

Cooper, 1989; Farrell, 1983; Farrell & Robb, 1980; Hirschman, 1970; Kolarska & Aldrich, 1980).

It would seem that the literature suggests that victims of sexual harassment are confronted with a specific type of organizational wrongdoing. If wrongdoing is perceived, then the recipient might respond in several ways ranging from Loyalty to Neglect. The type of response chosen is greatly dependent on the victim's perception of the organization's responsiveness to sexual harassment issues and in part, on the moderating influences of individually based characteristics such as Role Conflict or Role Ambiguity (Popovich & Licata; 1987). It would appear that responses to sexual harassment involve many variables prior, during and after the incident in question. The question remains as to how these variables relate to one another.

A recent article by Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (1994), consolidates the antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment into a comprehensive framework. The model proposes that two antecedents of sexual harassment - organizational context and job context. Organizational context refers to those aspects of the organizational climate which tolerates sexual harassment and the accessibility, presence of, and effectiveness of harassment remedies. Job Context refers to the gender ratio in day-to-day work contacts, the sex of the supervisor and the gender stereotypes of the job tasks.

The possible outcomes of sexual harassment fall into three categories: job related outcomes, psychological outcomes, and health outcomes. Job-related outcomes involves organizational withdrawal which is comprised of work withdrawal