders. It does not mean that in any given situation that disobeying may not be the "good" or "moral" or "best" or "desirable" thing to do. For example, one might argue a subordinate disobeying a boss's order to kill someone is the *right* thing to do; regardless of how we judge the action, and regardless of the reason for the action, it still represents undersuperiority. This also applies to intimacy. Saying touching someone on the shoulder is overintimacy does not imply that the person "should" or "should not" do this; it could be positive or negative; or the existing amount of intimacy "should" remain where it is. It simply means that the existing level of intimacy, stratification, or diversity between the two people guides this level of interaction In moral time, then, any intimacy or stratification or diversity greater than the current level is an "over" movement, while any intimacy or stratification or diversity less than the current level is an "under" movement.

As argued above, morality, explains Black, has a logic that urges actors to preserve the current status quo of social space (p. 11). Maintaining the status quo, that is, *not* pushing the boundaries of normatively proscribed behavior, is essential for remaining conflict free; any behavior that challenges the status quo is subject to social control by those, generally institutions, invested in maintaining and reproducing the existing social order. Because dynamic movements of social space, such as challenging normatively proscribed rules of conduct, cause conflict, Black asserts there is a moral duty to keep social space static. The status quo dictates rules of conduct, and explains how events become defined as wrong:

What is wrong is always a movement of social time. For example, rape is wrong because it is a radical seizure of intimacy—a movement of relational time. Desertion is wrong because it is a radical and multidimensional movement of social time—relational, vertical, and cultural at once (p. 11).

Black consistently asserts that movements of social time cause conflict. But are *all* movements of social time negative? Do movements of social time *always* cause conflict? The birth of a child is an event—a movement of social time. A child's birth is a often a joyous occasion, but even happy occasions potentially cause conflict. What if, for example, an older sibling is jealous of a new baby? What if the baby's birth is the result and reminder of adultery? Similarly, a wedding is often a joyous event, but may not be so for everyone. Some parents may view a child getting married as the loss of their child, but other parents may view the event as the addition of a family member.

While social time may not always cause direct conflict, conflict is always caused by a movement of social time (p. 5). Social change leading to conflict may involve non-physical conflict such as hurting someone's feelings, or being slighted. It can also result in conflict that involves physical interaction such as assault or homicide. "Every conflict is an event," writes Black, and "has a history: It arises with a movement of social time […]. If space were forever frozen, conflict would never occur" (p. 5). While much conflict occurs with an immediate movement of social time, as with an explosion, Black explains conflict occurs in varying degrees –rapidly, as with an assault, or more slowly over time. Black offers cigarette smoking causing cancer over time as a parallel situation in biology: "Just as each puff of a cigarette does not result in lung cancer, so each movement of social time does not result in [an immediate] conflict." (p. 5).

The *rate* of social change, however, affects the outcome of an event. The greater and faster the movement of social time, "the greater the likelihood of conflict and the greater the conflict is likely to be" (p. 6). An immediate movement in physical contact, such as a slap, is a greater and faster movement of intimacy than is a pat on the shoulder. The rate of social change affects vertical and cultural outcomes, too. Studies have shown, for example, neighborhoods with high residential turnover and ethnic diversity have more conflict, and the greater and faster the turnover, the greater the resulting conflict (see Pais et al. 2008; Sampson 1993; Shaw and McKay 1942). While social time can change slowly and still cause conflict, faster movements of social time produce greater and more immediate conflict.

In *Moral Time,* Black first introduces relational time, followed by vertical time, and concludes with a description of cultural time. My empirical test of Black's theory concerns only the relational dimension of social time. In the remainder of this section I will discuss the primary components of relational, vertical, and cultural time, but will elaborate on my discussion of relational time in my empirical test of intimacy, discussed in Chapters 5 through 7.

Relational Time

Relational time is measured by movements of intimacy, which Black (2011) defines as "the degree of participation in life of someone else" (p. 21). This involves the sharing of time, information, and activities with others as well as how intimate individuals might be with themselves (do they spend more time alone or with others, for example). Movements of intimacy can occur in many ways including general knowledge of each other, conversation, emotional sharing, or physical contact. These movements of relational time can also be measured. A pinch, for example, is less of a movement of intimacy than is a slap, which is less intimacy than

repeatedly hitting someone. And any of those behaviors occurring between absolute strangers is a greater increase of intimacy than if the same behavior occurred between people who know each other. Rubbing the shoulders of a co-worker one just met is a greater movement of intimacy than rubbing the shoulders of a long-time co-worker who is also a close friend, and the former will create more conflict than the latter. And more conflict results from more obvious movements of intimacy Thus, the rape of a stranger is a greater movement of intimacy than is the rape of an acquaintance, and while all rape creates conflict, stranger rape creates more conflict than does acquaintance rape (p. 23).

Intimacy has a unique feature: it has an asymmetric quality. Recall that Black asserts social distance is different from physical distance. This is particularly true with relational distance; the level of closeness in any given relationship may not be equal. A student, for example, may be relationally closer to a professor than the professor is to the student. The professor may have shared personal details about her life with students, such as whether she owns cats or dogs, has children, is married, or where she went for vacation. The professor, however, may have no knowledge of any personal details about the student other than whether or not the student shows up for class. In this sense, the student is relationally closer to the professor than the professor is to the student. It is important to note that these positions of social space are not static. If the professor were to join the students' committee, she might learn those same intimate details about the students' life. In this sense, their relational distance to each other has decreased.

Intimacy is a zero-sum game: any increase of intimacy results in a corresponding decrease of intimacy somewhere else (p. 44). If a husband, for example, has an affair, he increases his intimacy with his lover while reducing his intimacy with his wife. This results in a

change of intimacy for the wife both in reducing her intimacy with her husband, but may also increase her intimacy with herself if she begins spending more time alone or with another person should she begin to pursue romantic relationships outside the boundaries of her marriage.

Relational time is divided into two types of movement of intimacy: overintimacy and underintimacy. A decrease in relational distance leads to overintimacy through mechanisms of *overinvolvement* and *overexposure*; a decrease of intimacy produces underintimacy through *underinvolvement* and *underexposure*. Any change of intimacy—becoming relationally closer or more distant—is a change in relational time (p. 22). And these fluctuations of intimacy can cause conflict (p. 21).

Overintimacy – When we enter other's lives, we become *involved* in their lives, increasing our closeness to them, and they become closer to us when we *expose* something about ourselves to them (p. 22). "Too much of the former," writes Black, "is *overinvolvement,* and too much of the latter is *overexposure*" (p. 22).

All forms of physical contact represent intimacy because contact requires involvement with another. Any physical contact, whether casual, invited, or forced, is overinvolvement. Again, Black does not suggest the act should or should not happen, the term simply refers to the fact that intimacy has increased relative to the previously established level of intimacy. Overintimacy involves non-physical interaction, too. We violate expected patterns of closeness when we sit or stand too close to someone else, or when we allow our gaze to linger on someone for too long. Black explains looking at someone for too long, asking overly personal questions, eavesdropping, and unwanted sexual touching are all examples of being too involved in the life of another. The more distant we are before the interaction, the more conflict it is likely to cause. American culture dictates it is inappropriate to touch the belly of a pregnant woman without asking

permission to do so. While both are movements of overintimacy, touching the pregnant belly of a stranger always carries the risk of producing more conflict than does touching the pregnant belly of a friend because it is a greater movement of intimacy.

Overexposure of oneself or another represents overintimacy, too. Courtesy norms in American culture dictate confidentiality in some cases. Divulging the secret of a friend or coworker, for example, exposes too much information about them and may result in conflict. Laws even protect some types of confidentiality. Doctors, lawyers, and therapists, for example, are required to keep client information confidential. In some cultures, making out in public is offensive to others, and public nudity is considered extremely offensive. Consider the recent tabloids involving separate incidents in which Brittney Spears and Lindsay Lohan were photographed in short skirts (presumably) without underwear (Earl 2012; Lindsey 2011). The photographs resulted in scorn and criticism from the media and the public. Regardless of whether the women intended to share their nudity with the public or whether photographers were overinvolved by invading their privacy, the photographs increased our intimacy with them by revealing more than American standards of etiquette allow.

Underintimacy – Just as too much intimacy causes conflict, so does too little. Underinvolvement occurs when we decrease contact with others, and underexposure results when we reduce our openness with others (p. 44). Like overinvolvement, too little involvement can be bad manners, too. Failing to return a greeting or not participating in a conversation is seen as bad manners, argues Black, and is sometimes even equated with mental illness (p. 51). But underintimacy can result in violence, too. Black explains how adultery is underinvolvement, which he states is "one of the surest causes of conflict in the social universe" (p. 44). Just as rape is a rapid and vicious increase of intimacy, adultery is a rapid and vicious breach of intimacy. Some men beat or rape

women who attempt to leave them. Fleury, Sullivan, and Bybee (2000) investigated occurrences of continued violence after women moved to shelters, ending abusive relationships. They found one-third of the women in their study experienced assaults, threats, and sexual violence by their former partners after leaving them. Other women, Black argues, drawing on a study by Daly and Wilson (1988), are murdered due to the actual or threatened abandonment of a marriage or divorce (p. 47).

Underexposure, or too little openness, can also cause conflict. Black argues withholding information from others reduces their intimacy with others whether unintentional or not. And intentionally withholding information, such as keeping secrets, or, worse, espionage, can result in conflict. Scientists are expected to reveal research findings and withholding information can result in the loss of their credibility or entire career. Withholding information is often equated with lying, and lying, writes Black, "actively deceives people and poisons relationships" (p. 53). The U.S. government recently asked scientists, and the scientific journals that had agreed to publish their work, to redact recent articles that stated the researchers had successfully replicated the bird-flu virus (Grady and Broad 2011). The governmental request to withhold information resulted in backlash from the scientific community who fear this type of censorship will harm scientific openness and the ability to conduct similar research in the future.

Vertical Time

Black explains vertical space as the stratification, or inequality, existing between individuals, groups, or nations. The dynamic movement in vertical distance between actors is *vertical time.* The mere existence of inequality, a static position, does not cause conflict; it is the dynamic *change* in stratification that causes conflict in the vertical dimension (p. 60).

37

Vertical time is divided into two types of movement of inequality: overstratification and understratification. An increase of inequality leads to overstratification through mechanisms of *overinferiority* and *oversuperiority*; a decrease of inequality produces understratification in the forms of *undersuperiority* and *underinferiority*. Any change in social standing—upward or downward mobility—such as when an individual receives a promotion or gets fired, is a change in social stratification (p. 60).

Overstratification –Too much stratification, according to Black, causes conflict. A woman promoted into a high-level position over her male colleague, for example, may cause a change, not only in individual circumstances, but in the level of gender stratification throughout the organization. Overstratification may be positive for the woman promoted and negative for the man not promoted. The change in stratification results in oversuperiority for the woman, who has now 'risen above' her male colleagues' status in the workplace. Oversuperiority results in conflict when resentment builds because someone does much better than others or someone seems to have succeeded too easily or too quickly. Overinferiority, whether through one's own fault, sabotage, or unfortunate circumstances, causes conflict as well. Losing a job, being demoted, or having ones' honor challenged can all result in overinferiority – positions where people fall in level of stratification compared to others.

Black draws on anthropological studies throughout *Moral Time* to support the cross-historical nature of his theory and to make comparisons between less industrialized tribes and modern social life. He begins with a discussion of witches and sorcerers as an example of oversuperiority. That is, people who do better than, know more than, or exhibit extraordinary behavior over that of their peers have often been accused of practicing witchcraft. Thousands were executed in colonial Massachusetts for their inexplicable behavior, and modern day

Tanzanians who achieve great success still suffer that same fate (see notes for P. 61-63).

Similarly, those who accumulate more wealth than or rise above their peers in other ways, possessing talent or extra-plentiful harvests, for example, are sometimes accused of fraternizing with the supernatural as an explanation for their success. These examples tie in to Black's discussion that it is a crime to do *too* well. Jews and upwardly mobile blacks have often received criticism from whites for doing too well[1]. Finally, "rate busting" is a prime example of oversuperiority. Employees in American factories throughout the 1920's and 1930's who outperformed their workmates were often shunned and harassed for setting standards too high, which increased demands on production (Black 2011, p. 67). Similarly, Levine (1992) discusses how ratebusting in the Soviet Union occasionally resulted in murder, while in the US, it often resulted in the ratebuster's car tires being slashed."

Understratification – Just as too much stratification causes conflict so can too little. Undersuperiority, such as the fall of a superior, might be blamed on an inferior and cause conflict. Black draws on cross-cultural accusations of witchcraft throughout history to explain undersuperiority. When a persons' fortune suddenly reverses due to unexplained events, karma, or bad voodoo, might be suggested to explain their misfortune, especially if there are accusation that someone might be 'out to get them.' A particularly interesting section of undersuperiority focuses on theft as a movement of vertical time. Black asserts, although the degree is variable, that theft reduces someone's wealth and superiority and causes more conflict where inequality is greater (p. 87). In Ancient India, thieves from the lowest caste were punished most harshly and, as the caste of the thief increased, incurred less punishment up to the highest caste, which were

---

[1] In some cases conflict occurs from within a social group, too. Black (p. 67) discusses Elijah Anderson's (1999) study of urban life in Philadelphia in which Anderson describes scenes in which young Black men acting "too white" are subject to criticism and violence.

rarely punished (p. 87). Similar trends are also found in contemporary America. There is a long history of racial and class disparities in sentencing for drug violations in the U.S. (see The Sentencing Project 2005), and individuals with higher social status often receive lighter sentences than those with lower social status (Spohn 2000; Steffensmeier and Demuth 2000). Maddan, Hartley, Walker, & Miller (2011) compared sentences between white-collar offenders and street criminals, and found offenders with a college degree were more likely to receive lenient sentences than those without a college degree, and embezzlers in their study received less severe punishments than auto thieves.

Conversely, underinferiority can cause conflict, too. Reducing the superiority of others through acts of rebellion or a rejection of authority is underinferiority. Underinferiority often leaves superiors in positions of trying to "save face." This might occur when an employee refuses to follow the orders of a superior in front of colleagues. Similarly, a class clown challenging a teachers' authority can result in chaos in the classroom with the teacher having to call for help from others to regain authority. Some movements of underinferiority, however, are more serious. Black explains it is a crime in every legal system to challenge a legal official's authority (p. 91). In the military, for example, a rejection of authority usually results in formal discipline. Members of the U.S. military are subject to court martial and even death for disobeying orders. Recently, a U.S. Army doctor was sentenced to 6 months in military prison for refusing to deploy to Afghanistan (NBC News 2010). In 2006, a Navy chaplain was court martialed and fined for repeatedly disobeying his superiors' orders not to wear his uniform during personal media appearances (Wiltrout 2006). Rioting, resisting arrest, and challenging a judge all attract punishment, either formal as in "contempt of court charges," or informal as illustrated by police beatings in the Rodney King case. King's rejection of police authority, by

40

disobeying orders, resulting in a brutal case of excessive force, with King being repeatedly

kicked and beaten with batons by five police officers (see Cannon 1997 and Nelson 2000).

Whether formal or informal, punishment is often the response to underinferiority.

Cultural Time

Black describes culture as the expressive dimension of social life, which encompasses

"language, religion, and ideas, to art, clothing, and table manners" (p.101). In addition to

creating groups of similarly "expressive" people, culture also distinguishes one person, group, or

society from another (p. 101). Black labels these differences between cultures as diversity,

asserting, "cultural difference is a cultural distance" (p. 120). Just as vertical space fluctuates by

movements of stratification, cultural space fluctuates by changes in cultural distance. Any

movement in cultural distance is cultural time, and such a movement may cause conflict (p. 101).

Cultural time is divided into two types of movement of diversity: overdiversity and

underdiversity. A decrease in cultural distance leads to overdiversity through mechanisms of

overtraditionalism and *overinnovation*; while an increase in cultural distance, underdiversity,

occurs through *undertraditionalism* and *underinnovation*. Any change in cultural composition

within any group—including societies, religions, or genders—is cultural time. Workplaces, for

example, have culture. Those with unequal gender, sexual orientation, or racial/ethnic

compositions risk overdiversity or underdiversity, as do tribes, neighborhoods, or even nations.

Overdiversity –An increase of diversity, explains Black, can be a dangerous thing: it causes

conflict. The greater and faster the cultural difference appears, the greater the ensuing the

conflict (p. 101). This conflict may take the form of subtle disapproval to rioting or even

genocide (p.101). Overtraditionalism occurs when traditions come in contact with each other,

and overinnovation occurs with the development of something new within a culture (p.102).

41

While many groups agree to disagree, which may cause only slight movements of social time, Black (2011) argues one must either accept a culture, tradition, or belief, or reject it. A failure to accept another's culture (including sexuality, lifestyle, and beliefs) is a rejection of that culture and rejection, asserts Black, causes fluctuations in moral time, which can lead to conflict.

Black asserts ethnic conflicts are some of the most savage clashes of overtraditionalism in history. Being different is dangerous and hostility toward different cultures can lead to systematic injustices such as segregation, exclusion, or expulsion, and ranges from unfriendly insults to genocide (p. 103). While the degree varies by culture, many people fear or dislike those who look, believe, or behave differently. American Indian tribes were often at war with different tribes for being unlike themselves, and Melanesian tribes were known to kill and eat any unarmed lone intruder, according to Black (p. 103). During the 1994 civil war in Rwanda, for example, more than half a million Tutsi and Hutus were slaughtered due to ethnic conflict and efforts to gain governmental power (for more on genocide see Campbell 2010, 2011; see Cooney 2009 and the United Human Rights Council for more on ethnic conflict). Violence as a result of overtraditionalism occurs in the Unites States too, often taking the form of "hate crimes" based on differences in religion, race and ethnicity, or sexual orientation (see Harlow 2005; Shively 2005). Synagogues and Mosques are, for example, defaced by Christians and white supremacists (Jenkins 2012; Willmsen 2009) and hate crimes, including harassment, rape, and murder, based on the victims' perceived sexual orientation are well documented in the U.S. (see Herek, Cogan, and Gillis 2002; also see UCR 2011 for statistics on hate crimes in the U.S.).

Overinnovation, when something new comes into being, or something rapidly deviates from tradition, also causes conflict. Women's rapid and significantly increased presence in historically male-only occupations, for example, is a form of overinnovation, and has resulted in

numerous documented cases of workplace gender harassment over the last 50 years (see Pina and Gannon 2010; Willness, Steel, and Lee 2007; and EEOC 2011 for statistics). Religious innovation in the form of heresy, another type of overinnovation, also causes conflict. Christianity was itself once a crime, describes Black, because it challenged the traditional beliefs of Jews and Romans (p. 110). Similarly, over creativity in the form of both art (Mozart and Picasso) and science (Copernicus, Newton, Darwin, and Einstein) has historically been met with resistance, opposition, and even challenges of heresy (p. 112-117). Scientific overinnovation continues to cause conflict even in modern times. Much debate exists over the use of embryonic stem cells in the U.S. even though the use of adult stem cells has been widely accepted (Klinghoffer 2011). While some groups challenge the ethics of using embryonic stem cells based on religious arguments, some scientists reject the use because they fear it challenges the success other forms of medical innovation (Johnson 2013; see Bellomo 2006 for more on the stem cell debate).

Underdiversity – Just as an increase of diversity causes conflict, so can a *rejection of* diversity. Black reminds us that culture is also a zero-sum game: embracing one culture is the rejection of another culture, and rejection causes conflict (p. 120). A rejection of established culture, such as a child abandoning her family's religion, or the rejection of traditional gender roles, is *undertraditionalism.* The rejection of new culture, such as religious groups rejecting certain forms of technology, *is underinnovation*. Black describes Catholics killing Protestants for practicing innovative Christianity as well as the German's genocide of Jews for rejecting Jesus, but for also rejecting Adolph Hitler's new ethnic hierarchy. More recent examples of underinnovation include the Amish's rejection of almost all technology and Jehovah Witnesses' rejection of innovative medicine (blood transfusions).

"Old culture does not die quietly," Black writes, "nor do its followers always tolerate rejection" (p. 121). Norwegian terrorist, Anders Breivik, who was convicted of bombing a government building in Oslo, Norway, and gunning down 69 people on July 11, 2011, had no tolerance for the rejection of traditional ways. As outlined in his manifesto, Breivik believed feminism, a form of overinnovation, was responsible for the multicultural corruption, including the "Islamisation," occurring throughout Europe (Kane 2011). Because they embraced these forms of overinnovation, Breivik believed Norway's Labor Party was a traitor of traditional practices and beliefs. Breivik's attack was a symbol of his call for a return to "monoculturalism," to patriarchy, and for a rejection of all other non-christian religions (Jones 2011). In this sense, Breivik responded to what he believed was overdiversity with violence that stemmed from underdiversity, specifically through underinnovation.

While social space is comprised of three dimensions, relational, vertical, and cultural, this dissertation focuses specifically on the relational dimension. There are, however, instances in which vertical and cultural time impacts social change within the relational dimension. In the following sections I detail my approach to testing the relational dimension of Black's theory and elaborate on the impact the other dimensions may have on levels of intimacy.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Data for this project were collected using a web-based survey during the 2012 spring semester at a large Southeastern university. Participants were recruited via convenience sampling in classrooms and on student and departmental listservs. Students were asked to volunteer to participate in an IRB approved, anonymous, web-based survey gathering students' perceptions of sexualized interaction in the workplace.

Some advantages to administering surveys online include significant reductions in cost over telephone, personal interview, and mail surveys (Boboth et al. 2007). Flexible survey construction is an additional benefit. Many web-based survey software programs provide complex randomization features and automatic skip patterns, and allow for immediate receipt of questionnaire responses (Ardalan et al. 2007; Britto 2004; Smith and Williams 2007). Completing surveys online may also reduce bias due to less pressure to produce socially desirable responses (Parks, Pardi, and Bradizza 2006) and provide respondents with anonymity, which may encourage respondents to provide more open and honest responses to sensitive questions (Fricker et al. 2005).

While there are many benefits to web-based surveys, coverage bias has been indicated as a potential area for concern when utilizing online questionnaires. Coverage bias is likely to occur when the target population and the actual sample demographics are not close in composition (Duncan and Stansy 2001). In 2005, approximately 75 percent of U.S. households had some type of access to the internet, although minorities, the elderly, and lower income households generally comprise those with less internet access (Victory and Cooper 2002). The 2012 Internet Trends Report finds internet population penetration has now increased to 78 percent in the U.S. and coverage continues to increase among all populations (Meeker and Wu 2012). Since the target

population for this study is college students at a large public university, and all students at this university have, at a minimum, access to computer labs and campus internet and are required to routinely check email and use other web-based programs, coverage bias due to lack of internet access is not a drawback for this study.

Sample

Participants in this study were 1,936 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled during the Spring 2012 semester at a large public university in southeastern United States. Male respondents were slightly underrepresented in this sample compared to overall university enrollment, with men making up 51.5 percent of survey respondents compared to 58.1 percent of the university population. Compared to the demographics of the students enrolled in the university, (Table 1), undergraduate students were overrepresented in this sample. Respondents were primarily seniors (36.2 percent), followed by freshman (23.1 percent), juniors (16.8 percent), and sophomores (14.8 percent); graduate and professional students comprised the smallest portion of the sample (9.1 percent). The majority of students were between 18-21 years of age (70.2 percent), followed by 22-25 years (24.7 percent), 26-30 years (3.4 percent), with respondents 31 years and older comprising 1.8 percent of the sample. Caucasian students were overrepresented at 83.9 percent of the sample. Asian (5.4 percent), Hispanic or Latino (3.5 percent), Black or African American (3.1 percent), and "Other" (4.1 percent) racial groups were slightly underepresented compared to university statistics. Over 94 percent of students selected their sexual orientation as "straight," followd by 3 percent "bisexual", 2 percent "Gay", and 0.8 percent indicating "Queer/Other." Nearly 73 percent of respondents indicated their mother/guardian graduated from college and 76 percent of respondent's fathers/guardians are college graduates. Approximately 16 percent of respondents did not answer demographic

questions. While this sample may be generally representative of the university population, the

university population is not representative of the general population. Approximately 84.4 percent

of the U.S. population age 25 and older has at least at high school education, and 28.2 percent

have at least a bachelor's degree or higher, and only 10.5 percent have a graduate or professional

degree (American Community Survey 2011).

Table 1. Sample Demographics Compared with University Demographics

Demographic	Frequency	Percentage	University Population
Gender			
Female	784	48.5	42.4
Male	831	51.5	57.6
Race			
Asian	87	5.4	7.0
Black or African American	50	3.1	4.1
Hispanic/Latino	57	3.5	3.4
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Isles	7	0.4	0.2
American Indian/AK Native	8	0.5	71.6
White	1359	83.9	5.5
Other/2 or more races	51	3.2	
Grade Level			
Undergraduate	1755	90.9	82.5
Graduate	175	9.1	17.5
Freshman	446	23.1	
Sophomore	285	14.8	
Junior	325	16.8	
Senior	699	36.2	
Graduate	84	4.4	
Professional	91	4.7	
Age			
18-21	1141	70.2	
22-25	401	24.7	
26-30	55	3.4	
31 and over	29	1.8	
Sexual Orientation			
Bisexual	48	3.0	
Gay	32	2.0	

Straight	1529	94.3
Queer/Other	13	0.8
Mother/Guardian Education		
Less than high school	22	1.4
High school	151	9.3
Some college/technical	266	16.4
College degree	761	47.0
Master's degree	365	22.6
Doctorate	53	3.3
Father/Guardian Education		
Less than high school	19	1.2
High school	170	10.5
Some college/technical	199	12.3
College degree	620	38.2
Master's degree	461	28.4
Doctorate	152	9.4

Factorial Survey Method

The survey constructed for this study was based on a factorial design. The factorial survey method (FSM) developed by Rossi and Nock (1982) is a survey methodology designed to effectively measure 'social judgments.' This method involves presenting respondents with simulated, believable, real-world scenarios in which the levels of interaction in the scenarios, or the characteristics of those involved, are manipulated. FSM allows for the presentation of highly contextualized situations in which altering the characteristics of individuals, objects, or actions described in the vignettes potentially elicits different value judgments across vignettes (Konty 2002; Rossi and Nock 1982). While social desirability, a situation in which respondent answers are biased by the perception that they 'should' or 'ought to' respond a certain way, is a common form of measurement error in social research methods, the fact that the vignettes can also be randomized throughout the survey instrument, makes web-based factorial survey methods particularly useful in decreasing social desirability and eliciting more authentic respondent

judgments (Caro, Ho, McFadden, Gottlieb, Yee, Chan, and Winter 2012; Gideon and SpringerLink 2012).

Vignettes

This study utilizes vignettes to elicit a judgment response from respondents. In addition to the benefits of vignettes discussed above, including the ability to contextualize scenarios, vignettes also involve a relaxed story-telling approach that respondents may find interesting, potentially reducing early termination of the survey resulting from boredom or disinterest (Kayser-Jones and Koening 1994). Vignettes are particularly useful in studies seeking to elicit judgments from a "decision maker" about social interactions (Taylor 2006). As such, scenarios similar to those constructed for this study have been used to measure respondents' judgments in studies on sexual harassment and other forms of sexualized interaction (Dougherty et al. 1996; Ormerod 1991; Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson 1993).

The dependent variable, conflict scores, is measured by respondent's judgments of offensiveness (1=not at all offensive to 5=extremely offensive) to the behaviors depicted in eight vignettes. The vignettes in this survey portray various forms of sexualized interaction among coworkers, from ambiguous to overtly sexual. Vignettes were constructed based on focus groups in which 10 graduate students shared either previous experiences of sexualized interactions between coworkers or recalled stories of sexualized experiences of friends, family, or acquaintances. The scenarios included a variety of scenarios including physical touch, sexual joking, and disclosure. Physical touch vignettes include behaviors such as shoulder massaging, squeezing biceps, and sexualized touching accompanied by a sexual proposition in an elevator. Sexual joking vignettes include asking a coworker "Which one would you bang?" and simulated humping of another person as they are bending over at the water cooler. A person gossiping

about intimate details of a sexual encounter with another coworker with other employees is an

example of behaviors reflecting disclosure (see Appendix A "Questionnaire" for vignettes).

Contextual factors including the type of behavior, the gender of the actor (the person

initiating the interaction) and receiver (the "target" of the behavior), and the previous level of

intimacy (established relational distance) were manipulated in the vignettes throughout this

survey. The gender of the actor and receiver was altered for each of the eight specific behaviors

(M/F, F/M, M/M, F/F), creating 4 possible "gender pairings" for each of the 8 scenarios,

resulting in a total of 32 possible vignettes. While all of the above scenarios involve people of

the same rank, three of the eight behaviors were also manipulated to depict interactions between

people of different rank for the mixed-gender interactions, resulting in an additional 6 scenarios

for each respondent.

Table 2. Independent Intimacy Ranking Sample Demographics

Demographic	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Female	34	58.6
Male	18	31.0
Not reported	6	10.4
Race		
Asian	3	5.7
Black or African American	2	3.8
Hispanic/Latino	5	9.4
White	41	77.4
Other/2 or more races	2	3.8
Age		
18-21	24	45.3
22-25	10	18.9
26-30	5	9.4
31 and over	14	26.4
Respondent's Education		
High school	8	15.1
Some college/technical	30	56.6

College degree	6	11.3
Master's degree	7	13.2
Doctorate	2	3.8

N = 58

A separate anonymous online survey of university students was conducted to create a baseline indicating the amount of 'movement of intimacy' produced by each of the eight behaviors depicted in the vignettes. Respondents recruited via convenience sampling (*n*=58, demographics presented in Table 2) were unaware of the primary study or of the structure of the vignettes. Participants were provided with a general description of each behavior, but no other information, such as names, rank, location, or gender, and asked to rank order the behaviors from the least intimate behavior to the most intimate behavior. The results, depicted in Table 3, produced an independent measure of movement of intimacy that will be used for comparison against respondent's conflict scores for the first hypothesis (described in the next chapter).

Table 3. Independent Ranking of Behaviors by Type of Intimacy

Behavior	Mean	SD
1 Bicep squeeze	1.84	1.19
2 Asking, "Which one would you bang?"	2.91	1.49
3 Shoulder massage	3.34	1.96
4 Lingering gaze on body	4.57	1.67
5 Simulated humping at water cooler	5.47	2.00
6 Sharing details of sex with other coworkers (disclosure)	5.81	1.80
7 Email sex proposition	6.16	1.37
8 Elevator touch with sex proposition	6.74	1.35

N = 58; 1 = least intimate and 8 = most intimate

Survey Instrument

I proceeded with administering the survey after receiving Institutional Review Board approval (see Appendix B) of my survey instrument and research plan. The survey was constructed using Qualtrics Online Survey Tool and was administered through the university

Qualtrics system. Qualtrics was chosen for its ability to randomize multiple layers within the survey and to randomly present the order of the vignettes, along with the type of introduction received (strangers, acquaintances, or intimates), which allows for complex factorial designs. Further, Qualtrics automatically assigns randomly generated anonymous identification numbers to each respondent's results, automatically codes categorical data and missing data, and allows direct import of the data into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Participants were provided with a hyperlink to the online questionnaire. The first page explained that participation was voluntary and anonymous and continuing on to the survey signified participants' informed consent. Respondents randomly received one of three different introductions to the survey, which gave instructions and set up the existing relationship between actors and receivers in the vignettes as strangers, acquaintances, or intimates:

> In each of the following scenarios coworkers **have just met** and have yet to develop friendships.
>
> <div align="center">or</div>
>
> In each of the following scenarios coworkers are **acquaintances**. They have a history of being generally cordial at work but have never socialized outside of the workplace unless specifically indicated in the vignette. No previous romantic relationships exist between any of these coworkers.
>
> <div align="center">or</div>
>
> In each of the following scenarios coworkers have a history of being **quite friendly** and socializing outside of the workplace.
>
> <div align="center">and</div>
>
> Please read each vignette and rate how generally offensive you find each of the co-worker interactions depicted. Rate the general level of offensiveness of the scenario on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 equals not at all offensive and 5 equals extremely offensive.

In an effort to increase content validity, prompts reminding respondents of the nature of the existing relationship appeared before every third question. The survey software randomly

presented respondents with two gendered pairings for each of the 8 vignettes, as well as the 6

mixed-rank vignettes, resulting in a total of 22 vignettes per respondent. Only one vignette

appeared per page and the order of the vignettes was randomized throughout the survey. The

final section presented questions on respondent demographic characteristics, including gender,

race, age, sexual orientation, religious importance, political affiliation, grade level, and parent's

level of education. An outline of the questionnaire structure is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Outline of Questionaire Structure

Step 1	Respondents randomly received one of three different introductions explaining the level of intimacy between the individuals depicted in vignettes (strangers, acquaintances, or intimates).							
Step 2	Respondents recived 2 gender-parings for each of 8 behaviors presented randomly throughout the survey).							
16 vignettes	Behavior 1 M→F or M→M or F→M or F→F	Behavior 2 M→F M→M F→M F→F	Behavior 3 M→F M→M F→M F→F	Behavior 4 M→F M→M F→M F→F	Behavior 5 M→F M→M F→M F→F	Behavior 6 M→F M→M F→M F→F	Behavior 7 M→F M→M F→M F→F	Behavior 8 M→F M→M F→M F→F
Step 3 6 vignettes	Respondents received six additional vignettes depicting rank differences: 3 with female superior and 3 with male superior (presently randomly throughout survey)							
Step 4	Demographic questions							

Analytic Strategy

This empirical test of the overintimacy component of relational time involves comparing

levels of offensiveness conceptualized as "conflict scores," the dependent variable, to vignettes

depicting movements of intimacy. Movements of intimacy are measured in four ways. The first

independent variable, movements of intimacy by type of behavior, is measured by comparing

respondent's conflict scores to each of the eight behaviors depicted in the vignettes with the

independent measure of movement of intimacy. The second independent variable, previous level

of intimacy, involves comparing conflict scores between strangers, acquaintances, and intimates.

I will combine conflict scores to all vignettes with the "strangers" introduction, then compare the

"strangers" mean score with the "acquaintances" mean score, and then with the "intimates" mean score. The third independent variable, gender pairings, involves comparing aggregate conflict scores between vignettes depicting Male/Female, Male/Male, Female/Male, and Female/Female interactions. That is, I will combine responses to all vignettes with Male/Female interaction and compare these with each of the other three gender-pairings. Each behavior will further be analyzed by comparing means across the gender-pairings within each of the 8 vignettes. Rank, the fourth independent variable, will be tested on the aggregate level, by comparing conflict scores between the three vignettes depicting differing levels of rank. Conflict scores will also be compared within each of the three vignettes, comparing aggregate measures of upward and downward movements of intimacy, and conflict scores based on the gender of the actor and receiver across different levels of rank.

Analyses will be conducted using IBM$^®$ SPSS$^®$ Statistics version 20. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations, will be produced for all survey questions. Any variables not fitting general patterns will be removed from aggregate analyses and examined separately. After confirming that all variables meet normality assumptions, all means comparisons will be conducted using one-sample t tests, unless otherwise noted as Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) multiple comparisons tests. An alpha level of .05 will be used for all statistical tests.

CHAPTER 5: AN EMPIRICAL TEST OF OVERINTIMACY

Focusing specifically on the overintimacy aspect of relational time, this study measures student's perceptions of offensiveness to vignettes depicting movements of intimacy (sexualized interaction) between coworkers. Using value judgments of levels of offensiveness, conceptualized as "conflict scores," toward sexualized interactions between coworkers (movements of intimacy) allows for a test of the relationship between movements of relational time and conflict. Potential conflicts resulting from movements in relational time are measured in 4 ways: 1) by the type of intimate behavior, 2) by the previous level of intimacy, 3) between people of differing levels of occupational rank (boss and employee), and 4) by the ranking of intimacy between gender-pairings (intra-gender vs. cross-gender).

In section 5.1 of this chapter, *Movements of Intimacy,* I present hypotheses, findings, and discussion of conflict by the type of behavior. In section 5.2, I present hypotheses, findings and discussion of conflict by the level of previously established intimacy. I present hypotheses, findings, and discussion of tests of intimacy involving individuals with varying levels of organizational status in Chapter 6, *The Vertical Nature of Intimacy*. Chapter 7, The *Gendered Nature of Intimacy*, extends Black's conception of intimacy and details hypotheses, findings, and discussion of differences in intimacy by gender-pairings.

Movements of Intimacy

Intimacy in personal relationships can refer to a number of behaviors, including sexual intimacy, but also encompasses emotions, friendships, working relationships, self-disclosure, non-sexual physical touch, and conversations (Prager 2000). Intimacy can occur between individuals regardless of level of prior closeness. Strangers, for example, can become intimate when they share information about themselves or others. The use of mobile phones in public places

catapults strangers into potentially intimate conversations about people with whom they have no prior knowledge (Persson 2001). Non-sexual physical intimacy also occurs between strangers in similar settings. Close physical proximity to others, especially in crowds, forces people to share space and, potentially, body contact with other individuals. Contact sports require players to physically touch opponents and other teammates, and skin-to-skin contact sports such as wresting and ju jitsu have even higher levels of intimacy. Similarly, beauty and body treatments also require skin-to-skin contact with complete or near strangers and are an example of the asymmetric nature of intimacy. Massage therapy involves direct contact with the naked body, as do treatments such as body waxing, tattooing, or medical exams. Practitioners who touch others' bodies have more physical intimacy with their clients than clients do with the practitioners. In addition to physical intimacy, individuals working in service industries are expected to be "good listeners," which means they may have more emotionally intimate knowledge of clients than clients do of the practitioners (Guy, Newman, and Mastacii 2008; Merran and Kitzinger 2007) But the opposite can occur, too. Entertainers, such as film starts, musicians, or even exotic dancers, typically have far less knowledge of their audience than the audiences have about them. Many celebrities report being victims of stalking at the hands of over-adoring fans, (Celezic 2008). Intimacy is not always positive, nor is it always welcomed, and a wide range of behaviors can be considered as movements of intimacy.

Relational Distance by Type of Intimate Behavior

This test of overintimacy begins with comparing respondents' conflict scores to each of eight movements of intimacy with scores from the independent intimacy ranking introduced in Chapter 4. If, as Black (2011) argues, greater movements of intimacy result in greater social reaction:

H1: Conflict scores for each of the behaviors depicted in the vignettes will increase as interactions move from minor movements of intimacy to more obvious movements of intimacy, regardless of the social characteristics of the actors.

This hypothesis is based on Black's (2011) assertion that more obvious movements of intimacy have the potential to cause more conflict than less obvious movements of intimacy. A bivariate correlation reveals a strong positive correlation between the ranking of conflict scores and the movements of intimacy ($r=.810$, $p=.015$). Table 4 presents a summary of the aggregate judgments to each of the eight behaviors depicted in the vignettes by level of conflict as rated by respondents.

As indicated in Table 4, there is considerable variation in mean conflict scores, with means ranging from a low of 2.57 to a high of 4.44 (on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1= not at all offensive and 5 = extremely offensive). Minor movements of intimacy, such as squeezing muscles or rubbing shoulders, are rated as relatively inoffensive and therefore less likely to produce conflict. Behaviors featuring more sexualized interaction and therefore indicative of greater movements of intimacy, such as leering at body parts or sexualized joking involving an unaware victim, are rated as more serious. The greatest movements of intimacy, according to respondents, are overt sexualized touching and disclosing sexual information to coworkers, and these behaviors were also ranked as the most serious.

Table 4. Aggregate Conflict Means and Standard Deviations by Type of Intimacy

Vignette	Mean	SD	*N*	*t*
1) Mark, John, and Lisa are in the break room having coffee. While Mark reaches up into the cabinet for a mug, John **squeezes** Mark's **bicep**, saying, "Nice! Have you been working out?"..	2.57	1.04	1592	
2) Jim is sitting at a desk working. Sarah walks up and begins **massaging** Jim's **shoulders** saying, "You've been working at this a while. How's it going?"..	2.74***	1.11	1777	6.66
3) Karen walks up to George to discuss a file. George let's his **gaze linger** on Karen's breasts before looking up at her..	3.22***	1.07	1619	18.06
4) Jeff and Mike are talking in the hallway. Jeff makes a show of eyeing two attractive people as they walk by. He says to Mike, "Nice. **Which one would you bang**?"…………………………..	3.41***	1.14	1564	6.80
5) James secretly has a sexual interest in Matthew. James **emails** Matthew asking if he would like to join him for a *sexual* **encounter**..	3.86***	1.06	1659	15.83
6) Scott, Alice and Tina are in the break room. Scott is bending over getting water out of the water cooler. Alice looks at Tina, winks, and quietly walks up behind Scott without his knowledge, thrusting her hips forward and back in a sexual manner. Tina gives Alice a thumbs-up and they quietly laugh behind Scott's back. Scott is unaware of being the object of the "**faux hump**"…	3.92**	1.14	1564	2.62
7) Rob and Cindy worked late and are riding down the elevator together. Rob gets close to Cindy, brushes his hand against her breast and says, " Want to go back to my place and work off this stress?" (**elevator touch and proposition**)....................................	4.43***	.84	1710	24.97
8) Mary and Alicia have been socializing outside of work. After Alicia decides to no longer see Mary romantically, Mary tells several people gathered in the break room detailed personal information about Alicia and about their sexual encounters (**disclosure**).	4.44	.77	1648	.93

Scores out of 1 to 5 where 1= not at all offensive and 5 = extremely offensive
*** Significantly higher than previous behavior at p < .01*
Significantly higher than previous behavior at p <.001

With the exception of the two most offensive vignettes, which were rated similarly, all

behaviors were significantly higher than the previous behavior. Overall, judgments move in the

expected direction. However, a few conflict scores are out of order when compared to the

independent intimacy ranking. Respondents rated the email proposition as less offensive than the independent ranking of intimacy, and both sexualized joking vignettes, as well as the disclosure vignette, as much more offensive movements of intimacy than indicated by the independent movements of intimacy measure. While the scores are not in the exact predicted order, the overall pattern of rankings is consistent with Black's assertion. Respondents find relatively minor movements of intimacy as less offensive than greater movements of intimacy.

In general, results support Black's (2011) assertion that greater movements of intimacy result in greater negative social reaction and, potentially, conflict. When considering the discrepancies in respondent's ordering of the vignettes compared to the independent intimacy ranking, it is important to remember that the independent raters were not provided any information about the nature of the relationship between the people engaging in the behaviors. The fact that all of these vignettes depicted workplace behavior have influenced the ranking of some movements of intimacy.

Respondents rated the vignette depicting disclosure, revealing information about a sexual encounter with a coworker to other coworkers, along with the elevator touch proposition, as the two most offensive movements of intimacy. The differences between the rankings of intimacy and rankings of severity could be contributed to several factors. First, some of these behaviors may be viewed less appropriate in the workplace, and thus a greater movement of intimacy, based on context (such as at work versus at a ballgame). Differences in the characteristics of raters for the movement of intimacy survey verses the characteristics of raters in the primary survey may also offer plausible explanations for this discrepancy. A larger proportion of the independent ranking sample was female (65.4 percent) whereas slightly more men (51.5 percent) completed the primary survey than did women.

These results support previous investigations of respondents' perceptions of severity of sexual harassment by gender, which reveal women, in general, rate more behaviors as offensive then do men (Bell et al. 2002; Gutek et al. 1999; Kenig and John 1986; Rotundo, Nguyen, and Sackett 2001 Willness et al. 2007). Rotundo, Ngyeun, and Sackett (2001) conducted a met-analysis of over 33,000 men's and women's perceptions of sexual harassment, and found women define sexual harassment more broadly than do men and are more likely to find sexual jokes and sexual displays more offensive than men do.

The mean age of the independent ranking sample In this study is slightly higher than the mean age of the survey respondents and includes community members in addition to students in the sample. In additional to gender differences, previous studies of respondent's perceptions of sexual harassment also find older respondents are more likely than younger respondents, who are primarily students in these studies, to perceive a wider range of behaviors as more serious (Frazier et al. 1995; Hendrix 2000; Ohse and Stockdale 2008). It is possible the different social characteristics of these two groups affected the interpretation of the movements of intimacy depicted in each scenario differently too. Nevertheless, the strong positive correlation observed between the two measures offers general support to Black's argument.

Relational Distance by Previous Level of Intimacy

Black asserts intimacy is on a continuum of sorts—actors can range from zero intimacy (absolute strangers) to "total interpenetration" (1976, p. 41). Moving on this continuum is a movement in relational distance, which can be measured in several ways, including "the scope, frequency and length of the interaction between people, the age of the relationship, and the nature and number of links between them in a social network" (Black 1976 p. 41). Based on Black's discussion of intimacy, the previous level of intimacy, or how well the people depicted

60

in the vignettes know each other prior to the interaction, was manipulated to represent three categories of existing levels of intimacy: strangers, acquaintances, and intimates. Based on Black's (2011) assertion that movements of intimacy between strangers are much greater changes in relational distance than movements of intimacy between non-strangers, I hypothesize:

> **H2:** Vignettes depicting interactions between strangers will be judged most offensive and those between intimates will be least offensive, regardless of the behavior and social characteristic of the actors/receivers.

Findings presented in Table 5 provide support for Hypothesis 2. One-sample t-tests confirm that aggregate responses to all vignettes involving strangers (M = 3.63, SD = 0.77) are significantly ranked as more offensive ($p < .05$, $t = 2.24$) than those involving acquaintances (M = 3.56, SD = 0.73). Likewise, all aggregate responses to vignettes involving acquaintances are ranked as being significantly more offensive ($P < .001$, $t = 7.521$) than those involving intimates (M = 3.33, SD = 0.74).

Table 5. Aggregate Conflict scores between Previous Levels of Intimacy

Previous Level of Intimacy	Mean	SD	N	t
Intimates	3.33	.74	610	
Acquaintances	3.56***	.73	614	7.52
Strangers	3.63*	.77	625	2.24

*** $p < .001$
* $p < .05$

Black (2011:23) asserts movements in relational distance between strangers are more likely to result in conflict than movements in relational distance between people who have a previously established relationship. Clear support was found for this assertion. On the aggregate level, interactions between strangers represent a greater movement of intimacy than do the same

61

interactions occurring between acquaintances or between intimates and stranger interactions are judged more offensive than interactions between acquaintances or intimates.

However, when previous levels of intimacy were analyzed within each of the eight behaviors, the results remained in the overall direction, but some significant differences between strangers and acquaintances disappeared. One-way ANOVA was used to test the type of behavior controlling for previous level of intimacy. Due to unequal variance across the three previous levels of intimacy for five of the eight behaviors, Games-Howell post hoc test was applied. The Games-Howell test was chosen for its moderately conservative nature and because it is robust with respect to larger sample sizes (Field 2013).

Results indicate previous level of intimacy affects conflict scores for certain behaviors but not others. When analyzed by individual behavior, differences in conflict scores are not statistically different between strangers and acquaintances for five of the eight behaviors. This absence of significant difference between strangers and acquaintances in some of the vignettes may be because there is often little distinction made between these two types of relationships in the workplace. Some coworkers are friendlier than others, for example, and may seek out interaction with fellow employees, whereas other coworkers may remain isolated due to location, job type, or by choice. The rankings, however, are in the correct order, but the differences are small and therefore not statistically significant. In general, results fall in the expected direction across behaviors and across previous levels of intimacy, with interactions between strangers being judged more offensive than interactions between intimates for all eight movements of intimacy, as predicted by Black. The findings at the individual level suggest the level of previously established intimacy patterns the responses to behaviors depicted in the vignettes.

CHAPTER 6: THE VERTICAL FEATURES OF INTIMACY

Black describes the three dimensions of social space—relational, vertical, and cultural—as separate, but related. An interaction that deals primarily with movements of stratification, such as increasing or decreasing wealth or status, would be identified as a movement of vertical time. Similarly, interactions occurring in the cultural dimension of social space, such as racial discrimination, would be a movement of cultural time. But people of different races and differing levels of wealth can have close relationships, including family and friends, or distant relationships ranging from acquaintances, enemies, or complete strangers. That is, they experience intimacy at varying levels. While a primary type of movement may be within a particular dimension, the interaction may be conditioned by factors from one or both of the other dimensions. That is, the dimensions of social life are interrelated and therefore we would anticipate that they influence each other.

The aim of this empirical test focuses on movements of relational time, rather than vertical or cultural time. However, movements of intimacy, sexualized interaction in this case, can occur between people with differing levels of status or wealth, and from different races, ethnicities, or sexual orientations. In this way, intimacy is conditioned by vertical and cultural factors. This chapter presents a test of the vertical nature of intimacy, which investigates differences in responses to movements of intimacy among people from different occupational ranks.

Vertical Component of Relational Time – Black asserts, "intimacy varies with its location and direction in social space," (2011, p. 22). Difference in status is an example of how intimacy varies, and how location and direction in social space affects the rate and distance of social change occurring during movements of intimacy. According to Black, a movement of intimacy between equals, represents a smaller movement in relational distance than the same movement of

intimacy between superiors and subordinates (2011, p. 22). The more inequality existing between the parties, the more conflict overintimacy produces. Black further states, "downward intimacy is greater than upward intimacy" (2011, p. 22). A fistfight for example, between two people of equal rank would result in less conflict than a fistfight between a boss and employee; and hitting a boss would result in more conflict than being struck by a boss.

Black draws on examples of difference in status between slaves and owners to demonstrate this relationship. When blacks in the American South were considered an inferior caste, blacks could not ask free whites questions about themselves but whites had liberty to demand information from blacks (Black 2011). In this sense, free whites (social superiors) were allowed to have more intimacy with blacks (social inferiors) than blacks were allowed to have with whites. Similarly, Patterson (1982) describes how slave owners of the smaller farms in the American South often had a slightly different type of relationship with slaves than those at large plantations. Slaves had more access to the household, and with that, slightly more intimate knowledge of their owners on smaller farms. This intimacy, however, came with a price: "more personal contact meant greater exposure to sexual exploitation for slave women, including the not infrequent experience of gang rape by adolescent kinsmen of the owner" (1984, p. 206). Challenging a superior, the slave owner or his friends, resulted in severe punishment in addition to being raped.

We can deduce the following hypothesis based on Black's logic:

H3a: Vignettes depicting interactions between coworkers will reflect less movement of relational time and therefore be judged less offensive than those between superiors and subordinates.

Further, movements of intimacy from an inferior toward a superior represent a greater movement of intimacy than does the same behavior occurring between an inferior and a superior. Thus,

> *H3b:* Upward intimacy (from and inferior toward superior) will represent a greater
>
> movement of relational distance and be judged more offensive than downward intimacy
>
> (from a superior toward an inferior).

As indicated in Table 6, the data support Black's (2011) assertion that changes in relational distance between equals create less conflict than changes in relational distance between superiors and subordinates. At the aggregate level, movements of intimacy between individuals with different occupational ranks ($M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.13$) are significantly more offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 24.22$) than those occurring between individuals with the same rank ($M = 4.11$ $SD = 1.01$). This pattern is repeated when analyzing by type of movement of intimacy. The mean level of conflict for shoulder massaging among coworkers ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 1.11$) is significantly less offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 30.62$) than the same behavior occurring between workers of differing rank ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 1.13$). Likewise, sexual 'joking' with a coworker ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.14$) is significantly less offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 26.12$) than sexual joking with a superior or subordinate ($M = 4.11$ $SD = 0.97$), and touching/propositioning a coworker on an elevator ($M = 4.43$ $SD = 0.84$) is significantly less offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 8.34$) than is the same action toward a superior or subordinate ($M = 4.60$ $SD = 0.76$).

Table 6. Comparison of Coworkers vs. Mixed Rank Aggregate Conflict Means

Vignette	Coworkers Mean	Mixed-Rank Mean	Mean Difference	t
Combined Behaviors	3.52	4.11	.590	24.22***
(V2) Shoulder massage	2.74	3.64	.898	30.62***
(V4) Sexual joking	3.41	4.11	.699	26.12***
(V7) Elevator touch	4.43	4.60	.170	8.34***

***Significantly different at p < .001

Hypothesis 3b, testing Black's (2011) assertion that upward intimacy is a greater movement of relational distance than downward intimacy produces mixed results. When focusing on aggregate responses to "vertical" vignettes, upward intimacy, interactions in which an inferior is the actor and a superior is the receiver ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.87$), are ranked significantly more offensive (p <.01, $t = 2.93$) than downward intimacy, interactions in which the superior acts toward the inferior ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.91$). These findings are as predicted by the theory of moral time.

Table 7. Conflict Means Comparison by Vignette for Upward and Downward Intimacy

Vignette	Direction of Intimacy	Mean	SD	N	t
(V2) Shoulder massage	Upward	3.73***	1.17	1472	4.98
	Downward	3.58	1.22	1481	
(V4) Sexual joking	Upward	4.13	1.00	1325	.73
	Downward	4.10	1.01	1327	
(V7) Elevator touch/ proposition	Upward	4.59	.80	1401	-1.54
	Downward	4.62	.79	1402	

***p < .001

When the movements of intimacy were analyzed individually as presented in Table 7, respondents judged upward intimacy (M = 3.73, SD = 1.17) as significantly more offensive (p < .001, t = 4.98) than downward intimacy (M = 3.58, SD = 1.22) to only the shoulder massage vignette. There were no significant differences in offensiveness scores for vignettes depicting sexual joking or touching/propositioning in an elevator.

The hypothesis testing the vertical aspect of intimacy, however, yielded mixed results. Partial support was found for the second hypothesis, 3b, testing movements of upward and downward intimacy. Black (2011) asserts upward intimacy is a greater movement in relational distance than downward intimacy but respondents rated upward and downward intimacy equally offensive for two of the three 'vertical' vignettes. While a shoulder massage between an inferior and superior is judged less offensive than is sexual joking or an elevator touch/proposition, it is significantly *more* offensive for an inferior to massage a superiors shoulders than the reverse. This pattern, however, was not replicated in the other two vignettes. "Upward touching is worse than downward touching," writes Black (p. 30), and while conflict scores support Black's assertion for upward touching in the shoulder massage vignettes, data revealed no statistical difference in conflict scores between upward and downward touching in the elevator touch vignette. There was also no significant difference between upward and downward movements of intimacy with the sexual joking vignette or the elevator touch/proposition vignette.

Contrary to Black's assertion, previous sexual harassment research has found the opposite, that perceptions of severity are higher when the perpetrator's status is higher than the victim's (Pryor 1985; Stockdale et al. 1995). Stockdale et al. (1995) found sexual attention from a superior was regarded as more offensive and was, thus, more frequently defined as sexual harassment, than when a fellow coworker perpetrated the behavior. Regardless, this study at least

67

partially supports Black's claims for the direction of upward and downward intimacy since respondent's judged massaging a boss's shoulders more offensive than massaging the shoulders of an employee. It appears, however, that some forms of touching are rapid enough movements of intimacy that they are deemed offensive regardless of who is doing the touching. Other dimensions of social life pattern a relatively minor movement of intimacy, such as shoulder massaging, but if the primary dimension is powerful enough, in this case the *relational* dimension, other forms of social life (e.g. rank, culture) become irrelevant in influencing perceptions of offensiveness.

As noted above, the sexual joking vignette was rated no more offensive from an inferior to a superior than sexual jokes from a superior to an inferior. It is important to note that the other two behaviors testing upward and downward intimacy are touching behaviors, but the sexual joking behavior is verbal. It is possible that verbal overexposure is considered inappropriate regardless of who initiates the behavior. Bosses are expected to maintain confidentiality but subordinates are expected not to speak so intimately. It could be that breaching either of these expectations is equally offensive.

I analyzed an additional layer of the vertical nature of intimacy for hypothesis 3b. In addition to ranking vignettes by movements of upward and downward intimacy, I also compared upward and downward intimacy at both the aggregate and individual levels according to the *gender* of the superior and inferior (the gendered nature of intimacy is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7). One-sample t-tests reveal movements of intimacy with a male actor and a female receiver are judged more offensive than movements of intimacy with female actors and male receivers *regardless of the rank* of the people involved. As indicated in Table 8, respondents judged downward intimacy from a male boss to a female employee ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.85$) as

significantly more offensive (p < .001, *t* = 16.66) than downward intimacy from a female boss to

a male employee (*M* = 3.89, *SD* = 1.14). Similarly, upward intimacy from a male employee to a

female boss (*M* = 4.23, *SD* = 0.87) was judged significantly more offensive (p < .001, *t* = 4.98)

than upward intimacy from a female employee to a male boss (*M* = 4.03, *SD* = 1.08).

Table 8. Upward/Downward Intimacy Comparison by Gender of Superior/Inferior

Gender of Actor/Receiver	Direction of Intimacy	Mean	df	*t*
Male Boss→ Female Employee	Downward	4.26***	1519	16.6
Female Boss → Male Employee	Downward	3.89		
Male Employee → Female Boss	Upward	4.23***	1515	8.90
Female Employee → Male Boss	Upward	4.03		

***p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

Intimacy is judged more offensive for *all* vignettes when the receiver is female and the actor

is male, regardless of the rank of those involved. These findings are generally consistent with

sexual harassment literature investigating perceptions of severity based on the gender of the

harasser. The most common type of sex-based harassment involves male perpetrators and female

victims. In hypothetical scenarios, Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen (1983) found severity judgments

were higher in scenarios depicting male harassers toward women than those depicting women

harassers toward men. There is also broad consensus within the sexual harassment literature that

power and status differences between those being harassed and those doing the harassing affect

the perceived severity of the interaction (Berdahl 2007; DeSouza and Fansler 2003; Rospenda

1998; Rotundo, Nguyen, and Sackett 2001; Stainback, Ratliff, and Roscigno 2011). Smith, Pine,

and Hawley (1998) suggest men are more likely to view situations in which women initiate

contact as more likely to lead to an unplanned sexual encounter rather than the possibility of violence. In other words, women are more fearful of men's unwelcomed sexual advances than men are of women's advances. This difference in perception may be largely due to the difference in physical power between men and women and a perceived lack of violence resulting from female perpetrators (Berdahl, Magley, and Waldo 1996; Koss, Goodman, Browne, Fitzgerald, Keita, and Russo 1994).

Because only three behaviors were used in testing the vertical dimension of intimacy, I cannot speculate whether the non-significant findings might be replicated across other movements of intimacy. Including a "vertical" vignette for each of the eight behaviors, rather than only three, would have represented a stronger test of upward and downward directed movements of intimacy and might have produced different results. Comparing means by the gender of the superior and inferior follows the same pattern as between coworkers. When men act toward women, whether the man is a boss or an employee, the movement of intimacy is considered more serious than when a woman acts toward a man, regardless of their respective ranks. These results provide evidence that while rank conditions the general intimacy relationship, the gender of the actor and receiver has a far greater impact on perceived offensiveness than does rank.

CHAPTER 7: THE GENDERED NATURE OF INTIMACY

Just as movements of intimacy can be conditioned by status, they can also be conditioned by cultural factors, such as the way a culture normatively defines gender and sexual conduct. As demonstrated in Chapter 6, the gender of the actor and receiver in the "vertical" vignettes had a stronger impact on conflict scores than did the rank of the actor and receiver. In this chapter I elaborate on the impact gender has on all of the movements of intimacy presented in this study, and discuss how sexual orientation, an additional cultural factor, further conditions judgments of movements of intimacy in the workplace. Based on Black's discussions of intimacy, and on additional literature on intimacy in friendships and romantic relationships, I predict a gendered intimacy hierarchy as an additional test of the overintimacy aspect of relational time.

Gendering Intimacy

Conflict sometimes arises as a result of disagreements between genders. But conflict also occurs based on disagreements *about* gender, which Black (2011) defines as "the cultural dimension of sex: [that which] makes males masculine and females feminine" (p. 127). Black acknowledges that "feminine" and "masculine" are not biological traits but are culturally determined. In most western cultures, normatively accepted gender arrangements follow the "traditional" gender binary of male and female. Individuals deviating from traditional definitions of gender (e.g. masculine women and feminine men) and the associated behaviors are sometimes erroneously perceived by others to be homosexual. This perception may be true, but it also may be false; they may be heterosexual, bisexual, asexual, or may embrace some other type of self-defined sexuality (Black 2011, p. 129).

This is a similar argument that Judith Butler (1990) makes. Butler describes the process of "bending gender," that is, pushing the boundaries of normative behaviors and attitudes associated

with femininity as female and masculinity as male. According to Butler, the repeated presentation of the body appearing in certain styles (dresses for women and slacks for men, for example) "congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being" (p. 33). While these normative expectations of behaviors associated with gender are illusions, and ones' gendered appearance does not define their sexual orientation, these cultural expectations are extremely powerful and successfully force the reproduction of normative gender and sexual roles within a culture.

Regardless of how one defines their gender identity and sexual orientation, deviations from these heteronormative expectations, beliefs privileging heterosexuality and the masculine/feminine gender binary, may lead to indignation and even violence (Black 2011; Gutek and Morasch; Lorber 1994; West and Zimmerman 1987; for more on heteronormativity see Warner 1991). Fifteen years after the highly publicized murder of Matthew Shepard, a University of Wyoming student who was savagely beaten and left for dead because he was gay, some Americans still devoutly defend heteronormative arrangements in American culture. Paul Harris, a reporter for The Guardian, details a recent resurgence in violence against people perceived to be gay. A group of gang members "brutally beat and tortured a 30-year-old gay man and several other youths who had been associated with him […]. The gay victim was kidnapped, beaten, whipped and burned." Other recent attacks have occurred, too, including a group of men who were hit and had trash thrown at them after hugging, and the beating and robbery of a man by others who threw homophobic insults at the victim (Harris 2010). Similarly, individuals violating traditional gender boundaries, regardless of sexual preference, may suffer extreme violence. Mara Keisling, director National Center for Transgender Equality, asserts, "Trans people generally don't get stabbed once; they get stabbed 20 times, shot, burned and thrown into

a dumpster" (Tady 2007). Tady (2007) details findings from the Gender Public Advocacy Coalition (GPAC) report, which described "the deaths of 51 people under the age of 30 who may have been murdered because of their gender non-conformity," and found transgender victims often experience violence "beyond that necessary to terminate life." Keisling describes, for example, a transgender Latina teen, who in 2002 was not only beaten with a skillet while at a party, but was also strangled to death afterward (Tady 2007). Gender and sexual non-conformity challenge the status quo and, as discussed in Chapter 2, challenging the status quo causes conflict.

While Black does not specifically use the terms employed by Butler and other gender and sexuality scholars, he alludes to the possibility that "bending gender" is sometimes more conflictual than bending sexual orientation. He describes situations historically and cross-culturally in which certain combinations of genders and sexual preferences may or may not be acceptable. Homosexuality in ancient Greece, for example, was sometimes acceptable for men but not for women, yet men possessing feminine characteristics or enacting feminine behaviors were rejected. Based on a wealth of cross-cultural and historic evidence, Black (2011) asserts, "Masculine homosexual men and feminine homosexual women are less offensive" (p. 129), meaning non-heterosexuals who *appear* to adhere to traditional gender norms are less deviantized than those who both reject heterosexuality and appearances of femininity for women and masculinity for men. Individuals who challenge tradition by abandoning their gender, such as cross-dressers, especially if they are also perceived to have abandoned heterosexuality, generate the most disapproval in western cultures (p. 129).

Black builds the argument that heteronormativity in American culture limits the amount and types of acceptable physical intimacy allowed between men. Male homosexuality, then, attracts

more hostility than female homosexuality because the possibility for penetration, a much greater movement of intimacy between men, is assumed to occur between gay male couples but not lesbian couples. Further, Black explains homosexual women are less likely than gay men to have sexual interactions with strangers, which is a greater movement of relational time than with acquaintances or intimates.

Based on Black's discussion of sexual orientation in heteronormative cultures, I predict that vignettes depicting same-gender interaction between men will be judged more offensive than those depicting same-gender interaction between women. This difference is especially likely in vignettes depicting overtly sexualized interaction. But what if the behavior is more ambiguous, rather than overtly sexual? What if the behavior is assumed to be platonic in nature? What if the behavior occurs between mixed-gender pairs and the respondent assumes a heteronormative interaction? Because Black defines intimacy more broadly than is usual in American culture, little literature exists examining intimacy explaining various types of interaction between same-gender and cross-gender pairs. While not primarily designed to do so, studies focusing on intimacy in friendships and romantic relationships can help illuminate arrangements of intimacy. Exploring patterns presented in these studies allows for a richer understanding of the gendered nature of intimacy.

Literature focusing on intimacy in friendships and romantic relationships generally reports that women are more open and share more of themselves with others than do men (Bell 1981; Block 1980; Hook, Gerstein, Detterich, and Gridley 2003; McGill 1985; Rubin 1985). And when men do share with each other, it is often on a superficial level. Friendships among women tend to be defined by closeness and intimacy through emotional attachment, sharing feelings, and support, whereas men's friendships tend to revolve around activities rather than emotions (Bell

1981; Hook, Gerstein, Detterich, and Gridley 2003; McGill 1985; Reeder 2003; Rubin 1985).

Thus, as Black (2011) argues, and as existing literature suggests, women are more intimate with other women than men are with other men. Thus, all else being equal, the same movement of intimacy between two women will cause less conflict than the same movement of intimacy between two men.

While women tend to have more female friends than male friends and men tend to have more male friends than female friends, men are more likely to report feeling emotionally closer with female friends than with male friends (Buhrke and Fuqua 1987; Reeder 2003). In fact, some research suggests women are, in general, better at providing intimacy in friendships than are men (Wheeler, Reis, and Nezlek 1983). Rubin (1985 p. 158) found that men frequently reported sharing "nurturance and intimacy" with female friends that generally was not found in their friendships with men. Interestingly, the same women identified by these men as being their close friends often reported they were acquaintances with the men, rather than close friends, and indicated their most intimate friendships were with other women. Rubin (1985) suggests there is less reciprocity in heterosexual cross-gender friendships because men tend to talk and women tend to listen. Cross-gender friendships between women, regardless of sexual orientation, and gay men tend to have relationships similar to women's friendships in that they tend to be more nurturing and intimate (Rubin 1985). Same-sex friendships for women then, may represent a more reciprocal or equal sharing of intimacy, generally speaking, than do cross-sex friendships. By comparison, at least based on a limited number of studies, it appears that in mixed-gender friendships, one friend often shares more intimate details than the other shares. Typically when this occurs, it is usually the male sharing more of his life than the female shares of hers (see Rubin 1985). For example, Sara may like having drinks with Bill and may not mind lending a

friendly ear, but Bill may feel as if he is confiding deeply intimate details of his life with Sara, and may feel closer to her as a result, than she does with him. In this sense, mixed-gender friendships may represent a more asymmetric intimacy, generally speaking.

Gendered Intimacy Hierarchy

Judging the offensiveness of movements of intimacy is complicated according to the gender or perceived sexual orientation of the people with whom one shares intimacy. Due to the asymmetrical nature of intimacy (Black 2011), depending on the situational context, the same movements of intimacy may be judged more offensive when it occurs between two people of the same gender, but judged less offensive in a slightly different context or when between a man and a woman. For example, in societies that hold such a taboo, homosexuality involves overintimacy within a gender (Black 2011). Black (2011) asserts male homosexuality is considered more overintimate than female homosexuality largely because women more frequently share their lives, feelings, and exchange touch with each other more than men do with other men in American culture. Because heterosexuality is considered the normative sexual arrangement in most, if not all, cultures, norms restricting sex to heterosexual relations limits the range of sexually acceptable behaviors that can occur between two women or two men. Similarly, exposure between individuals of the same-sex is strictly policed too. While it is acceptable for men to be naked with other men in a sports locker room, cultural norms of heterosexism restrict the amount of exposure men are allowed to have with each other. Lingering glances or too much disclosure in a public restroom, for example, results in overexposure and may lead to conflict.

If, as Black (2011) argues and existing literature suggests, women are more intimate with other women than men are with other men, all else being equal, I hypothesize:

76

H4a: Vignettes depicting interactions with only male actors will represent a greater movement of relational distance than will those with only female actors.

H4b: Intra-gender intimacy between men will represent a greater movement of relational distance and be judged more offensive than intra-gender intimacy between women, regardless of the behavior.

H4c: Interactions between two women will represent the smallest movement of relational distance, followed by vignettes depicting a female actor and male receiver; interactions between male actors and female receivers will represent the greatest movement of intimacy. Thus, the predicted order from least relational distance and, thus least offensive, to most relational distance and most offensive will be as follows: F/F, F/M, M/M, M/F).

Data provide moderate support for hypotheses testing relational distance based on gender-pairings as indicated in Table 9. One-sample t tests confirm behaviors with male actors ($M =$ 3.72, $SD = .87$) are judged more offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 18.75$) than behaviors with female actors ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.72$), as predicted in hypothesis 4a. Comparisons between aggregate means for same-sex interactions as indicated in hypothesis 4b also yield support. The aggregate conflict mean for all Male/Male interactions ($M = 3.70$ $SD = 0.83$.) is significantly higher ($p <$ .001, $t = 13.50$) than the conflict mean for aggregate Female/Female interactions ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 0.93$).

Table 9. Aggregate Conflict scores by Gender-Pairing

Gender-Pairing	Mean	SD	N	t
Female/Male	3.39	.97	1735	
Female/Female	3.43	.93	1737	1.77
Male/Male	3.70***	.83	1758	13.50
Male/ Female	3.76**	.84	1755	2.73
Gender of Actor				
Male Actors	3.72***	.87		
Female Actors	3.39	.72		18.75

***Significantly higher than previous category at p < .001
**Significantly higher than previous category at p < .01

Hypothesis 4c, the ordering of intimacy between genders, produced less conclusive results. While Male/Female and Male/Male interactions fall in the expected order with significantly different conflict means ($M = 3.76$ and 3.70, respectively; t = 2.73; p < .01), data show no statistically different levels of conflict between Female/Male ($M = 3.39$) and Female/Female ($M = 3.23$) interactions ($t = 1.779$; p < .75). Although these differences are not statistically significant, they are in the predicted directions. Overall, therefore, the derived hypotheses are supported when aggregated scores are used. However, results are less predictable when considering context and nuance across the various vignettes.

Movements of intimacy between mixed-gender and same-gender pairs become more complicated when analyzing conflict scores across the different types of behaviors. As indicated in Table 10, respondents rate Male/Female interactions significantly more offensive than Female/Male interactions for all eight behaviors.

Table 10. Conflict Scores for Mixed-gender Interactions by Type of Behavior

Behavior	Mixed-gender Comparisons				
	M/F	F/M	t	Mean Diff	df
1 – Bicep squeeze	2.91***	2.54	9.67	.378	792
2 – Shoulder rub	3.18***	2.43	20.34	.758	857
3 - Lingering gaze on body	3.42***	3.26	4.11	.161	794
4 – Which one would you bang?	3.62***	3.45	4.36	.172	782
5 – Email proposition for sex	4.05***	3.59	11.88	.464	780
6 – Faux hump at water cooler	4.29***	3.78	15.86	.513	815
7 – Sexual touch on elevator	4.53***	4.17	13.79	.368	831
8 – Disclose details of sex	4.44***	4.34	3.94	.109	792

***p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

Conflict scores comparing same-gender pairs (M/M vs. F/F) are depicted in Table 11. Respondents find Male/Male interactions significantly more offensive than Female/Female interactions for all of the vignettes with the exception of the two sexual joking scenarios. There is no significant difference in conflict scores between Male/Male interaction and Female/Female interaction for the "which one would you bang" vignette. Interestingly, respondents rate Female/Female interactions for the "faux humping at the water cooler" vignette significantly more offensive than the same behavior between two men ($p < .001$, $t = -4.67$; $M = 3.95$, $M = 3.76$ respectively).

Next, as presented in Table 12, I compared vignettes based on the gender of the receiver. In general, vignettes depicting movements of intimacy toward female receivers are judged significantly more offensive when the actor is male. With the exception of the last vignette, disclosing details of sex, which indicates no significant difference in conflict scores for male or female actors with female receivers, respondents rated all Male/Female interactions significantly more offensive than the same interaction with both a female actor and female receiver.

Table 11. Conflict Scores for Same-Sex Interactions by Type of Behavior

Behavior	M/M	F/F	t	Mean Diff	df
1 – Bicep squeeze	2.59***	2.45	3.36	.141	702
2 – Shoulder rub	3.03***	2.53	12.92	.507	832
3 - Lingering gaze on body	3.64***	2.52	29.18	1.129	801
4 – Which one would you bang?	3.34	3.31	.89	.039	753
5 – Email proposition for sex	4.03***	3.86	4.46	.175	776
6 – Faux hump at water cooler	3.76	3.95***	-4.67	-.189	800
7 – Sexual touch on elevator	4.67***	4.37	12.35	.308	867
8 – Disclose details of sex	4.57***	4.46	4.57	.110	786

***$p < .001$ (two-tailed tests)

Comparisons of vignettes with male receivers are depicted in Table 12 as well. Similar to ratings between same-gender pairs, respondents find the overtly sexualized interactions from a male actor toward a male receiver more offensive than the same behavior occurring from a female actor toward a male receiver. Shoulder rubbing is more offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 15.72$) when occurring between two men ($M = 3.03$) than when from a woman toward a man ($M = 2.43$), a lingering gaze between two men ($M = 3.63$), is more offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 10.06$) than if occurring from a woman toward a man ($M = 3.26$), sexual touch on an elevator is rated more offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 20.36$) between two men ($M = 4.67$), than when a woman touches a man on an elevator ($M = 4.17$), and disclosing details of sex between two male coworkers ($M = 4.57$), is more offensive ($p < .001$, $t = 9.12$) than when a woman discloses having sex with a male coworker ($M = 4.35$). There was no significant difference in conflict scores between two men and from a woman toward a man for the bicep squeeze vignette, and the faux humping vignette. The only interaction between two men ($M = 3.34$) that was rated as less offensive than when occurring from a woman toward a man ($M = 3.45$) was the "which one would you bang?" sexual

joking vignette ($p < .05$, $t = -2.30$).

Table 12. Conflict Scores by Gender of Receiver

	Female Receiver Comparisons				
	M/F	**F/F**	**t**	**Mean Diff**	**df**
1 – Bicep squeeze	2.91***	2.45	11.97	.468	792
2 – Shoulder rub	3.18***	2.53	17.66	.658	857
3 - Lingering gaze on body	3.42***	2.52	23.01	.901	794
4 – Which one would you bang?	3.62***	3.31	7.91	.312	782
5 – Email proposition for sex	4.05***	3.86	4.97	.194	780
6 – Faux hump at water cooler	4.29***	3.95	10.61	.343	815
7 – Sexual touch on elevator	4.53***	4.37	6.31	.168	831
8 – Disclose details of sex	4.44	4.46	-.36	-.010	792
	Male Receiver Comparisons				
	F/M	**M/M**	**t**	**Mean Diff**	**df**
1 – Bicep squeeze	2.54	2.59	1.22	.051	702
2 – Shoulder rub	2.43	3.03***	15.72	.617	832
3 - Lingering gaze on body	3.26	3.64***	10.06	.389	801
4 – Which one would you bang?	3.45*	3.34	-2.30	-.100	753
5 – Email proposition for sex	3.59	4.03***	11.32	.445	776
6 – Faux hump at water cooler	3.78	3.76	-.48	-.019	800
7 – Sexual touch on elevator	4.17	4.67***	20.36	.508	867
8 – Disclose details of sex	4.35	4.57***	9.12	.220	786

*p<.05 ***p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

I also compared conflict scores according to the gender of the actor. As indicated in Table

13, comparisons vary between gender-pairs for many of the vignettes, although a few patterns

emerge. When comparing vignettes with male actors, respondents rated vignettes depicting a

lingering gaze as significantly more offensive when toward a male receiver ($M = 3.64$; $p < .001$,

$t = -5.58$) than when toward a female receiver ($M = 3.42$). Respondents also rated sexual touch

on an elevator as significantly more offensive ($p < .001$, $t = -4.91$) when occurring between two

men (M = 4.67) than when a man acts in this way toward a woman (M = 4.53). Similarly,

respondents judged disclosing details of sex between two men (M = 4.57), as significantly more

offensive (p < .001, t = -4.31) than the same behavior occurring from a man toward a woman (M

= 4.44). Respondents rate more ambiguous behaviors, such as a bicep squeeze, shoulder rubbing,

as well as both sexual joking interactions from a man toward a woman as significantly more

offensive than when the receiver of the action is another man.

Table 13. Conflict Scores by Gender of Actors

Behavior	Male Actor Comparison				
	M/F	M/M	t	Mean Diff	df
1 – Bicep squeeze	2.91***	2.59	8.39	.328	792
2 – Shoulder rub	3.18***	3.03	4.23	.158	857
3 - Lingering gaze on body	3.42	3.64***	-5.58	-.218	794
4 – Which one would you bang?	3.62***	3.34	7.15	.282	782
5 – Email proposition for sex	4.05	4.03	.631	.024	780
6 – Faux hump at water cooler	4.29***	3.76	16.48	.533	815
7 – Sexual touch on elevator	4.53	4.67***	-4.91	-.131	831
8 – Disclose details of sex	4.44	4.57***	-4.31	-.120	792
	Female Actor Comparison				
	F/M	F/F	t	Mean Diff	df
1 – Bicep squeeze	2.54*	2.45	2.50	.097	738
2 – Shoulder rub	2.43	2.53*	-2.16	-.099	824
3 - Lingering gaze on body	3.26***	2.52	17.85	.749	768
4 – Which one would you bang?	3.45**	3.31	3.44	.143	772
5 – Email proposition for sex	3.59	3.86***	-5.86	-.263	747
6 – Faux hump at water cooler	3.78	3.95***	-4.16	-.167	803
7 – Sexual touch on elevator	4.17	4.37***	-5.02	-.195	818
8 – Disclose details of sex	4.34	4.46***	-3.90	-.116	839

*p<.05 ***p<.001 (two-tailed tests)

The final section depicted in Table 13 compares conflict scores to vignettes with female actors by the gender of the receiver. These analyses produced mixed results. Respondents rated a bicep squeeze between two women ($M = 2.45$) as less offensive ($p < .05$, $t = 2.50$) than if the behavior occurred from a woman toward a man ($M = 2.54$); rated a lingering gaze between two women as less offensive than between a woman and man ($p < .001$, $t = 17.85$; $M = 2.52$ and $M = 3.26$, respectively), and, similarly, rated asking, "which one would you bang?" as less offensive ($p < .01$, $t = 3.44$) between two women ($M = 3.31$) than when occurring from a woman toward a man ($M = 3.45$). The four vignettes depicting greatest movements of intimacy were all judges as significantly more offensive when occurring between two women than when occurring between a female actor and a male receiver.

Consequently, at the aggregate level, results for the gendered nature of intimacy support relational time. Results support Black's (2011:26) assertion that movements of intimacy between two men represent greater movement of relational distance than the same movements of intimacy between two women. Thus, all else being equal, the same movement of intimacy between two women causes less conflict than the same movement of intimacy between two men. When combining all male-male scores and comparing them to all female-female conflict scores, movements of intimacy between two men were judged more offensive and, therefore, likely to be more offensive than movements of intimacy between two women. Previous sexual harassment studies comparing same-sex interactions provide similar results. When studying same-sex harassment on college campuses, (D'Augelli 1989) found gay male respondents disproportionately reported instances of harassment *based on sexual orientation,* than did lesbian women. Herek (2002) suggests heterosexual males' hostility toward homosexual men stems from cultural norms requiring heterosexual men to continually prove their own heterosexuality; one

way to accomplish this is through negative attitudes and even violence toward gay men. In addition, support was also found for the theory if we assume the assertion is valid, as discussed in Chapter 7, that women are more open and, thus, more relationally close to others than are men.

While aggregate results were somewhat predicted, results from analyses of the individual vignettes indicate that behavior matters, but the movement of intimacy is conditioned by the context of the behavior and by the gender of the people involved. In general, behaviors in which men initiate interactions are rated more offensive than the mean, and behaviors in which women initiate interactions are rated as less offensive than the mean.

While men acting towards women is almost always more offensive than the mean regardless of the behavior, the behavior matters when men act toward other men or when women engage in behavior that challenges traditional gender norms. Behaviors that could be interpreted as male bonding or locker room behavior are rated as less offensive than the mean for men and more offensive than the mean for women. Behaviors that are overtly sexual, when between two men, are rated as much more offensive (e.g. lingering gaze, sexual touching, divulging details of sexual encounter) then the same actions between two women.

Context matters for same-gender interaction when behaviors are overtly sexualized, but it also matters when behaviors are of a joking nature. The two sexual joking vignettes were judged among the least offensive when occurring between two men, but much more offensive when occurring between two women or between a man and woman. These findings demonstrate strong themes of homosociality in respondent's judgments. Britton (1990) asserts homosociality does not necessarily imply any type of sexual or erotic attraction, but refers to a social preference for one's own gender. Keisling (2005) describes how homosocial talk among men is a strategy to

balance male bonding—a desire for intimacy among male friends—with cultural expectations of hegemonic masculinity. Similarly, joking with other men about heterosexual conquest is an example of what Dellinger and Williams (2002) describe as a male bonding "locker-room" effect, which describes how men's friendships with other men often in American culture lack true intimacy, mostly because men are held to unreasonable standards of heterosexist masculinity. Joking about heterosexual sexual conquest then becomes a substitute for emotional intimacy in male friendships.

Interactions in which women are the actors are generally rated as less offensive than the mean for each behavior, *except when women are violating proscribed gender roles.* According to these results, it is more offensive for a woman to engage in sexual joking, "faux humping" another woman at the water cooler, than it is for two men to engage in the same behavior. Women engaging in this type of behavior violate *both* notions of intimacy, as well as normative gender roles. Women who "hump," even in a joking manner, are seen as pretending to be men or acting male-like, which violates sexual norms associated with a heterosexist culture. Challenging traditional sexual norms is a form of innovation. In this sense, women humping represent not only a movement of relational time, but also a movement of cultural time.

Other types of sexual gestures between men might be judged as extremely offensive because the behavior violates proscribed heteronormative behaviors. Because the *context* of the faux humping between two men is of a joking nature, the threat of homosexual sex is removed and the interaction becomes homosocial. Normative gender roles, however, limit the amount of homosocial behavior allowed between women. These findings support Black's assertion that challenging traditional gender roles may be more offensive than challenging normative

sexuality—at least in the sexual joking vignettes initiated by women. Women who engage in 'male bonding' types of homosocial behavior are judged harshly.

Interactions in which men initiate movements of intimacy, regardless of the gender of the receiver, are judged more offensive than interactions in which women initiate movements of intimacy. Thus, men are judged more harshly than are women for engaging in the same behavior. Similar patterns are found with criminal sentencing. Female offenders receive more lenient sentences than men who commit the same crimes (Albonetti 1997; Barak, Leighton, and Flavin 2007; Farnworth and Teske 1995; KoonsWitt 2002; Rodriguez, Curry, and Lee 2006; Steffensmeier, Kramer, and Streifel 1993). Rodriguez et al. (2006) investigated this tendency by type of crime committed, finding that the effect of gender on sentencing varies by crime type. Females convicted of property or drug offenses are less likely than men to be sentenced to prison and also receive shorter sentences than men if they are sentenced to prison. In contrast, women convicted of violent crimes are no less likely than men to receive prison time, but for those who do receive prison, their sentences tend to be significantly shorter than men's sentences. Heteronormative expectations of masculine men and feminine women may impact perceptions of who is most dangerous, perpetuating differences in judgments of offensiveness as well as formal sentences for deviant and criminal behaviors.

Partial support was also found for the ranking of conflict to movements of intimacy between gender-pairings. Vignettes in which men violated women's intimacy were judged most offensive followed by vignettes in which men violated other men's intimacy, as predicted. Again, these patterns are similar to those found in criminal sentencing. Male perpetrators of crimes against female victims are significantly more likely to receive harsher punishments than are perpetrators of crimes against male victims (Baumer, Messner, and Felson 2000; Beaulieu

86

and Messner 1999; Curry 2010; Glaeser and Sacerdote 2000; Myers 1980).

Levels of offensiveness to movements of intimacy from a woman toward a man and from a woman toward another woman were reversed from what was predicted. Based on aggregate comparisons, movements of intimacy from a woman toward a man were judged less offensive, than between two women. The disparity in this finding makes me question whether the ordering of intimacy hierarchy between genders was faulty or whether cultural constraints regarding sexual norms in American culture should be reconsidered. Are women less open with each other than they are with men or does heteronormativity dictate a *sexualized* movement of intimacy from one woman toward another violates normative heterosexuality and is thus judged more offensive than a movement of intimacy from a woman toward a man? Or, as suggested by Tucker (2013 personal correspondence), perhaps intimacy has multiple dimensions. Women may be more "open" with each other, which is one dimension of intimacy, but less "sexual" with each other, which is another dimension of intimacy.

Overall, the results support the relational dimension of Black's (2011) theory, although a couple problem areas emerge that may require further exploration. While aggregate results show strong support for Black's conception of overintimacy, the theory may be less accurate of more nuanced interaction, specifically with regards to combinations of individuals based on gender and sexual orientation. However, the lack of strong support for the theory with these more detailed interactions may be due to misspecification of the "intimacy hierarchy" based on gender relations as much as it is a failure of the theory. Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine which case is more accurate with the current data. Further research is needed, including research concerning the relative levels of intimacy in various gender-pairings.

CHAPTER 8. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study provides empirical test of the overintimacy aspect of Black's (2011) theory of

moral time. Using value judgments of levels of offensiveness, conceptualized as "conflict

scores," toward sexualized interactions between coworkers, allowed for a test of the relationship

between movements of relational time and conflict. Potential conflicts resulting from movements

in relational time were measured in 4 ways: 1) by the type of intimate behavior, 2) by the

previous level of intimacy, 3) between people of differing levels of occupational rank (boss and

employee), and 4) by the ranking of intimacy between gender-pairings. Overall, the results

support the relational dimension of Black's (2011) theory, especially at the aggregate level.

Type of Intimate Behavior. The results show strong support Black's proposition that "conflict is a

direct function of overintimacy" (2011, p. 22). Utilizing vignettes created for this study, I was

able to test judgments of offensiveness of several types of physical movements of intimacy.

These ranged from ambiguous touching, such as bicep squeezing and shoulder massaging which

were judged as the least offensive movements of intimacy, to more overtly sexualized touch,

which was judged as one of the two most offensive types of intimacy. I also tested offensiveness

of non-physical forms of intimacy, including lingering gazes, and emailed sexual propositions,

which were both judged as moderately offensive movements of intimacy. This study also

included tests of movements of intimacy in the form of "sexual joking." The sexual joking

vignettes, "which one would you bang" and the "faux hump at the water cooler," were both

judged as moderately offensive movements of intimacy.

Each of the above movements of intimacy is what Black (2011) refers to as overintimacy in

the form of *overinvolvement*, being too involved in the life of someone else. Overinvolvement

types of behaviors, such as touching, asking potentially inappropriate questions, or engaging in

jokes of a sexual nature, are sometimes considered inappropriate conduct or even sexually

harassing behavior. The final vignette, disclosing information about sex with a coworker, was

judged as one of the two most offensive movements of intimacy. This vignette is the only

behavior depicting the *overexposure* form of overintimacy, exposing too much information about

oneself or others. Because this behavior is less overt, not specifically happening toward the

receiver in the moment, this type of overintimacy may be initially viewed as less offensive

compared to overtly sexualized physical touch. Results, however, indicate that non-physical

forms of overintimacy may be just as conflict producing as unwanted physical touch. This study

is particularly important in this regard. As Black (2011) explains throughout *Moral Time,*

conflicts resulting from movements of intimacy are not confined to physical actions. As

supported by this test of overintimacy, overinvolvement, including, physical touch, sexual

joking, and inappropriate emails, are conflict-producing movements of intimacy. But so is

revealing too much information about someone else. This finding helps inform workplace

management and policy of the impact different forms of overintimacy in the workplace might

have on judgments of acceptable or unacceptable workplace interaction. Expanding definitions

of harassment to include instances of overexposure may reduce potential ambiguity about the

types of behaviors that potentially produce conflict among coworkers.

Previous Level of Intimacy. Just as the type of movement intimacy affects judgments of

offensiveness, so does the relational distance, or previous level of intimacy. Each of the

behaviors tested in this study were judged more offensive when occurring between coworkers

who are acquaintances, those who do not socialize outside of the workplace, then when occurring

between intimates, coworkers who frequently socialize at work and outside of the workplace.

And interactions occurring between new coworkers, those without any previous social

interaction with coworkers, are judged the most offensive.

Vertical Feature of Intimacy. Rank, or occupational status, also conditions judgments of movements of intimacy. Movements of intimacy between coworkers were always judged less offensive than the same movement of intimacy between people of different ranks. One reason for this might be due to the potential for the lower ranked individual to be exploited. If so, then downward intimacy, from a boss to employee, might be judged most offensive. The results of the comparison of downward versus upward intimacy, however, indicate the opposite: Upward intimacy, on the aggregate, is judged more offensive than downward intimacy. This finding, while supporting Black's assertion that upward intimacy is a greater movement of intimacy than downward intimacy, is conditioned by context. The pattern holds true in the shoulder massage vignette, a minor movement of intimacy, but there was no statistical difference in judgments of offensiveness between upward and downward intimacy for the more obvious movements of intimacy.

This finding suggests some interactions are rapid enough movements of intimacy that the behavior itself trumps rank or other measures of vertical distance. In other words, the movement of intimacy is judged offensive regardless of who initiates the behavior. However, when an additional factor is added, the gender of the boss and employee, a different pattern emerges within upward and downward intimacy. Downward and upward movements of intimacy are judged equally offensive when the receiver of the action is female and the actor male *regardless of their rank.* Movements of intimacy from a male boss toward female employee, or from a male employee toward a female boss are both considered more offensive than the same action form a woman toward a man, regardless of rank. In this sense, gender as a conditioning factor is more important than the rank of the individuals involved for each movement of intimacy.

The Gendered Nature of Intimacy. While the ranking of offensiveness of movements of intimacy between gender-pairings was as expected, in general, a few unexpected patterns emerged. First, some of the more overtly sexualized movements of intimacy were judged more offensive when from a man toward another man than when from a man toward a woman, but more ambiguous movements of intimacy were judged more offensive from a man toward a woman than between two men. Perceptions of intent may have affected these judgments. Due to the structure of the survey, it is unknown whether respondents viewed the minor movements of intimacy as occurring between two men as *friends* and, therefore, judged the interactions less offensive, but judged the same movements from a man toward a woman as potentially harassing behavior. The two sexual joking vignettes were judged as less offensive between two men than between the other gender arrangements. This suggests my suspicion about intent may be correct; respondents find ambiguous behaviors between two men as occurring between friends and therefore, less offensive, but find greater movements of intimacy as potentially harassing and, in the case of same-gender interactions, judge these more offensive based on heteronormative assumptions.

The gender hierarchy of movements of intimacy was as expected although there was no statistical difference in aggregate levels of offensiveness for interactions with a female actor and female receiver compared to those with a female actor and male receiver. My ranking of female-female interactions based on women's intimacy and openness with each other may have not have adequately accounted for the impact of heteronormative beliefs applied to interaction between women.

The finding that was most surprising was the higher levels of offensiveness for women engaging in the sexual joking behaviors. Sexual jokes were judged moderately offensive, but the level of offensiveness was conditioned by the gender of the person initiating the interaction.

Sexual jokes in which women initiate the interaction were judged much higher than the mean, while sexual jokes initiated by and between men were judged below the mean. Based on these findings, and the particular movements of intimacy examined in this study, Black may be correct in asserting the violation of proscribed gender roles may be more conflictual than the violation of heterosexuality in American culture.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are several limitations to this study in addition to those discussed above. Concern over the length of the survey constrained a more thorough test of some dimensions of intimacy, specifically upward and downward directed intimacy. To reduce the amount of time required to complete the survey, upward and downward movements of intimacy were tested using only 3 of the 8 vignettes. Additionally, only male-to-female and female-to-male interactions were included to test the vertical dimension of intimacy. Collecting conflict scores for mixed-rank interactions between two women or two men would provide a more thorough test of the effects of gender on movements of intimacy.

While Black's conceptual definition of "movements of intimacy" is clear, empirically measuring the concept was a difficult task. In order to do so, I first had to determine the existing location of individuals in social space. Testing the specific types of movements of intimacy through the individual sample, without involving social characteristics, allowed me to establish a hierarchy of movements of intimacy, from lesser movements to greater movements. Establishing the previous level of intimacy included very briefly describing the existing relationship between coworkers with one sentence each, as intimates, acquaintances, or strangers. Certainly a more detailed explanation of prior interaction between coworkers would have ensured respondents had more consistent understandings of the nature of those relationships. The length of the survey,

however, limited the descriptions.

I was initially concerned with my inability to fully understand respondent's judgments of the sexual orientation of the people depicted in the vignettes. Because a witness does not always know the sexual orientation of the people engaged in an interaction, I refrained from specifically mentioning sexual orientation. I relied on the respondent's judgments of offensiveness as indicators of the perceived sexual orientation of the people depicted. Respondent's who rated M->M sexualized interactions as significantly more offensive than the same M->F interactions probably hold stronger heterosexist beliefs than those rating the interaction the same regardless of the gender of the people involved. Rather than a drawback, I now view this as a strength of the study. Respondent's inability to confirm the sexual orientation of the people depicted in vignettes provides a far more realistic reaction to the scenarios. In most real world cases, respondents are judging other people's behaviors based on assumptions about gender and sexual orientation. Future studies might test for differences based on perception, asking some respondents to explain whether they interpreted same-gender interactions as occurring between two heterosexuals, two homosexuals, or between heterosexual and homosexual individuals.

Researchers interested in testing overintimacy might include items asking about previous experience with sexualized interactions in the workplace. Previous experience with sexual harassment or with exposure to conflict-producing sexualized interactions in the workplace may affect conflict scores. Gutek et al. (2004) assert the ability to "put oneself in the target's shoes" can affect how believable the scenarios are to the respondent. Those who have experienced a similar situation may identify more positively or negatively with either the actor or receiver. Conversely, some factors may prevent respondents from identifying with the individuals depicted in the vignettes. Individuals who experience frequent instances of sexualized interaction

in the workplace may be affected by habituation to constant exposure, which may depress the numbers and types of behaviors labeled as sexually harassing (Konrad and Gutek 1986).

The type of industry in which respondents have work experience might also affect conflict scores. The same behavior occurring in a more sexualized work environment may be judged more offensive in a less-sexualized work setting (O'Connor, Gutek, Stockdale, Geer, & Melancon 2004; Stockdale et al. 2004). Guiffre and Williams (1994), for example, found employees in restaurant work often did not label sexualized interaction in the workplace as sexually harassing. Similarly, sexualized interactions among hairstylists are sometimes viewed as a positive benefit of the job (Barlow 2012). Comparing the level of bureaucracy within or between work industries may reveal nuances about movements of intimacy at work missed in aggregate tests of this theory. Black, however, would argue that these contextual factors, such as type of industry or habituation, are less important in determining whether behaviors cause conflict. Regardless of how the movements of intimacy are labeled, the greater and faster the movement of intimacy the more conflict the movement produces, according to Black (2011). The repetition of an act should not affect its power to produce conflict.

Concluding Thoughts

Black asserts the theory of moral time explains conflict regardless of culture, context, or historical location. Based on this test of the relational dimension of moral time, Black's theory holds promise for explaining broad movements of conflict, but neglects to consider some of the contextual factors that influence perceptions of interaction that may *or may not* lead to conflict. Black would argue the drawback of most theories explaining deviance, and thus conflict, is that they fail to specify the causal mechanism of conflict. Black asserts his theory of moral time

specifies the moment when interaction becomes conflict, regardless of social-psychological and contextual factors.

However, as indicated in the results of this test of relational time, contextual factors matter when evaluating how conflictual individuals define interactions. Although Black briefly discusses the possibility that movements of social time will not lead to conflict, his general approach throughout *Moral Time* is that movements of social time *will* lead to conflict. Black's theory, then, overgeneralizes the cause of conflict and fails to explore covering conditions under which conflict is likely to occur.

One approach to addressing the under specificity of theories of deviance, along with addressing the overgeneralization of Black's theory, would be integrate Black's theory with a theory of deviance that considers the impact of contextual factors on conflict. Agnew's General Strain Theory (GST), for example, explains the cause of deviance as occurring due to the addition and subtraction of stimuli. Black asserts that social change—especially a rapid change in circumstance—leads to conflict. Like Black's theory, General Strain Theory (GST) explains temporal change that influences behavior.

Integrating moral time with GST would expand the explanatory power of Black's theory by considering how contextual factors affect the severity of movements of intimacy. An individual's ability to cope with strain, for example, influences the likelihood, and how quickly, one might resort to deviance to alleviate strain. It stands to reason that the same movement of social time between individuals with weaker coping mechanisms will be more likely to result in conflict than when occurring between two individuals with stronger coping mechanisms. Similarly, attitude and personality will affect the likelihood and rapidity in which movements of social time become conflictual. Integrating Black's (2011) theory of social time with Agnew's GST is just one

example of the way in which theories of deviance can better predict not only why, but also when and under what conditions, conflict is likely to occur.

Overall, this study offers an initial attempt to verify Black's (2011) theory of moral time. At least with respect to relational time, the study offers strong support. The other dimensions of Black's (2011) theory still need to be tested. The use of vignettes such as those reported here may serve as a means of collecting data for that purpose. Given the generality of Black's (2011) theory and the strong support provided by this initial test, researchers are encouraged to continue examining this novel theory and the general scientific approach of pure sociology.

REFERENCES

Agnew, Robert. 2001. "Building on the foundation of general strain theory: Specifying the types of strain most likely to lead to crime and delinquency." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(4): 319-352.

Akers, Ronald L. 1994. "A Social Learning Theory of Crime." Cullen, Francis T. and Robert Agnew. (1999). *Criminological Theory: Past to Present* Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Akers, Ronald L. and Christine .S. Sellers. 2004. *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application.* 4th ed. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing.

Albonetti, Celesta A. 1991. "An Integration of Theories to Explain Judicial Discretion." *Social Problems* 38:247-266.

—. 1997. "Sentencing under the Federal Sentencing Guidelines: Effects of Defendant Characteristics, Guilty Pleas, and Departures on Sentence Outcomes for Drug Offenses, 1991-1992." *Law & Society Review* 31:789-822.

Anderson, Elijah. 1999. *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1999

Ardalan, Ali, Roya Ardalan, Samuel Coppage, and William Crouch. 2007. A comparison of student feedback obtained through paper-based and web-based surveys of faculty teaching. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 38 (6): 1085-.

Arriaga, X. B. and V.A. Foshee. 2004. "Adolescent dating violence: Do adolescents follow in their friends', or their parents', footsteps?" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19(2): 162−184.

Avakame, Edem F., James J. Fyfe, and Candace McCoy. 1999. "Did you call the police? what did they do?" an empirical assessment of black's theory of mobilization of law. *Justice Quarterly* 16 (4): 765-92.

Barak, Gregg, Paul Leighton, and Jeanne Flavin. 2007. *Class, race, gender, and crime: the social realities of justice in America*. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bartol, Curt. 2002. *Criminal Behaviour: A Psychological Approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Baumeister, R.F. and J. M. Twenge. 2002. The cultural suppression of female sexuality. *Review of General Psychology 6*(2): 166-203.

Baumer, Eric, Julie Horney, Richard Felson, and Janet L. Lauritsen. 2003. "Neighborhood Disadvantage and the Nature of Violence." *Criminology* 41:39-72.

Baumer, E. P., S. F. Messner, And R. B. Felson. 2000. "The Role Of Victim Characteristics In The Disposition Of Murder Cases." *Justice Quarterly* 17:281-307.

Baumgartner, Mary P. 1984. "Social Control From Below." in D. Black (ed.) *Toward a General Theory of Social Control, Volume 1: Fundamentals*, Orlando: Academic Press.

(------). 1988. *The Moral Order of a Suburb*, New York: Oxford University Press.

(------). 1998. "Moral Life on the Cultural Frontier: Evidence from the Experience of Immigrants in Modern America" *Sociological Focus* 31(2): 155–79.

Beaulieu, M and S. F. Messner. 1999. "Race, Gender, and Outcomes in First Degree Murder Cases." *Journal of Poverty* 3.

Becker, Howard Saul. 1963. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. Free Press.

Bell, Robert R. 1981. *Worlds of friendship*, vol. 12. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Bellomo, Michael. 2006. *The Stem Cell Divide: The Facts, the Fiction, and the Fear Driving the Greatest Scientific, Political, and Religious Debate of our Time*. New York: American Management Association.

Berdahl, Jennifer L. 2007. "The sexual harassment of uppity women." *The Journal of applied psychology* 92:425-437.

Berdahl, Jennifer L., Vicki J. Magley, and Craig R. Waldo. 1996. "The Sexual Harassment of Men?" *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 20:527-547

Bethlehem, Jelke. 2010. Selection bias in web surveys. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale De Statistique* 78 (2): 161-88.

Black, Donald. 1976. *The Behavior of Law.* New York: Academic Press.

(------). 1980. *Manners And Customs Of The Police*. New. York: Academic Press.

(------). 1989. *Sociological Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

(------). 1993 *The Social Structure of Right and Wrong*. San Diego: Academic Press.

(------). 1995 "The Epistemology of Pure Sociology." *Law and Social Inquiry* 20(3): 829–70.

(------). 2000 "Dreams of Pure Sociology." *Sociological Theory* 18: 343–67

(------). 2002. "Pure Sociology and the Geometry of Discovery." In Toward a New Science of Sociology: A Retrospective Evaluation of The Behavior of Law, by Allan V. Horwitz. *Contemporary Sociology* 31(6): 668-674.

(------). 2004. "The Geometry of Terrorism." in *Theories of Terrorism* symposium edited by Roberta Senechal de la Roche. *Sociological Theory* 22:14-25.

(------). 2011. *Moral Time.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Block, Joel D. 1980. *Friendship*. New York: Macmillan

Borg, Maian J. 1998. "Vicarious Homicide Victimization and Support for Capital Punishment: A Test of Black's Theory of Law." *Criminology* 36: 537-567.

(------). 2000. "Drug testing in organizations: applying Horwitz's theory of the effectiveness of social control." *Deviant Behavior* 21:123-154.

Bourgois, Philippe. 2002. *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, John and David Biles. 1980. "Empirical Verification and Black's The Behavior of Law." *American Sociological Review* 45: 334-38.

Brendgen, Mara, Frank Vitaro, Richard E. Tremblay, and Francine Lavoie. 2001. "Reactive and proactive aggression: Predictions to physical violence in different contexts and moderating effects." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 29(4): 293.

Britto, Marwin. 2004. "WebCT Surveys: Opportunities and Challenges." *Academic Exchange Quarterly* 8(1).

Buhrke, Robin A. and Dale R. Fuqua. 1987. "Sex differences in same- and cross-sex supportive relationships." *Sex Roles* 17:339-352.

Bursik, R.J. 1988. "Social disorganization and theories of crime and delinquency: Problems and prospects." *Criminology* 26: 519−551.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble.* New York: Routledge.

Campbell, Bradley. 2009. "Genocide as Social Control." *Sociological Theory* 27: 150–72.·

(------). 2010. "Contradictory Behavior During Genocides." *Sociological Forum* 25(2): 296-314.

(------). 2011. "Genocide as a Matter of Degree." *The British Journal of Sociology* 62.4(2): 586-612.

Cannon, Lou. 1997. *Official negligence: how Rodney King and the riots changed Los Angeles and the LAPD.* New York: Times Books.

Caro, FG, T. Ho, D. McFadden, AS Gottlieb, C. Yee, TZ Chan, and J. Winter. 2012. "Using the internet to administer more realistic vignette experiments." *Social Science Computer Review* 30 (2): 184-201.

Caudill, Jonathan Wendell. 2010. "Social Control At The Margins: Utility Of Black's Theory Of Law In Policing Gang Affiliates." Dissertation, The University of Texas as Dallas. Retrieved Dec 28, 2012. ProQuest, Ann Arbor.

Celezik, Mike. 2008. "Celebrity Stalkers Pose Real Threat to Famous." Today.com website. Retrieved Feb 28, 2013 from http://www.today.com/id/24425310/site/todayshow/ns/today-entertainment/t/celebrity-stalkers-pose-real-threat-famous/#

Chappell, Allison T. and Scott R. Maggard. 2007. "Applying Black's Theory of Law to Crack and Cocaine Dispositions." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 51(3): 264-278

Chapple, Constance L. and Trina L. Hope. 2003. "An analysis of the self-control and criminal versatility of gang and dating violence offenders." *Violence and Victims* 18(6): 671−690.

Clark, Anna. 2011. "Signposts: The History of Sexuality." *History Today* 61(9): 57.

Clay-Warner, Jody and Jennifer McMahon-Howard. 2009. "Rape Reporting: "Classic Rape" and the Behavior of Law." *Violence and Victims* Volume 24(6): 723-743.

Clinard, Marshall Barron, and Robert F. Meier. 2004. *Sociology of Deviant Behavior.* Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Cloward, Richard A. 1959. "Illegitimate means, anomie, and deviant behavior." *American*

Sociological Review 24: 164–176.

Cloward, Richard A. and Lloyd E. Ohlin. 1960. *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*. New York: The Free Press.

Cohen, Albert K. 1955. *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Cohen, Lawrence E. and Marcus Felson. 1979. "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44: 588-608.

Cooney, Mark. 1998. *Warriors and Peacemakers: How Third Parties Shape Violence*. New York: New York University Press.

(------). 2002. "Still Paying the Price of Heterodoxy: 'The Behavior of Law' a Quarter-Century On." Contemporary Sociology 31(6): 658-661.

 (------). 2009 *Is Killing Wrong? A Study in Pure Sociology*, Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Copes, H., KR Kerley, KA Mason, and J. Van Wyk. 2001. "Reporting behavior of fraud victims and black's theory of law: An empirical assessment." *Justice Quarterly* 18 (2): 343-63.

Curry, Theodore R. 2010. "The conditional effects of victim and offender ethnicity and victim gender on sentences for non-capital cases." *Punishment & Society* 12:438-462.

D'Augelli, A. R. 1989. "Lesbians' and gay men's experiences of discrimination and harassment in a university community." *American journal of community psychology* 17:317-321.

Daigle, Leah E., Francis T. Cullen and John Paul Wright. 2007. "Gender differences in the predictors of juvenile delinquency: Assessing the generality-specificity debate." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 5(3): 254−286.

Dellinger, Kirsten and Christine L. Williams. 2002. "The Locker Room and the Dorm Room: Workplace Norms and the Boundaries of Sexual Harassment in Magazine Editing." *Social Problems* 49:242-257.

DeSouza, Eros and A. Gigi Fansler. 2003. "Contrapower Sexual Harassment: A Survey of Students and Faculty Members." *Sex Roles* 48:529-542.

Dougherty, Thomas W., Daniel B. Turban, Diane England Olson, Peggy D. Dwyer, and Melody W. Lapreze. 1996. "Factors affecting perceptions of workplace sexual harassment." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 17 (5): 489-501.

Duncan, Kristin Blenk and Elizabeth Stasny. 2001. "Using propensity scores to control coverage bias in telephone surveys." *Survey Methodology* 27(2): 121–130.

Earl, William. 2012. "Britney Spears Flashes Paparazzi Without Panties Again." Hollywoodlife.com. Retrieved Feb 28, 2013 from http://hollywoodlife.com/2012/05/15/britney-spears-flash-picture-no-underwear/#ref=/2012/05/15/britney-spears-flash-picture-no-underwear/pos=

EEOC, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 2011. "Sexual Harassment Charges EEOC & FEPAs Combined: FY 1997 – FY 2011." Vol. 2012. Washington, D.C. available at http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/sexual_harassment.cfm.

Evans, T. David, Francis T. Cullen, Velmer S. Burton, Jr, R. Gregory Dunaway and Michael L. Benson. 1997. "The Social Consequences of Self-control: Testing The General Theory of Crime." *Criminology* 35: 475-504.

Farnworth, M and R. H. C. Teske. 1995. "Gender differences in felony court processing: Three hypotheses of disparity." *Women and Criminal Justice* 62:23-44.

Fearon, James D. 1994. "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes." *American Political Science Review* 88(3): 577–592.

Felson, Richard B., and Paul-Philippe Paré. 2005. "The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(3): 597-610.

Fey, Mark and Kris Ramsay. 2011. "Uncertainty and Incentives in Crisis Bargaining: Game-Free Analysis of International Conflict." *American Journal of Political Science* 55(1):149-169.

Field, Andy P. 2013. *Discovering Statistics using SPSS: and sex and drugs and rock'n'roll.* 4th ed. London: Sage.

Fitzgerald, Louise F., and Alayne J. Ormerod. 1991. "Perceptions Of Sexual Harassment: The influence of gender and academic context." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 15(2): 281-94.

Fleury, R.E., Sullivan, C.M., & Bybee, D.I. 2000. "When ending the relationship doesn't end the violence: Women's experiences of violence by former partners." *Violence Against Women* 6(12), 1363-1383.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Translated by Alan Sheridan, London: Allen Lane, Penguin.

(------). 1990. *The History of Sexuality.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel, and Paul Rabinow. 1984. *The Foucault Reader.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Fricker, Scott, Mirta Galesic, Roger Tourangeau, and Ting Yan. 2005. "An experimental comparison of web and telephone surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69(3): 370–392.

Gideon, Lior. 2012. *Handbook of survey methodology for the social sciences.* New York: Springer New York.

Glaeser, Edward L. and Bruce Sacerdote. 2000. "The Determinants of Punishment: Deterrence, Incapacitation and Vengeance." in *NBER Working Papers 7676*: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

Godard, Ellis. 2003. "Reel life: the social geometry of reality shows." Pp. 73-96 in *Survivor Lessons: Essays on Communication and Reality Television,* Edited by Matthew J. Smith and Andrew F. Wood. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Goffman, Erving. 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goode, Erich. 1990. *Deviant Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Goode, Erich, and Nachman Ben-Yehuda. 2009. *Moral Panics: The Social Construction of Deviance*. Chichester, U.K: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gottfredson, Michael and Michael Hindelang. 1979. "A study of The Behavior of Law." *American Sociological Review* 44: 3-18.

Gottfredson, Michael R. and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Grady, Denise and William J. Broad. Dec. 20, 2011. "Seeing Terror Risk, U.S. Asks Journals to Cut Flu Study Facts." *The New York Times Online*. Retrieved January 13, 2013 from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/21/health/fearing-terrorism-us-asks-journals-to-censor-articles-on-virus.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

Grasmick, Harold G., Charles R. Tittle, Robert J. Bursik Jr., and Bruce J. Arneklev. 1993. "Testing the Core Empirical Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30: 5-29.

Greenberg, David F.1983a. "Donald Black's Sociology of Law: A Critique." *Law and Society Review* 17: 337-68

 (------). 1983b. "Resistance to Conventionality in the Sociology of Law: A Rejoinder to

        Horwitz." *Law and Society Review* 17: 385-90

Gregson, Christine. B. 1998. "California's Antistalking Statute: The pivotal role of intent."

        Golden Gate University Law Review 28(1-3): 221.

Gutek, Barbara A. 1985. *Sex and the workplace*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass.

Gutek, Barbara A. and Bruce Morasch. 1982. "Sex-Ratios, Sex-Role Spillover, and Sexual

        Harassment of Women at Work." *JOURNAL OF SOCIAL ISSUES* 38:55-74.

Gutek, Barbara A., Bruce Morasch, and Aaron Groff Cohen. 1983. "Interpreting social-sexual

        behavior in a work setting." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 22:30-48.

Gutek, Barbara A. and Mary P. Koss. 1993. "Changed Women and Changed Organizations:

        Consequences of and Coping with Sexual Harassment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*

        42:28-48.

Guy, M.E., Newman, M.A., & Mastracci, S.H. 2008. *Emotional labor: Putting the* service *in*

        public service. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Harlow, C.W. 2005. *Hate Crime Reported by Victims and Police,* Special Report, Washington,

        DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, (NCJ 209911): 1, available

        at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/hcrvp.pdf.

Hawdon, James and John Ryan J. 2009. "Social Capital, Social Control, and changes in

        victimization rates." *Crime and Delinquency* 55 (4): 526-549

Hembroff, Larry A. 1987. "Testing Black's Theory of Law." *American Journal of Sociology* 93:

        322- 47.

Herdt, Gilbert H. 2009. *Moral panics, sex panics: Fear and the fight over sexual rights*. New

        York: New York University Press.

Herek, Gregory. 2009. "Sexual Stigma and Sexual Prejudice in the United States: A Conceptual Framework." In *Contemporary Perspectives on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Identities* edited by Debra Hope, New York: Springer.

Herek, Gregory M., Jeanine C. Cogan, and J. Roy Gillis. 2002. "Victim Experiences in Hate Crimes Based on Sexual Orientation." *Journal of Social Issues* 58.2: 319-39.

Hernstein, Richard and Charles Murray. 1996. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in America.* New York: Free Press.

Hindelang, Michael J., Michael R. Gottfredson, and James Garofalo. 1978. *Victims of Personal Crime: An Empirical Foundation for a Theory of Personal Victimization.* Cambridge MA.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hook, Misty K., Lawrence H. Gerstein, Lacy Detterich, and Betty Gridley. 2003. "How close are we? Measuring intimacy and examining gender differences." *Journal of Counseling and Development : JCD* 81:462.

Horwitz, Allan V. 1983. "Resistance to Innovation in the Sociology of Law: A Response to Greenberg." *Law and Society Review* 2: 369-84

(------). 2002a. "Toward a New Science of Social Life: A Retrospective Examination of "The Behavior of Law." *Contemporary Sociology* 31(6): 641-644.

(------). 2002b. Creating Mental Illness. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jacques, Scott J. and Richard Wright. 2008. "Intimacy with Outlaws: The Role of Relational Distance in Recruiting, Paying, and Interviewing Underworld Research Participants." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 45: 22-38.

(------). 2008. "The Relevance of Peace to Studies of Drug Market Violence." *Criminology* 46:

    221-253.

(------). 2010. "A Sociological Theory of Drug Sales, Gifts, and Frauds." *Crime and Delinquency*

    20(10): 1-26.

Jensen, Gary F. 2000. "Deviance, Definition of." In the *Encyclopedia of Criminology and*

    Deviant Behavior. Volume One: Historical, Conceptual, and Theoretical

    Issues. Ed. Clifton Bryant. Philadelphia: Francis and Taylor.

Jenkins, Jack. 2012. "Attacks on Muslim American Houses of Worship on the Rise." Center for

    American Progress website. Retrieved Jan 6, 2013 from

    http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/religion/news/2012/09/26/39151/attacks-on-

    muslim-american-houses-of-worship-on-the-rise/.

Johnson, Alex. January 7, 2013. "Supreme Court lets embryonic stem cell research go forward."

    NBCNEWS.com website. Retrieved March 3, 2013 from

    http://usnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/01/07/16395707-supreme-court-lets-embryonic-

    stem-cell-research-go-forward?lite.

Jones, Jane Clare. 2011. "Anders Breivik's chilling anti-feminism." Guardian News and Media

    Limited. Accessed March 13, 2013 at

    http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/jul/27/breivik-anti-

    feminism?CMP=twt_gu.

Kane, Alex. 2011. "Breivik manifesto outlines virulent right-wing ideology that fueled Norway

    massacre." Mondoweiss.net July 24, 2011. Accessed March 13, 2013 at

    http://mondoweiss.net/2011/07/breivik-manifesto-outlines-virulent-right-wing-ideology-

    that-fueled-norway-massacre.html.

Kayser-Jones, J. and B. A. Koing. 1994. "Ethical issues." In J. F. Gubrium and A. Sankar (eds). *Qualitative Methods in Ageing Research* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kenig, Sylvia and John Ryan. 1986. "Sex Differences in Levels of Tolerance and Attribution of Blame for Sexual Harassment on a University Campus." Sex Roles 9(15): 535-549.

Kiesling, Scott Fabius. "Homosocial Desire in Men's Talk: Balancing and Re-Creating Cultural Discourses of Masculinity." *Language in Society* 34.5 (2005): 695-726.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1969. *Stages in the Development of Moral Thought and Action*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Konty, Mark Andrew. 2002. "Values, deviance and conformity: Measuring values with the factorial survey method."

Koss, Mary P., Lisa A. Goodman, Angela Browne, Louise F. Fitzgerald, Gwendolyn Puryear Keita, and Nancy Felipe Russo. 1994. "The culture and context of male violence against women." In , 3-17. US: American Psychological Association.

Koons-Witt, Barbara A. 2002. "The Effect Of Gender On The Decision To Incarcerate Before And After The Introduction Of Sentencing Guidelines." *Criminology* 40:297-328.

Kruttschnitt, Candace. 1981. "Social status and sentences of female offenders." *Law and Society Review* 15 (2): 247-265.

 (------). 1982. "Women, Crime, and Dependency: An Application of the Theory of Law." *Criminology* 19: 495-513.

Kuo, S., Longmire, D., Cuvelier, S., & Chang, K. 2010. "Prosecutorial decision making in Taiwan:A partial test of Black's behavior of law." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 54: 1023-1046.

Levine, David. 1992. Piece rates, output restriction, and conformism. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 13: 473-489.

"Lindsey Lohan no Underwear." Dec 11, 2011. Zimbio.com. WEBSITE retrieved February 28, 2013http://www.zimbio.com/Lindsay+Lohan/articles/DNrFnck3rV7/lindsay+lohan+no+underwear.

Lorber, Judith. 1994. *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lu, H., & Miethe, T. D. 2007. "Provincial laws on the protection of women in China: A partial test of Black's theory." *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 51: 25-39.

Luckenbill, David F. 1977. "Criminal Homicide as a Situated Transaction." *Social Problems* 25: 176-186.

Lutwak, Edward. 1968. *Coup d'É tat: A Practical Handbook.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Maddan, Sean, Richard D. Hartley, Jeffery T. Walker, and J. Mitchell Miller. 2011. "Sympathy for the Devil: An Exploration of Federal Judicial Discretion in the Processing of White-Collar Offenders." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 37 (1): 4-18.

Mallon, Ron. 2007. "A Field Guide to Social Construction." *Philosophy Compass* 2(1): 93-108.

Manning, Jason. 2012. "Suicide as Social Control." *Sociological Forum* 27(1): 207-227.

Mazerolle, Paul and Alex Piquero. (1997). "Violent responses to strain: An examination of conditioning influences." *Violence and Victims* 12: 323−343.

McGill, Michael E. 1985. *The McGill report on male intimacy*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McNaughton, Reyes, Heath Luz, Vangie A. Foshee, Daniel J. Bauer, and Susan T. Ennett. 2012.

"Heavy Alcohol Use and Dating Violence Perpetration During Adolescence: Family, Peer and Neighborhood Violence as Moderators." *Prevention Science* 13: 340-349.

Meeker, Mary and Liang Wu. 2012. "Internet Trends Report 2012." Kleiner, Perkins, Caufeld, and Byers. Report available at http://www.kpcb.com/insights/2012-internet-trends.

Mooney, Linda A. 1986. "The Behavior of Law in a Private Legal System." *Social Forces* 64: 733- 50.

Myers, Martha A. 1980. "Predicting the Behavior of Law: A Test of Two Models." *Law and Society Review* 4: 835-57.

NBC News. 2010. "Army doctor who refused to deploy gets 6 months." NBCNEWS.com updated 12/16/2010. Accessed March 3, 2013 from http://www.nbcnews.com/id/40706655/ns/us_news-crime_and_courts/t/army-doctor-who-refused-deploy-gets-months/#.UT4POujbEnV

Nelson, Jill. 2000, *Police Brutality: An Anthology.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Pais, J. F, South, S. J, and K. Crowder. 2008. "White Flight Revisited: A Multiethnic Perspective on Neighborhood Out-Migration." *Population Research and Policy Review* 28(3): 321–346.

Patterson, Orlando. 1982. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Parks, K.A., Pardi,A.M., & Bradizza, C.M. 2006. "Collecting data on alcohol use and alcohol-related victimization: A comparison of telephone and web-based survey methods." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 67(2): 318-323.

Persson, Anders. 2001. "Intimacy Among Strangers: On mobile telephone calls in public places." *Journal of Mundane Behavior* 2.

Phillips, Scott. 2003. "The Social Structure of Vengeance: A Test of Black's Model."
  Criminology 41(3): 673-708.

Phillips, Scott and Mark Cooney. 2005. "Aiding Peace, Abetting Violence: Third Parties and the
  Management of Conflict." *American Sociological Review* 70(2): 334–54.

Pina, Afroditi and Theresa A. Gannon. 2010. "An overview of the literature on antecedents,
  perceptions and behavioural consequences of sexual harassment." *Journal of Sexual
  Aggression* :1-24.

Powell, Robert. 2006. "War as a Commitment Problem." *International Organization* 60,
  169 – 203.

Prager, Karen J. 2000. "Intimacy in Personal Relationships." Pp. 229-242 in *Close Relationships-
  A Source Book*, edited by C. Hendrick and S. S. Hendrick. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
  Publications.

Reeder, Heidi M. 2003. "The Effect of Gender Role Orientation on Same- and Cross-Sex
  Friendship Formation." *Sex Roles* 49:143-152.

Rodriguez, Fernando S., Theodore R. Curry, and Gang Lee. 2006. "Gender Differences in
  Criminal Sentencing: Do Effects Vary Across Violent, Property, and Drug Offenses?"
  Social Science Quarterly 87:318-339.

Rospenda, Kathleen M. 1998. "Sexual and non-sexual harassment as interpersonal conflict
  stressors in the workplace: Effects on job, mental health, and physical health outcomes."
  ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.

Rossi, Peter H. and Steven L. Nock. 1982. *Measuring social judgments : the factorial survey
  approach*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Rotundo, M., D. H. Nguyen, and P. R. Sackett. 2001. "A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment." *The Journal of applied psychology* 86:914-922.

Rubin, Lillian B. 1985. *Just friends: the role of friendship in our lives*. New York: Harper & Row.

Sampson, Robert J. (1993). "The Community Context of Violent Crime". In *Sociology and the Public Agenda*, edited by William Julius Wilson. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sampson, Robert J. and William Julius Wilson. 1995. "Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality." in *Crime and Inequality*, edited by John Hagan & Ruth D. Peterson. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Schelling, Thomas. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

(------). 1966. *Arms and Influence.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shaw, Clifford R. & McKay, Henry D. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sampson, Robert, J. D. Morenoff and T. Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "Assessing 'neighbourhood effects': Social processes and new directions in research. " *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 443−478.

Sampson, Robert J. and W. Byron Groves. 1989. "Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 94(4): 774-802.

Senechal de la Roche, Roberta. 1996. "Collective Violence as Social Control." *Sociological Forum* 11(1): 97–128.

(------). 2001. "Why is Collective Violence Collective?" *Sociological Theory* 19(2) 126–44.

Shaw, Clifford R. & McKay, Henry D. (1942). *Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas*. Chicago:

University of Chicago Press.Siegel, Larry and Chris McCormick. 2006. *Criminology in Canada: Theories Patterns and Typologies*. Toronto: Thomson.

Shively, M. 2005. *Study of Literature and Legislation on Hate Crime in America,* final report submitted to the National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC: (NCJ 210300), available at www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/210300.pdf.

Shoemaker, Donald J. 2009. *Juvenile Delinquency*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Siegel, L.J. and C. McCormick. 2006. *Criminology in Canada: Theories, Patterns, and Typologies* (3rd ed.). Toronto: Thompson.

Smith, D. A. 1987. Police response to interpersonal violence: Defining the parameters of legal control. *Social Forces* 65 (Mar 87): 767-82.

Smith, R. E., C. J. Pine, and M. E. Hawley. 1998. "Social cognitions about adult male victims of female sexual assault." *Journal of sex research* 24:101.

Spohn, C .2000. Thirty years of sentencing reform: the quest for a racially neutral sentencing process. National Institute of Justice: Criminal Justice. Washington, DC

Stainback, Kevin, Thomas N. Ratliff, and Vincent J. Roscigno. 2011. "The Context of Workplace Sex Discrimination: Sex Composition, Workplace Culture and Relative Power." *Social Forces* 89:1165-1188.

Steffensmeier, Darrell And Chester L. Britt. 2001. "Judges' Race And Judicial Decision Making: Do Black Judges Sentence Differently?" *Social Science Quarterly* 82:749-764.

Steffensmeier, Darrell And Chris Hebert. 1999. "Women And Men Policymakers: Does The Judge's Gender Affect The Sentencing Of Criminal Defendants?" *Social Forces* 77:1163-1196.

Steffensmeier, D., J. Kramer, And C. Streifel. 1993. "Gender And Imprisonment Decisions."

     Criminology 31:411-446.

Steffensmeier, Darryl and S.Demuth. 2000. "Ethnicity and sentencing outcomes in U.S. federal

     courts: who is punished more harshly?" *American Sociological Review* 65:705–729

Sutherland, Edwin H. 1947. *Principles of Criminology.* 4th ed. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

(------). 1950. "The Sexual Psychopath laws." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology,* 40:5.

Sutherland, Edwin H. and Donald R. Cressey. 1978. *Criminology*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott

     Company.

Sutter, Daniel. 2000. "A Game Theoretic Model of the Coup d'E ́tat." *Economics and Politics*

     12(2): 205–223

Struckman-Johnson, Cindy J. and David L. Struckman-Johnson. 1993. "College men's and

     women's reactions to hypothetical sexual touch varied by initiator gender and coercion

     level." *Sex Roles* 29: 371-385.

Tady, Megan. 2007. "Transgender People Face Violence, Obstacles." The New Standard online.

     Retrieved January 17, 2013 from

     http://newstandardnews.net/content/index.cfm/items/4103.

Taylor, Brian J. 2006. "Factorial Surveys: Using Vignettes to Study Professional Judgment."

     British Journal of Social Work 36: 1187–1207.

The Sentencing Project. 2005. Racial disparity in sentencing: a review of the literature. The

     Sentencing Project, Washington, DC.

Toerien, Merran*, and Celia* Kitzinger. 2007. *"*Emotional labour in action: Navigating multiple

     involvements in the beauty salon." *Sociology* 41 (4): 645-62.

115

Traub, Stuart H., and Craig B. Little. 1999. *Theories of Deviance*. Itasca, Ill: F.E. Peacock
Publishers.

Tucker, James. 1999. *The Therapeutic Corporation*, New York: Oxford University Press.

(------). 2002. "New Age religion and the cult of the self." *Society* January/February: 46-51.

United Human Rights Council. 2013. "Genocide in Rwanda." *The United Human Rights Council
website.* Accessed March 3, 2013 at

http://untedhumanrights.rog/genocide/genocide_in_rwanda.htm

UCR. 2011. "Hate Crime Statistics." Uniform Crime Reports website retrieved Jan 6, 2013 from

http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/hate-crime/2011/tables/table-1.

Victory, Nancy and Kathleen Cooper. "A nation online: How americans are

expanding their use of the internet." Technical report, Washington DC:

National Telecommunication Economics and Statistics. Accessed March 11, 2013 at

http://www.ntia.doc.gov.

Warner, Michael (1991), "Introduction: Fear of a Queer Planet". *Social Text* 9 (4): 3–17.

Weeks, Jeffrey. 2010. *Sexuality*. New York: Routledge.

West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1:125-151.

Wheeler, Ladd, Harry Reis, and John B. Nezlek. 1983. "Loneliness, social interaction, and sex
roles." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45:943-953.

Willmsen, Christine. 2009. "Swastikas deface 2 synagogues in Seattle." Retrieved from The
Seattle Times website on Jan 6, 2013 from

http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2009860552_antisemitic14m.html.

116

Willness, Chelsea R., Piers Steel, and Kibeom Lee. 2007. " A Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents

and Consequences of Workplace Sexual Harassment." *Personnel Psychology* 60:127-

162.

Wilson, James Q. and Richard Hernstein. 1985. *Crime and Human Nature.* New York:

Simon and Schuster.

Wiltrout, Kate. 2006. "Navy chaplain found guilty of disobeying order." The Virginian-Pilot

online. Updated September 13, 2006. Accessed March 3, 2013 from

http://hamptonroads.com/node/153451

Wolfgang, Marvin E. 1958. *Patterns of Criminal Homicide*. Philadelphia: University of

Pennsylvania Press.

Wolfgang, Marvin E. and Franco Ferracuti. 1967. *The Subculture of Violence: Towards an*

Integrated Theory in Criminology. London: Tavistock.

Questionnaire

Consent form
Student status

<u>Informed Consent</u>

This research project aims to gather information to better understand people's perceptions of acceptable co-worker interactions and to help identify scenarios in which workplace harassment might occur. This online survey is brief and should take no more than 10-12 minutes of your time. We would greatly appreciate you filling out the entire survey, but please feel free to skip any item(s) that you wish. You may withdraw from the survey at any time prior to hitting the submit button. This survey is anonymous and we ask that you make no entry that might identify you in any way. You must be at least 18 years of age and a student at Virginia Tech to participate. There is no way for your answers to ever be linked to you. The information you provide will be reported in aggregate form to protect your identity and to guard against the possibility of connecting you to your responses. In addition to rating scenarios about co-worker interaction, you will be asked a few questions about yourself, such as your age, education level, work experience and ethnicity. These questions are included solely for comparisons. You will remain anonymous.

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research project at any time, please feel free to contact Angela Barlow, at barlow.a@vt.edu, or Dr. James Hawdon at hawdonj@vt.edu. The only benefits expected for this research are that you may potentially feel good about contributing to the knowledge base of sociological research on workplace harassment and co-worker interactions. There are no known risks for your participation in this project. **By continuing forward with the survey from this point, you are implying that you have read and agree to the above conditions.** Thank you very much for your time.

Are you a Virginia Tech student?

- ◯ Yes
- ◯ No

What is your current grade level?

- ◯ Freshman
- ◯ Sophomore
- ◯ Junior
- ◯ Senior
- ◯ Master's Student
- ◯ Ph.D. Student

Responses to each of the following questions involve grabbing the 'slider' and dragging it to a number between 1 and 5 where 1=Not at all offensive and 5=Extremely offensive.

Please pay attention to the name changes in vignettes and the implied gender. It is important to answer questions as

honestly as possible. Your answers are completely anonymous and cannot be tracked back to you.

Stranger Intro

In each of the following scenarios coworkers **have just met** and have yet to develop friendships.

Please read each vignette and rate how generally offensive you find each of the co-worker interactions depicted. Rate the general offensiveness of the scenario on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 equals not at all offensive and 5 equals extremely offensive.

Intimate Intro

In each of the following scenarios coworkers have a history of being **quite friendly** and socializing outside of the workplace.

Please read each vignette and rate how generally offensive you find each of the co-worker interactions depicted. Rate the general offensiveness of the scenario on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 equals not at all offensive and 5 equals extremely offensive.

Acquaintance Intro

In each of the following scenarios coworkers are **acquaintances**. They have a history of being generally cordial at work but have never socialized outside of the workplace unless specifically indicated in the vignette. No previous romantic relationships exist between any of these coworkers.

Please read each vignette and rate how generally offensive you find each of the co-worker interactions depicted. Rate the general offensiveness of the scenario on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 equals not at all offensive and 5 equals extremely offensive.

Mild 1.mwV. shoulders
Beth is sitting at her desk working. **Thomas** walks up and begins massaging **Beth's** shoulders saying, "You've been working at this a while. How's it going?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

What if Thomas is Beth's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

What if Beth is Thomas' boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

Ser1.mm.elevator
Steve and Rick worked late and are riding down the elevator together. **Rick** gets close to Steve, brushes his hand against **Steve's** crotch and says, " Want to go back to my place and work off this stress?"

119

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please move slider

Mild 1.ww/mm. shoulders

Rachel is sitting at a desk working. **Kristie** walks up and proceeds to massage **Rachel's** shoulders saying, "You've been working at this a while. How's it going?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please move slider

Jim is sitting at a desk working. **Keith** walks up and begins massaging **Jim's** shoulders saying, "You've been working at this a while. How's it going?"

	Not at all offenisve			Extremely offensive	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please move slider

REMINDER 1

Remember that the coworkers have just recently met. Very little interaction of any kind has occurred previously.
Remember that these coworkers are general acquaintances--cordial at work but have never socialized outside of the workplace
Remember that coworkers know each other well and frequently socialize outside of work.

Mod2.wmV.bang

Shelly and Jack are talking in the hallway. **Shelly** makes a show of eyeing two attractive people as they walk by. **She winks at Jack** saying, "Nice. Which one would you bang?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please move slider

What if Shelly is Jack's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please move slider

What if Jack is Shelly's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please move slider

Ser1.ww.elevator

Sara and Elizabeth worked late and are riding down the elevator together. **Sara** gets close to Elizabeth, brushes her hand against **Elizabeth's** breast and says, " Want to go back to my place and work off this stress?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Please move slider

Mod2.mwV.bang

Jeff and Kate are talking in the hallway. **Jeff** makes a show of eyeing two attractive people as they walk by. **He says to Kate**, "Nice. Which one would you bang?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

What if Jeff is Kate's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

What if Kate is Jeff's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

Amb3.wm/ww.gaze

Kevin walks up to Becky to discuss a file. **Becky** let's her gaze linger on **Kevin's** crotch area before looking up at him.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

Cindy walks up to Martha to discuss a file. **Martha** let's her gaze linger on **Cindy's** breasts before looking up at her.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

Mod2.mm/ww.bang

Allen and Eric are talking in the hallway. **Allen** makes a show of eyeing two attractive people as they walk by. **He says to Eric**, "Nice. Which one would you bang?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	
Please move slider						☐

Karen and Jane are talking in the hallway. **Karen** makes a show of eyeing two attractive people as they walk by. **She says to Jane**, "Nice. Which one would you bang?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider ☐

Remember that the coworkers have just recently met. Very little interaction of any kind has occurred previously.
Remember that these coworkers are general acquaintances--cordial at work but have never socialized outside of the workplace
Remember that coworkers know each other well and frequently socialize outside of work.

Ser1.mwV.elevator
Rob and Cindy worked late and are riding down the elevator together. **Rob** gets close to **Cindy**, brushes his hand against her breast and says, " Want to go back to my place and work off this stress?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

What if Rob is Cindy's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

What if Cindy is Rob's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

Amb3.mw/mm.gaze
Karen walks up to George to discuss a file. **George** let's his gaze linger on **Karen's** breasts before looking up at her.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

David walks up to Walter to discuss a file. **Walter** let's his gaze linger on **David's** crotch area before looking up at him.

	Not at all offenisve			Extremely Offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

Mild 1.wmV. shoulders
Eric is sitting at his desk working. **Emily** walks up and begins to **massage Eric's** shoulders saying, "You've been working at this a while. How's it going?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Click to write Choice 1 ☐

What if Emily is Eric's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5
Click to write Choice 1					☐

What if Eric is Emily's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5
Click to write Choice 1					☐

Ser1.wmV.elevator

Sara and Rick worked late and are riding down the elevator together. **Sara** gets close to Rick, brushes her hand against **Rick's** crotch and says, " Want to go back to my place and work off this stress?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5
Please move slider					☐

What if Sara is Rick's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5
Please move slider					☐

What if Rick is Sara's boss?

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5
Please move slider					☐

Demographics

What is your age?

- ○ 18-21
- ○ 22-25
- ○ 26-30
- ○ 31-40
- ○ 41-50
- ○ 51-60

- ○ 61 and older

What is your gender?

- ○ Female
- ○ Male

How would you describe your political views?

- ○ extremely liberal
- ○ liberal
- ○ slightly liberal
- ○ moderate
- ○ slightly conservative
- ○ conservative
- ○ extremely conservative

How important is religion in your life?

Extremely Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important	Not at all Important
○	○	○	○	○

What is your race?

- ○ Asian
- ○ American Indian or Alaska Native
- ○ Black or African American
- ○ Hispanic or Latino
- ○ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- ○ White (non-Hispanic)
- ○ Other

What your sexual orientation?

- ○ Bisexual
- ○ Gay
- ○ Straight
- ○ Queer/other

In what college is your major?

- ○ Agriculture and Life Science
- ○ Architecture and Urban Studies
- ○ Business
- ○ Engineering
- ○ Liberal Arts and Human Sciences
- ○ Natural Resources
- ○ Science
- ○ University Studies
- ○ Veterinary Medicine

What level of education has your Mother/guardian completed:

- ○ less than high school
- ○ high school
- ○ some college/technical
- ○ college graduate
- ○ master's degree
- ○ doctorate

What level of education has your Father/guardian completed:

- ○ less than high school
- ○ high school
- ○ some college/technical
- ○ college graduate
- ○ master's degree
- ○ doctorate

Would you care to view the last section of scenarios?

- ○ Yes, continue participating
- ○ No, go to end of survey

Reminder 3
Remember that the coworkers have just recently met. Very little interaction of any kind has occurred previously.
Remember that these coworkers are general acquaintances--cordial at work but have never socialized outside of the workplace
Remember that coworkers know each other well and frequently socialize outside of work.

Mild2.wm/ww.email

Katie secretly has a sexual interest in Nick. **Katie** emails **Nick** asking if he would like to join her for a sexual encounter.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Not at all offensive</td><td colspan="2">Extremely offensive</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Please move slider

Tina secretly has a sexual interest in Molly. **Tina** emails **Molly** asking if she would like to join her for a sexual encounter.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Not at all offensive</td><td colspan="2">Extremely offensive</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Please move slider

Mod1.mw/ww.cooler

Brian, Jerry and Tara are in the break room. Tara is bending over getting water out of the water cooler. **Brian** looks at Jerry, winks, and quietly walks up behind **Tara** without her knowledge, thrusting his hips forward and back in a sexual manner. Jerry gives Brian a thumbs-up while they quietly laugh behind Tara's back. Tara is unaware of being the object of the 'joke.'

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Not at all offensive</td><td colspan="2">Extremely offensive</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Please move slider

Brian, Jeff and Tina are in the break room. Jeff is bending over getting water out of the water cooler. **Brian** looks at Tina, winks, and quietly walks up behind **Jeff** without his knowledge, thrusting his hips forward and back in a sexual manner. Tina gives Brian a thumbs-up while they quietly laugh behind Jeff's back. Jeff is unaware of being the object of the 'joke.'

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Not at all offensive</td><td colspan="2">Extremely offensive</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Please move slider

Amb2.wm/mm.bicep

Lisa, Mark, and John are in the break room having coffee. While Mark reaches up into the cabinet for a mug, **Lisa squeezes Mark's bicep**, saying, "Nice! Have you been working out?"

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Not at all offensive</td><td colspan="2">Extremely offensive</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Please move slider

Mark, John, and Lisa are in the break room having coffee. While Mark reaches up into the cabinet for a mug, **John** squeezes **Mark's** bicep, saying, "Nice! Have you been working out?"

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Not at all offensive</td><td colspan="2">Extremely offensive</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>

Please move slider

Ser3.mm/wm.secrets

Mike and Dan have been socializing outside of work. After Dan decides to no longer see Mike romantically, **Mike** tells several people gathered in the break room detailed personal information about **Dan** and about their sexual encounters.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3">Not at all offensive</td><td colspan="2">Extremely offensive</td></tr>
</table>

126

	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider

Mary and Dan have been socializing outside of work. After Dan decides to no longer see Mary romantically, **Mary** tells several people gathered in the break room detailed personal information about **Dan** and about their sexual encounters.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider

Reminder 4

Remember that the coworkers have just recently met. Very little interaction of any kind has occurred previously.
Remember that these coworkers are general acquaintances--cordial at work but have never socialized outside of the workplace
Remember that coworkers know each other well and frequently socialize outside of work.

Amb2.mw/ww.bicep

John, Laura, and Mark are in the break room having coffee. While Laura reaches up into the cabinet for a mug, **Mark** squeezes **Laura's** bicep, saying, "Nice! Have you been working out?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider

Amy, Lisa, and Josie are in the break room having coffee. While Josie reaches up into the cabinet for a mug, **Amy** squeezes **Josie's** bicep, saying, "Nice! Have you been working out?"

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider

Mild2.mm/mw.email

James secretly has a sexual interest in Matthew. **James** emails **Matthew** asking if he would like to join him for a sexual encounter.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offesnsive		
	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider

Doug secretly has a sexual interest in Sarah. **Doug** emails **Sarah** asking if she would like to join him for a sexual encounter.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider

Ser3.ww/mw.secrets

Michael and Chelsea have been socializing outside of work. After Chelsea decides to no longer see Michael romantically, **Michael** tells several people gathered in the break room detailed personal information about **Chelsea** and about their sexual encounters.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive		
	1	2	3	4	5	

Please move slider ☐

Mary and Alicia have been socializing outside of work. After Alicia decides to no longer see Mary romantically, **Mary** tells several people gathered in the break room detailed personal information about **Alicia** and about their sexual encounters.

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

Mod1.ww/wm.cooler

Sharon, Mark and Lisa are in the break room. Sharon is bending over getting water out of the water cooler. **Lisa** looks at Mark, winks, and quietly walks up behind **Sharon** without her knowledge, thrusting her hips forward and back in a sexual manner. Mark gives Lisa a thumbs-up as they quietly laugh behind Sharon's back. Sharon is unaware of being the object of the 'joke.'

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offesnive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

Scott, Alice and Tina are in the break room. Scott is bending over getting water out of the water cooler. **Alice** looks at Tina, winks, and quietly walks up behind **Scott** without his knowledge, thrusting her hips forward and back in a sexual manner. Tina gives Alice a thumbs-up and they quietly laugh behind Scott's back. Scott is unaware of being the object of the 'joke.'

	Not at all offensive			Extremely offensive	
	1	2	3	4	5

Please move slider ☐

SH history

What is your work experience? I have been employed (check the highest level applicable):

- ○ Never
- ○ As a part-time employee with no benefits
- ○ As a permanent/long-term part-time employee
- ○ As a full-time employee but with no benefits
- ○ As a full-time employee with benefits
- ○ Self-employed

Think back to the job you held for the longest period of time. What was the size of the business (average number of people you might work with on any given day)?

- ○ work alone
- ○ 1-3 people
- ○ 4-7 people
- ○ 8-12 people

- ○ 13-20 people
- ○ More than 20 people

What was the gender composition of the people you worked with?

- ○ All Male
- ○ Mostly male
- ○ Equally mixed male and female
- ○ Mostly Female
- ○ All Female

Have you ever experienced or thought you might have experienced sexual harassment in the workplace?

yes   no   I'm not sure
○   ○   ○

How many times have you been harassed at work in the last year?

- ○ 0
- ○ 1-2 times
- ○ 3-6 times
- ○ 7-10 times
- ○ More than 10 times

The harassment I experienced was from a (check any that apply):

Male   Female   Group of males   Group of females   Mixed gender group
☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Have you ever witnessed what you believe to be sexual harassment?

- ○ yes
- ○ No

Please check any that apply. I have witnessed sexual harassment in the following ways:

- ☐ Male harasser toward male victim
- ☐ Female harasser toward male victim
- ☐ Male harasser toward female victim
- ☐ Female harasser toward female victim