



Technical Report

Department of the Interior (DOI)

Work Environment Survey

January-March 2017

September 29, 2017

CFI Group

Acknowledgments

The Federal Consulting Group and the CFI Group are grateful to numerous people for their assistance with and collaboration on the 2017 Work Environment Survey (WES). The survey was conducted under the guidance of Mary Pletcher, Department of Interior, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Human Capital and Diversity.

Members of The Department of the Interior also contributing to development and administration of this survey include: Alesia Pierre-Louis, Chief Learning Office & Director, Strategic Employee and Organization Development; Christopher Lawson, Director, Human Resource Information Systems; Chris Beardsley, former Senior Advisor, Office of Policy Management and Budget; and Matt Costello, Acting Director, CADR Office.

The Federal Consulting Group, specifically Jessica Reed, Director Federal Consulting Group; Rafael Williams, Contracting Office Representative; and former Contracting Office Representative, Paulette Owens, provided overall guidance throughout all phases of the study.

The 2017 WES was developed and administered by a team of individuals from the CFI Group. This includes Dr. Armando X. Estrada, Principal Investigator; Dr. Paul Cook, Subject Matter Expert; and Dr. Fawzi al Nassir, Lead Statistician. Heather Reed served as Program Lead; Justin Leopold and Stefanie Morrison, Project Managers; Nanci Banks, Senior Qualitative Analyst; and Mary Ensman, Contributor. Also, providing invaluable assistance with the results analyses and survey development were Denise Polcyn and Jennifer Waugh, Data Analysts; Carly Ahrens and Jeremy Frey, Operations Specialists; and Jeff Aldridge, Reporting Specialist.

Executive Summary

This Executive Summary presents key findings from the Department of the Interior (DOI) Work Environment Survey (WES), which was fielded from January 9 to March 5, 2017.¹ The Executive Summary provides the key findings. All key findings are fully documented within the main body of this Technical Report and its accompanying appendices. Detailed statistical results are documented in a companion Supplemental Statistical Report that accompanies this Technical Report. The WES survey was designed to assess employee attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors on a wide range of topics related to the *character, context, correlates, and consequences* of harassing and/or assault behaviors² experienced by employees within the DOI work environment. Specifically, we report analyses addressing the following research questions:

- What is the *character* of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What *contextual* factors influence specific behaviors or sets of experiences?
- What demographic, occupational, and organizational factors were *correlated* with harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What job-related *consequences* were associated with harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What additional findings were uncovered with regard to harassment and/or assault experiences?

The survey was sent to all DOI personnel employed as of December 10, 2016, ($N = 61,020$) during the period of January 9 to March 5, of 2017. Data from 28,203 employees were obtained by the end of the survey period, yielding a participation rate of 46.2%. Upon initial screening, a total of 27,200 completed questionnaires were available for analysis, yielding a survey response rate of 44.6%. Because not all DOI employees responded to the survey, employee population characteristics were obtained from DOI Human Resources to derive weights to estimate population parameters for the DOI workforce from the survey data. Comparison of the known employee population characteristics to the estimated study population characteristics indicated that these data were representative of the DOI population, especially with regard to age, sex, racial/ethnic background, disability status, appointment type, and work schedule. Accordingly, the results of statistical analyses of these data reflect estimated population parameters for the DOI workforce.

¹ This report does not present findings of a separate study of newly hired employees performed in July through September of 2017. Those findings will be documented in a separate report.

² Each measure of harassment included questions asking respondents to indicate if they experienced a harassing and assault behavior based on age, race/ethnicity, religion, disability and sexual orientation. Separate questions were also included to assess gender harassment and sexual harassment without asking about assault behaviors pertinent to those forms of harassment. A separate set of items were used to assess sexual assault related behaviors. Accordingly, the phrase “harassing and/or assault behaviors” is used to denote instances where an employee may have experienced a particular form of harassment, an assault behavior pertinent to a specific type of harassment, or a particular sexual assault related behavior.

WHAT IS THE CHARACTER OF HARASSING AND/OR ASSAULT BEHAVIORS EXPERIENCED?

Analyses revealed that an estimated 35.0% of employees experienced some form of harassment and/or assault related behaviors in the 12 months preceding the survey. Specifically:

- 20.5% experienced harassing behaviors based on their age
- 9.3% experienced harassing behaviors based on their racial or ethnic background
- 7.1% experienced harassing behaviors based on their religious beliefs
- 6.1% experienced harassing behaviors based on a perceived or actual disability
- 3.6% experienced harassing behaviors based on their sexual orientation
- 16.5% experienced gender harassment
- 8.0% experienced sexual harassment³
- 0.74% experienced sexual assault related behaviors

To further explore these findings, we examined differences in employees' experiences by various demographic and occupational characteristics. Demographic characteristics included variables measuring employees' age, sex, level of education, racial/ethnic background, and relationship status. Occupational characteristics included variables measuring employees' pay grade, tenure in the organization, employment classification, and type of work unit. Results of analyses comparing experience rates by demographic and occupational characteristics revealed that only certain demographic variables were associated with employees' experiences. Specifically:

- Younger (individuals aged 39 and younger) and older (individuals aged 50 and older) employees were more likely to experience higher rates of harassment based on their age than their middle-aged counterparts (individuals aged 40-49)
- Ethnic minority employees were more likely to experience higher rates of harassment based on their racial or ethnic background than their non-minority counterparts
- Employees with a documented disability were more likely to experience higher rates of harassment based on a perceived or actual disability than their non-disabled counterparts
- Sexual minority employees (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, other) were more likely to experience higher rates of harassment based on their sexual orientation than men or their heterosexual counterparts
- Women and sexual minority employees (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, other) were more likely to experience higher rates of gender harassment than men or their heterosexual counterparts

³ Meta-analytic results suggest that anywhere between 24%-84% of women report having experienced sexual harassment in the U.S. workplace; among private sector organizations these rates range from 24%-58%; and within governmental organizations their rates range from 31%-43% (Ilies et al., 2003). Direct comparison involving rates of harassment and/or assault behaviors to other studies and organizations must be made with due considerations to methodological (e.g., assessment approach – direct vs. indirect assessment of harassing and/or assault behaviors; sampling strategies, and weighting procedures used to estimate rates), and contextual/organizational factors (e.g., academic, private, military, and government organizations).

- Women and sexual minority (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, other) employees were more likely to experience higher rates of sexual harassment than men or their heterosexual counterparts
- Women, sexual minority (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, other), disabled, single or separated/widowed/divorced and, seasonal employees were more likely to experience higher rates of sexual assault related behaviors than their counterparts

None of the other demographic and occupational variables we examined were influential in our understanding of employees' harassment and/or assault experiences. In addition, regardless of the specific experience involved, the analyses indicate that in a majority of situations employees experienced these behaviors more than one time: 59.8% for those experiencing any form of harassment.

WHAT CONTEXTUAL FACTORS INFLUENCED SPECIFIC BEHAVIORS OR SETS OF EXPERIENCES?

Analyses of contextual factors involving specific behaviors or sets of experiences that significantly affected employees' personal and professional lives were performed with data from employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors and responded to follow-up questions exploring contextual factors about their specific experiences. Contextual factors included variables assessing the primary basis for the specific behavior or set of experiences, as well as variables assessing the situational characteristics and circumstances involved in the specific harassing and/or assault behavior experienced.

- *What was the primary basis for the specific behavior or set of experiences?* Among employees who experienced any behavior, 22.0% indicated the experience was primarily based on their age; 9.5% indicated the experience was primarily based on their racial/ethnic background; 6.2% indicated the experience was primarily based on their religious beliefs; 6.6% indicated the experience was primarily based on their disability status or condition; 2.0% indicated the experience was primarily based on their sexual orientation; 28.8% indicated the experience was primarily based on their sex/gender; and 24.8% indicated the experience was primarily based on unknown factors.
- *When and where did the specific behavior or set of experiences occur?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, for the majority of employees these experiences occurred during work hours (76.3%) and at a work location or site (87.3%) that was most frequently characterized as an indoor location (81.2%). Also, for the minority of these employees these experiences occurred while on travel (9.2%).
- *How often and for how long did the specific behavior or set of experiences persist?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, for the majority of employees these experiences occurred more than once (60.2%).
- *Who was involved in the specific behavior or set of experiences?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, for the majority of employees these experiences often

involved one person (57.1%), who was typically older (42.8%), male (59.9%), and most often a peer and/or coworker (54.2%).

- *Did their work role require them to continue to interact with the person(s) involved?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, the majority of employees had to continue to interact with the person(s) involved (85.5%).
- *Did they discuss the specific behavior or set of experiences with anyone at work?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, most employees talked to someone at work about their experience including coworkers (53.8%), another employee (45.1%), a supervisor (33.5%), or a manager (20.2%). Additionally, some employees talked with the person involved (35.2%).
- *Did they make a complaint/grievance/report⁴ in response to the specific behavior or set of experiences?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, just 25.3% of employees made a complaint/grievance/report about their experience.
- *What DOI resources were used to make a complaint/grievance/report?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, for employees who made complaints/grievances/reports, the most frequently used DOI resource was a supervisor or manager (19.3%). All other resources were used less frequently (Employee Assistance Program, Ombudsman,⁵ CADR Office or CORE PLUS, Employee & Labor Relations, Union, Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor, Equal Employment Opportunity Office, Office of the Inspector General Hotline, Office of the Inspector General, Other Law Enforcement/Civil Authority, or Department of Interior Ethics/Bureau Ethics Office).
- *What happened as a result of the complaint/grievance/report?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, for employees who made complaints/grievances/reports, 35.8% indicated that some action was taken. Actions focused on the organization involved explaining rules to everyone (29.1%), management conducted a review/investigation or other assessment (16.7%), and an investigation was conducted by a law enforcement official (4.9%). Actions involving the person engaging in the harassing behavior included someone talking to the person (29.6%), moving or reassigning this person to avoid continuing contact (8.5%), or some official career action was taken against person(s) involved (4.8%); and in some situations the person stopped the behavior (21.3%). Actions associated with the employee subjected to the behavior involved changing their station location or duties to help them avoid the person engaging in the harassing behaviors (10.9%). Additionally, some employees were encouraged to drop the issue (38.7%) or were discouraged from making a complaint/grievance/report (32.3%). Other employees indicated that the person engaging in the harassing behavior took action against them for complaining (33.8%); their coworker(s) treated them worse, avoided, or blamed them for the problem (30.4%); and some employees indicated leadership

⁴ Individuals were presented with various types of organizational resources by which to make a complaint/grievance/report that included both formal and informal types of resources (see Appendix C).

⁵ Ombudsman was only in existence about 1.5 months before the survey opened.

punished them for bringing the experience up (29.1%) or they were threatened with loss of employment (15.4%).⁶

- *What were the reasons for not making a complaint/grievance/report?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, most employees did not make a complaint/grievance/report about their experience (74.7%). Employees' most frequent reasons for not making a complaint/grievance/report involved the perceived seriousness of the behavior (71.3% did not consider it serious enough to report), desire to move on or forget about the incident (56.0%), the behavior or experience stopped on its own (52.4%), or skepticism about actions that would be taken (46.0% of employees did not think anything would be done).
- *What effect did the specific behavior or set of experiences have on employees' interpersonal relationships, physical or emotional well-being, job performance, or willingness to remain a part of the organization?* Regardless of the particular behavior involved, for some employees these experiences had a negative impact on them, but for many employees it did not. For some employees, these experiences had a *negative impact on their interpersonal relationships* with coworkers, supervisors, or managers (36.1%); resulted in arguments or damaged interpersonal relations at work (33.3%); and/or damaged other personal relationships (11.7%). For some employees, these experiences had a *negative impact on their physical or emotional well-being* leading them to call in sick or take leave (18.7%), seek counseling (15.6%), or medical attention (8.7%). For some employees, these experiences had a *negative impact on their job performance*, making it harder to complete their work (37.0%), negatively affected their performance evaluation or promotion potential (23.1%), or negatively affected their performance evaluation/renewal/permanent employment (14.4%). For some employees, these experiences *negatively affected their willingness to remain a part of the organization*, leading them to request a transfer (7.3%), consider leaving their bureau/office (34.3%), or take steps to leave the organization (15.0%).

WHAT DEMOGRAPHIC, OCCUPATIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS WERE CORRELATED WITH HARASSING AND/OR ASSAULT BEHAVIORS EXPERIENCED?

Analyses of demographic, occupational, and organizational factors influencing harassing and/or assault behaviors were performed with data from employees who indicated they experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors and who completed questions assessing demographic and occupational background characteristics and organizational factors associated with these behaviors. Demographic characteristics included variables measuring employees' age, sex, level of education, racial/ethnic background, and relationship status. Occupational characteristics included variables measuring employees' pay grade, tenure in the organization, employment classification, and type of work unit. Organizational characteristics included variables measuring employees' perceptions of supervisor support, trust, political dynamics and

⁶ It is worth noting that an individual who made a complaint/grievance/report may not actually be informed of the outcome of their complaint/grievance/report because personnel policies may prohibit disclosure of such information.

inclusion within the unit, bystander experiences with harassment and/or assault behaviors (bystander experiences involve situations where an employee witnessed another employee being subjected to harassing, discriminating and/or assault behaviors), perceptions of both general and leaders' tolerance of harassing and/or assault behaviors, and gender context.

First, we performed regression analyses to identify those factors that contribute the most to the likelihood that one might experience these behaviors. Second, we compared individuals who had and those who had not experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors across each of these factors. As noted earlier and confirmed in these analyses, with a few exceptions, demographic and occupational factors had a limited contribution on our understanding of employees' harassment and/or assault related behaviors experienced. However, these analyses revealed that organizational factors were among the most important variables to understand employees' experiences of harassment and/or assault related behaviors.

Which demographic, occupational, or organizational factors had the strongest influence on the likelihood that someone might experience harassing and/or assault behaviors? The most important variables involved for each type of experience are described below:

- Age harassment was more common for younger employees, in work environments perceived to be less inclusive and more tolerant of these behaviors and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their age
- Racial/ethnic harassment was more common for racial/ethnic minority employees than for non-minority employees, in work environments perceived to be more tolerant of these behaviors, and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their race/ethnicity
- Religious harassment was more common in work environments perceived to be more tolerant of these behaviors, and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their religious beliefs
- Disability harassment was more common for employees with a documented disability and more common where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their disability status or condition
- Sexual orientation harassment was more common where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sexual orientation
- Gender harassment was more common for women than men, for younger employees, and employees with a college education than for those without a college education, in work environments perceived as being less inclusive and more tolerant of these behaviors, and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sex/gender
- Sexual harassment was more common for women than men, in work environments that were perceived as being tolerant of these behaviors, and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sex/gender
- Sexual assault related behaviors were more common where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sex/gender

Given the importance of organizational factors, were there differences among individuals who were and were not harassed on the specific organizational variables? Regardless of the particular behavior involved, we observed consistent differences between employees who were harassed and those who were not. Specifically, employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were:

- Less likely to report supervisory support than employees who were not harassed
- Less likely to trust the organization than employees who were not harassed
- Less likely to view the organization as more inclusive than employees who were not harassed
- More likely to perceive greater pressure to conform to organizational norms (e.g., going along to get along) than employees who were not harassed
- More likely to perceive the organizational climate to be more tolerant of harassing behaviors than employees who were not harassed
- More likely to rate the leadership climate to be more tolerant of harassing behaviors than employees who were not harassed
- More likely to have witnessed harassment against other employees than employees who were not harassed

WHAT JOB-RELATED CONSEQUENCES WERE ASSOCIATED WITH HARASSING AND/OR ASSAULT BEHAVIORS EXPERIENCED?

Consequences of harassment and/or assault behaviors were examined with data from employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors and completed questions assessing job-related outcomes including job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment. Regression analyses revealed statistically significant associations of harassment and/or assault behaviors and these job-related outcomes. While the magnitude of the effects were small, the pattern of associations indicated that employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were less satisfied, less engaged, and less committed to the organization than their counterparts.

WHAT ADDITIONAL FINDINGS WERE UNCOVERED WITH REGARD TO HARASSMENT AND/OR ASSAULT EXPERIENCES?

- *What about individuals who may have witnessed behaviors occurring to someone else?* An estimated 22.4% of employees witnessed a harassing and/or assault behavior against another employee in the 12 months preceding the survey. For most of these experiences, it is estimated that employees witnessed these behaviors once, and/or once a month or less. Among these individuals:
 - 13.0% witnessed a harassment situation based on age of the other employee
 - 8.3% witnessed a harassment situation based on race/ethnicity of the other employee

- 5.1% witnessed a harassment situation based on religious beliefs of the other employee
 - 6.0% witnessed a harassment situation based on a perceived or actual disability of the other employee
 - 4.6% witnessed a harassment situation based on sexual orientation of the other employee
 - 13.2% witnessed a harassment situation based on sex/gender of the other employee
- *What actions were taken in response to witnessing harassing and/or assault behaviors?* Regardless of the particular behavior employees witnessed, the majority of employees took some action in response to the behaviors they witnessed (76.0%). Among employees who took some action, the most frequent actions included helping the person who was subject to the behaviors (33.5%); pointing out to the person who engaged in the harassing behaviors that s/he “crossed the line” (22.7%); and telling someone in a position of authority about the situation (21.4%).
 - *Did employees experience any harassing and/or assault behaviors before the past 12 months while they were employed by DOI?* An estimated 32.9% of employees experienced some form of harassing and/or assault behaviors before the past 12 months while being employed at DOI. Specifically:
 - 18.0% experienced harassing behaviors based on their age
 - 9.5% experienced harassing behaviors based on their racial or ethnic background
 - 6.6% experienced harassing behaviors based on their religious beliefs
 - 5.7% experienced harassing behaviors based on a perceived or actual disability
 - 4.0% experienced harassing behaviors based on their sexual orientation
 - 13.3% experienced sexually harassing behaviors⁷
 - 1.78% experienced sexual assault related behaviors
 - *What about the future use of DOI resources to make a complaint/grievance/report involving a harassing and/or assault experience?* A majority of employees indicated that they would use a supervisor or manager (78.1%) to make a complaint/grievance/report if they were to experience harassing behaviors in the future. All other resources were endorsed less frequently (Employee Assistance Program, Ombudsman,⁸ CADR Office or CORE PLUS, Employee & Labor Relations, Union, Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor, Equal Employment Opportunity Office, Office of the Inspector General Hotline, Office of the Inspector General, Other Law Enforcement/Civil Authority not in the Bureau, or Department of Interior Ethics/Bureau Ethics Office). Additionally, employees indicated that the majority of these resources would be moderately helpful.

⁷ Within this section of the survey, responses to questions involving gender and sexual harassment were presented together and a single item was used to assess gender and sexual harassment experiences in the period before the past 12 months to minimize response burden and optimize survey completion. Caution should be exercised in attempting to draw inferences about trends between rates of experience in the past 12 months and rates of experience prior to the past 12 months as these measures are not comparable (see Appendix C, Section C.5.1 for additional details).

⁸ Ombudsman was only in existence about 1.5 months before the survey opened.

These findings reveal that employees at all levels of the organization are either directly (through their own personal experiences) or indirectly (through the witnessing or hearing about other employees' experiences) affected by harassing and/or assault situations both personally and professionally. The findings shed light on the dynamics that underlie these behaviors and affirm the need for comprehensive responses to these problems. Readers are encouraged to review the complete set of findings presented in this Technical Report.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
Executive Summary	ii
Table of Contents	xi
List of Tables	xiii
List of Figures	xvi
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose.....	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 Tasks and Objectives.....	5
1.4 Organization of Report.....	7
2 Survey Methodology.....	8
2.1 Overview	8
2.2 Development of Survey.....	8
2.3 Data Collection Procedures	8
2.4 Description of Survey Instrument and Measures	9
3 Results and Findings	14
3.1 Overview of Results.....	14
3.2 Population and Employee Characteristics.....	16
3.3 Character of Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced.....	19
3.3.1 Summary of Analyses of Demographic, Occupational, and Harassing and/or Assault Experiences	42
3.4 Contextual Factors Influencing Specific Behaviors or Experiences	45
3.4.1 Summary of Contextual Factors Influencing Specific Behaviors or Experiences..	79
3.5 Demographic, Occupational, and Organizational Factors Correlated with Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced	81
3.5.1 Summary of Demographic, Occupational, and Organizational Factors Correlated with Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced	95
3.6 Job-Related Consequences of Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced	97
3.6.1 Summary of Job-Related Consequences of Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced	100

3.7 Additional Findings..... 101

4 Conclusions..... 110

4.1 Overview 110

4.2 Summary of Main Findings 110

4.3 Conclusions 114

References..... 115

Appendix A Glossary of Terms 118

Appendix B Survey Communications 125

Appendix C Survey Methodology 137

Appendix D Survey Instrument 172

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Topics and Constructs Assessed in the Study.....	4
Table 2.1 Description of Survey Constructs with Sample Items	10
Table 3.1 DOI – Employee and Estimated Study Population Demographic Characteristics	16
Table 3.2 DOI – Employee and Estimated Study Population Occupational Characteristics.....	17
Table 3.3 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate and Number of Harassment Experiences in Past 12 Months.....	19
Table 3.4 DOI – Estimated Number and Frequency Distribution of Harassment Experiences in Past 12 Months.....	21
Table 3.5 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate and Frequency of Any Form of Harassment in Past 12 Months	23
Table 3.6 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Age in Past 12 Months ..	25
Table 3.7 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Racial/Ethnic Background in Past 12 Months	27
Table 3.8 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Religious Beliefs in Past 12 Months.....	29
Table 3.9 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Disability Status in Past 12 Months.....	31
Table 3.10 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Sexual Orientation in Past 12 Months.....	33
Table 3.11 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Gender Harassment in Past 12 Months	36
Table 3.12 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Sexual Harassment in Past 12 Months	38
Table 3.13 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Sexual Assault Related Behaviors in Past 12 Months	40
Table 3.14 DOI – Associations of Demographic and Occupational Characteristics with Harassment Experiences in Past 12 Months	43
Table 3.15 DOI – Primary Basis for Experience of Greatest Effect.....	46
Table 3.16 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of When Occurred.....	47
Table 3.17 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Travel	47
Table 3.18 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Where Occurred.....	47
Table 3.19 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Work Location	48
Table 3.20 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Frequency of Occurrence	49
Table 3.21 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Persons Involved	51
Table 3.22 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Interactions....	54
Table 3.23 DOI – Discussion of the One Experience of Harassment - Summary	55

Table 3.24 DOI – Resources for Making Complaint of the One Experience of Harassment - Summary 57

Table 3.25 DOI – Average Ratings of the Helpfulness of DOI Resources Used to Make a Complaint/Grievance/Report of the One Experience of Harassment 60

Table 3.26 DOI – Helpfulness of Resources for Making Complaint of the One Experience of Harassment – Scale Distributions for Any Form of Harassment..... 61

Table 3.27 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Actions Focused on the Organization 62

Table 3.28 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Actions Focused on the Person(s) Involved..... 63

Table 3.29 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Negative Outcomes 65

Table 3.30 DOI – Satisfaction with Reporting of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary 68

Table 3.31 DOI – Satisfaction with Reporting Experience – Scale Distributions for Any Form of Harassment 70

Table 3.32 DOI – Reasons for Not Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary.. 70

Table 3.33 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment - Summary..... 74

Table 3.34 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Age 82

Table 3.35 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Racial/Ethnic Background 83

Table 3.36 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Religious Beliefs..... 84

Table 3.37 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Disability Status 85

Table 3.38 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Sexual Orientation 86

Table 3.39 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Gender Harassment..... 87

Table 3.40 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Sexual Harassment..... 88

Table 3.41 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Sexual Assault Related Behaviors 89

Table 3.42 DOI – Summary of Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment/Assault..... 90

Table 3.43 DOI – Differences in Ratings of Organizational Factors by Harassment Experienced..... 90

Table 3.44 DOI – Scale Distributions of Organizational Factors for Any Form of Harassment Experienced..... 95

Table 3.45 DOI – Linear Regression of Harassment and Job-Related Outcomes..... 97

Table 3.46 DOI – Differences in Ratings of Job-Related Outcomes by Harassment Experienced..... 98

Table 3.47 DOI – Scale Distributions of Job-Related Consequences for Any Form of Harassment Experienced.....	100
Table 3.48 DOI – Number and Percentage of Employees Witnessing Bystander Harassment..	101
Table 3.49 DOI – Estimated Average Frequency and Distribution of Bystander Harassment in Past 12 Months.....	102
Table 3.50 DOI – Actions Taken in Response to Bystander Harassment	104
Table 3.51 DOI – Harassment and/or Assault Experienced Before the Past 12 Months	106
Table 3.52 DOI – Pay Plan or Grade at Which Harassment First Occurred	106
Table 3.53 DOI – Future Use of Resources to Make a Complaint/Grievance/Report	108

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Conceptual Framework	6
Figure 3.1 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors in Past 12 Months.....	20
Figure 3.2 DOI – Frequency of Occurrence for Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors	21
Figure 3.3 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates of Harassment Based on Age in Past 12 Months	43
Figure 3.4 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassment Based on Racial/Ethnic Background, Disability Status, and Sexual Orientation in Past 12 Months	43
Figure 3.5 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassment based on Racial/Ethnic Background in Past 12 Months	44
Figure 3.6 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassment Based on Sexual Orientation in Past 12 Months	44
Figure 3.7 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Gender and Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Behaviors in Past 12 Months.....	44
Figure 3.8 DOI – Primary Basis for Experience of Greatest Effect	46
Figure 3.9 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Location Trends.....	49
Figure 3.10 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Frequency of Occurrence..	50
Figure 3.11 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Persons Involved Trends ..	53
Figure 3.12 DOI – Distribution of the Person(s) Engaging in Harassing Behavior for Any Form of Harassment.....	54
Figure 3.13 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Interactions Trends	55
Figure 3.14 DOI – Discussion of the One Experience of Harassment – Trends	57
Figure 3.15 DOI – Frequency Distribution of Likelihood to Make a Complaint/Grievance/ Report and Most Frequently Used DOI Resource of the One Experience of Harassment.....	59
Figure 3.16 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Actions Resulting from a Complaint/Grievance/Report for Any Form of Harassment.....	67
Figure 3.17 DOI – Satisfaction with Reporting Experience	69
Figure 3.18 DOI – Reasons for Not Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Trends	73
Figure 3.19 DOI – Effect of the One Experience of Harassment on Relationships at Work	77
Figure 3.20 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment – Physical or Emotional Well-Being.....	77
Figure 3.21 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment – Impact on Job Performance	78
Figure 3.22 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment – Remain Part of Organization.....	79
Figure 3.23 DOI – Estimated Bystander Harassment Witnessing Rates	102
Figure 3.24 DOI – Estimated Frequency of Witnessing Bystander Harassment.....	103
Figure 3.25 DOI – Actions Taken in Response to Bystander Harassment.....	105
Figure 3.26 DOI – Harassment and/or Assault Experienced Before the Past 12 Months	106

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report documents the results of the Work Environment Survey (WES). The survey was requested by the Department of the Interior (DOI) leadership and carried out in 2017. The WES was designed to assess employees' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors on a wide range of topics related to the *character, context, correlates, and consequences* of harassment and/or assault behaviors experienced by employees within the DOI work environment. The main body of this technical report presents findings related to employees' experiences with harassing and/or assault behaviors and the situational factors surrounding these experiences. The report also presents findings regarding demographic, occupational, and organizational factors linked with harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced at work; and job-related consequences of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced at work. Findings documented in this report provide empirically derived evidence that can serve to inform, influence, and impact strategic and long-term efforts to change the DOI culture, to prevent sexual harassment, and to ensure that every employee has a safe and respectful work environment.

1.2 Background

In August, 2016, the Federal Consulting Group (FCG) and DOI engaged with the CFI Group to conduct an assessment of the prevalence and climate for sexual harassment within the DOI. The assessment was designed to meet similar objectives as those of a parallel effort conducted for the National Park Service (NPS). Specifically, the assessment was to:

1. provide substantive evidence to inform the design of effective responses to harassment and justify resource allocation,
2. educate workforce leadership and employees on the extent, severity, and consequences of the problem,
3. identify the context, character, and causes for harassment to occur and/or be tolerated within the organization, and
4. provide a baseline for monitoring progress and effectiveness of specific interventions.

Over the course of several meetings with various organizational members,⁹ the CFI Group collaborated to refine topics and constructs from the NPS version of the WES to ensure relevance to the DOI workforce. As with the case for the NPS WES, the DOI WES would assess not only sexual harassment, but other forms of harassment (specifically, harassment based on age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status, sexual orientation, and gender)

⁹ Government scientists, union and legal representatives, communications and public affairs representatives, human resource representatives, and senior leaders.

as well as sexual assault related behaviors using the behavioral experience method.¹⁰ The DOI WES would also include measures of demographic and occupational characteristics, measures assessing perceptions of the workplace climate, and other constructs/variables identified as providing essential information to inform the understanding and treatment of the problem. The DOI WES was to be a census-based survey of the DOI workforce, and it would be designed to be completed on a voluntary basis, allowing employees to provide anonymous and confidential responses. Furthermore, the DOI WES would employ analytical methods to account for non-response bias and use appropriate weighting procedures to derive population estimates for the DOI workforce.¹¹ The DOI WES would be subject to internal review by relevant organizational members.¹²

As part of the research process, we reviewed publicly available research, studies, and investigative reports dealing with harassment and/or assault within the DOI workforce. Our search of DOI workforce specific studies and investigative reports were limited to non-scientific studies conducted by the NPS (e.g., Lighthouse Associates, 1999, 2000; U.S. Department of the Interior, 2016a, 2016b).¹³ These studies revealed a pattern of responses that pointed to personal and bystander experiences with sexual harassment and gender discrimination among women in the U.S. Park Police (USPP) and the NPS (bystander experiences involve situations where an employee witnessed another employee being subjected to harassing, discriminating and/or assault behaviors).¹⁴ Investigative reports documented patterns of sexually harassing behaviors from coworkers and supervisors at the Grand Canyon River District and patterns of sexually harassing behaviors from supervisors at the Canaveral National Seashore (U.S. Department of

¹⁰ The behavioral experience method presents a series of harassing and/or assault behaviors and asks respondents to indicate how often they experienced the behavior within some specified period of time (e.g., past 12 months) using a frequency type response scale that can range from never to one or more times a day (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995; Gruber, 1990; Illies, Hauserman, Schwochau, & Stibal, 2003; Lengnick-Hall, 1995).

¹¹ The process of weighting refers to the calculation of a sampling weight for each survey respondent. Weighting is appropriate whenever the sample design is complex and there is nonresponse to the survey. Although in the WES the sampling design was census-based, nonresponse still occurred, making weighting an appropriate and necessary step. Weights are calculated to allow researchers to make inferences from the data collected from survey respondents to all members of the target population. Without the weights, calculated aggregate estimates could be biased and therefore inaccurately reflect population parameters for a given construct (e.g., estimated experience rates of harassment and/or assault behaviors experienced in the population).

¹² This report does not present findings of a separate study of newly hired employees performed in July through September of 2017. Those findings will be documented in a separate report.

¹³ The term “non-scientific studies” refers to studies that do not adjust for nonresponse bias or weighting to account for the fact that not all individuals in a given population may have responded to a survey.

¹⁴ 76% of USPP female officers and 36% of female civilian personnel had “personally experienced sexual harassment while an employee of the USPP”; 71% of USPP female officers and 29% of female civilian personnel had “personally experienced (gender discrimination) while an employee of the USPP”; and 83% of USPP female officers and 62% of female civilian personnel “knew of other people who experienced sexual harassment or gender discrimination while employed at USPP” (for details see Lighthouse Associates, 1999). Similar findings were reported among NPS law enforcement personnel; 52% had “personally experienced sexual harassment while an employee of the NPS”; 63% had “personally experienced (gender discrimination) while an employee of the NPS”; and 77 % “knew of other people who experienced sexual harassment or gender discrimination while an employee of the NPS” (see Lighthouse Associates, 2000).

the Interior, 2016b).¹⁵ Based on this evidence, we ensured that the DOI WES included questions to assess personal and bystander experiences with harassment and/or assault behaviors and questions to assess situational characteristics surrounding specific harassing and/or assault behaviors that employees were likely to experience within the DOI work environment.

We relied on our review of the literature from the NPS effort to extrapolate for the DOI WES. Our review of literature on the measurement of harassment and/or assault behaviors in the workplace reaffirmed our decision to use behavioral methodology to assess employees' experiences with these behaviors (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995; Gruber, 1990; Illies, Hauserman, Schwochau, & Stibal, 2003; Lengnick-Hall, 1995; Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001) and highlighted the importance of delineating response options that aligned with the wording of behavioral items and to give careful consideration to the time period used to evaluate the occurrence of particular behaviors being assessed (Gutek, Murphy, & Douma, 2004).

Our examination of the literature on job-related attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors pertinent to harassment and/or assault in the workplace pointed to the importance of examining a myriad of demographic, occupational, and organizational variables associated with harassing and/or assault behaviors (e.g., Bowling & Beehr, 2006; O'Leary-Kelly, Bowes-Sperry, Arens Bates, & Lean, 2009; Pina, Gannon, & Saunders 2009; Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). However, due to practical constraints and guidance from organizational members, we limited our selection of variables to specific demographic characteristics (e.g., age, sex and gender identity, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, relationship status) and limited occupational characteristics (e.g., pay grade, tenure, employment status and type of work). We also limited our selection of organizational factors to include supervisor support (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002); inclusion, trust, and political dynamics within the organization (Cummings & Bromiley, 1996; Kacmar & Carlson, 1997; Severt & Estrada, 2016); general and leadership intolerance of harassing and/or assault behaviors (Estrada & Laurence, 2011; Estrada, Olson, Harbke & Berggren, 2011); and bystander harassment and/or assault experiences and gender context of the work environment and occupational field (Bastian, Lancaster, & Reyst, 1996; Estrada & Laurence, 2011).

Our examination of the literature on job-related attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors pertinent to harassment and/or assault in the workplace also suggested a myriad of job-related outcomes that could be examined in relation to these experiences (Chan, Lam, Chow, & Cheung, 2008; Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997; Hershcovis, & Barling, 2010; Lapierre, Spector, & Leck,

¹⁵ Investigation of the Grand Canyon River District validated complaints made by 13 former and current NPS employees and identified 22 other employees experiencing similar behaviors; it also noted that while some incidents were reported to supervisors and managers, they were not properly investigated or reported to Human Resources or Equal Employment Opportunity (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2016a). Investigation of the Canaveral National Seashore (CANAS) found that a law enforcement supervisor had shown a pattern of sexual harassment involving a law enforcement employee and two other female employees within the past five years; it also found that an administrative manager had made inappropriate comments to a law enforcement employee and to a member of his own staff (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2016b).

2005; Pascoe, & Smart Richman, 2009; Raver & Nishii, 2010; Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997; Sojo, Wood, & Genat, 2016). However, due to practical concerns and guidance from organizational members, we limited our selection of job-related outcomes to job satisfaction (Lapierre et al., 2005; Raver & Nishii, 2010; Sojo et al., 2016), job engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010), and organizational commitment (Chan et al., 2008; Raver & Nishii, 2010; Sojo et al., 2016).

Finally, our examination of the literature on job-related attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors pertinent to harassment and/or assault in the workplace also confirmed the importance of examining situational characteristics and circumstances involved in specific harassing and/or assault behaviors employees were likely to experience (Krieger et al., 2005; Mazzeo, Bergman, Buchanan, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 2001). Accordingly, we identified specific characteristics to assess situational factors, reporting behaviors and outcomes, and the impact of these experiences on interpersonal relationships (Lapierre et al. 2005; Sojo et al., 2016), physical or emotional well-being (Chan et al, 2008; Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997; Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009; Schneider et al., 1997; Sojo et al., 2016), job performance, and willingness to remain part of the organization (Chan et al., 2008; Raver & Nishii, 2010; Sojo et al., 2016).

Based on our review of the literature, and in consultation with organizational members, we refined the list of topics and constructs in order to identify valid and reliable measures for the WES. Table 1.1 shows the final list of topic areas and constructs included in the WES.

Table 1.1 Topics and Constructs Assessed in the Study

<i>Topic Area</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Constructs</i>
Work Experiences	Assessment of employees' experiences with harassment and/or assault behaviors at work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harassment Experiences with Regard to Age, Disability, Ethnicity, Religion, and Sexual Orientation • Gender and Sexual Harassment • Sexual Assault Related Behaviors
Demographic and Occupational Characteristics	Assessment of employee characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual Characteristics (Sex, Age, Race/Ethnicity, Education, Relationship Status) • Occupational Characteristics (Pay Grade, Tenure, Employment Status, Type of Work Unit)
Organizational Factors	Assessment of employees' attitudes and perceptions of the work unit and organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion and Support • Organizational Politics • Organizational Trust • Bystander Harassment • General and Leadership Intolerance for Harassment • Gender Context

Table 1.1 Continued

Topic Area	Description	Constructs
Job Related Outcomes	Assessment of employees' perceptions of their job	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job Satisfaction • Job Engagement • Organizational Commitment
Situational Characteristics	Assessment of employees' situational characteristics involving specific harassment and/or assault behaviors or set of experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situational Characteristics • Reporting Behaviors and Outcomes • Bystander Interventions

1.3 Tasks and Objectives

As noted above, the statement of work included four overarching objectives that specified the goals for the WES. Data collected from the WES would allow DOI to establish baseline estimates for the nature and prevalence of various forms of workplace harassment using behavioral experience methodology. Data from the WES would allow for appropriately weighted comparisons of selected demographic and professional characteristics (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, and age) for the various forms of workplace harassment. Additionally, data from the WES would examine perceptions of workplace climate at the work unit and other variables deemed essential to understanding the nature, extent, and impact of workplace harassment on the DOI workforce.

Figure 1.1 presents the conceptual framework that distills the project objectives into a relational structure that organizes constructs identified through our review of the literature and in consultation with DOI organizational members. The conceptual framework is not an analytical model. The framework is meant to help organize variables into a schematic by which to distill research questions.




Figure 1.1 Conceptual Framework

As shown in Figure 1.1, the WES included measures of employee demographic characteristics, occupational characteristics, and organizational factors associated with harassing and/or assault related behaviors; various forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors based on one's age, race/ethnicity, disability status, sexual orientation, as well as gender and sexual harassment and sexual assault; job-related outcomes including satisfaction, engagement and commitment; and other factors involving situational characteristics associated with these types of experiences, reporting behaviors, bystander experiences and harassment experiences before the most recent 12 months. This framework helped us to translate the four project objectives into the five overarching research questions designed to examine attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors related to the *character*, *context*, *correlates* and *consequences* of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced by employees within the DOI work environment. Specifically, we report analyses addressing the following research questions:

- What is the *character* of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What *contextual* factors influence specific behaviors or sets of experiences?
- What demographic, occupational, and organizational factors were *correlated* with harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What job-related *consequences* were associated with harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?

- What additional findings were uncovered with regard to harassment and/or assault experiences?

1.4 Organization of Report

This report documents the results of the WES. Specifically, it documents descriptive and inferential analyses designed to uncover the *character, context, correlates, and consequences* of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced by employees within the DOL work environment. The report is written to address specific interests of organizational members, organizational leaders and policy makers, and for members of the scientific community. We balanced the inclusion and exclusion of technical information to give the reader sufficient details to get a clear understanding of the survey methodology and analytical strategy employed to derive findings and conclusions from the WES. We include detailed technical information for scientifically minded readers in the Appendices to the report. The main body of the report describes the survey methodology, presents results from the analyses of the WES, and highlights major findings. A companion Supplemental Statistical Report documents all results and findings not otherwise highlighted in this report.

2 Survey Methodology

2.1 Overview

The Work Environment Survey (WES) was designed to assess employees' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors on a wide range of topics related to the *character, context, correlates, and consequences* of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced by employees within the work environment. In this section, we describe the process used to develop the survey, provide an overview of the data collection procedures, provide an overview of each of the measures included in the survey, and outline the analytical strategy used to examine research questions delineated within the Introduction. A complete technical description of the survey methodology is provided in Appendix C. A copy of the survey instrument is included in Appendix D.

2.2 Development of Survey

The CFI Group collaborated with various organizational members to establish topics and constructs to inform the development, content, and structure of the WES. We also reviewed internal surveys and publicly available research, studies, and investigative reports pertinent to the topic of harassment (e.g., Lighthouse Associates, 1999, 2000; U.S. Department of the Interior, 2016a, 2016b) and consulted literature on job-related attitudes and behaviors, organizational dynamics, and diversity to develop a conceptual framework for the WES. As shown previously, Figure 1.1 illustrated the conceptual framework used to identify measures for various constructs included in the WES. These included demographic, occupational, and organizational factors associated with harassing and/or assault related behaviors; various forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors; job-related outcomes; and other factors involving situational characteristics associated with these types of experiences.

2.3 Data Collection Procedures

We partnered with three organizations to assist with the data collection process for the WES. We obtained support from GovDelivery to distribute electronic invitations and reminders, CASO Document Management to manage distribution and collection of paper surveys, and Qualtrics to host the online survey. The separation of responsibilities among these companies and CFI Group assured that Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and employees' survey responses were compartmentalized, providing us the ability to ensure that employees' contact information could not be linked to individual survey responses. Our protocols also specified procedures for the secure transfer and storage of contact information, secure distribution of surveys, and secure collection and storage of data (see Appendix C for technical details). The WES was a census based survey, which was fielded from January 9, 2017 to March 5, 2017.¹⁶

¹⁶ This report does not present findings from a separate study of newly hired employees performed in July through September of 2017. Those findings will be documented in a separate report.

As of December 10, 2016, the population of employees included a total of 61,020 individuals. Of these, 61,010 individuals had valid email and/or postal addresses and were sent an electronic invitation or paper copy of the survey.¹⁷ A total of 28,203 surveys were submitted electronically or by postal delivery at the end of the survey period, yielding a participation rate of 46.2%.¹⁸ Upon screening of the data, we eliminated data from 1,003 surveys because they did not meet criteria for inclusion (see Appendix C for technical details), leaving a total of 27,200 completed surveys, yielding an adjusted response rate of 44.6%.¹⁹

Each completed survey had to be associated with a unique survey identifier, include responses to items assessing respondents' gender identity, responses to at least one item from the sexual harassment questions, responses to 50% of the core variables, and have variability within responses associated with reverse-coded items distributed throughout the survey (see Appendix C for technical details).

2.4 Description of Survey Instrument and Measures

The WES included multi-item measures assessing attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors related to the *character, context, correlates, and consequences* of harassing and/or assault behaviors²⁰ experienced by employees within the work environment. The WES was structured to include two preliminary questions assessing employees' employment classification and their work schedule to appropriately frame certain questions within the survey. The remaining questions were structured into five sections, organized to minimize response burden, and optimize survey completion (see Appendix C for technical details). Table 2.1 displays the sections of the survey, key constructs, and sample items for each of the measures included in the WES.

¹⁷ Paper surveys were mailed directly to 132 NPS employees without an email address on file.

¹⁸ Five follow-up emails were sent to all employees throughout the survey period. Each email thanked individuals who had responded to the survey and reminded others to complete the survey if they had not already done so. Response rates were tracked after each follow-up and at survey closing on March 5, 2017. We found no systematic evidence of differential participation among employees throughout the survey period. The fifth and final follow-up yielded only an additional 1.75% increase in participation rate. Participation rates were comparable to those obtained in the Federal Employee Value Survey for 2015—49.7% Government Wide; 57.4% for the Department of the Interior; 54.1% for the National Park Service (US Office of Personnel Management, 2015).

¹⁹ While all employees were invited to participate, less than 10% of those in the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) chose to do so. The low BIE response rate resulted in too few cases for inclusion in the analyses due to unreliability of the estimates.

²⁰ Each measure of harassment included questions asking respondents to indicate if they experienced a harassing and assault behavior based on age, race/ethnicity, religion, disability and sexual orientation. Separate questions were also included to assess gender harassment and sexual harassment without asking about assault behaviors pertinent to those forms of harassment. A separate set of items were used to assess sexual assault related behaviors. Accordingly, the phrase "harassing and/or assault behaviors" is used to denote instances where an employee may have experienced a particular form of harassment, an assault behavior pertinent to a specific type of harassment, or a particular sexual assault related behavior.

Table 2.1 Description of Survey Constructs with Sample Items

<i>Survey Section</i>	<i>Construct</i>	<i>Sample Item</i>
Part I Your Perceptions About Your Job	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job Satisfaction • Job Engagement • Organizational Commitment • Organizational Politics • Organizational Trust • Supervisor Support • Organizational Inclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How satisfied are you with your job? • I am immersed in my work. • I would be happy to spend the rest of my career in my work unit. • It is best not to rock the boat in my work unit. • I feel my work unit will keep its word. • My supervisor cares about my opinions. • Members of my current work unit feel accepted by other members.
Part II Work Related Experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harassment based on my age, race/ethnicity, religious beliefs, disability status, sexual orientation • Sexual Harassment • Gender Harassment • Sexual Assault Related Behaviors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How often did you hear negative comments or remarks based on your... • How often did someone at work tell offensive sexual stories or jokes? • How often did someone at work make offensive, sexist remarks? • How often did you experience any intentional sexual contacts that were against your will?
Part III One Behavior/ Experience with the Greatest Effect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Behavior or Experience with Greatest Effect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the type of behavior or experience based on your: age; race or ethnicity; religious beliefs; disability status or condition; sexual orientation; sex/gender; When and where did it occur? Who did it? Did you report it?
Part IV Organizational Policies & Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Intolerance for Harassment • Leadership Intolerance for Harassment • Bystander Harassment • Bystander Intervention • Resource Utilization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At your current work unit, it would be very risky to file a harassment complaint. • Do the persons below tolerate harassment? • How often have you witnessed another employee being harassed? • What actions did you take if you witnessed another employee being harassed? • Which resources would you use if you were to make an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about a harassment experience?
Part V Demographic & Occupational Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic and Occupational Characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age, Marital Status, Ethnicity, Race, Sexual Orientation, Education, Tenure, Pay Grade, Supervisory Status, Work Location, Gender Context.

Part I included multi-item scales designed to assess employees' attitudes and perceptions about their job to include *job satisfaction* (e.g., How satisfied are you with the kind of work you do?), *job engagement* (e.g., I am immersed in my work), *commitment* to the work unit (e.g., I feel a strong sense of belonging to my work unit), *political dynamics* (e.g., It is best not to rock the boat in my work unit) and *trust* (e.g., I feel my work unit will keep its word) within the work unit, as well as, *supervisor support* (e.g., Supervisor of your unit cares about your opinions?) and *inclusion* within the work unit (e.g., Members of your work unit feel accepted by other members of the work unit). Items assessing *job satisfaction* were rated on a 5-point response scale ranging from *very dissatisfied* (1) to *very satisfied* (5), with higher scores indicating employees were more satisfied with their job. Items assessing *job engagement* were rated on a 7-point response scale ranging from *never* (1) to *always/everyday* (7), with higher scores indicating employees were more engaged in their jobs. Items assessing *commitment*, *political dynamics*, *trust*, and *inclusion* within the work unit, as well as *supervisor support* were rated on a 5-point response scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5), with higher scores indicating higher levels of commitment, trust, inclusion within the work unit, and higher levels of support from supervisor. More negative perceptions of the political dynamics within the work unit are also indicated by higher scores.

Part II included items assessing employees' experiences with harassing and/or assault behaviors based on their age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, gender and sexual harassment, and a measure of sexual assault related behaviors. All measures asked about behaviors that occurred both during and before the past 12 months. This section also included a follow-up question to assess the pay grade at which each of the forms of harassment was experienced for the first time. Instructions asked employees to indicate how often they experienced a series of behaviors from someone at work in the past 12 months using a 6-point response scale that ranged from *never* (1), *once* (2), *once a month or less* (3), *two to three times a month* (4), *once a week or more* (5), to *one or more times a day* (6). Harassment experience rates were computed by averaging across items and counting employees who answered in the affirmative (i.e., selected any option from *once* to *one or more times a day*) for each type of harassing and/or assault experience occurring one or more times, with higher percentages indicating more employees experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors.

Part III included items assessing a variety of situational characteristics surrounding a specific harassing and/or assault behavior or set of experiences (e.g., time, location, frequency, and duration of the experience; sex, age, and employment status of the person[s] involved); reporting behaviors and outcomes; and items assessing the impact of these experiences on interpersonal relationships, physical or emotional well-being, job performance, and willingness to remain a part of the organization. Responses to this section of the survey were purposely focused on a single experience or set of related experiences to minimize response burden and

optimize survey completion.²¹ We computed descriptive statistics including counts, percentages, means and standard deviations, and median and modal values for these items.

Part IV included items assessing employees' perceptions of both the *general and leadership intolerance of harassment* in the work unit (e.g., Actions are being taken to prevent harassment; supervisors tolerate harassment), *bystander experiences* with harassing and/or assault behaviors (e.g., How often have you witnessed another employee being subjected to harassment based on their age?), *bystander responses* to harassing and/or assault experiences of other employees (e.g., I told someone in a position of authority about the situation), and items assessing *future use of resources* (e.g., Would you use a supervisor or manager to make a complaint/grievance/report?). Items assessing employees' perceptions of the *general intolerance of harassment* were measured on a 5-point response scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5), with higher scores indicating greater intolerance of harassment within the work unit (i.e., higher scores indicate that members of one's work unit do not tolerate harassment). Items measuring *leadership intolerance* of harassment were measured using a *yes, no, do not know* response format, and scored so that higher scores indicated greater leadership intolerance of harassment within the work unit (i.e., higher scores indicate that leaders within one's work unit do not tolerate harassment). Items assessing *bystander experiences* were measured on a 6-point response scale that ranged from *never* (1), *once* (2), *once a month or less* (3), *two to three times a month* (4), *once a week or more* (5), to *one or more times a day* (6). Bystander harassment experiences were computed by averaging items and counting employees who answered in the affirmative (i.e., selected any option from *once* to *one or more times a day*) for each type of bystander harassing experience occurring one or more times, with results indicating the percentage of employees who witnessed incidents of bystander harassment. For items assessing *bystander responses* and *future use of resources* we computed descriptive statistics including counts, percentages, means and standard deviations, and median and modal values.

Part V included items assessing employees' demographic and occupational characteristics to include age, relationship status, racial/ethnic background, sex and gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, education, tenure, pay grade, supervisory status,

²¹ We recognize that people may have experienced more than one type of harassing and/or assault behavior in the past 12 months. However, to ask about each specific form of harassment and/or assault experience would have added substantial content to an already lengthy survey. Hence, we made a compromise to focus on a specific behavior or experience that had the greatest effect on the person responding to the survey and asked them to respond to all subsequent questions to this section in terms of the specific form of harassment and/or assault experience that had the greatest effect on their personal and professional life. Following the same approach, we also included a single question to ask about harassing and/or assault behaviors related to the respondents' sex and/or gender (e.g., gender harassment, sexual harassment, sexual assault related behaviors) because asking about experiences for each of the sex/gender related experiences would have required repetition of the individual behaviors specific to gender harassment, sexual harassment, and sexual assault related behaviors, thus adding considerable length to the survey.

type of work location, gender context and career field. We computed descriptive statistics including counts, percentages, and means and standard deviations for each of these items.

3 Results and Findings

3.1 Overview of Results

Data were cleaned, cross-checked, verified, and screened prior to weighting. All active employees (as of December 10, 2016) were invited to complete the survey. However, some were not available during the fielding period (e.g., on extended leave, hospitalized, unable to locate), some submitted incomplete surveys, others started but did not submit the survey, and some declined to participate at the outset. Because unweighted survey results are subject to bias introduced by disproportionate numbers of respondents representing a specific group, the data were weighted to estimate results as though all employees completed a survey, reflecting population estimates and reducing non-response bias. The resulting weighted dataset was used to derive the population estimates and their corresponding margins of error were calculated for all variables in the database (see Appendix C for technical details).

Analyses were done in two steps. We performed structural and psychometric analysis to examine the measurement properties of multi-item scales included in the WES. Principal-axis factor analyses were performed to examine the structural relations among items within each of the multi-item scales. Internal consistency analyses were performed to estimate reliability of each of the multi-item scales and to validate results of factor analytic tests. Validity analyses examined associations among scale scores for different constructs included in the WES. Results of these analyses are presented in Appendix C.

Upon completion of structural and psychometric analyses, we also performed descriptive and inferential analyses designed to address specific research questions examined in the study. We computed descriptive statistics including counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations for characteristics of employees and for all constructs included in the WES. Descriptive statistics for multi-item scales were examined in relation to key demographic and occupational characteristics (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, age, pay grade, employment status) for specific results. Appropriate statistical significance tests, such as t-tests or Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests, were performed to assess whether significant differences existed between/ among groups. We also performed a series of regression analyses to examine associations among demographic, occupational, and organizational variables and employees' harassment and/or assault behaviors experienced; and to examine associations between harassment and/or assault behaviors experienced and employees' ratings of job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment. These analyses provided information about the unique associations between each independent variable (e.g., demographic, occupational, and organizational variables) and the dependent variable (e.g., type of harassment experienced), while controlling for the potential influence of every other variable included in the models we examined. Statistically significant differences among groups or associations among variables were annotated within respective tables and figures throughout the report and were also documented in the Supplemental Statistical Report. For all statistical significance testing, probability values

were set at $p < .05$, meaning that in 95% of such comparisons the differences would be of a magnitude such that they represent true differences in attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors and are not likely to be due to chance. Given that the likelihood of finding statistically significant results increases as a function of sample size, we also evaluated the practical significance of findings to ascertain the meaningfulness of particular results. A finding was deemed to be meaningful if it was both statistically and practically significant. Practical significance was determined by evaluating (a) the absolute value of the difference within subgroup comparisons—the absolute value of the difference within subgroup comparisons had to vary by 30% or more for the groups and/or variables involved, or (b) the absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood Chi Square—the absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood Chi Square had to be ≥ 100 for specific variables identified for the logistic regression analyses we performed.

We use several annotations throughout the results section to highlight key findings. In some instances, results were not reported due to instability or low reliability of results or because they meet criteria for suppression. A result was suppressed if it had (a) fewer than five cases in the numerator; (b) fewer than 15 cases in the denominator; and/or (c) high relative standard error of the estimate (see details in survey methodology or Appendix C).²² Suppressed results are denoted as “NR” when the result is “Not Reportable.” The denotation “NA” has two uses. First, we use “NA” to describe instances where data were “Not available” as in the case of some demographic data. Second, we use “NA” to describe instances where the computation of a result is “Not Applicable.” For example, if a point estimate is 0.0%, meaning no respondents were estimated to have experienced a behavior, the margin of error is not applicable. Dashed lines, (- -) are used to denote instances where no one received a question based on the skip logic employed, or where no one who received the question answered it. We use an asterisk (*) and/or capital letters (e.g., ABCD) to denote statistically significant differences among group(s). We use an arrow head (◀) to denote differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Additionally, we use shading to highlight the most important findings within respective tables.

The sections that follow present results of statistical analyses designed to examine attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors related to the *character, context, correlates, and consequences* of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced by employees within the DOI workforce. We begin by presenting descriptive statistics for individual and occupational characteristics for both the DOI population and for the estimated study population. The next section presents analyses involving the character of harassing and/or assault behaviors. This is followed by a presentation of results involving contextual factors influencing specific harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced among employees. Results examining associations among demographic, occupational, and organizational factors and harassing and/or assault behaviors

²² Numerator denotes the number of individuals who selected a particular option within a question. Denominator denotes the number of individuals who responded to the question itself. Hence, there had to be at least five people who selected a particular response option and at least 15 people who answered the question.

experienced are presented next. These analyses are followed by results examining job-related consequences of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced. The last section reports additional findings we uncovered with regard to harassment and/or assault experiences that were not described in earlier sections of the results. All results have been weighted to reflect estimated population parameters for the DOI workforce.

3.2 Population and Employee Characteristics

Demographic and occupational characteristics of the employee and study populations are presented in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2. Comparisons of the known employee population characteristics to the estimated study population characteristics reveal the estimated study population data is representative of the DOI population, especially with regard to age, racial/ethnic background, disability status, sex, appointment type, and work schedule. Hence the estimated study population mirrors the employee population in terms of age, racial/ethnic background, disability status, sex, appointment type, and work schedule (see Table 3.1 and Table 3.2).²³

Table 3.1 DOI – Employee and Estimated Study Population Demographic Characteristics

	Employee population		Estimated study population	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number*</i>	<i>Percent*</i>
Age				
25 or under	2,155	3.5%	2,162 (±91)	3.5% (±0.1)
26-29	3,411	5.6%	3,420 (±113)	5.6% (±0.2)
30-39	13,669	22.4%	13,682 (±203)	22.4% (±0.3)
40-49	15,247	25.0%	15,296 (±211)	25.1% (±0.3)
50-59	17,637	28.9%	17,605 (±220)	28.8% (±0.4)
60 or older	8,901	14.6%	8,869 (±172)	14.5% (±0.3)
Ethnicity/Race – Collapsed				
Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	45,654	75.5%	45,431 (±208)	75.4% (±0.3)
Minority	14,829	24.5%	14,861 (±208)	24.6% (±0.3)
Disability				
Yes	5,428	9.5%	6,342 (±149)	10.4% (±0.2)
No	51,569	90.5%	54,538 (±149)	89.6% (±0.2)
Sex				
Men	36,938	60.5%	36,849 (±237)	60.5% (±0.4)
Women	24,082	39.5%	24,104 (±237)	39.5% (±0.4)

*Number and percent values reflect estimated weighted proportions based on complete, eligible responses.

²³ We were not able to assess the accuracy of estimated population distributions for educational level, years of service, and supervisory status due to the nature and quality of the data we were able to obtain. Additionally, we were unable to assess the accuracy of the estimated population distributions for relationship status, gender identity, sexual orientation, and years of service because these data were not available from Human Resources. These limitations notwithstanding, results derived from the survey responses provide an accurate reflection of estimated population parameters for the DOI workforce.

Table 3.1 Continued

	Employee population		Estimated study population	
	Number	Percent	Number*	Percent*
Gender Identity				
Male	36,938	60.5%	36,849 (±238)	60.2% (±0.4)
Female	24,082	39.5%	24,104 (±237)	39.4% (±0.4)
Transgender	NA	NA	35 (±14)	0.1% (±0.0)
Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	NA	NA	191 (±29)	0.3% (±0.0)
Sexual Orientation – Collapsed				
Heterosexual	NA	NA	55,515 (±98)	95.7% (±0.2)
Sexual Minority	NA	NA	2,519 (±98)	4.3% (±0.2)
Sexual Orientation				
Heterosexual or straight	NA	NA	55,515 (±135)	91.6% (±0.2)
Lesbian	NA	NA	603 (±50)	1.0% (±0.1)
Gay	NA	NA	729 (±55)	1.2% (±0.1)
Bisexual	NA	NA	859 (±59)	1.4% (±0.1)
Other	NA	NA	329 (±37)	0.5% (±0.1)
I prefer not to say	NA	NA	2,559 (±99)	4.2% (±0.2)
Relationship Status - Collapsed				
Single	NA	NA	12,719 (±198)	21.0% (±0.3)
Partnered/Married	NA	NA	41,348 (±226)	68.1% (±0.4)
Separated/Widowed/Divorced	NA	NA	6,638 (±152)	10.9% (±0.3)

*Number and percent values reflect estimated weighted proportions based on complete, eligible responses.

Table 3.2 DOI – Employee and Estimated Study Population Occupational Characteristics

	Employee population		Estimated study population	
	Number	Percent	Number*	Percent*
Education Level				
Less than High School/High School Diploma/GED	12,587	20.9%	5,518 (±140)	9.1% (±0.2)
Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	8,944	14.9%	9,628 (±178)	15.9% (±0.3)
AA/College Degree	24,919	41.4%	28,917 (±241)	47.7% (±0.4)
Graduate Degree	13,730	22.8%	16,538 (±216)	27.3% (±0.4)
Appointment Type				
Permanent	54,031	88.6%	54,752 (±148)	89.8% (±0.2)
Term	2,981	4.9%	4,540 (±129)	7.5% (±0.2)
Temporary	3,962	6.5%	1,647 (±80)	2.7% (±0.1)

*Number and percent values reflect estimated weighted proportions based on complete, eligible responses.

Table 3.2 Continued

	Employee population		Estimated study population	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number*</i>	<i>Percent*</i>
Work Schedule				
Seasonal	3,608	6.2%	3,094 (± 108)	5.5% (± 0.2)
Non-seasonal	54,385	93.8%	52,745 (± 108)	94.5% (± 0.2)
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
Less than 1 year	NA	NA	5,040 (± 135)	8.3% (± 0.2)
1 to 3 years	NA	NA	9,025 (± 173)	14.8% (± 0.3)
4 to 5 years	NA	NA	5,060 (± 135)	8.3% (± 0.2)
6 to 10 years	NA	NA	12,276 (± 195)	20.2% (± 0.3)
11 to 14 years	NA	NA	6,401 (± 150)	10.5% (± 0.2)
15 to 20 years	NA	NA	8,558 (± 169)	14.1% (± 0.3)
More than 20 years	NA	NA	14,481 (± 207)	23.8% (± 0.3)
Pay Plan and Grade				
Wage Grade (WG) 1 – 4	543	0.9%	950 (± 62)	1.6% (± 0.1)
Wage Grade (WG) 5 – 8	2,446	4.0%	4,274 (± 125)	7.1% (± 0.2)
Wage Grade (WG) 9 – 16	1,508	2.5%	1,894 (± 86)	3.1% (± 0.1)
Other Wage Grade (WG)	757	1.2%	357 (± 39)	0.6% (± 0.1)
General Schedule (GS) 1 – 6	7,551	12.4%	5,205 (± 137)	8.6% (± 0.2)
General Schedule (GS) 7 – 10	11,946	19.6%	12,805 (± 198)	21.1% (± 0.3)
General Schedule (GS) 11 – 12	19,278	31.6%	20,053 (± 228)	33.1% (± 0.4)
General Schedule (GS) 13 – 15	12,976	21.3%	13,254 (± 201)	21.9% (± 0.3)
Senior Level (SL)/Scientific Professional (ST)/Senior Executive Service (SES)	356	0.6%	299 (± 36)	0.5% (± 0.1)
Other	3,613	5.9%	1,491 (± 77)	2.5% (± 0.1)
Supervisory Status				
Non-Supervisor	47,687	78.2%	33,069 (± 240)	54.7% (± 0.4)
Supervisor	13,287	21.8%	27,344 (± 240)	45.3% (± 0.4)

*Number and percent values reflect estimated weighted proportions based on complete, eligible responses.

3.3 Character of Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced

Estimated experience rates and number of occurrence for all forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors assessed in the WES are presented in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate and Number of Harassment Experiences in Past 12 Months

<i>Type of Experience</i>	<i>Experience rate</i>		<i>Estimated number</i>	
	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>Lower Limit</i>	<i>Upper Limit</i>
Any Form	35.0%	±0.4	21,201	21,664
Age	20.5%	±0.3	12,341	12,732
Racial/Ethnic	9.3%	±0.2	5,556	5,838
Religious	7.1%	±0.2	4,187	4,435
Disability	6.1%	±0.2	3,582	3,813
Sexual Orientation	3.6%	±0.2	2,114	2,295
Gender Harassment	16.5%	±0.3	9,913	10,273
Sexual Harassment	8.0%	±0.2	4,762	5,025
Sexual Assault Related Behaviors	0.74%	±0.07	412	495
Sexual Touching	0.48%	±0.06	262	330
Attempted Sex	0.19%	±0.04	99	142
Completed Sex	0.06%	±0.02	28	53

As can be seen in Table 3.3 and Figure 3.1, an estimated 35.0% of employees experienced some form of harassing and/or assault behaviors in the 12 months preceding the survey. More specifically, 20.5% experienced harassing behaviors based on their age; 9.3% experienced harassing behaviors based on their racial/ethnic background; 7.1% experienced harassing behaviors based on their religious beliefs; 6.1% experienced harassing behaviors based on a perceived or actual disability; 3.6% experienced harassing behaviors based on their sexual orientation; 16.5% experienced harassing behaviors based on their gender; 8.0% experienced sexually harassing behaviors; and 0.74% of experienced sexual assault related behaviors, with the preponderance of these experiences involving sexual touching (0.48%) or attempted sexual assault behaviors with or without sexual touching (0.19%).²⁴

²⁴ In many instances of sexual assault related behaviors, people experience a combination of behaviors. For example, someone who marked in the survey that they experienced “Made you have sexual intercourse” once or more might have also marked once or more to “Sexually touched you.” Rather than attempt to provide experience rates for every possible combination of behaviors, responses were coded to create three mutually exclusive categories: unwanted sexual touching (this includes only those respondents who marked once or more to intentional touching of genitalia, breasts, or buttocks), attempted sex (this includes those respondents who marked once or more to an attempt to make someone have sexual intercourse, oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object regardless of whether they also experienced unwanted sexual touching), and completed sex (this includes those respondents who marked once or more to making someone have sexual intercourse, oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object regardless of whether they also experienced unwanted sexual touching or attempted sex). Specifically, responses were coded as unwanted sexual touching (single category) if the respondents indicated experiencing sexual touching without identifying an attempted or completed sexual behavior. Responses were coded as experiencing attempted sex (with or without unwanted touching) if the respondents indicated experiencing attempted sexual intercourse, oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object, regardless of whether they also experienced unwanted sexual touching, but without an experience of completed sex. Responses were coded as experiencing completed sex (with




Figure 3.1 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors in Past 12 Months

While summarizing employees' experiences into proportions and averages provides a convenient way to describe these observations, translating these figures into numbers of employees affected offers another way to understand their meaningfulness. Considering the estimated rate for any form of harassment and reflecting on the estimated number of individuals it represents reveals that a rate of 35.0% translates into 21,201 to 21,664 who experienced some form of harassing and/or assault behavior in the 12 months preceding the survey. Likewise, a rate of 20.5% translates into 12,341 to 12,732 individuals who experienced some form of harassing behavior based on their age; a rate of 9.3% translates into 5,556 to 5,838 individuals who experienced some form of harassing behavior based on their racial/ethnic background; a rate of 7.1% translates into 4,187 to 4,435 individuals who experienced some form of harassing behavior based on their religious beliefs; a rate of 6.1% translates into 3,582 to 3,813 individuals who experienced some form of harassing behavior based on a disability status; a rate of 3.6% translates into 2,114 to 2,295 individuals who experienced some form of harassing behavior based on sexual orientation; a rate of 16.5% translates into 9,913 to 10,273 individuals who experienced some form of gender harassing behavior; a rate of 8.0% translates into 4,762 to 5,025 individuals who experienced some form of sexually harassing behavior; a rate of 0.74% translates into 412 to 495 individuals who experienced some type of sexual assault related behavior; a rate of 0.48% translates into 262 to 330 individuals who experienced some form of sexual touching behavior; a rate of 0.19% translates into 99 to 142 individuals who experienced some form of attempted sexual assault related behavior; and a rate of 0.06% translates into 28 to 53 individuals who experienced some form of completed sexual assault related behavior.

or without unwanted touching and/or attempted sex) if the respondents indicated experiencing a behavior associated with completed sex, regardless of whether they also indicated experiencing unwanted sexual touching or attempted sex. The results then show the percentage of employees who experienced any of the unwanted sexual touching behaviors only, any of the attempted sex behaviors excluding unwanted sexual touching, and any of the completed sex behaviors excluding unwanted sexual touching and attempted sex.

Table 3.4 DOI – Estimated Number and Frequency Distribution of Harassment Experiences in Past 12 Months

Type of Harassment	N	Average frequency	Once	Once a month or less	Two-three times a month	Once a week or more)	One or more times a day)
Any Form	21,432	3.0 (±0.0)	40.2% (±0.3)	34.7% (±0.3)	12.2% (±0.2)	7.4% (±0.2)	5.4% (±0.1)
Age	12,535	3.0 (±0.0)	39.5% (±0.5)	34.9% (±0.5)	13.4% (±0.4)	7.2% (±0.3)	4.9% (±0.2)
Racial/Ethnic	5,695	3.0 (±0.0)	44.5% (±0.8)	34.3% (±0.8)	8.6% (±0.5)	6.1% (±0.4)	6.5% (±0.4)
Religious	4,309	2.9 (±0.0)	46.7% (±1.0)	34.7% (±1.0)	9.1% (±0.6)	5.0% (±0.5)	4.5% (±0.4)
Disability	3,696	3.2 (±0.0)	38.4% (±0.9)	32.3% (±0.9)	12.8% (±0.7)	8.4% (±0.6)	8.1% (±0.5)
Sexual Orientation	2,202	3.1 (±0.0)	39.4% (±1.3)	34.8% (±1.3)	12.4% (±0.9)	6.0% (±0.7)	7.3% (±0.7)
Gender Harassment	10,091	3.1 (±0.0)	34.9% (±0.6)	38.1% (±0.6)	13.7% (±0.4)	8.8% (±0.4)	4.6% (±0.3)
Sexual Harassment	4,892	3.0 (±0.0)	42.3% (±0.8)	32.3% (±0.7)	12.6% (±0.5)	8.4% (±0.4)	4.3% (±0.3)
Sexual Assault Related Behaviors	451	2.8 (±0.1)	64.5% (±3.8)	13.6% (±2.9)	8.7% (±2.4)	5.5% (±2.0)	7.7% (±2.3)

Note. Frequency scale scores ranged from *once* to *one or more times per day* for respondents who reported experiencing harassing and/or assault behaviors. A value of 3 corresponds to *once a month or less*.

Table 3.4 shows the average frequency and corresponding distribution for all forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors measured in the WES. As shown in Table 3.4, average frequency ratings were within 2-3, on a response scale ranging from *once* (2) to *one or more times a day* (6), with *once a month or less* representing a value of 3.



Figure 3.2 DOI – Frequency of Occurrence for Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors

Examination of the distribution of these experiences clearly show that most employees experienced these types of behaviors more than once (see Table 3.4). Figure 3.2 displays the distribution of these experiences for all forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors measured in the WES. As shown in Figure 3.2, regardless of the particular behavior involved, 59.8% of employees experienced these behaviors more than once. This pattern is observed for all other forms of harassing behaviors measured with the exception of sexual assault behaviors which were experienced once by the majority of employees.

To identify vulnerability factors associated with employees' experiences, we examined harassing and/or assault rates by various demographic and occupational characteristics measured in the WES. Demographic characteristics included variables measuring employees' age, sex, level of education, racial/ethnic background, and relationship status. Occupational characteristics included variables measuring employees' pay grade, tenure in the organization, employment classification, and type of work unit.

For these analyses, t-tests or ANOVA tests were performed to identify statistically significant differences between/among groups. Given that the likelihood of finding statistically significant results increase as a function of sample size, we also evaluated the practical significance of these findings. Practical significance was determined by evaluating the absolute value of the difference within subgroup comparisons—the absolute value of the difference within subgroup comparisons had to vary by 30% or more for the groups and/or variables involved. Major findings for these analyses are highlighted within Table 3.5 to Table 3.13 and complete findings are documented in the Supplemental Statistical Report. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significant criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the most impactful of the variables are also shaded within the each of the tables.

Table 3.5 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate and Frequency of Any Form of Harassment in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Overall		21,432	35.0%	±0.4	
Age					
A	25 or under	1,106	51.2%BCDEF	±2.1	◀
B	26-29	1,573	46.0%ACDEF	±1.7	◀
C	30-39	5,073	37.1%ABDE	±0.8	
D	40-49	4,614	30.2%ABCEF	±0.7	
E	50-59	5,828	33.1%ABCDF	±0.7	
F	60 or older	3,152	35.5%ABDE	±1.0	
Relationship Status					
A	Single	5,488	43.1%BC	±0.9	
B	Partnered/Married	13,139	31.8%AC	±0.5	
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	2,558	38.5%AB	±1.2	
Ethnicity/Race					
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	15,374	33.8%*	±0.4	
	Minority	5,666	38.1%*	±0.8	
Disability					
	Yes	2,845	44.9%*	±1.2	
	No	18,435	33.8%*	±0.4	
Sex					
	Men	10,880	29.5%*	±0.5	
	Women	10,446	43.3%*	±0.6	
Gender Identity					
A	Male	10,880	29.5%BD	±0.5	
B	Female	10,446	43.3%A	±0.6	
C	Transgender	NR	NR	NR	
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	90	47.1%A	±7.2	
Sexual Orientation					
	Heterosexual	18,723	33.7%*	±0.4	
	Sexual Minority	1,372	54.5%*	±2.0	◀
Education Level					
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	1,593	28.9%BCD	±1.2	
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	3,199	33.2%ACD	±0.9	
C	AA/College Degree	10,134	35.0%ABD	±0.6	
D	Graduate Degree	6,216	37.6%ABC	±0.7	

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.5 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Appointment Type				
A	Permanent	18,929	34.6%BC	±0.4
B	Term	1,700	37.4%AC	±1.4
C	Temporary	707	42.9%AB	±2.4
Work Schedule				
	Seasonal	1,395	45.1%*	±1.8
	Non-seasonal	18,074	34.3%*	±0.4
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	1,328	26.3%BCDEFG	±1.2
B	1 to 3 years	3,211	35.6%ACG	±1.0
C	4 to 5 years	2,057	40.7%ABDEFG	±1.4
D	6 to 10 years	4,610	37.6%ACEG	±0.9
E	11 to 14 years	2,211	34.5%ACD	±1.2
F	15 to 20 years	3,083	36.0%ACG	±1.0
G	More than 20 years	4,779	33.0%ABCDF	±0.8
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	2,371	38.5%CD	±1.2
B	Middle Grade	7,285	38.4%CD	±0.7
C	Senior Grade	10,754	32.3%AB	±0.5
D	Executive Grade	78	26.1%AB	±5.3
Supervisory Status - Collapsed				
	Non-Supervisor	11,824	35.8%*	±0.5
	Supervisor	9,261	33.9%*	±0.6

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.5 displays experience rates for any form of harassing and/or assault behavior by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that age and sexual minority status were the only variables that were notably associated with employees harassing and/or assault experiences. Specifically, employees who were 29 and younger experienced more harassment than their older counterparts; and sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts (see Table 3.5). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy.

Table 3.6 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Age in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Overall		12,535	20.5%	±0.3	
Age					
A	25 or under	927	42.9%BCDEF	±2.1	◀
B	26-29	1,057	30.9%ACDEF	±1.6	◀
C	30-39	2,693	19.7%ABDF	±0.7	
D	40-49	1,917	12.6%ABCEF	±0.5	◀
E	50-59	3,440	19.6%ABDF	±0.6	
F	60 or older	2,449	27.6%ABCDE	±0.9	◀
Relationship Status					
A	Single	3,318	26.1%BC	±0.8	
B	Partnered/Married	7,603	18.4%AC	±0.4	
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	1,455	21.9%AB	±1.0	
Ethnicity/Race					
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	9,088	20.0%*	±0.4	
	Minority	3,233	21.8%*	±0.7	
Disability					
	Yes	1,663	26.3%*	±1.1	◀
	No	10,773	19.8%*	±0.3	
Sex					
	Men	6,865	18.6%*	±0.4	
	Women	5,600	23.3%*	±0.5	
Gender Identity					
A	Male	6,865	18.6%BD	±0.4	
B	Female	5,600	23.3%AD	±0.5	
C	Transgender	8	22.9%	±17.6	
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	63	33.0%AB	±7.0	
Sexual Orientation					
	Heterosexual	10,891	19.6%*	±0.3	
	Sexual Minority	783	31.1%*	±1.8	◀
Education Level – Collapsed					
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	971	17.6%BCD	±1.0	
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	1,936	20.1%A	±0.8	
C	AA/College Degree	5,920	20.5%A	±0.5	
D	Graduate Degree	3,522	21.3%A	±0.6	
Appointment Type					
A	Permanent	10,988	20.1%BC	±0.3	
B	Term	1,031	22.7%AC	±1.2	
C	Temporary	457	27.8%AB	±2.2	◀
Work Schedule					
	Seasonal	829	26.8%*	±1.6	◀
	Non-seasonal	10,482	19.9%*	±0.3	

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.6 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	839	16.7%BCDFG	±1.1
B	1 to 3 years	1,916	21.2%A	±0.9
C	4 to 5 years	1,161	23.0%ADEF	±1.2
D	6 to 10 years	2,463	20.1%ACG	±0.7
E	11 to 14 years	1,226	19.2%CG	±1.0
F	15 to 20 years	1,684	19.7%ACG	±0.9
G	More than 20 years	3,155	21.8%ADEF	±0.7
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	1,548	25.2%BCD	±1.1
B	Middle Grade	4,319	22.8%ACD	±0.6
C	Senior Grade	6,049	18.2%AB	±0.4
D	Executive Grade	38	12.9%AB	±4.3 ◀
Supervisory Status				
	Non-Supervisor	6,978	21.1%*	±0.4
	Supervisor	5,351	19.6%*	±0.5

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.6 displays experience rates for harassing behaviors based on age by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that age, disability status, sexual minority status, appointment type and schedule, and pay grade were significantly associated with employees' harassment experiences. Specifically, employees who were 29 and younger and 60 and older experienced more harassment than their counterparts; employees who were 40-49 experienced less harassment than any of the other groups; employees with a documented disability experienced more harassment than their non-disabled counterparts; sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts; and employees with a temporary employment classification or seasonal schedule experienced more harassment than their counterparts; and executive grade employees experienced less harassment than any other group (see Table 3.6). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note that while age, disability status, sexual minority status, appointment type and work schedule, and paygrade were significantly associated with employees' harassment experiences, age was by far the most impactful variable involved.

Table 3.7 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Racial/Ethnic Background in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Overall		5,695	9.3%	±0.2	
Age					
A	25 or under	205	9.5%	±1.3	
B	26-29	296	8.7%	±1.0	
C	30-39	1,267	9.3%	±0.5	
D	40-49	1,336	8.7%E	±0.5	
E	50-59	1,772	10.1%D	±0.5	
F	60 or older	790	9.0%	±0.6	
Relationship Status					
A	Single	1,410	11.1%B	±0.6	
B	Partnered/Married	3,466	8.4%AC	±0.3	
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	749	11.3%B	±0.8	
Ethnicity/Race – Collapsed					
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	2,611	5.8%*	±0.2	◀
	Minority	2,945	19.9%*	±0.7	◀
Ethnicity/Race					
A	Hispanic	861	20.5%BDFG	±1.2	◀
B	American Indian or Alaskan Native	785	18.2%ADF	±1.2	◀
C	Asian	181	19.6%DF	±2.7	◀
D	Black/African-American	538	25.9%ABCEFG	±1.9	◀
E	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	64	18.2%DF	±4.4	◀
F	Non-Hispanic White	2,611	5.8%ABCDEG	±0.2	◀
G	Multi racial	515	17.6%ADF	±1.4	◀
Disability					
	Yes	811	12.9%*	±0.8	◀
	No	4,820	8.9%*	±0.2	
Sex					
	Men	3,282	8.9%*	±0.3	
	Women	2,377	9.9%*	±0.4	
Gender Identity					
A	Male	3,282	8.9%BD	±0.3	
B	Female	2,377	9.9%A	±0.4	
C	Transgender	6	17.6%	±17.5	
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	30	15.7%A	±5.9	
Sexual Orientation - Collapsed					
	Heterosexual	4,945	8.9%*	±0.2	
	Sexual Minority	325	12.9%*	±1.4	◀

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.7 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Education Level - Collapsed				
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	512	9.3%	±0.8
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	972	10.1%D	±0.6
C	AA/College Degree	2,648	9.2%	±0.3
D	Graduate Degree	1,456	8.8%B	±0.4
Appointment Type				
A	Permanent	5,179	9.5%C	±0.2
B	Term	374	8.3%	±0.8
C	Temporary	119	7.2%A	±1.4
Work Schedule				
	Seasonal	266	8.6%	±1.0
	Non-seasonal	4,979	9.5%	±0.3
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	304	6.0%BCDEFG	±0.7 ◀
B	1 to 3 years	833	9.3%A	±0.6
C	4 to 5 years	524	10.4%A	±0.9
D	6 to 10 years	1,185	9.7%A	±0.5
E	11 to 14 years	646	10.1%A	±0.8
F	15 to 20 years	819	9.6%A	±0.6
G	More than 20 years	1,332	9.2%A	±0.5
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	562	9.2%	±0.7
B	Middle Grade	1,938	10.2%C	±0.4
C	Senior Grade	2,828	8.5%B	±0.3
D	Executive Grade	27	9.0%	±3.9
Supervisory Status - Collapsed				
	Non-Supervisor	3,159	9.6%*	±0.3
	Supervisor	2,411	8.8%*	±0.3

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.7 displays experience rates for harassing behaviors based on race/ethnicity by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that race/ethnicity, disability status, sexual minority status and years of service were significantly associated with employees'

harassment experiences. Specifically, ethnic minority employees experienced more harassment than their non-minority counterparts; employees with a documented disability experienced more harassment than their non-disabled counterparts; sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts; and employees with a less than a year of service experienced less harassment than their counterparts (see Table 3.7). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note that while race/ethnicity, disability status, sexual minority status and years of service were significantly associated with employees' harassment experiences, race/ethnicity was by far the most impactful variable involved.

Table 3.8 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Religious Beliefs in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Overall		4,309	7.1%	±0.2
Age				
A	25 or under	149	7.0%	±1.2
B	26-29	229	6.7%	±0.9
C	30-39	1,026	7.5% ^F	±0.5
D	40-49	1,067	7.0%	±0.4
E	50-59	1,273	7.3%	±0.4
F	60 or older	545	6.2% ^C	±0.5
Relationship Status				
A	Single	916	7.2%	±0.5
B	Partnered/Married	2,898	7.0%	±0.3
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	461	6.9%	±0.6
Ethnicity/Race				
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	3,037	6.7% [*]	±0.2
	Minority	1,195	8.1% [*]	±0.5
Disability				
	Yes	652	10.3% [*]	±0.8
	No	3,624	6.7% [*]	±0.2
Sex				
	Men	2,659	7.2% [*]	±0.3
	Women	1,614	6.7% [*]	±0.3
Gender Identity				
A	Male	2,659	7.2% ^D	±0.3
B	Female	1,614	6.7% ^D	±0.3
C	Transgender	NR	NR	NR
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	32	16.8% ^{AB}	±6.0

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.8 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Sexual Orientation				
	Heterosexual	3,779	6.8%*	±0.2
	Sexual Minority	254	10.1%*	±1.2
Education Level - Collapsed				
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	300	5.5%BCD	±0.6
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	694	7.2%A	±0.5
C	AA/College Degree	2,077	7.2%A	±0.3
D	Graduate Degree	1,180	7.1%A	±0.4
Appointment Type				
A	Permanent	3,874	7.1%	±0.2
B	Term	297	6.6%	±0.8
C	Temporary	121	7.3%	±1.4
Work Schedule				
	Seasonal	273	8.8%*	±1.1
	Non-seasonal	3,699	7.0%*	±0.2
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	221	4.4%BCDEFG	±0.6
B	1 to 3 years	572	6.4%ADF	±0.5
C	4 to 5 years	388	7.7%A	±0.8
D	6 to 10 years	977	8.0%ABG	±0.5
E	11 to 14 years	493	7.7%A	±0.7
F	15 to 20 years	677	7.9%ABG	±0.6
G	More than 20 years	945	6.5%ADF	±0.4
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	460	7.5%D	±0.7
B	Middle Grade	1,485	7.9%CD	±0.4
C	Senior Grade	2,142	6.4%B	±0.3
D	Executive Grade	7	2.2%AB	±2.5
Supervisory Status				
	Non-Supervisor	2,348	7.1%	±0.3
	Supervisor	1,902	7.0%	±0.3

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.8 displays experience rates for harassment behaviors based on religious beliefs by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that disability status,

sexual minority status, years of service and paygrade were significantly associated with employees' harassment experiences. Specifically, employees with documented disability experienced more harassment than their nondisabled counterparts; sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts; employees with a less than a year of service experienced less harassment than their counterparts; and executive grade employees experienced less harassment than their counterparts (see Table 3.8). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note that while disability status, sexual minority status, years of service and paygrade were significantly associated with employees' harassment experiences, none of these variables stood out as being more or less impactful.

Table 3.9 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Disability Status in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Overall		3,696	6.1%	±0.2	
Age					
A	25 or under	64	3.0% CDEF	±0.8	◀
B	26-29	138	4.1% EF	±0.7	◀
C	30-39	725	5.4% AEF	±0.4	
D	40-49	806	5.3% AEF	±0.4	
E	50-59	1,282	7.4% ABCD	±0.4	
F	60 or older	667	7.7% ABCD	±0.6	
Relationship Status					
A	Single	888	7.1% BC	±0.5	
B	Partnered/Married	2,132	5.2% AC	±0.2	
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	627	9.5% AB	±0.7	◀
Ethnicity/Race					
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	2,527	5.6% *	±0.2	
	Minority	1,106	7.5% *	±0.4	
Disability					
	Yes	1,667	26.4% *	±1.1	◀
	No	2,006	3.7% *	±0.2	◀
Sex					
	Men	2,030	5.6% *	±0.2	
	Women	1,636	6.9% *	±0.3	
Gender Identity					
A	Male	2,030	5.6% BD	±0.2	
B	Female	1,636	6.9% AD	±0.3	
C	Transgender	5	14.7%	±17.2	
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	25	13.1% AB	±5.6	

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.9 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Sexual Orientation				
	Heterosexual	3,181	5.8%*	±0.2
	Sexual Minority	235	9.5%*	±1.2 ◀
Education Level				
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	306	5.6%B	±0.6
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	756	7.9%ACD	±0.6
C	AA/College Degree	1,736	6.1%BD	±0.3
D	Graduate Degree	851	5.3%BC	±0.4
Appointment Type				
A	Permanent	3,390	6.3%BC	±0.2
B	Term	217	4.8%A	±0.7
C	Temporary	68	4.2%A	±1.1 ◀
Work Schedule				
	Seasonal	180	5.9%	±0.9
	Non-seasonal	3,245	6.2%	±0.2
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	171	3.4%BCDEFG	±0.5 ◀
B	1 to 3 years	526	5.9%A	±0.5
C	4 to 5 years	335	6.7%A	±0.7
D	6 to 10 years	816	6.8%A	±0.5
E	11 to 14 years	412	6.5%A	±0.6
F	15 to 20 years	546	6.5%A	±0.5
G	More than 20 years	878	6.2%A	±0.4
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	426	7.0%CD	±0.7
B	Middle Grade	1,508	8.0%CD	±0.4 ◀
C	Senior Grade	1,563	4.8%AB	±0.2
D	Executive Grade	NR	NR	NR
Supervisory Status				
	Non-Supervisor	2,387	7.3%*	±0.3
	Supervisor	1,281	4.7%*	±0.3

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.9 displays experience rates for harassment behaviors based on disability status by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences

are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that age, relationship status, disability status, sexual minority status, appointment type, years of service, and paygrade were significantly associated with employees harassing and/or assault experiences. Specifically, employees who were 29 and younger experienced more harassment than their older counterparts; employees who were separated/widowed/divorced experienced more harassment than their counterparts; employees with a documented disability experienced more harassment than their non-disabled counterparts; sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts; employees with a temporary employment classification experienced more harassment than their counterparts; employees with less than one year of service experienced less harassment than their counterparts; employees in the middle grades experienced more harassment than their counterparts (see Table 3.9). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note that while age, relationship status, disability status, sexual minority status, appointment type, years of service, and paygrade were significantly associated with employees' harassment experiences, disability status was by far the most impactful variable involved.

Table 3.10 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Harassment Based on Sexual Orientation in Past 12 Months

	Experience rate		
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Overall	2,202	3.6%	±0.2
Age			
A 25 or under	122	5.7% ^{CDEF}	±1.1 ◀
B 26-29	186	5.5% ^{CDEF}	±0.8 ◀
C 30-39	485	3.6% ^{AB}	±0.3
D 40-49	506	3.3% ^{AB}	±0.3
E 50-59	643	3.7% ^{ABF}	±0.3
F 60 or older	250	2.9% ^{ABE}	±0.4
Relationship Status			
A Single	725	5.7% ^{BC}	±0.4 ◀
B Partnered/Married	1,172	2.9% ^{AC}	±0.2
C Separated/Widowed/Divorced	290	4.4% ^{AB}	±0.5
Ethnicity/Race			
Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	1,488	3.3%*	±0.2
Minority	678	4.6%*	±0.4
Disability			
Yes	321	5.1%*	±0.6 ◀
No	1,873	3.5%*	±0.2

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.10 Continued

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Sex					
	Men	1,024	2.8%*	±0.2	
	Women	1,147	4.8%*	±0.3	◀
Gender Identity					
A	Male	1,024	2.8%BCD	±0.2	
B	Female	1,147	4.8%ACD	±0.3	
C	Transgender	8	23.5%ABD	±18.0	
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	23	12.2%ABC	±5.5	
Sexual Orientation - Collapsed					
	Heterosexual	1,325	2.4%*	±0.1	◀
	Sexual Minority	665	26.5%*	±1.8	◀
Sexual Orientation					
A	Heterosexual or straight	1,325	2.4%BCDEF	±0.1	◀
B	Lesbian	189	31.4%ACDEF	±3.8	◀
C	Gay	258	35.4%ABDEF	±3.6	◀
D	Bisexual	175	20.4%ABCEF	±2.8	◀
E	Other (e.g., questioning, asexual, undecided, self-identified, or intersex)	44	13.3%ABCDF	±4.2	◀
F	I prefer not to say	184	7.2%ABCDE	±1.1	◀
Education Level					
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	144	2.6%CD	±0.5	
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	336	3.5%	±0.4	
C	AA/College Degree	1,114	3.9%A	±0.2	
D	Graduate Degree	584	3.6%A	±0.3	
Appointment Type					
A	Permanent	1,920	3.5%C	±0.2	
B	Term	178	3.9%C	±0.6	
C	Temporary	95	5.8%AB	±1.2	◀
Work Schedule					
	Seasonal	192	6.2%*	±0.9	◀
	Non-seasonal	1,802	3.4%*	±0.2	
Years of Service at Bureau or Office					
A	Less than 1 year	112	2.2%BCDF	±0.4	◀
B	1 to 3 years	351	3.9%AC	±0.4	
C	4 to 5 years	265	5.3%ABDEFG	±0.7	◀
D	6 to 10 years	476	3.9%AC	±0.4	
E	11 to 14 years	211	3.3%C	±0.5	
F	15 to 20 years	325	3.8%AC	±0.4	
G	More than 20 years	452	3.2%C	±0.3	

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.10 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	276	4.5% ^C	±0.6
B	Middle Grade	805	4.3% ^C	±0.3
C	Senior Grade	1,024	3.1% ^{AB}	±0.2
D	Executive Grade	NR	NR	NR
Supervisory Status				
	Non-Supervisor	1,265	3.9% [*]	±0.2
	Supervisor	911	3.4% [*]	±0.2

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.10 displays experience rates for harassment based on sexual orientation status by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that age, relationship status, disability status, sex, sexual minority status, appointment type, work schedule and years of service were significantly associated with employees harassing and/or assault experiences. Specifically, employees who were 29 and younger experienced more harassment than their counterparts; employees who were single experienced more harassment than their counterparts; women experienced more harassment than men; sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts; employees with a temporary employment classification and/or seasonal schedule experienced more harassment than their counterparts; and employees with less than a year of service experience less harassment than their counterparts and employees with 4-5 years of service experienced more harassment than their counterparts (see Table 3.10). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note that while age, relationship status, sex, sexual minority status, appointment type, work schedule and years of service were significantly associated with employees' harassment experiences, sexual minority status was by far the most impactful variable involved.

Table 3.11 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Gender Harassment in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Overall		10,091	16.5%	±0.3	
Age					
A	25 or under	621	28.7%BCDEF	±1.9	◀
B	26-29	816	23.9%ACDEF	±1.5	◀
C	30-39	2,760	20.2%ABDEF	±0.7	
D	40-49	2,394	15.7%ABCEF	±0.6	
E	50-59	2,454	13.9%ABCDF	±0.5	
F	60 or older	1,010	11.4%ABCDE	±0.7	◀
Relationship Status					
A	Single	2,951	23.2%BC	±0.7	◀
B	Partnered/Married	5,763	13.9%AC	±0.3	
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	1,244	18.8%AB	±1.0	
Ethnicity/Race					
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	7,697	16.9%*	±0.3	
	Minority	2,232	15.0%*	±0.6	
Disability					
	Yes	1,073	16.9%	±0.9	
	No	8,948	16.4%	±0.3	
Sex					
	Men	2,945	8.0%*	±0.3	◀
	Women	7,094	29.5%*	±0.6	◀
Gender Identity					
A	Male	2,945	8.0%BD	±0.3	
B	Female	7,094	29.5%AD	±0.6	
C	Transgender	NR	NR	NR	
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	38	19.9%AB	±6.3	
Sexual Orientation					
	Heterosexual	8,577	15.5%*	±0.3	
	Sexual Minority	874	34.7%*	±1.9	◀
Education Level					
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	461	8.4%BCD	±0.8	◀
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	1,175	12.2%ACD	±0.7	
C	AA/College Degree	4,798	16.6%ABD	±0.4	
D	Graduate Degree	3,528	21.3%ABC	±0.6	
Appointment Type					
A	Permanent	8,802	16.1%BC	±0.3	
B	Term	849	18.7%AC	±1.2	
C	Temporary	406	24.7%AB	±2.1	◀

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.11 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Work Schedule				
	Seasonal	762	24.6%*	±1.6 ◀
	Non-seasonal	8,395	15.9%*	±0.3
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	612	12.1%BCDEF	±0.9
B	1 to 3 years	1,601	17.7%ACG	±0.8
C	4 to 5 years	1,022	20.2%ABEG	±1.1
D	6 to 10 years	2,240	18.3%AG	±0.7
E	11 to 14 years	1,102	17.2%ACG	±0.9
F	15 to 20 years	1,550	18.1%AG	±0.8
G	More than 20 years	1,895	13.1%BCDEF	±0.6
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	1,137	18.5%C	±1.0
B	Middle Grade	3,364	17.7%C	±0.6
C	Senior Grade	5,231	15.7%AB	±0.4
D	Executive Grade	48	16.0%	±4.6
Supervisory Status – Collapsed				
	Non-Supervisor	5,472	16.6%	±0.4
	Supervisor	4,479	16.4%	±0.4

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.11 displays experience rates for gender harassment by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that age, relationship status, sex, sexual minority status, education level, appointment type and work schedule were significantly associated with employees' gender harassment experiences. Specifically, employees who were 29 and younger experienced more harassment than their counterparts; employees who were 60 and older less harassment than their counterparts; employees who were single experienced more harassment than their counterparts; women experienced more harassment than men; sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts; employees with less than a high experienced less harassment than their counterparts; and employees with a temporary employment classification and/or seasonal schedule experienced more harassment than their counterparts (see Table 3.11). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note

that while age, relationship status, sex, sexual minority status, educational level, appointment type and work schedule were significantly associated with employees' gender harassment experiences, both sex and sexual minority status were the most impactful variables involved.

Table 3.12 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Sexual Harassment in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Overall		4,892	8.0%	±0.2	
Age					
A	25 or under	259	12.0% CDEF	±1.4	◀
B	26-29	446	13.0% CDEF	±1.2	◀
C	30-39	1,363	10.0% ABDEF	±0.5	
D	40-49	1,170	7.7% ABCEF	±0.4	
E	50-59	1,169	6.7% ABCDF	±0.4	
F	60 or older	464	5.2% ABCDE	±0.5	◀
Relationship Status					
A	Single	1,528	12.0% BC	±0.6	◀
B	Partnered/Married	2,634	6.4% AC	±0.2	
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	665	10.0% AB	±0.7	
Ethnicity/Race					
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	3,498	7.7%*	±0.2	
	Minority	1,313	8.9%*	±0.5	
Disability					
	Yes	554	8.8%*	±0.7	
	No	4,303	7.9%*	±0.2	
Sex					
	Men	1,668	4.5%*	±0.2	◀
	Women	3,198	13.3%*	±0.4	◀
Gender Identity					
A	Male	1,668	4.5% BD	±0.2	
B	Female	3,198	13.3% A	±0.4	
C	Transgender	NR	NR	NR	
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	24	12.6% A	±5.6	
Sexual Orientation					
	Heterosexual	4,123	7.4%*	±0.2	
	Sexual Minority	449	17.8%*	±1.5	◀

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.12 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Education Level				
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	355	6.4%CD	±0.7
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	626	6.5%CD	±0.5
C	AA/College Degree	2,426	8.4%AB	±0.3
D	Graduate Degree	1,417	8.6%AB	±0.4
Appointment Type				
A	Permanent	4,316	7.9%C	±0.2
B	Term	396	8.7%	±0.9
C	Temporary	174	10.6%A	±1.6
Work Schedule				
	Seasonal	370	12.0%*	±1.2
	Non-seasonal	4,102	7.8%*	±0.2
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	238	4.7%BCDEF	±0.6
B	1 to 3 years	727	8.1%ACDG	±0.6
C	4 to 5 years	516	10.2%ABEG	±0.9
D	6 to 10 years	1,217	9.9%ABEFG	±0.5
E	11 to 14 years	536	8.4%ACDG	±0.7
F	15 to 20 years	735	8.6%ADG	±0.6
G	More than 20 years	889	6.2%BCDEF	±0.4
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	580	9.5%CD	±0.8
B	Middle Grade	1,930	10.2%CD	±0.4
C	Senior Grade	2,201	6.6%AB	±0.3
D	Executive Grade	13	4.5%AB	±3.1
Supervisory Status				
	Non-Supervisor	2,783	8.4%*	±0.3
	Supervisor	2,033	7.4%*	±0.3

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.12 displays experience rates for sexual harassment by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that age, relationship status, sex, sexual minority status, appointment type and work schedule, years of service and paygrade were

significantly associated with employees' sexual harassment experiences. Specifically, employees who were 29 and younger experienced more harassment than their counterparts; employees who were 60 and older experienced less harassment than their counterparts; employees who were single experienced more harassment than their counterparts; women experienced more harassment than men; sexual minority employees experienced more harassment than their heterosexual counterparts; employees with a temporary employment classification and/or seasonal schedule experienced more harassment than their counterparts; employees with less than one year of service experienced less harassment than their counterparts; and executive grade employees experienced less harassment than their counterparts (see Table 3.12). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note that while age, relationship status, sex, sexual minority status, appointment type and work schedule, years of service and paygrade were significantly associated with employees' sexual harassment experiences, both sex and sexual minority status were the most impactful variables involved.

Table 3.13 DOI – Estimated Experience Rate of Sexual Assault Related Behaviors in Past 12 Months

		Experience rate			
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Overall		451	0.74%	±0.07	
Age					
A	25 or under	14	0.63%B	±0.44	
B	26-29	59	1.74%ACDEF	±0.50	◀
C	30-39	120	0.88%BF	±0.17	
D	40-49	111	0.73%B	±0.15	
E	50-59	111	0.63%B	±0.13	
F	60 or older	34	0.39%BC	±0.15	◀
Relationship Status					
A	Single	193	1.52%B	±0.23	◀
B	Partnered/Married	169	0.41%AC	±0.07	◀
C	Separated/Widowed/Divorced	81	1.23%B	±0.30	◀
Ethnicity/Race					
	Non-Minority (Non-Hispanic White)	281	0.62%*	±0.08	
	Minority	158	1.07%*	±0.18	◀
Disability					
	Yes	92	1.46%*	±0.33	◀
	No	356	0.66%*	±0.07	
Sex					
	Men	182	0.49%*	±0.08	◀
	Women	262	1.09%*	±0.14	◀

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance.

Table 3.13 Continued

		Experience rate		
		<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Gender Identity				
A	Male	182	0.49%BD	±0.08
B	Female	262	1.09%AD	±0.14
C	Transgender	0	0.00%	NA
D	Do not identify as female, male, or transgender	8	4.23%AB	±4.05
Sexual Orientation				
	Heterosexual	385	0.70%*	±0.07
	Sexual Minority	44	1.73%*	±0.59 ◀
Education Level – Collapsed				
A	Less than High School (HS)/HS Diploma/GED	49	0.89%	±0.29
B	Trade/Tech Certificate/Some College	66	0.69%	±0.19
C	AA/College Degree	219	0.76%	±0.11
D	Graduate Degree	118	0.71%	±0.14
Appointment Type				
A	Permanent	406	0.74%	±0.08
B	Term	31	0.68%	±0.29
C	Temporary	15	0.92%	±0.60
Work Schedule				
	Seasonal	44	1.44%*	±0.49 ◀
	Non-seasonal	376	0.72%*	±0.08
Years of Service at Bureau or Office				
A	Less than 1 year	15	0.29%CDE	±0.19 ◀
B	1 to 3 years	70	0.78%	±0.20
C	4 to 5 years	51	1.00%A	±0.32 ◀
D	6 to 10 years	120	0.98%AG	±0.19 ◀
E	11 to 14 years	55	0.87%A	±0.26
F	15 to 20 years	54	0.64%	±0.19
G	More than 20 years	82	0.57%D	±0.14
Pay Plan and Grade				
A	Junior Grade	67	1.08%C	±0.29 ◀
B	Middle Grade	179	0.95%C	±0.15 ◀
C	Senior Grade	188	0.56%AB	±0.09
D	Executive Grade	NR	NR	NR
Supervisory Status				
	Non-Supervisor	275	0.83%*	±0.10
	Supervisor	164	0.60%*	±0.10

Note. Asterisks and/or capital letters denote statistically significant differences among group(s) indicated. ◀ denotes differences that met criteria for both statistical and practical significance. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.13 displays experience rates for sexual assault related behaviors by demographic and occupational variables included in the WES. As noted earlier, findings that met statistical significance criteria are denoted by an asterisk and/or capital letters; findings that met practical significance criteria are denoted by an arrowhead; and the largest of those differences are shaded within the table. Examination of these data reveals that age, relationship status, race/ethnicity, disability status, sex, sexual orientation, work schedule, years of service, and pay grade were significantly associated with employees' sexual assault related experiences. Specifically, employees who were 26-29 years experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than their older counterparts; employees who were 60 and older experienced less sexual assault related behaviors their counterparts; employees who were single/separated/widowed/divorced experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than their partnered and/or married counterparts; employees with a documented disability experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than their non-disabled counterparts; women experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than men; sexual minority employees experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than their heterosexual counterparts; employees with a seasonal work schedule experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than their counterparts; employees with less than one year of service experienced less sexual assault related behaviors their counterparts; employees with 4-10 years of service experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than their counterparts; employees in the junior and middle grades experienced more sexual assault related behaviors than their counterparts (see Table 3.13). None of the other associations among demographic, occupational, and harassment experiences were noteworthy. It is important to note that while age, relationship status, race/ethnicity, disability status, sex, sexual orientation, work schedule, years of service, and pay grade were significantly associated with employees' sexual assault related behaviors, relationship status, disability status, sex, sexual minority status, work schedule were by far the most impactful variables involved.

3.3.1 Summary of Analyses of Demographic, Occupational, and Harassing and/or Assault Experiences

Collectively, the pattern of findings examining associations involving demographic and occupational variables and employees' experiences with harassing and/or assault behaviors clearly indicates that it is the matched demographic characteristic to the particular form of harassing and/or assault behavior experienced that yields the largest differences in these behaviors. An exception to this general pattern involved sexual assault related behaviors which was associated with disability status, relationship status, work schedule, as well as with the sex/gender related demographic characteristic. As noted previously, none of the associations among other demographic and occupational variables were significantly related to employees' harassment and/or assault behaviors. Therefore, these are not depicted in the Table 3.14.

Table 3.14 DOI – Associations of Demographic and Occupational Characteristics with Harassment Experiences in Past 12 Months

Variable	Any Form	Age	Racial/Ethnic	Religion	Disability	Sexual Orientation	Gender Harassment	Sexual Harassment	Sexual Assault Behaviors
Age	✓	✓							
Race/Ethnicity			✓						
Disability Status					✓				✓
Sex							✓	✓	✓
Sexual Orientation	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓
Relationship Status									✓
Work Schedule									✓

Table 3.14, and Figure 3.3 to Figure 3.7 highlight findings for the most impactful demographic and/or occupational characteristics associated with each specific form of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced.




Figure 3.3 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates of Harassment Based on Age in Past 12 Months




Figure 3.4 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassment Based on Racial/Ethnic Background, Disability Status, and Sexual Orientation in Past 12 Months




Figure 3.5 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassment based on Racial/Ethnic Background in Past 12 Months




Figure 3.6 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Harassment Based on Sexual Orientation in Past 12 Months




Figure 3.7 DOI – Estimated Experience Rates for Gender and Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Behaviors in Past 12 Months

3.4 Contextual Factors Influencing Specific Behaviors or Experiences

Analyses of contextual factors involving specific behaviors or set of experiences that significantly affected employees' personal and professional lives were performed with data from employees who indicated they experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors and who also responded to follow-up questions exploring situational characteristics such as time, location, frequency, and duration of the experience; sex, age, and employment status of the person(s) involved; reporting behaviors and outcomes; and the impact of these experiences on interpersonal relationships, physical or emotional well-being, job performance, and willingness to remain a part of the organization.

It is worth noting that the data available for these analyses are limited to those respondents who experienced some form of harassing and/or assault behavior and provided responses to questions within this section of the survey (n = 21,162). As noted in Section 2.4 of the methodology, responses to this section of the survey were purposely focused on a single experience or set of related experiences to minimize response burden and optimize survey completion.²⁵ Responses to questions involving gender harassment, sexual harassment and sexual assault related behaviors were assessed in reference to sex and/or gender within this section of the survey to minimize response burden and optimize survey completion.

We computed descriptive statistics including counts, percentages, means, standard deviations, and median and modal values for these items to describe overarching trends in these data and highlight these findings in the coming sections. Given the small number of employees involved in some of these analyses, differences in percentages who reported each form of harassment are reported for descriptive purposes only. Therefore, caution should be used in interpreting differences among specific forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors. We refer readers to the Supplemental Statistical Report for a complete description of these data.

²⁵ We recognize that people may have experienced more than one type of harassing and/or assault behavior in the past 12 months. However, to ask about each specific form of harassment and/or assault experience would have added substantial content to an already lengthy survey. Hence, we asked employees to focus their responses to a specific behavior or experience that had the greatest effect and asked them to respond to all subsequent questions in this section in terms of this experience.

Table 3.15 DOI – Primary Basis for Experience of Greatest Effect

	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Q33 Thinking about the one behavior or experience that had the greatest effect on you in the past 12 months, what was the primary basis for the behavior or experience?	21,162		
Your age	4,658	22.0%	±0.6
Your race or ethnicity	2,012	9.5%	±0.4
Your religious beliefs	1,319	6.2%	±0.3
Your disability status or condition	1,391	6.6%	±0.3
Your sexual orientation	434	2.0%	±0.2
Your sex/gender	6,103	28.8%	±0.6
Unknown	5,245	24.8%	±0.6

Table 3.15 presents the number and proportion of employees who provided information regarding the primary basis for the specific behavior or experience they used to answer subsequent questions in this section. As shown in Table 3.15, among employees who responded to this section of the WES (n = 21,162), 22.0% indicated the experience was primarily based their age; 9.5% indicated the experience was primarily based on their racial/ethnic background; 6.2% indicated the experience was primarily based on their religious beliefs; 6.6% indicated the experience was primarily based on disability status or condition; 2.0% indicated the experience was primarily based on their sexual orientation; 28.8% indicated the experience was primarily based on their sex/gender; and 24.8% indicated the experience was primarily based on some other unknown characteristic. Figure 3.8 displays these data.

*Figure 3.8 DOI – Primary Basis for Experience of Greatest Effect*

It is worth noting that regardless of the particular behaviors experienced, there were overarching trends that were common across employees' experiences. Trends observed in the data are described in subsequent sections. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3.16 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of When Occurred

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q34 When did the specific type of behavior or experience occur?	20,671	4,614	1,993	1,315	1,387	432	6,094	4,836
All of it occurred during work hours	76.3% (±0.6)	79.2% (±1.2)	81.6% (±1.8)	73.2% (±2.5)	82.7% (±2.1)	74.9% (±4.3)	79.4% (±1.0)	66.6% (±1.3)
Most of it occurred during work hours; some off work hours	11.7% (±0.4)	10.4% (±0.9)	10.7% (±1.4)	15.5% (±2.1)	11.9% (±1.8)	15.3% (±3.7)	13.5% (±0.9)	9.7% (±0.9)
Some of it occurred during work hours; most off work hours	5.5% (±0.3)	5.3% (±0.7)	5.5% (±1.1)	6.6% (±1.5)	2.6% (±1.0)	8.4% (±3.0)	5.1% (±0.6)	6.2% (±0.7)
None of it occurred during work hours; all off work hours	6.5% (±0.3)	5.0% (±0.7)	2.3% (±0.8)	4.7% (±1.3)	2.7% (±1.0)	1.5% (±1.7)	2.0% (±0.4)	17.4% (±1.1)

Table 3.17 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Travel

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q35 Did the specific behavior or experience occur while you were on travel?	20,920	4,636	2,010	1,307	1,390	432	6,084	5,062
Yes	9.2% (±0.4)	8.5% (±0.8)	11.5% (±1.5)	9.3% (±1.7)	7.3% (±1.5)	7.2% (±2.9)	11.6% (±0.8)	6.8% (±0.7)
No	90.8% (±0.4)	91.5% (±0.8)	88.5% (±1.5)	90.7% (±1.7)	92.7% (±1.5)	92.8% (±2.9)	88.4% (±0.8)	93.2% (±0.7)

Table 3.18 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Where Occurred

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q36 Where did the specific type of behavior or experience typically occur?	20,124	4,559	1,971	1,306	1,359	429	6,053	4,446
At a work location or site	87.3% (±0.5)	88.4% (±1.0)	89.6% (±1.4)	82.8% (±2.1)	93.2% (±1.5)	89.6% (±3.3)	89.3% (±0.8)	81.6% (±1.2)
At a work-sponsored social event	1.8% (±0.2)	1.8% (±0.4)	1.4% (±0.6)	3.4% (±1.1)	1.0% (±0.7)	3.2% (±2.2)	1.6% (±0.4)	1.9% (±0.4)
At a non-work sponsored social event where coworkers were present	2.4% (±0.2)	3.2% (±0.5)	1.5% (±0.7)	3.2% (±1.1)	0.8% (±0.7)	1.8% (±1.8)	2.4% (±0.4)	2.3% (±0.5)
At a permanent bureau/office supplied housing location, if applicable	1.1% (±0.2)	0.9% (±0.3)	1.3% (±0.6)	1.2% (±0.8)	NR	NR	1.0% (±0.3)	1.7% (±0.4)
At a location outside the park/office/site	7.4% (±0.4)	5.8% (±0.7)	6.2% (±1.2)	9.3% (±1.7)	4.6% (±1.3)	4.6% (±2.5)	5.7% (±0.6)	12.4% (±1.0)

Table 3.19 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Work Location

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/ gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q37 You indicated that the behavior or experience typically occurred at a work location or site. Which of the following best describes the location or site?	17,408	4,011	1,744	1,082	1,250	384	5,369	3,566
At an indoor location (office setting)	81.2% (±0.6)	83.4% (±1.2)	83.7% (±1.8)	83.9% (±2.3)	79.8% (±2.3)	76.1% (±4.5)	80.2% (±1.1)	79.1% (±1.4)
At an indoor location (shop or maintenance area)	8.4% (±0.4)	8.1% (±0.9)	8.7% (±1.4)	6.6% (±1.6)	13.8% (±2.0)	17.8% (±4.2)	6.0% (±0.7)	10.1% (±1.0)
At an outdoor location (e.g., field site) that did not require an overnight stay	8.3% (±0.4)	6.7% (±0.8)	5.7% (±1.2)	8.1% (±1.8)	5.7% (±1.4)	3.4% (±2.4)	11.2% (±0.9)	8.7% (±1.0)
At an outdoor location (e.g., field site) that required an overnight stay	2.1% (±0.2)	1.8% (±0.5)	1.8% (±0.7)	1.4% (±0.9)	0.7% (±0.7)	2.7% (±2.2)	2.6% (±0.5)	2.1% (±0.5)

Table 3.16 through Table 3.19 show employees' responses to question involving the time and location of a specific behavior or set of experiences that had the greatest effect on them. Responses shaded within the table show the most frequently endorsed response options for each question presented. As shown in Table 3.16 through 3.19, employees' response patterns clearly indicate the majority of experiences occurred within the DOI work environment. In fact, regardless of the particular behavior involved for the majority of employees these experiences occurred during work hours (76.3%), at a work location or site (90.8%) that was most frequently characterized as an indoor location (87.3%) and for a minority of employees some of these experiences occurred while on travel (9.2%). Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.




Figure 3.9 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Location Trends

Figure 3.9 displays the trends in these responses for all forms of harassment and/or assault behavior measured in this section of the survey. As illustrated in Figure 3.9 the pattern described above appropriately characterizes response distributions for these questions across specific types of behaviors we examined. The consistency of the pattern across these experiences points to the fact that these behaviors are experienced where employees typically work and not in any other place.

Table 3.20 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Frequency of Occurrence

	Any form	Age	Race/ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/gender	Unknown reasons
Q38 How often did the specific type of behavior or experience occur?	20,221	4,600	1,991	1,316	1,373	434	6,067	4,440
Once	39.8% (±0.7)	42.3% (±1.4)	37.4% (±2.2)	35.1% (±2.6)	28.1% (±2.4)	37.4% (±4.7)	35.2% (±1.2)	49.8% (±1.5)
More than once	60.2%							
Once a month or less	39.1% (±0.7)	41.3% (±1.4)	38.4% (±2.2)	46.8% (±2.7)	37.2% (±2.6)	40.7% (±4.7)	42.7% (±1.2)	30.2% (±1.4)
2-4 times a month	12.1% (±0.5)	9.9% (±0.9)	12.6% (±1.5)	12.0% (±1.9)	19.5% (±2.2)	9.0% (±3.1)	13.3% (±0.9)	10.7% (±0.9)
Every few days	6.3% (±0.3)	4.4% (±0.6)	6.9% (±1.2)	4.6% (±1.3)	9.9% (±1.7)	8.0% (±3.0)	6.5% (±0.7)	7.0% (±0.8)
Every day	2.7% (±0.2)	2.2% (±0.5)	4.6% (±1.0)	1.4% (±0.8)	5.2% (±1.3)	4.9% (±2.5)	2.3% (±0.4)	2.3% (±0.5)

Table 3.20 presents data on the frequency of occurrence associated with specific behaviors or set of experiences measured in the WES. Responses shaded within the table show the most frequently endorsed response options for each question presented. Examination of these response patterns suggests that regardless of the particular behavior or experience involved, the experiences involved were not isolated or episodic events. In fact, for the majority of employees, these experiences occurred more than once (60.2%). Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.




Figure 3.10 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Frequency of Occurrence

Figure 3.10 displays trends in these responses for all forms of harassment and/or assault behavior measured in this section of the survey. As illustrated in Figure 3.10 the pattern described above appropriately characterizes response distributions for these questions across the various behaviors we measured. The consistency of this pattern reveals that these behaviors are experienced with some degree of regularity.

Table 3.21 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Persons Involved

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/ gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q40 How many people were involved?	20,061	4,550	1,974	1,297	1,365	434	6,046	4,395
One person	57.1% (±0.7)	52.9% (±1.5)	43.0% (±2.2)	45.6% (±2.7)	45.0% (±2.7)	50.4% (±4.7)	63.1% (±1.2)	67.1% (±1.4)
More than one person	42.9% (±0.7)	47.1% (±1.5)	57.0% (±2.2)	54.4% (±2.7)	55.0% (±2.7)	49.6% (±4.7)	36.9% (±1.2)	32.9% (±1.4)
Q41 Was/were the person(s) who did this to you?	19,871	4,469	1,940	1,285	1,357	432	6,037	4,351
Male	59.9% (±0.7)	47.7% (±1.5)	40.8% (±2.2)	44.5% (±2.7)	41.3% (±2.6)	63.0% (±4.7)	80.2% (±1.0)	63.1% (±1.4)
Female	18.3% (±0.5)	20.2% (±1.2)	23.0% (±1.9)	16.8% (±2.1)	23.8% (±2.3)	13.6% (±3.6)	12.2% (±0.8)	21.9% (±1.3)
Both males and females	21.8% (±0.6)	32.1% (±1.4)	36.2% (±2.2)	38.7% (±2.7)	34.8% (±2.6)	23.4% (±4.2)	7.7% (±0.7)	15.0% (±1.1)
Q42 Was/were the person(s) who did this to you?	20,209	4,584	1,982	1,311	1,369	432	6,062	4,470
Younger	19.5% (±0.6)	39.8% (±1.4)	13.5% (±1.6)	13.3% (±1.9)	20.3% (±2.2)	12.6% (±3.5)	9.2% (±0.8)	17.7% (±1.1)
About my age	18.0% (±0.5)	7.5% (±0.8)	16.9% (±1.7)	24.0% (±2.4)	18.8% (±2.2)	19.5% (±4.0)	20.8% (±1.0)	23.4% (±1.3)
Older	42.8% (±0.7)	42.7% (±1.4)	33.8% (±2.1)	29.4% (±2.5)	29.0% (±2.5)	40.1% (±4.7)	55.0% (±1.3)	38.8% (±1.4)
Some were younger, older, and/or about my age	14.2% (±0.5)	6.8% (±0.8)	25.5% (±2.0)	28.4% (±2.5)	25.7% (±2.4)	23.2% (±4.2)	12.5% (±0.9)	10.6% (±0.9)
Do not know	5.4% (±0.3)	3.1% (±0.5)	10.3% (±1.4)	4.8% (±1.3)	6.2% (±1.4)	4.6% (±2.4)	2.5% (±0.4)	9.5% (±0.9)

Table 3.21 Continued

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/ gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q43 Was/were the person(s) who did this to you any of the following?	21,162	4,658	2,012	1,319	1,391	434	6,103	5,245
Peer(s)/Coworker(s)	54.2% (±0.7)	54.3% (±1.4)	50.0% (±2.2)	68.0% (±2.6)	52.9% (±2.6)	72.6% (±4.4)	57.5% (±1.2)	47.2% (±1.4)
Subordinate(s) or someone you supervise/manage	6.6% (±0.3)	8.6% (±0.8)	8.9% (±1.3)	5.5% (±1.4)	7.3% (±1.5)	10.0% (±3.2)	5.0% (±0.6)	5.7% (±0.7)
Your Team lead(s) (current or former)	8.3% (±0.4)	10.9% (±0.9)	8.3% (±1.3)	8.1% (±1.6)	16.5% (±2.0)	7.4% (±2.9)	6.8% (±0.7)	5.6% (±0.7)
Another Team lead(s) (current or former)	5.1% (±0.3)	5.1% (±0.7)	5.7% (±1.1)	4.5% (±1.3)	8.4% (±1.6)	6.0% (±2.7)	6.4% (±0.6)	2.7% (±0.5)
Your Supervisor(s) (current or former)	22.5% (±0.6)	24.5% (±1.3)	24.9% (±1.9)	20.6% (±2.3)	44.4% (±2.6)	23.1% (±4.2)	20.2% (±1.0)	16.3% (±1.0)
Another Supervisor(s) (current or former)	9.3% (±0.4)	10.5% (±0.9)	10.6% (±1.4)	8.4% (±1.6)	13.3% (±1.9)	6.9% (±2.8)	10.7% (±0.8)	5.6% (±0.7)
Your Manager(s) (current or former)	11.0% (±0.4)	13.0% (±1.0)	15.5% (±1.6)	8.0% (±1.6)	17.7% (±2.1)	10.3% (±3.3)	10.7% (±0.8)	6.9% (±0.7)
Another Manager(s) (current or former)	6.1% (±0.3)	6.9% (±0.8)	9.6% (±1.4)	5.7% (±1.4)	8.3% (±1.6)	6.0% (±2.7)	6.6% (±0.7)	2.8% (±0.5)
Another federal employee	9.8% (±0.4)	9.8% (±0.9)	13.0% (±1.5)	8.7% (±1.6)	10.2% (±1.7)	8.9% (±3.1)	10.6% (±0.8)	8.0% (±0.8)
A contractor	3.0% (±0.2)	2.2% (±0.5)	3.4% (±0.9)	3.2% (±1.1)	3.6% (±1.1)	4.3% (±2.4)	4.0% (±0.5)	2.1% (±0.4)
Other	2.9% (±0.2)	8.0% (±0.8)	14.8% (±1.6)	8.6% (±1.6)	5.2% (±1.3)	7.1% (±2.8)	12.7% (±0.9)	6.3% (±0.7)
Do not know	2.6% (±0.2)	2.3% (±0.5)	3.1% (±0.9)	3.3% (±1.1)	1.2% (±0.7)	NR	0.7% (±0.3)	5.3% (±0.6)
None selected	5.5% (±0.3)	3.2% (±0.5)	2.0% (±0.7)	2.4% (±1.0)	1.7% (±0.8)	NR	1.9% (±0.4)	15.2% (±1.0)

Table 3.21 presents data on individual characteristics of persons involved in a specific behavior or set of experiences measured in the WES. Responses shaded within the table show the most frequently endorsed response options for each question presented. Examination of these response patterns suggests that regardless of the particular behavior or experience involved, the person(s) involved one, or multiple individuals, who were most likely to be older and male, and could be characterized as a peer/coworker, supervisor, and/or manager. In fact, regardless of the particulars of the behaviors experienced, 57.1% of employees indicated the experience involved one person, while 42.9% of employees indicated the experience involved more than one person. The person(s) involved were most often male (59.9%), though female (18.3%), and/or both males and females were also involved (21.8%). The person(s) involved was most likely to be older (42.8%), though younger (19.5%), same age (18.0%), and/or mixed age (14.2%)

individuals were also involved. The person(s) involved were more likely to include a peer and/or coworker (54.2%), though supervisors (22.5%), and/or managers (11.0%) were also involved. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.




Figure 3.11 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Persons Involved Trends

Figure 3.11 displays the trends in these responses for all forms of harassment and/or assault behavior measured in this section of the survey. As illustrated in Figure 3.11 the pattern described above appropriately characterizes response distributions for these questions across the various behaviors we measured.




Figure 3.12 DOI – Distribution of the Person(s) Engaging in Harassing Behavior for Any Form of Harassment

Figure 3.12 displays the distribution of those engaging in the harassing behavior for any form of harassment.

Table 3.22 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Interactions

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q44 Did your work role require you to continue to interact with this/these person(s)?	20,154	4,548	1,977	1,305	1,367	429	6,035	4,492
No, I did not have to interact with this/these person(s) at all	14.5% (±0.5)	13.1% (±1.0)	16.8% (±1.7)	11.9% (±1.9)	7.6% (±1.5)	11.3% (±3.4)	12.8% (±0.9)	20.3% (±1.2)
Yes, I had to or still have to interact with this/these person(s)	85.5% (±0.5)	86.9% (±1.0)	83.2% (±1.7)	88.1% (±1.9)	92.4% (±1.5)	88.7% (±3.4)	87.2% (±0.9)	79.7% (±1.2)

Table 3.22 presents data on the interaction particulars for a specific behavior or set of experiences measured in the WES. Responses shaded within the table show the most frequently endorsed response options for each question presented. Examination of these response patterns

suggests that regardless of the particular behavior or experience involved, a majority of employees had to continue to interact with the person(s) involved. In fact, 85.5% of employees indicated their work role required them to continue to interact with the person(s) involved. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.



Figure 3.13 DOI – Context of the One Experience of Harassment – Interactions Trends

Figure 3.13 displays the trends in these responses for all forms of harassment and/or assault behavior measured in this section of the survey. As illustrated in Figure 3.13 the pattern described above appropriately characterizes response distributions for these questions across each of the specific behaviors we examined.

Table 3.23 DOI – Discussion of the One Experience of Harassment - Summary

Q46 Discussed the experience with:	Any form	Age	Race/ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/gender	Unknown reasons
My coworkers	10,796 53.8% (±0.7)	2,197 48.7% (±1.5)	1,176 60.7% (±2.2)	483 37.1% (±2.7)	854 62.7% (±2.6)	253 60.2% (±4.8)	3,708 62.2% (±1.2)	2,126 46.6% (±1.5)
Another employee in my bureau	8,945 45.1% (±0.7)	1,848 41.3% (±1.5)	966 50.6% (±2.2)	407 31.6% (±2.6)	696 52.2% (±2.7)	222 53.4% (±4.8)	3,095 52.7% (±1.3)	1,712 37.9% (±1.4)

Table 3.23 Continued

Q46 Discussed the experience with:	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/ gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Someone from another bureau/office	3,095 15.9% (±0.5)	617 14.0% (±1.1)	470 24.9% (±2.0)	152 11.8% (±1.9)	307 23.5% (±2.4)	83 20.3% (±4.2)	909 15.8% (±1.0)	558 12.5% (±1.0)
My team leader	3,467 17.6% (±0.5)	615 13.8% (±1.0)	433 22.5% (±1.9)	147 11.4% (±1.9)	392 29.7% (±2.5)	90 21.6% (±4.2)	1,049 18.1% (±1.0)	740 16.5% (±1.1)
My supervisor	6,694 33.5% (±0.7)	1,319 29.3% (±1.3)	781 40.3% (±2.2)	247 19.0% (±2.2)	726 53.3% (±2.7)	143 33.8% (±4.7)	2,054 34.7% (±1.2)	1,424 31.2% (±1.4)
My manager	3,999 20.2% (±0.6)	716 16.0% (±1.1)	552 28.8% (±2.1)	137 10.6% (±1.8)	449 33.7% (±2.6)	83 19.6% (±4.1)	1,157 19.9% (±1.0)	906 20.0% (±1.2)
A senior leader	2,562 13.0% (±0.5)	466 10.5% (±0.9)	383 20.0% (±1.9)	72 5.5% (±1.4)	319 24.2% (±2.4)	71 16.8% (±3.9)	718 12.3% (±0.9)	533 11.8% (±1.0)
The person(s) involved	6,818 35.2% (±0.7)	1,325 30.4% (±1.4)	727 38.9% (±2.2)	437 34.5% (±2.7)	725 55.7% (±2.7)	158 39.1% (±4.9)	1,873 32.7% (±1.2)	1,573 35.6% (±1.4)

Table 3.23 presents data on the percentage of employees who talked to someone about specific behaviors or set of experiences measured in the WES. Responses shaded within the table show the most frequently endorsed response options for each question presented. Examination of these response patterns suggests that regardless of the particular behavior or experience involved, employees talked to someone at work about their experience. In fact, sizable percentages of employees indicated they discussed these experiences with someone at work: 53.8% of employees discussed the experience with a coworker; 45.1% of employees discussed the experience with another employee; 33.5% of employees discussed the experience with a supervisor; 20.2% of employees discussed the experience with a manager; and 35.2% of employees discussed the experience with the person(s) involved. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.



Figure 3.14 DOI – Discussion of the One Experience of Harassment – Trends

Figure 3.14 displays the trends in these responses for all forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors measured in this section of the survey. As illustrated in Figure 3.14 the pattern described above appropriately characterizes response distributions for these questions across the various behaviors we examined. Collectively, the pattern of findings suggests that regardless of the particular behavior involved, employees share their experiences with someone at work.

Table 3.24 DOI – Resources for Making Complaint of the One Experience of Harassment - Summary

	Any form	Age	Race/ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/gender	Unknown reasons
Estimated percent of employees who made a complaint/grievance/report.	20,243	4,536	1,967	1,301	1,375	430	6,017	4,617
Yes	25.3%	20.0%	34.0%	14.0%	45.8%	34.8%	25.4%	22.7%
No	74.7%	80.0%	66.0%	86.0%	54.2%	65.2%	74.6%	81.7%

Table 3.24 Continued

	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/ gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Q47 Did you make a complaint/grievance/report using any of the following resources?								
Supervisor or Manager	3,892 19.3% (±0.6)	625 13.8% (±1.0)	528 27.0% (±2.0)	142 10.9% (±1.8)	478 34.9% (±2.6)	110 25.7% (±4.4)	1,175 19.6% (±1.0)	835 18.1% (±1.1)
Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	1,021 5.1% (±0.3)	195 4.4% (±0.6)	106 5.5% (±1.1)	41 3.2% (±1.1)	197 14.7% (±2.0)	32 7.7% (±3.0)	263 4.4% (±0.6)	188 4.1% (±0.6)
Ombudsman (if applicable)	197 1.0% (±0.1)	33 0.7% (±0.3)	35 1.8% (±0.7)	NR	27 2.1% (±0.9)	12 3.0% (±2.2)	52 0.9% (±0.3)	34 0.7% (±0.3)
CADR Office, CORE PLUS	405 2.0% (±0.2)	40 0.9% (±0.3)	84 4.4% (±1.0)	10 0.8% (±0.7)	81 6.1% (±1.4)	20 4.9% (±2.6)	105 1.8% (±0.4)	64 1.4% (±0.4)
Employee & Labor Relations (Human Resources)	1,187 6.0% (±0.3)	183 4.1% (±0.6)	176 9.2% (±1.4)	48 3.7% (±1.2)	211 15.9% (±2.1)	38 9.2% (±3.2)	307 5.2% (±0.6)	222 4.9% (±0.7)
Union (if applicable)	556 2.8% (±0.2)	101 2.3% (±0.5)	99 5.2% (±1.1)	9 0.7% (±0.6)	108 8.2% (±1.6)	14 3.6% (±2.4)	104 1.8% (±0.4)	122 2.7% (±0.5)
Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor	1,273 6.4% (±0.3)	229 5.1% (±0.7)	221 11.4% (±1.5)	35 2.7% (±1.0)	239 17.9% (±2.2)	34 8.2% (±3.1)	320 5.4% (±0.6)	196 4.3% (±0.6)
Equal Employment Opportunity Office	1,010 5.1% (±0.3)	157 3.5% (±0.6)	205 10.6% (±1.5)	25 2.0% (±0.9)	215 16.2% (±2.1)	30 7.1% (±2.9)	222 3.8% (±0.5)	156 3.4% (±0.6)
Office of Inspector General Hotline	190 1.0% (±0.1)	34 0.8% (±0.3)	42 2.2% (±0.8)	NR	35 2.6% (±1.0)	9 2.2% (±2.0)	27 0.5% (±0.2)	40 0.9% (±0.3)
Office of Inspector General	265 1.3% (±0.2)	40 0.9% (±0.3)	58 3.0% (±0.9)	8 0.6% (±0.6)	42 3.2% (±1.1)	NR	52 0.9% (±0.3)	61 1.4% (±0.4)
Other Law Enforcement/Civil Authority not in the bureau	213 1.1% (±0.2)	29 0.6% (±0.3)	40 2.1% (±0.7)	NR	33 2.5% (±1.0)	6 1.5% (±1.8)	50 0.8% (±0.3)	53 1.2% (±0.4)
Department of Interior Ethics/Bureau Ethics Office	332 1.7% (±0.2)	40 0.9% (±0.3)	69 3.6% (±0.9)	20 1.6% (±0.8)	72 5.5% (±1.4)	6 1.5% (±1.8)	52 0.9% (±0.3)	74 1.6% (±0.4)

Table 3.24 presents the percentage of employees who made a complaint/grievance/report regarding behaviors or experiences and the specific resource they utilized by type of harassment and/or assault experience measured in the WES. Responses shaded within the table show the most frequently endorsed response options for each question presented. Examination of these response patterns suggests that regardless of the particular behavior involved, employees were not likely to make a complaint/grievance/report about their experience. In fact, 74.7% of employees indicated they did not make a complaint/grievance/report, while only 25.3% did. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3.24 also shows that regardless of the particular behavior involved, employees were not very likely to have used a DOI resource to make a complaint/grievance/report. An exception to this general pattern involved complaints/grievances/reports made to a supervisor or manager; 19.3% of employees made a complaint/grievance/report to a supervisor or manager (see Figure 3.15). All other resources were used less frequently (e.g., Employee Assistance Program, Ombudsman,²⁶ CADR Office or CORE PLUS, Employee & Labor Relations, Union, Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor, Equal Employment Opportunity Office, Office of the Inspector General Hotline, Office of the Inspector General, Other Law Enforcement/Civil Authority, Department of Interior Ethics/Bureau Ethics Office, National Park Service Law Enforcement/Park Police).




Figure 3.15 DOI – Frequency Distribution of Likelihood to Make a Complaint/Grievance/Report and Most Frequently Used DOI Resource of the One Experience of Harassment

²⁶ Ombudsman was only in existence about 1.5 months before the survey opened.

Table 3.25 DOI – Average Ratings of the Helpfulness of DOI Resources Used to Make a Complaint/Grievance/Report of the One Experience of Harassment

Q47 How helpful was it?	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
Supervisor or Manager	2.0 (±0.0)	2.0 (±0.1)	1.8 (±0.1)	2.1 (±0.2)	1.7 (±0.1)	1.8 (±0.3)	2.3 (±0.1)	2.1 (±0.1)
Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	2.4 (±0.1)	2.5 (±0.2)	2.4 (±0.2)	2.0 (±0.3)	2.5 (±0.2)	2.3 (±0.5)	2.5 (±0.2)	2.3 (±0.2)
Ombudsman (if applicable)	2.1 (±0.2)	1.3 (±0.2)	1.6 (±0.2)	NR	2.7 (±0.6)	NR	2.5 (±0.4)	2.5 (±0.5)
CADR Office, CORE PLUS	1.9 (±0.1)	2.1 (±0.4)	1.8 (±0.2)	1.7 (±0.5)	1.8 (±0.3)	1.6 (±0.3)	1.7 (±0.2)	2.2 (±0.3)
Employee & Labor Relations (Human Resources)	1.8 (±0.1)	1.9 (±0.2)	1.6 (±0.1)	1.9 (±0.3)	1.8 (±0.2)	1.8 (±0.4)	1.8 (±0.1)	2.0 (±0.2)
Union (if applicable)	2.3 (±0.1)	2.1 (±0.2)	2.0 (±0.3)	3.1 (±0.5)	2.4 (±0.3)	1.2 (±0.2)	2.3 (±0.3)	2.7 (±0.3)
Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor	2.2 (±0.1)	2.1 (±0.1)	2.3 (±0.2)	2.3 (±0.4)	2.2 (±0.2)	2.1 (±0.4)	2.1 (±0.1)	2.3 (±0.2)
Equal Employment Opportunity Office	2.2 (±0.1)	1.9 (±0.2)	2.3 (±0.2)	2.1 (±0.4)	2.2 (±0.2)	2.0 (±0.4)	2.1 (±0.2)	2.2 (±0.2)
Office of Inspector General Hotline	2.1 (±0.2)	1.9 (±0.5)	2.2 (±0.4)	NR	2.4 (±0.5)	NR	1.7 (±0.5)	2.3 (±0.3)
Office of Inspector General	2.1 (±0.2)	1.6 (±0.4)	2.0 (±0.3)	1.9 (±1.1)	2.6 (±0.5)	NR	2.1 (±0.4)	2.2 (±0.3)
Other Law Enforcement/Civil Authority not in the bureau	2.5 (±0.2)	2.3 (±0.5)	2.3 (±0.5)	NR	2.7 (±0.6)	2.1 (±1.0)	2.6 (±0.4)	2.8 (±0.3)
Department of Interior Ethics/Bureau Ethics Office	1.9 (±0.1)	1.9 (±0.4)	1.6 (±0.2)	2.5 (±0.6)	2.0 (±0.3)	2.1 (±1.3)	1.4 (±0.1)	2.2 (±0.3)

Scale scores ranged from *not at all helpful* (1) to *extremely helpful* (5), with values ranging from 2-3 indicating *somewhat to moderately helpful*.

As shown in Table 3.25, regardless of the particular behavior, or resource involved, employees indicated the majority of these resources were somewhat helpful. Average ratings of the helpfulness of each of the resources ranged from 1-3, on a response scale that scores ranged from *not at all helpful* (1) to *extremely helpful* (5), with values ranging from 1-3 indicating *not at all to moderately helpful*. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of

harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3.26 DOI – Helpfulness of Resources for Making Complaint of the One Experience of Harassment – Scale Distributions for Any Form of Harassment

Q47 How helpful was it?	N	Average rating	Not at all helpful (1)	Somewhat helpful (2)	Moderately helpful (3)	Very helpful (4)	Extremely helpful (5)
Supervisor or Manager	3,867	2.0 (±0.0)	52.0% (±1.6)	18.1% (±1.2)	11.1% (±1.0)	11.2% (±1.0)	7.6% (±0.9)
Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	1,002	2.4 (±0.1)	29.1% (±2.9)	30.3% (±2.9)	16.7% (±2.4)	16.3% (±2.4)	7.7% (±1.8)
Ombudsman (if applicable)	184	2.1 (±0.2)	39.8% (±7.3)	35.2% (±7.2)	3.7% (±4.0)	13.1% (±5.8)	8.2% (±5.0)
CADR Office, CORE PLUS	399	1.9 (±0.1)	51.9% (±4.9)	23.8% (±4.4)	14.6% (±3.8)	4.7% (±2.6)	5.0% (±2.6)
Employee & Labor Relations (Human Resources)	1,157	1.8 (±0.1)	57.3% (±2.9)	19.7% (±2.4)	10.9% (±1.9)	7.2% (±1.6)	5.0% (±1.4)
Union (if applicable)	547	2.3 (±0.1)	41.2% (±4.2)	22.3% (±3.7)	14.2% (±3.2)	9.7% (±2.8)	12.6% (±3.1)
Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor	1,250	2.2 (±0.1)	38.1% (±2.7)	29.4% (±2.6)	15.7% (±2.1)	10.7% (±1.8)	6.2% (±1.5)
Equal Employment Opportunity Office	1,000	2.2 (±0.1)	39.7% (±3.1)	27.5% (±2.9)	15.4% (±2.4)	11.7% (±2.1)	5.6% (±1.6)
Office of Inspector General Hotline	179	2.1 (±0.2)	53.1% (±7.4)	12.8% (±5.8)	13.5% (±5.9)	14.3% (±6.0)	6.4% (±4.7)
Office of Inspector General	260	2.1 (±0.2)	49.6% (±6.1)	19.5% (±5.3)	9.6% (±4.3)	13.6% (±4.8)	7.8% (±4.0)
Other Law Enforcement/Civil Authority not in the bureau	207	2.5 (±0.2)	34.5% (±6.8)	21.8% (±6.2)	11.2% (±5.1)	19.6% (±6.0)	12.9% (±5.3)
Department of Interior Ethics/Bureau Ethics Office	326	1.9 (±0.1)	53.4% (±5.5)	25.2% (±5.0)	4.9% (±3.0)	12.3% (±4.1)	4.1% (±2.8)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses. Ombudsman was only in existence about 1.5 months before the survey opened. Scale scores ranged from *not at all helpful* (1) to *extremely helpful* (5), with values ranging from 2-3 indicating *somewhat to moderately helpful*.

Table 3.26 shows the average rating and distribution of ratings for the helpfulness of each resource assessed in the WES. As can be seen in Table 3.26, the distribution of responses for each of the resources was within the 1-3 score, indicating that these resources were somewhat to moderately helpful.

Table 3.27 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Actions Focused on the Organization

Q48 Did any of the experiences listed below occur as a result of making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report?	Any form	Age	Race/ ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/ gender	Unknown reasons
a. The person I told took no action	5,035	899	655	182	622	150	1,511	1,017
Yes	39.9% (±1.4)	36.6% (±3.2)	40.3% (±3.8)	31.9% (±7.2)	49.8% (±3.9)	38.5% (±8.1)	39.8% (±2.5)	38.2% (±3.0)
No	35.8% (±1.3)	36.1% (±3.2)	34.2% (±3.7)	41.8% (±7.4)	27.6% (±3.7)	22.5% (±7.5)	40.9% (±2.5)	35.1% (±3.0)
Don't Know	24.3% (±1.2)	27.3% (±3.0)	25.5% (±3.5)	26.3% (±6.9)	22.7% (±3.5)	38.9% (±8.1)	19.3% (±2.1)	26.7% (±2.8)
b. The rules of harassment were explained to everyone in the workplace	5,018	891	657	180	618	147	1,506	1,019
Yes	29.1% (±1.3)	29.1% (±3.1)	30.6% (±3.6)	31.3% (±7.2)	27.9% (±3.7)	28.0% (±7.9)	26.1% (±2.3)	33.2% (±3.0)
No	53.3% (±1.4)	50.9% (±3.3)	53.6% (±3.8)	60.5% (±7.4)	50.2% (±3.9)	47.4% (±8.2)	59.7% (±2.5)	47.4% (±3.1)
Don't Know	17.5% (±1.1)	20.0% (±2.8)	15.8% (±3.0)	8.2% (±5.1)	21.8% (±3.4)	24.6% (±7.7)	14.2% (±1.9)	19.4% (±2.5)
c. A review/investigation/other assessment of the workplace was conducted by management	5,039	902	657	180	621	147	1,506	1,027
Yes	16.7% (±1.1)	12.0% (±2.3)	21.1% (±3.3)	12.4% (±5.7)	12.9% (±2.9)	23.6% (±7.6)	15.9% (±1.9)	21.4% (±2.6)
No	63.1% (±1.3)	66.3% (±3.2)	58.7% (±3.8)	71.4% (±7.1)	64.1% (±3.9)	55.7% (±8.2)	67.2% (±2.4)	56.0% (±3.1)
Don't Know	20.2% (±1.1)	21.7% (±2.8)	20.2% (±3.3)	16.3% (±6.2)	23.1% (±3.5)	20.7% (±7.4)	16.9% (±2.0)	22.7% (±2.7)
d. An investigation was conducted by a law enforcement official	5,008	897	655	180	616	145	1,501	1,014
Yes	4.9% (±0.6)	1.9% (±1.1)	7.9% (±2.3)	3.7% (±4.0)	4.4% (±1.9)	10.8% (±6.3)	5.2% (±1.2)	5.0% (±1.5)
No	80.2% (±1.1)	83.2% (±2.6)	77.7% (±3.4)	84.1% (±6.2)	76.3% (±3.5)	69.8% (±8.0)	84.0% (±1.9)	76.7% (±2.7)
Don't Know	14.9% (±1.0)	14.9% (±2.5)	14.4% (±2.9)	12.2% (±5.7)	19.3% (±3.3)	19.4% (±7.3)	10.8% (±1.7)	18.3% (±2.5)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses. An individual who made a complaint/grievance/report may not actually be informed of the outcome of their complaint/grievance/report because personnel policies may prohibit disclosure of such information.

Table 3.27 presents data on various actions that may have resulted from making a complaint/grievance/report regarding harassing and/or assault behaviors. Responses shaded within the table show the most notable response options for each question presented. Examination of these response patterns reveals that regardless of the specific form of harassment or assault behaviors experienced, employees indicated some actions were taken as a result of making a complaint/grievance/report, 35.8% of employees indicated that some action was taken (see item a in Table 3.27).²⁷ Examination of response patterns to items addressing organizational actions reveals that regardless of the harassing and/or assault behaviors involved: 29.1% of employees indicated the rules were explained to everyone; 16.7% of employees indicated management conducted a review/investigation or other assessment; and 4.9% of employees indicated an investigation was conducted by a law enforcement official (see Table 3.27 items b, c, d). Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3.28 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Actions Focused on the Person(s) Involved

Q48 Did any of the experiences listed below occur as a result of making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report?	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
e. Someone talked to the person(s) to ask him/her/them to change their behavior	5,026	896	659	180	617	147	1,500	1,026
Yes	29.6% (±1.3)	21.8% (±2.8)	23.8% (±3.4)	35.3% (±7.3)	19.4% (±3.3)	24.5% (±7.7)	37.3% (±2.5)	34.6% (±3.0)
No	39.3% (±1.4)	43.5% (±3.3)	46.3% (±3.8)	45.2% (±7.4)	46.9% (±4.0)	29.3% (±8.0)	37.4% (±2.5)	29.8% (±2.9)
Don't Know	31.1% (±1.3)	34.6% (±3.2)	29.9% (±3.6)	19.5% (±6.5)	33.7% (±3.8)	46.2% (±8.2)	25.3% (±2.3)	35.6% (±3.0)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses. An individual who made a complaint/grievance/report may not actually be informed of the outcome of their complaint/grievance/report because personnel policies may prohibit disclosure of such information.

²⁷ It is worth noting that an individual who made a complaint/grievance/report may not actually be informed of the outcome of their complaint/grievance/report because personnel policies may prohibit disclosure of such information.

Table 3.28 Continued

Q48 Did any of the experiences listed below occur as a result of making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report?	Any form	Age	Race/ ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/ gender	Unknown reasons
g. Person(s) was moved/reassigned so I did not have as much contact with him/her/them	5,011	901	657	180	616	145	1,495	1,017
Yes	8.5% (±0.8)	6.4% (±1.8)	10.1% (±2.6)	5.1% (±4.4)	8.3% (±2.5)	21.1% (±7.5)	8.5% (±1.5)	8.0% (±1.8)
No	85.1% (±1.0)	85.8% (±2.4)	81.2% (±3.2)	92.1% (±5.0)	85.3% (±3.0)	66.4% (±8.2)	87.6% (±1.8)	84.7% (±2.3)
Don't Know	6.4% (±0.7)	7.8% (±1.9)	8.7% (±2.4)	NR	6.4% (±2.2)	12.5% (±6.5)	3.9% (±1.1)	7.2% (±1.8)
h. There was some official career action taken against person(s) for the behavior	5,021	897	657	180	622	144	1,499	1,022
Yes	4.8% (±0.6)	2.5% (±1.2)	3.2% (±1.7)	7.3% (±4.9)	2.8% (±1.6)	12.0% (±6.5)	5.8% (±1.3)	5.9% (±1.6)
No	74.7% (±1.2)	76.6% (±2.9)	80.6% (±3.2)	84.8% (±6.1)	73.4% (±3.6)	61.9% (±8.3)	75.7% (±2.2)	68.4% (±2.9)
Don't Know	20.6% (±1.1)	20.9% (±2.8)	16.2% (±3.0)	7.9% (±5.0)	23.8% (±3.5)	26.0% (±7.9)	18.5% (±2.0)	25.7% (±2.8)
i. The person(s) stopped the behavior	5,026	895	661	182	620	145	1,495	1,028
Yes	21.3% (±1.2)	19.5% (±2.7)	13.3% (±2.8)	23.5% (±6.8)	17.6% (±3.2)	21.1% (±7.5)	23.8% (±2.2)	26.2% (±2.8)
No	59.8% (±1.4)	61.2% (±3.2)	64.9% (±3.7)	63.5% (±7.3)	66.2% (±3.8)	52.9% (±8.2)	59.0% (±2.5)	52.8% (±3.1)
Don't Know	18.9% (±1.1)	19.3% (±2.7)	21.8% (±3.3)	13.1% (±5.8)	16.2% (±3.1)	26.1% (±7.8)	17.2% (±2.0)	20.9% (±2.6)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses. An individual who made a complaint/grievance/report may not actually be informed of the outcome of their complaint/grievance/report because personnel policies may prohibit disclosure of such information.

Table 3.28 presents data on various actions that may have resulted from making a complaint/grievance/report regarding harassing and/or assault behaviors. Responses shaded within the table show the most notable response options for each question presented. Examination of responses to items addressing actions focused on the person(s) who engaged in the harassing behavior revealed that: 29.6% of employees indicated someone talked to the person(s) about changing their behavior; 8.5% of employees indicated the person(s) involved was moved or reassigned to avoid continuing contact; 4.8% of employees indicated some official career action was taken against person(s) involved; and 21.3% of employees indicated the person

stopped the behavior (see Table 3.28 items e, g, h, i).²⁸ Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3.29 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Negative Outcomes

Q48 Did any of the experiences listed below occur as a result of making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report?	Any form	Age	Race/ ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/ gender	Unknown reasons
f. My work station location or duties were changed to help me avoid the person(s)	5,010	895	651	178	618	145	1,506	1,018
Yes	10.9% (±0.9)	7.7% (±1.9)	11.5% (±2.7)	10.1% (±5.4)	12.7% (±2.9)	18.5% (±7.3)	12.2% (±1.8)	9.3% (±1.9)
No	83.7% (±1.0)	84.5% (±2.5)	81.8% (±3.2)	85.6% (±6.0)	83.3% (±3.2)	74.4% (±7.8)	84.0% (±1.9)	84.8% (±2.3)
Don't Know	5.4% (±0.7)	7.8% (±2.0)	6.6% (±2.2)	4.3% (±4.3)	4.0% (±1.9)	7.1% (±5.6)	3.7% (±1.1)	5.9% (±1.6)
j. I was encouraged to drop the issue	5,034	899	659	180	625	145	1,502	1,024
Yes	38.7% (±1.4)	39.9% (±3.2)	39.2% (±3.8)	40.2% (±7.4)	50.3% (±3.9)	45.3% (±8.2)	35.9% (±2.5)	33.3% (±3.0)
No	55.3% (±1.4)	55.0% (±3.3)	56.2% (±3.8)	54.3% (±7.4)	41.0% (±3.9)	53.4% (±8.2)	59.6% (±2.5)	57.8% (±3.1)
Don't Know	6.0% (±0.7)	5.1% (±1.6)	4.6% (±1.9)	5.5% (±4.5)	8.8% (±2.5)	NR	4.5% (±1.2)	8.9% (±1.9)
k. I was discouraged from making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report	5,008	891	658	180	624	147	1,490	1,018
Yes	32.3% (±1.3)	31.5% (±3.1)	31.6% (±3.7)	29.5% (±7.1)	46.0% (±3.9)	28.0% (±7.9)	31.8% (±2.4)	27.1% (±2.8)
No	62.8% (±1.3)	64.8% (±3.2)	64.8% (±3.7)	66.2% (±7.3)	46.6% (±3.9)	71.0% (±7.9)	64.0% (±2.5)	66.1% (±3.0)
Don't Know	4.9% (±0.6)	3.6% (±1.5)	3.5% (±1.7)	4.4% (±4.2)	7.4% (±2.3)	NR	4.2% (±1.1)	6.8% (±1.7)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

²⁸ Note. An individual who made a complaint/grievance/report may not actually be informed of the outcome of their complaint/grievance/report because personnel policies may prohibit disclosure of such information.

Table 3.29 Continued

Q48 Did any of the experiences listed below occur as a result of making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report?	Any form	Age	Race/ ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/ gender	Unknown reasons
l. The person(s) who did this took action against me for complaining	5,011	893	653	180	623	145	1,502	1,016
Yes	33.8% (±1.3)	34.3% (±3.2)	35.7% (±3.8)	21.8% (±6.7)	44.4% (±3.9)	25.7% (±7.8)	33.0% (±2.4)	30.2% (±2.9)
No	54.5% (±1.4)	55.0% (±3.3)	51.2% (±3.8)	68.0% (±7.2)	44.8% (±3.9)	60.4% (±8.3)	58.2% (±2.5)	53.3% (±3.1)
Don't Know	11.7% (±0.9)	10.7% (±2.2)	13.1% (±2.8)	10.2% (±5.4)	10.9% (±2.7)	13.9% (±6.7)	8.9% (±1.5)	16.5% (±2.4)
m. My coworkers treated me worse, avoided me, or blamed me for the problem	5,019	898	659	180	620	147	1,493	1,021
Yes	30.4% (±1.3)	29.4% (±3.1)	36.5% (±3.8)	34.5% (±7.3)	35.8% (±3.9)	34.1% (±8.1)	28.8% (±2.4)	25.0% (±2.8)
No	60.9% (±1.4)	63.0% (±3.2)	54.7% (±3.8)	57.1% (±7.4)	50.8% (±3.9)	63.1% (±8.2)	64.5% (±2.5)	64.3% (±3.0)
Don't Know	8.7% (±0.8)	7.6% (±1.9)	8.7% (±2.4)	8.4% (±5.1)	13.4% (±2.9)	NR	6.7% (±1.4)	10.7% (±2.0)
n. My leadership punished me for bringing it up	5,024	898	653	180	622	147	1,507	1,017
Yes	29.1% (±1.3)	31.5% (±3.1)	33.3% (±3.7)	32.5% (±7.2)	41.6% (±3.9)	25.8% (±7.8)	24.7% (±2.2)	22.8% (±2.7)
No	60.8% (±1.4)	60.9% (±3.2)	55.4% (±3.8)	62.3% (±7.4)	45.7% (±3.9)	65.6% (±8.1)	67.4% (±2.4)	62.7% (±3.0)
Don't Know	10.1% (±0.9)	7.6% (±1.9)	11.3% (±2.7)	5.1% (±4.4)	12.7% (±2.9)	8.6% (±5.8)	7.9% (±1.5)	14.5% (±2.3)
o. I was threatened with loss of employment	5,005	897	658	180	618	145	1,491	1,016
Yes	15.4% (±1.0)	19.2% (±2.7)	14.3% (±2.9)	13.3% (±5.8)	26.8% (±3.6)	8.2% (±5.8)	12.3% (±1.8)	12.0% (±2.2)
No	77.6% (±1.2)	74.1% (±3.0)	75.3% (±3.4)	84.4% (±6.1)	61.9% (±3.9)	82.2% (±7.2)	82.6% (±2.0)	82.5% (±2.5)
Don't Know	7.0% (±0.7)	6.7% (±1.8)	10.3% (±2.6)	NR	11.4% (±2.8)	9.6% (±6.1)	5.1% (±1.2)	5.5% (±1.6)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

Table 3.29 presents data on negative outcomes that may have resulted from making a complaint/grievance/report regarding harassing and/or assault behaviors. Responses shaded within the table show the most notable response options for each question presented. Examination of responses to items addressing actions focused on employees revealed that regardless of the particular behavior involved: 10.9% of employees indicated their station

location or duties were changed to help them avoid the person(s); 38.7% of employees were encouraged to drop the issue; 32.3% of employees were discouraged from making a complaint/grievance/report; 33.8% of employees indicated the person(s) involved took action against them for complaining; 30.4% of employees indicated their coworker(s) treated them worse, avoided or blamed them for the problem; 29.1% of employees indicated leadership punished them for bringing the experience up; and 15.4% of employees indicated they were threatened with loss of employment (see Table 3.29 items f, j, k, l, m, n, o). Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.




Figure 3.16 DOI – Results of Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary of Actions Resulting from a Complaint/Grievance/Report for Any Form of Harassment

Figure 3.16 displays the actions resulting from a complaint/grievance/report for any form of harassment.

Table 3.30 DOI – Satisfaction with Reporting of the One Experience of Harassment – Summary

Q49 How satisfied were you with:	Any form	Age	Race/ ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/ gender	Unknown reasons
The availability of information on how to file a complaint/grievance/report?	5,044 2.7 (±0.0)	896 2.7 (±0.1)	653 2.7 (±0.1)	182 2.8 (±0.2)	626 2.5 (±0.1)	147 2.7 (±0.2)	1,510 2.7 (±0.1)	1,031 2.8 (±0.1)
How you were treated by personnel handling the complaint/grievance/report?	4,973 2.7 (±0.0)	883 2.8 (±0.1)	646 2.6 (±0.1)	182 2.6 (±0.2)	615 2.5 (±0.1)	150 2.8 (±0.2)	1,487 2.8 (±0.1)	1,010 2.8 (±0.1)
Actions taken by the person handling the complaint/grievance/report?	4,972 2.6 (±0.0)	884 2.6 (±0.1)	642 2.5 (±0.1)	181 2.6 (±0.2)	611 2.4 (±0.1)	150 2.6 (±0.2)	1,499 2.6 (±0.1)	1,006 2.7 (±0.1)
Being informed about the current status of the complaint/grievance/report?	4,934 2.5 (±0.0)	876 2.6 (±0.1)	644 2.4 (±0.1)	182 2.6 (±0.2)	611 2.4 (±0.1)	147 2.4 (±0.2)	1,472 2.6 (±0.1)	1,003 2.6 (±0.1)
The amount of time it took to address the complaint/grievance/report?	4,947 2.5 (±0.0)	876 2.6 (±0.1)	646 2.3 (±0.1)	179 2.7 (±0.2)	611 2.2 (±0.1)	147 2.6 (±0.2)	1,482 2.6 (±0.1)	1,007 2.6 (±0.1)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses. Scale scores ranged from *Very Dissatisfied* (1) to *Very Satisfied* (5), with values ranging from 2-3 indicating *dissatisfied to neutral responses*.

Table 3.30 presents ratings of satisfaction with reporting on harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced. Responses shaded within the table show the most notable response options for each question presented. As shown in Table 3.30, regardless of the particular behaviors experienced, or the resource involved, employees were generally dissatisfied with the availability of information, the treatment received by personnel, actions and time required to resolve issues, and information about the status of the complaint/grievance/report. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the means for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.



Figure 3.17 DOI – Satisfaction with Reporting Experience

Figure 3.17 displays the pattern of ratings for all behaviors measured in this section of the WES. As can be seen in Figure 3.17, regardless of the particular behavior experienced or the particular dimension of satisfaction being assessed all ratings were below 3, the neutral point of the scale indicating that employees were generally dissatisfied with their reporting experiences.

Table 3.31 DOI – Satisfaction with Reporting Experience – Scale Distributions for Any Form of Harassment

Q49 How satisfied were you with:	N	Average rating	(1) Very Dissatisfied	(2) Dissatisfied	(3) Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied	(4) Satisfied	(5) Very Satisfied
The availability of information on how to file a complaint/grievance/report?	5,044	2.7 (±0.0)	21.1% (±1.1)	19.6% (±1.1)	33.4% (±1.3)	20.4% (±1.1)	5.5% (±0.7)
How you were treated by personnel handling the complaint/grievance/report?	4,973	2.7 (±0.0)	21.5% (±1.2)	18.4% (±1.1)	31.9% (±1.3)	20.3% (±1.1)	7.9% (±0.8)
Actions taken by the person handling the complaint/grievance/report?	4,972	2.6 (±0.0)	24.0% (±1.2)	20.8% (±1.2)	32.1% (±1.3)	16.7% (±1.1)	6.4% (±0.7)
Being informed about the current status of the complaint/grievance/report?	4,934	2.5 (±0.0)	25.7% (±1.2)	18.5% (±1.1)	38.0% (±1.4)	12.8% (±1.0)	5.0% (±0.6)
The amount of time it took to address the complaint/grievance/report?	4,947	2.5 (±0.0)	29.2% (±1.3)	16.4% (±1.1)	36.0% (±1.3)	12.4% (±0.9)	6.0% (±0.7)

Note. Only individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses. Scale scores ranged from *not at all helpful* (1) to *extremely helpful* (5), with values ranging from 2-3 indicating *somewhat to moderately helpful*.

Table 3.31 shows the mean and distribution of ratings for satisfaction with reporting items included the WES for any form of harassment. As can be seen in Table 3.28, the distribution of responses for each of the resources was below 3, indicating that employees are generally dissatisfied with their reporting experiences.

Table 3.32 DOI – Reasons for Not Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Summary

Q50 Reasons for not making oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about the behavior or experience	Any form	Age	Race/ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/gender	Unknown reasons
The behavior or experience stopped on its own	7,642 52.4% (±0.8)	1,848 52.7% (±1.7)	563 44.7% (±2.8)	581 54.2% (±3.0)	355 49.7% (±3.7)	136 49.8% (±5.9)	2,085 48.0% (±1.5)	2,074 60.9% (±1.7)
I took care of it myself by confronting the person(s) who did it	4,530 31.1% (±0.8)	986 28.2% (±1.5)	333 26.6% (±2.5)	345 32.3% (±2.9)	263 36.8% (±3.6)	85 30.7% (±5.7)	1,256 28.9% (±1.4)	1,264 37.1% (±1.6)

Note. Individuals who did not make a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

Table 3.32 Continued

Q50 Reasons for not making oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about the behavior or experience	Any form	Age	Race/ ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/ gender	Unknown reasons
I took other actions to handle the situation	4,691 32.4% (±0.8)	988 28.4% (±1.5)	410 32.8% (±2.7)	313 29.5% (±2.8)	267 37.3% (±3.6)	65 23.7% (±5.4)	1,561 36.0% (±1.4)	1,087 32.2% (±1.6)
I thought it was not serious enough to discuss or report	10,536 71.3% (±0.7)	2,626 73.9% (±1.5)	705 55.6% (±2.8)	833 76.5% (±2.6)	431 59.7% (±3.6)	199 70.8% (±5.6)	3,289 74.4% (±1.3)	2,453 71.4% (±1.5)
I did not know who to report the behavior to and/or how to file a complaint	1,636 11.3% (±0.5)	385 11.2% (±1.1)	204 16.4% (±2.2)	93 8.8% (±1.9)	112 15.8% (±2.9)	52 19.0% (±5.1)	456 10.6% (±1.0)	334 9.9% (±1.1)
I did not want more people to know	4,053 28.0% (±0.7)	843 24.4% (±1.5)	420 33.3% (±2.7)	303 28.2% (±2.8)	267 37.1% (±3.6)	150 53.9% (±5.9)	1,159 26.7% (±1.3)	910 27.1% (±1.5)
I was ashamed or embarrassed	1,946 13.4% (±0.6)	421 12.2% (±1.1)	167 13.2% (±2.0)	93 8.7% (±1.8)	202 28.2% (±3.4)	88 31.7% (±5.8)	600 13.8% (±1.1)	375 11.2% (±1.1)
I did not want people to think less of me	3,533 24.4% (±0.7)	832 24.0% (±1.5)	334 26.5% (±2.5)	207 19.2% (±2.5)	309 43.1% (±3.7)	115 41.6% (±5.9)	1,094 25.2% (±1.3)	641 19.1% (±1.4)
I thought other people would blame me	2,403 16.6% (±0.6)	532 15.4% (±1.2)	280 22.2% (±2.4)	157 14.7% (±2.3)	197 27.7% (±3.4)	66 23.8% (±5.4)	768 17.7% (±1.2)	403 12.0% (±1.1)
I felt partially to blame	1,013 7.0% (±0.4)	207 6.0% (±0.8)	56 4.5% (±1.3)	47 4.4% (±1.4)	119 16.8% (±3.0)	21 7.4% (±3.7)	329 7.6% (±0.8)	234 7.0% (±0.9)
I wanted to forget about it or move on	8,237 56.0% (±0.8)	2,046 57.9% (±1.6)	710 55.7% (±2.7)	661 60.6% (±2.9)	448 61.8% (±3.6)	201 71.7% (±5.6)	2,388 54.6% (±1.5)	1,783 52.2% (±1.7)
I did not think I would be believed	2,625 18.1% (±0.5)	644 18.5% (±1.3)	369 29.0% (±2.6)	138 12.8% (±2.1)	220 30.9% (±3.5)	70 25.7% (±5.6)	706 16.3% (±1.1)	478 14.2% (±1.2)
I did not think anything would be done	6,752 46.0% (±0.8)	1,681 47.5% (±1.6)	771 60.2% (±2.7)	471 43.2% (±3.0)	400 55.7% (±3.7)	151 55.2% (±6.0)	2,022 46.5% (±1.5)	1,255 36.8% (±1.6)
I did not trust that the process would be fair	4,719 32.4% (±0.8)	1,113 31.8% (±1.6)	603 47.4% (±2.8)	335 30.9% (±2.8)	332 46.7% (±3.7)	111 41.0% (±6.0)	1,344 31.0% (±1.4)	881 26.1% (±1.5)

Note. Individuals who did not make a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

Table 3.32 Continued

Q50 Reasons for not making oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about the behavior or experience	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
I thought I might get in trouble for something I did	1,855 12.8% (±0.6)	475 13.6% (±1.2)	233 18.4% (±2.2)	99 9.2% (±1.9)	148 20.9% (±3.2)	42 15.4% (±4.8)	461 10.7% (±1.0)	398 11.8% (±1.1)
I thought I would be labeled as a troublemaker	5,624 38.6% (±0.8)	1,307 37.3% (±1.6)	650 51.2% (±2.8)	379 34.9% (±2.9)	361 50.4% (±3.7)	125 46.0% (±6.0)	1,812 41.7% (±1.5)	990 29.2% (±1.6)
I thought it might hurt my performance appraisal	3,367 22.9% (±0.7)	945 26.8% (±1.5)	394 30.9% (±2.6)	204 18.5% (±2.4)	271 37.6% (±3.6)	85 30.5% (±5.7)	831 19.0% (±1.2)	637 18.8% (±1.4)
I thought it might hurt my chances of being renewed or obtaining permanent position	1,815 27.5% (±2.1)	138 29.2% (±4.3)	35 37.4% (±10.3)	25 26.1% (±9.9)	35 45.4% (±11.5)	18 37.9% (±15.0)	164 24.2% (±3.4)	85 24.2% (±4.8)
I was worried about potential negative consequences from leadership	4,282 29.1% (±0.7)	1,140 32.1% (±1.6)	537 42.0% (±2.7)	263 23.8% (±2.6)	311 43.7% (±3.7)	115 41.2% (±5.9)	1,136 25.9% (±1.3)	781 22.9% (±1.4)
I was worried about potential negative consequences from my coworkers or peers	3,964 27.0% (±0.7)	854 24.2% (±1.4)	412 32.4% (±2.6)	329 29.9% (±2.8)	290 40.5% (±3.7)	130 46.8% (±5.9)	1,194 27.2% (±1.3)	755 22.3% (±1.4)
I thought it might hurt my career	4,342 33.9% (±0.8)	1,061 35.0% (±1.7)	566 48.6% (±2.9)	294 29.3% (±2.9)	295 47.2% (±3.9)	98 42.3% (±6.5)	1,238 33.5% (±1.5)	790 25.9% (±1.6)
I did not want to hurt the person's/s' career/s or family/ies	3,242 3.3% (±0.3)	664 18.9% (±1.3)	262 20.5% (±2.3)	276 25.1% (±2.7)	173 24.3% (±3.3)	91 32.5% (±5.7)	981 22.4% (±1.3)	795 23.6% (±1.5)
I was concerned for my physical safety	479 2.7% (±0.5)	75 2.1% (±0.5)	63 5.0% (±1.3)	40 3.7% (±1.3)	40 5.5% (±1.9)	17 6.1% (±3.5)	106 2.4% (±0.5)	139 4.1% (±0.7)
I feared losing my job	1,664 11.4% (±0.5)	377 10.8% (±1.1)	253 19.9% (±2.3)	67 6.1% (±1.6)	179 24.8% (±3.3)	47 17.1% (±4.9)	351 8.0% (±0.8)	390 11.6% (±1.1)
Some other reason	5,163 35.8% (±0.8)	1,130 32.7% (±1.6)	513 41.2% (±2.8)	363 33.4% (±2.9)	284 39.7% (±3.6)	107 39.3% (±6.0)	1,726 39.9% (±1.5)	1,039 31.2% (±1.6)

Note. Individuals who did not make a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

Several items were included in the WES to explore reasons why employees did not make a complaint/grievance/report in response to their specific behavior or set of experiences. Recall

that 74.7% did not make a complaint/grievance/report (see Table 3.24 and Figure 3.15). Table 3.32 presents employee responses to these questions for each of the harassing and/or assault behaviors or experiences measured in the WES. Responses shaded within the table show the most frequently endorsed response options for each question presented. Examination of the response patterns observed for these items indicates that regardless of the specific experience involved, employees’ most frequent reasons for not making a complaint/grievance/report involved the perceived seriousness of the behavior, desire to move on, skepticism about actions that would be taken, and the behavior stopped on its own. About 71% of employees thought it was not serious enough to discuss or report; 56.0% of employees wanted to forget about it or move on; 52.4% of employees indicated the behavior or experience stopped on its own; and 46.0% of employees did not think anything would be done (trends shown in Figure 3.18). Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.




Figure 3.18 DOI – Reasons for Not Reporting the One Experience of Harassment – Trends

Table 3.33 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment - Summary

Q45 As a result of the behavior or experience:	Any form	Age	Race/ ethnicity	Religious	Disability	Sexual orientation	Sex/ gender	Unknown reasons
g. Did it damage your relationship with coworkers, supervisors, or managers?	20,390	4,580	1,974	1,307	1,389	432	6,055	4,654
Yes	36.1% (±0.7)	33.8% (±1.4)	44.4% (±2.2)	31.4% (±2.6)	57.5% (±2.6)	48.1% (±4.7)	35.4% (±1.2)	29.5% (±1.3)
No	56.5% (±0.7)	59.2% (±1.4)	47.0% (±2.2)	60.3% (±2.7)	33.5% (±2.5)	40.8% (±4.7)	57.8% (±1.2)	63.3% (±1.4)
Don't Know	7.4% (±0.4)	7.0% (±0.8)	8.6% (±1.3)	8.3% (±1.6)	9.0% (±1.6)	11.1% (±3.3)	6.8% (±0.7)	7.2% (±0.8)
f. Did it cause arguments or damage interpersonal relations at work?	20,402	4,587	1,980	1,311	1,382	432	6,050	4,659
Yes	33.3% (±0.6)	27.9% (±1.3)	43.0% (±2.2)	27.4% (±2.5)	49.7% (±2.6)	45.1% (±4.7)	34.1% (±1.2)	29.1% (±1.3)
No	60.9% (±0.7)	66.5% (±1.4)	51.1% (±2.2)	65.5% (±2.6)	40.4% (±2.6)	48.4% (±4.7)	61.5% (±1.2)	64.7% (±1.4)
Don't Know	5.8% (±0.3)	5.6% (±0.7)	6.0% (±1.1)	7.1% (±1.5)	9.9% (±1.7)	6.5% (±2.8)	4.4% (±0.5)	6.2% (±0.7)
h. Did it damage other personal relationships?	20,368	4,576	1,977	1,311	1,381	432	6,035	4,656
Yes	11.7% (±0.4)	10.5% (±0.9)	17.0% (±1.7)	5.8% (±1.4)	23.1% (±2.3)	15.8% (±3.8)	10.8% (±0.8)	9.6% (±0.9)
No	85.3% (±0.5)	86.8% (±1.0)	79.7% (±1.8)	92.5% (±1.6)	72.5% (±2.4)	80.9% (±4.0)	87.1% (±0.9)	86.1% (±1.0)
Don't Know	3.0% (±0.2)	2.7% (±0.5)	3.3% (±0.9)	1.7% (±0.9)	4.4% (±1.2)	3.3% (±2.2)	2.2% (±0.4)	4.3% (±0.6)
i. Did it cause you to call in sick or take other type of leave?	20,380	4,575	1,979	1,311	1,387	432	6,040	4,655
Yes	18.7% (±0.5)	15.6% (±1.1)	27.6% (±2.0)	10.7% (±1.8)	43.8% (±2.6)	24.1% (±4.3)	16.2% (±1.0)	15.7% (±1.1)
No	79.9% (±0.6)	83.1% (±1.1)	70.5% (±2.0)	88.2% (±1.9)	54.3% (±2.6)	75.9% (±4.3)	82.9% (±1.0)	82.6% (±1.1)
Don't Know	1.3% (±0.2)	1.3% (±0.4)	1.8% (±0.7)	1.0% (±0.7)	1.9% (±0.9)	0.0% (NA)	0.9% (±0.3)	1.8% (±0.4)
k. Did you seek counseling from a religious leader/counselor/health care provider?	20,376	4,574	1,982	1,307	1,390	432	6,036	4,653
Yes	15.6% (±0.5)	10.6% (±0.9)	23.4% (±1.9)	12.1% (±1.9)	41.9% (±2.6)	20.5% (±4.1)	14.3% (±0.9)	11.5% (±0.9)
No	83.5% (±0.5)	88.4% (±1.0)	76.1% (±1.9)	87.6% (±1.9)	56.7% (±2.6)	79.5% (±4.1)	85.1% (±0.9)	86.8% (±1.0)
Don't Know	1.0% (±0.1)	1.1% (±0.3)	0.5% (±0.4)	NR	1.4% (±0.8)	0.0% (NA)	0.6% (±0.2)	1.7% (±0.4)

Note. Individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

Table 3.33 Continued

Q45 As a result of the behavior or experience:	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
j. Did you seek any type of medical attention?	20,331	4,551	1,982	1,308	1,387	431	6,032	4,643
Yes	8.7% (±0.4)	6.0% (±0.7)	13.6% (±1.6)	2.3% (±1.0)	35.0% (±2.6)	11.0% (±3.3)	6.4% (±0.6)	6.0% (±0.7)
No	90.3 (±0.4)	92.9% (±0.8)	85.6% (±1.6)	97.3% (±1.0)	64.3% (±2.6)	88.1% (±3.4)	93.0% (±0.7)	92.3% (±0.8)
Don't Know	1.0% (±0.1)	1.1% (±0.4)	0.8% (±0.5)	0.4% (±0.5)	0.7% (±0.6)	NR	0.6% (±0.2)	1.7% (±0.4)
c. Did it make it harder to complete your work or do your job?	20,420	4,577	1,980	1,311	1,387	431	6,058	4,676
Yes	37.0% (±0.7)	32.7% (±1.4)	47.1% (±2.2)	21.0% (±2.3)	58.8% (±2.6)	43.5% (±4.7)	40.9% (±1.2)	29.4% (±1.3)
No	59.6% (±0.7)	63.8% (±1.4)	50.3% (±2.2)	76.5% (±2.4)	37.5% (±2.6)	53.2% (±4.7)	56.0% (±1.3)	66.4% (±1.4)
Don't Know	3.4% (±0.3)	3.5% (±0.6)	2.6% (±0.8)	2.5% (±1.0)	3.7% (±1.1)	3.4% (±2.2)	3.2% (±0.5)	4.2% (±0.6)
d. Did it negatively affect your performance evaluation or promotion potential?	18,011	3,990	1,846	1,191	1,256	363	5,157	4,209
Yes	23.1% (±0.6)	26.0% (±1.4)	31.0% (±2.2)	15.5% (±2.2)	46.9% (±2.8)	26.3% (±4.8)	19.3% (±1.1)	16.4% (±1.2)
No	68.4% (±0.7)	65.3% (±1.5)	59.2% (±2.3)	80.1% (±2.4)	41.1% (±2.7)	64.7% (±5.1)	72.4% (±1.2)	75.8% (±1.3)
Don't Know	8.4% (±0.4)	8.7% (±0.9)	9.8% (±1.4)	4.4% (±1.3)	11.9% (±1.9)	9.0% (±3.4)	8.4% (±0.8)	7.8% (±0.9)
e. Did it negatively affect your performance evaluation/renewal/permanent employment?	2,338	586	121	116	123	69	892	432
Yes	14.4% (±1.5)	11.3% (±2.8)	40.4% (±9.1)	7.1% (±6.5)	30.6% (±8.8)	38.3% (±12.2)	9.9% (±2.1)	14.1% (±3.6)
No	75.8% (±1.8)	76.5% (±3.6)	55.0% (±9.1)	91.1% (±6.9)	48.7% (±8.9)	51.8% (±11.9)	83.1% (±2.6)	73.3% (±4.4)
Don't Know	9.8% (±1.3)	12.2% (±2.9)	4.6% (±5.6)	NR	20.7% (±8.2)	9.9% (±9.9)	7.1% (±1.9)	12.5% (±3.5)
l. Did you consider leaving the bureau?	20,412	4,584	1,980	1,311	1,388	434	6,046	4,669
Yes	34.3% (±0.7)	33.9% (±1.4)	51.1% (±2.2)	26.1% (±2.4)	57.8% (±2.6)	39.8% (±4.7)	31.0% (±1.2)	26.7% (±1.3)
No	64.2% (±0.7)	64.7% (±1.4)	48.0% (±2.2)	72.9% (±2.5)	39.8% (±2.6)	57.7% (±4.7)	68.0% (±1.2)	71.2% (±1.3)
Don't Know	1.5% (±0.2)	1.5% (±0.4)	0.9% (±0.5)	0.9% (±0.7)	2.4% (±1.0)	2.5% (±2.0)	1.0% (±0.3)	2.1% (±0.5)

Note. Individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

Table 3.33 Continued

Q45 As a result of the behavior or experience:	<i>Any form</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Race/ethnicity</i>	<i>Religious</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual orientation</i>	<i>Sex/gender</i>	<i>Unknown reasons</i>
b. Did you take steps to leave your organization?	20,406	4,584	1,976	1,311	1,384	423	6,043	4,686
Yes	15.0% (±0.5)	13.7% (±1.0)	24.4% (±1.9)	10.3% (±1.8)	29.3% (±2.5)	14.0% (±3.7)	12.8% (±0.9)	12.4% (±1.0)
No	84.2% (±0.5)	85.6% (±1.0)	75.2% (±2.0)	89.7% (±1.8)	70.0% (±2.5)	86.0% (±3.7)	86.7% (±0.9)	85.8% (±1.0)
Don't Know	0.8% (±0.1)	0.8% (±0.3)	0.4% (±0.4)	0.0% (NA)	0.6% (±0.6)	0.0% (NA)	0.5% (±0.2)	1.8% (±0.4)
a. Did you request a transfer or change of assignment?	20,429	4,593	1,977	1,309	1,381	432	6,048	4,698
Yes	7.3% (±0.4)	5.9% (±0.7)	11.8% (±1.5)	3.7% (±1.2)	18.4% (±2.1)	4.7% (±2.5)	6.7% (±0.7)	5.6% (±0.7)
No	91.8% (±0.4)	93.2% (±0.8)	87.1% (±1.6)	96.3% (±1.2)	80.9% (±2.2)	94.8% (±2.5)	93.0% (±0.7)	92.7% (±0.8)
Don't Know	9.0% (±0.1)	0.9% (±0.3)	1.2% (±0.6)	0.0% (NA)	0.8% (±0.6)	NR	0.3% (±0.2)	1.7% (±0.4)

Note. Individuals who made a complaint/grievance/report and responded to the follow up questions above were included in these analyses.

Table 3.33 presents responses to items asking employees about the impact of specific harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced on their personal and professional lives. Responses shaded within the table show the most notable response options for each question presented. Examination of responses patterns to these questions reveals that for many employees their experiences did not have a negative impact on them. However, for some employees these experiences had a negative impact on their interpersonal relationships, their physical or emotional well-being, their job performance, and willingness to remain a part of the organization.




Figure 3.19 DOI – Effect of the One Experience of Harassment on Relationships at Work

As shown in Figure 3.19, regardless of the specific form of harassment and/or assault behavior experienced, for some employees these experiences had a *negative impact on their interpersonal relationships*: 36.1% of employees indicated it damaged relationships with coworkers, supervisors, or managers, while 56.6% did not; 33.3% of employees indicated it caused arguments or damaged interpersonal relations at work, while 60.9% did not; and 11.7% of employees indicated it damaged other personal relationships, while 85.3% did not. This pattern of findings was generally observed across the various forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors measured in the WES. Some variability was observed for this pattern for certain types of harassment and/or assault behaviors. However, given the small number of employees involved in some of these analyses differences in percentages who reported each form of harassment are presented for descriptive purposes only. Caution should be used in interpreting any of these differences across specific forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors.




Figure 3.20 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment – Physical or Emotional Well-Being

Moreover, regardless of the particular behavior involved, for some employees these experiences had a *negative impact on their physical or emotional well-being*: 18.7% of employees called in sick or took leave, while 79.9% did not; 15.6% of employees sought counseling, while 83.5% did not; and 8.7% of employees sought medical attention, while 90.3% did not. This pattern of findings was generally observed across the various forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors measured in the WES. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution (see Figure 3.20).




Figure 3.21 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment – Impact on Job Performance

As can be seen in Figure 3.21, regardless of the particular behavior involved, for some employees, these experiences had a *negative impact on their job performance*: 37.0% of employees made it harder to complete their work, while 59.6% did not; 23.1% of employees indicated it negatively affected their performance evaluation or promotion potential, while 68.4% did not; and 14.4% of employees indicated it negatively affected their performance evaluation/renewal/permanent employment, while 75.8% did not. This pattern of findings was generally observed across the various forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors measured in the WES. Because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.




Figure 3.22 DOI – Results of the One Experience of Harassment – Remain Part of Organization

As shown in Figure 3.22, regardless of the particular behavior involved, for some employees these experiences *negatively affected their willingness to remain a part of the organization*: 34.3% of employees indicated they considered leaving DOI, while 64.2% did not; 15.0% of employees took steps to leave their organization, while 84.2% did not; and 7.3% of employees requested a transfer, while 91.8% did not. This pattern of findings was generally observed across the various forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors measured in the WES. Some variability was observed for this pattern for certain types of harassment and/or assault behaviors. However, because these analyses rely on a much smaller subset of employees who responded to these questions, differences in the percentages reported for specific forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors are presented for descriptive purposes only. Variation in the general pattern for specific behaviors should be interpreted with caution.

3.4.1 Summary of Contextual Factors Influencing Specific Behaviors or Experiences

To summarize, regardless of the particular behaviors involved, employees' experiences occurred during work hours, at a work location, or at a site that was indoors. Employees experienced these behaviors more than once. Employees' experiences most often involved one person, who was typically older, male, and most often a peer and/or coworker with whom they had to continue to interact. Most employees talked to someone at work about their experience but did not make a complaint/grievance/report about their experience. Among employees who made complaints/grievances/reports, the most frequently used DOI resource was a supervisor or manager. In about a third of these cases some type action was taken. Employees' most frequent reasons for not making a complaint/grievance/report involved the perceived seriousness of the behavior, desire to move on, or forget about the incident, and skepticism about action taken, or trust about the fairness of the process. For many employees, their experiences did not have a

negative impact on them, but for some employees it had a negative impact on their interpersonal relationships, their physical or emotional well-being, and their willingness to remain a part of the organization.

3.5 Demographic, Occupational, and Organizational Factors Correlated with Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced

In the previous section, we examined all of the demographic and occupational characteristics to identify vulnerability characteristics that may be associated with harassment and/or assault behaviors employees may experience within the DOI work environment. Those analyses revealed that the matched demographic characteristic was the most impactful variable involved in understanding the nature of employees' particular experiences. In this section, we examine organizational factors that might contribute to our understanding of factors influencing employees' harassment and/or assault related behaviors. Specially, we examined relationships among demographic, occupational, and organizational factors associated with the various forms of harassment and/or assault behaviors measured in the WES. Demographic variables included age, sex, gender identity, sexual minority status, race/ethnicity, disability status, relationship status, and education. Occupational variables included appointment type, work schedule, paygrade, and years of service. Organizational variables included supervisor support, organizational trust, organizational inclusion, organizational politics, general and leadership intolerance for harassment, bystander experiences, and gender context. Separate logistic regressions analyses were performed for each of the harassment and/or assault behaviors measured. We entered all demographic, occupational, and organizational variables into a simultaneous logistic regression equation using a forward selection procedure to assess the relative importance of each variable for each of the models we examined. For all statistical significance tests probability values were set at $p < .05$. Given that the likelihood of finding statistically significant results increases as a function of sample size, we also evaluated the practical significance of findings to ascertain the meaningfulness of particular results. Practical significance was determined by evaluating the absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood Chi Square—the absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood Chi Square had to be ≥ 100 for specific variables identified for the logistic regression analyses we performed. Main findings are shaded in Table 3.34 to Table 3.41 for each of the types of harassment we examined. Results for those variables that met statistical and practical significance criteria are shaded within each table of results.

Table 3.34 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Age

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	3.300	550.824	--	27.102	--	--
Sex	-0.097	13.108	0.000	0.907	-19740.592	13.071
Age	-0.452	192.145	0.000	0.636	-19830.027	191.941
Education Level	0.241	57.291	0.000	1.273	-19763.109	58.105
Race/Ethnicity	0.133	17.429	0.000	1.142	-19742.865	17.617
Relationship Status	-0.182	41.806	0.000	0.833	-19754.802	41.490
Pay Grade	--	42.716	--	--	--	--
Middle vs. Junior Grade	-0.226	24.271	0.000	0.798	-19755.047	41.981
Senior vs. Junior Grade	-0.309	40.301	0.000	0.734	-19755.047	41.981
Executive vs. Junior Grade	0.019	0.008	0.927	1.019	-19755.047	41.981
Years of Service	0.072	76.597	0.000	1.075	-19772.896	77.678
Appointment Type	-0.277	37.311	0.000	0.758	-19752.387	36.660
Supervisor Support	-0.115	52.502	0.000	0.891	-19760.231	52.348
Organizational Politics	0.072	12.642	0.000	1.075	-19740.367	12.621
Organizational Inclusion	-0.248	197.739	0.000	0.780	-19832.505	196.895
Bystander Harassment	-2.330	5218.589	0.000	0.097	-22512.974	5557.834
General Intolerance	-0.428	419.931	0.000	0.652	-19945.524	422.933
Leadership Intolerance	0.127	11.406	0.001	1.135	-19739.791	11.467

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service. N = 52,945, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.341

Table 3.34 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with experiences of harassment based on age. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced, only age, perceptions regarding the general inclusiveness of the organization and the general intolerance for harassment in the work place and bystander experience met both statistical and practical significance criteria for these analyses.²⁹ None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with harassment based on age. Hence, harassment based on age was less common among older than younger employees; and in work environments perceived to be more inclusive and less tolerant of these behaviors, where

²⁹ Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variables identified.

employees were less likely to have witnessed harassment against another employee based on their age.

Table 3.35 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Racial/Ethnic Background

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	2.816	207.747	--	16.703	--	--
Sex	0.294	58.975	0.000	1.341	-11437.953	59.751
Age	-0.089	4.823	0.028	0.914	-11410.477	4.800
Education Level	0.166	15.366	0.000	1.181	-11415.835	15.515
Race/Ethnicity	-1.391	1374.959	0.000	0.249	-12086.631	1357.108
Relationship Status	-0.106	7.617	0.006	0.900	-11411.864	7.574
Pay Grade	--	12.055	--	--	--	--
Middle vs. Junior Grade	0.030	0.217	0.641	1.030	-11413.317	10.479
Senior vs. Junior Grade	0.069	1.157	0.282	1.072	-11413.317	10.479
Executive vs. Junior Grade	0.871	11.514	0.001	2.390	-11413.317	10.479
Organizational Politics	0.057	4.122	0.042	1.059	-11410.138	4.122
Organizational Inclusion	-0.217	81.074	0.000	0.805	-11448.699	81.242
Organizational Trust	-0.171	30.063	0.000	0.843	-11423.040	29.925
Bystander Harassment	-2.095	2457.132	0.000	0.123	-12581.845	2347.535
General Intolerance	-0.451	290.163	0.000	0.637	-11554.005	291.855

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service. N = 52,943, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.318

Table 3.35 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with experiences of harassment based on racial/ethnic background. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experiences, the racial/ethnic background of the employee, perceptions of organizational inclusion within the work unit, and bystander experiences were the only variables that met both statistical and practical significance criteria.³⁰ None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with harassment based on racial/ethnic background. Hence, harassment based on race/ethnicity was more common for racial/ethnic minority employees than for non-minority employees; and in work environments perceived to be less

³⁰ Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variables identified.

inclusive and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their race/ethnicity.

Table 3.36 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Religious Beliefs

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	2.276	234.166	--	9.739	--	--
Sex	0.281	44.726	0.000	1.324	-10268.577	45.408
Age	-0.137	7.695	0.006	0.872	-10249.708	7.671
Education Level	0.109	5.546	0.019	1.115	-10248.667	5.589
Relationship Status	0.186	18.112	0.000	1.205	-10255.069	18.391
Pay Grade	--	11.136	--	--	--	--
Middle vs. Junior Grade	-0.133	3.563	0.059	0.876	-10251.538	11.329
Senior vs. Junior Grade	-0.220	8.941	0.003	0.802	-10251.538	11.329
Executive vs. Junior Grade	-0.772	3.015	0.082	0.462	-10251.538	11.329
Years of Service	0.058	22.747	0.000	1.060	-10257.396	23.046
Work Schedule	-0.303	13.829	0.000	0.738	-10252.481	13.217
Supervisor Support	-0.054	4.969	0.026	0.948	-10248.359	4.971
Organizational Inclusion	-0.138	25.362	0.000	0.871	-10258.547	25.349
Organizational Trust	-0.188	29.557	0.000	0.829	-10260.524	29.302
Bystander Harassment	-2.909	3590.011	0.000	0.055	-11959.628	3427.510
General Intolerance	-0.299	109.828	0.000	0.742	-10300.681	109.616

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service. N = 52,902, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.266

Table 3.36 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with experiences of harassment based on religious beliefs. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced, bystander experience and perceptions regarding the general intolerance of harassing behaviors were the only variables that met both statistical and practical significance criteria.³¹ None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with harassment based on religious beliefs. Hence, harassment based on religious beliefs was more common in work environments that were perceived to be more tolerant of harassing behaviors and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their religious beliefs.

³¹ Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variables identified.

Table 3.37 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Disability Status

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	2.328	105.867	--	10.254	--	--
Sex	-0.278	35.221	0.000	0.758	-7656.371	35.113
Age	0.266	20.378	0.000	1.305	-7649.117	20.607
Education Level	0.147	8.315	0.004	1.158	-7643.005	8.383
Relationship Status	-0.239	25.601	0.000	0.788	-7651.478	25.329
Disability Status	-2.137	1815.919	0.000	0.118	-8492.775	1707.923
Pay Grade	--	33.883	--	--	--	--
Middle vs. Junior Grade	-0.055	0.518	0.472	0.947	-7655.946	34.265
Senior vs. Junior Grade	-0.333	17.301	0.000	0.717	-7655.946	34.265
Executive vs. Junior Grade	-1.141	2.192	0.139	0.320	-7655.946	34.265
Years of Service	0.081	34.467	0.000	1.084	-7656.325	35.021
Organizational Politics	0.187	29.003	0.000	1.206	-7653.365	29.102
Organizational Inclusion	-0.256	72.731	0.000	0.774	-7675.451	73.274
Organizational Trust	-0.098	6.316	0.012	0.907	-7641.961	6.294
Bystander Harassment	-2.233	1719.663	0.000	0.107	-8453.269	1628.910
General Intolerance	-0.339	92.905	0.000	0.712	-7685.405	93.182
Leadership Intolerance	-0.170	6.810	0.009	0.844	-7642.206	6.785

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service. N = 52,285, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.375

Table 3.37 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with experiences of harassment based on a disability status or condition. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced, disability status of the employee and bystander experience were the only variables that met both statistical and practical significance criteria.³² None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with harassment based on disability status or condition. Hence, harassment based on a disability status or condition was more common for employees with a documented disability and more common where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their disability status or condition.

³² Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variables identified.

Table 3.38 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment Based on Sexual Orientation

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>S.E.</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	1.305	0.244	28.515	--	3.688	--	--
Sex	-0.353	0.052	45.684	0.000	0.703	-6394.715	45.697
Education Level	0.180	0.058	9.646	0.002	1.197	-6376.778	9.824
Race/Ethnicity	-0.146	0.058	6.321	0.012	0.864	-6374.981	6.231
Relationship Status	-0.430	0.052	67.245	0.000	0.650	-6405.016	66.300
Appointment Type	-0.440	0.077	32.414	0.000	0.644	-6387.042	30.352
Work Schedule	-0.412	0.095	18.945	0.000	0.662	-6380.691	17.650
Organizational Politics	0.209	0.037	31.784	0.000	1.232	-6387.806	31.881
Organizational Inclusion	-0.245	0.031	64.132	0.000	0.783	-6403.949	64.166
Bystander Harassment	-2.212	0.060	1367.094	0.000	0.110	-6964.796	1185.859
General Intolerance	-0.368	0.039	87.572	0.000	0.692	-6415.498	87.263
Leadership Intolerance	-0.273	0.075	13.246	0.000	0.761	-6378.466	13.200

Note. N = 52,666, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.226

Table 3.38 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with experiences of harassment based on a sexual orientation. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced, bystander experience was the only variable that met both statistical and practical significance criteria.³³ None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with harassment based on sexual orientation. Hence, harassment based on sexual orientation was more common where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sexual orientation.

³³ Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variable identified.

Table 3.39 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Gender Harassment

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	3.202	699.540	--	24.570	--	--
Sex	-1.747	2981.056	0.000	0.174	-17511.440	3359.696
Age	-0.469	164.103	0.000	0.625	-15913.606	164.028
Education Level	0.679	325.189	0.000	1.972	-16002.783	342.382
Race/Ethnicity	0.340	87.089	0.000	1.405	-15876.331	89.478
Relationship Status	-0.243	61.592	0.000	0.784	-15862.148	61.110
Pay Grade	--	19.637	--	--	--	--
Middle vs. Junior Grade	0.047	0.794	0.373	1.049	-15840.206	17.227
Senior vs. Junior Grade	0.039	0.480	0.489	1.040	-15840.206	17.227
Executive vs. Junior Grade	0.930	19.246	0.000	2.534	-15840.206	17.227
Years of Service	0.029	9.531	0.002	1.029	-15836.379	9.573
Appointment Type	-0.102	3.941	0.047	0.903	-15833.551	3.918
Work Schedule	-0.439	51.064	0.000	0.645	-15856.358	49.531
Supervisor Support	0.059	10.274	0.001	1.061	-15836.739	10.293
Organizational Inclusion	-0.267	161.496	0.000	0.765	-15912.530	161.876
Organizational Trust	-0.078	8.528	0.003	0.925	-15835.845	8.504
Bystander Harassment	-2.238	4182.990	0.000	0.107	-18031.027	4398.869
General Intolerance	-0.500	459.279	0.000	0.607	-16063.715	464.246
Leadership Intolerance	-0.172	16.953	0.000	0.842	-15840.028	16.871
Gender Context	0.231	70.670	0.000	1.260	-15867.173	71.162

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service. N = 53,023, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.439

Table 3.39 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with experiences of gender harassment. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced, sex, age, educational level, perceptions of the general inclusivity of the organization, general intolerance of harassing behaviors, and bystander experience were the only variables that met both statistical and practical significance criteria.³⁴ None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with gender harassment. Hence, gender harassment was more common for women than men, for employees with a college education than for those without a college

³⁴ Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variables identified.

education; gender harassment was more common in less inclusive environments that are perceived as being tolerant of these behaviors and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sex/gender.

Table 3.40 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Sexual Harassment

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	2.745	166.298	--	15.569	--	--
Sex	-0.914	557.081	0.000	0.401	-11112.985	576.298
Age	-0.373	66.481	0.000	0.689	-10858.087	66.501
Education Level	0.282	39.259	0.000	1.326	-10844.859	40.045
Relationship Status	-0.357	88.949	0.000	0.700	-10868.835	87.997
Pay Grade	--	66.793	--	--	--	--
Middle vs. Junior Grade	0.031	0.248	0.619	1.031	-10858.129	66.584
Senior vs. Junior Grade	-0.316	22.683	0.000	0.729	-10858.129	66.584
Executive vs. Junior Grade	0.116	0.129	0.719	1.123	-10858.129	66.584
Years of Service	0.048	16.445	0.000	1.049	-10833.132	16.590
Work Schedule	-0.197	7.432	0.006	0.821	-10828.469	7.265
Supervisor Support	0.069	9.815	0.002	1.071	-10829.750	9.826
Organizational Politics	-0.122	17.724	0.000	0.885	-10833.698	17.724
Organizational Inclusion	-0.182	53.318	0.000	0.834	-10851.547	53.421
Organizational Trust	-0.185	30.628	0.000	0.831	-10840.084	30.495
Bystander Harassment	-1.764	2000.315	0.000	0.171	-11809.829	1969.985
General Intolerance	-0.610	433.193	0.000	0.543	-11043.099	436.526
Leadership Intolerance	-0.187	12.283	0.000	0.829	-10830.954	12.234
Gender Context	0.124	13.596	0.000	1.132	-10831.666	13.660

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service. N = 52,957, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.322

Table 3.40 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with employees' experiences of sexual harassment. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced, only sex, their perceptions of the general intolerance for harassment in the work place, and bystander experiences were the only variables that met both statistical and practical significance criteria.³⁵ None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with sexual harassment. Hence, sexual harassment was more common for women than men, in environments that were perceived as being tolerant of these behaviors and where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sex/gender.

³⁵ Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variables identified.

Table 3.41 DOI – Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Sexual Assault Related Behaviors

<i>Variable</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Odds Ratio</i>	<i>Model Log Likelihood</i>	<i>Change in -2 Log Likelihood</i>
Constant	0.385	2.864	--	1.470	--	--
Sex	-0.378	11.586	0.001	0.685	-1808.645	11.817
Age	-0.238	4.333	0.037	0.788	-1804.884	4.295
Race/Ethnicity	-0.446	15.928	0.000	0.640	-1810.379	15.284
Relationship Status	-0.887	64.807	0.000	0.412	-1836.081	66.688
Pay Grade	--	8.493	--	--	--	--
Middle vs. Junior Grade	-0.388	6.143	0.013	0.679	-1807.590	9.705
Senior vs. Junior Grade	-0.450	8.053	0.005	0.637	-1807.590	9.705
Executive vs. Junior Grade	-15.615	0.000	0.994	0.000	-1807.590	9.705
Organizational Trust	-0.282	15.929	0.000	0.754	-1810.805	16.136
Bystander Harassment	-1.569	165.070	0.000	0.208	-1889.718	173.962
General Intolerance	-0.637	70.228	0.000	0.529	-1838.145	70.817

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service. N = 52,954, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.201

Table 3.41 shows the demographic, occupational, and organizational factors that were significantly associated with employees' experiences of sexual assault related behaviors. While many of the demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were associated with employees' harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced, bystander experiences was the only variable that met both statistical and practical significance criteria.³⁶ None of the other demographic, occupational, and organizational variables were significantly associated with employees' experiences with sexual harassment. Hence, sexual assault related behaviors were more common in work environments where employees witnessed harassment against another employee based on their sex/gender.

³⁶ Absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was ≥ 100 for specific variables identified.

Table 3.42 DOI – Summary of Logistic Regression Results for Predictors of Harassment/Assault

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Racial/Ethnic</i>	<i>Religion</i>	<i>Disability</i>	<i>Sexual Orientation</i>	<i>Gender Harassment</i>	<i>Sexual Harassment</i>	<i>Sexual Assault Behaviors</i>
Age	✓					✓		
Sex						✓	✓	
Education Level						✓		
Relationship Status								
Disability Status				✓				
Race/Ethnicity		✓						
Pay Grade								
Organizational Politics								
Organizational Inclusion	✓							
Organizational Trust						✓		
Bystander Harassment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
General Intolerance	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Leadership Intolerance								

Table 3.42 summarizes results of logistic regression analyses for the predictors of harassment and/or assault behaviors examined in the WES. As shown in Table 3.42, the most consistently important variables associated with harassing and/or assault behaviors involve the organizational factors. To further examine these findings, we compared differences between individuals who experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors across each of the organizational factors included in the WES.

Table 3.43 DOI – Differences in Ratings of Organizational Factors by Harassment Experienced

		Experienced Harassment			Did Not Experience Harassment			Effect Size <i>Hedges' g</i>
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	
Age	Supervisor Support	12,067	3.2	±0.0	47,411	3.9	±0.0	-0.67 (M)
	Organizational Trust	12,480	2.9	±0.0	48,267	3.6	±0.0	-0.75 (M)
	Organizational Inclusion	12,522	3.2	±0.0	48,510	3.8	±0.0	-0.71 (M)
	Organizational Politics	12,374	3.2	±0.0	48,088	2.6	±0.0	0.67 (M)
	Leadership Intolerance	12,243	0.47	±0.01	48,281	0.69	±0.00	-0.52 (M)
	General Intolerance	12,322	3.0	±0.0	47,990	3.7	±0.0	-0.88 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	5,487	45.6%	±0.9	2,300	4.8%	±0.2	1.04 (L)*

Note. Scores ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) for scales measuring supervisor support, organizational trust, inclusion, politics, and general intolerance. Leadership intolerance was measured on a scale of yes (1) and no (0). Higher scores indicate greater levels of support, trust, inclusion; more pressure to conform to organization norms (Organizational Politics), greater intolerance of harassing behaviors, and greater number of employees experiencing bystander harassment. All differences in scores and percentages are statistically significant unless otherwise noted ($p < .05$). *Effect size for Bystander Experiences is Cohen's h .

Table 3.43 Continued

		Experienced Harassment			Did Not Experience Harassment			Effect Size
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>Hedges' g</i>
Racial/Ethnic	Supervisor Support	5,407	3.1	±0.0	53,992	3.9	±0.0	-0.75 (M)
	Organizational Trust	5,660	2.7	±0.0	54,998	3.5	±0.0	-0.88 (L)
	Organizational Inclusion	5,691	3.0	±0.0	55,256	3.8	±0.0	-0.86 (L)
	Organizational Politics	5,591	3.3	±0.0	54,782	2.7	±0.0	0.72 (M)
	Leadership Intolerance	5,583	0.40	±0.01	54,866	0.67	±0.00	-0.64 (M)
	General Intolerance	5,602	2.8	±0.0	54,634	3.6	±0.0	-0.99 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	2,413	44.0%	±1.3	2,576	4.7%	±0.2	1.01 (L)*
Religion	Supervisor Support	4,139	3.2	±0.0	55,236	3.8	±0.0	-0.62 (M)
	Organizational Trust	4,288	2.8	±0.0	56,344	3.5	±0.0	-0.72 (M)
	Organizational Inclusion	4,309	3.1	±0.0	56,607	3.7	±0.0	-0.68 (M)
	Organizational Politics	4,258	3.3	±0.0	56,096	2.7	±0.0	0.63 (M)
	Leadership Intolerance	4,244	0.45	±0.01	56,178	0.66	±0.00	-0.51 (M)
	General Intolerance	4,267	2.9	±0.0	55,937	3.6	±0.0	-0.80 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	1,702	40.7%	±1.5	1,347	2.4%	±0.1	1.07 (L)*
Disability	Supervisor Support	3,515	2.9	±0.0	55,190	3.8	±0.0	-0.93 (L)
	Organizational Trust	3,668	2.6	±0.0	56,292	3.5	±0.0	-1.02 (L)
	Organizational Inclusion	3,692	2.8	±0.0	56,549	3.7	±0.0	-1.02 (L)
	Organizational Politics	3,623	3.5	±0.0	56,053	2.7	±0.0	0.88 (L)
	Leadership Intolerance	3,641	0.35	±0.01	56,136	0.66	±0.00	-0.75 (M)
	General Intolerance	3,648	2.7	±0.0	55,884	3.6	±0.0	-1.11 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	1,622	45.3%	±1.6	1,964	3.5%	±0.2	1.10 (L)*
Sexual Orientation	Supervisor Support	2,124	3.1	±0.1	56,956	3.8	±0.0	-0.72 (M)
	Organizational Trust	2,188	2.7	±0.0	58,152	3.5	±0.0	-0.85 (L)
	Organizational Inclusion	2,196	2.9	±0.0	58,431	3.7	±0.0	-0.86 (L)
	Organizational Politics	2,179	3.4	±0.0	57,881	2.7	±0.0	0.76 (M)
	Leadership Intolerance	2,168	0.37	±0.02	57,973	0.65	±0.00	-0.68 (M)
	General Intolerance	2,187	2.7	±0.0	57,729	3.6	±0.0	-0.99 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	807	37.8%	±2.1	1,906	3.3%	±0.1	0.96 (L)*

Note. Scores ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) for scales measuring supervisor support, organizational trust, inclusion, politics, and general intolerance. Leadership intolerance was measured on a scale of yes (1) and no (0). Higher scores indicate greater levels of support, trust, inclusion; more pressure to conform to organization norms (Organizational Politics), greater intolerance of harassing behaviors, and greater number of employees experiencing bystander harassment. All differences in scores and percentages are statistically significant unless otherwise noted ($p < .05$). *Effect size for Bystander Experiences is Cohen's h .

Table 3.43 Continued

		Experienced Harassment			Did Not Experience Harassment			Effect Size
		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>Hedges' g</i>
Gender Harassment	Supervisor Support	9,835	3.3	±0.0	49,684	3.9	±0.0	-0.51 (M)
	Organizational Trust	10,029	3.0	±0.0	50,757	3.5	±0.0	-0.65 (M)
	Organizational Inclusion	10,085	3.2	±0.0	50,986	3.8	±0.0	-0.67 (M)
	Organizational Politics	9,983	3.2	±0.0	50,519	2.7	±0.0	0.57 (M)
	Leadership Intolerance	9,942	0.44	±0.01	50,629	0.68	±0.00	-0.59 (M)
	General Intolerance	10,026	2.9	±0.0	50,335	3.7	±0.0	-0.92 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	5,041	51.1%	±1.0	2,918	5.8%	±0.2	1.11 (L)*
Sexual Harassment	Supervisor Support	4,746	3.2	±0.0	54,674	3.8	±0.0	-0.64 (M)
	Organizational Trust	4,869	2.8	±0.0	55,812	3.5	±0.0	-0.82 (L)
	Organizational Inclusion	4,880	3.0	±0.0	56,087	3.8	±0.0	-0.79 (M)
	Organizational Politics	4,849	3.3	±0.0	55,550	2.7	±0.0	0.64 (M)
	Leadership Intolerance	4,818	0.38	±0.01	55,658	0.67	±0.00	-0.69 (M)
	General Intolerance	4,842	2.7	±0.0	55,409	3.6	±0.0	-1.08 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	2,761	57.9%	±1.4	5,180	9.4%	±0.2	1.11 (L)*
Sexual Assault Related Behaviors	Supervisor Support	433	2.8	±0.1	58,935	3.8	±0.0	-0.95 (L)
	Organizational Trust	445	2.5	±0.1	60,192	3.4	±0.0	-0.99 (L)
	Organizational Inclusion	451	2.8	±0.1	60,472	3.7	±0.0	-0.92 (L)
	Organizational Politics	434	3.5	±0.1	59,920	2.7	±0.0	0.87 (L)
	Leadership Intolerance	444	0.33	±0.04	60,019	0.65	±0.00	-0.75 (M)
	General Intolerance	442	2.5	±0.1	59,796	3.6	±0.0	-1.20 (L)
	Bystander Experiences	279	64.8%	±4.6	7,661	12.8%	±0.3	1.14 (L)*

Note. Scores ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) for scales measuring supervisor support, organizational trust, inclusion, politics, and general intolerance. Leadership intolerance was measured on a scale of yes (1) and no (0). Higher scores indicate greater levels of support, trust, inclusion; more pressure to conform to organization norms (Organizational Politics), greater intolerance of harassing behaviors, and greater number of employees experiencing bystander harassment. All differences in scores and percentages are statistically significant unless otherwise noted ($p < .05$). *Effect size for Bystander Experiences is Cohen's h .

Results of comparative analyses involving organizational characteristics are summarized in Table 3.43 and fully documented in the Supplemental Statistical Report. As can be seen in Table 3.43, these analyses reveal that, regardless of the particular behaviors involved, or the demographic or occupational characteristics we considered, employees who experienced some form of harassment and/or assault behavior gave consistently lower ratings to scales measuring supervisory support, organizational trust, organizational inclusion, organizational politics, general and leadership intolerance of harassment in the work unit, and higher ratings for bystander harassing and/or assault behaviors than employees who did not. The magnitudes of these effects (see *Hedges' g* statistics in Table 3.43) were in the medium to large range (Cohen,

1992), highlighting that the significant associations observed among organizational factors and harassing and/or assault behaviors.

Specifically, employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were less likely to report supervisory support than employees who were not harassed. Average ratings for supervisory support on a 5-point scale (with higher ratings indicating greater levels of support) were 3.1 vs. 3.9, respectively, for harassment based on racial/ethnic background; 3.2 vs. 3.8, respectively, for harassment based on religious beliefs; 2.9 vs. 3.8, respectively, for harassment based on an actual or perceived disability; 3.1 vs. 3.8, respectively, for harassment based on sexual orientation; 3.3 vs. 3.9, respectively, for gender harassment; 3.2 vs. 3.8, respectively, for sexual harassment; and 2.8 vs. 3.8, respectively, for sexual assault related behaviors.

Employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were less likely to trust the organization than employees who were not harassed. Average ratings of trust in the organization on a 5-point scale (with higher ratings indicating greater levels of trust) were 2.9 vs. 3.6, respectively, for harassment based on age; 2.7 vs. 3.5, respectively, for harassment based on racial/ethnic background; 2.8 vs. 3.5, respectively, for harassment based on religious beliefs; 2.6 vs. 3.5, respectively, for harassment based on an actual or perceived disability; 2.7 vs. 3.5, respectively, for harassment based on sexual orientation; 3.0 vs. 3.5, respectively, for gender harassment; 2.8 vs. 3.5, respectively, for sexual harassment; and 2.5 vs. 3.4, respectively, for sexual assault related behaviors.

Employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were less likely to view the organization as more inclusive than employees who were not harassed. Average ratings of the inclusiveness of the organization on a 5-point scale (with higher ratings indicating greater levels of inclusion) were 3.2 vs. 3.8, respectively, for harassment based on age; 3.0 vs. 3.8, respectively, for harassment based on racial/ethnic background; 3.1 vs. 3.7, respectively, for harassment based on religious beliefs; 2.8 vs. 3.7, respectively, for harassment based on an actual or perceived disability; 2.9 vs. 3.7, respectively, for harassment based on sexual orientation; 3.2 vs. 3.8, respectively, for gender harassment; 3.0 vs. 3.8, respectively, for sexual harassment; and 2.8 vs. 3.7, respectively, for sexual assault related behaviors.

Employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were more likely to perceive greater pressure to conform to organizational norms (e.g., going along to get along) than employees who were not harassed. Average ratings of the perceived pressure to conform to organizational norms on a 5-point scale (with higher ratings indicating greater pressure to conform to organization norms) were 3.2 vs. 2.6, respectively, for harassment based on age; 3.3 vs. 2.7, respectively, for harassment based on racial/ethnic background; 3.3 vs. 2.7, respectively, for harassment based on religious beliefs; 3.5 vs. 2.7, respectively, for harassment based on an actual or perceived disability; 3.4 vs. 2.7, respectively, for harassment based on sexual orientation; 3.2 vs. 2.7, respectively, for gender harassment; 3.3 vs. 2.7, respectively, for sexual harassment; and 3.5 vs. 2.7, respectively, for sexual assault related behaviors.

Employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were more likely to perceive the organizational climate with regard to harassing behaviors as being more tolerant of harassing behaviors than employees who were not harassed (i.e., higher scores indicate that members of one's work unit do not tolerate harassment). Average ratings of the perceived levels of organizational intolerance for harassing behaviors on a 5-point scale (with higher ratings indicating an organizational climate more intolerant of harassment) were 3.0 vs. 3.7, respectively, for harassment based on age; 2.8 vs. 3.6, respectively, for harassment based on racial/ethnic background; 2.9 vs. 3.6, respectively, for harassment based on religious beliefs; 2.7 vs. 3.6, respectively, for harassment based on an actual or perceived disability; 2.7 vs. 3.6, respectively, for harassment based on sexual orientation; 2.9 vs. 3.7, respectively, for gender harassment; 2.7 vs. 3.6, respectively, for sexual harassment; and 2.5 vs. 3.6, respectively, for sexual assault related behaviors.

Employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were more likely to perceive the leadership climate with regard to harassing behaviors as being more tolerant of harassing behaviors than employees who were not harassed (i.e., higher scores indicate that leaders within one's work unit do not tolerate harassment). Average ratings of leadership intolerance for harassing behaviors on a "yes," "no," and "don't know" scale (with higher ratings indicating greater intolerance of harassment among leaders) were .47 vs. .69, respectively, for harassment based on age; .40 vs. .67, respectively, for harassment based on racial/ethnic background; .45 vs. .66, respectively, for harassment based on religious beliefs; .35 vs. .66, respectively, for harassment based on an actual or perceived disability; .37 vs. .65, respectively, for harassment based on sexual orientation; .44 vs. .68, respectively, for gender harassment; .38 vs. .67, respectively, for sexual harassment; and .33 vs. .65, respectively, for sexual assault related behaviors.

Employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors themselves were more likely to witness the corresponding type of harassment against others than employees who were not harassed (e.g., those who experienced age harassment were more likely to witness age harassment against other employees). The percentage of employees who witnessed the corresponding type of harassment against others was 45.6% vs. 4.8%, respectively, for harassment based on age; 44.0% vs. 4.7%, respectively, for harassment based on racial/ethnic background; 40.7% vs. 2.4%, respectively, for harassment based on religious beliefs; 45.3% vs. 3.5%, respectively, for harassment based on an actual or perceived disability; 37.8% vs. 3.3%, respectively, for harassment based on sexual orientation; 51.1% vs. 5.8%, respectively, for gender harassment; 57.9% vs. 9.4%, respectively, for sexual harassment; and 64.8% vs. 12.8%, respectively, for sexual assault related behaviors.

Table 3.44 DOI – Scale Distributions of Organizational Factors for Any Form of Harassment Experienced

<i>Organizational factor</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Average rating</i>	<i>Strongly disagree (1)</i>	<i>Disagree (2)</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</i>	<i>Agree (4)</i>	<i>Strongly agree (5)</i>
Supervisor Support	20,728	3.4 (±0.0)	9.8% (±0.4)	13.5% (±0.5)	20.8% (±0.6)	33.7% (±0.6)	22.2% (±0.6)
Organizational Trust	21,313	3.0 (±0.0)	6.2% (±0.3)	21.5% (±0.6)	35.3% (±0.6)	31.5% (±0.6)	5.4% (±0.3)
Organizational Inclusion	21,410	3.3 (±0.0)	7.5% (±0.4)	16.4% (±0.5)	26.9% (±0.6)	39.7% (±0.7)	9.5% (±0.4)
Organizational Politics	21,192	3.1 (±0.0)	2.6% (±0.2)	25.1% (±0.6)	38.7% (±0.7)	26.0% (±0.6)	7.6% (±0.4)
General Intolerance	21,125	3.1 (±0.0)	6.0% (±0.3)	19.6% (±0.5)	40.4% (±0.7)	28.6% (±0.6)	5.3% (±0.3)

Note. Scale distributions shown are for a multi-item construct. Responses to individual scale items were averaged and grouped as follows: Strongly Disagree = 1 - <1.5, Disagree = 1.5 - <2.5, Neither Agree nor Disagree = 2.5 - <3.5, Agree = 3.5 - <4.5, Strongly Agree = 4.5 - 5. Higher scores indicate greater levels of support, trust, inclusion; more pressure to conform to organization norms (Organizational Politics), and greater intolerance of harassing behaviors.

Table 3.44 shows the average and distribution of ratings for each of the organizational factor assessed in the WES for those employees who experienced some form of harassing behavior.

3.5.1 Summary of Demographic, Occupational, and Organizational Factors Correlated with Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced

To summarize, analyses of demographic, occupational, and organizational factors influencing harassing and/or assault behaviors revealed that organizational factors were among the most important variables to understand employees' harassment and/or assault related behaviors experienced. Harassment based on age was less common among older than younger employees; and in work environments that were less inclusive and perceived to be tolerant of these behaviors and where employees witnessed harassment by other employees. Harassment based on race/ethnicity was more common among racial/ethnic minorities, and in work environments that were perceived more tolerant of harassment and where employees were more likely to have witnessed harassment by other employees. Harassment based on religious beliefs was more common in work environments that were perceived to be more tolerant of harassment and where employees witnessed harassment by other employees. Harassment based on a disability status or condition was more common for employees with a documented disability and more common where employees witnessed harassment by other employees. Harassment based on sexual orientation was more common where employees witnessed harassment by other

employees. Gender harassment was more common for women than men, younger than older employees, among college educated than noncollege educated employees, and in environments that were perceived to be less inclusive, and more tolerant of these behaviors, and where employees were more likely to have witnessed harassment by other employees. Sexual harassment was more common for women than men, and in environments that were perceived as being tolerant of these behaviors and where employees witnessed harassment by other employees. Sexual assault related behaviors were more common where employees witnessed harassment by other employees. Moreover, employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were less likely to report supervisory support, to trust the organization, and to view the organization as inclusive; they also perceived greater pressure to conform to organizational norms; rated the organization and the leadership as being more tolerant of harassing behaviors; and were more likely to witness harassment by other employees than employees who were not harassed.

3.6 Job-Related Consequences of Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced

To understand the impact of harassment and/or assault related behaviors on employees' job-related attitudes, we examined relationships among harassment and/or assault behaviors and the various job outcomes measured in the WES. Separate regression analyses were performed for each outcome variable (i.e., job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment). All harassment and/or assault variables were entered simultaneously into separate equations for each of the job outcomes we modeled. Statistical findings for these analyses are summarized in Table 3.45 and are also documented in the Supplemental Statistical Report.

Table 3.45 DOI – Linear Regression of Harassment and Job-Related Outcomes

<i>Type of Harassment</i>	Job Satisfaction		Job Engagement		Organizational Commitment	
	<i>B</i>	<i>Semi Partial r</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Semi Partial r</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Semi Partial r</i>
Age	-0.152	-0.134	-0.231	-0.071	-0.283	-0.103
Race/Ethnicity	-0.105	-0.096	-0.206	-0.047	-0.335	-0.091
Religious Beliefs	-0.044	-0.041	-0.135	-0.028	-0.170	-0.042
Disability	-0.136	-0.127	-0.375	-0.073	-0.384	-0.088
Sexual Orientation	-0.022	-0.020	0.028	0.004	-0.042	-0.007
Gender Harassment	-0.069	-0.058	-0.201	-0.054	-0.179	-0.057
Sexual Harassment	-0.050	-0.042	-0.035	-0.007	-0.119	-0.028
Sexual Assault	-0.004 ^{NS}	-0.004	0.070 ^{NS}	0.005	-0.129	-0.011

Note. All coefficients are statistically significant, $p < .05$, unless noted by NS.

As shown in Table 3.45 harassment and/or assault experiences were significantly associated with each of the outcome variables examined in our models. Though the variance accounted for by these variables is small (R Squared values ranged from 0.039 - 0.132; Cohen, 1992), the pattern of associations among harassment and/or assault variables was negative, indicating that employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were less satisfied and engaged with their jobs and were less likely to remain committed to the organization.

Table 3.46 DOI – Differences in Ratings of Job-Related Outcomes by Harassment Experienced

	Experienced Harassment			Did Not Experience Harassment			Effect Size
	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>Hedges' g</i>
Age							
Job Satisfaction	12,535	3.4	±0.0	48,558	3.9	±0.0	-0.71 (M)
Job Engagement	12,527	5.2	±0.0	48,555	5.6	±0.0	-0.37 (S)
Organizational Commitment	12,530	3.1	±0.0	48,545	3.6	±0.0	-0.56 (M)
Racial/Ethnic Background							
Job Satisfaction	5,695	3.3	±0.0	55,313	3.8	±0.0	-0.81 (L)
Job Engagement	5,695	5.1	±0.0	55,302	5.6	±0.0	-0.40 (S)
Organizational Commitment	5,695	2.9	±0.0	55,294	3.6	±0.0	-0.69 (M)
Religious Beliefs							
Job Satisfaction	4,309	3.4	±0.0	56,673	3.8	±0.0	-0.65 (M)
Job Engagement	4,307	5.1	±0.0	56,664	5.5	±0.0	-0.36 (S)
Organizational Commitment	4,304	3.0	±0.0	56,660	3.6	±0.0	-0.56 (M)
Disability Status							
Job Satisfaction	3,696	3.1	±0.0	56,612	3.8	±0.0	-1.02 (L)
Job Engagement	3,689	4.9	±0.0	56,604	5.5	±0.0	-0.55 (M)
Organizational Commitment	3,693	2.8	±0.0	56,597	3.6	±0.0	-0.77 (M)
Sexual Orientation							
Job Satisfaction	2,202	3.2	±0.0	58,485	3.8	±0.0	-0.80 (L)
Job Engagement	2,202	5.1	±0.1	58,471	5.5	±0.0	-0.36 (S)
Organizational Commitment	2,201	2.9	±0.0	58,468	3.5	±0.0	-0.62 (M)
Gender Harassment							
Job Satisfaction	10,091	3.4	±0.0	51,049	3.9	±0.0	-0.60 (M)
Job Engagement	10,087	5.2	±0.0	51,037	5.6	±0.0	-0.35 (S)
Organizational Commitment	10,088	3.1	±0.0	51,034	3.6	±0.0	-0.51 (M)

Note. Scores ranged from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5) for the satisfaction scale. Scores ranged from never (1) to always or every day (7) for the job engagement scale. Scores ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) for the organizational commitment scale. Higher scores indicate greater levels of job satisfaction, job engagement, and commitment to the organization. All differences in scores and percentages are statistically significant unless otherwise noted ($p < .05$).

Table 3.46 Continued

	Experienced Harassment			Did Not Experience Harassment			Effect Size
	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>Hedges' g</i>
Sexual Harassment							
Job Satisfaction	4,892	3.3	±0.0	56,144	3.8	±0.0	-0.70 (M)
Job Engagement	4,886	5.2	±0.0	56,134	5.5	±0.0	-0.33 (S)
Organizational Commitment	4,890	3.0	±0.0	56,127	3.6	±0.0	-0.56 (M)
Sexual Assault Behaviors							
Job Satisfaction	451	3.2	±0.1	60,540	3.8	±0.0	-0.83 (L)
Job Engagement	451	5.1	±0.1	60,524	5.5	±0.0	-0.33 (S)
Organizational Commitment	451	2.8	±0.1	60,522	3.5	±0.0	-0.75 (M)

Note. Scores ranged from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5) for the satisfaction scale. Scores ranged from never (1) to always or every day (7) for the job engagement scale. Scores ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) for the organizational commitment scale. Higher scores indicate greater levels of job satisfaction, job engagement, and commitment to the organization. All differences in scores and percentages are statistically significant unless otherwise noted ($p < .05$).

To further examine these findings, we compared differences between employees who experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors and each of the outcome variables included in the WES. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3.46 and fully documented in the Supplemental Statistical Report. Importantly, these analyses reveal that regardless of the particular behavior involved, or the pay grade, years of service, appointment type and work schedule, and/or matched demographic characteristic for the specific type of harassing and/or assault behavior involved, employees who experienced some form of harassment and/or assault behavior gave consistently lower ratings for job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment. The magnitudes of these effects (see *Hedges' g* statistics in Table 3.43) were in the medium to large range for ratings of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and within the small range for job engagement (Cohen, 1992). These results point to the significant negative associations that can be observed between harassment and/or assault behaviors and important job-related outcomes among members of the DOI workforce.

Table 3.47 DOI – Scale Distributions of Job-Related Consequences for Any Form of Harassment Experienced

	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Job Satisfaction (average rating = 3.5, ±0.0)			
(1) Very Dissatisfied	154	0.7%	±0.1
(2) Dissatisfied	2,127	9.9%	±0.4
(3) Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied	7,819	36.5%	±0.6
(4) Satisfied	9,857	46.0%	±0.7
(5) Very Satisfied	1,474	6.9%	±0.3
Job Engagement (average rating = 5.2, ±0.0)			
(1) Never	145	0.7%	±0.1
(2) Almost Never or a Few Times a Year or Less	467	2.2%	±0.2
(3) Rarely or Once a Month or Less	1,455	6.8%	±0.3
(4) Sometimes or a Few Times a Month	3,612	16.9%	±0.5
(5) Often or Once a Week	5,466	25.5%	±0.6
(6) Very Often or a Few Times a Week	7,026	32.8%	±0.6
(7) Always or Every Day	3,245	15.2%	±0.5
Organizational Commitment (average rating = 3.2, ±0.0)			
(1) Strongly Disagree	1,614	7.5%	±0.4
(2) Disagree	3,723	17.4%	±0.5
(3) Neither Agree nor Disagree	6,308	29.4%	±0.6
(4) Agree	7,219	33.7%	±0.6
(5) Strongly Agree	2,559	11.9%	±0.4

Note. Scale distributions shown are for a multi-item construct. Responses to individual scale items were averaged and grouped as follows: Satisfaction Scale: Very Dissatisfied = 1 - <1.5, Dissatisfied = 1.5 - <2.5, Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied = 2.5 - <3.5, Satisfied = 3.5 - <4.5, Very Satisfied = 4.5 - 5; Frequency Scale: Never = 1 - <1.5, Almost Never or a Few Times a Year or Less = 1.5 - <2.5, Rarely or Once a Month or Less = 2.5 - <3.5, Sometimes or a Few Times a Month = 3.5 - <4.5, Often or Once a Week = 4.5 - <5.5, Very Often or a Few Times a Week = 5.5 - <6.5, Always or Every Day = 6.5 - 7; Agreement Scale: Strongly Disagree = 1 - <1.5, Disagree = 1.5 - <2.5, Neither Agree nor Disagree = 2.5 - <3.5, Agree = 3.5 - <4.5, Strongly Agree = 4.5 - 5.

Table 3.47 shows the average and distribution of ratings for each of the job-related outcome variables assessed in the WES for those respondents who experienced some form of harassing behavior.

3.6.1 Summary of Job-Related Consequences of Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors Experienced

Regression analyses revealed statistically significant associations of harassment and/or assault behaviors to job-related outcomes. While the magnitude of the effects were small, the pattern of associations indicating that employees who experienced harassment and/or assault behaviors were less satisfied and engaged with their jobs and were less likely to remain committed to the organization.

3.7 Additional Findings

We included a multi-item scale to examine employees' experiences with bystander harassment within the DOI working environment. As noted earlier, bystander experiences involve situations where an employee witnesses another employee being subjected to harassing/discriminating and/or assault behaviors. We estimated the number, percentage, and frequency of these experiences for each of six forms of bystander harassment. Results of the analyses are presented in Table 3.48 and Table 3.49. Complete results for these analyses are fully documented in the Supplemental Statistical Report. It should be noted the percentages reported are not experience rates because multiple employees might have witnessed the same event.

Table 3.48 DOI – Number and Percentage of Employees Witnessing Bystander Harassment

	Percent witnessing		
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Any Form	13,549	22.4%	±0.3
Age	7,799	13.0%	±0.3
Racial/Ethnic	5,011	8.3%	±0.2
Religious	3,059	5.1%	±0.2
Disability	3,620	6.0%	±0.2
Sexual Orientation	2,738	4.6%	±0.2
Sex/Gender	7,961	13.2%	±0.3

As shown in Table 3.48 and in Figure 3.23, an estimated 22.4% of employees witnessed a harassing and/or assault behavior against another employee in the 12 months preceding the survey. Specifically, 13.0% indicated the bystander harassment experience was based on the person's age; 8.3% indicated the bystander harassment experience was based on the person's racial/ethnic background; 5.1% indicated the bystander harassment experience was based on the person's religious beliefs; 6.0% indicated bystander harassment experience was based on the person's disability status or condition; 4.6% indicated the bystander harassment experience was based on the person's sexual orientation; and 13.2% indicated the bystander harassment experience was based on the person's sex/gender. In a majority of these situations, employees witnessed these behaviors once a month or less.




Figure 3.23 DOI – Estimated Bystander Harassment Witnessing Rates

Table 3.49 DOI – Estimated Average Frequency and Distribution of Bystander Harassment in Past 12 Months

Type of Bystander Harassment	N	Average frequency	Once	Once a month or less	Two-three times a month	Once a week or more	One or more times a day
Any Form	13,549	3.0 (±0.0)	37.3% (±0.5)	38.5% (±0.6)	12.9% (±0.4)	7.3% (±0.3)	4.0% (±0.2)
Age	7,799	3.0 (±0.0)	39.4% (±1.1)	39.0% (±1.1)	11.7% (±0.7)	6.8% (±0.6)	3.2% (±0.4)
Racial/Ethnic	5,011	3.0 (±0.0)	37.7% (±1.4)	37.3% (±1.3)	13.4% (±1.0)	7.2% (±0.7)	4.4% (±0.6)
Religious	3,059	2.9 (±0.0)	42.9% (±1.8)	39.3% (±1.7)	10.0% (±1.1)	4.9% (±0.8)	2.9% (±0.7)
Disability	3,620	3.0 (±0.0)	38.6% (±1.6)	37.5% (±1.6)	12.5% (±1.1)	6.3% (±0.8)	5.1% (±0.8)
Sexual Orientation	2,738	3.0 (±0.0)	41.5% (±1.9)	36.3% (±1.8)	11.2% (±1.2)	7.3% (±1.0)	3.7% (±0.8)
Sex/Gender	7,961	3.2 (±0.0)	30.8% (±1.0)	39.7% (±1.1)	15.5% (±0.8)	9.4% (±0.7)	4.6% (±0.5)

Note. Frequency scale scores ranged from *once* to *one or more times per day* for respondents who reported experiencing harassing and/or assault behaviors. A value of 3 corresponds to *once a month or less*.

Table 3.49 presents the means and distribution of the frequencies of bystander harassment experiences reported by employees. As can be seen in Table 3.46, the average frequency ratings were within a score of 3, on a scale ranging from *once* (2) to *one or more times a day* (6), with *once a month or less* representing a value of 3. The complete distribution of each type of bystander harassment is also shown in Table 3.48.




Figure 3.24 DOI – Estimated Frequency of Witnessing Bystander Harassment

Examination of the distribution of these experiences clearly show that most employees witnessed a harassing and/or assault behavior more than once (see Table 3.48). Figure 3.24 displays the distribution of these experiences for all forms of bystander harassment measured in the WES. As shown in Figure 3.24, regardless of the particular form of bystander harassment involved, 62.7% of employees witnessed a harassing situation more than once. This pattern is observed for all other specific forms of bystander harassment measured in the WES. The pattern of findings suggests that a sizable number of employees may witness harassing behaviors among other employees within the DOI working environment.

A follow-up item exploring actions taken in response to the bystander harassment situation was asked of those who responded affirmatively to items experiencing bystander harassment. Table 3.50 shows the type of action(s) typically taken as a result of a bystander harassment situation.

Table 3.50 DOI – Actions Taken in Response to Bystander Harassment

	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Q54 Which of the following actions best describes your most typical response(s) to the situation you witnessed?			
I did not take any action	3,256	24.0%	±0.7
I asked the person who was experiencing the behavior if he/she needed help	4,533	33.5%	±0.8
I pointed out to person who appeared to be causing the situation that he/she “crossed the line” with comments/behaviors	3,070	22.7%	±0.7
I stepped in with the intent of diffusing/stopping the situation	1,897	14.0%	±0.6
I asked others to step in as a group and diffuse the situation	559	4.1%	±0.3
I told someone in a position of authority about the situation	2,894	21.4%	±0.7
I considered intervening but I feared I would experience negative consequences	2,135	15.8%	±0.6
I considered intervening but did not feel I had the authority to do so	1,769	13.1%	±0.6
I stepped in but then was discouraged or criticized by others for doing so	625	4.6%	±0.4
I stepped in but then was harassed myself by the person(s) I was trying to stop	727	5.4%	±0.4
None selected	307	2.3%	±0.3

As can be seen in Table 3.50 and Figure 3.25, regardless of the specific form of bystander harassment, the majority of employees took some action in response to behaviors they witnessed; 73.7% took some action and 24.0% did not take any action (2.3% did not make a selection). Among employees who took some action, the most frequent actions taken were: to help the person experiencing the behavior, 33.5% asked the person [who was subject to the behavior] if s/he needed help; 22.7% pointed out to person [who engaged in the harassing behavior] that s/he “crossed the line;” 21.4% told someone in a position of authority about the situation. Some employees contemplated an action but did not act for fear of negative consequences; 15.8% considered intervening but feared negative consequences, and 13.1% considered intervening but felt they lacked the authority to do so.





Figure 3.25 DOI – Actions Taken in Response to Bystander Harassment

We also included a series of single item measures to assess employees' harassing and/or assault experiences in the period before the past 12 months. Employees were asked if they had experienced any of the behaviors listed in the earlier sections in the period before the past 12 months using a "yes" and "no" response format. Employees who responded in the affirmative were counted as having experienced harassment in the period before the past 12 months. Table 3.51 presents results for these single item measures for each of the harassing behaviors assessed in the WES. Within this section of the survey, responses to questions involving gender and sexual harassment were presented together and a single item was used to assess gender and sexual harassment experiences in the period before the past 12 months to minimize response burden and optimize survey completion. Caution should be exercised in attempting to draw inferences about trends between rates of experience in the past 12 months and rates of experience prior to the past 12 months as these measures are not comparable (see Appendix C, Section C.5.1 for additional details).

Table 3.51 DOI – Harassment and/or Assault Experienced Before the Past 12 Months

	Experience rate		
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Any Form	18,430	32.9%	±0.4
Age	10,021	18.0%	±0.3
Racial/Ethnic Background	5,281	9.5%	±0.2
Religious Belief	3,666	6.6%	±0.2
Disability Status	3,118	5.7%	±0.2
Sexual Orientation	2,210	4.0%	±0.2
Sexual Harassment	7,401	13.3%	±0.3
Sexual Assault Related Behaviors	993	1.78%	±0.11

As shown in Table 3.51 and Figure 3.26, an estimated 32.9% of employees experienced some form of harassing and/or assault behaviors before the past 12 months while being employed at DOI. Among these individuals, 18.0% experienced harassing behaviors based on their age; 9.5% experienced harassing behaviors based on their racial/ethnic background; 6.6% experienced harassing behaviors based on their religious beliefs; 5.7% experienced harassing behaviors based on a perceived or actual disability; 4.0% experienced harassing behaviors based on their sexual orientation; 13.3% experienced sexually harassing behaviors; and 1.78% of experienced sexual assault related behaviors.

*Figure 3.26 DOI – Harassment and/or Assault Experienced Before the Past 12 Months**Table 3.52 DOI – Pay Plan or Grade at Which Harassment First Occurred*

	Pay grade at first occurrence			Pay grade at first occurrence		
	Age			Sexual Orientation		
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Junior Grade	2,182	21.9%	±0.8	530	24%	±1.8
Middle Grade	3,756	37.6%	±1.0	890	40.2%	±2.1
Senior Grade	3,700	37.1%	±1.0	705	31.9%	±2.0
Executive Grade	21	0.2%	±0.1	NR	NR	NR
Other	324	3.2%	±0.4	84	3.8%	±0.9

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

Table 3.52 Continued

	Pay grade at first occurrence			Pay grade at first occurrence		
	Racial/Ethnic			Sexual Harassment		
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Junior Grade	1,024	19.5%	±1.1	2,309	31.3%	±1.1
Middle Grade	1,956	37.2%	±1.3	2,757	37.4%	±1.1
Senior Grade	2,043	38.8%	±1.3	2,051	27.8%	±1.0
Executive Grade	17	0.3%	±0.2	9	0.1%	±0.1
Other	223	4.2%	±0.6	250	3.4%	±0.4
	Religious Beliefs			Sexual Assault Related Behaviors		
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>
Junior Grade	791	21.6%	±1.4	362	36.5%	±3.1
Middle Grade	1,402	38.3%	±1.6	376	38.0%	±3.1
Senior Grade	1,337	36.5%	±1.6	212	21.4%	±2.7
Executive Grade	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Other	127	3.5%	±0.6	39	3.9%	±1.4
	Disability					
	<i>N</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>MoE</i>			
Junior Grade	559	18.0%	±1.4			
Middle Grade	1,298	41.8%	±1.7			
Senior Grade	1,090	35.1%	±1.7			
Executive Grade	6	0.2%	±0.2			
Other	156	5.0%	±0.8			

Note. Junior Grade includes WG 1-4 and GS 1-6; Middle Grade includes WG 5-16 and GS 7-10; Senior Grade includes GS 11-15; and Executive Grade includes Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, and Senior Executive Service.

An item asking about the employee's pay category or grade when the behaviors were first experienced was presented to those who responded affirmatively to the question regarding harassment in the period before the past 12 months. Table 3.52 presents the distribution of responses for each of the harassment and/or assault behaviors included in the WES. For ease of comparison between Wage Grade and General Schedule pay grades, the two pay scales have been merged into *Junior Grade* (WG 1-4; GS 1-6), *Middle Grade* (WG 5-16; GS 7-10), *Senior Grade* (GS 11-15), and *Executive Grade* (Senior Level, Scientific or Professional, Senior Executive Service). The Supplemental Statistical Report contains the fully documented responses to this item. As can be seen in Table 3.52, there were no discernable patterns to these responses across the various forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors we measured. Experience rates were proportionately distributed for middle and senior pay grade employees and slightly lower for junior pay grade employees.

Table 3.53 DOI – Future Use of Resources to Make a Complaint/Grievance/Report

Q55 If you were to make an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about a harassment experience involving someone at work, which of the following options would you be most likely to use?	Yes Percent MoE N	No Percent MoE N	DK Percent MoE N	Helpfulness Mean MoE
Supervisor or Manager	78.1% ±0.3 46,486	12.7% ±0.3 7,555	9.2% ±0.2 5,506	3.8 ±0.0
Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	44.4% ±0.4 25,846	30.5% ±0.4 17,745	25.0% ±0.4 14,561	3.5 ±0.0
Ombudsman (if applicable)	17.0% ±0.3 9,720	30.4% ±0.4 17,356	52.6% ±0.4 29,991	3.4 ±0.0
CADR Office, CORE PLUS	14.9% ±0.3 8,541	35.1% ±0.4 20,066	50.0% ±0.4 28,604	3.5 ±0.0
Employee & Labor Relations (Human Resources)	42.5% ±0.4 24,606	28.4% ±0.4 16,425	29.1% ±0.4 16,819	3.6 ±0.0
Union (if applicable)	16.5% ±0.3 9,063	46.6% ±0.4 25,693	36.9% ±0.4 20,333	3.5 ±0.0
Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor	42.6% ±0.4 24,536	27.4% ±0.4 15,773	30.0% ±0.4 17,240	3.6 ±0.0
Equal Employment Opportunity Office	40.1% ±0.4 23,030	28.7% ±0.4 16,475	31.2% ±0.4 17,929	3.6 ±0.0
Office of Inspector General Hotline	21.8% ±0.3 12,435	39.6% ±0.4 22,599	38.5% ±0.4 21,976	3.4 ±0.0
Office of Inspector General	20.0% ±0.3 11,374	40.7% ±0.4 23,172	39.3% ±0.4 22,411	3.5 ±0.0
Other Law Enforcement/ Civil Authority not in the bureau	18.9% ±0.3 10,777	44.4% ±0.4 25,308	36.7% ±0.4 20,960	3.6 ±0.0
Department of Interior Ethics/Bureau Ethics Office	34.3% ±0.4 19,735	32.5% ±0.4 18,696	33.1% ±0.4 19,046	3.6 ±0.0
Other	21.3% ±0.3 11,446	78.7% ±0.3 42,260		3.7 ±0.0

Note. Scale values range from *Not at all Helpful* (1) to *Extremely Helpful* (5), with a value of 3 representing *Moderately Helpful*. The mean for the helpfulness score is based on responses received.

We included an item to ask if employees would use any DOI resources to make a complaint/grievance/report if they were to experience a harassing and/or assault behavior in the

future and to rate the expected helpfulness of the resource.³⁷ Table 3.53 presents the results for these questions. Regardless of whether the employee did or did not experience and/or witness a specific form of harassment or assault behavior, the majority of employees would use a supervisor or manager; 78.0% would make a complaint/grievance/report to a supervisor or manager, but they would also consider using other DOI resources. Among the most common DOI resources were: 44.0% would use the Employee Assistance Program, 42.5% would use Employee and Labor Relations, 42.6% would use the Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor, and 40.1% would use the Equal Employment Opportunity Office. Regardless of the particular resource involved, employees rated the majority of resources as moderately helpful. The scale values ranged from *not at all helpful* (1) to *extremely helpful* (5), with a value of 3 representing *moderately helpful*.³⁸

³⁷ Ombudsman was only in existence about 1.5 months before the survey opened.

³⁸ There is a disparity between the reported use of these resources (see Table 3.24) and the reported future use of the same. However, research shows that past behavior does not always predict future behavior (Oullette & Wood, 1998).

4 Conclusions

4.1 Overview

The purpose of the WES was to assess employees' attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors with regard to harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced within the DOI work environment. Specifically, the WES was designed to ascertain the *character* of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced; identify *contextual* factors influencing specific behaviors or sets of experiences; examine the relative importance of demographic, occupational, and organizational *correlates* of harassing and/or assault behaviors; examine job-related *consequences* associated with harassing and/or assault behaviors; and explore additional findings uncovered with regard to employees' harassment and/or assault experiences. Analysis of data from 27,200 employees enabled us to estimate the experience rates of harassment/assault behaviors; describe situational characteristics surrounding specific behaviors or set of experiences; identify the relative importance of demographic, occupational, and organizational correlates of these behaviors; and examine the impact of harassment/assault behaviors on employee's job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment. Results of descriptive and inferential analyses performed on these data reveal that harassment and/or assault behaviors experiences of employees are both prevalent and problematic for individual employees as well as for the organization. We summarize the main findings in the coming sections.

4.2 Summary of Main Findings

Harassment is experienced by many employees. Analyses reveal that harassment and/or assault behaviors are experienced by a sizable proportion of the DOI workforce. An estimated 35.0% of employees experienced some form of harassment and/or assault behaviors in the 12 months preceding the survey. Specifically, the estimated percentages of employees who experienced various forms of harassment or sexual assault related behaviors measured in the WES (i.e., harassment based on age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status or condition, sexual orientation, gender harassment, sexual harassment, and sexual assault related behaviors) range from 0.74% to 20.5%. These proportions amount to approximately 400 to 21,500 employees who were subject to such experiences. Further examinations of these findings reveal that members of underrepresented groups appear to be affected more by experiences of harassment and/or assault that are associated with their underrepresented characteristic. Ethnic minority employees were more likely to experience harassment based on their racial/ethnic background than their non-ethnic minority counterparts; disabled employees were more likely to experience harassment based on a disability status or condition than their nondisabled counterparts; women and sexual minority employees were more likely to experience harassment and/or assault behaviors based on their sexual orientation, as well as gender and sexual harassment, than either men or heterosexual counterparts; and both younger (39 and younger) and older (50 and older) employees experienced more harassment and/or assault behaviors based

on age than their middle age counterparts (40-49). The totality of this evidence points to a systemic problem that touches a number of employees regardless of age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status or condition, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Harassment and/or assault behaviors appear to be broad ranging, affecting many members of the DOI workforce. Harassment is clearly not limited to a specific group or groups of employees.³⁹

Harassment is experienced at work, with some regularity, and over a period of time.

Analyses indicate that employees' experiences occur during working hours, at a work location or site that is most frequently characterized as an indoor location, like an office setting. Moreover, employees experience these behaviors more than once. Hence, harassment is not typically an isolated event or unitary experience that occurs in far off places, rather, it occurs within the confines of an employee's usual place of work and over a period of time.

Harassment is experienced from others at work and is persistent in nature. Harassment and/or assault experiences most typically involve person(s) that are internal rather than external to the DOI workforce; hence it represents more of an "insider threat" among fellow members of the workforce than from partners, volunteers, or people in the community or employees' families/social spheres. The person(s) involved are most often older and male employees, who may be peer(s)/coworker(s), or serve as supervisor(s) or manager(s) of employees experiencing the harassing and/or assault behaviors. Moreover, most employees who experience harassing and/or assault behaviors must continue to interact with the person(s) involved. Hence, harassment is best considered as an "insider threat" given that it involves other members of the DOI workforce.

Harassed individuals usually talk to someone at work but do not tend use DOI resources - except for supervisors and/or managers. Employees experiencing harassing and/or assault behaviors at work discuss their experiences with coworkers and/or other employees, as well as their supervisors/managers and even senior leaders. Employees experiencing these behaviors at work may even discuss the experience with the person(s) involved. Importantly, employees tend *not* to make a written or oral complaint/grievance/report. The notable exception to this observation involves supervisor(s)/manager(s), where the data indicate that some employees appear to make complaints/grievances/reports to a supervisor or manager. Hence, employees who experience harassing and/or assault behaviors talk to others at work but seldom engage the system and its resources to deal with such situations.

³⁹ Meta-analytic results suggest that anywhere between 24%-84% of women report having experienced sexual harassment in the workplace; among private sector organizations these rates range from 24%-58%; and within governmental organizations their rates range from 31%-43% (Ilies et al., 2003). Direct comparison involving rates of harassment and/or assault behaviors to other studies and organizations must be made with due considerations to methodological (e.g., assessment approach – direct vs. indirect assessment of harassing and/or assault behaviors; sampling strategies, and weighting procedures used to estimate rates), and contextual/organizational factors (e.g., academic, private, military, and government organizations).

Evidence regarding the utility of DOI resources, and associated actions and outcomes of making a complaint/grievance/report, suggests that DOI resources may not be particularly effective for either the individual or the organization. While some employees who experience harassing and/or assault behavior indicated that some action was taken in response to a complaint/grievance/report, these actions had a limited impact on the person(s) involved or the organization as a whole, and they were not particularly supportive of the employee subject to the harassing and/or assault behavior. Evidence regarding the utility of DOI resources indicates that resources were deemed to be only somewhat or moderately helpful for employees. But, employees were generally dissatisfied with the availability of information, the treatment received by personnel, actions and time required to resolve issues, and information about the status of the complaint/grievance/report. Among employees not making a complaint/grievance/report, dismissing, discounting, and downplaying the behavior were among the most common reasons noted for not opting to make a complaint/grievance/report. Some employees also felt that nothing would be done. Hence, the efficacy and utility of DOI resources is limited and may not provide adequate means to address harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced by members of the DOI workforce.

Harassing/assault behaviors impact employees differently – some employees have negative experiences and some do not. Though many employees indicated their experiences did not have a negative influence on them, for some employees these experiences had a deleterious effect on their interpersonal relationships, their physical or emotional well-being, their job performance, and their willingness to remain a part of the organization. Some employees indicated the experience led to arguments or damaged interpersonal relations at work to include relationships with coworkers, supervisors, or managers. Other employees indicated the experience caused them to call in sick or take leave, or seek medical attention or counseling. And, other employees found it harder to complete their work, or felt that the experience had a negative impact on their performance evaluation or promotion potential or renewal/permanent employment.⁴⁰ Ultimately, the net effect of these experiences is that it influenced employees' willingness to remain a part of the organization. Collectively, the evidence reveals a pattern of negative effects that harassing and/or assault behaviors can have on members of the DOI workforce and on the organization as a whole.

Harassment and/or assault experiences are related to demographic, occupational, and organizational factors, but the most important of these factors involve organizationally focused variables. While we found that demographic and occupational factors were related to harassing and/or assault experiences of employees, organizational factors were by far the most important variables to understand the nature of these experiences. Organizational factors like perceptions of

⁴⁰ The ending for this question varied for permanent and temporary employees. Permanent employees were asked about the negative effects of the experience in reference to performance evaluation or promotion potential. Term or Temporary employees were asked about the negative effect of the experience in reference to their performance evaluation or chance for renewal or permanent employment.

supervisor support, organizational trust and inclusion, politics within the organization, as well as the perceived general and leadership tolerance of harassing behaviors, and bystander experiences were rated consistently lower among employees who experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors than those who did not. Hence, when we consider the multitude of variables that are associated with harassing and/or assault experiences at work, it appears that certain demographic factors (e.g., age, sex, gender identity and sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, disability) together with organizational factors matter more than other variables. In particular, the importance of organizational variables points to a consistent set of environmental factors that may produce conditions that are conducive to the manifestation of harassing and/or assault behaviors within the DOI work environment.

Harassing and/or assault behaviors appear to have a negative effect on job-related outcomes like job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment. While the associations among harassing and/or assault behaviors and these outcomes varied in terms of its strength, the patterns of associations were negative, indicating that employees who experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors were more likely to report lower levels of job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment than those who did not. The observed pattern was consistent even when considering demographic and occupational characteristics of employees who experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors and those who did not. Hence, these data clearly point to the negative impact that harassment and/or assault behaviors can have not only on the members of the DOI workforce but also on the productivity and effectiveness of the entire organization.

Employees not only experience but may also bear witness and respond to other's harassing and/or assault behaviors. An estimated 22.4% of employees witnessed a harassing and/or assault behavior in the 12 months preceding the survey. Employees experienced the majority of these behaviors once, and/or, once a month or less. Not all employees reacted to the bystander harassing and/or assault experience in a similar manner. Some employees took action, while others did not, in response to behaviors they witnessed. Among employees taking some action, the most frequent action taken was to help the person experiencing the behavior; to tell the person doing the behavior that they “crossed the line;” or to tell someone in a position of authority. Among employees who did not take any action, the most frequent reasons for not taking any action involved fear of negative consequences or a perceived lack of authority to take action. These findings point to the pervasive nature of harassing and/or assault behaviors within the broader DOI work environment. Harassment and/or assault behaviors not only affect the person(s) involved but may also affect others who witness such behaviors when they occur.

Retrospective data on harassing and/or assault experiences occurring prior to the 12 months preceding the survey suggests that these behaviors may have a longer past than the most recent 12 months. An estimated 32.9% of employees indicated they experienced some form of harassing and/or assault behaviors before the past 12 months while being employed at DOI. Though these findings must be cautiously interpreted given their retrospective nature, and their

susceptibility to memory distortion and bias, they do provide evidence of the prevalent and persistent nature of harassing and/or assault behaviors manifested within the DOI work environment. That employees' can recall instances that date well before the past 12 months also attests to the harmful nature of these experiences on employees' personal and professional lives. Harassment and/or assault experiences are not a new phenomenon within the DOI workforce.

4.3 Conclusions

The goals of this project were met in terms of enhancing our collective understanding of the nature, extent and impact of harassing and/or assault behaviors within the DOI workforce. Employees at all levels are either directly (through their own personal experiences) or indirectly (through the witnessing or hearing about other employees' experiences) affected by harassing and/or assault situations both personally and professionally. The findings shed light on the dynamics that underlie these behaviors and affirm the need for comprehensive responses to these problems.

References

- Arvey, R. D., & Cavanaugh, M. A. (1995). Using surveys to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment: Some methodological problems. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 39–52.
- Bastian, L. D., Lancaster, A. R., & Reyst, H. E. (1996). *Department of Defense 1995 sexual harassment survey* (Report No. 96-014). Arlington, VA. Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 998–1012.
- Chan, D. K-S., Lam, C. B., Chow, S. Y., & Cheung, S. F. (2008). Examining the job related, psychological, and physical outcomes of workplace sexual harassment: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 362-376.
- Cummings, L. L., & Bromiley, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In RM Kramer & TR Tyler, (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 302-330), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dansky, B. S., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1997). Effects of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research and treatment* (pp. 162-174). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 565-573.
- Estrada, A.X., & Laurence, J.H. (2009). The impact of training on the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue policy. *Military Psychology, 21*, 62-80.
- Estrada, A.X., Olson, K.J., Harbke, C.R., & Berggren, A.W. (2011). Evaluating a brief scale measuring psychological climate for sexual harassment. *Military Psychology, 23*, 410-432.
- Feldblum, C.R., & Lipnic, V.A. (2016) *Select task force on the study of harassment in the workplace*. Washington, DC. US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
- Gruber, J.E. (1990). Methodological problems and policy implications in sexual harassment research. *Population Research and Policy Review, 9*, 235-254.
- Gutek, B. A., Murphy, R. O., & Douma, B. (2004). A review and critique of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ). *Law and Human Behavior, 28*, 457-482.
- Hershcovis, M.S., & Barling, J. (2010, August 16). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 874–888.
- Ilies, R., Hauserman, N., Schwochau, S., & Stibal, J. (2003). Reported incidence rates of work-related sexual harassment in United States: Using meta-analysis to explain reported rate disparities. *Personnel Psychology, 56*, 607-631.
- Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the perceptions of politics scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of management, 23*(5), 627-658.

- Krieger, N., Chen, J. T., Waterman, P. D., Hartman, C., Stoddard, A. M., Quinn, M. M., Langhout, R. D., Bergman, M. E., Cortina, L. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Williams, J. H. (2005). Sexual harassment severity: Assessing situational and personal determinants and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*, 975-1007.
- Lapierre, L. M., Spector, P. E., & Leck, J. D. (2005). Sexual versus nonsexual workplace aggression and victims' overall job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 155-169.
- Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (1995). Sexual harassment research: A methodological critique. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 841-864.
- Lighthouse Associates. (1999). *U.S. Park Police gender equity study*. Springfield, VA.
- Lighthouse Associates. (2000). *U.S. Department of Interior National Park Service women in law enforcement study*. Burke, VA. Author.
- Mazzeo, S. E., Bergman, M. E., Buchanan, N. T., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. (2001). Situation-specific assessment of sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 120-131.
- Murray, B. (1998). Psychology's voice in sexual harassment law. *American Psychological*
- O'Leary-Kelly, A.M., Bowes-Sperry, L., Arens Bates, C., & Lean, E.R. (2009). Sexual Harassment at Work: A Decade (Plus) of Progress. *Journal of Management, 35*, 503-536
- Oullette, J.A., & Wood, W. (1998). Habit and intention in everyday life: The multiple processes by which past behavior predicts future behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*, 54-74.
- Pascoe, E., & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*, 531-554.
- Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*, 126-138.
- Raver, J. L. & Nishii, L.H. (2010). Once, twice, three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and general workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 236-254.
- Reynolds, M. (2016). Statement of Michael Reynolds, Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, before the house committee on oversight and government reform, on the National Park Service response to incidents of employee misconduct. Retrieved from <https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Reynolds-Statement-NPS-9-22.pdf>.
- Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D. H., & Sackett, P. R. 2001. A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 914-922.
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A.B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook for essential theory and research* (pp. 10-24). New York. Psychology Press.

- Schneider, K. T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 401-415.
- Severt, J., & Estrada, A. (2016, August). *Validating an inclusion scale for use in military contexts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association in Denver, CO.
- Sojo, V. E., Wood, R. E., & Genat, A. E. (2016). Harmful workplace experiences and women's occupational well-being: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 40*, 10-40.
- Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 178–190.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. (2016a). *Investigative report of the misconduct at the Grand Canyon River District*. Washington, DC. Office of the Inspector General. Retrieved from <https://www.doioig.gov/reports/investigative-report-misconduct-grand-canyon-river-district>.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. (2016b). *Investigative report of sexual misconduct by chief ranger at the Canaveral National Seashore*. Washington, DC. Office of the Inspector General. Retrieved from https://www.doioig.gov/sites/doioig.gov/files/SexualMisconduct_ChiefRanger_CanaveraINationalSeashore_Public.pdf.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2015). *Federal employee viewpoint survey results: National Park Service*. Washington DC. Author.
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2016). *Federal employee viewpoint survey Governmentwide management report*. Washington DC. Author. Retrieved from https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2016FILES/2016_FEVS_Gwide_Final_Report.PDF
- Willness, C.R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 127-162.

Appendix A Glossary of Terms

Glossary of Terms

Attempted sex – A specific behavior within the measure of sexual assault related behaviors defined in the question as an intentional sexual contact against one’s will or without one’s consent asking “Attempted to make you have sexual intercourse, but was not successful?” and/or “Attempted to make you perform or receive oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object, but was not successful?” May or may not be accompanied by sexual touching.

Behaviors – In the context of the survey, behaviors are actions, physical or verbal, experienced by the person answering the survey question. Behaviors are specific to the person answering the survey questions and not behaviors observed between two other people (with the exception of bystander harassment experiences).

Bystander harassment experiences – A scale/construct in the survey measuring how often someone witnessed a situation where another employee was harassed or discriminated based on their age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status or condition, and sex/gender in the past 12 months. Does not include personal experiences of harassment or imply any form of group harassment against the person responding to the survey.

CFI Group – CFI Group measures customer, citizen, and employee satisfaction using its patented, cause-and-effect methodology that is recognized for its superior precision, diagnostic approach, and linkage to financial results. CFI Group holds a blanket purchase agreement (BPA) with FCG.

Completed sex – A specific behavior within the measure of sexual assault related behaviors defined in the question as an intentional sexual contact against one’s will or without one’s consent asking “Made you have sexual intercourse?” and/or “Made you perform or receive oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object?” Maybe or may not be accompanied by sexual touching or attempted sex.

Concessioner – A person or entity who operates a business within federal premises, usually as the only seller of certain goods or services.

Contractor – A person or entity who contracts with the federal government to provide services, supplies, or other work.

Coworker – Individuals who one works with at the same or adjacent pay grade level.

Crude and offensive behavior – A scale/construct in the survey measuring experiences with verbal/nonverbal behaviors of a sexual nature that were offensive or embarrassing to the person experiencing them (e.g., “repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?”).

Demographic characteristics – Variables measuring employees’ age, sex, level of education, racial/ethnic background, and relationship status.

Disability – A physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such individual; a record of such an impairment; or being regarded as having such an impairment (Source: The Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. 12102).

Documented disability – A disability on record with the Bureau/Office Human Resources (HR) function.

DOI – Department of the Interior

Duties – In the context of the survey, “duties” refers to activities employees perform on a regular basis as part of their job. These are activities they are expected to perform and have been established by their supervisor and job description.

Effect size – A statistical annotation of the size of a difference between two or more groups. Annotations of statistical significance of means or proportions among groups are indicators of the probability that any differences would occur by chance – effect size is a measure of the magnitude of those differences.

Employee – An individual appointed in the civil service, does not include contractors, non-paid interns, or volunteers.

Estimated population – Proportions and means calculated with statistical weighting techniques to represent values in the population (i.e., takes into account differential response rates by groups within the population) and has an associated margin of error.

Experience rate – The estimated percentage of people in the workforce who experienced a form of harassing and/or assault related behaviors (e.g., how many people experienced something one or more times).

FCG – The Federal Consulting Group (FCG) collaborates with government organizations to effectively track the metrics and develop strategies to measure customer and employee satisfaction, communications initiatives, performance improvement strategies, and internal strategic planning results. As a government organization, FCG partners with federal agencies via an interagency agreement.

Gender context – A scale/construct in the survey measuring gender mix of employees’ coworkers, leaders, and individuals in their occupation or career field.

Gender harassment – A scale/construct in the survey measuring verbal/nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, offensive, or condescending attitudes based on the sex of the person experiencing them (e.g., “put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?”).

General intolerance for harassment – A scale/construct in the survey measuring perceived climate for harassment within one’s work unit (e.g., “At your current work unit, it would be very risky to file a harassment complaint”).

GS – The General Schedule, a Federal Government pay scale typically used for salaried employees.

Item/subitem – Individual questions or choices within a survey question.

Job engagement – A scale/construct in the survey measuring employees’ engagement with their job (e.g., “I am immersed in my work”).

Job outcomes – Scales/constructs measuring perceptions about employees’ job satisfaction, job engagement, and commitment to their organization.

Job satisfaction – A scale/construct in the survey measuring employees’ satisfaction with various facets of their jobs (e.g., security, promotion opportunities, coworkers, job as a whole).

Logistic regression – A statistical approach analogous to linear regression for modeling the relationship between a categorical dependent variable and one or more continuous independent variables.

Leadership intolerance for harassment – A scale/construct in the survey measuring perceived intolerance for harassment within one’s work unit (e.g., “Do your team leaders, supervisors, and/or managers tolerate harassment?”).

Linear regression – A statistical approach for modeling the relationship between a continuous dependent variable and one or more continuous independent variables.

Manager – Those in management positions who typically supervise one or more supervisors.

Median – A value or quantity lying at the midpoint of a frequency distribution of values or quantities (i.e., half of the response choices fall above the median and half fall below it).

Mode – The number which appears most often in a set of numbers (i.e., the most frequently selected response choice).

MoE/Margin of error – A confidence interval around an estimated value (i.e., the precision of the estimate and the confidence interval coincides with how confident one is that the interval contains the true population value being estimated).

NPS – National Park Service

NA/Not applicable/Not available – “NA” has two uses. First, “NA” stands for “Not available” when information, such as demographic data from DOI Human Resources, was not available. Second, “NA” stands for “Not Applicable” in situations where a result does not apply.

NR/Not Reportable – “NR” indicates that a result is not reportable due to low reliability of the estimate; a caution that a result is not stable and reliable enough to be interpreted and could be misleading if it were displayed.

Occupational characteristics – Variables measuring employees’ pay grade, tenure in the organization, employment classification, and type of work unit.

One behavior or experience – A survey technique using a series of follow-up questions to examine situational characteristics of harassing and assault experiences, such as location and duration, characteristics of the offender(s), and actions taken in response to the situation (such as reporting and subsequent experiences).

Organizational characteristics – Variables measuring employees’ levels of supervisor support, perceptions of trust, political dynamics and inclusion within the unit, bystander experiences with harassment and/or assault behaviors, perceptions of both general and leaders’ intolerance of harassing and/or assault behaviors, and gender context.

Organizational commitment – A scale/construct in the survey measuring employees’ identification, involvement, and emotional attachment to the work unit (e.g., “I would be very happy to remain with this organization for the rest of my career”).

Organizational inclusion – A scale/construct in the survey measuring perceived inclusion within one’s work unit (e.g., “Members of my work unit value each other’s perspective and contribution”).

Organizational intolerance for harassment – A scale/construct in the survey measuring perceived intolerance for harassment within one’s work unit (e.g., “Harassment is not tolerated in my work unit”).

Organization politics – A scale/construct in the survey measuring perceived pressure to conform to organizational norms (e.g., “Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in my work unit”).

Organizational trust – A scale/construct in the survey measuring perceived trust in one’s work unit (e.g., “I feel my work unit will keep its word”).

Partner – A person, volunteer, or entity who has some degree of involvement with the mission of DOI Bureaus/Offices through agreement or memorandum of understanding.

Permanent employee – An employee hired without time limitations.

Scale – A series of questions (items/subitems) on a related topic; typically, a single score is calculated for a scale and specific results for items/subitems are not reported.

Seasonal employment – A work schedule with annually recurring periods of work of less than 12 months.

Sexual assault related behaviors – A scale/construct in the survey measuring five behaviors related to sexual assault (e.g., “Sexually touched you,” “Attempted to have sexual intercourse”). The five behaviors are indicative of sexual assault but do not constitute a legal definition.

Sexual coercion – A scale/construct in the survey measuring instances of specific treatment or favoritism conditioned on sexual cooperation (e.g., “Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?”).

Sexual harassment – A scale/construct in the survey measuring three general categories of sexually harassing behaviors: crude or offensive behaviors, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Experiences of sexual harassment were conditional on the person perceiving the behaviors to be harassing.

Sexual minority – Items in the survey assessing the sexual orientation of the survey respondent which included: heterosexual or straight; lesbian; gay; bisexual; other (e.g. questioning, asexual, undecided, self-identified, or intersex); and prefer not to say.

Sexual touching – A specific behavior within the measure of sexual assault related behaviors defined in the question as an intentional sexual contact against one’s will or without one’s consent asking “Sexually touched you (e.g., intentional touching of genitalia, breasts, or buttocks) or made you sexually touch him/her?”

Supervisor – First-line supervisors are typically responsible for employees’ performance appraisals and leave approval.

Supervisor support – A scale/construct in the survey measuring perceived supervisor support (e.g., “The supervisor of your work unit cares about your opinions”).

Senior Leader – The heads of departments/agencies and their immediate leadership team, responsible for directing the policies of DOI Bureaus/Offices. May hold either a political or career appointment, and typically a member of the Senior Executive Service or equivalent.

Team Lead – Team leaders are not official supervisors; those who provide employees with day-to-day guidance in work projects, but do not have supervisory responsibilities or conduct performance appraisals.

Temporary employee – An employee who is appointed for less than one year.

Term employee – An employee who is appointed for no less than one year but not to exceed four years.

Unwanted sexual attention – A scale/construct in the survey measuring unwanted attempts to establish a sexual relationship (e.g., “Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle or kiss you?”)

Weighting – A statistical technique to estimate results as though all employees completed a survey, reflecting population estimates and reducing non-response bias.

WES – Work Environment Survey

WG – The Wage Grade, a Federal Government pay scale typically used for employees paid on an hourly basis.

Workplace – Any location where one typically performs his or her job duties; distinguished from locations where one engages in personal, non-job-related activities.

Work unit – A unit or team of employees that have been assigned to accomplish specific tasks.

Appendix B Survey Communications

DOI Survey Announcement (Example)

Sent By: Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Indian Education, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Interior Business Center, National Park Service, Office of Inspector General, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Office of the Special Trustee, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Office of the Solicitor, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Sent: Prior to the survey launch on 01/09/2017

Subject Line: Notice of Upcoming Work Environment Survey

During the week of January 9, all [BUREAU/OFFICE] employees will receive an invitation to participate in a Work Environment Survey, which is designed to assess the prevalence of harassment in the Department of the Interior's workforce and the environment in which harassment occurs.

This survey is being conducted, in large part, in response to work conducted by the OIG, investigating sexual harassment and other misconduct in the Department.

The survey is being sponsored and funded by the Department, but will be conducted by a third-party survey expert, CFI Group, to ensure the process is objective. [BUREAU/OFFICE] employees will receive an email invitation from GovDelivery, a FEDRamp-certified organization, on behalf of CFI Group and the [BUREAU/OFFICE].

The invitation will include instructions for taking the survey online, as well as how to request a paper copy of the survey if that is more convenient for you. If you request a paper copy of the survey, it should be because you intend on taking the paper survey versus having a copy for your records.

Participation is optional and you will be free to discontinue your participation at any time. Additionally, your responses will remain completely confidential and anonymous and at no time will your responses be linked back to you or result in any formal complaint related to experiences you share.

The Department and the [BUREAU/OFFICE] are committed to providing a safe and productive workplace. Your participation in this survey will assist us in that commitment, and it will serve as yet another opportunity for [BUREAU/OFFICE] employees to demonstrate their leadership in participation in such efforts.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact [NAME] or me, directly.

DOI WES Survey Invitation Email

Sent: 01/09/2017 and 01/10/2017

From: GovDelivery, on behalf of CFI Group and the [BUREAU/OFFICE]

From Address: CFIGroup@public.govdelivery.com

Subject Line: The [BUREAU/OFFICE] Work Environment Survey



I am inviting you on behalf of the [BUREAU/OFFICE] leadership and the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the Work Environment Survey, which is designed to assess the prevalence of harassment in our workforce and the environment within which harassment occurs. The survey is being conducted by our third-party survey expert, CFI Group, to ensure the process is objective and professional.

Please be informed that participation in the survey is completely optional. Additionally, your responses to survey questions will remain completely confidential and anonymous. Responses will not be linked back to any individual at any time.

We are committed to eliminating harassment in your workplace and making it the safest, most productive work environment possible. To that end we need your input to understand the breadth of the problem and develop potential solutions. Issues like harassment affect everyone, either directly or indirectly, so everyone has valuable input if you are willing to share it. Your perspective is critical to this endeavor.

To take the survey, please click on the link below.

Answer the survey

The survey is mobile compatible, Section 508 compliant, and works with screen readers. This survey can be forwarded to your personal email account if you would like to take the survey at home or on your personal computer or mobile device. On the first page of the survey you will have the option of choosing whether to take the survey in English or Spanish.

Please be advised that if you need to pause the survey at any point, clicking on the link above will return you to where you left off. If you are taking the survey on a public computer, close the internet browser if you step away from the computer at any point.

If you prefer to take the survey on paper, please click [here](#) or call [PHONE] and leave a message to request a copy be mailed to you.

If you require technical assistance, you may contact CFI Group at [EMAIL] or leave a message at [PHONE] with a brief description of your question and your call will be returned as quickly as possible.

This survey will close on February 15, 2017.

Thank you in advance of your participation.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE]

[TITLE], [OFFICE]

DOI WES Survey Reminder Emails

Sent: 01/17/2017 and 01/24/2017

From: GovDelivery, on behalf of CFI Group and the [BUREAU/OFFICE]

From Address: CFIGroup@public.govdelivery.com

Subject Line: The [BUREAU/OFFICE] Work Environment Survey - Reminder



This is a friendly reminder to a survey invitation sent to you previously. If you have already completed the survey, we thank you for your participation. You can ignore this email and any future reminders.

If you have not yet completed the survey, I remind you that the Department of the Interior and the [BUREAU/OFFICE] are committed to eliminating harassment in our workplaces and creating the safest, most productive work environment possible. To help us achieve this, your input into the breadth of the problem is critical.

To take the survey, please click on the link below.

Answer the survey

Please be advised that your window of opportunity to participate is getting shorter, as it is closing on February 15, 2017.

The survey is mobile compatible, Section 508 compliant, and works with screen readers. This survey can be forwarded to your personal email account if you would like to take the survey at home or on your personal computer or mobile device. On the first page of the survey you will have the option of choosing whether to take the survey in English or Spanish.

Please be advised that if you need to pause the survey at any point, clicking on the link above will return you to where you left off. If you are taking the survey on a public computer, close the internet browser if you step away from the computer at any point.

If you prefer to take the survey on paper, please click [here](#) or call [PHONE] and leave a message to request a copy be mailed to you.

If you require technical assistance, you may contact CFI Group at [EMAIL] or leave a message at [PHONE] with a brief description of your question and your call will be returned as quickly as possible.

Thank you in advance of your participation.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE]

[TITLE], [OFFICE]

DOI WES Survey First Final Reminder Email

Sent: 01/31/2017

From: GovDelivery, on behalf of CFI Group and the [BUREAU/OFFICE]

From Address: CFIGroup@public.govdelivery.com

Subject Line: The [BUREAU/OFFICE] Work Environment Survey – Final Reminder



This is a final reminder to a survey invitation sent to you previously. If you have already completed the survey, we thank you for your participation.

If you have not yet completed the survey, I remind you that the Department of the Interior and the [BUREAU/OFFICE] are committed to eliminating harassment in our workplaces and creating the safest, most productive work environment possible. To help us achieve this, your input into the breadth of the problem is critical.

To take the survey, please click on the link below.

Answer the survey

Please be advised that this is your final opportunity to participate in the survey, as it is closing on February 15, 2017.

The survey is mobile compatible, Section 508 compliant, and works with screen readers. This survey can be forwarded to your personal email account if you would like to take the survey at home or on your personal computer or mobile device. On the first page of the survey you will have the option of choosing whether to take the survey in English or Spanish.

Please be advised that if you need to pause the survey at any point, clicking on the link above will return you to where you left off. If you are taking the survey on a public computer, close the internet browser if you step away from the computer at any point.

If you prefer to take the survey on paper, please click [here](#) or call [PHONE] and leave a message to request a copy be mailed to you.

If you require technical assistance, you may contact CFI Group at [EMAIL] or leave a message at [PHONE] with a brief description of your question and your call will be returned as quickly as possible.

Thank you in advance of your participation.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE]

[TITLE], [OFFICE]

DOI WES Survey First Additional Reminder Email

Sent: 02/16/2017

From: GovDelivery, on behalf of CFI Group and the [BUREAU/OFFICE]

From Address: CFIGroup@public.govdelivery.com

Subject Line: The [BUREAU/OFFICE] Work Environment Survey – Extended Through March 5, 2017

The logo for CFI Group, featuring the letters "CFI" in a white box followed by the word "Group" in a white sans-serif font.The logo for GOVDELIVERY, featuring the word "GOVDELIVERY" in a white sans-serif font with a white envelope icon to the right.

The Work Environment Survey is being administered to all bureaus within the Department of the Interior. To ensure all Department of the Interior employees have an adequate amount of time to participate in the Work Environment Survey the last day to complete the survey has been extended to March 5, 2017.

If you have already completed the survey, I thank you for your participation. If you have not yet completed the survey, I remind you that the Department of the Interior and the [BUREAU/OFFICE] are committed to eliminating harassment in our workplaces and creating the safest, most productive work environment possible. To help us achieve this, your input into the breadth of the problem is critical.

To take the survey, please click on the link below.

Answer the survey

Please be advised that your window of opportunity to participate closes on March 5, 2017.

The survey is mobile compatible, Section 508 compliant, and works with screen readers. This survey can be forwarded to your personal email account if you would like

to take the survey at home or on your personal computer or mobile device. Each survey link is unique to help prevent employees from taking the survey more than once. Therefore, the link cannot be shared with others. On the first page of the survey you will have the option of choosing whether to take the survey in English or Spanish.

Please be advised that if you need to pause the survey at any point, clicking on the link above will return you to where you left off. If you are taking the survey on a public computer, close the internet browser if you step away from the computer at any point.

If you prefer to take the survey on paper, please click [here](#) or call [PHONE] and leave a message to request a copy be mailed to you. The last day to request a paper copy of the survey is February 20, 2017. In order for your completed paper survey to be included in the survey results it must be mailed back to CFI Group by March 4, 2017 (postage date no later than 3/4/2017).

If you require technical assistance, you may contact CFI Group at [EMAIL] or leave a message at [PHONE] with a brief description of your question and your call will be returned as quickly as possible.

Thank you in advance of your participation.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE]

[TITLE], [OFFICE]

DOI WES Survey Second Additional Reminder Email

Sent: 02/23/2017

From: GovDelivery, on behalf of CFI Group and the [BUREAU/OFFICE]

From Address: CFIGroup@public.govdelivery.com

Subject Line: The [BUREAU/OFFICE] Work Environment Survey – Extended Through March 5, 2017

The logo for CFI Group, featuring the letters "CFI" in a white box followed by the word "Group" in a white sans-serif font.The logo for GOVDELIVERY, featuring the word "GOVDELIVERY" in a white sans-serif font with a white envelope icon to the right.

This is the final reminder to the survey invitations sent to you previously. If you have already completed the survey, I thank you for your participation. If you have not yet completed the survey, I remind you that the Department of the Interior and the [BUREAU/OFFICE] are committed to eliminating harassment in our workplaces and creating the safest, most productive work environment possible. To help us achieve this, your input into the breadth of the problem is critical.

To take the survey, please click on the link below.

Answer the survey

Please be advised that this is your final opportunity to participate in the survey, as it is closing on March 5, 2017.

The survey is mobile compatible, Section 508 compliant, and works with screen readers. This survey can be forwarded to your personal email account if you would like to take the survey at home or on your personal computer or mobile device. Each survey link is unique to help prevent employees from taking the survey more than

once. Therefore, the link cannot be shared with others. On the first page of the survey you will have the option of choosing whether to take the survey in English or Spanish.

Please be advised that if you need to pause the survey at any point, clicking on the link above will return you to where you left off. If you are taking the survey on a public computer, close the internet browser if you step away from the computer at any point.

The deadline for requesting a paper copy of the survey has passed. If you already requested a paper copy of the survey, in order for your completed paper survey to be included in the survey results it must be mailed back to CFI Group by March 4, 2017 (postage date no later than 3/4/2017).

If you require technical assistance, you may contact CFI Group at [EMAIL] or leave a message at [PHONE] with a brief description of your question and your call will be returned as quickly as possible.

Thank you in advance of your participation.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE]

[TITLE], [OFFICE]

Appendix C Survey Methodology

Methodology for the Work Environment Survey

This appendix documents the methodology for the Work Environment Survey (WES) performed at the request of the Department of Interior (DOI) in 2017. The WES was designed to assess employee attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors on a wide range of topics related to the *character* – extent of harassment and/or assault behaviors, *context* – situational characteristics involving specific behaviors or set of experiences that significantly affected individuals, *correlates* – demographic, occupational, and organizational factors associated with harassment and/or assault behaviors, and *consequences* – influence of harassment and/or assault behaviors on satisfaction and engagement at work, and commitment to the organization – of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced by employees within the work environment.

This appendix is organized into several sections. The first section provides a brief overview of the survey development process to include the identification of topics, delineation of content, and formatting and structural layout of all measures incorporated into the WES. The second section describes data collection procedures to include the sampling of employees, survey administration procedures, safeguarding and protection of data, and quality assurance steps taken to preserve the integrity of the data. The third section describes procedures used for weighting survey responses to estimate population parameters of the workforce. The fourth section describes analytical procedures used to test the statistical significance of results to include descriptive and inferential statistical analyses performed on the survey data. The final section provides a detailed description of all measures included in the WES.

C.1 Development of Survey

Over the course of several meetings with organizational members, our team collaborated to establish topics and constructs to inform the development, content, and structure of the WES. As part of these efforts, our team reviewed surveys used with employees (e.g., Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS); U.S. Office of Personnel Management (USOPM), 2016) and publicly available research, studies, and investigative reports pertinent to the topic of harassment within the workforce (e.g., Lighthouse Associates, 1999, 2000; U.S. Department of the Interior, 2016a, 2016b). Additionally, we consulted relevant literature on job-related attitudes and behaviors; group, and organizational dynamics; and equity and diversity issues within work organizations to identify additional topics (e.g., Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Chan, Lam, Chow, & Cheung, 2008; Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997; Hershcovis, & Barling, 2010; Krieger et al., 2005; Lapierre, Spector, & Leck, 2005; Mazzeo, Bergman, Buchanan, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 2001; O'Leary-Kelly, Bowes-Sperry, Arens Bates, & Lean, 2009; Pascoe, & Smart Richman, 2009; Pina, Gannon, & Saunders 2009; Raver & Nishii, 2010; Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997; Sojo, Wood, & Genat, 2016; Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). Based on our review of the literature, and in consultation with organizational members, we refined the list of topics, constructs and specific content to develop a conceptual framework for the WES (see Figure C.1).




Figure C.1 Conceptual Framework

As shown in Figure C.1, the WES included measures of employee demographic characteristics, occupational characteristics, and organizational factors associated with harassing and/or assault related behaviors; various forms of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced in the past 12 months; job-related outcomes and other factors involving situational characteristics associated with these types of experiences. Demographic factors included variables measuring employees' age, sex, level of education, racial/ethnic background, and relationship status. Occupational factors included variables measuring employees' pay grade, tenure in the organization, employment classification, and type of work unit. Organizational factors included variables measuring employees' levels of supervisor support, perceptions of trust, political dynamics and inclusion within the unit, bystander experiences with harassment and/or assault behaviors, perceptions of both general and leaders' intolerance of harassing and/or assault behaviors, and gender context. Measures of workplace harassment included variables measuring harassment based on age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status, sexual orientation, as well as, gender and sexual harassment, and sexual assault related behaviors. Job outcomes included variables measuring job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment. Other factors included variables measuring experiences of harassment prior to the past 12 months, situational characteristics associated with specific behaviors or set of experiences, reporting behaviors and outcomes, and questions concerning bystander intervention behaviors.

The WES was structured to include two preliminary questions assessing respondent' employment classification and their work schedule to appropriately frame certain questions within the survey. The remaining questions were structured into six sections, organized to minimize response burden and optimize survey completion.

Table C.1 Description of Survey Constructs with Sample Items

<i>Survey Section</i>	<i>Construct</i>	<i>Sample Item</i>
Part I Your Perceptions About Your Job	• Job Satisfaction	• How satisfied are you with your job?
	• Job Engagement	• I am immersed in my work.
	• Organizational Commitment	• I would be happy to spend the rest of my career in my work unit.
	• Organizational Politics	• It is best not to rock the boat in my work unit.
	• Organizational Trust	• I feel my work unit will keep its word.
	• Supervisor Support	• My supervisor cares about my opinions.
	• Organizational Inclusion	• Members of my current work unit feel accepted by other members.
Part II Work Related Experiences	• Harassment based on my age, race/ethnicity, religious beliefs, disability status, sexual orientation	• How often did you hear negative comments or remarks based on your...
	• Sexual Harassment	• How often did someone at work tell offensive sexual stories or jokes?
	• Gender Harassment	• How often did someone at work make offensive, sexist remarks?
	• Sexual Assault Related Behaviors	• How often did you experience any intentional sexual contacts that were against your will?
Part III One Behavior/ Experience with the Greatest Effect	• Specific Behavior or Experience with Greatest Effect	• Was the type of behavior or experience based on your: age; race or ethnicity; religious beliefs; disability status or condition; sexual orientation; sex/gender; When and where did it occur? Who did it? Did you report it?
Part IV Organizational Policies & Procedures	• General Intolerance for Harassment	• At your current work unit, it would be very risky to file a harassment complaint.
	• Leadership Intolerance for Harassment	• Do the persons below tolerate harassment?
	• Bystander Harassment	• How often have you witnessed another employee being harassed?
	• Bystander Intervention	• What actions did you take if you witnessed another employee being harassed?
	• Resource Utilization	• Which resources would you use if you were to make an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about a harassment experience?

Table C.1 Continued

<i>Survey Section</i>	<i>Construct</i>	<i>Sample Item</i>
Part V Demographic & Occupational Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographic and Occupational Characteristics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age, Marital Status, Ethnicity, Race, Sexual Orientation, Education, Tenure, Pay Grade, Supervisory Status, Work Location, Gender Context.

Table C.1 displays the sections of the survey, key constructs, and sample items for each of the measures included in the survey. A copy of the survey instrument is included in Appendix D of the Technical Report for DOI. As shown in Table C.1, the survey was structured into five parts. *Part I* included items assessing employees' perceptions about their job, including satisfaction and engagement with the job, commitment to the work unit, political dynamics and trust within the work unit, as well as support from supervisors and inclusion within the work unit. *Part II* included items assessing employees' experiences with harassing and/or assault behavior based on their age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, gender and sexual harassment, and sexual assault related behaviors that occurred during and before the past 12 months. This section also included a follow-up question to assess the pay grade at which each of the forms of harassment was experienced for the first time. *Part III* included items assessing a variety of situational characteristics surrounding a specific harassing and/or assault behavior or set of experiences (e.g., time, location, frequency, and duration of the experience; sex, age, and employment status of the person[s] involved); reporting behaviors and outcomes; and items assessing the impact of these experiences on interpersonal relationships, physical or emotional well-being, job performance, and willingness to remain part of the organization. Responses to this section of the survey were purposely focused on a single experience or set of related experiences to minimize response burden and optimize survey completion.⁴¹ *Part IV* included items assessing employees' perceptions of both the general and leaders' intolerance of harassment in the work unit, bystander experiences with harassing and/or assault behaviors, bystander responses to bystander harassing and/or assault experiences, and items assessing future use of resources. *Part V* included items assessing employees' demographic and occupational characteristics to include age, relationship status, racial/ethnic background, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability status, education, tenure, pay grade, supervisory status, type of work location, and gender context of their current work unit and career field.

⁴¹ We recognize that people may have experienced more than one type of harassing and/or assault behavior in the past 12 months. However, to ask about each specific form of harassment and/or assault experience would have added substantial content to an already lengthy survey. Hence, we made a compromise to focus on a specific behavior or experience that had the greatest effect on the person responding to the survey and asked them to respond to all subsequent questions to this section in terms of the specific form of harassment and/or assault experience that had the greatest effect on their personal and professional life. Following the same approach, we also included a single question to ask about harassing and/or assault behaviors related to the respondents' sex and/or gender (e.g., gender harassment, sexual harassment, sexual assault related behaviors) because asking about experiences for each of the sex/gender related experiences would have required repetition of the individual behaviors specific to gender harassment, sexual harassment, and sexual assault related behaviors, thus adding considerable length to the survey.

C.2 Data Collection Procedures

C.2.1 Sampling Approach

The WES was a census-based survey that was fielded from January 9, 2017 to March 5, 2017. All active employees were eligible to participate. Table C.2 documents sampling statistics for the WES.

Table C.2 DOI WES Sampling Statistics

	DOI
Total Sample	61,020
Delivered Invitations/Surveys	61,010
Submitted Surveys	28,203
Participation Rate	46.2%
Completed Surveys	27,200
Response Rate	44.6%

As of December 10, 2016, the population of DOI employees included a total of 61,020 individuals. Of these, 61,010 individuals had valid email and/or postal addresses and were sent an electronic invitation or paper copy of the survey. A total of 28,203 surveys were submitted electronically and/or by postal delivery at the end of the survey period (i.e., March 5, 2017), yielding a participation rate of 46.2%.⁴²

Upon screening of the data, we eliminated data from 1,003 surveys because they did not meet criteria for inclusion, leaving a total of 27,200 completed questionnaires, yielding an adjusted response rate of 44.6%.⁴³ The 2016 American Association of Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) RR1 standard was used to calculate WES response rates (<https://www.aapor.org/>).

Each submitted survey had to be associated with a unique survey identifier, include responses to items assessing respondents' gender identity, responses to at least one item from the sexual harassment questions, responses to 50% of the core variables and those responses had to have variability associated with reverse coded items distributed throughout the survey. Each of these criteria are elaborated in the coming sections.

⁴² Five follow-up emails were sent to all employees throughout the survey period. Each email thanked individuals who had responded to the survey and reminded others to complete the survey if they had not already done so. Response rates were tracked after each follow-up and at survey closing on March 5, 2017. We found no systematic evidence of differential participation among employees throughout the survey period. The fifth and final follow-up yielded only an additional 1.75% increase in participation rate.

⁴³ While all employees were invited to participate, less than 10% of those in the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) chose to do so. The low BIE response rate resulted in too few cases for inclusion in the analyses due to unreliability of the estimates.

Unique Survey Identifier – Each survey had to be associated with a valid survey identifier that could not be linked to more than one submitted survey. If an individual submitted both an electronic and paper survey, we relied on their electronic responses and discarded paper responses.

Responses to Gender Identity and Gender/Sexual Harassment Questions – Each survey had to include responses to an item assessing employees’ gender identity (see item 60 in survey instrument) and to at least one item in either the gender or sexual harassment questions (see items 25a-q in survey instrument).

Responses to Core Variables – Each survey had to include responses to at least 50% of non-skip questions which were distributed throughout the survey. These items were embedded within the measure of job satisfaction and job engagement (see items 3a-j and 4a-i, respectively in survey instrument); commitment to the work unit (see items 5a-f in survey instrument); political dynamics and trust within the work unit (see items 6a-g and 7a-g, respectively in survey instrument); supervisor support (see items 8a-d in survey instrument); inclusion within the work unit (see items 9a-e in survey instrument); general intolerance of harassment (see items 51a-k in survey instrument); leadership intolerance of harassment (see items 52b-d in survey instrument); and bystander harassment (see items 53a-f in survey instrument).

No Variance – Any case where a response pattern did not vary for reverse coded item(s) was excluded from the analytical database. Items with neutral response alternatives, (e.g., *neither agree nor disagree*) were not considered for this criterion. Reverse coded items were distributed throughout the survey within the measures of political dynamics and trust within the work unit (see items 6a and 6b, and 7a, 7b, 7e, and 7g, respectively in the survey instrument); supervisor support (see item 8d in the survey instrument); and general intolerance for harassment (see items 51a, 51b, 51f, and 51g in the survey instrument). Cases were only considered to have “no variable” if the response pattern did not vary for each individual question block with reverse coded items.

C.2.2 Survey Data Collection Approach

The WES was made available to all active employees online via a secured website or upon request in paper format. Three independent organizations provided support in the administration of the WES. GovDelivery handled all email addresses and managed the distribution of electronic invites to all employees. GovDelivery was selected because it is FedRAMP authorized by the Joint Accreditation Board, assuring that secure protection of employee contact information would be achieved and that individual contact information could not be associated with any survey responses. This procedure allowed the team to address confidentiality safeguards and ensure anonymity for all employees. CASO Document Management handled all postal addresses and managed the distribution and collection, and scanning of all paper surveys. Scanned copies of all submitted surveys were transferred to CFI

Group via secure FTP for data processing. CASO Document Management was selected because they are Service Organization Controls (SOC) II compliant allowing them to maintain a secure, independent network of client and survey data. At no point were postal addresses, which were provided to CASO by the Department of the Interior, uploaded to a system/computer connected to the internet. Postal addresses were sent to CASO via postal mail on an encrypted disk. Qualtrics provided electronic survey platforms for CFI Group to administer and collect data from the online survey. Qualtrics was selected because their servers are protected by high-end firewall systems, with scans performed regularly to ensure that any vulnerabilities found can be addressed quickly. Qualtrics services also have quick failover points and redundant hardware, with complete backups performed nightly. University Translator Services created Spanish translations of the WES. The online version of the WES was designed to comply with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

All employees with a government issued email address on file received an emailed invitation from GovDelivery that contained an authenticated, single-submission, web-link to enable access to the WES posted on CFI Group's secure servers. A small group of employees without an email address in the DOI database were mailed paper surveys to their work address. Prior to the official launch of the survey, a "soft launch" was executed on January 9, 2017. GovDelivery sent electronic invitations to two percent of employees to ensure that links could be successfully opened, that surveys were able to be completed via the online secure link, and that survey responses were consistent with the design of the survey. On January 10, 2017, GovDelivery sent electronic invitations to all remaining employees to execute the official launch of the survey. GovDelivery also sent three follow-up email reminders after the initial email invites were sent. Follow-up emails thanked employees for completing the survey and reminded other employees to complete the survey if they had not yet done so. On February 14, 2017, a decision was made to extend the field date by two and a half weeks (18 days) to allow more time for employees to participate in the survey. GovDelivery sent an additional two email reminders to all employees alerting them to the additional time available to complete the survey.⁴⁴ The survey closed on March 5, 2017.

Employees had the option of requesting a paper copy of the survey be mailed to them by filling out an online form or calling a toll-free number. Both means of requesting a paper survey were made available in the email invitation and reminder messages. Paper survey requests were processed and mailed directly to individual employees throughout the survey period by CASO Document Management.

⁴⁴ Participation rates were calculated several days following each follow-up. On January 23, 2017, following the first follow-up (sent January 17, 2017), the participation rate had increased by 9.58% over the first two weeks of fielding. On January 30, 2017, the participation rate increased by 5.81% following the second follow-up (sent January 24, 2017). On February 15, 2017, the participation rate increased by 5.16% following the third follow-up (sent January 31, 2017). On February 22, 2017, the participation rate increased by 1.78% following the fourth follow-up (sent February 16, 2017). On March 6, 2017, the participation rate increased by 1.75% following the fifth and final follow-up (sent February 23, 2017).

C.2.3 Data Processing

Test data were generated prior to the execution of the official launch of the survey. Test data were compared against the finalized questionnaire to ensure all questions and answers could be accounted for. Test data were also used to define metadata, implement skip logic, ensure re-scaling requirements were met, and variables were computed for segmentation. Once the official launch was executed, interim data were downloaded and used to finalize data preparation procedures in advance of the survey closing. Upon survey closure, a final dataset was downloaded, cleaned, cross-checked, verified to specification and screened prior to analyses. Data cleaning included quality assurance steps to ensure data had been properly specified and coded in the survey database. This step included finalizing sample disposition codes and establishing rules for treatment of missing data. Two independent research teams prepared and processed data in parallel and compared results. Syntax and analytic coding was reviewed by separate data analysts prior to final data processing. Cross-checking of data from the paper survey included steps for inspecting responses, coding them into the database, and validating each of these entries. Data screening addressed inconsistencies in response patterns and involved examination of item-level characteristics for both online and paper collected survey data. An aggregate data file was created by merging online and paper collected datasets to verify for accuracy of data entry and merging.

An additional step in data processing addressed illogical responses to questions. In the online version of the survey, respondents were guided to appropriate follow-on questions through skip logic. In other words, respondents only saw follow-on questions appropriate to a prior response. In the paper survey where skip logic was printed in the survey booklet but not controlled electronically, analysts observed whether responses were logical and inappropriate responses to follow-on questions were set to missing. Similar inspection was made of responses on the paper survey to identify and set to missing situations where a respondent failed to follow instructions, such as selecting multiple responses in a question where only one selection was indicated.

Even though the online survey used skip logic to control the display of questions, there were still instances where a respondent could make an illogical choice. For example, in the survey Part III, One Behavior or Experience with the Greatest Effect, respondents were asked to indicate the primary basis for the experience that had the greatest effect on them. Their choices were behaviors or experiences based on their age, race/ethnicity, religious beliefs, disability status or condition, sexual orientation, sex/gender, or unknown reasons. To be included in the analyses, the selection of the experience in Part III had to be consistent with responses to questions in Part II, Work-Related Experiences. For example, someone may have selected religious beliefs as the basis for their harassment experience of greatest effect in Part III, but did not indicate experiencing that type of harassment in the past 12 months in Part II. In that

situation, their responses to Part III were set to missing. If someone selected “Unknown” in Part III, their responses were retained regardless of the type of harassment they indicated in Part II.

A similar illogical situation could occur If someone in Part V, Demographic and Professional Characteristics, indicated they had been employed by DOI less than one year, yet in Part II they indicated experiencing a form of harassment prior to the past 12 months. In those instances, responses to the questions in Part II regarding experiences prior to the past 12 months were set to missing.

C.2.4 Data Protection

Data collection procedures were designed to ensure the highest level of security and privacy possible for handling employee contact information and survey responses. As noted above, CFI Group obtained support from GovDelivery to distribute invitations and reminders, CASO Document Management to manage distribution and collection of the paper surveys, and Qualtrics to host the online survey. The separation of responsibilities among these companies and CFI Group assured that Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and employee survey responses were compartmentalized, ensuring that employee contact information could not be linked to individual survey responses. Protocols specified procedures for the secure transfer and storage of contact information, secure distribution of surveys, and secure collection and storage of data. Each of these procedures are described in the coming sections.

Secure transfer and storage of contact information – DOI uploaded sample files directly into the GovDelivery Communications Cloud one week before the official launch of the WES. Sample files contained email addresses and bureau/office codes for all active employees. A two-factor authentication process was used to load files securely in the GovDelivery Communications Cloud. Employee contact information was stored securely within the application, protected by redundant firewalls, and highly specialized intrusion detection hardware. The bureau and office code information was used to create bureau/office specific links to the WES the employee would complete.

Secure distribution of surveys – GovDelivery sent electronic invitations containing an authenticated, single-submission-web link to access the survey on CFI Group’s secure servers. Employees could choose to forward the survey invitation to their personal email address if they preferred to take the survey elsewhere. In total, five reminder emails containing the survey link were sent by GovDelivery during the fielding period to all individuals included in the sample file, regardless of whether they had completed the survey. A paper copy of the survey was made available to all employees upon request. CASO Document Management managed the distribution of paper surveys to employees who requested them.

Collection and storage of data – Employee responses to the survey were collected via the authenticated, single-submission web link. Authentication provided a means of encryption that ensured that the respondent was communicating directly with the survey website such that the

contents of the communication could not be read or forged by a third party. Each survey link was valid for only one survey submission and was deactivated once the survey was submitted. Upon submission, completed surveys were downloaded into CFI Group's data warehouse on a secure server. Paper surveys received from respondents were kept by CASO in a locked file, scanned for delivery to CFI Group, and shredded upon completion of data entry. At no point in the process was any of the contact information associated with the survey responses.

In addition to the secure protocols described above, CFI Group also employed procedures to protect respondents' data from indirect disclosure. The separation of the invitation, data collection process, and data analyses prevented any of the organizations supporting this work (i.e., DOI, GovDelivery, Qualtrics, CASO Document Management, and CFI Group) from linking contact information with individual survey responses. Contact information was held by GovDelivery and CASO Document Management, and never associated with the survey data collected via Qualtrics or by CFI Group. Further, CFI Group performed all the data analyses and never had access to any information that could be associated with any employee who provided survey responses with their identity. Any potentially identifying information resulting from the crossing of particular variables was suppressed to prevent any form of disclosure. Also, responses from potentially identifiable groups were suppressed if they failed to meet criteria for inclusion (see inclusion criteria described previously), and any group with fewer than 15 members overall or fewer than five responding to a specific question were excluded from analyses to protect the anonymity of employees from small groups within the workforce.

C.3 Analytical Weighting Procedures

The WES was a census-based survey of the DOI workforce. While all employees were asked to participate in the survey, some were not available during the fielding period (e.g., on extended leave, hospitalized, unable to locate), some submitted incomplete surveys, others started but did not complete the survey, and some declined to participate at the outset. Because unweighted survey results are potentially subject to bias introduced by disproportionate numbers of respondents representing a specific group, the data were weighted to estimate results as though all sampling units (employees) completed a survey, reflecting population estimates and reducing non-response bias. The resulting weighted dataset was used to derive population estimates and their corresponding margin of errors.

Non-response adjustments and non-response weights were derived based on returned surveys (responses) to account for those who did not respond to the survey all together or did not respond to critical items in the survey. To reduce bias unaccounted for by the previous step, non-response weights were post-stratified or scaled up to match certain known population totals for select demographic characteristics (sex [2 levels], and age [6 levels]). Unique weights were applied to each DOI bureau/office and to the overall DOI results.

Rules for presenting results were established at this stage based on the weighted number of responses in an analysis cell and size of the statistical error component. Small cell sizes and/or large standard errors of estimate can lead to unreliable or misleading results. Inspection of the data offered empirical evidence for setting criteria for minimum cell size and maximum acceptable error. If a result did not meet one or both criteria, it was marked as “Not Reportable” and masked. Specific rules for suppressing a result are discussed in Section C.4.2.

Separate analytical weights for the WES were created for each DOI bureau/office and DOI to account for varying response rates among sub-groups within each bureau/office or within DOI. People in different sub-groups may respond in proportions that are not the same as the proportion of the sub-group in the population. For example, younger males with an associate’s degree may respond at a lower rate than older females with a college degree. Therefore, to avoid biasing results in favor of the sub-group that respond in higher proportions, weights were used to bring results in line with population proportions. Base weights took on a value of 1 since the survey was a census. The base weights were then adjusted for nonresponse in two steps. The nonresponse adjusted weights were then poststratified to known population totals to derive the final weights. The coming sections describe procedures used to weight DOI data to include construction of the initial dataset to estimate nonrespondents and to construct the final dataset for weighting. Case dispositions codes and procedures used in the derivation of the nonresponse and poststratification adjustment factors are also described. The last section describes procedures to calculate final weights.

C.3.1 Constructing Nonrespondents and Final Dataset for Weighting

To derive weighting adjustment factors and ultimately final weights, a dataset was created representing both respondents and nonrespondents. Because the survey was anonymous, only survey responses were available with no knowledge about nonrespondents in the returns dataset. Therefore, a dataset of nonrespondents was constructed for each bureau/office as well as for DOI. These datasets were appended to the existing datasets of respondents to come up with a final dataset representing both respondents and nonrespondents used for weighting bureaus/offices and DOI survey data.

For each bureau/office, a nonrespondent dataset was constructed based on demographic information derived from administrative records available from the employee population. Only the selected demographic variables in the nonrespondents dataset were populated and all other variables corresponding to the return dataset were left blank. Since it was anticipated that sex (2 levels: male, female), age (6 levels: 25 years old or under, 26-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 years old or older), race/ethnicity (2 levels: non-minority, minority), and education (4 levels: less than high school/high school/GED, trade/tech certificate/some college, AA/4-year college degree, and graduate degree) would influence survey responses, and since some of these variables did not have any missing information (e.g., sex and age) or a very small percentage of missing information (e.g., race/ethnicity and education) in the data file, these four variables were

used to construct the nonrespondents portion of the dataset to weight by bureau/office and for DOI. The administrative records for the sex and age variables were complete, however, the variables race/ethnicity and education had some missing values. To construct the nonrespondents dataset, the first step was to cross four demographic variables (sex, age, race/ethnicity, and education) to calculate the number and percent of these characteristics within the population for each combination and corresponding levels within each of four variables (sub-group).

For each bureau/office, the nonrespondents dataset construction started with the variable sex where the number and percent of males and females in the population were identified. The difference between the total number of males in the population and total number of males in the returns dataset represented the initial number of male nonrespondents. Similarly, the difference between the total number of females in the population and the total number of females in the returns dataset represented the initial number of female nonrespondents. Because not all respondents answered the gender question, the number of missing values for the sex variable was calculated, and then distributed over the two sex categories (male and female) based on the proportion of males and females in the population. This estimated number of missing values for males and females was then subtracted from the initial number of nonrespondents in each category to come up with the final number of nonrespondents based on the sex variable. This process was repeated for each of the remaining variables (age, race/ethnicity, and education) using the crossing procedure as a guideline for the number of records in each sub-group. Finally, each nonrespondents dataset was appended to the returns dataset for each bureau/office to come up with a dataset representing respondents and nonrespondents by bureau/office. These bureau/office datasets were then merged to come up with the DOI respondents and nonrespondents dataset.

C.3.2 Case Disposition

Disposition codes were assigned to each case based on known and unknown eligibility and completion of survey responses. Each individual in the dataset was assigned to only one disposition group for weighting purposes. Nine mutually exclusive disposition code groups were identified (see Table C.3). Information about case dispositions was obtained from Survey Control System (SCS) and from survey returns. Case disposition codes are defined below.

Table C.3 Case Disposition Codes Used for Weighting

<i>Case disposition code (CASE_DC)</i>	<i>Condition</i>	<i>Eligibility status</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Comment</i>
1 – Record ineligible	Sample member/record became ineligible for any reason	4 – Ineligible - Any	AR	Not Applicable
2 – Eligible – Complete Response	Return satisfies the completion criteria defined below	1 – Respondent	SCS	Created to flag Complete Response
3 – Eligible – Incomplete Response- Partial Response	Return not blank and satisfies the partial incomplete criteria defined below	2 – Nonrespondent - Known eligibility	SCS	Created to flag Incomplete Response
4 - Eligible Incomplete – Break Offs	Return is not blank and satisfies the Break Off criteria defined below	2 – Nonrespondent - Known eligibility	SCS	Created to flag Break Offs
5 – Refusal	Refused to respond for any reason	2 – Nonrespondent - Unknown eligibility	SCS	Not Applicable
6 – Blank	Returned blank survey	3 – Nonrespondent - Unknown eligibility	SCS	Created to flag Blank Responses.
7 - Eligible Non-Interview (Nonrespondent)	Employees accessed the survey but did not submit questionnaire	3 – Nonrespondent – Known Eligibility		Not used for weighting but used as part of CASE_DC = 9
8 – PND	Postal non-deliverable, non-locatable, email bounce	3 – Nonrespondent - Unknown eligibility	SCS	Not Applicable
9 – Nonrespondent	Nonresponse	3 – Nonrespondent - Unknown eligibility	SCS/AR	Based on completed/near completed variables in population

Note. AR = Administrative Record. SCS = Survey Control System

Eligibility. All DOI employees in the administrative files as of December 10, 2016 with email address and/or postal address were considered eligible for the survey. The total number of eligible employees in the DOI study population was 61,020.

Complete Eligible Response. Survey responses were considered as complete eligible responses (CASE_DC = 2) if respondents answered the gender question (see item 60 in the survey instrument) and answered at least one item within the sexual harassment questions (see item 25a-q in the survey instrument) and at least 50% of items measuring job satisfaction and job engagement (see items 3a-j and 4a-i, respectively, in survey instrument); commitment to the work unit (see items 5a-f in survey instrument); political dynamics trust within the work unit (see items 6a-g and 7a-g, respectively in survey instrument); supervisor support (see items 8a-d in survey instrument); inclusion within the work unit (see items 9a-e in survey instrument); general intolerance of harassment (see items 51a-k in survey instrument); leadership intolerance of harassment (see items 52b-d in survey instrument); and bystander harassment (see items 53a-f in survey instrument).

Eligible Incomplete – Partial Response. Responses were considered incomplete partial responses (CASE_DC = 3) if respondents responded to the gender identity question but did not answer at least one item in sexual harassment questions (see item 25a-q in the survey instrument); or did not satisfy the 50% condition, or did not respond to at least one item in the sexual harassment questions (see item 25a-q in the survey instrument) and did not satisfy the 50% condition; or employees did not respond to the gender identity question (see item 60 in the survey instrument) but satisfied the 50% and (see item 25a-q in the survey instrument) conditions.

Eligible Incomplete Response – Break Off. Responses were considered a Break Off (CASE_DC = 4) if respondents did not answer the gender identity question (see item 60 in the survey instrument) and did not satisfy the 50% criterion, but answered at least one of the remaining questions; or did not answer the gender identity question (see item 60 in the survey instrument) and did not satisfy the criterion for the sexual harassment question (see item 25a-q in the survey instrument), but answered at least one of the remaining questions; or did not answer the gender question and did not satisfy both the sexual harassment question (see item 25a-q in the survey instrument) or the 50% criteria for the remaining questions, but answered at least one of the remaining questions.

Blank Survey. Surveys submitted, but no questions were answered (CASE_DC = 6).

Eligible Non-Interview (Nonrespondents with known eligibility). Employees who accessed the survey but did not submit the questionnaire were considered nonrespondents with known eligibility and classified as (CASE_DC = 7). This disposition group includes not submitted complete responses, incomplete-partial responses, break offs, blanks, and others. Eligible Non-Interviews were not used in weighting as a separate category at any stage; they

were only used in calculating the contact rate. For weighting purposes, they were part of CASE_DC = 9 and hence all disposition codes for weighting were mutually exclusive.

Nonrespondents. Employees who did not respond to the survey were classified as nonrespondents (CASE_DC = 9). Also, respondents who submitted questionnaires that had no response variance among categories 1, 2, 4, and 5 in a block of questions containing reverse coded sub-items (see items 6a-g, 7a-g, 8a-g, and 51a-k in the survey instrument) were treated as nonrespondents. The block of questions included reverse coded items within the measures of political dynamics and trust within the work unit (see items 6a and 6b, and 7a, 7b, 7e, and 7g, respectively in the survey instrument); supervisor support (see item 8d in the survey instrument); and general intolerance for harassment (see items 51a, 51b, 51f, and 51g in the survey instrument).

Case disposition totals for the WES survey are shown in Table C.4 below.

Table C.4 DOI Case Disposition Counts

<i>Case disposition category (CASE_DC)</i>	<i>Count</i>
1 Record ineligible	0
2 Eligible - Complete Response	27,200
3 Eligible - Incomplete Response - Partial Response	892
4 Eligible - Incomplete Response - Break Offs	84
5 Refusal	0
6 Blank	10
7 Eligible Non-Interview (Nonrespondent)	4,213
8 PND	0
9 Nonrespondent	28,621
Total	61,020

C.3.3 Nonresponse Adjustments and Weights

Sampling or base weights were defined as the inverse of selection probabilities. However, since WES was a census, sampling weights took on a value of 1. Nonresponse adjustments were derived in two steps. First, sampling weights for cases with known eligibility (CASE_DC = 2, 3, 4) were adjusted to account for cases with unknown eligibility (CASE_DC = 1, 5, 6, 8, 9). This is equivalent to adjusting for units' nonresponse, the outcome of this step is the unit nonresponse adjusted weights. Second, units' nonresponse adjusted weights derived in the previous step were adjusted for complete eligible respondents (CASE_DC = 2) to account for those who submitted incomplete surveys (CASE_DC = 3, 4). This is equivalent to item nonresponse. These two steps allowed us to estimate the nonresponse weights.

Both unit and item nonresponse adjustment factors were model-based adjustments. They were derived from a logistic regression model as the inverse of logistic regression model predicted probabilities. The dependent variable for the unit nonresponse logistic regression model was a binary variable representing the response to the survey, where 1 represented respondents (CASE_DC = 2, 3, 4) and 0 represented nonrespondents (CASE_DC = 1, 5, 6, 8, 9). The dependent variable for the item nonresponse logistic regression model was a binary variable, where 1 represented respondents who completed the survey (CASE_DC = 2) and 0 represented respondents who did not complete the survey (CASE_DC = 3, 4).

The choice of best predictors (independent variables) for each logistic regression model was derived using Chi-squared Automatic Interaction Detector (CHAID). To derive best predictors for the unit nonresponse logistic model, a CHAID model was used where the dependent variable was a binary variable representing respondents versus nonrespondents and the independent variables were the four demographic categorical variables from the population: sex (2 levels), age (6 levels), race/ethnicity (2 levels), and education (4 levels). The final resulting nodes from the CHAID model where each node represented a combination of levels of some or all of the independent demographic variables were then used as a set of independent variables in the unit nonresponse logistic regression model. The unit nonresponse adjustment factors were then derived as the inverse of the logistic model predicted probabilities. The unit nonresponse weights were computed as the product of sampling weights by the unit nonresponse adjustments.

Similarly, survey completion or equivalently item nonresponse adjustment factors were derived using the CHAID model with the binary dependent variable representing completed versus incomplete surveys and the four demographic categorical independent variables. The resulting nodes from CHAID were then used as a set of independent variables in the item nonresponse logistic regression model. Item nonresponse adjustment factors were computed as the inverse of model predicted probabilities. The final nonresponse weights were derived by multiplying item nonresponse adjustment factors by the unit nonresponse weights derived in the previous step.

C.3.4 Final Weights Derivations

Nonresponse weights were poststratified (adjusted) to match known population totals. The two most complete demographic variables from the administrative records (population, sex [2 levels] and age [6 levels]), were used to construct the poststratification cells. Thus, 12 poststratification cells were constructed. The poststratification adjustment factors were derived as the total of each poststratification cell divided by the sum of weighted complete responses corresponding to each cell. Final weights were derived as the product of poststratification adjustment factors by the nonresponse adjusted weights (completion weights).

It should be noted that there were 226 individuals who responded to the gender question and submitted complete surveys, but did not classify themselves as males or females. They either identified themselves as a “Transgender” or they “Did not want to identify themselves as male, female, or transgender.” In addition, there were 135 respondents who submitted complete surveys and identified themselves as males or females in answering the gender question, but did not answer the age question (65 males with missing age, and 70 females with missing age). These responses were obviously not part of the 12 poststratification cells and there is no corresponding representation in the population for the 226 responses since the actual number of transgender is unknown and it is also unknown where those who did not want to identify their orientation really belong in the population. However, these respondents were still taken into consideration and their complete responses were used in the analysis as appropriate. Accordingly, the final weights for males and females came from the 12 poststratification cells plus the 135 respondents who submitted complete surveys and identified themselves as males or females resulting in a total final weight for the sex variable of 60,953. Similarly, the final weights for age came from the 12 poststratification cells plus the 226 who did not classify themselves as males or females resulting in a total final weight for the age variable of 61,035.

Sampling weights, the nonresponse adjustment factor, the poststratification adjustment factors, the nonresponse adjusted weights, and the final weight along with statistical measures for the WES survey are shown in Table C.5 below. Final weights range between 1.00 and 11.07 with an average of 2.25.

Table C.5 DOI Adjustment Factors and Weights

Statistic	Sampling Weight	Unit Nonresponse Adjustment Factor	Item Nonresponse Adjustment Factor	Nonresponse Adjusted Weight	Post Stratification Factor	Final Weight
Count	61,020	28,176	27,200	27,200	27,200	27,200
Minimum	1.00	1.27	1.00	1.31	0.12	1.00
Maximum	1.00	6.37	4.99	30.69	1.73	11.07
Mean	1.00	2.12	1.04	2.20	1.03	2.25
Standard Deviation	0.00	0.88	0.36	1.10	0.16	1.02
Sum	61,020	59,848	28,190	59,968	28,108	61,179
CV	0.00	0.42	0.35	0.50	0.15	0.45

C.4 Analytical Approach

C.4.1 Structural and Psychometric Analyses

Upon completion of data processing procedures, data were analyzed to examine the structural and psychometric properties of multi-item scales included in the WES. Principal-axis factor analyses (PAF), with an oblique rotation, were performed to examine the structural relations among items within each of the multi-item scales using SPSS Version 24. An oblique rotation was chosen because it seemed likely the factors would be correlated. Factors were identified on the basis of Kaiser's rule of eigenvalue > 1 (Kaiser, 1960) and confirmed by examination of a scree plot (Cattell, 1966). A factor was retained if its eigenvalue was greater than unity (Kaiser, 1960) and verified by the scree plot (Cattell, 1966). Psychometric analyses were performed to examine reliability and validity of each of the multi-items scales. Internal consistency analyses were performed to estimate reliability of each of the multi-item scales and to validate results of factor analytic tests. Validity analyses examine associations among scale scores for different constructs and yielded evidence of the convergent and predictive validity of constructs included in the WES. Results of these analyses informed the calculation of scale scores used to estimate rates of harassment and/or assault behaviors assessed in the WES. Results of these analyses are presented separately within the section describing measures included in the WES.

C.4.2 Descriptive and Inferential Analyses

Upon completion of structural and psychometric analyses, descriptive and inferential analyses were also performed that were designed to meet the project objectives outlined in the statement of work: (1) provide substantive evidence that can inform the design of effective responses and justify resource allocation; (2) educate workforce leadership and employees on the extent, severity, and consequences of the problem; (3) identify the context, character, and causes for harassment to occur and/or be tolerated within the organization; (4) provide a baseline for monitoring progress and effectiveness of specific interventions. Specific research questions examined included:

- What is the character of harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What contextual factors influence specific behaviors or sets of experiences?
- What demographic, occupational, and organizational factors were correlated with harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What job-related consequences were associated with harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced?
- What additional findings were uncovered with regard to harassment and/or assault experiences?

Descriptive and inferential analyses were designed to answer specific research questions that aligned with the project objectives. Descriptive statistics including counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations for characteristics of respondents and for all constructs included in the WES. Descriptive statistics for multi-item scales were examined in relation to key demographic and occupational characteristics (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, age, pay grade, employment status) for specific results. Appropriate statistical significance tests were performed to assess whether significant differences between groups existed by conducting t-tests or Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Logits transformation was employed to account for the asymmetric distribution of proportions when making inferences about proportions.

In addition to tests of statistical significance between groups, a rule was adopted to guard against over-interpretation of small, yet statistically significant results. Because the analytical cell sizes in this study were often large, even small differences tended to be statistically significant, but not necessary meaningful when interpreting results. Therefore, the report flags differences that are not just statistically significant, but also represent a change of at least 30% from the overall result. In other words, when breakdown groups are being compared, the difference in percentages or means were only flagged for discussion if the difference between two groups was statistically significantly different and of a magnitude of at least 30% of the overall result. For example, if an overall result was reported as 40%, the absolute difference between two breakdown groups had to exceed 12 percentage points to be reported (30% of 40% equals 12). In this way, the reader knows that a difference between groups represents a meaningful difference and is not just an artifact of large numbers of people represented in the finding. Likewise, the report presents the number of people represented in breakdowns to help interpret differences that are statistically significant and larger than 30% of the overall mean, but might only apply to a small number of people. The goal of these rules is to aid the reader in making proper interpretations of the data based on meaningful differences.

Regression analyses were also performed to examine association among variables in the WES. To examine how various demographic, occupational, and organizational factors (independent variables) were associated to employees' harassment and/or assault behaviors experienced, logistic regression analyses were performed, employing likelihood ratio estimation procedures. These analyses provided information about the unique associations between each independent variable (i.e., demographic, occupational, and organizational factors) and the dependent variable (i.e., harassment experienced), while controlling for the potential influence of every other variable included in the models examined. Results include the unstandardized beta (B), standard error of the unstandardized beta (S.E. B), Wald statistic and associated probability value (p-value), Odds Ratio (OR), 95% confidence interval (95% CI), model log likelihood statistic, and the model if the particular variables are removed (i.e., Change in -2 Log Likelihood) for each of the logistic regression models examined. Logistic regression is used to predict the probability of the occurrence of an event, which by definition is constrained to be between 0 and 1. Odds ratios can range from 0.00 to infinity, with 1.00 as the point at which the

odds are considered equal (that is, the variable has no effect on harassment and/or assault experienced). In a logistic regression, an odds ratio greater than 1.00 means the independent variable is associated with the dependent variable; the larger the odds ratio, the stronger the association. For interpreting results of the logistic regression analyses, an absolute value for Change in -2 Log Likelihood was set at ≥ 100 for specific variables to have significant and meaningful associations with the dependent variables. To determine differences among significant variables emerging from the logistic regression analyses, we inspected means and percentages for employees who experienced harassment and those who did not. The order of those difference is determined by how those variables are coded:⁴⁵

- Age – 6 age groups coded 1=25 or under, 2=26-29, 3=30-39, 4=40-49, 5=50-59, 6=60 or older
- Sex – coded 1=women, 0=men
- Education level – coded 1=no college, 0=college
- Race/ethnicity – coded 1=minority, 0=non-minority
- Relationship status – coded 1=single/separated/widowed/divorced, 0=partnered/married
- Pay grade – 4 pay grade groups coded 1=low, 2=medium, 3=high, 4=executive
- Years of service – 7 tenure groups coded 1=less than 1 year, 2=1 to 3 years, 3=4 to 5 years, 4=6 to 10 years, 5=11 to 14 years, 6=15 to 20 years, 7=more than 20 years
- Appointment type – coded 1=temp/term, 0=permanent
- Work schedule – coded 1=seasonal, 0=non-seasonal
- Supervisor support – a continuous variable with higher values indicating more support
- Organizational trust – a continuous variable with higher values indicating more trust
- Organizational politics – a continuous variable with higher more pressure to conform to organizational norms
- Organizational inclusion – a continuous variable with higher values indicating more inclusion
- Bystander harassment – coded 1=witnessed harassment against others, 0=did not witness harassment against others
- General intolerance for harassment – a continuous variable with higher values indicating more intolerance of harassment
- Leadership intolerance for harassment – a continuous variable with higher values indicating more intolerance of harassment among leaders
- Gender context – coded 1=mostly women, 3=mostly men

To examine associations between harassment and/or assault behaviors experienced and rating of job satisfaction, job engagement and organizational commitment, linear regression analyses were performed, employing maximum likelihood estimation procedures. These analyses provided information about the unique associations between each independent variable (i.e.,

⁴⁵ See additional description of each variable in Section C.5.2.

harassment experienced) and the dependent variable (i.e., job satisfaction, job engagement, and organizational commitment), while simultaneously controlling for the potential influence of every other variable included in the models examined. Results include the unstandardized beta (B), standard error of the unstandardized beta (S.E. B), t-statistic and associated probability value (p-value), standardized beta (B) 95% confidence interval (95% CI), zero-order correlation (r), partial correlation (partial r), and the semi-partial correlation coefficient (semi-partial r) for each of the regression models examined. In a linear regression, a standardized beta coefficient can range from -1 to +1, with negative values indicating an inverse association among variables, and positive values indicating a parallel association among variables; the larger the beta coefficient the stronger the associations among variables in the model.

Statistically significant differences among groups or associations among variables were annotated within respective tables and figures throughout the report and were fully documented in a Supplemental Statistical Report. For all statistical significance testing, probability values were set a $p < .05$, meaning that in 95% of such comparisons the differences were of a magnitude such that they represent true differences in attitudes, perceptions and behaviors and are not likely to be due to chance. In some instances, results were not reported because the estimates were not stable due to low reliability or because they met criteria for suppression. A result was suppressed if it met any of the following criteria: fewer than five cases in the numerator (weighted values), fewer than 15 cases in the denominator (weighted values), and/or the relative standard error (RSE) for a mean where $RSE > 50\%$ of the estimate or for a proportion where $RSE[-\ln(p)] > 0.225$ for $p \leq 0.5$ and $RSE[-\ln(1-p)] > 0.225$ for $p > 0.5$.⁴⁶ Any result that met either criteria was suppressed within a respective table and denoted as “NR” to indicate the result “Not Reportable.” In these cases, the results were deemed unstable and potentially misleading, so they are not presented.

Before any of the analyses described above were conducted, the data were inspected to verify if there were violations of normality or homogeneity of variance that would invalidate a procedure. These inspections were in addition to the data preparation steps described in Section C.2 previously. In no cases were outliers or distribution anomalies detected that caused concern for the tests of significance or regression analyses performed. For the regression analyses described above, analyses were not conducted if the dependent variable did not exceed the suppression rules. An additional check was made to identify situations where missing data in one or more of the independent variables could have caused the dependent variable to fall below the suppression criteria for that specific analysis.

⁴⁶ Numerator denotes the number of individuals who selected a particular option within a question. Denominator denotes the number of individuals who responded to the question itself. Hence, there had to be at least five people who selected a particular response option and at least 15 people who answering the question.

C.5 Description of Measures

Electronic and paper versions of the WES included a cover letter describing the general purpose of the study, addressing confidentiality safeguards, and instructions directing employees who agreed to take part in the survey to complete and submit the survey via postal mail or electronically via a secure link. Below, are descriptions of each of the single and multi-item measures that were included in the WES. For ease of reading, the description of measures is presented as follows: harassment and assault behaviors; demographic, occupational, and organizational factors; job-related outcomes; other factors associated with specific behaviors or sets of experiences with harassment and/or assault behaviors.

C.5.1 Harassment and Assault Related Behaviors

Harassment based on age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status or condition, and sexual orientation. A standard set of seven behavioral items adapted from Estrada and Laurence (2011) were used to assess harassing and/or assault experiences based on age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status or condition, and sexual orientation (e.g., negative comments, offensive jokes, exclusionary or discriminatory behavior, physical threats or assault behaviors).

Instructions asked employees to indicate how often they experienced any of seven behaviors from someone at work in the past 12 months using a 6-point response scale that ranged from *never* (1), *once* (2), *once a month or less* (3), *two to three times a month* (4), *once a week or more* (5), to *one or more times a day* (6).⁴⁷ This approach avoids confounding of terms that could occur if survey participants were asked if they had experienced, for example, “sexual harassment.” Harassment scores were computed by averaging across items within each type of harassment and counting employees who answered in the affirmative (i.e., selected any option from *once* to *one or more times a day*) for each type of harassing and/or assault experience occurring one or more times – i.e., higher percentages indicating more employees experienced harassing behaviors.

Gender Related Harassing Behaviors. Four items from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire developed for the US Department of Defense ([SEQ-DoD]; Fitzgerald, Magley,

⁴⁷ The measures of harassment and assault related behaviors were framed for any behavioral experiences within the past 12 months as of the data of the survey. This time frame was chosen to facilitate recall of behavioral experiences and not confound recall with recency/latency memory effect. Additionally, the 12-month time frame establishes a baseline of experiences for future comparisons (i.e., trending) that avoids compounding of the same experiences year after year (leading to inflated experience rates when the same behaviors are counted in subsequent years). While the 12-month time frame anchors the behavioral experiences, the research team also want to allow employees to indicate if they had experienced harassing and/or assault behaviors prior to the past 12 months. The following discussion first addresses calculation of experience rates in the past 12 months followed by calculations of experience rates prior to the past 12 months. Note that experience rates and other statistics are presented at the scale level and results for each item comprising a scale are not presented. It is not appropriate to draw conclusions from individual items that comprise a scale.

Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999; Stark, Chernyshenko, Lancaster, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 2002) were used to assess employees' experiences with *gender related harassing behaviors* (e.g., "put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?"). Instructions asked employees to indicate how often they experienced any of four behaviors from someone at work in the past 12 months using a 6-point response scale that ranged from *never* (1), *once* (2), *once a month or less* (3), *two to three times a month* (4), *once a week or more* (5), to *one or more times a day* (6). Gender harassment scores were computed by averaging across items and counting employees who answered in the affirmative (i.e., selected any option from *once* to *one or more times a day*) as having experienced gender harassment one or more times – i.e., higher percentages indicating more employees experienced harassing behaviors.

Sexual Harassment Behaviors. Twelve items from the SEQ-DoD (Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Stark et al., 2002) were used to assess three general categories of sexually harassing behaviors, including *crude or offensive behaviors* (e.g., "repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?"), *unwanted sexual attention* (e.g., "made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle or kiss you?"), and *sexual coercion* (e.g., "treated you badly for refusing to have sex?"). *Sexual coercion* is also known as *quid pro quo*. Instructions asked employees to indicate how often they experienced any of the twelve behaviors from someone at work in the past 12 months using a 6-point response scale that ranged from *never* (1) *once* (2), *once a month or less* (3), *two to three times a month* (4), *once a week or more* (5), to *one or more times a day* (6). Sexual harassment scores were calculated by averaging across items within each type of harassment and counting employees who answered in the affirmative (i.e., selected any option from *once* to *one or more times a day*) and indicated some or all of the behaviors experienced were sexual harassment. Scores were computed separately for any form of sexually harassing behavior, and for each sub-type of sexually harassing behavior (i.e., crude or offensive behaviors, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion) occurring one or more times – i.e., higher percentages indicating more employees experienced sexually harassing behaviors.

Sexual Assault Related Behaviors. Modified items from the SEQ-DoD (Fitzgerald et al., 1999) were used to assess employees' experiences with *sexual assault related behaviors* (sexual touching – i.e., intentional touching of genitalia, breasts, or buttocks; attempted and/or completed sexual intercourse – i.e., vaginal, oral, or anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object). Instructions asked employees to indicate how often they experienced intentional sexual contacts that were against their will or which occurred when they did not or could not consent from someone at work in the past 12 months. Items used a 6-point response scale ranging from *never* (1), *once* (2), *once a month or less* (3), *two to three times a month* (4), *once a week or more* (5), to *one or more times a day* (6). Sexual assault related behavior scores were computed by averaging across items and counting employees who answered in the affirmative (i.e., selected any option from *once* to *one or more times a day*) as having experienced any sexual assault related behavior one or more times. Scores were computed for any form of sexual assault related behavior, and separately for each sub-type of sexual assault related behavior (i.e., sexual

touching; attempted sexual behaviors with or without sexual touching and completed sexual behaviors with or without touching and with or without attempted sex) occurring one or more times (i.e., higher percentages indicating more employees experienced sexual assault related behaviors).⁴⁸

Experiences Prior to the Past 12 Months. We included a single item asking respondents to indicate if they had experienced any the harassing and/or assault behaviors before the past 12 months using a yes-no response format for harassment based on age, race/ethnicity, religious beliefs, disability status, and sexual orientation. Each item was placed immediately after the respective harassment form it was meant to assess in order to ensure that respondents would have the proper framing to consider and respond to the content of the item.⁴⁹ For sexual harassing behaviors, employees were also asked if they considered any of the behaviors to be sexual harassment. Experience rates were calculated for each form of harassment and sexual assault related behaviors based on an affirmative response to any of these follow-on questions.

⁴⁸ In many instances of sexual assault related behaviors, people experience a combination of behaviors. For example, someone who marked in the survey that they experienced “Made you have sexual intercourse” once or more might have also marked once or more to “Sexually touched you.” Rather than attempt to provide experience rates for every possible combination of behaviors, responses were coded to create three mutually exclusive categories: unwanted sexual touching (this includes only those respondents who marked once or more to intentional touching of genitalia, breasts, or buttocks), attempted sex (this includes those respondents who marked once or more to an attempt to make someone have sexual intercourse, oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object regardless of whether they also experienced unwanted sexual touching), and completed sex (this includes those respondents who marked once or more to making someone have sexual intercourse, oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object regardless of whether they also experienced unwanted sexual touching or attempted sex). Specifically, responses were coded as unwanted sexual touching (single category) if the respondents indicated experiencing sexual touching without identifying an attempted or completed sexual behavior. Responses were coded as experiencing attempted sex (with or without unwanted touching) if the respondents indicated experiencing attempted sexual intercourse, oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object, regardless of whether they also experienced unwanted sexual touching, but without an experience of completed sex. Responses were coded as experiencing completed sex (with or without unwanted touching and/or attempted sex) if the respondents indicated experiencing a behavior associated with completed sex, regardless of whether they also indicated experiencing unwanted sexual touching or attempted sex. The results then show the percentage of employees who experienced any of the unwanted sexual touching behaviors only, any of the attempted sex behaviors excluding unwanted sexual touching, and any of the completed sex behaviors excluding unwanted sexual touching and attempted sex.

⁴⁹ Note that single lifetime estimates of the percent who experienced each form of harassing and/or assault behaviors were not created by combining responses obtained from the multi-item scales and the single-item question. The single-item measures of experiences prior to the past 12 months did not employ a behavioral experience method and are neither parallel nor equivalent in content or format. The response alternatives employed were also distinct from one another. Therefore, the use of different response alternatives makes it difficult to justify the aggregation of these items into a single overall lifetime estimated prevalence rate. The number of items and the response alternatives used to render a judgement are not parallel or equivalent, making it scientifically indefensible to combine responses into a single score. For the same reasons, caution should be exercised in attempting to draw inferences about trends between rates of experience in the past 12 months and rates of experiences prior to the past 12 months. The measures are not comparable. The measures of experiences prior to the past 12 months were included to give respondents an opportunity to share all experiences they have had and to give a general understanding if harassing behaviors are pervasive over time. The measures of experiences prior to the past 12 months were not intended to be used for trend analyses. Future surveys of this population will use the same questions with a past 12-month time frame allowing for precise trend comparisons. As noted earlier, using a 12-month time frame in future surveys will also avoid double counting of experiences going forward, with only the most recent experiences being assessed and not the same ones captured in previous surveys.

Experience rates were not calculated for gender harassment or any of the three subcomponents of sexual harassment in order to balance the length of the survey. To measure each of these would have required repetition of the individual behaviors specific to gender harassment and the subcomponents of sexual harassment, thus adding considerable length to the survey.

C.5.2 Individual and Occupational Factors

Age. An item from the FEVS (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2016) was used to measure employees' age. Employees were asked to select their age-grouping using options that included *25 or under*; *26-29*; *30-39*; *40-49*; *50-59*; and *60 or older*. Two analytical variables were created based on responses to this item. A dichotomous variable was created by collapsing age groupings into *39 and younger* vs. *40 and older* based on the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. A trichotomous variable was created by combining age groupings into *young* (25 or under; 26-29; 30-39), *middle-aged* (40-49) and *older* (50-59; 60 or older). The original, dichotomous, or trichotomous forms of the variable were scored so that higher scores always indicated greater age.

Sex, Gender Identity, and Sexual Orientation. Two items adapted from Estrada (2011) were used to measure employees' sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation. The first item asked employees to self-identify as *female*, *male*, *transgender*, or *I do not identify as male, female, or transgender*, with individuals self-identifying as transgender receiving a follow-up item to indicate if they were *transgender – male-to-female*, *transgender – female-to-male*, *gender non-conforming*, *unsure*, or *I prefer not to say*. The second item asked employees to self-identify as *heterosexual or straight*, *lesbian*, *gay*, *bisexual*, *other* (e.g., *questioning*, *asexual*, *undecided*, *self-identified*, or *intersex*), or *I prefer not to say*. Based on responses to these items, analytical variables were created for *sex* (male vs. female), *gender identity* (male, female, transgender), *sexual minority status* (heterosexual vs. sexual minority), and *sexual orientation* (heterosexual or straight, lesbian, gay, bisexual, other, and I prefer not to say).

Racial/Ethnic Background. Two items from the FEVS (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2016) were used to measure employees' racial/ethnic background. Employees indicated whether they were Hispanic or Latino using a *yes-no* response format. Employees also indicated their racial background using options that included *American Indian or Alaskan Native*; *Asian*; *Black/African-American*; *Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*; *White*; or *Two or more races*. Based on responses to these items, analytical variables were created for *ethnic minority status* (Non-Minority [Non-Hispanic White] vs. Minority) and *racial/ethnic background* (American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian; Black/African-American; Hispanic; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; Non-Hispanic White; or Multi-racial).

Relationship Status. An item taken from Estrada (2011) was used to measure employees' relationship status. Employees indicated their current marital status using options that included *single*, *partnered*, *married*, *separated*, *divorced*, or *widowed*. For analytical purposes, the

original and a trichotomous form of the variable were used, which combined marital status responses into *single*, *partnered/married*, or *separated/divorced/widowed*.

Pay grade. An item was adapted from the FEVS (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2016) to measure employees' pay plan and grade. Employees identified their pay grade using one of nine categories that included *Wage Grade (WG 1-16)*, *General Schedule (GS 1-15)*, and *Senior Grade (Senior Level, Scientific Professional, Senior Executive Service)*. For analytical purposes, the original form of the variable and a categorical form of the variable were used, which combined pay grades as follows: *Junior Grade (WG 1-4; GS 1-6)*, *Middle Grade (WG 5-16; GS 7-10)*, *Senior Grade (GS 11-15)* and *Executive Grade (Senior Level, Scientific Professional, Senior Executive Service)*. All versions of this variable were scored so that higher scores always indicated higher grade.

Tenure with Organization. An item from the FEVS (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 2016) was used to measure employees' tenure with the organization. Employees were asked to identify their tenure level using one of the options that included *less than 1 year*, *1 to 3 years*, *4 to 5 years*, *6 to 10 years*, *11 to 14 years*, *15 to 20 years*, and *more than 20 years*. This item was scored so that higher scores were indicative of longer tenure with the organization.

Employment Status. Employees were asked to indicate their current employment classification using options that included *permanent* (an employee hired without time limitations), *term* (appointment of no less than one year but not to exceed four years), and *temporary* (appointment of less than one year). Employees were also asked to indicate their work schedule using options that included *seasonal* (work schedule that is less than 12 months and may be recurring), and *non-seasonal*. Based on responses to these items, analytical variables were created for *appointment type* (permanent, term, temporary), *work schedule* (seasonal vs. non-seasonal) and *combined* (permanent-seasonal, permanent-non-seasonal, term, temporary-seasonal, and temporary-non-seasonal).

C.5.3 Organizational Factors

This section describes measurement and calculation of the organizational factors used as predictors of workplace harassment. Each factor is measured using an established multi-item scale. Note that composite scores and other statistics are presented at the scale level and results for each item comprising a scale are not presented. It is not appropriate to draw conclusions from individual items that comprise a scale.

Supervisor Support. Four items from Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, and Rhoades (2002) were used to measure perceived supervisor support (e.g., "The supervisor of your work unit cares about your opinions"). Items were rated on a five-point response scale that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated items were positively correlated, ranging from .80 to .85 (mean inter-item correlation = .83). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single

factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .88 to .92. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 3.49 (accounting for 87.28% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Composite scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived supervisor support. Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .95.

Organizational Trust. Six items from Cummings and Bromiley (1996) were used to measure perceived trust in the work unit (e.g., “I feel my work unit will keep its word”). Items were rated on a five-point response scale that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated all of the items were positively correlated, ranging from .49 to .80 (mean inter-item correlation = .60). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .65 to .86. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 4.01 (accounting for 66.96% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Composite scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived trust in the work unit. Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .89.

Organizational Politics. Seven items from Kacmar and Carlson (1997) were used to measure perceived pressure to conform to organizational norms (e.g., “Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in my work unit”). Items were rated on a five-point response scale that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Initial examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated all of the items were positively correlated, ranging from .36 to .69 (mean inter-item correlation = .51). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .63 to .86. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 4.12 (accounting for 58.91% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Composite scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating greater pressure to conform to organizational norms (going along to get along). Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .88.

Organizational Inclusion. Five items from Estrada, Harbke and Severt (2016) were used to measure perceived inclusion within the work unit (e.g., “Members of my work unit value each other's perspective and contribution”). Items were rated on a five-point response scale that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated all of the items were positively correlated, ranging from .73 to .86 (mean inter-item correlation = .80). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .87 to .91. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 4.20 (accounting for 84.13% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Composite scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with

higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived inclusion within the work unit. Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .95.

Bystander Harassment Experiences. Six items adapted from Estrada and Laurence (2011) were used to assess bystander harassment experiences. Instructions asked employees to indicate how often they witnessed a situation where another employee was harassed or discriminated based on their age, racial/ethnic background, religious beliefs, disability status or condition, and sex/gender in the past 12 months. Items were rated on a six-point response scale that ranged from *never* (1), *once* (2), *once a month or less* (3), *two to three times a month* (4), *once a week or more* (5), to *one or more times a day* (6). Bystander harassment scores were computed by counting employees who answered in the affirmative (i.e., selected any option from *once* to *one or more times a day*), indicating that they experienced a specific form of bystander harassment one or more times – i.e., higher percentages indicating more employees experienced bystander harassing behaviors.

General Intolerance for Harassment. Nine items adapted from Estrada, Olson, Harbke, and Berggren (2011) were used to measure perceived intolerance for harassment within the work unit (e.g., “Harassment is not tolerated in my work unit”). Items were rated on a five-point response scale that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated all of the items were positively correlated, ranging from .44 to .74 (mean inter-item correlation = .57). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .67 to .82. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 5.57 (accounting for 61.91% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Composite scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived intolerance for harassment within the work unit (i.e., higher scores indicate that members of one’s work unit do not tolerate harassment). Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .92.

Leadership Intolerance for Harassment. Three items adapted from Estrada and Laurence (2011) were used to assess leadership intolerance of harassment. Employees were asked to indicate whether team leaders, supervisors, or managers tolerated harassment using a “no,” “yes,” and “don’t know” response format. Affirmative responses were coded as 1, negative responses were coded as 0. Scores were computed by averaging across items with higher scores indicating greater intolerance of harassment. Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated all of the items were positively correlated, ranging from .62 to .75 (mean inter-item correlation = .68). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .74 to .89. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 2.36 (accounting for 78.92% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Composite scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of perceived leadership intolerance of harassment within

the work unit (i.e., higher scores indicate that leaders within one's work unit do not tolerate harassment). Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .86.

Gender context. Three items adapted from Bastian, Lancaster, and Reyst (1996) were used to assess the gender context of the work environment. Employees were asked to indicate the gender mix of coworkers, leaders, and individuals in their occupation or career field using options that included *mostly women* (1), *a relatively even mix of women and men* (2), *mostly men* (3), and *do not know* (coded as missing). Scores were computed by averaging across items with higher scores indicative of a male dominated work environment.

C.5.4 Job Related Outcomes

This section describes measurement and calculation of the organizational factors used as predictors of workplace harassment. Each factor is measured using an established multi-item scale. Note that composite scores and other statistics are presented at the scale level and results for each item comprising a scale are not presented. It is not appropriate to draw conclusions from individual items that comprise a scale.

Job Satisfaction. Nine items from Short (1985) were used to assess employees' satisfaction with their job. Employees indicated their level of satisfaction with various facets with their job (e.g., security, promotion opportunities, coworkers, job as a whole) using a five-point response scale that ranged from *strongly dissatisfied* (1) to *strongly satisfied* (5). Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated items were positively correlated, ranging from .22 to .67 (mean inter-item correlation = .41). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .45 to .84. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 4.35 (accounting for 48.43% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of job satisfaction. Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .86.

Job Engagement. Nine items from Schaufeli and Bakker (2010) were used to assess employees' engagement with their job (e.g., I am immersed in my work). Items were rated on a seven-point response scale that ranged from *never* (1) to *always or everyday* (7). Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated items were positively correlated, ranging from .51 to .83 (mean inter-item correlation = .66). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .67 to .90. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 6.32 (accounting for 70.21% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of job engagement. Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .94.

Organizational Commitment. Six items from Meyer and Allen (1991) were used to assess employees' identification, involvement and emotional attachment to the work unit (e.g., I would be very happy to remain with this organization for the rest of my career). Items were rated on a five-point response scale that ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Examination of the inter-item correlation matrix indicated that items were positively correlated, ranging from .49 to .83 (mean inter-item correlation = .67). Results of principal axis factor analysis yielded a single factor solution, with item loadings ranging from .71 to .91. Eigenvalue statistics (Kaiser, 1960) and the scree plot (Cattell, 1966) further supported this interpretation – eigenvalue for the factor was 4.39 (accounting for 73.17% of the common variance); a single factor was also evident in the scree plot. Scores were computed based on these results by averaging across items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of commitment to the work unit. Cronbach (1951) alpha coefficient for the scale was .92.

C.5.5 Other Factors Associated with Harassing and/or Assault Behaviors

Primary basis for behavior or experience. An item from Estrada and Berggren (2009) was used to measure the primary basis for a behavior or experience that had the greatest effect on employees. Employees were asked to indicate whether the primary basis for the behavior or experience was based on their age, race or ethnicity, religious belief, disability status or condition, sexual orientation, or sex/gender. Employees were also offered an option to indicate that the reasons for the behavior or experience were unknown to them. As we noted earlier, responses to this section of the survey were purposely focused on a single experience or set of related experiences to minimize response burden and optimize survey completion.⁵⁰

Situational characteristics. Several items from Estrada and Berggren (2009) were used to assess situational characteristics of the specific behavior or experience to include *time* (e.g., on or off duty hours), *location* (e.g., while on travel vs. work location or site), *frequency* (e.g., once to every day), *duration* (e.g., once to over a week or a year), *characteristics of persons involved* (e.g., sex, age, employment status, individual vs. group), and whether *continued interaction* was required.

Consequences of Behavior or Experience. Several items from Estrada and Berggren (2009) were used to assess consequences associated with the specific behavior or experience to include impacts on *interpersonal relationships* (e.g., relationship with other employees, spouse

⁵⁰ We recognize that people may have experienced more than one type of harassing and/or assault behavior in the past 12 months. However, to ask about each specific form of harassment and/or assault experience would have added substantial content to an already lengthy survey. Hence, we made a compromise to focus on a specific behavior or experience that had the greatest effect on the person responding to the survey and asked them to respond to all subsequent questions to this section in terms of the specific form of harassment and/or assault experience that had the greatest effect on their personal and professional life. Following the same approach, we also included a single question to ask about harassing and/or assault behaviors related to the respondents' sex and/or gender (e.g., gender harassment, sexual harassment, sexual assault related behaviors) because asking about experiences for each of the sex/gender related experiences would have required repetition of the individual behaviors specific to gender harassment, sexual harassment, and sexual assault related behaviors, thus adding considerable length to the survey.

or other persons), *physical and emotional well-being* (e.g., take sick leave, seek counseling or medical attention), *job performance* (e.g., performance evaluation, promotion opportunities), and *retention* (e.g., transfer job, leave organization).

Reporting Behaviors and Outcomes. Several items from Estrada and Berggren (2009) were used to measure employees' reporting behaviors and outcomes. Employees were asked to indicate if they *discussed the experience with anyone at work* (e.g., peer/coworker, supervisor, or manager); whether they *made a complaint/grievance/report using a DOI resource* (e.g., supervisor or manager, EEO Counselor or Office, Employee Assistance Program, or Labor Relations); *helpfulness of the action* taken for the complaint/grievance/report (e.g., not at all helpful to extremely helpful); the *outcomes associated with such actions* (e.g., actions focused on the person involved, the organization, or employee); if they chose not to make a complaint/grievance/report to indicated their *reasons for not doing so* (e.g., seriousness, avoidance, behavior stopped); and *resources they might use if they were to make a complaint/grievance/report in the future* (e.g., supervisor or manager, EEO Counselor or Office, Employee Assistance Program, or Labor Relations) and *how helpful the particular resource* (e.g., not at all helpful to very helpful).

Bystander Intervention. Two items from Estrada and Berggren (2009) were adapted to measure *actions taken* in response to witnessing a harassment episode against another employee (e.g., help the person, tell someone) and *reasons for not taking action* in response to witnessing a harassment episode (e.g., feared negative consequences, lack authority). Note that this measure asked respondents if they had observed harassing behaviors against another person, not whether they experienced the harassing behaviors themselves.

References

- Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. Retrieved from <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adea.cfm>
- Bastian, L. D., Lancaster, A. R., & Reyst, H. E. (1996). *Department of Defense 1995 sexual harassment survey* (Report No. 96-014). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 998–1012.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245–276.
- Chan, D. K-S., Lam, C. B., Chow, S. Y., & Cheung, S. F. (2008). Examining the job related, psychological, and physical outcomes of workplace sexual harassment: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*, 362-376.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 6*, 297-334.
- Cummings, L. L., & Bromiley, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In RM Kramer & TR Tyler, (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 302-330), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 565-573.
- Estrada, A.X. (2011). *Results of the 2011 Clark County Work Environment Study*. Vancouver, WA: Washington State University Vancouver.
- Estrada, A.X., & Berggren, A.W. (2009). Sexual harassment and its impact for women officers and cadets in the Swedish Armed Forces. *Military Psychology, 21*, 162-185.
- Estrada, A., Harbke, C., & Severt, J. (2016, April). *Antecedents and outcomes of employee perceptions of inclusion at work*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology in Anaheim, CA.
- Estrada, A.X., & Laurence, J.H. (2009). The impact of training on the Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue policy. *Military Psychology, 21*, 62-80.
- Estrada, A.X., Olson, K.J., Harbke, C.R., & Berggren, A.W. (2011). Evaluating a brief scale measuring psychological climate for sexual harassment. *Military Psychology, 23*, 410-432.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C.R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The sexual experiences questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). *Military Psychology, 11*, 243-263.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1960). The application of electronic computers to factor analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 141–151.

- Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the perceptions of politics scale (POPS): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of management, 23*(5), 627-658.
- Krieger, N., Chen, J. T., Waterman, P. D., Hartman, C., Stoddard, A. M., Quinn, M. M., Langhout, R. D., Bergman, M. E., Cortina, L. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Williams, J. H. (2005). Sexual harassment severity: Assessing situational and personal determinants and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35*, 975-1007.
- Lapierre, L. M., Spector, P. E., & Leck, J. D. (2005). Sexual versus nonsexual workplace aggression and victims' overall job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10*, 155-169.
- Lighthouse Associates. (1999). *U.S. Park Police gender equity study*. Springfield, VA.
- Lighthouse Associates. (2000). *U.S. Department of Interior National Park Service women in law enforcement study*. Burke, VA. Author.
- Lipari, R.N., & Lancaster, A.R. (2003). *Armed forces 2002 sexual harassment survey* (Report No. 2003-026). Arlington, VA: Defense Manpower Data Center.
- Mazzeo, S. E., Bergman, M. E., Buchanan, N. T., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. (2001). Situation-specific assessment of sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 120-131.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Gellatly, I.R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 710-720.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A.M., Bowes-Sperry, L., Arens Bates, C., & Lean, E.R. (2009). Sexual Harassment at Work: A Decade (Plus) of Progress. *Journal of Management, 35*, 503-536
- Pascoe, E., & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*, 531-554.
- Pina, A., Gannon, T. A., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*, 126-138.
- Raver, J. L. & Nishii, L.H. (2010). Once, twice, three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and general workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 236-254.
- Schneider, K. T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 401-415.
- Severt, J., & Estrada, A. (2016, August). *Validating an inclusion scale for use in military contexts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association in Denver, CO.

- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A.B. Bakker, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook for essential theory and research* (pp. 10-24). New York. Psychology Press.
- Short, L.O. (1985). *The United States Air Force organizational assessment package*. Maxwell Air Force Base, AL: Leadership and Management Development Center, Air University.
- Sojo, V. E., Wood, R. E., & Genat, A. E. (2016). Harmful workplace experiences and women's occupational well-being: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *40*, 10-40.
- Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O.S., Lancaster, A.R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (2002). Toward standardized measurement of harassment: Shortening the SEQ-DoD using item response theory. *Military Psychology*, *14*(1), 49-72.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. (2016a). *Investigative report of the misconduct at the Grand Canyon River District*. Washington, DC. Office of the Inspector General. Retrieved from <https://www.doioig.gov/reports/investigative-report-misconduct-grand-canyon-river-district>.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. (2016b). *Investigative report of sexual misconduct by chief ranger at the Canaveral National Seashore*. Washington, DC. Office of the Inspector General. Retrieved from https://www.doioig.gov/sites/doioig.gov/files/SexualMisconduct_ChiefRanger_CanaveralNationalSeashore_Public.pdf.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. (2016c). *Investigation of alleged off-duty misconduct by an Official at Denali National Park*. Washington, DC. Office of the Inspector General. Retrieved from https://www.doioig.gov/sites/doioig.gov/files/InvestigativeSummaries_AllegedOff-DutyMisconductByAnOfficialAtDenaliNationalPark.pdf
- U.S. Office of Personnel Management. (2016). *Federal employee viewpoint survey: Governmentwide management report*. Washington DC. Author. Retrieved from https://www.fedview.opm.gov/2016FILES/2016_FEVS_Gwide_Final_Report.PDF
- Willness, C.R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, *60*, 127-162.

Appendix D Survey Instrument

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR WORK ENVIRONMENT SURVEY



Bureau/Office-specific questionnaire items are indicated with notes and brackets throughout the document. A Bureau/Office acronym table is provided at the end of the questionnaire.

WELCOME TO THE [BUREAU/OFFICE] WORK ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

You are invited to participate in the [BUREAU/OFFICE] Work Environment Survey as part of our efforts to understand employee attitudes and harassment experiences within our workforce. The survey is being conducted by a third party to ensure the process is as objective and professional as possible. Participation in the survey is completely optional and your responses to survey questions will remain confidential and anonymous. Please consider this information as you determine whether you would like to participate.

The survey will ask you to provide your opinions regarding your experience working in the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. This survey asks about your perceptions about your job, work unit, and the larger organization. The survey also includes questions regarding unwanted behaviors from others you might have experienced while working within the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. Again, you are in no way obligated to complete this survey if you do not wish to do so. Additionally, you may skip any question or sets of questions that you do not want to answer or that may cause you discomfort. Should you choose to take part in the survey, we would greatly welcome your candid and thoughtful answers to survey questions.

Your responses to survey questions will remain confidential and anonymous. Responses will NOT be linked back to any individual at any time. Please also note that your responses to the survey will NOT result in a formal complaint related to your experiences, as the survey is not linked to the formal reporting process for such complaints. No one from the [BUREAU/OFFICE] will be able to link any responses to particular individuals. All data will be analyzed at the group level without specific reference to any individual. Reports of findings will not contain any information that could be used to identify individuals or their specific departments/units or work locations. Remember that you are free to discontinue your participation at any time without any consequence.

An executive summary of general survey findings will be made available when the research is completed. The summary will not include information on specific cases of harassment or any personally identifiable information. To obtain the executive summary, visit the following website: [URL]. Please note that you must be within the DOI network to access internal resource links.

If you would prefer to take this survey in Spanish, please call [PHONE NUMBER] and leave a message to request a copy be mailed to you. The deadline for submitting the survey is March 4, 2017.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE]
[TITLE], [OFFICE]

By moving forward and completing the survey, you agree to participate. Your individual responses will remain anonymous and confidential. You are free to skip any item(s) that you do not wish to answer or to discontinue your participation at any time.

We thank you for volunteering to participate in this survey. As noted previously, questions in this survey ask about your attitudes and opinions about your job, your organization, and about work-related experiences that may have occurred within the scope of any work or activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE] and involved “someone at work”. If you are unsure of what a term or classification means, please refer to the definitions page found at the back of this questionnaire document.

Before you begin the survey, we would like to ask a preliminary question to help us tailor the survey for your participation.

1. What is your current employment classification? (Select one.)

- Permanent (an employee hired without time limitations)
- Term (appointment of no less than one year but not to exceed four years)
- Temporary (appointment of less than one year)

[If you answered Term to Question 1, please skip Question 2 and proceed to Question 3.]

2. What is your work schedule? (Select one.)

- Seasonal (work schedule that is less than 12 months and may be recurring)
- Non-seasonal

PART I. YOUR PERCEPTIONS ABOUT YOUR JOB

In this section, we want to find out how you feel about your job and employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. Read each statement below and select the response alternative that best describes your opinion of the statement.

3. How satisfied are you with the following? (Respond to each item.)	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
a. The kind of work I do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. My job security	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. My pay and benefits	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. My opportunities for promotion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. My relationship with my coworkers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The direction/supervision I receive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. My chances to acquire valuable job skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. My job as a whole	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The level of effort of my coworkers compared to my level of effort	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. My opportunities to participate in varied workplace experiences within the agency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Only answer this question if you are a Term or Temporary employee.] k. My chances of becoming a permanent employee if I decide to pursue permanent employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Only answer this question if you are a Term or Temporary employee.] l. My chances of continuing in a term or temporary appointment if I decide to pursue such employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. How would you describe your feelings about work? (Respond to each item.)	Never	Almost Never or a Few Times a Year or Less	Rarely or Once a Month or Less	Sometimes or a Few Times a Month	Often or Once a Week	Very Often or a Few Times a Week	Always or Every Day
a. I am enthusiastic about my job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I am proud of the work that I do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I am immersed in my work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. My job inspires me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. I feel happy when working intensely	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. I am energized by my work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. I often lose track of time when working	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. How would you describe your feelings about your current work unit? (Respond to each item.)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I feel like “part of the family” in my work unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I feel “emotionally attached” to my work unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I feel a strong sense of belonging to my work unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I really feel as if my work unit’s problems are my own	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. My work unit has a great deal of personal meaning for me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career in my work unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. How would you describe your perceptions regarding your current work unit? (Respond to each item.)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Employees are encouraged to speak out frankly even when we are critical of well-established ideas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. There is no place for people who always agree with everything around here; good ideas are desired even if it means disagreeing with superiors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Agreeing with powerful others is the best alternative in my work unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. It is best not to rock the boat in my work unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Sometimes it is easier to remain quiet than to fight the system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Telling others what they want to hear is sometimes better than telling the truth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. It is safer to believe what I am told than to make up my own mind	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. How would you describe your perceptions regarding your current work unit? (Respond to each item.)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. I feel my work unit takes advantage of its employees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I think the people in my work unit succeed by stepping on other people	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I feel our work unit is straightforward in dealing with us	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I think our work unit does not mislead us	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. I feel employees cannot depend on our work unit to fulfill its commitments to us	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. I feel my work unit will keep its word	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. I often doubt the truth of what management tells me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Do you agree or disagree that the supervisor of your current work unit: (Respond to each item.)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Cares about your opinions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Really cares about your well-being?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Strongly considers your goals and values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Shows very little concern for you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Do you agree or disagree that members of your current work unit: (Respond to each item.)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Treat one another with dignity and respect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Value each other's perspective and contribution?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Ensure that members are included in work unit activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Share a sense of belonging to the work unit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Feel accepted by other members of the work unit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART II. WORK-RELATED EXPERIENCES

Questions in this section ask about work-related experiences that may have occurred within the scope of any work or activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE] and involved "someone at work."

"Someone at work" may include any person(s) you have contact with as part of your duties. This person(s) could be a coworker, supervisor, visitor, contractor, concessioner, partner, inside or outside of your work unit, or anyone else you interact with on the job. These individuals may be in your work unit, other work units within the organization, or in other organizations that you come into contact with as part of your duties.

The behaviors or experiences could have occurred within the scope of any work or an activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. Behaviors or experiences could have occurred at work or away from your primary duty location; before, during, or after work hours while engaged in work or an activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. Please include them as long as the experience or behavior occurred within the scope of any work or activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE].

Please note that responding to these questions will not result in a formal complaint about your experiences. We are gathering this information to learn about behaviors and/or experiences from employees of the [BUREAU/OFFICE].

Read each statement carefully and indicate the extent to which you may have experienced any of the situations described. Answer each question as frankly and completely as you can. Note that all information will be confidential.

10. In the past 12 months, how often have you experienced any of the following behaviors based on your AGE? (Respond to each item.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. I was subjected to negative comments or remarks based on my age	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. I was subjected to offensive jokes based on my age	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. I was denied a potential reward or benefit based on my age	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. I was physically threatened or assaulted based on my age	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. I was not asked to participate in social or recreational activities based on my age	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. I was ignored by others based on my age	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. I was given more menial tasks than my job normally requires based on my age	<input type="checkbox"/>					

11. Now think back to the time BEFORE the past 12 months. Have you experienced ANY of the behaviors listed above based on your AGE while you were employed by the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? (Select one.)

- Yes No

[If you answered No to Question 11, please skip Question 12 and proceed to Question 13 on the next page.]

12. You indicated that you experienced behaviors listed above based on your AGE in the time BEFORE the past 12 months. What was your pay category or grade when you experienced these behaviors for the first time? (Select one.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 1-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 1-6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Level (SL)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 5-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 7-10 | Scientific Professional (ST)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 9-16 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 11-12 | Senior Executive Service (SES) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Wage Grade (WG) | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 13-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

REMEMBER: "Someone at work" may include any person(s) you have contact with as part of your duties. This person(s) could be a coworker, supervisor, visitor, contractor, concessioner, partner, inside or outside of your work unit, or anyone else you interact with on the job. The behaviors or experiences could have occurred outside of work hours or away from your work location as long as they occurred in the context of your duties.

13. In the past 12 months, how often have you experienced any of the following behaviors based on your RACIAL or ETHNIC BACKGROUND? (Respond to each item.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. I was subjected to negative comments or remarks based on my racial or ethnic background	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. I was subjected to offensive jokes based on my racial or ethnic background	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. I was denied a potential reward or benefit based on my racial or ethnic background	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. I was physically threatened or assaulted based on my racial or ethnic background	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. I was not asked to participate in social or recreational activities based on my racial or ethnic background	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. I was ignored by others based on my racial or ethnic background	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. I was given more menial tasks than my job normally requires based on my racial or ethnic background	<input type="checkbox"/>					

14. Now think back to the time BEFORE the past 12 months. Have you experienced ANY of the behaviors listed above based on your RACIAL or ETHNIC BACKGROUND while you were employed by the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? (Select one.)

- Yes No

[If you answered No to Question 14, please skip Question 15 and proceed to Question 16 on the next page.]

15. You indicated that you experienced behaviors listed above based on your RACIAL or ETHNIC BACKGROUND in the time BEFORE the past 12 months. What was your pay category or grade when you experienced these behaviors for the first time? (Select one.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 1-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 1-6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Level (SL)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 5-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 7-10 | Scientific Professional (ST)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 9-16 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 11-12 | Senior Executive Service (SES) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Wage Grade (WG) | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 13-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

REMEMBER: "Someone at work" may include any person(s) you have contact with as part of your duties. This person(s) could be a coworker, supervisor, visitor, contractor, concessioner, partner, inside or outside of your work unit, or anyone else you interact with on the job. The behaviors or experiences could have occurred outside of work hours or away from your work location as long as they occurred in the context of your duties.

16. In the past 12 months, how often have you experienced any of the following behaviors based on your RELIGIOUS BELIEFS? (Respond to each item.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. I was subjected to negative comments or remarks based on my religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. I was subjected to offensive jokes based on my religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. I was denied a potential reward or benefit based on my religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. I was physically threatened or assaulted based on my religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. I was not asked to participate in social or recreational activities based on my religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. I was ignored by others based on my religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. I was given more menial tasks than my job normally requires based on my religious beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>					

17. Now think back to the time BEFORE the past 12 months. Have you experienced ANY of the behaviors listed above based on your RELIGIOUS BELIEFS while you were employed by the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? (Select one.)

Yes No

[If you answered No to Question 17, please skip Question 18 and proceed to Question 19 on the next page.]

18. You indicated that you experienced behaviors listed above based on your RELIGIOUS BELIEFS in the time BEFORE the past 12 months. What was your pay category or grade when you experienced these behaviors for the first time? (Select one.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 1-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 1-6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Level (SL)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 5-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 7-10 | Scientific Professional (ST)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 9-16 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 11-12 | Senior Executive Service (SES) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Wage Grade (WG) | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 13-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

REMEMBER: "Someone at work" may include any person(s) you have contact with as part of your duties. This person(s) could be a coworker, supervisor, visitor, contractor, concessioner, partner, inside or outside of your work unit, or anyone else you interact with on the job. The behaviors or experiences could have occurred outside of work hours or away from your work location as long as they occurred in the context of your duties.

19. In the past 12 months, how often have you experienced any of the following behaviors based on a perceived or actual DISABILITY? (Respond to each item if applicable.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. I was subjected to negative comments or remarks based on a perceived or actual disability	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. I was subjected to offensive jokes based on a perceived or actual disability	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. I was denied a potential reward or benefit based on a perceived or actual disability	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. I was physically threatened or assaulted based on a perceived or actual disability	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. I was not asked to participate in social or recreational activities based on a perceived or actual disability	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. I was ignored by others based on a perceived or actual disability	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. I was given more menial tasks than my job normally requires based on a perceived or actual disability	<input type="checkbox"/>					

20. Now think back to the time BEFORE the past 12 months. Have you experienced ANY of the behaviors listed above based on a perceived or actual DISABILITY while you were employed by the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? (Select one.)

- Yes No

[If you answered No to Question 20, please skip Question 21 and proceed to Question 22 on the next page.]

21. You indicated that you experienced behaviors listed above based on a perceived or actual DISABILITY in the time BEFORE the past 12 months. What was your pay category or grade when you experienced these behaviors for the first time? (Select one.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 1-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 1-6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Level (SL)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 5-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 7-10 | Scientific Professional (ST)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 9-16 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 11-12 | Senior Executive Service (SES) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Wage Grade (WG) | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 13-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

REMEMBER: "Someone at work" may include any person(s) you have contact with as part of your duties. This person(s) could be a coworker, supervisor, visitor, contractor, concessioner, partner, inside or outside of your work unit, or anyone else you interact with on the job. The behaviors or experiences could have occurred outside of work hours or away from your work location as long as they occurred in the context of your duties.

22. In the past 12 months, how often have you experienced any of the following behaviors based on your SEXUAL ORIENTATION? (Respond to each item.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. I was subjected to negative comments or remarks based on my sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. I was subjected to offensive jokes based on my sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. I was denied a potential reward or benefit based on my sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. I was physically threatened or assaulted based on my sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. I was not asked to participate in social or recreational activities based on my sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. I was ignored by others based on my sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. I was given more menial tasks than my job normally requires based on my sexual orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>					

23. Now think back to the time BEFORE the past 12 months. Have you experienced ANY of the behaviors listed above based on your SEXUAL ORIENTATION while you were employed by the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? (Select one.)

- Yes No

[If you answered No to Question 23, please skip Question 24 and proceed to Question 25 on the next page.]

24. You indicated that you experienced behaviors listed above based on your SEXUAL ORIENTATION in the time BEFORE the past 12 months. What was your pay category or grade when you experienced these behaviors for the first time? (Select one.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 1-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 1-6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Level (SL)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 5-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 7-10 | Scientific Professional (ST)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 9-16 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 11-12 | Senior Executive Service (SES) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Wage Grade (WG) | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 13-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

This section of the questionnaire presents a series of new questions about work-related experiences that may have occurred within the scope of any work or activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE] and involved "someone at work."

REMEMBER: "Someone at work" may include any person(s) you have contact with as part of your duties. This person(s) could be a coworker, supervisor, visitor, contractor, concessioner, partner, inside or outside of your work unit, or anyone else you interact with on the job. The behaviors or experiences could have occurred outside of work hours or away from your work location as long as they occurred in the context of your duties.

Read each question carefully and provide a response to each item below.

25. In the past 12 months, how often did someone at work: (Respond to each item.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. Repeatedly tell sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. Make unwelcomed attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. Treat you differently because of your sex (e.g., mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. Make offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. Make gestures or use body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
f. Refer to people of your sex in insulting or offensive terms?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
g. Make offensive, sexist remarks (e.g., suggested that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
h. Make unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
i. Put you down or act in a condescending way toward you because of your sex?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
j. Repeatedly ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you had said "no"?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
k. Make you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
l. Make you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., by mentioning an upcoming review)?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
m. Touch you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
n. Intentionally corner you or lean over you in a sexual way?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
o. Treat you badly for refusing to have sex?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
[Only answer this question if you are a Permanent employee.] p. Imply faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
[Only answer this question if you are a Term or Temporary employee.] q. Imply you would be renewed, get permanent employment or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?	<input type="checkbox"/>					

[Only answer this question if you indicated you experienced any of the behaviors in Question 25.]

26. Do you consider any of the behaviors listed on the previous page that you marked as having experienced to be sexual harassment? (Select one.)

- None were sexual harassment
 Some were sexual harassment; some were not sexual harassment
 All were sexual harassment

27. Now think back to the time BEFORE the past 12 months. Have you experienced ANY of the behaviors listed on the previous page while you were employed by the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? (Select one.)

- Yes No

[If you answered No to Question 27, please skip Questions 28 and 29 and proceed to Question 30 on the next page.]

28. Do you consider any of the behaviors you experienced in the time BEFORE the past 12 months to be sexual harassment? (Select one.)

- None were sexual harassment
 Some were sexual harassment; some were not sexual harassment
 All were sexual harassment

29. You indicated that you experienced behaviors listed on the previous page in the time BEFORE the past 12 months. What was your pay category or grade when you experienced these behaviors for the first time? (Select one.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 1-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 1-6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Level (SL)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 5-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 7-10 | Scientific Professional (ST)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 9-16 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 11-12 | Senior Executive Service (SES) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Wage Grade (WG) | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 13-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

The following questions ask about unwanted experiences of an abusive, humiliating, or sexual nature that can vary in terms of severity. Some of the questions contain strongly-worded language. Some behaviors listed can be viewed as assault, and others can be viewed as hazing or some other type of unwanted experience. These behaviors can happen to anyone, regardless of their sex.

When answering these questions, please include experiences occurring within the scope of any work or activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. Please include experiences no matter who did it to you or where it happened. It could have been done to you by a male or female; someone you knew well or did not know at all; coworkers, supervisors, visitors, contractors, concessioners, partners, or anyone else you interact with on the job. It could have been done to you while at work, on official work travel, or away from your work location while you were engaged in work, or an activity associated with your employment with the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. Please include experiences even if you or others had been drinking alcohol, using drugs, or otherwise impaired.

Responding to these questions will not result in a formal complaint about your experiences. We are gathering this information to learn about behaviors and/or experiences from employees of the [BUREAU/OFFICE].

YOUR ANSWERS ARE STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL REMAIN ANONYMOUS.

Read each question carefully and provide a response to each item below.

30. In the past 12 months, how often did you experience any of the following intentional sexual contacts that were against your will or which occurred when you did not or could not consent, in which someone: (Respond to each item.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. Sexually touched you (e.g., intentional touching of genitalia, breasts, or buttocks) or made you sexually touch him/her?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
b. Attempted to make you have sexual intercourse, but was not successful?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
c. Made you have sexual intercourse?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
d. Attempted to make you perform or receive oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object, but was not successful?	<input type="checkbox"/>					
e. Made you perform or receive oral sex, anal sex, or penetration by a finger or object?	<input type="checkbox"/>					

31. Now think back to the time BEFORE the past 12 months. Have you experienced ANY of the behaviors listed above while you were employed by the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? (Select one.)

- Yes No

[If you answered No to Question 31, please skip Question 32 and proceed to Question 33 on the next page.]

32. You indicated that you experienced behaviors listed above in the time BEFORE the past 12 months. What was your pay category or grade when you experienced these behaviors for the first time? (Select one.)

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 1-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 1-6 | <input type="checkbox"/> Senior Level (SL)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 5-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 7-10 | Scientific Professional (ST)/ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wage Grade (WG) 9-16 | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 11-12 | Senior Executive Service (SES) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Wage Grade (WG) | <input type="checkbox"/> General Schedule (GS) 13-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

[If you have indicated you have not experienced any type of discrimination, harassment or unwanted behaviors based on your Age, Racial or Ethnic Background, Religious Beliefs, Disability Status, Sexual Orientation, or for any other reason in the past 12 months, please skip this section (PART III) and proceed to Part IV (Question 51). If you are unsure, please read the introduction of PART III to see if this section is applicable to you.]

PART III. ONE BEHAVIOR OR EXPERIENCE WITH THE GREATEST EFFECT

You indicated that you experienced some of the behaviors described in the previous sections in the past 12 months while employed at the [BUREAU/OFFICE]. We want to learn about the circumstances surrounding the TYPE OF BEHAVIOR OR EXPERIENCE THAT HAD THE GREATEST EFFECT ON YOU. Think about the ONE BEHAVIOR OR EXPERIENCE that had the greatest effect on you in the past 12 months and answer the questions below in terms of that specific experience. It is important that you select the ONE BEHAVIOR OR EXPERIENCE that had the greatest effect on you in the past 12 months even if you indicated more than one behavior experienced in the previous questions. ONE BEHAVIOR OR EXPERIENCE can be a single event or series of related events as long as similar behaviors were experienced or the same people were involved. Selecting ONE BEHAVIOR OR EXPERIENCE in the past 12 months is intended to help limit the number of questions we ask you.

33. Thinking about the ONE BEHAVIOR (single event) OR EXPERIENCE (series of related events) that had the greatest effect on you in the past 12 months, what was the primary basis for the behavior or experience? (Select one.)

- Your age
- Your race or ethnicity
- Your religious beliefs
- Your disability status or condition
- Your sexual orientation
- Your sex/gender
- Unknown

34. When did the specific type of behavior or experience occur? (Select one.)

- All of it occurred during work hours
- Most of it occurred during work hours; some off work hours
- Some of it occurred during work hours; most off work hours
- None of it occurred during work hours; all off work hours

35. Did the specific behavior or experience occur while you were on travel (i.e., on temporary assignment, attending a conference, attending training)? (Select one.)

- Yes No

36. Where did the specific type of behavior or experience typically occur? (Select one.)

- At a work location or site
- At a work-sponsored social event (e.g., office picnic, happy hour, or party)
- At a non-work sponsored social event where coworkers were present
- At a permanent [BUREAU/OFFICE] supplied housing location, if applicable
- At a location outside the park/site [NPS]

- At a location outside the office/site [BIA, BIE, BLM, BOEM, BOR, BSEE, IBC, OIG, ONRR, OST, OSMRE, OS, SOL, USFWS, USGS]

[If you answered "At a work location" to Question 36, please answer Question 37; otherwise, proceed to Question 38.]

37. You indicated that the behavior or experience typically occurred at a work location or site. Which of the following best describes the location or site? (Select one.)

- At an indoor location (office setting)
- At an indoor location (shop or maintenance area)
- At an outdoor location (e.g., field site) that did not require an overnight stay
- At an outdoor location (e.g., field site) that required an overnight stay

38. How often did the specific type of behavior or experience occur? (Select one.)

- Once
- Once a month or less
- 2-4 times a month
- Every few days
- Every day

39. How long did the specific type of behavior or experience persist? (Select one.)

- It happened one time
- A week
- A month
- A few months
- A year or more

40. How many people were involved? (Select one.)

- One person More than one person

41. Was/were the person(s) who did this to you? (Select one.)

- Male Female Both males and females

42. Was/were the person(s) who did this to you? (Select one.)

- Younger About my age Older
- Some were younger, older, and/or about my age
- Do not know

43. Was/were the person(s) who did this to you any of the following? (Mark all that apply.)

- A [BUREAU/OFFICE] Peer(s)/Coworker(s)
- A [BUREAU/OFFICE] Subordinate(s) or someone you supervise/manage
- Your [BUREAU/OFFICE] Team lead(s) (current or former)
- Another [BUREAU/OFFICE] Team lead(s) (current or former)
- Your [BUREAU/OFFICE] Supervisor(s) (current or former)
- Another [BUREAU/OFFICE] Supervisor(s) (current or former)
- Your [BUREAU/OFFICE] Manager(s) (current or former)
- Another [BUREAU/OFFICE] Manager(s) (current or former)
- Another federal employee
- A contractor
- A concessioner [NPS]
- A park partner [NPS]
- A park visitor [NPS]
- A partner [USFWS]
- A visitor [USFWS, BIA, BIE, BLM]
- The subject of or witness in an audit, investigation, or other review. [OIG]
- Bureau of Indian Affairs law enforcement [BIA]
- A social worker [BIA]
- A teacher/professor [BIE]
- A student [BIE]
- An external partner (Friends Groups, Cooperative Associations, etc.) [BLM]
- A concessioner/district personnel [BOR]
- A Reclamation partner [BOR]
- A Reclamation visitor [BOR]
- Your [BUREAU/OFFICE] Supervisor(s)/Section Chief (current or former) [BSEE, BOEM]
- Another [BUREAU/OFFICE] Supervisor(s)/Section Chief (current or former) [BSEE, BOEM]
- An industry representative or employee [BSEE, BOEM]

- An IIM account holder) [OST]
- A tribal official/staff [OST]
- Another visitor [OST]
- A partner/cooperator (e.g., university employee) [USGS]
- Do not know
- Other

44. Did your work role require you to continue to interact with this/these person(s)? (Select one.)

- No, I did not have to interact with this/these person(s) at all
- Yes, I had to or still have to interact with this/these person(s)

45. As a result of the behavior or experience: (Respond to each item.)	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. Did you request a transfer or change of assignment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Did you take steps to leave your organization?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Did it make it harder to complete your work or do your job?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Only answer this question if you are a Permanent employee.]			
d. Did it negatively affect your performance evaluation or promotion potential?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Only answer this question if you are a Term or Temporary employee.]			
e. Did it negatively affect your performance evaluation or chances for renewal or permanent employment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Did it cause arguments or damage interpersonal relations at work?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Did it damage your relationship with coworkers, supervisors, or managers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Did it damage other personal relationships (e.g., your spouse or a friend)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Did it cause you to call in sick or take other type of leave?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Did you seek any type of medical attention?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Did you seek counseling from a religious or spiritual leader, counselor, or medical or mental health care provider?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Did you consider leaving the [BUREAU/OFFICE]?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

46. As a result of the behavior or experience, did you discuss it with any of the following people? (Respond to each item.)	Yes	No
a. The person(s) involved	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. My coworkers – People with whom you work that are not your supervisor (or chain of command)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. My team leader – Team leaders are not official supervisors; those who provide employees with day-to-day guidance in work projects, but do not have supervisory responsibilities or conduct performance appraisals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. My supervisor – First-line supervisors are typically responsible for employees' performance appraisals and leave approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. My manager – Those in management positions who typically supervise one or more supervisors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. A senior leader – The heads of departments/agencies and their immediate leadership team, responsible for directing the policies and priorities of the department/bureau. May hold either a political or career appointment and typically a member of the Senior Executive Service or equivalent.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Another [BUREAU/OFFICE] employee	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Someone from another bureau/office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

47. As a result of the behavior or experience, did you make a complaint/grievance/report, either orally or in writing, to address the behavior or experience using any of the following resources? (Respond to each item if applicable.)	Yes No		If you answered Yes that you used a resource, how helpful was it?				
			Not at all Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful
a. Supervisor or Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Ombudsman (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. CADR (Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution) Office, CORE PLUS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Employee & Labor Relations (Human Resources)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Union (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Equal Employment Opportunity Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Office of Inspector General Hotline	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Office of Inspector General	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Other Law Enforcement or Civil Authority not in the [BUREAU/OFFICE]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Department of the Interior Ethics/[BUREAU/OFFICE] Ethics Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. National Park Service Law Enforcement/Park Police [NPS]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Office of RACA (Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action) [BIA, BIE]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Justice Services [BIA]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Integrity and Professional Responsibility Advisor (IPRA) [BSEE, BOEM]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If you answered Yes to any of the items in Question 47, please answer Questions 48 and 49; otherwise, proceed to Question 50.]

48. Did any of the experiences listed below occur as a result of making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report? (Respond to each item.)	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. The person I told took no action	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The rules of harassment were explained to everyone in the workplace	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A review, investigation, survey, or other assessment of the workplace was conducted by management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. An investigation was conducted by a law enforcement official	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Someone talked to the person(s) to ask him/her/them to change their behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. My work station location or duties were changed to help me avoid the person(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The person(s) was/were moved or reassigned so that I did not have as much contact with him/her/them	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. There was some official career action taken against the person(s) for the behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The person(s) stopped the behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. I was encouraged to drop the issue	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. I was discouraged from making an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. The person(s) who did this took action against me for complaining (e.g., the behavior or experience became worse, or I was threatened)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. My coworkers treated me worse, avoided me, or blamed me for the problem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. My leadership punished me for bringing it up (e.g., loss of privileges, denial of promotion/training, or reassignment to a less favorable job)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. I was threatened with loss of employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

49. How satisfied were you with: (Respond to each item.)	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
a. The availability of information on how to file a complaint/grievance/report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. How you were treated by personnel handling the complaint/grievance/report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Actions taken by the person handling the complaint/grievance/report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Being informed about the current status of the complaint/grievance/report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The amount of time it took to address the complaint/grievance/report?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If you answered No to all of the items in Question 47, please answer Question 50; otherwise proceed to Question 51.]

50. Previously you indicated that you opted not to make an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about the behavior or experience. What were your reasons for not doing so? (Respond to each item.)	Yes	No
a. The behavior or experience stopped on its own	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. I thought it was not serious enough to discuss or report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. I took care of it myself by confronting the person(s) who did it	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I took other actions to handle the situation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. I did not know who to report the behavior to and/or how to file a complaint	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. I did not want more people to know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. I was ashamed or embarrassed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. I did not want people to think less of me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. I thought other people would blame me	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. I felt partially to blame	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. I wanted to forget about it or move on	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. I did not think anything would be done	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. I did not think I would be believed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. I did not trust that the process would be fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. I thought I might get in trouble for something I did	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. I thought I would be labeled as a troublemaker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q. I thought it might hurt my performance appraisal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Only answer this question if you are a Term or Temporary employee.]		
r. I thought it might hurt my chances of being renewed or obtaining a permanent position	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
s. I was worried about potential negative consequences from leadership, such as being denied a promotion or training opportunity, being disciplined, or made to perform additional duties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
t. I was worried about potential negative consequences from my coworkers or peers, such as being excluded from social activities, being ignored, or being the target of insulting or disrespectful remarks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[Only answer this question if you are a Permanent employee.]		
u. I thought it might hurt my career	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v. I did not want to hurt the person's/s' career/s or family/ies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
w. I was concerned for my physical safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
x. I feared losing my job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
y. Some other reason	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART IV. ORGANIZATIONAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This section of the survey explores your opinions regarding your work unit and its leaders. Consider each statement below and select the response alternative that best describes your opinion about each statement.

51. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the statements below regarding your current work unit? (Respond to each item.)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. It would be very risky to file a harassment complaint	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A harassment complaint would not be taken seriously	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A harassment complaint would be thoroughly investigated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. I would feel comfortable reporting a harassment complaint	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Harassment is not tolerated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Individuals who harass others get away with it	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. I would be afraid to report a harassment complaint	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Penalties against individuals who harass others at work are strongly enforced	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Actions are being taken to prevent harassment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Employees engaging in misconduct are held accountable for their actions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Supervisors engaging in mismanagement are held accountable for their actions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

52. Do the persons below tolerate harassment? (Respond to each item if applicable.)	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. My coworkers -- People with whom you work that are not your supervisor (or chain of command)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. My team leaders -- Team leaders are not official supervisors; those who provide employees with day-to-day guidance in work projects, but do not have supervisory responsibilities or conduct performance appraisals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. My supervisors -- First-line supervisors are typically responsible for employees' performance appraisals and leave approval	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. My managers -- Those in management positions who typically supervise one or more supervisors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

53. Think for a moment about your current work unit only. In the past 12 months, how often have you WITNESSED a situation where ANOTHER EMPLOYEE was subjected to harassment or discrimination based on the following? (Respond to each item.)	Never	Once	Once a Month or Less	Two-Three Times a Month	Once a Week or More	One or More Times a Day
a. Age	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Racial or Ethnic Background	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Religious Beliefs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disability Status or Condition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Sexual Orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Sex/Gender	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[If you indicated you witnessed any of the types of harassment or discrimination listed in Question 53, please answer Question 54; otherwise, proceed to Question 55.]

54. You indicated in the previous question that you witnessed a situation where another employee was subjected to harassment or discrimination. Which of the following actions best describes your most typical response(s) to the situation you witnessed? (Mark all that apply.)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	I did not take any action
<input type="checkbox"/>	I asked the person who was experiencing the behavior if s/he needed help
<input type="checkbox"/>	I pointed out to the person who appeared to be causing the situation that s/he “crossed the line” with his/her comments or behaviors
<input type="checkbox"/>	I stepped in with the intent of diffusing/stopping the situation
<input type="checkbox"/>	I asked others to step in as a group and diffuse the situation
<input type="checkbox"/>	I told someone in a position of authority about the situation
<input type="checkbox"/>	I considered intervening in the situation, but I feared I would experience negative consequences
<input type="checkbox"/>	I considered intervening in the situation, but did not feel I had the authority to do so
<input type="checkbox"/>	I stepped in to diffuse/stop the situation, but then was discouraged or criticized by others for doing so
<input type="checkbox"/>	I stepped in to diffuse/stop the situation, but then was harassed myself by the person(s) I was trying to stop

55. If you were to make an oral and/or written complaint/grievance/report about a harassment experience involving someone at work, which of the following options would you be most likely to use? (Respond to each item.)				For each choice you answered Yes, how helpful do you believe this option(s) would be?				
	Yes	No	Don't Know	Not at all Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Very Helpful	Extremely Helpful
a. Supervisor or Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Ombudsman (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. CADR (Collaborative Action and Dispute Resolution) Office, CORE PLUS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Employee & Labor Relations (Human Resources)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Union (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Equal Employment Opportunity Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Office of Inspector General Hotline	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Office of Inspector General	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Other Law Enforcement or Civil Authority not in the [BUREAU/OFFICE]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Department of the Interior Ethics/[BUREAU/OFFICE] Ethics Office	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. National Park Service Law Enforcement/Park Police [NPS]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Office of RACA (Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action) [BIA, BIE]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Justice Services [BIA]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Integrity and Professional Responsibility Advisor (IPRA) [BSEE, BOEM]	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q. Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART V. DEMOGRAPHIC AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

We would like to conclude the survey by asking some questions about your personal background. This information will allow us to combine responses across individuals to build the survey database. **YOUR RESPONSES WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND ANONYMOUS FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE SURVEY. DATA WILL BE COMPILED TO ENABLE US TO REPORT THE VIEWS AND EXPERIENCES OF GROUPS OF INDIVIDUALS.** Read each item and select the response alternative that applies to you. Remember, answering questions is optional.

56. What is your age? (Select one.)

- 25 or under 30-39 50-59
 26-29 40-49 60 or older

57. What is your current marital status? (Select one.)

- Single Partnered Married
 Separated Divorced Widowed

58. Are you Hispanic or Latino? (Select one.)

- Yes No

59. What is your racial background? (Select one.)

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
 Asian
 Black/African-American
 Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 White
 Two or more races

60. How do you describe your gender identity? (Select one.)

- Male
 Female
 Transgender
 Do not identify as female, male, or transgender

[If you answered Transgender to Question 60, please answer Question 61; otherwise, proceed to Question 62.]

61. You indicated that you consider yourself to be transgender. How would you describe yourself? (Select one.)

- Transgender, male to female
 Transgender, female to male
 Gender non-conforming
 Unsure
 I prefer not to say

62. Which of the following do you consider yourself to be? (Select one.)

- Heterosexual or straight
 Lesbian
 Gay
 Bisexual
 Other (e.g., questioning, asexual, undecided, self-identified, or intersex)
 I prefer not to say

63. Do you have a documented disability (i.e., on record with the [BUREAU/OFFICE])? (Select one.)

- Yes No

64. What is the highest level of education that you have completed to date? (Select one.)

- Less than a High School Diploma
 H.S. Diploma/GED or Equivalent
 H.S. Diploma + Trade or Technical Certificate
 H.S. Diploma + Some college, but no degree
 Associate's Degree (AA, AS)
 Bachelor's Degree (BA, BS)
 Master's Degree (MA, MS, MBA)
 Advanced Professional Degree (PhD, JD, MD)

65. How many years have you been employed with the [BUREAU/OFFICE]? Include time spent as a temporary, term and/or permanent employee. (Select one.)

- Less than 1 year
 1 to 3 years
 4 to 5 years
 6 to 10 years
 11 to 14 years
 15 to 20 years
 More than 20 years

66. What is your current pay category or grade?

(Select one.)

- Wage Grade (WG) 1-4
- Wage Grade (WG) 5-8
- Wage Grade (WG) 9-16
- Other Wage Grade (WG)
- General Schedule (GS) 1-6
- General Schedule (GS) 7-10
- General Schedule (GS) 11-12
- General Schedule (GS) 13-15
- Senior Level (SL)/Scientific Professional (ST)/
Senior Executive Service (SES)
- Other

Note: Wage Grades not shown for OIG, IBC, ONRR, OSMRE, SOL, BSEE, BOEM and OST. General Schedules 13, 14, and 15 listed individually for OIG.

67. What is your supervisory status? (Select one.)

- Team Leader** – Team leaders are not official supervisors; those who provide employees with day-to-day guidance in work projects, but do not have supervisory responsibilities or conduct performance appraisals
- Supervisor** – First-line supervisors are typically responsible for employees' performance appraisals and leave approval
- Manager** – Those in management positions who typically supervise one or more supervisors
- Senior Leader** – The heads of departments/agencies and their immediate leadership team, responsible for directing the policies and priorities of the department/bureau. May hold either a political or career appointment and typically a member of the Senior Executive Service or equivalent.
- None of the above

68. Which of the following best describes your current work location? (Select one.)

- National Park Service Headquarters Office (WASO) [NPS]
- Regional Office [NPS]
- Park or Other Field Location [NPS]
- Headquarters Office [USFWS]
- Regional Office [USFWS]
- Science, Research, Technical Service, or Other Administrative Center [USFWS]
- Refuge or Other Field Location [USFWS]
- 100% Telework [USFWS]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work [USFWS])

- Headquarters Office (Main Interior Building or Herndon) [OIG]
- Regional Office [OIG]
- Science, Research, Technical Service, or Other Administrative Center [OIG]
- Field Office [OIG]
- 100% Telework [OIG]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work [OIG])
- Headquarters Office (Washington) [OS]
- 100% Telework [OS]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work [OS])
- District of Columbia (Washington) [IBC]
- Virginia (Herndon/Reston) [IBC]
- Colorado (Denver) [IBC]
- Idaho (Boise), Arizona (Sierra Vista), Alaska (Anchorage), California (Sacramento) [IBC]
- 100% Telework [IBC]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work [IBC])
- Headquarters Office (Washington) [ONNR]
- Dallas, Texas [ONNR]
- Denver, Colorado [ONNR]
- Farmington, New Mexico [ONNR]
- Houston, Texas [ONNR]
- Oklahoma City, Oklahoma [ONNR]
- Tulsa, Oklahoma [ONNR]
- 100% Telework [ONNR]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work [ONNR])
- Headquarters Office (Washington, D.C. / Capital Region (Northern Virginia) [BIA]
- Regional Office [BIA]
- Jail / Detention Facility [BIA]
- 100% Telework [BIA]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work [BIA])
- Headquarters Office (Washington, D.C. / Capital Region (Northern Virginia) [BIE]
- Regional Office [BIE]
- School / Institution of Higher Learning [BIE]
- 100% Telework [BIE]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work [BIE])
- Headquarters Office (Washington) [OSMRE]

- Regional Office [OSMRE]
- Field Office [OSMRE]
- 100% Telework [OSMRE]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [OSMRE]
- Headquarters Office (Washington) [BLM]
- Headquarters (Other than Washington) [BLM]
- State Office [BLM]
- Field Office / District Office [BLM]
- National Interagency Fire Center [BLM]
- National Operations Center [BLM]
- 100% Telework [BLM]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [BLM]
- Headquarters Office (Washington) [SOL]
- Regional / Field Office [SOL]
- 100% Telework [SOL]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [SOL]
- Headquarters Office (Washington) / Denver-Based Office [BOR]
- Pacific Northwest Region [BOR]
- Mid-Pacific Region [BOR]
- Lower Colorado Region [BOR]
- Upper Colorado Region [BOR]
- Great Plains Region [BOR]
- 100% Telework [BOR]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [BOR]
- Headquarters Office (Greater Washington Metropolitan Area) [BSEE]
- Regional Office (Alaska, Gulf of Mexico, Pacific) [BSEE]
- District Office [BSEE]
- 100% Telework [BSEE]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [BSEE]
- Headquarters Office (Greater Washington Metropolitan Area) [BOEM]
- Regional Office (Alaska, Gulf of Mexico, Pacific) [BOEM]
- 100% Telework [BOEM]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [BOEM]
- Headquarters Office (Washington) [OST]
- Headquarters Office-West (Albuquerque) [OST]

- Regional Office [OST]
- Field Office [OST]
- American Indian Records Repository [OST]
- 100% Telework [OST]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [OST]
- Headquarters Office (Reston) [USGS]
- Regional Office [USGS]
- Field Office [USGS]
- 100% Telework [USGS]
- Other (none of the above describe the environment in which I routinely accomplish my work) [USGS]

68.2. What office are you in? (Select one.)

[Only asked for OIG]

- Office of Management
- Immediate Office (includes Office of General Counsel)
- Office of Investigations
- Office of Audits, Inspections, and Evaluations
- Prefer not to answer

68.2. What office do you work in? (Select one.)

[Only asked for IBC]

- Office of the Director
- Acquisition Services Directorate
- Financial Management Directorate
- Human Resources Directorate
- Other

68.2. What office do you work in? (Select one.)

[Only asked for ONRR]

- Director and Deputy Director Office
- Audit and Compliance Management
- Financial and Production Management
- Coordination, Enforcement, Validation and Appeals
- Other

69. What is the mix of your current work unit? (Select one.)

- Mostly men
- A relatively even mix of men and women
- Mostly women
- Don't know

70. What is the mix of the leadership within your current work unit? Include Team Leaders, Supervisors, and Managers. (Select one.)

- Mostly men
- A relatively even mix of men and women
- Mostly women
- Don't know

71. What is the mix of your occupation or career field? (Select one.)

- Mostly men
- A relatively even mix of men and women
- Mostly women
- Don't know

You are now at the end of the survey.

We appreciate your participation and thank you for sharing your opinions and experiences regarding workplace harassment. Please use the envelope provided to mail in your completed survey.

The deadline for submission is March 4, 2017.

If you are experiencing harassment in the workplace, there are many ways to report the issue and have it addressed. Your servicing human resources office or your servicing EEO/Civil Rights office is available to provide guidance and assistance on determining your options. You may also reach out to any HR or EEO office who will be able to assist you.

Bureau/Office Acronym	Bureau/Office Name
NPS	National Park Service
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
BIE	Bureau of Indian Education
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BOEM	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
BOR	Bureau of Reclamation
BSEE	Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement
IBC	Interior Business Center
OIG	Office of Inspector General
ONRR	Office of Natural Resources Revenue
OSMRE	Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement
OS	Office of the Secretary of the Interior
SOL	Office of the Solicitor
OST	Office of the Special Trustee
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey

Glossary of Terms

Concessioner: A person or entity who operates a business on or off federal premises, usually as the only seller of certain goods or services.

Contractor: A person or entity who contracts with the federal government to provide services, supplies, or other work.

Coworker: Someone with whom you work that is not your supervisor (or chain of command).

Disability: A physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such individual; a record of such an impairment; or being regarded as having such an impairment (Source: The Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. 12102).

Employee: An individual appointed in the civil service, does not include contractors, non-paid interns or volunteers.

Manager: Those in management positions who typically supervise one or more supervisors.

Partner: A person, volunteer or entity who has some degree of involvement with the Department or agency's mission through agreement or memorandum of understanding.

Permanent employee: An employee hired without time limitations.

Seasonal employment: A work schedule with annually recurring periods of work of less than 12 months.

Supervisor: First-line supervisors are typically responsible for employees' performance appraisals and leave approval.

Senior Leader: The heads of departments/agencies and their immediate leadership team, responsible for directing the policies of the department/bureau. May hold either a political or career appointment, and typically a member of the Senior Executive Service or equivalent.

Team Lead: Team leaders are not official supervisors; those who provide employees with day-to-day guidance in work projects, but do not have supervisory responsibilities or conduct performance appraisals.

Temporary employee: An employee who is appointed for less than one year.

Term employee: An employee who is appointed for no less than one year but not to exceed four years.

Work unit: A unit or team of employees who have been assigned to accomplish specific task

Federal Consulting Group

Rafael Williams
Contracting Officer's
Representative (COR)
202-208-3035 (tel)
Rafael_Williams@ios.doi.gov

Jessica Reed
Director
202-208-4699 (tel)
Jessica_Reed@ios.doi.gov

Call Order #109
IA# 20309
D12PA00231

CFI Group

625 Avis Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48108
734-930-9090 (tel)
www.cfigroup.com