Motivations behind catcalling: exploring men's engagement in street harassment behaviour

Kari A. Walton & Cory L. Pedersen

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

ARTICLE

Motivations behind catcalling: exploring men's engagement in street harassment behaviour

Kari A. Walton and Cory L. Pedersen

Department of Psychology, Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Surrey, Canada

ABSTRACT

'Catcalling' is a common form of street harassment, often described as sexual harassment from a stranger in a public place. In most cases, it involves a man intruding on a woman's attention using words, whistles, sounds, or gestures, which essentially define the woman as a sexual object. The purpose of the present study was to explore men's motivations for catcalling and to investigate the characteristics of men who catcall relative to those who do not. Male participants ($N = 258$) completed online survey measures of sexism, masculinity/femininity, social dominance, and attitudes towards sexual harassment. We also included a measure exploring motivations for catcalling and reactions that catcallers hope to elicit in their targets. The most frequently reported motivations for catcalling were to flirt with and to express sexual interest in the target, and the most desired reaction from recipients was friendliness. Further, men who reported having engaged in catcalling demonstrated higher levels of hostile sexism, self-ascribed masculinity, social dominance orientation, and tolerance of sexual harassment.

Street harassment is a form of sexual harassment that is perpetrated by a stranger in a public place (Bowman, 1993; Gardner, 1995; Leonardo, 1981). This widespread practice is frequently disregarded, partly because street harassment is often fleeting in nature, lacking in legal recourse, trivialised, and normalised (Bowman, 1993; Heben, 1994; Nielsen, 2000; Tran, 2015; Tuerkheimer, 1997). This is greatly problematic, as street harassment significantly harms victims (primarily women) both physically and mentally and perpetuates a culture that degrades, dehumanises, and devalues women (Chhun, 2011; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Kissling, 1991; Tran, 2015).

There is a general lack of research on the topic of street harassment, especially research investigating the motivations that drive perpetrators to harass. Considering the high prevalence rates and negative impacts of street harassment, it remains of utmost importance to work to reduce this behaviour; to do so, we must first understand what motivates men to engage in this behaviour. The purpose of the present study was to investigate men's motivations for engaging in a type of street harassment known as catcalling, as well as to examine the reactions they hope to elicit in targets. A secondary purpose was to elucidate differences between men who catcall and men who do not.

CONTACT Cory L. Pedersen ✉ cory.pedersen@kpu.ca Department of Psychology Kwantlen Polytechnic University, Surrey, Canada

Street harassment vs. catcalling

Street harassment is perpetrated by a harasser unknown to the victim (Bowman, 1993; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Gardner, 1995). In the majority of cases, men perpetrate and women are victims (Kissling & Kramarae, 1991; Tran, 2015; Tuerkheimer, 1997), though individuals of additional minority statuses are also at risk for victimisation (Davis, 1994; Fileborn, 2018; Fogg-Davis, 2006; Logan, 2015). Harassers engage in verbal or nonverbal behaviours such as whistles, leers, winks, grabs, car honks, gestures, or comments to intrude upon their target and may also stalk or follow their victim (Bowman, 1993; Gardner, 1995; Leonardo, 1981; Vera-Gray, 2016). When verbal remarks are made, they are 'frequently sexual in nature and often comment evaluatively on [the victim's] physical appearance or on [their] presence in public' (Bowman, 1993, p. 523). Verbal remarks may also be threatening or blatantly insulting; in rare cases, street harassment is a precursor to more violent physical or sexual assault, including rape and murder (Bowman, 1993; Chhun, 2011; Davis, 1994; Kearl, 2010).

The term 'catcalling' refers to a subcategory of street harassment behaviour; catcalls may be verbal or non-verbal, but unlike street harassment more generally, do not include stalking or physical contact. Definitions of catcalling include behaviours such as name-calling, propositioning, wolf-whistling, leering, winking, gesturing, and/or using signs to rate physical appearance (Chhun, 2011; YouGov, 2014). As with street harassment, there is currently no definitive consensus in the definition; though precise definitions are useful for research purposes, some argue that defining catcalling too specifically would contribute to under-representation of the construct, disregarding instances of catcalling that are more ambiguous (Vera-Gray, 2016). Thus, we conceptualise catcalling in the present work as verbal or non-verbal communication directed at strangers in public, typically from men to women, that is frequently about the recipient's appearance or that is sexual in nature.

Prevalence & impact

Street harassment is highly pervasive. Depending on the specific definitions involved, prevalence estimates fall anywhere upward of 30% (Macmillan et al., 2000). Higher end estimates in the U.S. and Canada indicate that 85% to 100% of women have experienced it at least once in their lifetime (Gardner, 1995; Johnson & Bennett, 2015; Macmillan et al., 2000; Nielsen, 2000), and Kearl (2010) notes that as many as 80% of women globally face at least one occasion of street harassment. Further, Nielsen (2000) found that 61% of their female sample experienced catcalls every day.

The prevalence of street harassment is particularly concerning when victim impact is considered. Women experience uncomfortable physical reactions such as muscle tension, difficulty breathing, numbness, trembling, dizziness, and nausea in response to being harassed (Tran, 2015). Moreover, street harassment can also escalate from catcalls to violence, putting the victim at risk for further physical harm (Bowman, 1993; Davis, 1994; Kearl, 2010; Tran, 2015). Street harassment also impacts victims mentally and emotionally, often with far-reaching consequences. Victims tend to experience a variety of negative emotions in response to being harassed, such as anger, fear, disgust, bodily shame, degradation, invasion, embarrassment, helplessness, and disempowerment (Bowman, 1993; Chhun, 2011; Fairchild & Rudman, 2008; Tuerkheimer, 1997). Catcalls also blatantly sexually objectify the recipient (Bowman, 1993; Chhun, 2011; Gardner, 1995), resulting in increased self-objectification (Fairchild & Rudman, 2008), body-image self-consciousness (Chaudoir & Quinn, 2010; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), and negative self-evaluations among victims (Davidson et al., 2015). These negative experiences impose mental strain on victims, potentially triggering psychological trauma, anxiety, or depression (Bowman, 1993; Chhun, 2011; Davidson et al., 2016; Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997).

Catcalls vs compliments

Despite the negative impacts of street harassment, catcalls in particular are often dismissed by men, and sometimes women, as mere compliments (Benard & Schlaffer, 1984; Chhun, 2011; Gardner, 1995; Gennaro & Ritschel, 2019; O'Leary & Baldwin, 2016; YouGov, 2014). This is because catcalls frequently involve the expression of sexual attraction to or liking for the recipient's appearance. Given not all women report distaste for the harassment experience (Grossman, 2008; Kissling & Kramarae, 1991), Fairchild (2010) explored contextual factors that influence women's interpretations of catcalling as complimentary or harassing. Though emotions varied by situation, women felt similarly fearful of catcalling across all contexts, suggesting fear is a consistent and notable component, even if catcalls are interpreted positively.

Some argue that the impact of harassing behaviour is more relevant than the recipient's interpretation of it. Vera-Gray (2016) conceptualises catcalling behaviour as inherently intrusive. This shifts the focus away from interpretation and towards the action itself, thus allowing for a broader range of behaviours and their impact to be addressed. Similarly, Kissling (1991) acknowledges that some women interpret certain catcalls as flattering and that some men might indeed have good intentions when making them. This does not mean such behaviour is without consequence or that it should be tolerated. Catcalls – regardless of intention or interpretation – are objectifying in nature, predicated on gender privilege, and reinforcing of a hostile social environment for women, even when not facially derogatory (Bowman, 1993; Fisher et al., 2019; Kissling, 1991; Tran, 2015).

Contributing factors

Few studies to date have examined the various factors contributing to, or motivations behind, street harassing behaviour. Among these, along with research on sexual harassment more broadly, indicate that both situational factors and person factors play an important role.

Situational factors

Group norms that are tolerant or supportive of sexual harassment have been found to increase ingroup members' likelihood to sexually harass (Pryor et al., 1993). Further, group members may be influenced to act in accordance with such norms even if they privately disagree with them (Cialdini et al., 1991; Forsyth, 1995). The presence of other ingroup members also contributes to men's sexual harassment proclivity due to the anonymity provided (Postmes & Spears, 1998; see also Gardner, 1995); groups that offer high anonymity to their members and that have harassment-tolerant norms create an environment where an individual is likely to sexually harass. Group contexts can also foster an 'us versus them' mentality, which encourages bonding within the group (Dall'Ara & Maass, 1999); if group norms permit sexual harassment, men may bond with others in their group by sharing in the harassment of a woman (or multiple women) together (Gardner, 1995; Thomae & Pina, 2015). Wesselmann and Kelly (2010) found that college-aged men were more likely to engage in catcalling behaviour when in a group than when alone, due to the influence of group norms, the anonymity granted, and the opportunity for group bonding. These results share similarity with past research conducted by Benard and Schlaffer (1984) who found that catcallers described their behaviour as both harmless and fun, with the majority reporting that catcalling helped them to relieve boredom and develop camaraderie with other men. On a darker note, 15% of the sample expressed an explicit desire to anger or humiliate women with their catcalls.

Person factors

There is consensus that sexual harassment is part of a broader culture that accepts, if not encourages, discrimination, hostility, and violence towards women (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Pryor, 1987; Thomae & Pina, 2015). Foundational to said culture are various attitudes and beliefs, many of which underlie

and motivate sexually harassing behaviour. Men who embrace sexist opinions are more likely to harbour hostile attitudes towards women, which can manifest in their behaviour (Flood, 2007; Glick & Hilt, 2000; Pryor & Whalen, 1997). Pryor et al. (1995) found that the holding of hostile and sexist beliefs is associated with higher likelihood to sexually harass. Similarly, Russell and Trigg (2004) reported that those who are more tolerant of sexual harassment are more likely to harbour ambivalence and hostility towards women. Sexism is also deeply rooted in traditional/conservative gender role beliefs (Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Swim & Cohen, 1997), which are stereotypical 'opinions about males and females and about purported qualities of masculinity and femininity' (Deaux & Kite, 1987, p. 97). Traditionally conservative masculinity has been found to be positively associated with supportive attitudes towards and more engagement in sexually harassing behaviours (Flood, 2007; Jacobs, 1996; Pryor, 1987; Sinn, 1997).

Social dominance – which reflects acceptance of or even preference for inequality among social groups (e.g. men and women) – is strongly associated with both sexism and traditional/conservative gender role beliefs; individuals who score high in social dominance orientation tend to endorse sexist ideologies and gender role stereotypes, all of which play a key role in sexual harassment (Pratto et al., 1994; Pryor, 1987).

The current study

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the characteristics of heterosexual men who engage in catcalling – relative to men who do not – by comparing them on endorsement of sexism, masculinity/femininity, social dominance, and attitudes towards sexual harassment, thus constructing a basic characterisation of the attitudes and beliefs of men who catcall. Given previous research on sexual harassment more broadly, we hypothesised that men who engage in catcalling would score higher on measures of sexism, social dominance, traditionally conservative masculinity, and tolerance of sexual harassment than men who do not engage in catcalling behaviour. This study also explores potential motivations for catcalling, such as flattery and flirtation, power, anonymity, group dynamics, misogyny, and sexuality. Additionally, we examined the desired reaction(s) (e.g. fear, passivity, attraction) that catcallers hope to elicit in their target(s).

Method

Participants

Participants were primarily recruited via convenience sampling through the research participant pool of a large Western Canadian university; participating students were offered course credit to specified psychology classes. Participants were also recruited via snowball sampling through various social media platforms, including Facebook, Instagram, Reddit, and Twitter. Participating members of the public did not receive any compensation for participation.

The initial sample comprised 448 heterosexual men. For the purposes of the present study, it was necessary to include only cisgender male participants, thus, two non-binary individuals were excluded. A further 168 were excluded for insufficient completion rate (<75%), and an additional 20 were removed on suspicion of disingenuity. This resulted in a final sample of 258 men who were predominantly Caucasian (72.9%) and college/university educated (78.4%).

This total was separated into two subcategories; men who catcall ($n = 86$), who ranged in age from 16 to 75 years ($M = 29.06$; $SD = 12.50$) and men who do not catcall ($n = 172$), who ranged in age from 16 to 66 years ($M = 28.55$; $SD = 11.20$).

Measures

Demographics

Participants responded to a 7-item questionnaire regarding their sexual orientation and gender (to ascertain participant eligibility), age, ethnicity, relationship status, socioeconomic status, and highest level of completed education.

Ambivalent sexism inventory-short form

The ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1996) consists of 12 items answered on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*strong disagreement*) to 5 (*strong agreement*). Six items measuring hostile sexism include statements such as, 'Women seek to gain power by getting control over men' and 'Women exaggerate problems they have at work'. Six items assessing benevolent sexism include statements such as, 'Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess' and 'Women should be cherished and protected by men'. This inventory results in two subscale scores, one for the total of items that measure hostile sexism ($\alpha = .87$) and another for the total of items that measure benevolent sexism ($\alpha = .77$).

Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale (SHAS)

The SHAS (Mazer & Percival, 1989) assesses tolerance and acceptance of sexual harassment using 19 items answered on a 5-point Likert scale. The scale was modified to a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Sample items include, 'An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn to handle them,' and 'A lot of what people call sexual harassment is just normal flirtation.' Higher scores indicated increased tolerance of sexual harassment ($\alpha = .91$).

Social dominance orientation

The SDO7 (Ho et al., 2015) measures two components of group domination – dominance and anti-egalitarianism – with 16 items answered on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly oppose*) to 7 (*strongly favour*). Four items measuring pro-trait dominance include statements such as, 'Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups'. Four items measuring con-trait dominance include items such as, 'No one group should dominate in society'. Four items measuring pro-trait anti-egalitarianism include items such as, 'We should not push for group equality'. Four items measuring con-trait anti-egalitarianism include items such as, 'We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed'. Con-trait items are reverse scored so that higher total scores indicate stronger attitudes favouring social dominance ($\alpha = .93$).

Traditional masculinity-femininity

The TMF (Kachel et al., 2016) assesses central facets of self-ascribed masculinity and femininity. The scale consists of 6 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*very masculine*) to 7 (*very feminine*). Scale items include 'I consider myself as . . . ', and 'Ideally, I would like to be . . . '. Higher scores indicate higher self-ascribed femininity, while lower scores reflect higher endorsement of masculinity ($\alpha = .80$).

Catcalling motivations & reactions

The present study necessitated the development of a set of items to assess men's motivations for engaging in catcalling behaviour. Thus, a 23-item scale was developed, based on motivations identified and explored in prior literature (see Benard & Schlaffer, 1984; Oswald et al., 2019;

Wesselmann & Kelly, 2010), that present possible motivations for engaging in catcalling. Scale items comprised motivational forces including group factors (e.g. 'Because all my friends do it'), anonymity (e.g. 'Because the woman doesn't know who I am'), misogyny (e.g. 'Because I feel a sense of dislike towards women and this behaviour is satisfying'), power (e.g. 'To show I have power'), mood (e.g. 'To improve my mood'), sexuality (e.g. 'To show my sexual interest in the woman'), and flirtation/flattery (e.g. 'To show I like the woman').

Participants were presented with the prompt, 'Please think about whether or not you have, within the last year or so, expressed verbal or non-verbal communication of a sexual or flirtatious nature – such as whistling, gesturing, calling out, or making comments – to a woman/group of women you did not know, in a public setting, referring to her/their physical appearance (check all that apply)'. Participants then viewed a list of six descriptions of various catcalling behaviours and selected which behaviours, if any, they had engaged in within the past year. The six descriptions included; 'stared intentionally (not trying to hide it) at a female stranger in public because you found her attractive', 'winked or whistled at a woman (group of women) who you did not know in public', 'suggested to a female stranger in public that she should show off her smile', 'called out to a female stranger in public commenting on her appearance (e.g. making reference to her hair, makeup . . . etc.)', 'called out to a female stranger in public that she's really attractive (e.g. telling her that she's "hot", "sexy" . . . etc.)', 'said something explicitly sexual to a female stranger in public (e.g. telling her that you're turned on by her, want to have sex with her . . . etc.)', and 'select this if you have NOT engaged in any of these behaviours within the last year or so'.

Participants who reported having engaged in catcalling behaviour(s) were asked to indicate approximately how often they had done so on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not very often*) to 4 (*very often*) before being presented with the list of 23 potential motivation items. Participants then indicated on a 3-point Likert scale how much each item was a reason or motive for their behaviour, where 0 indicated that the item was never a reason why they catcalled and 2 indicated that the item was very much a reason they catcalled.

Participants then reported what reaction(s) they hoped to elicit in the recipient of their catcalls. Borrowing from Oswald et al. (2019), a list of 20 items with varying reactions were provided (e.g. 'I hoped the woman would . . . '). Participants rated how much each item was a hoped-for reaction on the same 3-point Likert scale used in the previous set of questions, where 0 indicated that the item was not at all a hoped-for reaction and 2 indicated that the item was very much a reaction that they hoped to elicit. The potential hoped-for reactions included friendliness, ignorance, aggression, attention, sexual interest/attraction, romantic interest, and feelings of fear, disgust, anger, shame, shock, intimidation, and flattery.

Design & procedure

After receiving ethics approval from a Western Canadian university IRB, we recruited eligible participants to a 30-minute, anonymous online survey to the software Qualtrics. The study was presented as an examination of men's public interactions with women. Upon completion of consent, basic demographic questions were asked; participants who indicated that they were not over 16 years, male, and heterosexual were automatically directed to the end of the survey. Eligible participants were then presented with the catcalling motivations and reactions measure and the remaining four measures as listed above.

Statistical analysis

A series of five independent-group t-tests were conducted to address this study's research questions of whether men who catcall score higher than men who do not on the dependent variables of benevolent and hostile sexism, traditional conservative masculinity, social dominance, and tolerance of sexual harassment. Assumptions of homogeneity of variance using Levene's test were nonsignificant ($p > .05$)

for all analyses, indicating no violation of the assumption. Motivational factors for engaging in catcalling, as well as hoped-for reactions from the recipient, were explored by examining frequency data.

Results

Five separate independent-group t-tests were conducted to ascertain whether men who catcall scored higher than men who do not on the dependent variables of benevolent sexism, hostile sexism, traditional conservative masculinity, social dominance, and tolerance of sexual harassment. Assumptions of homogeneity of variance were met (Levene's $p > .05$) for all analyses. Motivational factors for engaging in catcalling, as well as hoped for reactions from the recipient, were explored by examining frequency data.

Analyses of differences between catcallers & non-catcallers

Independent-group t-tests indicated no significant differences in age, $t(256) = -.33$, $p = .740$, or socioeconomic status, $t(256) = -.52$, $p = .606$, between catcallers and non-catcallers. A series of chi-square tests of independence were conducted between men who catcall and men who do not on categorical demographic variables of ethnicity, relationship status, and highest level of completed education, which were recoded to meet chi-square analysis assumptions (i.e. no expected values less than 5 per cell; see Field, 2013). No significant differences were found between catcallers and non-catcallers in ethnicity, $\chi^2(2, N = 258) = 2.18$, $p = .336$, relationship status, $\chi^2(3, N = 258) = 2.68$, $p = .443$, or highest level of completed education, $\chi^2(3, N = 258) = 1.60$, $p = .659$. Demographic characteristics by catcalling status are summarised in Table 1.

The first t-test on the dependent variable of sexism revealed a statistically significant effect for the hostile sexism subscale, $t(256) = -4.24$, $p < .001$, Hedges' $g = .56$, but a non-significant effect for the benevolent sexism subscale, $t(256) = -1.60$, $p = .111$. Results further revealed significant t-tests for the dependent variables of masculinity/femininity endorsement, $t(256) = 2.15$, $p = .033$, Hedges' $g = .28$, social dominance orientation, $t(247) = -3.48$, $p = .001$, Hedges' $g = .47$, and tolerance of

Table 1. Distribution of demographic characteristics by catcalling status.

	Catcallers $n = 86$ $M_{age} = 29.06$ $(SD = 12.50)$	Non-Catcallers $n = 172$ $M_{age} = 28.55$ $(SD = 11.20)$
Ethnicity	58 (67.4)	130 (75.6)
(a) White	15 (17.4)	25 (14.5)
(b) Asian (South or East)	13 (15.1)	17 (9.9)
(c) Other		
Relationship Status	40 (46.5)	82 (47.7)
(a) Single	13 (15.1)	15 (8.7)
(b) Casually dating	18 (20.9)	38 (22.1)
(c) Non-married committed	15 (17.4)	37 (21.5)
(d) Married/Civil union		
Education	15 (17.4)	41 (23.8)
(a) High school or less	35 (40.7)	62 (36.0)
(b) Some college/university	20 (23.3)	41 (23.8)
(c) College/university degree	16 (18.6)	28 (16.3)
(d) Postgraduate studies		

Percentages appear in parentheses. Demographic variables were recoded to satisfy statistical assumptions. Ethnicity: White, Asian (South or East), 'other' (inclusive of Indigenous/Aboriginal, Hispanic/Latinx, Middle Eastern, Pacific Islander, and Multiracial/other categories); Relationship Status: Single (inclusive of single, separated, legally divorced, and widowed), casually dating, non-married committed, married/civil union; Education: High school or less (inclusive of some high school and completed high school), some college/university, college/university degree (inclusive of Bachelor's and vocational degrees).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for dependent variables of men who do and do not engage in catcalling.

	Catcallers n = 86 M (SE)	Non-Catcallers n = 172 M (SE)	95% CI of Difference	
			Lower	Upper
Benevolent sexism	10.70 (.52)	9.73 (.35)	−2.18	.23
Hostile sexism**	11.17 (.57)	8.38 (.37)	−4.08	−1.49
Masculinity/femininity*	13.56 (.38)	14.63 (.29)	.09	2.05
Social dominance orientation**	41.22 (1.96)	33.62 (1.18)	−11.82	−3.27
Tolerance of sexual harassment**	64.09 (1.84)	50.45 (1.10)	−17.63	−9.65

Higher scores indicate greater endorsement of each construct. Benevolent and hostile sexism range = 0–24; masculinity/femininity range = 5–35, where higher scores indicate greater femininity; social dominance orientation range = 16–96; tolerance of sexual harassment range = 19–114. *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$.

Table 3. Frequency of engagement in six different types of catcalling behaviour.

	Frequency (n = 86)	Percent
Stared intentionally (i.e. 'leering', 'ogling')	70	81.4
Made a specific comment about appearance (e.g. hair, clothes)	28	32.6
Made a specific comment about attractiveness (e.g. 'hot', 'sexy')	13	15.1
Winked or whistled	12	14.0
Suggested that a woman show off her smile	7	8.1
Made a sexually explicit comment	6	7.0
'How often [in the last year] have you engaged in [catcalling] behaviour?'		
Not very often	51	59.3
Somewhat often	18	20.9
Quite often	12	14.0
Very often	5	5.8

sexual harassment, $t(247) = −6.73$, $p < .001$, Hedges' $g = .91$. Men who catcall scored significantly higher on measures of hostile sexism, self-ascribed traditionally conservative masculinity, social dominance orientation, and tolerance of sexual harassment relative to those who do not. Means and standard errors by catcalling status are provided in Table 2.

Frequency of types of catcalling

Within our sample of 258 heterosexual men, 33.4% (n = 86) reported having engaged in catcalling within the last year. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the six different types of catcalling behaviours that participants endorsed to indicate that the most frequently reported form of catcalling was staring – obviously and intentionally (i.e. leering or ogling) – at a female stranger in public because of felt attraction (81.4%); moreover, 57% of participants reported engaging in *only* leering. Second most endorsed was the act of calling out a specific comment to a female stranger about her appearance, such as referring to her hair, clothes, or make-up. Participants also reported having called out a comment to a female stranger about her attractiveness (e.g. calling her 'hot' or 'sexy'), as well as engaging in winking or whistling behaviour. Least frequently endorsed were the catcalling behaviours of telling a female stranger to show off her smile, and of making an explicitly sexual comment. Regarding the frequency at which participants reported engaging in catcalling behaviour overall, more than half (59.3%) of catcallers indicated their engagement in the behaviour was 'not very often', while approximately 20% of catcallers reported engaging in the behaviour quite or very often.

Motivations for catcalling

A principle component analysis (PCA) organised the motivational factors into clusters of like items, using eigenvalues greater than 1 with a direct oblimin rotation. The overall Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)

Table 4. Endorsed motivations for engaging in catcalling behaviour in the last year.

'I engaged in the [catcalling] behaviour . . . '	Frequency $n = 82$	Percent Per Item	Percent Per Category
Sexually Positive Affect			**72%**
To show that I like the woman	70	85.4	
To show my sexual interest in the woman	68	82.9	
Because this is a normal way of flirting	60	73.1	
Because having her respond improves my self-esteem	37	45.1	
Flirtation/Flattery			**62%**
To compliment the woman	61	74.4	
Because women like it	41	50.0	
Gratification Cost/Benefit Motives			**47%**
To improve my mood or cheer me up	41	50.0	
Because it turns me on	40	48.8	
Because the woman was dressed provocatively	40	48.8	
Because it's easy to get away with it	32	39.0	
Anonymity & Power:			**18%**
Because the woman doesn't know who I am	31	37.8	
Because it's fun to get a rise out of the woman	12	14.6	
Because it makes me feel in control	10	12.1	
To show I have power	6	7.3	
Group Dynamics			**15%**
Because it makes me feel like one of the guys	14	17.1	
Because it makes me feel popular with the guys	13	15.9	
Because all my friends do it	13	15.9	
Because my friends and I think it's funny	10	12.2	
Misogyny			**4%**
I don't like feminism and this behaviour is a way to punish women for trying to take power away from men	6	7.3	
To make the woman feel self-conscious	5	6.0	
Because I feel a sense of dislike towards women and this behaviour is satisfying	3	3.7	
To make fun of the woman	2	2.4	
To make the woman feel uncomfortable	2	2.4	

Raw data and percentages for motives reflect instances endorsed across responses of 82 catcallers.

measure was .73, an acceptable value (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant, $\chi^2(253) = 1140.88$, $p < .001$, indicating the data were appropriate for factoring. The PCA revealed six components explaining 70% of the total variance. We labelled the six components anonymity/power, sexually positve affect, misogyny, flirtation/flattery, gratification cost/benefits, and group dynamics (see Supplementary Table 1).

As indicated in Table 4, the sexually positive affect composite was the most highly endorsed, with an average of 72% of catcallers endorsing this category overall. Within the composite, the most popular reason for catcalling was 'to show that I like the woman' (85.4%) followed by 'to show my sexual interest in the woman' (82.9%) and 'because this is a normal way of flirting' (73.1%). The second most frequently reported motivational composite was flirtation/flattery, with an average of 62% of catcallers endorsing this composite. Within the flirtation/flattery motive category, the most endorsed reason for catcalling was 'to compliment the woman' (74.4%). The gratification cost/benefit analysis composite was the third most strongly endorsed, with 47% of catcallers endorsing this category overall. The most highly endorsed motive within this composite was 'to improve my mood or cheer me up' (50%), followed by 'because it turns me on' and 'because the woman was dressed provocatively' – both endorsed by 48.8% of participants. Less strongly endorsed were the motive composites regarding anonymity/power (18%), group dynamics (15%), and misogyny (4%).

Table 5. Hoped-for recipient reactions among catcallers.

'I hoped that the woman would …'	Frequency (n = 82)	Percent Per Item (%)
Smile at me	70	85.4
Flirt with me	66	80.5
Converse with me	64	78.0
Feel flattered	64	73.2
Feel attracted to me	60	73.2
Pay attention to me	59	72.0
Admire my confidence	51	62.2
Want to date me	45	54.9
Want to have sex with me	43	52.4
View me as masculine	27	32.9
View me as powerful	14	17.0
Feel flustered/shocked	10	12.2
Ignore me	9	10.9
Feel intimidated	7	8.5
Yell at me or insult me	4	4.9
Feel angry	4	4.9
Feel afraid	4	4.9
Feel dirty or ashamed	3	3.6
Feel disgusted	3	3.6
I don't care how she reacts	36	43.9

Raw data and percentages reflect instances endorsed across responses of 82 catcallers.

Hoped-for recipient reactions

Participants' hoped-for reactions from the recipients of their catcalls were also examined. Table 5 indicates that the most frequently endorsed reactions were those that might be described as 'friendliness', with 85.4% of catcallers hoping the recipient would smile in response to being catcalled, 80.5% hoping she would flirt, and 78% hoping that she would converse. Further, 73.2% of participants indicated they hoped the recipient would feel flattered by their catcalls and more than half (73.2%) endorsed the item, 'I hoped the woman would feel attracted to me'. Additionally, 62.2% of participants hoped the recipient would admire their confidence. Approximately half of catcallers hoped that their target would want to date (54.9%) or have sex (52.4%) with them. Only a small number of catcallers endorsed the negative reaction items regarding shock (12.2%), intimidation (8.5%), anger (4.9%), fear (4.9%), shame (3.6%), and disgust (3.6%). Although the majority (72%) of catcallers hoped to gain their target's attention, 10.9% hoped to be ignored and 43.9% were not concerned about the target's response, endorsing the statement, 'I don't care how she reacts'.

Discussion

We examined group differences between men who engage in catcalling relative to men who do not. Additionally, we investigated men's motivations for engaging in catcalling, as well as their hoped-for recipient reactions. Within our sample of 258 heterosexual men, 33.4% reported engaging in catcalling within the past year, suggesting this behaviour is quite common.

First, analyses of various beliefs and characteristics allowed us to examine group differences between men who do and who do not catcall. Consistent with our hypotheses, men who reported having engaged in catcalling within the past year demonstrated greater endorsement of sexist beliefs, self-ascribed traditional/conservative masculinity, social dominance orientation, and tolerance of sexual harassment than men who did not report engaging in catcalling. The one exception was benevolent sexism, on which catcallers scored similarly to non-catcallers. This nonsignificant finding is nonetheless consistent with that reported by Russell and Trigg (2004) on predictors of sexual harassment more broadly. Thus, given past research on the associations of these variables

with sexual harassment proclivity, our results are unsurprising in the context of catcalling behaviour.

Most catcallers reported engaging in leering (ogling) as their primary catcalling behaviour, with 57% of catcallers reporting engaging in only leering and no other behaviours; 24.4% reported engaging in leering along with one or more other catcalling behaviours. Leering may have been the most common form of catcalling behaviour reported because participants perceive it as the least invasive, most defensible activity – and the least likely to be rebuffed. Unlike more overt and intrusive forms of catcalling behaviour (e.g. making explicitly sexual comments), which are less ambiguous, and which might incur retaliatory responses, leering allows for plausible deniability. Catcallers who leer can more easily maintain that the action was misconstrued or misinterpreted by their intended victim.

Indeed, catcalling is more common than other more confrontational forms of street harassment (Macmillan et al., 2000), suggesting prevalence decreases as the form of harassment becomes increasingly more intrusive and objectionable. Moreover, catcallers intending to flatter or flirt with their target may perceive the more ambiguous forms of catcalling (i.e. leering or commenting on appearance) to be complimentary and less harassing. Considering most catcalling participants endorsed an intention to compliment their target, this could explain why making explicitly sexual comments was least frequently reported by participants, as this behaviour may be considered the least complimentary.

More than half of catcallers reported engaging in catcalling behaviour(s) 'not very often' within the past year. Our results may thus be best interpreted as a reflection of men who primarily engage in more subtle or ambiguous forms of catcalling relatively infrequently. Nonetheless, nearly half of catcallers indicated that they catcall in ways other than (or in addition to) leering/ogling, and 40% reported catcalling 'somewhat often' or more. In other words, our sample was relatively balanced between those who only engage in leering and those who engage in other forms of catcalling, as well as between those who catcall infrequently and those who catcall more frequently. Further research is clearly needed to fully explore the ways that frequency of catcalling and variations in catcalling behaviour relate to each other, as well as to participant attitudes and motivations.

Participants reported a variety of motivations for engaging in catcalling. The most frequently reported motive composite for catcalling was sexually positive affect, suggesting catcalling is often motivated by a desire to express sexual interest in the target; participants indicated they catcall to 'show that [they] like the woman' and 'because this is a normal way of flirting'. The second most endorsed motivations fell into the category of flirtation/flattery with intentions to 'compliment the woman' or 'because women like it'. Collectively, these findings are consistent with previous literature indicating that some men believe women enjoy being catcalled and that catcalling is a normative strategy for flirting and communicating sexual attraction (Benard & Schlaffer, 1984). Moreover, our findings align with literature indicating men are more likely than women to interpret catcalls as compliments (Gennaro & Ritschel, 2019) and to perceive their behaviour as harmless (Benard & Schlaffer, 1984).

Similar to the findings of Oswald et al. (2019), who examined heterosexual men's motivations for sending unsolicited photos of their genitalia to women, catcalling behaviour may be representative of perpetrators' misperception of their target's interest in being a recipient. Women tend to experience negative emotions in response to being catcalled, yet the participants in our study primarily expressed a desire for their target to feel flattered and attracted in response to their behaviours, and least frequently endorsed a desire to provoke negative emotions such as anger or fear. In other words, catcallers appear to interpret and intend their behaviour as innocent flirting without realising their target is likely to feel unappreciative of their actions and be impacted negatively by them. Indeed, given past research suggesting that it is common for men to overestimate women's sexual interest (Hart & Howard, 2016; Lee et al., 2020), it is reasonable to expect that catcallers may make a similar misjudgement. Some women, however, do report enjoyment of receiving catcalls (Fairchild, 2009, 2010; Grossman, 2008), which understandably contributes to the ambiguity of what ought to be acceptable behaviour and what ought not to be.

Some men, however, may find recipient's negative responses to their catcalling to be reinforcing. Anonymity/power and misogynistic motives were endorsed by some catcallers; men whose motivations fell into these categories endorsed statements such as 'I feel a sense of dislike towards women and this [catcalling] behaviour is satisfying', and '[I engage in catcalling behaviour] because it's fun to get a rise out of the woman'. These findings are consistent with past research indicating that some men wish to anger or humiliate women with their catcalls (Benard & Schlaffer, 1984). Moreover, this further relates to the findings of Oswald et al. (2019), who discovered that motives related to misogyny and power sometimes drive men to send women unsolicited photos of their genitalia – another form of sexual harassment.

When catcallers were asked about the reactions that they hoped to elicit in the recipients of their catcalls, nearly half (44%) expressed endorsement for the statement, 'I don't care how she reacts'. Some men may find the act of catcalling to be intrinsically satisfying (worth engaging in regardless of how their behaviour is received). For instance, men who are motivated to catcall by group dynamics, such as factors related to the influence of group norms or the opportunity for group bonding, may find catcalling to be satisfying because it serves a function such as strengthening their group's cohesiveness or providing entertainment among their friends, which do not depend on any particular response from the target. Moreover, men who engage in catcalling with more malicious intent might take pleasure in objectifying and harassing women despite their target's reaction. An additional explanation may be that participants interpreted the statement to mean 'I wouldn't care if she failed to react in the way that I was hoping for', which could perhaps indicate feelings of tolerance or acceptance for the various ways that women might respond to catcalls despite having a preferred response. On the contrary, some catcallers endorsed the self-gratification motive of improvement of mood, suggesting that it may be reasonable to expect that some men engage in catcalling due to hopes of receiving a specific, sought-after reaction that will in turn provide them with a benefit, such as an ego-boost.

Limitations & future directions

We utilised a self-report measure to identify participants' engagement in catcalling behaviour; it is therefore possible that participants were dishonest – either due to memory deficits or an intentional desire to misrepresent their engagement in catcalling due to demand characteristics. It is also possible that some participants may have misinterpreted the descriptions of catcalling to include genuinely complimentary interactions and may have been falsely categorised as a catcaller. However, as Wesselmann and Kelly (2010) note, participants' under-reporting of their engagement in catcalling, or their mis-categorisation of themselves as a catcaller, would be counterproductive in terms of finding the expected differences between groups. Thus, our results are likely an underestimate of the differences between men who catcall and men who do not, as well as an overestimate of how many men have good intentions when catcalling.

Further limitations include our reliance on convenience sampling limited to heterosexual men. Similarly, the acquired sample was primarily White, and college/university educated. Future studies should attempt to examine motivations behind catcalling using a more diverse sample. Additionally, most catcallers reported engaging predominantly in leering or ogling, one of the more subtle and ambiguous forms of catcalling; future researchers should obtain a larger sample that includes a variety of different catcalling behaviours to reduce chances of misrepresentation. Furthermore, the present study only examined the specific motivations we identified; certainly, there are other motivations for engaging in catcalling that our measure did not capture.

It would also be worthwhile to examine differences among catcallers by comparing those who engage in it frequently with those who catcall infrequently, or by comparing catcallers who engage in more overt forms of harassment with those who engage in more covert forms. Indeed, the present study attempted to examine such relationships, however, our small sample of catcallers prevented adequate testing of these relationships. Additionally, it would be beneficial to analyse the contradictions and tensions between responses made by the same participant, for example, where they may have

indicated motives related to both flirting and anonymity, or where their reported motivation(s) contradict with their hoped-for reaction(s). Lastly, future researchers may consider using vignettes to describe various instances of catcalling, as this may limit participants' misinterpretation of the interaction.

Conclusion

Given the high prevalence rates and harmful impacts of catcalling, as well as the lack of research exploring men's motivations for engaging in catcalling, the present study provides much-needed empirical insight into the various reasons why men catcall. We established that men primarily engage in catcalling for reasons of sexually positive affect and to flatter or flirt with their target. Motive categories regarding gratification cost/benefit analysis, group dynamics, and anonymity/power were also endorsed. Only a small minority of catcallers reported being motivated by misogyny. By engaging in catcalling, men primarily hoped to receive friendly responses from women and to elicit feelings of flattery and attraction, whereas a small portion hoped to elicit negative emotions.

These results provide evidence to suggest that while catcalling behaviour is deliberately motivated by misogynistic ideologies in some men, the majority do not intend to cause harm or negative psychological outcomes. At the same time, we demonstrated that men who catcall have score higher on measures of hostile sexism, traditionally conservative masculinity, social dominance orientation, and tolerance of sexual harassment than men who do not. Thus, while most catcallers claim no desire to demean or harm women, their attitudes and behaviours are in tension with their stated aims. This study contributes to the literature on street harassment and can be used to inform education programmes that address issues of gender inequality, sexual harassment, and the sexual objectification of women.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Cory L. Pedersen (iD) http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9769-3207

References

Benard, C., & Schlaffer, E. (1984). The man in the street: Why he harasses. In A. M. Jaggar & P. S. Rothenberg (Eds.), *Feminist frameworks* (pp. 395–398). McGraw-Hill.

Bowman, C. G. (1993). Street harassment and the informal ghettoization of women. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(3), 517–580. http://doi.org/10.2307/1341656

Chaudoir, S. R., & Quinn, D. M. (2010). Bystander sexism in the intergroup context: The impact of cat-calls on women's reactions towards men. *Sex Roles*, *62*(9–10), 623–634. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9735-0

Chhun, B. (2011). Catcalls: Protected speech or fighting words. *Thomas Jefferson Law Review*, *33*, 273–295. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/tjeflr33&div=12&id=&page=

Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct: A theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 201–234). Academic.

Dall'Ara, E., & Maass, A. (1999). Studying sexual harassment in the laboratory: Are egalitarian women at higher risk? *Sex Roles*, *41*(9/10), 681–704. http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018816025988

Davidson, M. M., Butchko, M. S., Robbins, K., Sherd, L. W., & Gervais, S. J. (2016). The mediating role of perceived safety on street harassment and anxiety. *Psychology of Violence*, *6*(4), 553–561. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0039970

Davidson, M. M., Gervais, S. J., & Sherd, L. W. (2015). The ripple effects of stranger harassment on objectification of self and others. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *39*(1), 53–66. http://doi.org/10.1177/0361684313514371

Davis, D. E. (1994). The harm that has no name: Street harassment, embodiment, and African American women. *UCLA Women's Law Journal*, *4*, 133–178. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/uclawo4&div=15&id=&page=

Deaux, K., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Thinking about gender. In B. B. Hess & M. M. Ferree (Eds.), *Analyzing gender: A handbook of social science research* (pp. 92–117). Sage.

Fairchild, K. (2009). *Everyday stranger harassment: Frequency and consequences* (Doctoral dissertation). Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Fairchild, K. (2010). Context effects on women's perceptions of stranger harassment. *Sexuality & Culture*, 14(3), 191–216. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-010-9070-1

Fairchild, K., & Rudman, L. A. (2008). Everyday stranger harassment and women's objectification. *Social Justice Research*, 21(3), 338–357. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-008-0073-0

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics: And sex and drugs and rock 'n roll* (4th ed.). Sage.

Fileborn, B. (2018). Naming the unspeakable harm of street harassment: A survey-based examination of disclosure practices. *Violence Against Women*, 25(2), 223–248. http://doi.org/10.1177/1077801218768709

Fisher, S., Lindner, D., & Ferguson, C. J. (2019). The effects of exposure to catcalling on women's state self-objectification and body image. *Current Psychology*, 38(6), 1495–1502. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9697-2

Flood, M. (2007). Men, sex, and homosociality: How bonds between men shape their sexual relations with women. *Men and Masculinities*, 10(3), 339–359. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0891243219863031

Fogg-Davis, H. G. (2006). Theorizing black lesbians within black feminism: A critique of same- race street harassment. *Politics & Gender*, 2(01), 57–76. http://doi.org/10.1017/s1743923x06060028

Forsyth, D. R. (1995). Norms. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology* (pp. 412–417). Blackwell.

Fredrickson, B., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21(2), 173–206. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x

Gardner, C. B. (1995). *Passing by: Gender and public harassment*. University of California Press.

Gennaro, K. D., & Ritschel, C. (2019). Blurred lines: The relationship between catcalls and compliments. *Women's Studies International Forum*(Vol. 75, p. 102239). Pergamon. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2019.102239

Glick, P., & Hilt, L. (2000). Combative children to ambivalent adults: The development of gender prejudice. In T. Eckes & H. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 243–272). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 491–512. http://doi.org/10.1037/t00700-000

Grossman, A. J. (2008, May 14). Catcalling: Creepy or a compliment?. *CNN*. http://www.cnn.com/2008/LIVING/personal/05/14/lw.catcalls/index.html

Hart, J., & Howard, R. M. (2016). I want her to want me: Sexual misperception as a function of heterosexual men's romantic attachment style. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 92, 97–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.12.031

Heben, T. (1994). A radical reshaping of the law: Interpreting and remedying street harassment. *South California's Review of Law and Women's Studies*, 4, 183–219. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/scws4&div=16&id=&page=

Ho, A. K., Sidanius, J., Kteily, N., Sheehy-Skeffington, J., Pratto, F., Henkel, K. E., Foels, R., & Stewart, A. L. (2015). The nature of social dominance orientation: Theorizing and measuring preferences for intergroup inequality using the new SDO7 scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(6), 1003–1028. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000033

Jacobs, J. R. (1996). Psychological and demographic correlates of men's perceptions of and attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 57(9-A), 3826.

Johnson, M., & Bennett, E. (2015). *Everyday sexism: Australian women's experiences of street harassment*. The Australia Institute.

Kachel, S., Steffens, M. C., & Niedlich, C. (2016). Traditional masculinity and femininity: Validation of a new scale assessing gender roles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 956. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00956

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575

Kearl, H. (2010). *Stop street harassment: Making public places safe and welcoming for women*. Praeger.

Kissling, E. A. (1991). Street harassment: The language of sexual terrorism. *Discourse & Society*, 2(4), 451–460. http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926591002004006

Kissling, E. A., & Kramarae, C. (1991). Stranger compliments: The interpretation of street remarks. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 14(1), 75–93. http://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.1991.11089751

Lee, A. J., Sidari, M. J., Murphy, S. C., Sherlock, J. M., & Zietsch, B. P. (2020). Sex differences in misperceptions of sexual interest can be explained by sociosexual orientation and men projecting their own interest onto women. *Psychological Science*, 31(2), 184–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797619900315

Leonardo, M. D. (1981). Political economy of street harassment. *AEGIS: Magazine on ending violence against women*. (pp. 51–57). Retrieved from http://www.stopstreetharassment.org

Logan, L. S. (2015). Street harassment: Current and promising avenues for researchers and activists. *Sociology Compass*, 9(3), 196–211. http://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12248

Macmillan, R., Nierobisz, A., & Welsh, S. (2000). Experiencing the streets: Harassment and perceptions of safety among women. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 37(3), 306–322. http://doi.org/10.1177/0022427800037003003

Mazer, D. B., & Percival, E. (1989). Ideology or Experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. *Sex Roles*, *20*(3–4), 135–145. http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287987

Nielsen, L. B. (2000). Situating legal consciousness: Experiences and attitudes of ordinary citizens about law and street harassment. *Law and Society Review*, *34*(4), 1055–1090. http://doi.org/10.2307/3115131

O'Leary, C., & Baldwin, J. R. (2016). *Catcalling as a "double edged sword": Midwestern women, their experiences, and the implications of men's catcalling behaviours* (Master's thesis). ProQuest.

Oswald, F., Lopes, A., Skoda, K., Hesse, C. L., & Pedersen, C. L. (2019). I'll show you mine so you'll show me yours: Motivations and personality variables in photographic exhibitionism. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *57*(5), 597–609. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2019.1639036

Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (1998). Deindividuation and antinormative behavior: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *123* (3), 238–259. http://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.123.3.238

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*(4), 741–763. http://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.67.4.741

Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles*, *17*(5–6), 269–290. http://doi.org/10.1007/bf00288453

Pryor, J. B., & Whalen, N. J. (1997). A typology of sexual harassment: Characteristics of harassers and the social circumstances under which sexual harassment occurs. In W. T. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research and treatment* (pp. 5–28). Allyn & Bacon.

Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). A social psychological model for predicting sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, *51*(1), 69–84. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1995.tb01309.x

Pryor, J. B., LaVite, C. M., & Stoller, L. M. (1993). A social psychological analysis of sexual harassment: The person/situation interaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *42*(1), 68–83. http://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1993.1005

Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles*, *50*(7/8), 565–573. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SERS.0000023075.32252.fd

Sinn, J. S. (1997). The predictive and discriminate validity of masculinity ideology. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*(1), 117–135. https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2172

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents*. University of Texas Press.

Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert and subtle sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *21*(1), 103–119. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00103.x

Thomae, M., & Pina, A. (2015). Sexist humor and social identity: The role of sexist humor in men's in-group cohesion, sexual harassment, rape proclivity, and victim blame. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research*, *28*(2), 187–204. http://doi.org/10.1515/humor-2015-0023

Tran, M. (2015). Combatting gender privilege and recognizing a woman's right to privacy in public spaces: Arguments to criminalize catcalling and creepshots. *Hastings Women's Law Journal*, *26*, 185–206. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/haswo26&div=18&id=&page=http://www.lexisnexis.com.libproxy.lib.ilstu.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=172728

Tuerkheimer, D. (1997). Street harassment as sexual subordination: The phenomenology of gender-specific harm. *Wisconsin Women's Law Journal*, *12*, 167–206. https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/wiswo12&div=11&id=&page=

Vera-Gray, F. (2016). Men's stranger intrusions: Rethinking street harassment. *Women's Studies International Forum*, *58*, 9–17. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2016.04.001

Wesselmann, E. D., & Kelly, J. R. (2010). Cat-calls and culpability: Investigating the frequency and functions of stranger harassment. *Sex Roles*, *63*(7–8), 451–462. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9830-2

YouGov. (2014). *Catcalling: Never OK and not a compliment*. Poll dates August 14-15, 2014. YouGov Today. https://today.yougov.com/topics/lifestyle/articles-reports/2014/08/15/catcalling