USP University Student Publishing Alliance.

Journal of Psychology, Crime and Justice Studies

Find us at:
www.publishyourdissertation.com

2024

Do psychosocial traits explain belief in myths and misconceptions towards sexual harassment?

Laura Haynes[1]

Loughborough University, UK

Abstract

The prevalence of myths and misconceptions surrounding sexual harassment in England and Wales poses significant challenges to addressing and mitigating its impacts. While accounting for age and gender, this study explores how psychosocial characteristics such as psychopathy and self-esteem influence people's perceptions about these kinds of myths and fallacies. 199 responses were gained using online survey methodology and the potential associations between attitudes regarding sexual harassment and psychological and sociodemographic characteristics were examined using the Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale, and the Psychopathic Personality Trait scale. Whilst prior studies have found a link between psychopathic personality traits and rape myths, no study to date has examined this among sexual harassment myths specifically. Statistical analysis revealed that males and those with lower cognitive empathy held more problematic views on sexual harassment. The study's conclusion addresses how these findings might impact public policy, education, and intervention in an effort to decrease the incidence of sexual harassment. It will also advance our knowledge of risk factors and characteristics of those who are most likely to endorse sexual harassment beliefs and, as a result, be targeted.

Keywords: *Sexual Harassment, Rape Myths; Psychopathy; Self-esteem; Psychosocial Traits*

[1] **Publication based upon dissertation research conducted and submitted in partial fulfilment for the Degree BSc in Criminology at Loughborough University (2024).**

1. Introduction

Sexual harassment is an offence that continues to be of widespread concern globally and prominently throughout England and Wales. According to the England and Wales Crime Survey (Office for National Statistics, 2023), 798,000 women and 275,000 men over the age of 16 were victims of sexual assault in 2022, respectively. When someone engages in unwelcome sexual activity towards another person and causes them to feel distressed, scared, offended, or embarrassed, that behaviour is legally defined as sexual harassment in England and Wales (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017). Sexual harassment can manifest in a number of ways, including nonverbal (unwanted looks or gestures), physical (touching or groping), verbal (comments or jokes), and cyber (unwanted internet approaches or explicit messages). It is crucial to remember that sexual harassment can affect both men and women, and perpetrators can be of any gender.

The UK, despite being considered to be a developed and progressive society, is not immune to the challenges posed by sexual harassment. In fact, it is a pervasive issue that cuts across various sectors, including workplaces, educational institutions, public spaces, and online environments. Numerous studies and reports highlight the prevalence of sexual harassment in the UK, emphasising the urgent need for comprehensive measures to address and combat this problem. Approximately 35% of women worldwide report experiencing sexual harassment; however, only 40% of them seek assistance, and fewer than 10% report the incident to law authorities (World population review, 2020). In England and Wales, an overwhelming 43% of the population have experienced at least one form of sexual harassment in the last 12 months, with nearly three quarters (72%) having experienced it over their lifetime (Office for National Statistics, 2023). Women were significantly more likely to have experienced any form of sexual harassment in the last twelve months than men: 51% of women, compared to 34% of men (Adams et al, 2020). These alarming statistics emphasize the magnitude of the problem and highlight the urgent need for concerted efforts to address and prevent sexual harassment on a global scale and specifically England and Wales. Whilst men do encounter sexual harassment, research conveys that they are far less inclined to report than their female counterparts (Chapleau et al., 2008). It is widely acknowledged that

the predominant and most severe instances of sexual harassment typically target women by men. As result, I have decided to focus my study on this particular form of sexual harassment. Legal frameworks, such as the UK's Equality Act, protect individuals from sexual harassment and try to create an atmosphere that is courteous and safe for all. There are three forms in which sexual harassment manifests itself outlined in the Equality Act 2010. The first type, which applies to all the protected characteristics apart from pregnancy and maternity, and marriage and civil partnership, involves unwanted conduct which is related to a relevant characteristic and has the purpose or effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating, or offensive environment for the complainant or of violating the complainant's dignity. The second type is sexual harassment which is unwanted conduct of a sexual nature where this has the same purpose or effect as the first type of harassment. The third type is treating someone less favourably because he or she has either submitted to or rejected sexual harassment, or harassment related to sex or gender reassignment (Government Equalities Office, 2023). The Equality Act 2010 protects people from sexual harassment by encouraging a culture of equality, respect, and responsibility and by giving them the legal tools to confront and eliminate such behaviour in many spheres of their lives. Through the Act, victims of sexual harassment are able to take legal action against harassers and in certain situations, against employers or service providers who violate their legal obligations. The Act's protections extend beyond work environments to include associations, public functions, housing, educational institutions, associations offering products and services, and contacts with the police and criminal justice system. This wide range guarantees people's protection against sexual harassment in a variety of public and private contexts. Service providers are held responsible for stopping sexual harassment under the Equality Act. This motivates businesses to take proactive steps to establish a harassment-free, inclusive, and polite workplace, by creating explicit policies, training courses, and reporting procedures. Additional advice is provided by the Equality and Human Rights Commission's (EHRC) statutory code of practice, which offers a framework for organisations to comprehend and successfully apply the act's provisions as well as aiding courts and tribunals in interpreting the law (Equality and Human Rights Commission, 2017).

In England & Wales, a comprehensive piece of legislation called the Sexual Offences Act 2003 was created to prevent and deal with various forms of sexual misconduct (Willmott et al., 2021). The Act creates a strong legal framework that works to dissuade potential

offenders and shield people from sexual harassment by explicitly outlining the circumstances and sexual offences that are illegal. The Act's emphasis on consent, which offers a thorough explanation of what qualifies as legitimate and informed permission in sexual interactions, is one important feature. By setting a legal standard that emphasises the value of mutual agreement and respect in intimate relationships (Lindsay et al., 2023), this greatly aids the prevention of sexual offences. Nevertheless, sexual harassment is not covered under this legislation (Thornton et al., 2023). Calls for a revised Sexual Offenses Act are becoming more and more frequent. While the Sexual Offences Act 2003, when compared to other countries, marks a considerable advancement in the fight against sexual assault and misconduct, there are still areas for improvement and issues with its implementation and enforcement (Griffith, 2021).

However, the complicated societal views, cultural norms, and media portrayals of sexual harassment frequently influence public perceptions of the practice (Lilley et al., 2023; Williams et al., 2023). In both global and UK societies, despite recent increases in knowledge of the problem, there is still a high prevalence of general belief in myths and misconceptions about what sexual harassment is and why it is damaging. This likely explains the low rates of reporting (Stewart et al., 2024) and conviction that accompany this high prevalence as highlighted by previous literature (Metson & Willmott, 2024). These misconceptions have fostered a culture where victims may be viewed with suspicion, held accountable and dissuaded from reporting. The elusive and frequently subtle character of sexual harassment makes it challenging to gauge the frequency of this type of assault (Berman et al., 2002). In the 28 EU Member States, between 83 and 102 million women (45%–55%) are reported to have experienced sexual harassment of some kind since the age of 15 (Latcheva,2017). Furthermore, it is estimated that approximately 35% of women worldwide have experienced sexual harassment in their lifetime (World Population Review, 2020). The number of sexual offences reported to the police has increased over the past ten years, but it still falls far short of the survey's estimated victim count (Willmott & Hudspith, 2024). The crime survey for England and Wales (CSEW) estimates that 1.1 million adults aged 16 and over experienced sexual assault in the year ending in March 2022 (798,000 women and 275,000 men), based on the most recent statistics available.

Lots of sexual harassment instances are dealt with by organisations who employ those concerns. Police investigations into sexual harassment are rare and even more rarely result in

a CJS outcome/conviction. Many cases are not taken seriously enough and the way that police in E&W handle accusations of sexual harassment and interact with victims, suspects, and even members of their own ranks, sends a strong message to the general public about the boundaries of what is and is not morally acceptable. Many Street harassment victim-survivors believed that complaining to the police was pointless as they felt nothing could be done and were unaware that their experiences were unlawful (Fileborn, 2019). In order to help put a stop to sexual harassment and violence, it may be possible to harness the symbolic power of the police by making visible improvements to the way they respond to it (Fray et al., 2022; Hohl & Stanko, 2022; Sowersby et al., 2022).

It is widely considered that movements like #MeToo, have given survivors the confidence to voice their experiences and is contributing to positive changes in public opinion (Sweeny, 2020). Even with advancements, there is still a critical need to promote increased empathy and comprehension within communities and among individuals regarding sexual harassment. In order to do this, ingrained attitudes and social conventions about sexual harassment must be questioned. Redefining public views of sexual harassment and creating a culture in which victims are supported, offenders are held responsible, and society as a whole strives to eradicate this ubiquitous problem requires education campaigns, honest communication, and legislative changes. This research therefore attempts to contribute to addressing this issue by seeking to better understand the psychosocial correlates of public attitudes towards sexual harassment. Shifting public perceptions is essential for creating a society that values consent, respects boundaries, and actively opposes all forms of sexual harassment and the way in which this may be achieved, is by better understanding those most likely to endorse problematic beliefs surrounding sexual harassment, such that tailored interventions can be designed and evaluated.

In addition to being correlated with the actual occurrence of sexual harassment (Crittenden, 2009), endorsing views that are supportive of such behaviour also feeds into a generalised misperception about sexual harassment and its victims. These false beliefs frequently discourage victims from coming forward with reports of occurrences and downplay how serious the problem is, allowing it to go unchecked. Common defences like "the woman is overreacting" or "it was just harmless banter" work to undermine the experiences of victims (Page et al., 2015). When individuals believe these beliefs, victims may minimize the seriousness of the harassment, place the blame on themselves, and decide not to report it.

As a result, the actions of those who commit these crimes go undetected and could develop into more serious kinds of violence or coercion. My study is important in order to better understand who holds these problematic viewpoints so that they can be targeted through tailormade education programmes.

2. Literature Review

Sexual harassment remains a serious social concern in England and Wales, reflecting complex issues with gender relations, power, and cultural perspectives. In 2023, five percent of those sixteen years of age and older said they had encountered at least one type of sexual harassment in the previous twelve months. The prevalence was around three times higher in women (8%) than in men (3%) according to the Office for National Statistics. Studies by the Trades Union Congress (2016) showed that more than half of UK women had experienced sexual harassment at work, underscoring the fact that a sizable number of people face sexual harassment on a yearly basis, with a disproportionate number of women being affected.

A growing emphasis is being placed on creating initiatives to stop sexual harassment, however, appeals for stricter restrictions and more effective application of current laws have been heard consistently throughout the world (Stone and Vogelstein 2019). In E&W, the inadequacy of the current legislation to address public sexual harassment has continued to be a source of worry for legislators and women's rights organisations explaining the large prevalence of sexual harassment offences that still occur. According to Bell et al. (2002 pg.163), the general goal of anti-sexual harassment rules is to "deter those who might harass, encourage those who would report harassment, and protect harassment targets". Institutions, the legal system, and society at large need to remain dedicated to promoting awareness of the prevalence of sexual harassment and creating safer, more equitable environments.

Despite this, a 2021 UN survey found that 80% of sexual harassment victims in the UK never report the incident (UN Women UK, 2021). But among all of the reasons, of primary concern is the widespread belief that a complaint will not result in a change or improvement and might actually lead to a worsening of the situation due to the distress caused by the reporting process itself (Bell, Street, & Stafford, 2014). There are several factors that may discourage the reporting of sexual harassment. Some of the reasons for people’s reluctance to report sexual harassment are rooted in the fear of retaliation from a perpetrator and

judgement from others (Bergman et al., 2002). The impact of high-profile incidents, media coverage, and campaigns on people's willingness to report both recent and historical incidents to the police are likely to result in annual variations in the number of offences recorded by the police. The culture of silence surrounding it has adversely affected research development. It has been difficult to gain a deep insight into the victim's perspective on sexual harassment because many women are afraid to disclose their stories due to a fear of retaliation or because they are uncertain as to whether their experience can be considered sexual harassment (Freedman-Weiss et al., 2020). However, in recent years, an online community has emerged to oppose the isolation victims of workplace harassment were experiencing. The #MeToo movement demonstrated the magnitude of a problem that had been masked by mass underreporting, with Facebook recording 4.7 million users of the hashtag within 24 hours of Milano's tweet (Baum, 2019) and trended in 85 different countries (Jaffe 2018). #MeToo created a space for female victims to share their experiences without fear of retaliation, disbelief, or judgement and has created a fresh wave of international enthusiasm for the fight against sexual harassment. Not only has this demonstrated the vast range of experiences which constitute sexual harassment, but it has also begun to dismantle the normalization of these abusive behaviours. Throughout history, women have struggled with the widespread problem of sexual harassment, frequently lacking sufficient resources to address it (Siegel, 2003). In the past, forensic psychiatrists, and courts frequently viewed allegations of sexual harassment with scepticism. They generally believed that these kinds of incidents were unusual, and cases were either ignored, normalised, or handled insufficiently, with discussions on the topic lacking prominence (Recupero, 2018). However, the criteria for assessing claims of sexual harassment may be shifting as a result of the increased public recognition of women's voices in recent times, as demonstrated by movements like #MeToo. Nowadays, sexual harassment is more commonly accepted in the UK, and as a result, companies are putting stronger policies in place to deal with it (Pina, 2019).

This chapter will situate this study within the research by reviewing the literature that is currently accessible. It will cover some of the key issues surrounding sexual harassment, its relation to sociodemographic factors and explore the attitudes held towards it in E&W. The conceptualisation and measurement of psychopathy and psychopathic personality traits will also be looked at and its potential relationship with sexual harassment myth endorsement as well as touching on the role of self-esteem and whether this can affect

attitudes towards sexual harassment. Furthermore, it will identify gaps in the literature and present prospects for future research in this area.

2.1. Historic review of sexual harassment

The recognition of sexual harassment as a form of gender discrimination evolved in the 1970s, coinciding with a spike in scholarly research on the subject following the release of US author Catherine MacKinnon's landmark article, "Sexual Harassment of Working Women," in 1979 (Blackstone et al., 2009). Referrals to "Sexual Harassment" first surfaced in the UK's mainstream media in 1975, initially as a result of US stories being reported; official organisational responses have since spread quickly (Dobbin and Kelly 2007). By then, the term had gained widespread usage, women had come forward to speak about experiences they had long kept hidden, and a common issue had been identified (Bacchi & Jose, 1994), coined as an obstacle to women's equality (Thomas, 2004). As legal and academic understanding of sexual harassment grew, so did informal public perceptions. Examining sexual harassment through a historical lens helps us to pose some basic questions regarding the nature of the practice, the contexts in which it has been debated, and the laws and legalese that either permit or restrict the relevant behaviour (Siegel, 2003).

Although sexual harassment has always existed, attitudes towards it and how it is addressed have changed over time. Studies and surveys throughout the years have repeatedly shown that a sizable percentage of people, especially women, have at some point in their life encountered sexual harassment in the UK. According to the Office for National Statistics (2023), 25% of women between the ages of 16 and 24 reported having experienced sexual harassment. In more recent years, there have been calls for a major shift in how society views and handles harassment as a result of the #MeToo movement and other initiatives (Bethel, 2018). The act of women banding together and talking about their experiences has not only increased the frequency of conversations about sexual harassment in society but has also sparked a sense of solidarity and encouraged more people to come forward and share their stories, highlighting the historical shift. Unfortunately, official complaints remain remarkably low for a number of reasons, such as the individual bearing the burden of proof, the process often being ambiguous and traumatising, the presence of institutional and societal barriers to reporting, and the unsatisfactory results for the complainants (Pina, 2019), thus making it difficult to determine the annual rate of sexual harassment.

Another factor contributing to the difficulty in determining the exact number of women who experience sexual harassment is because many of the individuals experiencing these behaviours rarely label them as such. Many studies (Ellis, Barak, and Pinto 1991; Ilies et al., 2003; Magley, Hulin, et al. 1999; Magley and Shupe 2005) have shown that while over half of working women report experiencing sexual harassment at work, less than 20 percent of those women actually characterise the experience as "sexual harassment". It is understandable that a significant portion of the research in this field has focused on identifying the precise factors that influence an individual's perception of sexual harassment, as what one person identifies as such may not be the same for another.

2.2. Understanding sexual harassment perpetration.

Examining the many causes that lead people to engage in sexual harassment is necessary to comprehend the perpetration of such behaviour and is a crucial aspect of preventative initiatives (Cedeno & Bohlen, 2022). It has been contentious to concentrate just on the factors that predict sexual harassment targeting, in part due to the natural tendency to "blame the victims". Victim blaming is the practice of not holding the offender responsible for their conduct, but rather attributing the damaging or abusive behaviour that a person experiences to their words or actions (Sexual Assault Centre of Edmonton, 2022). Moreover, victim focused research can result in a potentially skewed picture of sexual harassment perpetration (Gruber & Morgan, 2005). While further research on harassers and the cultural environments that foster harassment is undoubtedly needed, knowing who is being targeted is still essential for risk assessment, developing policy solutions, and comprehending the reasons for some targets' silence and others' outburst. According to studies, young people frequently blame women and girls for acts of violence against them and have victim-blaming attitudes (Sundaram & Jackson, 2018). Considering sexual harassment is often a predictor as well as a cause of gender and other social injustices, concerns about it are consistent with psychology's social justice goals (McLaughlin et al., 2017). From a sociocultural gender perspective, sexual harassment results from processes of gender role socialisation that support male dominance, sexual objectification of women, and cultural acceptance of violence against women (Cleveland & McNamara, 1996; Galdi., et al 2014). The views of feminist psychology indicate that sexual harassment frequently results from and perpetuates the current gender hierarchy

in which heterosexual men have greater power and privilege, and the root of SH is often placed in traditional gender norms and roles (Holland & Cortina, 2016). Hostile sexist attitudes, a short-term mating orientation, acceptance of rape and SH myths, low empathy, and support for traditional masculine ideology are all examples of SH proclivity factors (Diehl et al, 2016; Fox & Tang, 2017; Pryor, 1987). Sexism has been shown to have a major influence on perceptions of sexual harassment in the workplace (Russell & Trigg, 2004), with empirical evidence on the relationship between high levels of hostile and benevolent sexism and a lower perception of sexual harassment (Sibley & Wilson, 2004). Sakallı-Uğurlu et al., (2010) found that hostile sexism by men and women was a predictor of tolerant attitudes toward sexual harassment, attributing the occurrence of harassment to provocation by women. According to Thornton's (2018) analysis, women worldwide are overrepresented at the bottom of the workplace hierarchy, holding only 25% of high positions. McLaughlin et al, (2012) suggests employees such as women, people of colour, those in precarious positions, and those with the least authority at work are seen to be more vulnerable and are thus more likely to experience sexual harassment.

Previous studies demonstrate that personality influences engagement in sexual harassment. In terms of personality traits sexual harassment proclivity is associated with low levels of honesty–humility and with lower levels of openness (Lee et al., 2003). Males who engage in sexual harassment tend to exhibit lower levels of conscientiousness and accept the myths surrounding it. Conversely, sexual harassing behaviours in women are linked to increased neuroticism and extraversion. The relationship between sexual harassment behaviours and perceived social standards was also less for women who were more neurotic or extraverted, indicating that differences in views were related to certain characteristics (Hardies, 2019). SH proclivity is also linked to the "Dark Triad" personality traits of psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism (Zeigler-Hill et al., 2016).

According to Abbey et al. (2014), alcohol use is well acknowledged as a mediating element in the commission of sexual violence in general. Alcohol use has been shown to dramatically raise the likelihood of sexual harassment for both the victim and the harasser (Abbey et al., 1998; Koss et al., 1987; Norris, Nurius, & Graham, 1999). Furthermore, drinking alcohol might make victims less aware of their inhibitions and perpetrators less sensitive to social cues, which could result in misinterpretations of sexual intentions (Abbey et al., 1998; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987).

2.3. Prevalence, attrition, and consequences of sexual harassment in E&W

Sexual harassment has been theorized as a stressor with consequences for the physical and mental health of its targets. Harassment is linked to a higher chance of anxiety, depression, and PTSD in addition to a lower sense of psychological well-being, self-worth, and confidence (Pryor and Fitzgerald 2003; Welsh 1999; Willness, Steel, and Lee 2007 as cited in Houle et al. 2011). The few studies that have examined the frequency and health effects of sexual harassment victimisation in adolescents have found that girls were more likely than boys to attempt suicide, have lower self-esteem, admit to taking sexual harassment more personally, and be psychologically more affected by the behaviour (Bagley, Bolitho, & Bertrand, 1997; Chiodo, Wolfe, Crooks, Hughes, & Jaffe, 2009; Gadin & Hammarstrom, 2005). One of the most significant effects is that it can impede women's freedom of movement and general daily decision-making (Dhillon & Bakaya, 2014). Women adapt and limit their own behaviours, language, and movements to prevent or lessen the effects of sexual harassment and violence in public places, as evidenced by the worldwide online project The Everyday Sexism Project, which gathers women's stories of sexism, harassment, and violence. Their accounts demonstrate the sexualized intimidation that women face just when running, waiting for taxis, or walking on the street (Sundaram & Jackson, 2018). Numerous research findings suggest that street harassment of women and girls can begin as early as age 11 (Betts et al., 2019; Girlguiding, 2021). Recognising that not everyone will suffer the same set of symptoms is crucial because the impacts of sexual harassment are individual. In order to help victims deal with the psychological effects of sexual harassment, supportive therapies like counselling and therapy can be quite helpful. In order to foster healing and recovery, it is crucial to establish a secure and encouraging environment in both professional and interpersonal settings.

Based on empirical evidence, women who are subjected to harassment may be more susceptible to negative physiological reactions, including hypertension and cephalalgia, (Baum, 2019). Physical symptoms such as headaches, nausea, restless nights, appetite loss, and weight loss are commonly reported by victims of sexual harassment (Willness et al. 2007). Reports of harassment have a direct bearing on one's ability to advance professionally, leave a job (McLaughlin et al., 2017) and its effects can disrupt well-being at work (Brown et al., 2017). These effects can persist long after the harassment has occurred and may impact

victims' overall well-being and mental health. Sexual harassment can act as a barrier to full participation in education, employment, and public life. Victims may feel reluctant to attend school, participate in extracurricular activities, or engage in social events for fear of encountering their harasser or experiencing further harassment. Comparable to the coercive and controlling actions taken by abusive individuals against their intimate partners (Conroy et al., 2023), certain behaviours—such as sexualized compliments, remarks about one's appearance or attire, and wolf whistling at a colleague or acquaintance—might not seem like harassment when taken alone, while for others, the nature and frequency of the behaviour is problematic.

2.4. Attitudes towards sexual harassment in E&W

Sexual harassment is among the most underreported social issues globally and in the UK (Berdahl & Raver, 2011)**.** Myths surrounding sexual harassment have allowed hostile sexism and patriarchal violence to become more common (Diehl et al., 2018). Lonsway et al. (2008) defines sexual harassment myths as the idea that women overstate the severity and scope of their harassment and cause their own victimisation. Sexual harassment myths are linked to arguments in favour of making sexual advances and downplaying the seriousness of sexual harassment (Rotundo et al., 2001). Page, Pina, and Giner-Sorolla (2016) showed positive correlations between sexual harassment myth acceptance and moral disengagement in sexual harassment. More specifically, those who are likely to believe sexual harassment myths may lack moral judgment, which, in turn, can influence emotional reactions to hostile work environment harassment. Sexual harassment myths encompass societal beliefs that: (1) women invite unwanted sexual behaviour, (2) sexual conduct at work is normal, natural, and/or inevitable, and (3) that sexually harassing acts are harmless and pleasurable (Lonsway et al., 2008). Nonetheless, there exists a discrepancy in the proportion of sexual harassment incidents that are reported. According to Foster and Fullager (2018), victims worry that their complaints won't be taken seriously or regarded seriously enough, which would spare the harasser from repercussions.

According to Kunkel et al. (2003), people are regularly exposed to sexual content in the media. The portrayal of women as sexual objects in various media forms, including magazines, music videos, video games, and movies, fosters increased tolerance for misconceptions

surrounding rape, gender role norms, hostile sexual views, and benign sexism. It also corresponds with a decline in support for feminist viewpoints (Milburn et al., 2000). Sexual harassment can therefore be regarded as one of the most telling signs of women being objectified in society (Bernard et al., 2018). Sexual objectification in the media not only affects attitudes toward women, but it also leads women to internalize this perspective and to self-objectify (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Social media gives survivors a voice against sexual harassment and helps campaigns like #MeToo gain momentum. It is becoming a potent instrument for campaign organisation, lobbying, bringing offenders accountable and can be a useful tool to educate users about consent and the consequences of sexual harassment. This being said the digital sphere can magnify undesirable behaviours with instances of online harassment and inappropriate content. Everyday sexism and harassment are either invisible, go unrecognised, or are also regularly written off as something that 'just occurs' and that women should be able to handle (Thomas and Kitzinger, 1994). As evidenced by the propensity of participants to put up with sexual harassment, this kind of procedure eventually feeds a vicious circle of silence that silences victims (Zonicle, 2022) fosters a culture in which victims feel reluctant to report (Sundaram & Jackson, 2018). The effort to confront sexual harassment also becomes invisible because individuals who do so are frequently portrayed as disruptive and as causing harm to the establishment (Sundaram & Jackson, 2018).

However, sexual harassment appears to be taken seriously by employers in the UK. Sexual harassment was included in the harassment policies of 111 organisations out of 112 surveyed in the UK which shows a change in attitudes towards creating safer and more respectful environments in England and Wales, reflecting a rising awareness of and dedication to addressing this issue. Sixty-nine percent of respondents considered sexual harassment to be a "fairly important problem for employers," compared to seventeen percent who considered it to be a "major problem" and two percent who said it was "no problem at all" (Equal Opportunities Review, 2002 as cited in Hunt et al., 2010).

Lawmakers in the UK have become increasingly concerned about the pervasiveness of the issue, as evidenced by a 2018 Parliamentary Inquiry on sexual harassment in public spaces and a 2018 House of Commons briefing paper on the subject of sexual harassment in higher education emphasising the importance in changing public attitudes (Boyer, 2012). The UK government has recently proposed the Protection against Sex-based Harassment in Public Bill (UK Parliament, 2023), in response to advocacy from women's rights organisations and

drawing from the first-hand experiences of women and girls. This measure is now being examined in the House of Lords and has not faced any opposition during its passage through parliament. It seeks to permit a maximum two-year sentence for anyone found guilty of various counts of sexual harassment and street harassment. It is anticipated that the new directive's implementation will help law enforcement deal with cases of sexual harassment in public spaces more skilfully.

3.Sexual Harassment Attitudes and Sociodemographics

3.1. Attitudes towards SH and age

Associations between age related social attitudes are intricate and frequently intertwined with shifts across generations (Ohse & Stockdale, 2008). Compared to earlier generations, younger generations show higher degrees of acceptance towards sexual harassment, according to Lott et al. (1992). This demonstrates how attitudes towards sexual harassment are influenced by generational variations and the pervasiveness of false beliefs about what constitutes appropriate behaviour. Anticipating a positive link between age and the perception of sexual harassment is plausible given the proven association between sexism, sex-role beliefs, and perceptions of sexual harassment (e.g., Foulis and McCabe 1997; O'Connor et al. 2004; Wiener and Hurt 2000). This implies that older people are more likely than their younger counterparts to classify a situation at work as sexual harassment, in part because younger people are more likely than older people to harbour negative, sexist attitudes towards women (Ohse & Stockdale, 2008).

3.2. Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment and gender

According to some of the strongest findings (Berdahl and Moore 2006; Gallivan Nelson & Carroll, 2012; McCabe and Hardman 2005), women are less accepting than males of sexual activity at work and consider gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion to be more serious. More than males, women also reject a variety of "myths" surrounding SH, such as the notion that women exaggerate or invent the problem and have hidden agendas when they report SH (Lonsway et al., 2008). Kessler et al., (2020) highlights

women in comparison to men perceive a broader range of actions as sexual harassment. Crucially, though, sex disparities in perceptions seem to be contingent upon the behaviour of the offender (Osman 2006), when attention is verbal, unclear, or less frequent, gender differences in perceptions are less noticeable (Hurt et al., 1999 as cited in Osman 2007, Osman 2004). Gutek (1993) discovered that 59% of men and 89% of women considered sexual touching to be harassment, indicating women perceive sexual touching as harassment at higher rates than men. Furthermore, data indicates that LGBT individuals perceive sexual harassment in a different way. The opinions of college students on the sexual harassment of LGBT individuals, for instance, was examined by Brassel et al., 2018. When directed towards transgender persons, "unwanted sexual comments" were perceived as "put downs," while when directed against lesbian or gay people, they were perceived as "come-ons."

3.3. Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment and ethnicity

Cultural conventions and views regarding sexual harassment differ. Certain acts that others would view as harassment may be accepted or even normalised more readily in different cultures. Intersectional individuals, such as young women who are also racial minorities, have a higher risk of sexual harassment as they belong to multiple marginalized groups (Cantalupo, 2018). Although women from different backgrounds may be equally offended by certain actions, some groups are more prone to voice their discomfort than others. Hispanics and Asian-American women tend to share the belief that it is inappropriate to complain if they are sexually harassed (Marmo & Queneau, 2000) suggesting that ethnicity and cultural background can influence the interpretation and experience of sexual harassment. In a study of 37 African American women, Buchanan (2005) discovered that they thought their experiences were different from those of Caucasian women, especially in light of the stereotype that Black women are inherently promiscuous. This illustrates how attitudes towards sexual harassment can be shaped by racial stereotypes, which affects how people interpret and react to incidents of sexual harassment involving BAME as well as how society perceives these incidents. Fitzgerald and Shullman (1993, p. 13) stated that research on cultural beliefs and attitudes on sexual harassment "may be best conceptualised in much the same way as rape myths" due to their similarities. While some research shows that participants who identify as Caucasian have higher RMA than participants who identify as

Black, Asian, and other Minority Ethnic (BAME) (Stephens et al., 2016), other more recent research indicates that BAME participants in the UK are more likely than Caucasian participants to express problematic attitudes regarding sexual violence (Conroy et al., 2023; Willmott et al., 2024) which, in terms of sexual harassment, we can presume to be comparable. In order to develop more effective and inclusive prevention, intervention, and support programmes, further research and understanding of the intersections between sexual harassment and ethnicity are needed.

3.4. Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment and educational attainment

Sexual harassment in educational settings is a distressing aspect of learning and is not a recent development in higher education across the globe (Kayuni, 2013). Higher educated people tend to be more aware of societal issues, including sexual harassment, and excessive acceptance of sexual harassment myths is often the result of ignorance about the circumstances and consequences of it (Diehl et al., 2014). Studies indicate that those who have obtained sexual harassment education were less likely to believe sexual harassment myths than others. The field can benefit practically from the findings of training effects, which imply that educational workshops have the ability to lessen the acceptance of negative attitudes towards sexual harassment (Lonsway et al., 2008). Due to classes, seminars, and university efforts, individuals with higher educational attainment may be more exposed to conversations around consent, gender equality, and job ethics. Increased emphasis on respecting boundaries, comprehending power dynamics, and fostering a culture of consent may result from this increased knowledge of sexual harassment and its negative effects. Given the widespread misperception of sexual harassment cases and the customary tendency to minimise the detrimental effects of SHMA on its targets, educating people about the serious repercussions of sexual harassment could play a significant role in prevention efforts (Diehl et al. 2014). Still, the higher education sector's progress was deemed to be uneven and excessively sluggish in a recent independent assessment of how institutions have applied educational programmes regarding the matter. It was determined that additional regulatory action was necessary (OFSTED, 2021).

3.5. Attitudes towards Sexual Harassment and psychopathy traits

The PPTS evaluates characteristics (affective responsiveness, cognitive responsiveness, interpersonal manipulation, and egocentricity) that are consistent with Cleckley's (1941) original conceptualization of psychopathy. Affective responsiveness more precisely describes traits like emotional shallowness and poor empathy. The capacity to comprehend and cognitively reflect the emotions of others, as well as to interact emotionally with them on a cognitive level, is measured by cognitive responsiveness. The study of interpersonal manipulation looks into traits including pretence, grandiosity, and dishonesty. Lastly, egocentricity is associated with a propensity to prioritise one's own values, views, and pursuits (Boduszek et al., 2018). Personality traits have a strong relationship with perceptions, attitudes, and behaviours (Paulhus et al., 2018). This relationship influences how bystanders react when faced with circumstances like sexual harassment (Reid & Dundes, 2017). Leone et al. (2020) conducted a study which highlighted the importance of empathy in bystander intervention for sexual harassment. A core trait of psychopathy is a lack of empathy, which may result in a lack of care indifference towards victims of sexual harassment and sexual violence in general. The correlation between psychopathy, beliefs about rape, and sexual offences is well-established in previous research, where affective disorders, interpersonal characteristics, and beliefs about rape are commonly linked to a higher risk of committing sexual violence (Hoffman & Verona, 2019; Johnson & Beech, 2017). Whilst little prior testing has looked at these psychopathy traits and sexual harassment attitudes, rape myth literature has, and has found according to Watts et al. (2017), among the student population investigated, callous affect and a lack of empathy to be direct predictors of rape myth acceptance. These results are consistent with those of Methot-Jones et al. (2019), who found that the same traits of psychopathy were associated with violent and sexist attitudes towards women in general. Egocentricity was revealed to be a significant predictor of RMA after adjusting for gender by Cooke et al. (2022) and Ioannides and Willmott (2024). DeLisle et al. (2019) discovered that in a small sample of active military personnel, RMA scores were correlated with both the affective and interpersonal aspects of psychopathy. Endorsement of Rape myths has the potential to deter people from feeling empathy and from realising the advantages of stepping in and ending an unwanted sexual encounter (Willmott & Widanaralalage, 2024). Thus, even in cases where a person has empathy, their support for

Rape Myths may lessen the possibility that they would become involved as a spectator (Longpré et al, 2022). It is reasonable to assume that the connections between psychopathy and rape myths (see Willmott et al., 2024) would also apply to myths about sexual harassment; nonetheless, more research is warranted to help comprehend the relationship between the four facets of psychopathy and the pervasive issue of sexual harassment, into which my study seeks to shed more light.

4. Psychopathy

4.1. Significance of psychopathy

Understanding psychopathy can help one better understand the underlying biological and psychological processes that underlie antisocial behaviour. This knowledge can be useful in determining risk factors, creating preventative strategies, and creating focused interventions for people who are more likely to engage in these kinds of behaviours. Due to its profound effects on people, relationships, and legal systems, psychopathy is a prominent topic in the domains of psychology, criminology, and general society. Analysing psychopathy's clinical, social, and legal ramifications is necessary to comprehend its relevance (Kiehl and Hoffman 2011).

4.2. Evolution and historical perspectives of psychopathy

Psychopathy can also be found in preindustrial communities, indicating that it is not a product of modern civilization's needs but has existed from the beginning of human history. Psychopathy has also evaded psychiatry. Psychopathy did not fall into any of the three basic categories of mental disorder that medicine recognised until the mid-eighteenth century: sadness (depression), psychosis, and delusion. Consequently, the phrase "mania without delusions" was coined by the renowned French psychiatrist Philippe Pinel (1745– 1826) (Millon et al. 1998, as cited in Buzina, 2012), and he is deserving of credit for being the first to describe the phenomenon. Hervey Cleckley influenced how psychopathy is currently understood (Lilienfeld et al., 2014). Cleckley published his ground-breaking research on psychopathy in 1941, and it has shaped our comprehension of the concept ever since. Case

studies of people who were somewhat successful in their pursuits but exhibited a variety of actions associated with a certain set of underlying problematic personality traits were detailed in 'The Mask of Sanity' (Cleckley, 1964).

4.3. Psychopathy and demographic differences

Psychopathy is typified by patterns of behaviour and characteristics that are widely regarded as undesirable in most cultures and communities. Nonetheless, certain characteristics like impulsivity and egocentrism are commonly observed in kids and teenagers. Children and teenagers are still developing many critical relational skills and ways of thinking. Low empathy has been linked in numerous studies to children and adolescents who have ongoing behavioural issues and ongoing criminal careers as adults (Bjørnebekk and Mørkrid Thøgersen, 2021). There is evidence from certain studies that psychopathy manifests in both sexes, with the exception that men are more likely than women to exhibit all forms of psychopathy (Miller et al., 2011). Nonetheless, some contend that the "fundamental characteristics and defining manifestations of psychopathic traits" exhibit clear gender disparities (Forouzan & Cooke, 2005, p. 768). First, biological sex differences might result in differential expression of psychopathy in males and females. For example, because of differences in body size, women may rely less on physical aggression and more on manipulation and coercion to achieve the same goals (Nicholls & Petrila, 2005). Though they could manifest differently, there isn't much evidence to imply that psychopathic qualities are any less relevant to women. Cleckley (1964) once described psychopathic individuals as more intelligent than average and having superior general intelligence; these characteristics enabled them to manipulate others and have a superficial, glib interpersonal style. However, Salekin et al. (2004) concluded that, "Despite widespread adoption of the connection between psychopathy and intelligence during Cleckley's era, today's notion of psychopathy is no longer explicitly linked to good intelligence" (pg.74). More intelligent "psychopaths" can mimic emotions and use their traits to control others in a less evident and more efficient manner (Bate et al, 2014). However conflicting research studied by Sharratt et al, (2019) reveals that "psychopaths" may have lower IQs.

4.4. Measures for Assessing Psychopathy

Psychopathy evaluations have an impact on risk assessments, treatment planning, and sentence decisions in both legal and forensic situations. Comprehending the psychopathic inclinations of an individual can be beneficial in establishing legal accountability, assessing the likelihood of recidivism, and creating recovery plans. The Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCLR), created by Dr. Robert Hare (1991, 2003), is a popular instrument for evaluating psychopathy. Initially, the PCL was primarily meant to be used in forensic populations study, but over the past ten years, professionals in the criminal justice system as well as psychologists and psychiatrists employed in more conventional mental health settings have developed a keen interest in both the concept of psychopathy and the PCL itself (Hart et al, 1992). The PCL-R is a 20-item symptom construct rating scale that yields a psychopathy score between 0 and 40 based on a semi-structured interview, case file data, and other supporting documentation. The most common cut-off score for labelling someone as a psychopath is 30 or more. Nonetheless, some studies have identified subclinical.

4.5. Self-esteem and attitudes towards sexual harassment

Since self-worth is based on accepting one's thoughts and feelings (Berman et al., 2002), people who have higher self-esteem are more likely to show greater initiative (Baumeister et al., 2003). Their ability to recognise and confront sexual harassment may be enhanced by their increased assertiveness, which makes them less likely to follow social norms or myths that minimise sexual harassment, prioritising one's own opinions. One common exaggeration of the significance of self-esteem is the belief that all evil stems from low self-esteem and all good stems from high self-esteem (Manning, Bear and Minke, 2006). It is plausible that self-esteem, in particular heightened cases could serve as a link between the adoption of sexually aggressive behaviours and dysfunctional sexual attitudes, namely those associated with the "macho" culture (Moreira et al., 2021). A person's perception of themselves as a sexual being, is referred to as their ‘sexual self-esteem’. As a result, sexual self-esteem can be understood as the importance that an individual places on their sexuality, and it frequently influences views of what constitutes acceptable sexual behaviour (Mayers, Heller & Heller 2003). Cormier (2007) identifies a link between self-esteem and the way individuals perceive and articulate grievances, implying a potential correlation between self-perception and the

evaluation of others who share adverse experiences, such as sexual harassment however based on the limited evidence, further research is required into this relationship.

4.6. The current study

The endorsement of sexual harassment myths has been the subject of relatively few research to date. Psychosocial variables related to the acceptance of rape myths have been studied, but not in relation to sexual harassment. Additionally, the relevance, complexity, and practicality of the psychopathy measures used in earlier studies are restricted in which this study aims to contribute to development by using more robust and nuanced assessment instruments. To further explore the relationship between psychopathy and attitudes towards sexual harassment, the current study makes use of the Psychopathic Personality Trait Scale (Boduszek et al., 2016; 2018, 2022) and the Sexual Harassment Scale (Mazer and Percival 1989). According to Lott and colleagues (1982), the SHAS extends the 10-item tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory (TSHI) developed at the University of Rhode Island. Gender and ethnicity will accounted for during this study, as previous academic studies have demonstrated the importance of these factors. In order to ascertain whether self-esteem was a predictor of endorsement of sexual harassment myths and whether our perceptions of ourselves influence how we see others who encounter adverse experiences, the Rosenberg self-esteem scale (1965) was also implemented. This study makes use of the RSES because it has proven to successfully capture the intended concept, have good correlations with other measures, and reliably predict future behaviour or results (Rosenberg, 1965).

5. Methodology

5.1 Study Design

A cross sectional online survey-based design was implemented to collect data from participants at a single point in time, to investigate the possible relationship between demographic characteristics (gender and ethnicity) and psychological traits (AR, CR, IPM, EGO) on participant attitudes towards sexual harassment.

5.2. Participants and sampling procedure.

199 participants completed the survey in full. The research employed a dual sampling strategy, utilizing convenience sampling for its ease of accessibility and complementing it with snowball sampling. The study's participants were chosen from a small pool of initial contacts who satisfied the research criteria. For the purpose of enabling a snowball sampling method, the compliant participants were then asked to share the study with their networks and recommend more people they knew who fit the study characteristics and would be willing participants. Snowball sampling is regarded as a useful technique for the investigation of sensitive subjects (Waters, 2014), which makes it appropriate for this study that addresses the delicate issue of sexual harassment. The inclusion criteria required participants to be older than eighteen years old and to have a high level of written and spoken English. Three months were allotted to the data collection, which took place between November 2023 and January 2024 in order to guarantee a complete and representative dataset for analysis. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 94 years (M= 47.05, SD= 18.13). The majority of participants were female (64.3%), and the rest were men (35.7%). The highest level of educational attainment was above a university degree (50.8%), followed by individuals below a university degree (30.7%) and then individuals currently studying for a university degree (18.6%). Participants were mostly from a white background (86.4%) and the rest of participants were BAME (5% black or black British; 4% Asian or Asian British;3.5% mixed; and 1% other).

5.3. Measures

Demographic questions. Using self-reported open-ended answers to questions like "How old are you in years?", "How would you describe your gender?", "How would you describe your ethnicity?", demographic data was gathered and subsequently categorised. The highest level of education attained by the participants was another of the questions. Based on the responses given, age was recorded as a continuous variable, with gender, education and ethnicity binary coded as (1) male, (0) female; (1) university educated, (0) less than university educated; (1) Caucasian, (0) BAME. It should be noted that participants were not asked to report their gender identity or the gender they were assigned at birth; therefore, there is no

differentiation between biological sex and gender identity. The responses provided for the gender variable were coded as male or female. Whilst the use of the term 'BAME' can be seen as problematic and can mask experiences and specific challenges faced by individual ethnic groups, it is used in this study due to practicality and the need to highlight between disparities and the white majority.

5.3.1. Psychopathic Personality Traits Scale - Revised (PPTS-R; Boduszek et al., 2022).

Boduszek and colleagues' psychopathic personality traits scale is designed to assess psychopathic traits in both forensic and non-forensic populations with higher scores indicating increased levels of each psychopathic trait (e.g., item 11, "I know how to fake emotions like pain and hurt to make other people feel sorry for me" and item 21, "seeing people hurt doesn't distress me"). The self-report scale consists of 28 items that are measured across 4 subscales. Each subscale consists of 7 items and measures one of the following: affective responsiveness [AR] (where higher scores indicate greater deficits in affective responsiveness), Cognitive responsiveness [CR] (higher scores indicate greater deficits in CR), interpersonal manipulation [IPM] (higher scores indicate an increased ability to manipulate others), and egocentricity [EGO] (higher scores indicate increased egocentricity). Every attribute is handled on a continuum without any cut-off points. A 5-point Likert scale is used in the scale (1 being strongly disagree and 5 being strongly agree) and items 22 and 10 are reverse scored. Sub scores ranged from 7-35. The test is an expanded and revised version of the original PPTS, which was created by Boduszek and colleagues in 2016 and 2018. Instead of assessing behaviours, the items on the test were designed to evaluate knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs.

5.3.2. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale-(Rosenberg,1965)

The Rosenberg self-esteem scale is a unidimensional scale consisting of 10 statements regarding general feelings about oneself (e.g item 9, "all in all I am inclined to feel like I'm a failure", item 6, "I certainly feel useless at times"). Participants may indicate how strongly they disagree or agree with each statement using a 4-point Likert scale (1 being strongly disagree and 4 being strongly agree). Items 2,5,6,8,9 are reverse scored. The test was first intended to

gauge high school pupils' self-esteem. Nonetheless, the scale has been used to numerous groups since its creation, including adults, and standards have been made available for numerous of those groups (Rosenberg, 2006). Research indicates that the RSES is dependable and valid (Kernaleguen & Conrad, 1980), with an internal consistency coefficient of 0.89 (Kernis et al. 1989). Total scores range from 10-40. Low self-esteem is indicated by scores below 15, whereas scores between 15 and 25 are within the usual range (Rosenberg, 2019).

5.3.3. The Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (SHAS) - (Mazer & Percival, 1989)

In order to investigate the role of ideology and awareness in the reporting of sexual harassment experiences, the Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (SHAS) was created for a study that looked at relationships between sexual harassment experiences, perceptions about harassment, and attitudes (about both harassment and sex roles) (Mazer & Percival, 1989). The 19-item sexual harassment scale comprises statement items with an opinion component that are scored according to respondents' experiences and views of sexual harassment, gauging their attitudes. Sample items include, item 1, “an attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them” and item 14, “a lot of what people call sexual harassment is just normal flirtation between men and women”. The measure includes a variety of distinct sexual harassment claims and is assessed on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) with higher scores corresponding to increased tolerance and acceptance of sexual harassment and the myths surrounding it. Total scores range from 19-95.

5.4. Study procedure.

Using a cross-sectional design, data was collected via online survey. Although it doesn't ensure it, the anonymity provided by an anonymous online survey completed from the comfort of your home is intended to promote honesty in responses. Important ethical issues were taken care of before data collection began (as detailed in the ethical procedures section below). Participants were initially shown the participant information form after clicking the survey link either sent directly by the researcher or shared by a participant. This included information on the survey's contents, the study's inclusion requirements, contact information for the

researcher and project supervisor, and information about what to do if respondents found the survey distressing. Following their perusal of the information sheet, they were referred to the consent form, which confirmed their right to withdraw and described all the uses of their data. Should they choose not to consent, the survey would conclude. Once consent was obtained, participants were asked to answer a series of demographic questions, including those about gender, age, ethnicity, and their highest level of education. They were also asked trait-based questions, from the Rosenberg self-esteem scale (1965) and the psychopathic personality traits scale (Boduszek et al., 2022), which was followed by attitudinal questions in the form of the sexual harassment scale evaluating participants perceptions towards sexual harassment (Mazer & Percival, 1989). Completion time for the questionnaire ranged between ten to twenty minutes.

5.5. Ethical procedures and considerations

The survey followed ethical protocols, and an ethics application was filed to Loughborough University in advance. In addition to the questionnaire, the application included a consent form, participant information page, and debrief explaining the study's objectives and what the participants should expect. If participants wished to withdraw from the study at any given point, they were reminded of their right to do so without needing to provide explanation. Participants were assured of their anonymity and informed that their replies would only be utilised in the study. Recognising the sensitive nature of the subject, it was critical to provide contact information for support agencies in case any of the questions caused discomfort to the participants or they had been personally impacted by any of the issues raised. They acknowledged their understanding and readiness to participate by signing the consent form upon reading the participant information page. If they agreed, they could proceed to the demographic questions; if not, they proceeded to the debrief. After data collection was complete participants were debriefed and thanked for their time.

5.6. Analytical procedure

Data analysis was conducted using version 29 of the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Following the survey's closure, the data was moved to an SPSS data file so that analysis

could start. Group differences in SHAS scores between participant demographic groupings were examined using t-tests. The study employed hierarchical regression analyses to investigate the role of psychopathic personality trait variables (AR, CR, IPM, and EGO) in the first phase of the model. In the second step, control factors (gender and ethnicity) were incorporated. The frequency distributions on the likert scales for SHAS, PPTS and RSES were also calculated via descriptive statistics.

6. Results

Descriptive statistics including the means (*M*) and standard deviations (*SD*) for all continuous study variables including, the four PPTS subscales, SHAS, RSES and age, are presented in Table 1. Descriptive data indicates that on average participants scored low on all four psychopathy dimensions. The average self-esteem score was 29, which was relatively high given that the scores could vary from 10 to 40. This suggests that the majority of the people in the sample had reasonably high levels of self-esteem. The majority of participants did not hold problematic attitudes towards sexual harassment, as seen by the mean score of 48 out of 95, which can be considered low when evaluating sexual harassment myths.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for all continuous variables.

Variables	*M*	*SD*	Range	Minimum	Maximum
AR	8.05	2.37	21.00	7.00	28.00
CR	13.14	2.34	15.00	9.00	24.00
IPM	11.21	3.68	21.00	7.00	28.00
EGO	9.14	2.70	21.00	7.00	28.00
SHAS	48.07	10.14	51.00	23.00	74.00
AGE	47.05	18.13	76.00	18.00	94.00
RSES	29.25	4.67	23.00	17.00	40.00

Note: AR = Affective Responsiveness; CR = Cognitive Responsiveness; IPM = Interpersonal Manipulation; EGO = Egocentricity; SHAS = Sexual harassment attitude scale scores; RSES = Rosenberg self-esteem scale scores.

To examine the group differences in ethnicity scores for sexual harassment attitude scores, psychopathy personality trait scores and self-esteem scores, independent samples *t*-tests were conducted and presented in Table 2. BAME participants (M = 8.88, SD = 2.46) scored statistically significantly higher on egocentricity than Caucasian participants (M= 10.77, SD = 3.54). This indicates that BAME participants exhibited significantly higher ecocentrism than their Caucasian counterparts. The degree of difference was moderate. BAME participants (M = 50.00, SD = 9.36) scored higher on the Sexual harassment attitude scale than Caucasian respondents (M = 47.76, SD = 10.25) though the degree of difference was not statistically significant. No other statistically significant differences were observed between BAME and Caucasian participants in participant self-esteem scores or for the other facets of psychopathy.

Table 2: Ethnicity differences in sexual harassment, self-esteem, and psychopathy scores.

Scale	Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	Cohen's *d*
SHAS	Caucasian	47.76	10.25	-1.064	.22
	BAME	50.00	9.36		
RSES	Caucasian	29.23	4.65	-1.420	-.03
	BAME	29.37	4.88		
AR	Caucasian	7.94	2.29	-1.634	-.34
	BAME	8.74	2.75		
CR	Caucasian	13.11	2.32	-.458	-.10
	BAME	13.33	2.48		
EGO	Caucasian	8.88	2.46	-2.677**	-.72
	BAME	10.77	3.54		
IPM	Caucasian	11.10	3.68	-1.029	-.21
	BAME	11.88	3.66		

Note: SHAS= Sexual harassment attitude scale, RSES= Rosenberg self-esteem scale, PPTS= Psychopathic personality trait scale; BAME = Black Asian Minority Ethnic heritage. Cohen's d: 0.2 = small effect size; 0.5 = moderate effect size; 0.8 = large effect size (Cohen, 1998) $^{**}p < .005$.

Independent samples T- tests were conducted to examine if any educational differences in sexual harassment, self-esteem, and psychopathy scores were observed among the current sample and are presented in table 3 below. University educated participants (M = 11.68, SD =

3.93) scored statistically significantly higher on interpersonal manipulation than non-university educated individuals (M = 11.68, SD = 3.93), highlighting university attendees were more manipulative overall. The degree of difference was small. Participants with a university education (M = 9.43, SD = 3.04) were also found to score statistically significantly higher in egocentricity compared to individuals who were not university educated (M = 8.47, SD = 1.51). This indicates that university attendees exhibit a higher level of egocentricity than their counterparts. The degree of difference was also small. Affective responsiveness levels varied across respondents with and without university education. Participants who attended university (M = 8.21, SD = 2.71) scored statistically significantly higher than participants who did not (M=7.68, SD=1.23). This suggests that participants with a university education had significantly less affective responsiveness overall. Here, the degree of difference was small. There were no other statistically significant differences found in sexual harassment attitude scores, self-esteem scores or cognitive responsiveness scores based upon level of education.

Table 3: Education differences in sexual harassment, self-esteem, and psychopathy scores.

Scale	Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	Cohen's *d*
SHAS	Uni educated	47.76	9.75	-.631	.10
	Less than uni educated	48.75	11.01		
RSES	Uni educated	29.40	4.67	.701	.11
	Less than uni educated	28.90	4.70		
AR	Uni educated	8.21	2.71	1.863*	.22
	Less than uni educated	7.68	1.23		
CR	Uni educated	13.01	2.44	-1.143	-.18
	Less than uni educated	13.42	2.08		
EGO	Uni educated	9.43	3.04	2.964**	.36
	Less than uni educated	8.47	1.51		
IPM	Uni educated	11.68	3.93	2.753***	.42
	Less than uni educated	10.14	2.77		

Note: PPTS= psychopathic personality trait scale; BAME = Black Asian Minority Ethnic heritage. Cohen's d: 0.2 = small effect size; 0.5 = moderate effect size; 0.8 = large effect size (Cohen, 1998) *p < .05. **p < .005. ***p <.001.

Table 4 presents the group differences between participant genders for sexual harassment, self-esteem, and psychopathy scores. Male participants (M = 51.43, SD = 46.20) scored statistically significantly higher on sexual harassment than females (M= 46.20, SD=9.75) highlighting men are more likely to endorse sexual harassment myths than females. The degree of difference was moderate. Male respondents (M = 30.32, SD = 4.74) scored statistically higher on levels of self-esteem than females (M = 28.65, SD = 4.54) and the degree difference was small. Men scored higher in all four psychopathy personality trait variables. Male participants (M = 9.11, SD = 3.42) scored statistically significantly higher in affective responsiveness than female participants (M = 7.46, SD = 1.14) displaying greater deficits in AR. The degree of difference was moderate. Male respondents (M = 13.60, SD = 2.85) scored significantly statistically higher in lack of cognitive responsiveness than female respondents (M = 12.8, SD = 1.95) indicating that men have significantly greater deficits in cognitive responsiveness than female participants. The degree of difference was small. Male participant's (M = 10.3, SD = 3.73) scored statistically significantly higher on egocentricity than female participants (M = 8.45, SD = 1.54). The degree of difference was moderate. Data related to interpersonal manipulation also indicated that male participants (M = 12.61, SD = 4.56) scored statistically significantly higher in comparison to female respondents (M = 10.42, SD = 2.81). This indicates that male participants exhibited significantly higher interpersonal manipulation tendencies than females in the current sample. The degree of difference was again moderate. Overall, male participants scored statistically significantly higher in all study variables as shown in table 4.

Table 4: Gender differences in sexual harassment, self-esteem, and psychopathy scores

Scale	Group	*M*	*SD*	*t*	Cohen's *d*
SHAS	Male	51.43	10.01	3.590***	.53
	Female	46.20	9.75		
RSES	Male	30.32	4.74	2.440**	.36
	Female	28.65	4.54		
AR	Male	9.11	3.42	4.980***	.74
	Female	7.46	1.14		
CR	Male	13.6	2.85	2.290*	.34
	Female	12.8	1.95		
EGO	Male	10.3	3.73	5.110***	.76
	Female	8.45	1.54		
IPM	Male	12.61	4.56	4.180***	.62
	Female	10.42	2.81		

Note: SHAS = Sexual harassment attitude scale, RSES= Rosenberg self-esteem scale; BAME = Black Asian Minority Ethnic heritage. Cohen's d: 0.2 = small effect size; 0.5 = moderate effect size; 0.8 = large effect size (Cohen, 1998) *p < .05. **p < .005. ***p <.001.

Table 5 displays the correlations between all study variables including those related to SHAS scale scores and AR, CR, IPM, EGO, gender, and ethnicity. The strongest associations between study variables were observed were between SHAS and gender (r = .25, p < 001) followed by CR (r = .17, p < .001), EGO (r = .17, p < .001) and IPM (r = .17, p < .001).

Table 5. Correlations between SHAS, Psychopathy Trait scores, Gender, and Ethnicity.

Variables	SHAS	AR	CR	EGO	IPM	Gender	Ethnicity
SHAS	-						
AR	.11	-					
CR	.17***	.47***	-				
EGO	.17***	.74***	.33***	-			
IPM	.17***	.52***	.14**	.64***	-		
Gender	-.25***	-.34***	-.16**	-.34***	-.29	-	
Ethnicity	-.08	-.12	-.03	-.24***	-.07	.23	-

Note: SHAS = Sexual harassment attitude scale; AR = Affective Responsiveness; CR: Cognitive Responsiveness; IPM = Interpersonal Manipulation; EGO = Egocentricity *p < .05. **p < .005. ***p <.001.

Finally, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to explore whether psychopathic personality traits (AR, CR, IPM, and EGO) were directly associated with SHAS scores, while controlling for gender and ethnicity. The four dimensions of the Psychopathic Personality Traits Scale (PPTS) were entered in Step 1, followed by the inclusion of gender and ethnicity in Step 2. Model 1 was statistically significant F (4, 194) =2.97, p <.01, accounting for 6% of the variance in SHAS scores. Of the four psychopathy predictor variables in model one, only CR made a statistically significant contribution. This indicates that participants displaying greater deficits in cognitive responsiveness (cognitive empathy trait) exhibited higher SHAS scores, or alternatively put, greater endorsement of myths surrounding sexual harassment. After including ethnicity and gender at Step 2, the total variance explained by the six-predictor variable increased to 10% overall and was statistically significant, F (6 ,192) = 3.41, p < .001. Inclusion of gender and ethnicity at Step 2 accounted for a further 4% of variance in the outcome variable, R^2 change = .4, F change (2, 192) = 0.448. Two of the six predictor variables in model two were now shown to be statistically significant SHAS score predictors. Even after accounting for the effects of gender and ethnicity, CR (β = .16; p < .05) continued to have a statistically significant impact on SHAS scores. Gender (β = .21 p < .001) was also significantly associated with SHAS scores indicating that men in the sample, exhibited greater endorsement of sexual harassment myths than their female counterpart participants.

Table 6. Hierarchical Multiple Regression of psychopathy trait associations with SHAS scores.

	R	R^2	R^2 Change	B	SE	β	t
Step 1	.240	.058**					
AR				-.54	.47	-.13	-1.13
CR				.72	.34	.17*	2.08
EGO				.47	.43	.13	1.10
IPM				.36	.25	.13	1.43
Step 2	.31	.10***	.04				
AR				-.67	.47	-.16	-1.43
CR				.70	.34	.16*	2.06
EGO				.34	.44	.09	.77
IPM				.31	.25	.11	1.22
Gender				-4.43	1.59	-.21***	-2.79
Ethnicity				-.34	2.14	-.01	-.16

Note: SHAS= Sexual harassment attitude scale; AR = Affective Responsiveness; CR: Cognitive Responsiveness; IPM = Interpersonal Manipulation; EGO = Egocentricity *p < .05. ***p <.001.

7. Discussion

The research results provide insight into the intricate relationship between psychosocial traits and the acceptance of sexual harassment myths and misconceptions. There has been limited research on the elements that lead people to believe myths and misconceptions about sexual harassment, despite the fact that doing so is essential to creating successful preventative and intervention techniques. The reality is that academics continue to disagree over what constitutes psychopathy, how to define it, and how to evaluate it (Lilienfeld, 1998), which has always made researching it challenging. According to Harris and Rice (2006), recidivism should be the only outcome examined and Hare's original psychopathy check list (the most extensively used clinical/forensic measure of psychopathy) should be the only index utilised to quantify psychopathy. It is expected, however, that future research will encompass a wider range of definitions and forms of psychopathy, as well as a greater range of outcome factors, and will have a broader focus. With the purpose of advancing the literature, the current study employed the PPTS, a non-clinical, self-reported measure of psychopathy (Boduszek et al., 2016). While gender and ethnicity have been found to significantly influence the acceptance of Rape myths (Mori et al., 1995; Yapp & Quayle, 2018), they have not been adequately examined in the context of sexual harassment. This study adds to the body of literature by controlling for these important individual-level factors. A more nuanced view of the intricate interplay between individual qualities and societal circumstances in developing attitudes towards sexual harassment behaviour is provided by this comprehensive approach, which advances the literature on the link between psychopathy and attitudes towards sexual harassment.

The association between ethnicity and egocentricity among the four psychopathy characteristics examined was notable, even though ethnicity did not show up as a significant factor impacting attitudes towards sexual harassment in this study. To be more precise, egocentricity was substantially greater among those from Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) backgrounds than in people from Caucasian origins. This research implies that differences in egocentric inclinations among various ethnic groups may be caused by environmental or cultural variables. Cooke et al. (2022) found previously that egocentrism is a strong predictor of increased Rape Myth Acceptance. However, past research has not

specifically examined the association between egocentricity and attitudes towards sexual harassment. The apparent link between ethnicity and egocentricity in this study raises important concerns concerning the interplay of psychopathic traits, cultural factors, and attitudes towards sexual harassment.

Three of the four psychopathy dimensions examined—interpersonal manipulation, egocentricity, and affective responsiveness—showed a significant relationship with university education, indicating a noteworthy link between certain psychopathic traits and higher education. According to this research, people who have attended or are studying at university may be more prone to manipulative behaviour, self-centeredness, and decreased emotional responsiveness than people who have not attended university. It's interesting to note that these outcomes differ from those of Salekin et al.'s 2004 study, which found no connection between psychopathy and IQ. Bates et al. (2014), on the other hand, offers a different viewpoint, speculating that higher intellect could allow people to exhibit psychopathic tendencies more effectively and subtly, possibly hiding their presence.

Of the four psychopathy dimensions examined, cognitive responsiveness (cognitive empathy trait) was significantly related to sexual harassment. This relationship shows that individuals who have greater deficits in cognitive responsiveness hold more problematic views towards sexual harassment and have a greater acceptance of the myths surrounding it. Whilst empathy has never previously been explored as a distinct facet in past research with sexual harassment, this finding broadly accords with previous rape myth literature by Watts et al. (2017) who also found lack of empathy to be an important determinant of rape myth acceptance. Much like the rape myth literature (see Daly et al, 2024 for a review), participants sexual harassment attitude scores were also significantly positively correlated with cognitive responsiveness, suggesting a direct relationship between problematic attitudes and a lack of cognitive responsiveness. The results align with studies that have demonstrated inadequate empathy as a key SH predisposition component, supporting the myths around it (Diehl et al., 2016; Fox & Tang, 2017; Pryor, 1987). Given its significance for moral growth and prosocial behaviour, empathy is a crucial human quality (Van Dongen, 2020). The psychopathic personality is characterised by a lack of empathy, which means often they are emotionally unaffected by circumstances that typically elicit powerful emotions in others, such as seeing grief or suffering in others (Viding, 2019). The insights gained from responses to the SHAS provide

valuable understanding of individuals' attitudes and beliefs about sexual harassment and the common misconceptions about it, in which the findings emphasise how individuals' tendencies towards victim-blaming views are influenced by their lack of empathy towards victims.

Consistent with previous research (Berdahl and Moore 2006; Gallivan Nelson et al. 2007; McCabe and Hardman 2005) male participants expressed more problematic attitudes towards sexual harassment than female participants in which gender was significantly correlated with endorsement of sexual harassment myths in the current sample. Controlling for this demographic factor yielded interesting results, as cognitive responsiveness (characterised by one's ability to mentally represent another person's emotional processes and engage with others emotionally at a cognitive level) was still a significant determinant of sexual harassment myth belief and male participants had significantly greater deficits in cognitive responsiveness than female participants. Males also had a noteworthy relationship with the 3 other psychopathy dimensions scoring highly in affective responsiveness, interpersonal manipulation, and egocentricity too, which correlates with the 2011 research by Miller et al. suggesting that men are more likely than women to display psychopathy in all its manifestations. The affective responsiveness (AR) deficits observed in men, according to Patrick (1994), lend credence to the preconceptions of masculine emotional detachment. Higher levels of egocentrism and interpersonal manipulation (IPM) can also manifest as a preference for one's own needs and interests above those of others, a disrespect for other people's feelings and welfare, and a view of other people as nothing more than devices to be exploited for one's own gain. When considered as a whole, these traits may indicate possible challenges with processing emotions and empathising with other experiences. Although the findings suggest that women are more cognitively responsive than men, it is not a given that it applies to all women unless tested among a larger more representative sample in future. Diehl et al., 2016; Fox & Tang, 2017; Pryor, 1987 highlights, adopting traditional gender role norms and retaining sexist beliefs have been identified as important factors in the acceptance of sexual harassment and the myths surrounding it in which men do more so than women (Gallagher & Parrott, 2011). Men also exhibited higher levels of self-esteem than their female counterparts. Casale (2020), notes that boys and girls show similar levels of self-esteem in childhood, but by adolescence, a gender difference appears, with adolescent boys reporting

greater levels of self-esteem than adolescent girls. The most often mentioned causes for gender differences in self-esteem include biological differences (Schmitt et al., 2016) and gender roles (Zuckerman & Hall, 2016).

Despite recent social movements like #MeToo and other sexual assault awareness campaigns, our culture still lacks a thorough understanding of the frequency, dynamics, and repercussions of sexual harassment and assault. For this reason, education is necessary. A contributing factor to the problem's persistence is the ignorance and illiteracy surrounding sexual violence. This is demonstrated by the fact that many people have misconceptions about basic victim psychology and believe that real or legitimate victims of sexual violence will come forward quickly to share their stories. A trauma-informed disclosure and reporting environment can only be fostered by deeper education regarding the nature of harmful vs beneficial responses (Dworkin, Brill, & Ullman, 2019). Education regarding sexual harassment and assault is particularly important for institutional leaders, schools, and the workplace. In order to inform staff members on their rights and obligations with regard to sexual harassment, some businesses have implemented mandated training programmes including sexual harassment awareness training, bystander training, self-defence training, prevention, and response training (Freyd & Smidt, 2019). In general, programmes aimed at preventing sexual harassment through education and training are crucial parts of larger campaigns to advance respect, equity, and safety in businesses, educational institutions, and public spaces. To ensure that these programmes are relevant and effective in addressing changing cultural norms and concerns, ongoing evaluation and improvement are essential. In order to better target these interventions to the most vulnerable populations, it is necessary to understand the nomological network of harassment in order to identify the personal traits that will influence how others perceive harassment and what factors increase the likelihood of engaging in harassment and sexual violence in which this study has aimed to do so.

Study strengths and limitations.

It is important to consider several limitations when interpreting the study's findings. First, because social desirability response bias exists in all self-report studies, self-reported measures of psychopathy and SHAS may have an impact on the validity of the results. The phenomenon known as "social desirability bias" occurs when participants alter their answers

to fit anticipated researcher expectations or to present themselves in a more positive light. Furthermore, given that the majority of participants had completed a bachelor's degree or higher and that young, female, and Caucasian individuals were disproportionately represented, sampling bias may have an impact on the findings' capacity to be broadly generalised. Future studies should aim to enlist more diverse samples by using a range of sampling techniques such as systematic and stratified. This will improve the generalizability of the results by ensuring that demographic variables such as age, ethnicity, and gender are more proportionally represented. However, one advantage is that these variables have never been examined in this manner previously. One notable quality of the study is its cross-sectional design, which allowed for quick and thorough targeting of a sizable portion of the target population. Additionally, the guarantee of participant anonymity encourages open communication, which is especially important when discussing controversial topics. But it's important to proceed with caution and view these results as preliminary. A larger sample size will be required for future study in order to draw more reliable results.

8. Conclusion

The current study extends the literature on the role of psychosocial characteristics in explaining beliefs in myths and misconceptions towards sexual harassment by highlighting the importance of cognitive responsiveness, a trait unique to the psychopathic personality and the role of gender in expressing problematic attitudes towards sexual harassment specifically in men. Efforts to combat sexual harassment should consider both individual cognitive processes and larger societal dynamics. Interventions should be tailored to not just promote empathy and understanding, but also to challenge gender norms and stereotypes that perpetuate negative attitudes and actions. This study emphasised the need for focused interventions that target the psychological variables and underlying attitudes that support the spread of sexual harassment myths and misconceptions. While cultural perceptions and legislation approaches to sexual harassment are continually evolving in E&W, it is vital to have a current authentic study reflecting sentiments today. It is hoped that by identifying the involvement of psychosocial variables in generating these harmful beliefs around sexual harassment, policy makers will be able to take proactive steps to ensure that common misconceptions do not impede justice.

References

Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., & Ross, L. T. (1998). Sexual Assault Perpetration by College Men: The Role of Alcohol, Misperception of Sexual Intent, and Sexual Beliefs and Experiences. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *17*(2), 167–195. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1998.17.2.167

Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Woerner, J., Pegram, S. E., & Pierce, J. (2014). Review of Survey and Experimental Research That Examines the Relationship Between Alcohol Consumption and Men's Sexual Aggression Perpetration. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *15*(4), 265–282. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521031

Adams, L., Hilger, L., Moselen, E., Basi, T., Gooding, O., & Hull, J. (2020). *2020 Sexual Harassment Survey Government Equalities Office IFF Research*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/60f03e068fa8f50c77458285/2021-07-12_Sexual_Harassment_Report_FINAL.pdf

Bacchi, C., & Jose, J. (1994). Historicising sexual harassment. *Women's History Review*, *3*(2), 263–270. https://doi.org/10.1080/09612029400200050

Bagley, C., Bolitho, F., & Bertrand, L. (1997). Sexual assault in school, mental health and suicidal behaviors in adolescent women in Canada. *Adolescence*, *32*(126), 361–366. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9179331/

Bate, C., Boduszek, D., Dhingra, K., & Bale, C. (2014). Psychopathy, intelligence and emotional responding in a non-forensic sample: an experimental investigation. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *25*(5), 600–612. https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2014.943798

Baum, B. (2019). WORKPLACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE "ME TOO" ERA: THE UNFORESEEN CONSEQUENCES OF CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT. *Journal of Business and Behavioral Sciences*, *31(1), 4–24.* http://www.asbbs.org/files/2019/JBBS_31.1_Spring_2019.pdf#page=4

Baumeister, R. F., & Boden, J. M. (1998, January 1). *5 - Aggression and the Self: High SelfEsteem, Low Self-Control, and Ego Threat* (R. G. Geen & E. Donnerstein, Eds.). ScienceDirect; Academic Press. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/B9780122788055500067

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does High Self-Esteem

Cause Better Performance, Interpersonal Success, Happiness, or Healthier Lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *4*(1), 1–44.

Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review*, *103*(1), 5–33. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.103.1.5

Bell, M. E., Street, A. E., & Stafford, J. (2014). Victims' Psychosocial Well-Being After Reporting Sexual Harassment in the Military. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *15*(2), 133–152. https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2014.867563

Bell, M. P., Quick, J. C., & Cycyota, C. S. (2002). Assessment and Prevention of Sexual Harassment of Employees: An Applied Guide to Creating Healthy Organizations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*(1&2), 160–167. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00203

Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: Double jeopardy for minority women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(2), 426–436. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.426

Berdahl, J. L., & Raver, J. L. (2011). Sexual harassment. *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Vol 3: Maintaining, Expanding, and Contracting the Organization.*, *3*, 641–669. https://doi.org/10.1037/12171-018

Bergman, M. E., Langhout, R. D., Palmieri, P. A., Cortina, L. M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). The (un)reasonableness of reporting: Antecedents and consequences of reporting sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(2), 230–242. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.230

Berman, H., Izumi, J., & Arnold, C. (2002). Sexual Harassment and the Developing Sense of Self Among Adolescent Girls. *Canadian Journal of Counselling I Revue Canadienne de Counseling I*, *36*, 265. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ657147.pdf

Bernard, P., Legrand, S., & Klein, O. (2018). From bodies to blame: Exposure to sexually objectifying media increases tolerance toward sexual harassment. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, *7*(2), 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000114

Bethel, C. (2018). # MeToo: The Perfect Storm Needed to Change Attitudes Toward Sexual Harassment and Violence. *Harvard Public Health Review*, *16*, 1–5. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48515212?seq=1

Betts, L., Harding, R., Peart, S., Sjolin Knight, C., Wright, D., & Newbold, K. (2019).

Adolescents' experiences of street harassment: creating a typology and assessing the emotional impact. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, *11*(1), 38–46. https://doi.org/10.1108/jacpr-12-2017-0336

Bjørnebekk, G., & Mørkrid Thøgersen, D. (2021). Possible Interventions for Preventing the Development of Psychopathic Traits among Children and Adolescents? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(1), 409. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19010409

Blackstone, A., Uggen, C., & McLaughlin, H. (2009). Legal Consciousness and Responses to Sexual Harassment. *Law & Society Review*, *43*(3), 631–668. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2009.00384.x

Boduszek, D., Debowska, A., Sherretts, N., & Willmott, D. (2018). Psychopathic Personality Traits Scale (PPTS): Construct Validity of the Instrument in a Sample of U.S. Prisoners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01596

Boduszek, D., Debowska, A., & Willmott, D. (2019). *Psychopathic Personality Traits Model (PPTM): a new approach to defining psychopathy.* In M. DeLisi (Eds.). Routledge International Handbook of Psychopathy and Crime (pp. 216-224). Oxon: Routledge.

Boyer, K. (2021). Sexual harassment and the right to everyday life. *Progress in Human Geography*, *46*(2), 030913252110243. https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325211024340

Brassel, S. T., Settles, I. H., & Buchanan, N. T. (2018). Lay (Mis)Perceptions of Sexual Harassment toward Transgender, Lesbian, and Gay Employees. *Sex Roles*, *80*(1-2), 76–90. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-018-0914-8

Brown, J., Gouseti, I., & Fife-Schaw, C. (2017). Sexual harassment experienced by police staff serving in England, Wales and Scotland: A descriptive exploration of incidence, antecedents and harm. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles*, *91*(4), 356–374. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032258x17750325

Buzina, N. (2012). PSYCHOPATHY -HISTORICAL CONTROVERSIES AND NEW DIAGNOSTIC APPROACH. *Psychiatria Danubina*, *24*(2), 134–142. http://www.antoniocasella.eu/archipsy/Buzina_2012.pdf

Cantalupo, N. C. (2018, May 1). *And Even More of Us Are Brave: Intersectionality & Sexual Harassment of Women Students of Color*. Papers.ssrn.com. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3168909

Casale, S. (2020). Gender Differences in Self-esteem and Self-confidence. *The Wiley Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, 185–189. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119547174.ch208

Cedeno, R., & Bohlen, J. (2022). *Sexual Harassment And Prevention Training*. PubMed; StatPearls Publishing. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK587339/

Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2008). Male Rape Myths: The role of gender, violence, and sexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*(5), 600–615. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260507313529

Chiodo, D., Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C., Hughes, R., & Jaffe, P. (2009). Impact of Sexual Harassment Victimization by Peers on Subsequent Adolescent Victimization and Adjustment: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *45*(3), 246–252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.01.006

Cleckley, H. M. (1964). The Mask of Sanity: An Attempt to Clarify Some Issues about the SoCalled Psychopathic Personality. In *Google Books*. Ravenio Books. https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ksw4DwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT449&ots=sUanJRUYKL&sig=89oW7CHZueUonKiUBfurHhh541M&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Cleveland, J. N., & McNamara, K. (1996). Understanding Sexual Harassment: Contributions from Research on Domestic Violence and Organizational Change. *Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Perspectives, Frontiers, and Response Strategies*, 217–240. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483327280.n11

Conroy, E., Willmott, D., Murphy, A., & B. Kennath Widanaralalage. (2023). Does perpetrator gender influence attitudes towards intimate partner violence (IPV)? Examining the relationship between male-perpetrated and female-perpetrated IPV attitudes among a sample of UK young adults. *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*. https://doi.org/10.1108/mhsi-05-2023-0057

Cooke, D. J. (2021). *Psychopathic Personality Disorder* (J. M. Brown & M. A. H. Horvath, Eds.). Cambridge University Press; Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-forensicpsychology/psychopathic-personalitydisorder/9063A810515C68B6623B1163F441F3BD

Cormier, K. E. (2007). Grievance Practices in Post-Soviet Kyrgyz Agriculture. *Law & Social*

Inquiry, *32*(2), 435–466. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2007.00065.x

Crittenden, C. (2009). *EXAMINING ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON A UNIVERSITY CAMPUS: WHAT ROLE DO MYTHS AND STEREOTYPES PLAY?* https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/51197297.pdf

Daly, E., Smith, O., Bows, H., Brown, J., Chalmers, J., Cowan, S., Horvath, M., Leverick, F., Lovett, J., Munro, V., Willmott, D. (2023). Myths about Myths? A Commentary on Thomas (2020) and the Question of Jury Rape Myth Acceptance. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence,* 7(1),189-200. DOI:10.1332/239868021X16371459419254

Dhillon, M., & Bakaya, S. (2014). Street Harassment: A Qualitative Study of the Experiences of Young Women in Delhi. *SAGE Open*, *4*(3), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014543786

Diehl, C., Glaser, T., & Bohner, G. (2014). Face the consequences: Learning about victim's suffering reduces sexual harassment myth acceptance and men's likelihood to sexually harass. *Aggressive Behavior*, *40*(6), 489–503. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21553

Diehl, C., Rees, J., & Bohner, G. (2016). Predicting Sexual Harassment From Hostile Sexism and Short-Term Mating Orientation: Relative Strength of Predictors Depends on Situational Priming of Power Versus Sex. *Violence against Women*, *24*(2), 123–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801216678092

Dobbin, F., & Kelly, Erin L. (2007). How to Stop Harassment: Professional Construction of Legal Compliance in Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, *112*(4), 1203– 1243. https://doi.org/10.1086/508788

Dworkin, E. R., Brill, C. D., & Ullman, S. E. (2019). Social reactions to disclosure of interpersonal violence and psychopathology: A systematic review and metaanalysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *72*, 101750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2019.101750

Ellis, S., Barak, A., & Pinto, A. (1991). Moderating Effects of Personal Cognitions on Experienced and Perceived Sexual Harassment of Women at the Workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *21*(16), 1320–1337. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.15591816.1991.tb00473.x

Equality and Human Rights Commission. (2017). *Equality and Human Rights Commission Sexual harassment and the law: Guidance for employers*.

https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/sexual-harassment-andthe-law-guidance-for-employers.pdf

Experiences of harassment in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics. (2023, December). Www.ons.gov.uk. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/experiencesofharassmentinenglandandwales/december2023

Fileborn, B. (2018). Naming the Unspeakable Harm of Street Harassment: A Survey-Based Examination of Disclosure Practices. *Violence against Women*, *25*(2), 223–248. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801218768709

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Shullman, S. L. (1993). Sexual Harassment: A Research Analysis and Agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *42*(1), 5–27. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1993.1002

Forouzan, E., & Cooke, D. J. (2005). Figuring outla femme fatale: conceptual and assessment issues concerning psychopathy in females. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *23*(6), 765–778. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.669

Foster, P. J., & Fullagar, C. J. (2018). Why Don't We Report Sexual Harassment? An Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *40*(3), 148–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/01973533.2018.1449747

Foulis, D., & McCabe, M. P. (1997). Sexual harassment: factors affecting attitudes and perceptions. *Sex Roles*, *37*(9-10), 773–798. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02936339

Fox, J., & Tang, W. Y. (2017). Women's experiences with general and sexual harassment in online video games: Rumination, organizational responsiveness, withdrawal, and coping strategies. *New Media & Society*, *19*(8), 1290–1307. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816635778

Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T.-A. (1997). Objectification Theory: Toward Understanding Women's Lived Experiences and Mental Health Risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*(2), 173–206. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x

Fray, C., Powell-Booth, K., Nelson, K., Harvey, R., Reid, P., Wager, N., Willmott, D., Mason, S., Jones, A. (2022). The Prevalence and Impact of Children's Exposure to Domestic Violence in Jamaica. *Caribbean Journal of Psychology, 15*(2) 132 - 162. DOI: 10.37234/CJP.2022.1502.A005

Freedman-Weiss, M. R., Chiu, A. S., Heller, D. R., Cutler, A. S., Longo, W. E., Ahuja, N., & Yoo, P. S. (2020). Understanding the Barriers to Reporting Sexual Harassment in Surgical Training. *Annals of Surgery*, *271*(4), 608–613. https://doi.org/10.1097/sla.0000000000003295

Freyd, J. J., & Smidt, A. M. (2019). So you want to address sexual harassment and assault in your organization? Training is not enough; Education is necessary. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *20*(5), 489–494. https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2019.1663475

Gådin, K. G., & Hammarström, A. (2005). A possible contributor to the higher degree of girls reporting psychological symptoms compared with boys in grade nine? *European Journal of Public Health*, *15*(4), 380–385. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/cki097

Galdi, S., Maass, A., & Cadinu, M. (2013). Objectifying Media. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *38*(3), 398–413. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684313515185

Gallagher, K. E., & Parrott, D. J. (2011). What Accounts for Men's Hostile Attitudes Toward Women? The Influence of Hegemonic Male Role Norms and Masculine Gender Role Stress. *Violence against Women*, *17*(5), 568–583. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801211407296

Gallivan Nelson, & Carroll, K. A. (2012). Sexual Harassment: "Is It Just Me or Are You Hot?" *Springer EBooks*, 395–414. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4059-4_21

Girlguiding. (2021). *It happens all the time:Girls' and young women's experiences of sexual harassment*. https://www.girlguiding.org.uk/globalassets/docs-and-resources/research-and-campaigns/girlguiding-research-briefing_girls-experiencesof-sexual-harassment_june2021.pdf

Government Equalities Office, for, D., for, D., for, D., & Department for Transport. (2023). *Equality Act 2010 - Explanatory Notes*. Legislation.gov.uk. https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/notes/division/3/2/2/14

Griffith , R. (2021, November 25). *British Journal of Nursing - Causing or inciting sexual activity with persons who have a mental disorder*. British Journal of Nursing. https://www.britishjournalofnursing.com/content/legal/causing-or-inciting-sexualactivity-with-persons-who-have-a-mental-disorder/

Gruber, J., & Morgan, P. (2005). In the Company of Men: Male Dominance and Sexual Harassment. In *Google Books*. UPNE. https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=v4eD8IaJG9kC&oi=fnd&pg=PA294&ots=Ggy2Hu_-__&sig=gO4EINtF9B78F-Ld6ooQEOXoq1I&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Gutek, B. A. (1993). Sexual harassment: Rights and responsibilities. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *6*(4), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01385021

Hardies, K. (2019). Personality, social norms, and sexual harassment in the workplace. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *151*, 109496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.07.006

Hare, R. D. (2004). *Hare Psychopathy Checklist - Revised*.

Harris, G., & Rice, M. (2006). *Treatment of Psychopathy: A Review of Empirical Findings.* Semantic Scholar. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Treatment-of-Psychopathy%3A-A-Review-of-Empirical-Harris-Rice/02aedd8acd125ca3425789807eb752ce8402618d

Hart, S. D., Hare, R. D., & Harpur, T. J. (1992). The Psychopathy Checklist—Revised (PCLR). *Advances in Psychological Assessment*, *8*, 103–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/9781-4757-9101-3_4

Hoffmann, A. M., & Verona, E. (2019). Psychopathic traits, gender, and motivations for sex: Putative paths to sexual coercion. *Aggressive Behavior*, *45*(5), 527–536. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21841

Hohl, K., & Stanko, E. A. (2022). Five Pillars: A Framework for Transforming the Police Response to Rape and Sexual Assault. *International Criminology*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43576-022-00057-y

Holland, & Cortina . (2016). *Sexual Harassment: Undermining the Wellbeing of Working Women*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283751740_Sexual_Harassment_Undermining_the_Wellbeing_of_Working_Women

Houle, J. N., Staff, J., Mortimer, J. T., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2011). The Impact of Sexual Harassment on Depressive Symptoms during the Early Occupational Career. *Society and Mental Health*, *1*(2), 89–105. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869311416827

Hunt, C. M., Davidson, M. J., Fielden, S. L., & Hoel, H. (2010). Reviewing sexual harassment in the workplace – an intervention model. *Personnel Review*, *39*(5), 655–673. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011064190

ILIES, R., HAUSERMAN, N., SCHWOCHAU, S., & STIBAL, J. (2003). REPORTED INCIDENCE RATES OF WORK-RELATED SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE UNITED STATES: USING META-ANALYSIS TO EXPLAIN REPORTED RATE DISPARITIES. *Personnel*

Psychology, *56*(3), 607–631. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00752.x

Jaffe, S. (2018). The Collective Power of #MeToo. *Dissent*, *65*(2), 80–87. https://doi.org/10.1353/dss.2018.0031

Ioannides, A. & Willmott, D. (2023). Do Psychopathic Traits, Sexual Victimisation Experiences and Emotional Intelligence Predict Attitudes Towards Rape? Examining the Psychosocial correlates of Rape Myth Beliefs among a cross-sectional community sample. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 54*(3), 217 - 228. DOI: 10.24425/ppb.2023.148054

Johnson, L. G., & Beech, A. (2017). Rape myth acceptance in convicted rapists: A systematic review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *34*, 20–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.03.004

Kayuni, H. (2013). The Challenge of Studying Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: An Experience from the University of Malawi's Chancellor College. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, *11*(2), 83–99. https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol11/iss2/6/

Kernaleguen, A., & Conrad, S. G. (1980). Analysis of Five Measures of SelfConcept. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *51*(3), 855–861. https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1980.51.3.855

Kernis , M. (1989). *APA PsycNet*. Psycnet.apa.org. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/198932868-001

Kessler, A. M., Kennair, L. E. O., Grøntvedt, T. V., Bjørkheim, I., Drejer, I., & Bendixen, M. (2020). The Effect of Prototypical #MeToo Features on the Perception of SocialSexual Behavior as Sexual Harassment. *Sexuality & Culture*, *24*(5), 1271–1291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-019-09675-7

Kiehl, K. A., & Hoffman, M. B. (2011). THE CRIMINAL PSYCHOPATH: HISTORY, NEUROSCIENCE, TREATMENT, AND ECONOMICS. *Jurimetrics*, *51*, 355–397. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4059069/#R35

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *55*(2), 162–170. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-006x.55.2.162

Kunkel, D., Biely, K., Eyal, K., Cope-Farrar, E., Donnerstein, R., & Fandrich. (2003). *A Biennial Report of the Kaiser Family Foundation 2003 S E X*. https://www.issuelab.org/resources/7671/7671.pdf

Latcheva, R. (2017). Sexual Harassment in the European Union: A Pervasive but Still Hidden

Form of Gender-Based Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *32*(12), 1821–1852. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517698948

Lee, K. (2003). Personality and the likelihood to sexually harass . *Sex Roles*, *49*(1/2), 59–69. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1023961603479

Lindsay, J., Willmott., D. & Richardson, E. (2023). Football Culture and Domestic Violence: Dissecting the Link among a Focus Group of Non-abusive Youth Football Fan's. *Youth, 3*(3), 1078-1100. DOI: 10.3390/youth3030069

Lilienfeld, S. O. (1998). Methodological advances and developments in the assessment of psychopathy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *36*(1), 99–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967(97)10021-3

Lilienfeld, S. O., Watts, A. L., & Smith, S. F. (2015). Successful Psychopathy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *24*(4), 298–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721415580297

Lilley, C., Willmott, D., Mojtahedi, D. & Labhardt, D. (2023). Intimate Partner Rape: A Review of Six Core Myths Surrounding Women's Conduct and the Consequences of Intimate Partner Rape. *Social Sciences, 12*(1), 34-55. DOI: 10.3390/socsci12010034

Longpré, N., Moreton, R. E., Snow, E. J., Kiszel, F., & Fitzsimons, M. A. (2022). Dark Traits, Harassment and Rape Myths Acceptances Among University Students. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 0306624X2211390. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x221139037

Lonsway, K. A., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Sexual Harassment Mythology: Definition, Conceptualization, and Measurement. *Sex Roles*, *58*(9-10), 599–615. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9367-1

Lott, B., Reilly, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1982). Sexual Assault and Harassment: A Campus Community Case Study. *Signs*, *8*(2), 296–319. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3173901

Magley, V. J., Hulin, C. L., Fitzgerald, L. F., & DeNardo, M. (1999). Outcomes of self-labeling sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(3), 390–402. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.390

Magley, V. J., & Shupe, E. I. (2005). Self-Labeling Sexual Harassment. *Sex Roles*, *53*(3-4), 173–189. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-5677-3

Manning, M. A., Bear, G. G., & Minke, K. M. (2006). Self-Concept and Self-Esteem. In G. G. Bear & K. M. Minke (Eds.). *Children's Needs III: Development, Prevention, and Intervention*, 341–356. National Association of School Psychologists.

MARMO, M., & QUENEAU, H. (2000). SEXUAL HARASSMENT: DIFFERENT STANDARDS FOR DIFFERENT RACIAL AND ETHNIC GROUPS? *Journal of Individual Employment Rights*, *9*(4), 309–321. https://doi.org/10.2190/hrht-ak1x-5e55-1m9y

Mayers, K. S., Heller, D. K., & Heller, J. A. (2003). Damaged Sexual Self-Esteem: A Kind of Disability. *Sexuality and Disability*, *21*(4), 269–282. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:sedi.0000010069.08844.04

Mazer, D. B., & Percival, E. F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. *Sex Roles*, *20*(3-4), 135–147. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00287987

McCabe, M. P., & Hardman, L. (2005). Attitudes and Perceptions of Workers to Sexual Harassment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *145*(6), 719–740. https://doi.org/10.3200/socp.145.6.719-740

McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual Harassment, Workplace Authority, and the Paradox of Power. *American Sociological Review*, *77*(4), 625–647. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412451728

McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2017). The Economic and Career Effects of Sexual Harassment on Working Women. *Gender & Society*, *31*(3), 333–358. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243217704631

Metson, J., & Willmott, D. (2024). Victim Care or Defendant Rights? Assessing Public Attitudes towards Special Measures Designed to Support Vulnerable Witnesses at Trial. *Social Sciences, 13*(4), 198. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13040198

Methot-Jones, T., Book, A., & Gauthier, N. Y. (2019). Less than human: psychopathy, dehumanization, and sexist and violent attitudes towards women. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *149*, 250–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.06.002

Milburn, M. A., Mather, R., & Conrad, S. D. (2000). The Effects of Viewing R-rated Movie Scenes That Objectify Women on Perceptions of Date Rape. *Sex Roles*, *43*(9/10), 645–664. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1007152507914

Miller, J. D., Watts, A., & Jones, S. E. (2011). Does psychopathy manifest divergent relations with components of its nomological network depending on gender? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*(5), 564–569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.028

Moreira, B., Carvalho, J., & Nobre, P. (2021). The Role of Dysfunctional Sexual Beliefs and Sexual Self-Esteem in Sexual Aggression: A Study with Male College Students. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2021.2015036

Mori, L., Bernat, J. A., Glenn, P. A., Selle, L. L., & Zarate, M. G. (1995). Attitudes toward rape: Gender and ethnic differences across Asian and Caucasian college students. *Sex Roles*, *32*(7-8), 457–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01544182

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *34*(2), 186–196. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.2.186

Nicholls, T. L., & Petrila, J. (2005). Gender and psychopathy: an overview of important issues and introduction to the special issue. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *23*(6), 729–741. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.677

NORRIS, J., NURIUS, P. S., & GRAHAM, T. L. (1999). When a Date Changes from Fun to Dangerous. *Violence against Women*, *5*(3), 230–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778019922181202

O'Connor, M., Gutek, B. A., Stockdale, M., Geer, T. M., & Melançon, R. (2004). Explaining sexual harassment judgments: Looking beyond gender of the rater. *Law and Human Behavior*, *28*(1), 69–95. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:lahu.0000015004.39462.6e

Office for National Statistics. (2023, March 23). *Sexual Offences in England and Wales Overview - Office for National Statistics*. Office for National Statistics. https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/bulletins/sexualoffencesinenglandandwalesoverview/march2022

OFSTED. (2021, June 10). *Review of sexual abuse in schools and colleges*. GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-sexual-abuse-in-schoolsand-colleges/review-of-sexual-abuse-in-schools-and-colleges

Ohse, D. M., & Stockdale, M. S. (2008). Age Comparisons in Workplace Sexual Harassment Perceptions. *Sex Roles*, *59*(3-4), 240–253. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9438y

Osman, S. L. (2004). Victim Resistance: Theory and Data on Understanding Perceptions of Sexual Harassment. *Sex Roles*, *50*(3/4), 267–275.

https://doi.org/10.1023/b:sers.0000015557.00936.30

Osman, S. L. (2006). The Continuation of Perpetrator Behaviors that Influence Perceptions of Sexual Harassment. *Sex Roles*, *56*(1-2), 63–69. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-0069149-1

Osman, S. L. (2007). Predicting Perceptions of Sexual Harassment Based on Type of Resistance and Belief in Token Resistance. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *44*(4), 340–346. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20620319?seq=1

Page, T. E., Pina, A., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2015). "It was only harmless banter!" The development and preliminary validation of the moral disengagement in sexual harassment scale. *Aggressive Behavior*, *42*(3), 254–273. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21621

PATRICK, C. J. (1994). Emotion and psychopathy: Startling new insights. *Psychophysiology*, *31*(4), 319–330. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14698986.1994.tb02440.x

Paulhus, D. L., Curtis, S. R., & Jones, D. N. (2018). Aggression as a trait: the Dark Tetrad alternative. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *19*, 88–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.04.007

Pina, D. A. (2019, September 26). *Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: How Lessons Learned from the #MeToo Movement Can Be Turned into Policy Change*. Equalities.blog.gov.uk. https://equalities.blog.gov.uk/2019/09/26/sexualharassment-in-the-workplace-how-lessons-learned-from-the-metoo-movement-canbe-turned-into-policy-change/

Pryor, J. B., LaVite, C. M., & Stoller, L. M. (1993). A Social Psychological Analysis of Sexual Harassment: The Person/Situation Interaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *42*(1), 68–83. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1993.1005

Recupero, P. (2018). The Notion of Truth and Our Evolving Understanding of Sexual Harassment. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law*, *46*, 23–30. https://web.archive.org/web/20200319031011id_/http://jaapl.org/content/jaapl/46/1/23.full.pdf

Rosenberg. (2019). *Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale*. Wwnorton.com. https://wwnorton.com/college/psych/psychsci/media/rosenberg.htm Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*. Psycnet.apa.org. https://psycnet.apa.org/doiLanding?doi=10.1037%2Ft01038-000

Rosenberg, M. (2006). *Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSE)*. https://www.apa.org/obesityguideline/rosenberg-self-esteem.pdf

Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D.-H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(5), 914–922. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.914

Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of Sexual Harassment: An Examination of Gender Differences, Ambivalent Sexism, Social Dominance, and Gender Roles. *Sex Roles*, *50*(7/8), 565–573. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:sers.0000023075.32252.fd Sakallı-Uğurlu, N., Salman, S., & Turgut, S. (2010). Predictors of Turkish Women's and Men's Attitudes toward Sexual Harassment: Ambivalent Sexism, and Ambivalence Toward Men. *Sex Roles*, *63*(11-12), 871–881. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9847-6

Salekin, R. T. (2002). Psychopathy and therapeutic pessimism. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *22*(1), 79–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0272-7358(01)00083-6

Salekin, R. T., Neumann, C. S., Leistico, A.-M. R., & Zalot, A. A. (2004). Psychopathy in Youth and Intelligence: An Investigation of Cleckley's Hypothesis. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, *33*(4), 731–742. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15374424jccp3304_8

Salekin, R. T., Worley, C., & Grimes, R. D. (2010). Treatment of psychopathy: A review and brief introduction to the mental model mpproach for psychopathy. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *28*(2), 235–266. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.928

Schmitt, D. P., Long, A. E., McPhearson, A., O'Brien, K., Remmert, B., & Shah, S. H. (2016). Personality and gender differences in global perspective. *International Journal of Psychology*, *52*(s1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12265

Sexual Assault Centre of Edmonton. (2022). *Victim Blaming*. Sexual Assault Centre of Edmonton. https://www.sace.ca/learn/victim-blaming/

Sharratt, K., Boduszek, D., & Retzler, C. (2019). Clarifying the Relationship between Psychopathy and Intelligence Using Four Dimensions of the WASI-II. *Deviant Behavior*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2019.1582968

Sibley, C. G., & Wilson, M. S. (2004). Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexist Attitudes Toward Positive and Negative Sexual Female Subtypes. *Sex Roles*, *51*(11-12), 687–696. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-004-0718-x

Siegel, R. (2003). *Directions in Sexual Harassment Law CATHAlUNE A MACKINNON & REVA B.*

SIEGEL EDS. FORTHCOMING YALE PRESS 2003.
https://law.yale.edu/sites/default/files/documents/pdf/Faculty/Siegel_Introduction AShortHistoryOfSexualHarrasmentLaw.pdf

Sowersby, C., Erskine-Shaw, M. & Willmott, D. (2022). Masochist or Murderer? A Discourse Analytic Study Exploring Social Constructions of Sexually Violent Male Perpetrators, Female Victims-Survivors and the Rough Sex Defence on Twitter. *Frontiers in Psychology. 13*: 867991. DOI: 10.3389/FPSYG.2022.867991

Stephens, T., Kamimura, A., Yamawaki, N., Bhattacharya, H., Mo, W., Birkholz, R., Makomenaw, A., & Olson, L. M. (2016). Rape Myth Acceptance Among College Students in the United States, Japan, and India. *SAGE Open*, *6*(4), 215824401667501. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016675015

Stewart, S., Willmott, D., Murphy, A. & Phillips, C. (2024). "I thought I'm better off just trying to put this behind me" - A Contemporary Approach to Understanding Why Women Decide Not to Report Sexual Assault. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 35*(1), 85-101. DOI:10.1080/14789949.2023.2292103

Stone , M., & Vogelstein. (2019, March 7). *Celebrating #MeToo's Global Impact*. Foreign Policy; Foreign Policy. https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/03/07/metooglobalimpactinternationalwomensday/

Sundaram, V., & Jackson, C. (2018). "Monstrous men" and "sex scandals": the myth of exceptional deviance in sexual harassment and violence in education. *Palgrave Communications*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0202-9

Sweeny, J. (2020). The #MeToo Movement in Comparative Perspective. *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law*, *29*, 33. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/ajgsp29&div=6&id= &page=

Thomas , A. M. (2004). Politics, policies and practice: assessing the impact of sexual harassment policies in UK universities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *25*(2), 143–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569042000205145

Thomas, A. M., & Kitzinger, C. (1994). ?It's Just Something that Happens?: the Invisibility of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *1*(3), 151–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.1994.tb00014.x

Thomas, C. (2023). *Juries, Rape and Sexual Offences in the Crown Court 2007-21 1 The need for clarity about rape prosecutions*.

https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10165027/1/2023_CrimLR_Issue_3_Print%20%28Cheryl%20Thomas%29.pdf

Thornton , G. (2018). *Diversity Global Data Women in business: beyond policy to progress*. https://www.grantthornton.co.uk/globalassets/1.-member-firms/global/insights/women-in-business/grant-thornton-women-in-business-2018report.pdf

Thornton, G., Willmott., D., Richardson, E. & Hudspith., L. (2023). Examining the Immediate and Enduring Psychological Impact of Street Harassment on Women's Mental Health. *Mental Health and Social Inclusion.* DOI:10.1108/MHSI-07-2023-0080

Trades Union Congress. (2016). *Still just a bit of banter? Sexual harassment in the workplace in 2016 In association with 2 Contents*. https://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/SexualHarassmentreport2016.pdf UK Parliament . (2023). *Protection from Sex-based Harassment in Public Bill 2022-23*. https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9691/

UN Women. (2021). *Prevalence and reporting of sexual harassment in UK public spaces A report by the APPG for UN Women*. https://www.unwomenuk.org/site/wpcontent/uploads/2021/03/APPG-UN-Women-Sexual-HarassmentReport_Updated.pdf

Van Dongen, J. D. M. (2020). The Empathic Brain of Psychopaths: from Social Science to Neuroscience in Empathy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00695

Viding , E. (Ed.). (2019). 2. Explaining the lack of empathy. *Oxford University Press EBooks*, 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780198802266.003.0002

Waters, J. (2014). Snowball sampling: a cautionary tale involving a study of older drug users. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *18*(4), 367–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2014.953316

Watts, A. L., Bowes, S. M., Latzman, R. D., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2017). Psychopathic traits predict harsh attitudes toward rape victims among undergraduates. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *106*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.022

Wiener, R. L., & Hurt, L. E. (2000). How do people evaluate social sexual conduct at work?: A psycholegal model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*(1), 75–85. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.1.75

Williams, S., Willmott, D. & Murphy, A. (2023). The Court of Social Media Opinion: Examining How Twitter Users Respond to the Retrial of Footballer Ched Evans. *Internet Journal of Criminology*, 1-24.

Willmott, D., Boduszek, D., Debowska, A., & Hudspith, L. (2021). *Jury Decision Making in Rape Trials: An Attitude Problem?* In D. Crighton & G. Towl (Eds.), Forensic Psychology (3rd Ed., pp. 94-119). Chichester: Wiley

Willmott, D. & Hudspith, L. (2024). *Jury Trials and Rape Myth Bias: Examining the Research Evidence, Stakeholder Perspectives and Effective Solutions*. In N. Monaghan (Eds.). Contemporary Challenges in the Jury System: A Comparative Perspective (pp. 167-188). London: Routledge.

Willmott, D., Rafique, A., Widanaralalage, K., & Agneswaren, A. (2024). Investigating the Role of Psychopathic Personality Traits, Gender, and Ethnicity in Rape Myth Acceptance. *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law*. DOI: 10.1080/13218719.2024.2314000

Willmott, D. & Widanaralalage, K. (2024). Male Rape Myths: Examining the role of Victim Empathy and Socio-demographics in a cross-sectional sample of UK Adults. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice, 76,* 100645. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcj.2023.100645

Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A Meta-Analysis Of The Antecedents And Consequences Of Workplace Sexual Harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*(1), 127–162. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00067.x

World Population Review. (2020). *Rape Statistics By Country 2020*. Worldpopulationreview.com. https://worldpopulationreview.com/countryrankings/rape-statistics-by-country

Yapp, E. J., & Quayle, E. (2018). A systematic review of the association between rape myth acceptance and male-on-female sexual violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *41*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.002 Zeigler-Hill, V. (2013). Self-Esteem. In *Google Books*. Psychology Press. https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=s6fNy0lH5fwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=importance+of+self+esteem&ots=W1jczkPOSP&sig=oN6h3aB1KtTqvIKaiNu8qXdJ8ic&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=importance%20of%20self%20esteem&f=false

Zeigler-Hill, V., Besser, A., Morag, J., & Keith Campbell, W. (2016). The Dark Triad and sexual harassment proclivity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *89*, 47–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.048

Zonicle, A. (2022). *The Invisibility of Vulnerability: A Phenomenological Investigation of Black Women's Experiences of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace - ProQuest*. Www.proquest.com. https://www.proquest.com/openview/8ec351fd1adc12438bf281751c3b8093/1?pqorigsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

Zuckerman, M., Li, C., & Hall, J. A. (2016). When men and women differ in self-esteem and when they don't: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *64*, 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.07.007

Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaire booklet

A.1. Demographic information

1. Age

Please enter your age in years in the box below

2. What gender do you identify as?

   Male
   Female
   Transgender
   Non-binary
   Gender- fluid
   Other (please specify)
   Prefer not to say

3. Please select your ethnicity

   White
   Mixed
   Asian or Asian British
   Black or black British
   Other (please specify)
   Prefer not to say

4. What is your highest form of education?

   Below a university degree
   Currently studying for a university degree
   Above a university degree
   Other (please specify)
   Prefer not to say

A.2. Psychopathic Personality Traits Scale - Revised (Boduszek et al., 2022)

		Strongly agree (4)	Agree (3)	Sometimes Agree (2)	Disagree (1)	Strongly disagree (0)
1	I don't care if I upset someone to get what I want.					
2	Before slagging someone off, I don't try to imagine and understand how it would make them feel.					

3	I know what to say or do to make another person feel guilty.					
4	I tend to focus on my own thoughts and ideas rather than on what others might be thinking.					
5	What other people feel doesn't concern me.					
6	I don't take into account the other person's feelings before I do or say something, even if they may be affected by my behaviour.					
7	I'm good at saying nice things to people, to get what I want out of them.					
8	I don't try to understand another person's opinion if I don't agree with it.					
9	Seeing people cry doesn't really upset me.					
10	I can guess how people will feel in different situations.					
11	I know how to fake emotions like pain and hurt to make other people feel sorry for me.					
12	No matter what happens and what people say, I'm usually the one who is right.					
13	I don't feel bad when a friend is going through a tough time.					
14	I can't really tell when someone is feeling awkward or uncomfortable.					
15	I sometimes provoke people on purpose to see how they react in certain situations.					
16	I'm happy to help somebody as long as I get something in return.					
17	I don't really feel compassion when people talk about the death of their loved ones.					
18	I find it difficult to understand what other people feel.					
19	I'm good at pretending that I like someone if this will get me what I want.					
20	Something has to benefit me otherwise it I'm not willing to do it.					
21	Seeing somebody suffer doesn't distress me.					
		Strongly agree (4)	Agree (3)	Sometimes Agree (2)	Disagree (1)	Strongly disagree (0)

22	I can see when someone is hiding what they really feel.					
23	I would lie to someone if this gets me what I want.					
24	I like it when people do as I say, regardless of whether I'm right or wrong.					
25	It doesn't really bother me to see somebody in pain.					
26	I find it hard to understand why some people get very upset when they lose someone close to them.					
27	I'm good at getting people to do what I want, even if they don't want to at first					
28	How others feel is irrelevant to me, as long as I feel good.					

A.3. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965)

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. There are four possible answers for each of the 10 questions, from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". Please select a box to indicate how strongly you disagree or agree with each statement.

1) On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
2) At times, I think I am no good at all.
3) I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4) I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5) I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6) I certainly feel useless at times.
7) I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
8) I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9) All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
10) I take a positive attitude towards myself.

A.4. The Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (SHAS) (Mazer & Percival, 1989)

1. An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.

2. Most men are sexually teased by many of the women with whom they interact on the job or at school.

3. Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behaviour by the way they talk, act, or dress.

4. A man must learn to understand that a woman's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no."

5. It is only natural for a woman to use her sexuality as a way of getting ahead in school or at work.

6. An attractive man has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.
7. I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.
8. It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.
9. Innocent flirtations make the workday or school day interesting.

10. Encouraging a professor's or a supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situations.

11. One of the problems with sexual harassment is that some women can't take a joke.

12. The notion that what a professor does in class may be sexual harassment is taking the idea of sexual harassment too far.

13. Many charges of sexual harassment are frivolous and vindictive.

14. A lot of what people call sexual harassment is just normal flirtation between men and women.

15. Sexual assault and sexual harassment are two completely different things.

16. Sexual harassment refers to those incidents of unwanted sexual attention that aren't too serious.

17. Sexual harassment has little to do with power.
18. Sexism and sexual harassment are two completely different things.

19. All this concern about sexual harassment makes it harder for men and women to have normal relationships.