ORIGINAL ARTICLE

WILEY

"Without support, victims do not report": The Co-creation of a workplace sexual harassment risk assessment survey tool

Aitor Gómez-González[1] | Sandra Girbés-Peco[2] |
José Miguel Jiménez González[1] | María Vieites Casado[3]

[1]Department of Pedagogy, University Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain

[2]Department of Teaching and Learning and Educational Organization, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

[3]Department of Sociology, School of Economics and Business, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Correspondence
Sandra Girbés-Peco, Department of Teaching and Learning and Educational Organization, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
Email: sandra.girbes@ub.edu

Abstract

Workplace sexual harassment (WSH) remains a common experience for many women worldwide. European policies and guidelines point to the need to establish comprehensive WSH prevention programs and strategies. One of the strategies contemplated is establishing risk assessment and monitoring systems to prevent and identify WSH situations. However, few WSH risk assessment tools are currently available to European organizations and companies. This article analyses the co-creation process that has led to developing an evidence-based risk assessment survey tool (ST) to prevent in a wide diversity of work contexts. This process has involved experts, survivors, activists, and other relevant stakeholders. The research has been carried out based on the communicative methodology through the implementation of qualitative fieldwork. Furthermore, an extensive review of scientific literature and international guidelines has been carried out. The established co-creation process has led to the inclusion of the Isolating Gender Violence approach in a risk assessment ST to prevent WSH for the first time.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Sexual harassment (SH) is the most prevalent form of violence against girls and women in the European Union (European Union Fundamental Rights Agency, 2014). It is estimated that between 83 and 102 million women (around 45% and 55% of European women) have experienced at least one form of SH since 15 (Latcheva, 2017). Sexual harassment, as defined in EU Gender Equality Directives, supposes a specific type of discrimination "where any form of unwanted verbal, non-verbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature occurs, with the purpose or effect of violating the dignity of a person, in particular when creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment" (European Parliament, 2004). According to FRA (2014), physical SH is the most reported SH in Europe, followed by verbal and non-verbal SH. Furthermore, the EU-wide survey carried out by FRA (2021) indicates that 57% of participating women say that SH took place in public spaces such as the street or a park.

This article focuses on workplace sexual harassment (WSH). Specifically, it analyses the co-creation process that has led to developing a survey tool (ST) to prevent SH in a wide variety of European work contexts. WSH has received increasing attention from its recognition as a socio-legal phenomenon in the 1970s (McDonald, 2012). The "MeToo" movement, with a diversity of local denominations, has been a lever in the visibility of the WSH, encouraging women from all over the world to join through social networks to denounce the pain and harm caused by its widespread occurrence (Sen et al., 2018). WSH contemplates abusive workplace behaviors which have hierarchical power relations at their core. It includes behaviors present in general bullying, mobbing, racial harassment, and sex-based harassment (Thornton, 2002). However, unlike other counterproductive workplace behaviors, WSH has an explicitly sexual dimension (Samuels, 2003).

Previous studies have shown significant discrepancies concerning WSH incidence depending on representativeness, measurements, time frame, or cultural context (Hanson et al., 2020; Nielsen et al., 2010). However, studies such as the one carried out by Timmerman and Bajema (1999) suggest that between 17% and 81% of European employed women reported experiencing some form of WSH. There is a broad consensus that women, especially young women, are disproportionately exposed to WSH (García-Hernández et al., 2020). However, WSH can also affect any worker, especially those who present elements of vulnerability because of their sexual orientation, gender identity, race, age, or disability, amongst others (Chamberlain et al., 2008). In addition, several risk factors increase the chances of suffering WSH, among which are working in contact with the public; with people in distress; with objects of value; in situations that are not (or not correctly) covered or protected by labor law and social protection; during unsocial working hours; alone or in relative isolation; in intimate spaces and private homes; in conflict zones, in leadership positions or highly masculinized sectors, among others (Chvatík et al., 2021; Foley, et al., 2020; International Labor International Labour Organisation, 2016; Tinkler & Jao, 2020).

The consequences of WSH have been studied in depth from various fields, demonstrating adverse psychological, health, job-related, and organizational outcomes (Chan et al., 2008; Fitzgerald et al., 1997). These consequences have been evidenced in WSH direct targets (e.g., experiencing anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder, among others) (Magley et al., 1999; Willness et al., 2007). Furthermore, a limited number of studies have also identified its negative impact on bystanders' welfare. For instance, studies such as Miner-Rubino and Cortina (2007) suggest that working in a misogynistic environment can negatively affect all employees. Their analysis shows that observing hostility toward women and perceiving the organization's tolerance about harassment predict lower well-being, which is also related to higher withdrawal for female and male workers.

Concerning the actions raised against WSH, policies, collective agreements, recommendations, training, and complaints procedures have been promoted internationally by organizations such as the United Nations Committee

on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, the International Labor Organization, the European Union, and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (McCann, 2005). Some research has pointed to the need to accompany these legislative advances with a broader involvement of agents promoting cultural change: employers, trade unions, civil society, media, and education institutions among others (European Trade Union Confederation, 2014; Handy, 2006). From this approach, the EU Erasmus + ASTRAPI project proposes an eight-point framework for a transformative approach to ending WSH (Cyprus Academy of Public Administration & Hypatia Foundation Promoting Equality, 2020, p. 18), which includes: (1) tackling gender inequalities, discrimination, and social norms; (2) human resource policies, procedures, and practices; (3) effective complaints procedures; (4) support and remedies for victims/survivors; (5) active bystander approaches; (6) perpetrator accountability; (7) raising awareness, training, workplace guidance, and campaigns, and (8) comprehensive prevention and risk assessment in the workplace.

This article provides new knowledge about one of the areas mentioned above, scientifically explored to a lesser extent: an evidence-based tool contributing to WSH risk assessment and monitoring. This work also starts from the considerations offered by previous investigations, which shed light on the excessive focus placed on definitional distinctions of SH and the little attention received by theoretical approaches that inform effective prevention strategies and actions (McDonald, 2012). Taking these considerations into account, we present the methodology implemented in our study bellow. Second, we provide the main results, focusing on the evidence-based ST designed from the literature review. In addition, we report the co-creation process that has accompanied the ST design and has led to incorporating the Isolating Gender Violence (IGV) approach (Vidu et al., 2021) in a tool aimed at preventing, monitoring, and reporting WSH. Isolating Gender Violence is defined as "any kind of violence against those who advocate for gender violence victims. The objective of such violence is to isolate gender violence victims and discourage reporting or receiving support, in order to maintain the impunity of gender violence" (Vidu et al., 2021; p.185). Therefore, the violence suffered by people who support the victims has also been addressed.

Finally, we discuss the main contributions, limitations, and future lines of research provided by this work.

2 | METHODS

The research has been grounded on the communicative methodology (CM) (Puigvert et al., 2017). This methodology has been widely used in previous research on gender violence (Díez-Palomar et al., 2014; Valls-Carol, 2014). The CM aims to go beyond the diagnosis of social problems and identify those elements capable of reducing social inequalities. From this perspective, knowledge is built through an egalitarian dialog between researchers and a wide diversity of stakeholders.

The Center of Research on Excellence for All ethics committee has approved this study (reference number: 20211218). The research has been developed in two phases. First, we have carried out a review of scientific literature focused on WSH. The source selection has been performed prioritizing articles published in scientific journals indexed in the Web of Sciences and published from 1990 to the present. Keywords used included: SH; workplace; prevention; risk assessment; risk management; risk prevention; survey, monitoring, and organizational climate. In addition, we have analyzed recommendations disseminated by international organizations (e.g., UN Women and the ILO), as well as previous WSH risk assessments and organizational climate surveys.

The second phase has involved the implementation of qualitative fieldwork including communicative focus group ($N = 2$); semi-structured interviews with communicative orientation ($N = 5$), and content validity. The communicative approach has meant that participants have held central positions in knowledge construction, recognizing them as experts through their lived experiences. In this regard, it is worth mentioning that our research has included WSH survivors. Therefore, we have considered strategies identified in previous research with communicative and feminist orientations (Melgar Alcantud, Puigvert, 2021). Among them is to establish an egalitarian climate and use of dialog and make available relevant information and resources on the topic studied to participants.

The communicative focus groups were conducted to identify collective interpretations about the contents and characteristics that a WSH risk assessment ST should have. Table 1 shows the composition of the three focus groups carried out:

Semi-structured interviews with communicative orientation were conducted with activists and experts in SH from 5 different fields of knowledge (Economics and Business; Law; Education; Political Science and Sociology). The interviews aimed to collect theoretical contributions from the experts and practical experiences from the activists concerning specific aspects that the ST should cover. The interviews made it possible to contrast the knowledge provided by the researchers with that of the participants. Table 2 shows the participants' profiles:

Content validity (Newman et al., 2013; Ricci et al., 2019) has been carried out to ensure that the items incorporated in the ST were acceptable, comprehensive, and relevant for experts and other relevant stakeholders to whom the tool is addressed (e.g., low skilled workers, NGOs, or foundations). To this end, content validity has been carried out through direct communication with members of three different panels. We describe them in Table 3:

Communication with the panels' members has been conducted through various strategies, including focus groups, interviews, or exchanges via email, video call, or telephone.

2.1 | Data analysis

Personal information obtained was anonymized by applying pseudonyms. We transcribed data collected from communicative interviews and focus groups for further analysis. The analysis was performed following the orientations of the CM (Pulido et al., 2014). Two dimensions (exclusionary and transformative) and eight categories were established. The exclusionary dimension considered those elements that hinder WSH identification, monitoring, and reporting. Conversely, the transformative dimension included data referring to those elements that promote WSH recognition and action. Eight categories of analysis were also established. Seven of them deductively: (1) victim

TABLE 1 Communicative focus group composition

Typology	Focus group composition
Focus group with activists and survivors	Four members of a support network for survivors of gender-based violence. Three of them are women and one man. All of them have suffered cases of SH and have supported other survivors through the network.
Mixed focus group	Focus group with a former trade union representative (woman), a member of an equity unit at a Spanish university (woman), and an expert in sexual harassment (woman).

TABLE 2 Participants involved in the semi-structured interviews

Pseudonym	Profile
Carla	Woman, 28 years old. Survivor and activist. Postdoctoral researcher at a Spanish university. Field: Economics and business.
Sara	Woman, 30 years old. Survivor and activist. Postdoctoral researcher in an American university. Field: Sociology and law.
Carles	Man, 40 years old. The main researcher of an research project focused on violence against the LGTBI + community. Field: Education.
Lourdes	Woman, 43 years old. Head of equality policies at a Spanish university. Field: Sociology and political science
Mario	Man, 67 years old. Full professor at a Spanish university. Field: Economics and business

TABLE 3 Panels involved in the validity content

Panel	Profile
Workers panel	Ten participants (all women) in an adult education association. All of them with low academic degrees. They occupy or have held unskilled jobs (e.g., domestic caregivers, cleaners, factory workers, or saleswomen).
Expert panel	Mixed panel composed by the members of the EU ASTRAPI project, which has incorporated five different profiles from seven european countries: 1) four universities/research groups (Cyprus (N = 2), Greece (N = 1), and Spain (N = 1)); 2) two foundations on gender equity (Cyprus (N = 1) and Bulgaria (N = 1)); 3) an organization composed of five trade unions (Denmark); 4) one feminist think tank (Belgium), and 5) an independent researcher and policy advisor on gender-based violence at work (UK).
Expert panel	The panel consists of five academics: Four are involved in Spanish universities and one in an American university. They are experts in SH prevention from different disciplines (e.g., methodology, mathematics, education, social work, and law).

profile; (2) gender harassment; (3) unwanted sexual attention; (4) sexual coercion; (5) WSH circumstances; (6) institutional gender perspective; and (7) others. One of them inductively: (8) IGV (Vidu et al., 2021).

3 | RESULTS

In this section, we present the main results of our study. First, we present the evidence-based ST, which has been grounded in the literature review. Second, we focused on the co-creation process accompanying the ST design.

3.1 | The design of an evidence-based risk assessment survey tool

The ST has been designed to provide a reliable and valid tool to define WSH levels of intensity. Furthermore, the ST arises from the need of developing and improving WSH data collection and management systems to advance toward greater comparability of data across European countries (ILO, 2016; UN Women, 2019).

The design of the ST has meant contemplating WSH prevention programs and strategies, including primary (e.g., policy and training), secondary (e.g., response after the problem has occurred), and tertiary prevention (e.g., longer-term responses after the problem has occurred) (Chamberlain et al., 2008; McDonald et al., 2015). Thus, the ST assesses specific organizational risk factors within these three areas. Furthermore, the ST contemplate the risk or potential risk of WSH in spheres such as (1) working conditions and arrangements, work organization, and human resource management; (2) third parties (e.g., clients, customers, service providers, users, patients, or students), and (3) discrimination, abuse of power, and gender, cultural and social norms that support WSH (Cyprus Academy of Public Administration & Hypatia Foundation Promoting Equality, 2020). The analysis has also comprised previous tools mentioned in the reviewed literature, such as the SH Questionary (SEQ) (Fitzgerald et al., 1997) or the Workplace Climate Survey (Workplaces Respond to Domestic and Sexual Violence, 2015).

This analysis process has led us to establish six sections:

- *Section 1: Personal data (15 items).*

It collects basic demographics (e.g., sex, age, sexuality, gender identity, race/ethnicity, position in the organization, etc.). This section has been included following the guidelines of UN Women (2019), which recommends collecting personal data to trace the intersectional power relations within patterns of WSH. However, this section is presented with the awareness that organizations should carefully assess the implications of collecting this type

of data, especially for worker safety and victims' protection. For instance, small- and medium-sized enterprises or businesses must consider not including this section in the ST, as it could violate the respondent's right to anonymity. In these cases, carrying out a confidential and anonymous survey could help identify critical issues in the working environment to a greater extent.

- *Sections 2, 3 and 4: Gender harassment (21 items); Unwanted sexual attention (24 items); and Sexual coercion (14 items).*

These three sections come from the well-known SH dimensional model provided by Fitzgerald et al. (1997). Gender harassment includes "a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors not aimed at sexual cooperation, but that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about women" (Fitzgerald, et al., 1997, p.430). Unwanted sexual attention comprises a "wide range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors that is offensive, unwanted, and unreciprocated" (Fitzgerald et al., 1997, p.431). Sexual coercion refers to the "canonical example of SH, that is, the extortion of sexual cooperation in return for job-related considerations" (Fitzgerald et al., 1997, p.431). Starting from this conceptualization, the items contemplated in these three sections collect a wide range of behaviorally specific questions, from generally offensive sex-related behaviors (e.g., language/gestures, intrusive behaviors, etc.) to attempts or situations of coerced sexual exchange (*quid pro quo* SH). Situations covering both face-to-face and incidents perpetrated with technologies are covered (Ford, 2013).

- *Section 5: WSH circumstances (14 items)*

This section focuses primarily on the WSH organizational dimension (Chamberlain et al., 2008; O'Hare & O'Donohue, 1998). It collects information on situations in which the organization could facilitate WSH through power differentials created by hierarchical structures and relationships. In addition, it collects information about locations and circumstances under which WSH may or may have occurred. It includes typical workplaces and other spaces where work-related activities could be carried out (e.g., bathroom, journey back home, hotel room, etc.).

- *Section 6: Institutional gender perspective (24 items).*

Also focused on the organizational sphere, this section collects information on the knowledge of workers and organization members regarding the organization's policies and procedures, training programs, track records for receipt, response, and dispositions toward WSH, among others (Jenner et al., 2020).

The 112 items that make up the ST are distributed throughout the six sections described above. Tables 4–9 (see annexes) show all the items conforming to the tool.

The ST collects situations experienced or witnessed in the last 12 months (UN Women, 2019). However, item 2.10 allows the identification of WSH incidents prior to the last 12 months.

Finally, considering the social context in which the research has been developed, the ST incorporates three items (5.7; 5.7.1, 5.8) that collect the potential impact COVID-19 pandemic could have on working conditions and WSH incidents.

3.2 | The inclusion of IGV in the survey tool through a co-creation process

The ST provided in the previous section has also resulted from a co-creation process, which has involved a wide variety of stakeholders and experts. The discussions and feedback obtained with the participants have made it possible to modify some items, identify omissions and incorporate new aspects that the researchers had not initially considered. This section focuses on the primary contribution extracted from this dialogic process: the inclusion of the IGV

TABLE 4 Survey tool Section 1: Personal data

Item	Type of response
1.1. Age:	One answer can be selected
18–29	
30–39	
40–49	
50–59	
60 or more	
1.2. Gender:	One answer can be selected
Woman	
Men	
Transgender	
Non-binary	
Fluid	
I prefer not to reveal	
1.3. Sexual orientation:	One answer can be selected
Heterosexual	
Gay	
Lesbian	
Asexual	
Bisexual	
Pansexual	
Other	
I prefer not to reveal	
1.4. City of birth:	Open response
1.5. Do you belong to a minority ethnic group?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
If yes, please select one of the following options:	One answer can be selected
(Include minorities present in the country)	
1.6. Current family or relationship status:	One answer can be selected
Single	
Married	
Divorced	
Widower	
I live in a couple	
Living apart together	
Other	

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
1.7. Who do you live with? Please, select the option you consider most appropriate:	One answer can be selected
Nuclear family (with your partner and children, and/or with parents and/or siblings)	
Extended family (with other relatives: Your parents, grandparents, or others)	
Single-parent family	
My partner	
My partner and children	
Alone with children	
With friends	
With friends and children	
With acquaintances	
With acquaintances and children	
Alone	
Other	
1.8. The approximate annual income of the coexistence nucleus is:	One answer can be selected
Less than or equal to 5.000 €	
Between 5.001 and 10.000 €	
Between 10.001 and 15.000 €	
Between 15.001 and 20.000 €	
Between 20.001 and 30.000 €	
Between 30.001 and 50.000 €	
More than 50.000 €	
1.9. Which of the following options describe better your current employment situation?	One answer can be selected
Permanent contact	
Temporary contract	
Internship contract	
Self-employed	
Others	
1.10. What is your highest educational level?	One answer can be selected.
Primary education	
Lower secondary education (typically between ages 10 and 13 years old)	
Upper secondary education (typically between ages 14 and 16 years old)	
Post-secondary non-tertiary education	
Short-cycle tertiary education (e.g., usually provide professional knowledge, skills, and competencies)	
Bachelor's degree or equivalent level	
Master's degree or equivalent level	
Tertiary education (e.g., Ph.D.)	

(Continues)

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
1.11. Which of the following options describes better the position you hold in your workplace?	One answer can be selected
Employee	
Supervisor	
Manager	
Department director	
General director	
CEO	
Counselor/advisor	
Collaborator	
Trainee	
Volunteer	
Other	
1.12. Does your workplace or your situation at your workplace meet any of the following characteristics? If yes, select the options you consider most appropriate:	Multiple answers can be selected
I work in contact with the public	
I work with people in distress	
I work with objects of value	
I work during unsocial working hours (for instance, evening and night work)	
I work alone or in relative isolation, or in a remote location	
I work in an intimate space or private home	
I work in a conflict zone (for instance, providing public and emergency services)	
I work in a zone with high rates of unemployment	
I work in a highly masculinized workplace	
I work in a context in which alcohol consumption is tolerated or encouraged.	
I feel unsafe in my work car parking	
I feel unsafe traveling to and from work	
I consider my workplace is not adequately covered or protected by labor law and social protection	
I consider my job is low paid	
I consider my work present precarious or insecure working conditions	
1.13. How long have you been working in your current workplace?	One answer can be selected
Less than 12 months	
Between 1 and 3 years	
Between 4 and 6 years	
Between 7 and 9 years	
More than 10 years	
1.14. Optional question:	Multiple answers can be selected
Do you present any of the following characteristics? If yes, please, select it.	
I have a disability	
I am a person living with HIV	
I go through financial difficulties	

TABLE 5 Survey tool Section 2: Gender harassment

Item	Type of response
In the past 12 months, how often did someone at work (including supervisors, co-workers, clients, or customers...):	
2.1. Tell sexist stories or jokes that were offensive to me?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.1.a. Tell sexist stories or jokes that were offensive to someone at my workplace?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.2. Display offensive material to me?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.2.a display offensive material to someone at my workplace?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.3. Make offensive remarks about my appearance, body, or sexual activities?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	

(Continues)

T A B L E   5   (Continued)

Item	Type of response
2.3.a. Make offensive remarks about the appearance, body, or sexual activities of someone at my workplace?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.4. Refer to people of my gender in insulting or offensive terms?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.4.a. Refer to the gender of another person in my workplace in insulting or offensive terms?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.5. Put me down or act in a condescending way toward me because of my gender?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.5.a. Put somebody down or act in a condescending way toward them because of their gender?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
2.6. In the past 12 months, were you physically threatened or assaulted?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.6.a. In the past 12 months, someone at your workplace was physically threatened or assaulted?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.7. If you experienced any of the behaviors described above: was it motivated by some of the following elements?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options that you consider most representative.	
My age	
My gender	
My sexual orientation	
My gender identity	
My race or ethnicity	
My religion	
My disability	
Other	
2.8. If you have experienced any of the abovementioned situations, has it resulted in any negative consequences?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	

(Continues)

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
2.8.a. If someone in your work context has experienced any of the abovementioned situations, has it resulted in any negative consequence?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
2.8.b. If yes: have you identified any of the following consequences?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options that you consider most representative	
Feeling uncomfortable in the workplace	
Difficulty concentrating or performing tasks	
Avoid socializing with people at work	
Fear of going to work	
Consider leaving work	
Leave the job	
Depression or adverse psychological consequences	
Problem socializing with friends or family	
Others	
2.8.c. Do you consider the harassment could have harmed the access to training and/or career progression of the harassed person?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
2.9. In the case of having witnessed that someone has experienced any of the situations described in the previous questions:	One answer can be selected
Have you contacted the affected person or offered any help?	
Yes	
No	
2.9.a. If not, why not? Please, select the options you consider most representative.	Multiple answers can be selected
For fear that providing support could have personal repercussions for me	
For fear that providing support could have employment repercussions for me	
For fear that providing support could have consequences for my environment (e.g., other colleagues, family members, etc.)	
It was a situation that did not concern me	
Others	

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
2.9.b. If yes, did it imply any negative consequences for you, or were you afraid to receive any negative consequences?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
2.9.b.a. If yes, did you identify any of the following consequences?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options you consider most representative	
Feeling uncomfortable in the workplace	
Difficulty concentrating or performing tasks	
Avoid socializing with people at work	
Fear of going to work	
Consider leaving work	
Leave the job	
Depression or adverse psychological consequences	
Problem socializing with friends or family	
Others	
2.10. The questions asked in this section have focused on the last 12 months. Have you experienced any of these behaviors in the past beyond the previous 12 months?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	

perspective in the tool (Vidu et al., 2021). Adopting this approach involves (1) designing the ST considering the relationship between WSH and IGV; (2) including items to collect the consequences suffered by those who advocate for WSH victims; and (3) including items that allow bystanders to report WSH situations.

First, the interviews, focus groups, and contacts with survivors and experts have shed light on the relationship between IGV and the perpetuation of WSH. As previously mentioned, IGV refers to any kind of violence against people who advocate for gender violence victims (Vidu et al., 2021). The relationship between IGV and WSH was not identified in the review of the scientific literature on WSH, nor the guidelines provided by international organizations. Therefore, this co-creation process was essential to include the IGV perspective in the design of the ST.

In this regard, the following quote shows one of the contributions provided by Sara during an interview. This survivor and activist state that the only way victims report is to feel supported. However, knowing that the attacks will also affect people who support them contributes to the victims not daring to report WSH incidents. Therefore, risk prevention systems and tools must consider this connection between lack of protection of victim's support networks and difficulty for victims to report:

> It's a very hard process for the victims because it always involves a lot of questioning [...] And what was the key to moving forward with the complaint and being able to be well and succeed? Well, it was the support we received [...]. However, then we saw that the attacks also went to those supports. That was really hard [...]. It is essential to realize that the lack of complaints comes from attacks on the people who support us.

TABLE 6 Survey tool Section 3: Unwanted sexual attention

Item	Type of response
In the past 12 months, how often did someone at work (including supervisors, co-workers, clients, or customers):	
3.1. Attempted to discuss sex in a way that made me feel uncomfortable	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.1a. Attempted to discuss sex in a way that made someone at my workplace feel uncomfortable	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.2. I received unwanted sexual attention. for example, verbal and/or nonverbal behaviors related to my sexuality or/and my body are offensive and undesirable to me and are not reciprocated.	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.2.a. Someone at my workplace received unwanted sexual attention. for example, verbal and/or nonverbal behaviors related to their sexuality or/and body that are offensive and unwanted to them and that are not reciprocated.	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.3. Staring or leering at me in a way that made me feel uncomfortable	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
3.3.a. Staring or leering at someone at my workplace in a way that made them feel uncomfortable	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.4. Requested me for drink or dinner, despite rejection	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.4.a. Requested someone at my workplace for drink or dinner, despite rejection	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.5. Attempted to stroke or rub, what made me feel uncomfortable	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.5.a. Attempted to stroke or rub someone at my workplace, what made them feel uncomfortable	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	

(Continues)

T A B L E   6   (Continued)

Item	Type of response
3.6. Somebody touched me in a way that made me feel uncomfortable.	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.6.a. Somebody touched someone else at my workplace in a way that made them feel uncomfortable.	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.7. Made unwanted attempts to establish a sexual relationship with you, or engage in sexual activities with you, despite your efforts to discourage these attempts or express disinterest	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.7.a. Made unwanted attempts to establish a sexual relationship with someone at my workplace, or engage in sexual activities with them, despite their efforts to discourage these attempts or express disinterest	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
3.8. If you have experienced some behaviors mentioned above: was the situation motivated by any of the following elements? Please, select the options that you consider most representative.	Multiple answers can be selected
My age	
My gender	
My sexual orientation	
My gender identity	
My race or ethnicity	
My religion	
My disability	
Other	
3.9. If you have experienced any of the abovementioned situations, has it resulted in any negative consequences?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.9.a. If someone in your work context has experienced any of the abovementioned situations: has it resulted in any negative consequence?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
3.9.b. If yes: have you identified any of the following consequences?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options that you consider most representative	
Feeling uncomfortable in the workplace	
Difficulty concentrating or performing tasks	
Avoid socializing with people at work	
Fear of going to work	
Consider leaving work	
Leave the job	
Depression or adverse psychological consequences	
Problem socializing with friends or family	
Others	

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
3.9.c. Do you consider the harassment could have hurt the access to training and/or career progression of the harassed person?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
3.10. If you have witnessed that someone in your work context has experienced any of the abovementioned situations, have you contacted the affected person or offered any help?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
3.10.a. If not, why not? Please, select the options you consider most representative.	Multiple answers can be selected
For fear that providing support could have personal repercussions for me	
For fear that providing support could have employment repercussions for me	
For fear that providing support could have consequences for my environment (e.g., other colleagues, family members, etc.)	
It was a situation that did not concern me	
Others	
3.10.b. If yes, did it imply any negative consequences for you, or were you afraid to receive any negative consequences?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
3.10.b.a. If yes, did you identify any of the following consequences?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options you consider most representative	
Feeling uncomfortable in the workplace	
Difficulty concentrating or performing tasks	
Avoid socializing with people at work	
Fear of going to work	
Consider leaving work	
Leave the job	
Depression or adverse psychological consequences	
Problem socializing with friends or family	
Others	
3.11. The questions asked in this section have focused on the last 12 months. Have you experienced any of these behaviors in the past beyond the previous 12 months?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	

TABLE 7 Survey tool Section 4: Sexual coercion

Item	Type of response
In the past 12 months, how often did someone at work (including supervisors, co-workers, clients, or customers):	
4.1. Make you feel like you were being bribed with some reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
4.1.a. Make somebody at your workplace feel like they were being bribed with some reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
4.2. Make you feel threatened with some retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by mentioning an upcoming review)	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
4.2.a. Make somebody at your workplace feel threatened with some retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by mentioning an upcoming review)	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	

(Continues)

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
4.3. If you have experienced some of the aforementioned behaviors: has the situation been motivated by any of the following elements? Please, select the options that you consider most representative.	Multiple answers can be selected
My age	
My gender	
My sexual orientation	
My gender identity	
My race or ethnicity	
My religion	
My disability	
Other	
4.4. If you have experienced any of the situations described above: has it resulted in any negative consequences?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
4.4.a. If someone you know has experienced any of the above-mentioned situations, has it resulted in any negative consequence?	One answer can be selected
Never	
Once	
Once a month or less	
Two-Three times a month	
Once a week or more	
One or more times a day	
4.4.b. If yes: have you identified any of the following consequences?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options that you consider most representative	
Feeling uncomfortable in the workplace	
Difficulty concentrating or performing tasks	
Avoid socializing with people at work	
Fear of going to work	
Consider leaving work	
Leave the job	
Depression or adverse psychological consequences	
Problem socializing with friends or family	
Others	

T A B L E 7 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
4.4.c. Do you consider the harassment could have harmed the access to training and/or career progression of the harassed person?	One answer can be selected. Item
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
4.5. If you have witnessed that someone has experienced any of the abovementioned situations, have you contacted the affected person in any way or offered any help?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
4.5.a. If not, why not? Please, select the options you consider most representative.	Multiple answers can be selected
For fear that providing support could have personal repercussions for me	
For fear that providing support could have employment repercussions for me	
For fear that providing support could have consequences for my environment (e.g., other colleagues, family members, etc.)	
It was a situation that did not concern me	
Others	
4.5.b. If yes, did it imply any negative consequences for you, or were you afraid to receive any adverse effects?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
4.5.b.a. If yes, did you identify any of the following consequences?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options you consider most representative	
Feeling uncomfortable in the workplace	
Difficulty concentrating or performing tasks	
Avoid socializing with people at work	
Fear of going to work	
Consider leaving work	
Leave the job	
Depression or adverse psychological consequences	
Problem socializing with friends or family	
Others	
4.6. The questions asked in this section have focused on the last 12 months. Have you experienced any of these behaviors in the past beyond the previous 12 months?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	

TABLE 8 Section 5: Sexual harassment circumstances

Item	Type of response
5.1. In your current workplace, is there any place/environment you consider particularly hostile or threatening?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
5.1.a. If so, what context/s?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options you consider most representative	
Office	
Classroom/room	
Bathrooms	
Parking	
Private office	
Private home	
Transport	
Bar or entertainment venue	
Hotel or residence	
Internet, social networks, or email	
Telephone	
Other *(specify)*	
5.2. If you have indicated that you have suffered or witnessed any harassment incident described in previous sections: What was the position of the aggressor? Please, select the most representative option.	One answer can be selected
Supervisor	
Manager	
Department director	
Managing director	
CEO	
Counselor/advisor	
Collaborator	
Voluntary	
Trainee	
Partner or ex-partner (who does not work in the same workplace)	
Someone with whom I/he/she has or had a relationship (which does not work in the same workplace)	
Other	
5.2.a. The aggressor was:	One answer can be selected
Woman	
Men	
Transgender	
Non-binary	
Fluid	
Other: (Indicate)	

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
5.2.b. In the case of multiple aggressors, you can provide additional information here:	Open question
5.3. What was the position of the victim? Please, select the most representative options	One answer can be selected
Supervisor	
Manager	
Department director	
Managing director	
CEO	
Counselor/advisor	
Collaborator	
Voluntary	
Trainee	
Partner or ex-partner (who does not work in the same workplace)	
Someone with whom I/he/she has or had a relationship (which does not work in the same workplace)	
Others	
5.3.a. The victim was:	One answer can be selected
Woman	
Men	
Transgender	
Non-binary	
Fluid	
Other	
5.3.b. In the case of multiple victims, you can provide additional information here:	Open question
5.4. Where did the situation take place?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the most representative answers.	
Office	
Classroom/room	
Bathrooms	
Parking	
Private office	
Private home	
Transport	
Bar or entertainment venue	
Hotel or residence	
Internet, social networks, or email	
Telephone	
Others	

(Continues)

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
5.5. What was the reaction of the victim? **Please, select the most representative answers.** Not tell anyone Tell a co-worker Inform the superior or management Submit a formal complaint to a specific unit in the workplace Submit an anonymous complaint to a particular unit in the workplace Tell a friend or family member Tell a professional (e.g., psychologist, or social worker) Report to a trade union Report to the police I do not know Other	Multiple answers can be selected
5.6. Do you know any case where the victim has not reported the incident to the organization for fear of being questioned or criticized? Yes No	One answer can be selected
5.7. Do you consider that the COVID-19 pandemic has harmed your employment situation? Yes No I do not know	One answer can be selected
5.7.a. Do you consider that the COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted the employment situation of people who work in your company/organization? Yes No I do not know	One answer can be selected
5.8. Do you consider the COVID-19 pandemic has made it challenging to report incidents of sexual harassment in your workplace? Yes No I do not know	One answer can be selected

The interactions established with experts and stakeholders have led to a broader identification of the WSH consequences. The following quote for Mario (an SH expert) emphasizes the need to incorporate the consequences suffered by the victims of IGV in risk assessment initiatives:

> The first victim who dared to report and those who supported her have been really crushed, in terms of slander on social networks, even in the press. And also, labor consequences. After that, when one of us applies for a position, there is always someone who says, "well, it has been said that these people…".

TABLE 9 Survey tool Section 6: Institutional gender perspective

Item	Type of response
6.1. Do you know of any case of sexual harassment experienced by someone from your workplace?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
6.1.a. If yes: did the victim inform the company/organization about the sexual harassment incident?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.2. If you would identify a case of sexual harassment in your workplace, would you inform your company/organization?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.3. Would you know how to act in the event of suffering or witnessing a case of sexual harassment in your workplace?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.4. Does your company/organization have a workplace policy and/or a code of conduct that includes aspects related to sexual harassment?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.5. Does your company/organization have a complaints procedure in case of sexual harassment?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.6. Does your company/organization contemplate sanctioning measures against sexual harassment behaviors at the workplace?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.7. Is there a named person in your workplace responsible for collecting and managing sexual harassment incidents?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.8. Is there some unit or service in your workplace in charge of monitoring and/or evaluating measures adopted against sexual harassment?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
6.9. Does your company/organization include sexual harassment as one of the risks present in the occupational safety and health management systems?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.9.a. If so: Do procedures contemplated to address sexual harassment respond to the victim's needs?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.10. Do you consider your company/organization to manage harassment complaints efficiently? (e.g., they respond within a reasonable time frame, they report on the development of the process)	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.11. Do you consider your company/organization applies improvements so that sexual harassment incidents reported do not happen again?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.12. In training initiatives promoted by your company/organization: has the issue of sexual harassment in the workplace been addressed?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.13. Does your company/organization take actions aimed at raising awareness on the problem of workplace sexual harassment?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.14. Does your company/organization consult with local entities or associations to receive guidance on dealing with sexual harassment (e.g., women workers, trade unions, women's organizations, or gender experts)?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.15. Does your collective bargaining agreement contemplate sexual harassment in the workplace?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
6.16. To improve prevention, management, or eradication of sexual harassment in the workplace: is there any other type of action you consider your company/organization should consider?	Open question
6.17. Have you suffered or know someone who has suffered gender violence by a current or former intimate partner (regardless of whether it was a stable or a sporadic relationship)?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.17.a. If so: Has the aggression harmed the quality of work or the ability to attend work of the victim?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.17.b. If so: did you identify any of the following consequences?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options you consider most representative	
Not being able to get to work on time	
Feeling uncomfortable in the workplace	
Difficulty concentrating or performing tasks	
Avoid socializing with people at work	
Fear of going to work	
Fear of stalking, harassment, or assault at work (in person or by email/telephone/text, etc.)	
Be given sick leave	
Consider leaving job	
Leave the job	
Depression or adverse psychological consequences	
Problem socializing with friends or family	
Lack of financial independence	
Others	
6.17.c. Do you consider that aggression could have harmed your access to training and/or career progression?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	
6.18. Does your company have any service/resource to provide support to employees who have experienced an incident of gender violence?	One answer can be selected
Yes	
No	
I do not know	

(Continues)

TABLE 9 (Continued)

Item	Type of response
6.19. If so, what kind of support does your company/organization provide?	Multiple answers can be selected
Please, select the options you consider most representative	
Information or training for employees on gender violence	
Prevention measures for gender violence survivors	
Safety and security planning in the workplace (e.g., including reassignment of work duties or location to workers who have taken out restraining or protection orders)	
Information and referrals to specialist gender violence organizations	
Paid leaves to survivors of gender violence	
Flexible work arrangements	
Emergency financial assistance if financial abuse has occurred	
Others	

Interactions like the previous one has led researchers to include in the ST specific items to collect the consequences suffered by people who support the WSH victims (e.g., 2.9.b; 2.9.b.a; 3.10.b; 3.10.b.a; among others).

Finally, adopting the IGV perspective in the ST design has also involved including specific items to allow bystanders to act as upstanders (Flecha, 2021; Melgar Alcantud, Geis, 2021). Thus, the ST allows WSH victims to report incidents, but it also includes items that enable bystanders to position themselves and report situations they have witnessed (e.g., item 2.1.a; 2.2.a; 2.3.a; 2.4.a; 2.5.a; 2.6.a., among others). This need to expand the opportunities for anyone present in an organization (either victim or bystander) to report WSH situations is present in the following quote from an interview with Carla, a survivor and activist:

> It must be made clear that even if it is not a problem that has affected you or that you have not suffered it directly, tell it if you realize that this is happening to someone! Tell it someone [...]. And that is the way we can break the silence.

4 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this article, we have reported the process of designing an evidence-based ST aimed at identifying, monitoring, and reporting WSH incidents. This work is grounded on extensive knowledge generated by previous studies, which had considered the different manifestations of WSH, its risk factors, and its consequences for workers' well-being and organizational health (Chan et al., 2008; Fitzgerald et al., 1997). Specifically, our article has delved into those theoretical approaches that inform effective prevention strategies and actions (McDonald, 2012). This study is also based on the progress made by civil society through movements such as #Metoo, which have contributed to making visible both the worldwide incidence of the WSH and the emergence of new global recognition and support strategies (Sen et al., 2018). The review of these studies and experiences has led us to identify and contribute to several knowledge gaps. For instance, the ST provided data collection on WSH risks and incidents. Thus, it contributes to attenuating WSH under-reporting situations and the lack of adequate monitoring systems (ILO, 2016; UN Women, 2019).

The ST design has been performed by implementing the communicative methodology (Puigvert et al., 2017). It has implied establishing a dialogical process, which consisted of contrasting the main theoretical contributions

on WSH with the knowledge and experiences contributed by relevant stakeholders. First, the literature review has allowed us to lay the foundations for the design of the evidence-based ST. This review has led to the establishment of six specific sections (1) personal data; (2) gender harassment; (3) unwanted sexual attention, and (4) sexual coercion; (5) WSH circumstances, and (6) institutional gender perspective including a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors and organizational circumstances and perspectives related to WSH (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; O'Hare & O'Donohue, 1998). The 112 items raised throughout these six sections configure a tool capable of measuring WSH levels of intensity in very diverse work contexts. This tool should be contemplated as part of a comprehensive prevention program.

The evidence-based ST obtained has been refined, expanded, and validated through a co-creation process involving experts, activists, and other relevant stakeholders from eight countries (Cyprus, Greece, Spain, Bulgaria, Denmark, Belgium, UK, and United States). This article has focused on one of the main contributions drawn from this dialogic process: the inclusion for the first time of the IGV perspective (Melgar Alcantud, Geis, 2021) in an ST aimed at WSH risk assessment. Thus, the ST has contemplated the risks and incidents suffered by the direct WSH victims, but also any kind of violence against those who advocate for WSH victims (Vidu et al., 2021). The IGV approach has been shaped through specific items that allow collecting consequences suffered by people who support WSH victims (Aubert & Flecha, 2021) and items aimed at bystanders to act as upstanders through reporting WSH incidents (Flecha, 2021).

It is worth mentioning we are currently piloting the ST in five European countries. The results obtained from the piloting will imply resuming the co-creation process that has accompanied its design. Therefore, the ST provided in this article should not be considered a final tool but rather an open proposal to incorporate new theoretical and practical contributions.

Finally, some challenges and future lines of research have emerged throughout the research process. For instance, more knowledge is needed about effective strategies that allow risk assessment initiatives to reach the workers in the most vulnerable situations and whose working conditions contribute to maintaining the silence surrounding WSH. Furthermore, it will be necessary to develop further research that sheds light on practical solutions that increase the safety of workers who report WSH incidents through surveys aimed at the WSH risk assessment.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings will be available in ASTRAPI Project at https://astrapi-project.eu/ following an embargo from the date of publication to allow for commercialization of research findings.

ORCID

Aitor Gómez-González https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8994-9885
Sandra Girbés-Peco https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7503-7604
José Miguel Jiménez González https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3006-1448
María Vieites Casado https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9252-6867

REFERENCES

Aubert, Adriana, and RamónFlecha. 2021. "Health and Well-Being Consequences for Gender Violence Survivors from Isolating Gender Violence." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 18(16): 8626. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18168626.

Chamberlain, Lindsey Joyce, MarthaCrowley, DanielTope, and RandyHodson. 2008. "Sexual Harassment in Organizational Context." *Work and Occupations* 35(3): 262-295. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888408322008.

Chan, Darius, SukYee Chow, ChunBun Lam, and Shu FaiCheung. 2008. "Examining the Job-Related, Psychological and Physical Outcomes of Workplace Sexual Harassment: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 32(4): 362-376. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00451.x.

Chvatík, Viktor, JackHardwicke, and EricAnderson. 2021. "Inclusive Masculinity and Czechia Youth." *International Sociology* 37(1): 124-142. https://doi.org/10.1177/02685809211046599.

Cyprus Academy of Public Administration & Hypatia Foundation Promoting Equality. 2020. *European Toolkit for the Effective Implementation of Policy to Prevent and Handle Sexual Harassment in the World of Work. ASTRAPI Project*. https://astrapi-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/ASTRAPI-Sexual-harassment-toolkit-EN.pdf.

Díez-Palomar, Javier, MartaCapllonch, and EmiliaAiello. 2014. "Analyzing Male Attractiveness Models from a Communicative Approach: Socialization, Attraction, and Gender-Based Violence." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(7): 844-849. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414537205.

European Parliament. 2004. *Gender Equal Access to Goods and Services Directive*. European Parliamentary Research System. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/593787/EPRS_STU(2017)593787_EN.pdf.

European Trade Union Confederation. 2014. *Safe at Home, Safe at Work. Trade Union Strategies to Prevent, Manage and Eliminate Workplace Harassment and Violence against Women*. European Commission. https://www.etuc.org/sites/default/files/document/files/en_-_brochure_-_safe_at_home_1.pdf.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. 2014. *Violence against Women: An EU-wide Survey: Main Results*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2014/vaw-survey-main-results.

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. 2021. *Crime, Safety and Victims' Rights: Fundamental Rights Survey*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/fra-2021-crime-safety-victims-rights_en.pdf.

Fitzgerald, Louise, SuzanneSwan, and Vicki J.Magley. 1997. "But Was it Really Sexual Harassment? Legal, Behavioral and Psychological Definitions of the Workplace Victimization of Women." In *Sexual Harassment: Theory, Research and Treatment*, edited by O'Donohue W., 5-28. Allyn & Bacon.

Flecha, Ramón. 2021. "Second-Order Sexual Harassment: Violence against the Silence Breakers Who Support the Victims." *Violence against Women* 27(11): 1980-1999. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801220975495.

Foley, Meraiah, Sarah Oxenbridge, Rae Cooper, and Marian Baird. 2020. "'I'll Never Be One of the Boys': Gender Harassment of Women Working as Pilots and Automotive Tradespeople." *Gender, Work & Organization* 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12443.

Ford, Dianne P. 2013. "Virtual Harassment: Media Characteristics' Role in Psychological Health." *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 28(4): 408-428. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-12-2012-0398.

García-Hernández, Renán Jesús, JulitaElemí Hernández-Sánchez, and VerónicaGarcía-Martínez. 2020. "Sexual Harassment in a Higher Education Institution." *Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies* 9(3): 210-233. https://doi.org/10.17583/generos.2020.5609.

Handy, Jocelyn. 2006. "Sexual Harassment in Small-Town New Zealand: A Qualitative Study of Three Contrasting Organizations." *Gender, Work and Organization* 13(1): 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2006.00293.x.

Hanson, Linda L. Magnusson, AnnaNyberg, EllenorMittendorfer-Rutz, FredrikBondestam, and Ida E. H.Madsen. 2020. "Work Related Sexual Harassment and Risk of Suicide and Suicide Attempts: Prospective Cohort Study." *Bmj* 370: m2984. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m2984.

International Labour Organisation. 2016. *Final Report, Meeting of Experts on Violence against Women and Men in the World of Work (3–6 October 2016). Conditions of Work and Equality Department*. Geneva: International Labour Office, Conditions of Work and Equality Department. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/–-dgreports/–-gender/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_546303.pdf.

Jenner, Sabinne C., PiaDjermester, and SabineOertelt-Prigione. 2020. "Prevention Strategies for Sexual Harassment in Academic Medicine: A Qualitative Study." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 3(5–6): NP2490-NP2515. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520903130.

Latcheva, Rossalina. 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.

Magley, Vicki J., Charles L.Hulin, Louise F.Fitzgerald, and MaryDeNardo. 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.

McCann, Deirdre. 2005. *Sexual Harassment at Work: National and International Responses. Project Report*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

McDonald, Paula. 2012. "Workplace Sexual Harassment 30 Years on: A Review of the Literature." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 14(1): 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00300.x.

McDonald, Paula, SaraCharlesworth, and TinaGraham. 2015. "Developing a Framework of Effective Prevention and Response Strategies in Workplace Sexual Harassment." *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources* 53(1): 41-58. https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12046.

Melgar Alcantud, Patricia, GemmaGeis, RamónFlecha, and MartaSoler. 2021. "Fear to Retaliation: The Most Frequent Reason for Not Helping Victims of Gender Violence." *International and Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences* 10(2): 31-50. https://doi.org/10.17583/rimcis.2021.8305.

Melgar Alcantud, Patricia, LidiaPuigvert, OriolRios, and ElenaDuque. 2021. "Language of Desire: A Methodological Contribution to Overcoming Gender Violence." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 20: 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211034597.

Miner-Rubino, Kathi, and LiliaCortina. 2007. "Beyond Targets: Consequences of Vicarious Exposure to Misogyny at Work." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92(5): 1254-1269. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1254.

Newman, Isadore, JanineLim, and FernandaPineda. 2013. "Content Validity Using a Mixed Methods Approach: Its Application and Development through the Use of a Table of Specifications Methodology." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 7(3): 243-260. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689813476922.

Nielsen, Morten Birkeland, BritaBjorkelo, GuyNotelaers, and StaleEinarsen. 2010. "Sexual Harassment: Prevalence, Outcomes, and Gender Differences Assessed by Three Different Estimation Methods." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma* 19(3): 252-74. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771003705056.

O'Hare, Elizabeth A., and WilliamO'Donohue. 1998. "Sexual Harassment: Identifying Risk Factors." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 27(6): 561-580. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1018769016832.

Puigvert, Lidia, RosaValls, CarmeGarcia Yeste, ConsolAguilar, and BarbaraMerrill. 2017. "Resistance to and Transformations of Gender-Based Violence in Spanish Universities: A Communicative Evaluation of Social Impact." *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 13(3): 361-380. https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689817731170.

Pulido, Cristina, CarmenElboj, RogerCampdepadrós, and JoanCabré. 2014. "Exclusionary and Transformative Dimensions: Communicative Analysis Enhancing Solidarity Among Women to Overcome Gender Violence." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(7): 889-894. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414537212.

Ricci, Laetitia, Jean-BaptisteLanfranchi, FabienneLemetayer, ChristineRotonda, FrancisGuillemin, JoëlCoste, and ElisabethSpitz. 2019. "Qualitative Methods Used to Generate Questionnaire Items: A Systematic Review." *Qualitative Health Research* 29(1): 149-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732318783186.

Samuels, Harriet. 2003. "Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: A Feminist Analysis of Recent Developments in the UK." *Women's Studies International Forum* 26(5): 467-482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2003.08.004.

Sen, Purna, EuniceBorges, EstefaniaGuallar, and JadeCochran. 2018. *Towards an End to Sexual Harassment: The Urgency and Nature of Change in the Era of #MeToo*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women).

Thornton, Margaret. 2002. "Sexual Harassment Losing Sight of Sex Discrimination." *Melbourne University Law Review* 26(2): 422-444. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/agispt.20025194.

Timmerman, Greetje, and CristienBajema. 1999. "Incidence and Methodology in Sexual Harassment Research in Northwest Europe." *Women's Studies International Forum* 22(6): 673-681. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-5395(99)00076-X.

Tinkler, Justine E., and ZhaoJao. 2020. "The Sexual Harassment of Federal Employees: Gender, Leadership Status, and Organizational Tolerance for Abuses of Power." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 30(3): 349-364. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muz037.

UN Women. 2019. *What Will it Take? Promoting Cultural Change to End Sexual Harassment*. United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women).

Valls-Carol, Rosa. 2014. "Contributions for Eradicating Gender Violence Female Empowerment and Egalitarian Dialogue in the Methodological Foundations of FACEPA Women's Group." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(7): 909-915. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414537216.

Vidu, Ana, LidiaPuigvert, RamónFlecha, and Garazi López de Aguileta. 2021. "The Concept and the Name of Isolating Gender Violence." *Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies* 10(2): 176-200. http://doi.org/10.17583/generos.2021.8622.

Willness, Chelsea, PiersSteel, and KibeomLee. 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.

Workplaces Respond to Domestic and Sexual Violence. 2021. *How-to Guide. Workplace Climate Surveys*. https://www.workplacesrespond.org/harassment-climatesurveys/.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Aitor Gómez-González is a Professor of research methods at the University Rovira i Virgili. His expertise has been centered on developing the communicative methodology, which produces research with social impact. Among the fields of study in which the communicative methodology has obtained a more significant social impact is the prevention of gender violence.

Sandra Girbés-Peco is a Lecturer professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning and Organizational Education at the Faculty of Education of the University of Barcelona. She is a member of CREA, Community of Research on Excellence for All. CREA has been leading research in gender violence for over 30 years. Dr Girbés-Peco's research includes the preventive socialisation of gender violence.

José Miguel Jiménez González is a Professor in the Department of Pedagogy of the Faculty of Educational Sciences at the University Rovira i Virgili. He is a researcher at the MEDIS research group (Educational Research Methodology with Social Impact). His lines of research and teaching include occupational risk prevention.

María Vieites Casado is a researcher at CREA (Community of Research on Evidence for All) at the University of Barcelona. With this research group, she has been the coordinator of European projects that have worked on preventing gender-based violence in schools and organisations through the dialogic model of conflict prevention and resolution. Her lines of research are successful educational actions and policies based on scientific evidence with social impact.