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Abstract
Sexual harassment cases in the academic setting are one of the cases that are increasing every year in Indonesia. Although cases of sexual harassment in the academic setting are increasing sexual harassment cases are still often considered like an iceberg phenomenon, which means that there have been many cases that have occurred, but still, few cases have been reported. One consideration that makes victims of sexual harassment reluctant to report is the negative evaluation of sexual harassment bystanders. The literature shows that there are differences between male and female observers in perceiving forms of behavior that are considered sexual harassment. The difference in perception is closely related to the gender bias that individuals have. This study aims to determine the relationship between gender bias and perceptions of sexual harassment in the academic setting. This study uses a quantitative approach with a correlational design. The sample of this study was 246 students who were pursuing undergraduate and diploma studies. The results showed no significant relationship between gender bias and perceptions of sexual harassment. In other words, there are other factors outside of gender bias that are related to perceptions related to sexual harassment in individuals.
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**Introduction**

Cases of sexual harassment in campus are increasingly prevalent in Indonesia. The perpetrators of sexual harassment in the campus setting itself are very diverse, ranging from students and lecturers to residents in the campus location or place of research interests.\(^1\) In cases of sexual harassment in the academic setting, there is a significant delay before the survivor finally reports the incident that occurred. Generally, survivors consider several aspects before reporting these incidents. Some of these considerations are cost, negative feedback from others, and the possibility of being blamed.\(^2\)

Based on data for the period 2015-2021 reported by the National Commission on Violence against Women (Komnas Perempuan), sexual violence that occurred in colleges or universities occupied the first position for sexual violence in the academic setting.\(^3\) Additionally, during this period, Komnas Perempuan received 67 cases reported by women related to violence in the academic setting. The forms of violence that occurred in the academic setting ranged from sexual violence (87.91%), psychological and discrimination (8.8%), and physical violence (1.1%).

The literature shows that survivors of sexual harassment in the campus setting are reluctant to report sexual harassment experienced because they are embarrassed, worried that they cannot prove the incident, and most do not realize that the events experienced are part of sexual violence.\(^4\)

In addition, the permissive and normalizing attitude towards sexual harassment cases and the authority of the colleges or universities, which tends to be less assertive in providing sanctions for perpetrators, also tend to make survivors unwilling to report sexual harassment incidents. Therefore, cases of sexual harassment in the academic setting are still often described as an iceberg phenomenon. In other words, many cases have occurred, but only a few cases are known or even reported.

In general, the bad stigma in society towards victims of sexual abuse also makes victims less likely to report cases to the authorities.\(^5\) Society still has the perception that sexual violence is an event that must be covered up because it is a disgrace, so many cases are resolved in a family manner or even are resolved without the knowledge of the authorities, and when further traced, the victim has withdrawn the report.\(^6\) Moreover, the media coverage that is aired every time there is an incident of sexual harassment seems to corner the victim, starting from the assumption that the lust of the perpetrator of sexual harassment arises because of the victim’s ‘revealing’ clothes and the situation (e.g. the victim goes alone at night).\(^7\)

Another factor that causes victims of sexual harassment in the academic setting to be reluctant to report and not demand justice is the gap in power relations between the perpetrator and the victim. It is exemplified by cases of sexual harassment committed by lecturers against students.\(^8\) The same literature also explains that in the fact-finding process of sexual harassment cases in the academic setting, especially on campuses, there is a possibility of data manipulation due to the emotional attachment between the perpetrator and the party formed as the investigation team.

---

Survivors who experience sexual harassment in the academic setting may experience negative impacts in multiple aspects. Fear, depression, anger, resentment, and even trauma are some of the psychological effects they may experience. They may also experience physical impacts in the form of hair loss, frequent heart palputations, or decreased body condition due to decreased appetite. Additionally, the psychological and physical impacts experienced may also affect their academic achievements, such as declining performance, causing a decrease in their GPAs.

Theoretically, forms of sexual harassment are seen based on a behavioral construct consisting of three dimensions: sexual coercion, behavior involving unwanted attention, and gender harassment. In addition, there are 3 important aspects in determining sexual harassment: the behavioral aspect in terms of the rightness or wrongness of sexual behavior, the situational aspect relating to differences in the place or time of sexual harassment, and the legality aspect, which indicates that behavior is declared unlawful.

The three aspects of determining sexual harassment are supposed to help people perceive sexual harassment. Perception of sexual harassment is a subjective meaning process that underlies the way individuals perceive an incident or behavior of sexual harassment. On the other hand, in practice, there are still gaps or differences of opinion from one individual to another in responding to sexual harassment. In reality, there are still differences between men and women in perceiving sexual harassment. Differences in perceptions related to sexual harassment are influenced by several factors, ranging from the gender of the target of sexual harassment, the gender of the perpetrator of sexual harassment, or gender-based attitudes.

In addition to the above factors, the observer’s gender bias can be a factor in perceiving whether the behaviors are classified as sexual harassment. Gender bias is a condition in which some aspects of an individual are treated differently based on their gender and can have a positive, negative, or neutral impact on the individual themselves or others. In the legal context, gender bias tends to influence lawyers’ perceptions, where lawyers will be more likely to blame and judge behavior as sexual harassment on male perpetrators than on female perpetrators. More specifically, lawyers’ perception that male offenders are more deserving of blame than female offenders is caused by gender bias related to the theory of chivalry bias. Literature shows that gender bias places female offenders at a disadvantage in the eyes of the law, giving them an advantage in law enforcement and the justice system.

Gender bias itself also tends to make victims unwilling to report incidents of sexual harassment that occur. In cases of sexual harassment in
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the academic setting, victims did not report the incidents of sexual harassment because the parties who assisted victims (e.g., lecturers, students, or the community) did not show partiality to victims and even blamed or insulted the victims.\textsuperscript{21} Not reporting the perpetrator is an example of inappropriate handling, and it has the potential to have psychological consequences, ranging from anxiety disorders to a desire to end one’s life.\textsuperscript{22} Furthermore, the observer’s partiality toward the victim is related to society’s role expectation, where men and women must behave or look according to their gender, so the difference in roles creates injustice to both men and women in sexual harassment.\textsuperscript{23} According to the explanation above, gender bias influences observers’ perceptions of sexual harassment on male and female perpetrators and victims, and it discourages victims from reporting sexual harassment that occurs.

In cases of sexual harassment, gender bias is related to gender role stereotypes that people have. Gender role stereotypes play an important role in influencing individual expectations about how they and others should behave according to their respective genders, so it will also be related to how they perceive a behavior and how they interpret the behavior.\textsuperscript{24} Gender stereotypes that are strongly attached to individuals influence perceptions or behaviors and must be adjusted to the nature of one’s gender.\textsuperscript{25}

There is something unique about sexual harassment in the academic setting that sets it apart from other types of sexual harassment. Given that it is difficult to distinguish between consensual romantic relationships between students and relationships that refer to sexual exploitation, the understanding of what constitutes sexual harassment in academia is hazy.\textsuperscript{26} In perceiving forms of sexual harassment between lecturers and students, compared to male students, female students were found to be more likely to judge behavior as sexual harassment in all forms of situations. It is applicable even though the perpetrators and victims of sexual harassment were of the same or different genders. However, female and male students were found to still have difficulty determining or not labeling behavior as sexual harassment when the perpetrator and victim were of the same gender.\textsuperscript{27} Another study revealed that male students apply different standards in perceiving sexual harassment depending on the gender of the perpetrator-victim, even though the behavior at issue is the same.\textsuperscript{28} One example is that behavior such as touching the buttocks is less likely to be judged as sexual harassment by men when it is perpetrated by a female perpetrator on a male victim.\textsuperscript{29} In contrast, it is more likely to be judged as sexual harassment if the victim is female.

Most men were found to have an assumption that women are not physically strong and unlikely to commit sexual harassment, so they tend not to take harassing behavior seriously as a form of sexual harassment when the perpetrator is a woman.\textsuperscript{30} Men are also less likely to judge a behavior as harassment when it is committed by women, as they are less likely to judge behavior such as touching the buttocks as sexual harassment.\textsuperscript{31} This is because men are generally more likely to assume that women are more physically weak and therefore less capable of committing sexual harassment.\textsuperscript{32} This assumption is based on gender stereotypes that men are more physically strong than women.\textsuperscript{33}
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by a female perpetrator against a male victim in ambiguous forms of behavior. However, both men and women were found to be unanimous in assessing sexual harassment when the harassing behavior was explicit, either in a sexual context or non-verbally, by showing physical involvement.31 Thus, it can be concluded that gender bias caused by embedded stereotypes creates a condition in which individuals perceive sexual harassment differently or only take sides based on gender.

In addition, students’ assessment of lecturer-student interactions and interactions between students that lead to sexual harassment behavior is related to their gender roles.32 The study explains that people with masculine gender roles tend to perceive behavior as more harassing when the perpetrator has a higher level of power (e.g., lecturer) than the perpetrator who has the same position (e.g., fellow students). Meanwhile, it was explained that differences in the level of power between perpetrators and victims of sexual harassment in the academic setting did not affect the perceptions of individuals with feminine gender roles when determining sexual harassment.33

Although some studies reveal that gender role stereotypes can be a factor influencing perceptions of sexual harassment some studies find different things. For example, Foulis and McCabe found that there was no influence of gender role stereotypes that could indicate differences in perceptions between men and women regarding sexual harassment.34 What may explain these findings relates to cultural differences and media exposure that may influence perceptions of sexual harassment.

Furthermore, in one study that discussed lecturer-student interactions involving a sample of students from four countries (Australia, Brazil, Germany, and the United States of America), it was found that gender differences appeared only in participants from the USA and Brazil.35 Female participants from the USA were more attached to feministic views, so they perceived sexualized lecturer-student interactions as sexual harassment more than female participants from Germany and Australia. Meanwhile, in Brazilian culture, sexual behavior is very likely to be manifested in cross-gender interactions so that the form of offers or behaviors that lead to sexuality between lecturers and students is not viewed negatively. Thus, it can be concluded that culture will influence gender role stereotypes which are then closely related to gender bias, so separate research is needed regarding perceptions of sexual harassment in Indonesia as a country that has a different culture compared to countries that have been studied previously.

Based on our literature review, there have indeed been several studies related to observer perceptions related to sexual harassment in Indonesia, but these studies have only involved worker participants and high school students with discussions that focus more on perceptual factors along with the impact of sexual harassment on victims.36 In addition, generally, the studies found in Indonesia still focus on the discussion of victims and perpetrators.37 Meanwhile, through the findings of the literature previously described, in cases of sexual harassment, victims are often found unwilling to report incidents of sexual harassment due to the negative judgment of observers toward victims.38 Thus, it is important to conduct research related to sexual harassment from the perspective of observers in Indonesia.

---
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This study aims to determine the significance of the relationship between gender bias and perceptions related to sexual harassment in the academic setting. Studies on the relationship between gender bias and perceptions of sexual harassment are considered important to explore because gender bias can cause an individual to perceive sexual harassment solely based on the gender of the harassers, so it is possible that the assessment related to sexual harassment given by the observer does not match the reality of the sexual harassment event that occurred. Since people can normalize the assessment related to the form of sexual harassment based on the gender of the perpetrator or victim, the disparity between the observer’s assessment and the sexual harassment that occurred can perpetuate the incident.

It is a quantitative and non-experimental study. Using a convenience sample, participants in this study were students who were currently pursuing undergraduate and diploma education programs. Convenience sampling is one of the non-probability sampling techniques based on coincidence and the convenience of researchers regarding the availability of access in research sampling. It means that everyone has the right to become a research sample if the researcher considers that the person who happened to be met is suitable to be used as a data source.

Data collection was conducted online by distributing questionnaires through various social media platforms or chat messaging, such as WhatsApp, LINE, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and LinkedIn. It was done because we conducted the study amid the COVID-19 pandemic, making it impossible for us to collect data offline.

In this study, the instrument used to measure the perception of sexual harassment is the Sexual Harassment Definitions Questionnaire (SHDQ) developed by Foulis and McCabe in 1997. SHDQ consists of 16 items, with dichotomous variables used to make participants decide whether they perceive an incident as sexual harassment. The SHDQ has a score range of 0–16. A high score indicates that participants perceived more incidents as sexual harassment, while a low score indicates that participants did not perceive an incident as sexual harassment. Example of SHDQ items in their original language is (1) “Jane is walking along the street when two men yell sexually suggestive comments to her from a passing car” and (2) “Jane is walking along the street when two women yell sexually suggestive comments to her from a passing car.”

Another questionnaire is the Gender Role Stereotypes Scale (GRSS), which measures gender bias and was developed by Mills, Culbertson, Huffman, and Connell in 2012. GRSS has 14 items, of which seven are related to masculine gender role stereotypes, and the other seven are related to feminine gender role stereotypes. GRSS has a 5-point Likert scale, with options as follows: (1) should always be done by men, (2) usually done by men, (3) equal responsibility for both, (4) usually done by women, and (5) should always be done by women. GRSS has a score range of 14–70. A higher score indicates that the participant has a high level of traditional gender role stereotyping, which has an impact on his or her high level of gender bias, while a low score indicates that the participant has a low level of traditional gender role stereotyping. An example of a GRSS item in its original language is “Earn most of the money to support the family.”

In the paper is not an expert judgment with SHDQ and GRSS for validity. Those instruments were each tested by two experts in the field of social psychology. There were only minor revisions given by the two experts. SHDQ only needs improvement in grammar and replacement of the names of people used in the scenario by using names that are more familiar in Indonesia, while the results of expert judgment on GRSS were related to the form of activities that must be adjusted to the daily habits of Indonesian people. We then changed the names of ‘Jane’ and ‘Mike’ to ‘Ani’ and ‘Budi’ in SHDQ, and we changed the activities in GRSS from “Mow the lawn” to “Repairing broken roof tiles” and “Shovel snow

---
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After the expert judgment stage, we conducted a readability test. The test was conducted by involving seven participants for SHDQ and seven participants for GRSS. The participants involved in the test were students in the age range of 20–22 years old. The test uses online by video call through the Google Meet application. We gave instructions first before they filled out the questionnaire. We also accompanied the participants while they completed the questionnaire. From this stage, there was no feedback or questions regarding either questionnaire from each participant.

Furthermore, we conducted a tryout to analyze the items on both instruments (N = 35). Participants tryout were students currently pursuing undergraduate and diploma education. Based on the item analysis test using corrected inter-item correlation, we decided to involve all items SHDQ, while for GRSS, two items got deleted based on the result of corrected inter-item correlation that showed <0.2. We decided to delete the two items because they decreased the test-retest reliability. After we deleted the two items, the reliability of the GRSS measuring instrument, which previously showed a value of 0.679, increased to 0.703.

The Data of Students Harassement in Kuantitatif

Participants (N = 246) in this study came from DKI Jakarta and its greater area (Bodetabek), as well as outside Jabodetabek. Participants aged 17 to 27 (mean = 21; SD = 1.47). Detailed information on participants’ sex and location can be found in Table 1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refused to answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DKI jakarta</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodetabek</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Jabodetabek</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. Sexual Harassment Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stalking/ a stranger following you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unwanted sexual looks or gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Showing pornography (e.g. showing naked pictures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exposing genitals/ masturbating in front of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Saying girl, babe, honey, or similar words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Whistling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Asking personal questions about sexual life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sexual comments about clothing, anatomy, or looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Unwanted deliberate touch/ pinching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pulling or playing with hair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Putting hands on shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Touching/ rubbing/ squeezing breasts with hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Poking with penis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Patting on the buttocks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is From 14 forms of sexual harassment experiences in the UN Taxonomy of Sexual Harassment (UNT) questionnaire, the most common forms of harassment experienced by participants in this study were: being called “Sayang,” which is defined as “Babe” or similar by strangers; being groped; and receiving sexual comments about clothing, body shape, or appearance. In contrast, forms of harassment that were rarely or even never experienced by participants were: being shown genitals in public places, having breasts or genitals touched or squeezed, and being deliberately nudged with male genitals. The table above shows the list of sexual harassment behavior based on the UNT questionnaire. with on Both SHDQ and GRSS were developed in Indonesia. To fulfill the psychometric requirements, the first conducted forward with psycometric and then continued with backward problem. The word talking is a process for carried out by sexual haressment world on pretending intepretation.

Talking Statistical Analysis of Sexual Harassment is to find out the distribution of research data, we conducted a normality test using the Shapiro-Wilk test. From the results, it can be concluded that the data obtained in this study are not normally distributed, so we conducted a correlation test using a non-parametric statistical method. We used Spearman’s rho to see the significance between gender bias and perceptions of sexual harassment. The results of the correlation calculation using Spearman’s rho showed an insignificant negative correlation between gender bias and perceptions of sexual harassment (r=-0.094, p=0.143).

The Challenging of Bias Gender and Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in students victims

This study was conducted to determine the relationship between gender bias and students’ perceptions of sexual harassment in the academic setting. However, the results of the correlation test conducted to see the relationship between gender bias and perceptions of sexual harassment showed no significant relationship between gender bias and perceptions of sexual harassment. The results of this study differ from the results of previous studies, which found that gender bias formed from gender role stereotypes can be a factor related to individual perceptions in assessing forms of behavior that are considered sexual harassment or not.45

We suspect that the insignificant results of the study could be due to various factors. First, there are factors other than gender bias that may play a greater role in perceptions of sexual harassment, seeing that gender bias is not the only factor that can influence perceptions of sexual harassment.43 Studies on the role of gender stereotypes on perceptions of sexual harassment are inconsistent with previous research. Cultural differences and media exposure are considered to be related to the gender role stereotypes that a person holds.44 They contributed to the inconsistent results found between previous research conducted in the United States of America and in Australia, which found the role of gender role stereotypes on attitudes towards sexual harassment and not on perceptions of sexual harassment.45

Furthermore, we also suspect that the influence of cultural context makes the results of this study insignificant. From a cultural point of view, Indonesian society has always been attached to a patriarchal culture, where the position of men in the hierarchy is in a higher position than women. The Convention Watch Working Group argues that patriarchal culture has been reflected in Indonesia’s history, where in the past, women were used as sex slaves for foreign colonizers and were not allowed to pursue education.46 Patriarchal culture indirectly has an impact on the formation of a mindset in a society where men are portrayed as masculine and strong, while women are close to femininity and are often seen as weak, so when there is sexual harassment behavior such as whistling or flirting with others, people tend to consider this behavior as normal, especially if the behavior is done by men against women.47 Thus, we suspect that the patriarchal culture has an influence on one’s perception of sexual harassment, and it is possible that it also impacts the results of this study.

Another factor that can explain the study’s findings is the measuring instrument, specifically the SHDQ, which was used to assess perceptions of sexual harassment. In general, the context of sexual harassment scenarios in SHDQ describes a situation in which the perpetrator and victim have an equal level or status of power (e.g., fellow students), whereas people tend to judge a behavior as sexual harassment if the perpetrator and the
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survivor of sexual harassment have an unequal power status. It is because sexual harassment in which the context of the scenario between the perpetrator and the survivor has an equal status level is still not recognized by both victims and observers of sexual harassment itself. Thus, the scenario used in SHDQ in which the status of the perpetrator and victim is equal could explain the insignificant result.

Furthermore, the SHDQ developed by Foulis and McCabe is a vignette-type measure with a dichotomous item response model, with the items describing sexual harassment behavior and requiring individuals to select a definite and unambiguous response, even if they perceive the scenario differently in real life. The scenario’s format is considered to make it difficult for people to imagine scenarios that are not similar to their gender, such as male participants who must position themselves in scenarios with examples of ‘If you are Jane (or Ani, in the Indonesian version)’ and vice versa. Participants’ difficulty in imagining scenarios that differed from their gender may have been due to their ignorance of how the other gender would react when assessing the scenario, resulting in them being unable to make assumptions about how others outside of their gender would assess sexual harassment.

Another explanation that can be considered regarding the insignificant results of this study is the participants’ sexual harassment experience. One’s experience of sexual harassment was found to influence his or her perception of sexual harassment. The experience of sexual harassment does not always affect the person in determining whether or not a behavior is considered sexual harassment, but the discomfort caused by the experience of sexual harassment will affect how he or she assesses a behavior as sexual harassment. As shown in Figure 1, the majority of participants said they had never or rarely experienced sexual harassment. It implies that the participants may have had no prior experience with sexual harassment or only had limited exposure to it. Thus, the low frequency of sexual harassment experiences reported by participants may be related to how observers perceive those listed behaviors as sexual harassment, which may influence the study’s insignificant findings.

Furthermore, while we did not measure participants’ level of understanding of sexual harassment in this study, it is possible that participants’ understanding of sexual harassment has improved. Greater knowledge of sexual harassment provides participants with more information about the types of behavior that are considered sexual harassment. However, an increased understanding of common sexual harassment leads to social desirability bias which affects participants’ tendency to provide answers when they are involved in an assessment of sexual harassment, where the answers will be adjusted to the norms that are considered good and accepted in society. The presence of such tendencies could allow for social desirability bias, which could have influenced the responses given by study participants.

Conclusion

Several factors influence observers’ perspectives when determining whether a behavior is considered sexual harassment or not. Gender bias derived from gender role stereotypes is one of the factors thought to influence individual perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors. However, gender bias, which was initially thought to be related to the perception of sexual harassment, was found to be insignificant in this study.
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We suspect that the study’s findings are due to a variety of factors, including weaknesses in the measuring instruments, the influence of Indonesian culture, and the presence of increased understanding among participants, which influences their responses.

One of the study’s weaknesses is the unbalanced gender demographic data, with female participants outnumbering male participants. Because of the disparity in the number of male and female participants, the research subjects may not be representative of the population. Another weakness is that we did not measure other variables that could explain the study’s findings, one of which is the participants’ level of understanding of behaviors categorized as sexual harassment.

Based on the findings, we recommend that future researchers investigate the involvement of other factors that can influence sexual harassment perception, such as cultural factors, knowledge-related factors, and sexual harassment experience. Future researchers might need to consider quota sampling to ensure that the number of male and female participants is not too widely divergent. Furthermore, future researchers with an interest in similar topics can try to investigate gender bias and other criterion variables or consider using other measuring instruments that have more varied forms of sexual harassment scenarios, such as scenarios where the perpetrator and victim’s level of power or status is not entirely equal.
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