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ABSTRACT

Work place harassment is one of the stressful phenomena that employees have reported often. It can influence the work environment which increases the stress levels of individuals at work place and affect the personal life. Harassment Laws defend employees in a workplace by constituting harassment as unlawful. Trainings of coping, controlling and awareness of harassment incidents have been shown to be one way that organizations attempt to diminish incidents, by giving employees information on the topic. This paper is aimed to examine the impact of harassment policy of Pakistan on workplace environment in higher education institutions in the country. It will investigate the catastrophic incidents of harassment and explore the existing state of harassment in institutions. The study will provide a vision into harassment, and its impact in today’s work environment to provide stress free aura. This will provide reasoning as to why it is important for institutions to take this matter seriously, as well as recommendations to approach the subject and how to educate people about its effects and after effects.
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1. Introduction

Harassing behaviors encompass a broad range of actions, including unwelcome sexual advances or requests for sexual favors when the acceptance or rejection of such actions serves as a basis for academic or employment decisions. They create an unhealthy and abusive working and learning environment which can be a major impediment for a professional to perform in their fields. Every country is against harassment, every organizations and institutions have their own policies and laws to lessen and control harassing incidents. Pakistani Institutions follow the policy given by HEC, which is implemented in nearly all higher education institutions.

The kind of work, I have opted for has been touched scarcely, so the purpose of my study will be to give awareness to the professionals to have stress free life. It is essential for everyone who supervises employees to have solid understanding of what harassment is and to know how to recognize the implicit and explicit warning signs of dangers that put themselves, their employees, and their institutions at risk. While some occurrences of harassment in the workplace might be obvious, this is not true in all situations. People are often surprised to learn that harassment complaints can legitimately be made by workers not directly impacted by harassing behaviors at work, yet who are subject to observing or being exposed to implicit or explicit conduct of a sexual nature in the workplace.

Head of the institutions who are not properly trained often allow risky behaviors to take place simply because they do not fully understand what is considered harassment. The truth is that harassment in
the workplace can take many forms. Institutions can have liability in situations where harassing behaviors are allowed to take place that involve supervisors, subordinates, colleagues and students. This fact is something that everyone who holds a supervisory position needs to know. In addition to knowing how to recognize harassment, managers must know why it is essential to be proactive in putting a stop to such actions, as well as how to do so. Many heads of the institutions of the institutes are shocked to learn that their institutions are liable for harassment that occurs in the workplace whether or not they were aware it is taking, or has taken, place. It is vital that heads know the appropriate way to respond to complaints of harassment if such are made, regardless of whether or not they believe the allegations to be valid.

Generally, women are blamed for the harassment they face at work places. Thus, it becomes increasingly disgraceful for women to even report or talk about such an issue in our society. In the new global economy, sexual harassment is considered to be the most flagrant type of violence against the young women who comprise a large portion of the work force and are unaware of their legal rights and protections against these acts. Cultural based discrimination is one major reason to escalate the issue.

The policy guidelines are pertinent to all employees, women and men, and make the management responsible for preventing these acts in their institutions and accountable if such acts take place. Organizations should not discourage the reporting of sexual harassment cases in order to maintain a false impression of a harassment free environment. Instead, they should feel proud that their employees trust their system of dealing with such incidences in an appropriate manner. That will be the measure of professionalism in institutions. The enforcement of this policy will improve the productivity of institutions; transform their culture and increasing the employee satisfaction level. In order to be in compliance with this policy, institutions should adopt the Code of Conduct provided in this document. Sexual harassment at work place leaves a victim wondering “why me, what to do now, how to manage devastating psychological dent in the personality, where to report and what are legal protective rights available to me?” with no real answer to that question.

The study is aimed at to explore the level of understanding and awareness of workplace Harassment policy after its implementation, Organisations response towards workplace Harassment policy and effectiveness of workplace Harassment policy to minimize and control the harassment incidents in Higher education Institutions of Pakistan. The objective of this study is to address the research question that “How effective is the workplace harassment Policy to give awareness and control the harassment incidents in working environments of higher education institutions of Pakistan?

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Harassment is defined as “unwelcome verbal, visual, or physical conduct of a sexual nature that is severe or pervasive and affects working conditions or creates a hostile work environment” (Know Your Rights, 2012). There is a thin line between occasional unwanted sexual advances and comments that may be deemed inappropriate. These are not always labeled as sexual harassment, but if “a number of relatively minor separate incidents...affect your work” (Know Your Rights, 2012) then this could turn out to be sexual harassment. An expanded definition of sexual harassment, defined by Equal Employment
Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines (1980) is, “an unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.”

Sigal (2006) defines sexual harassment at workplace as, “Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual’s employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual’s work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment.”

According to Steven (2012), sexual harassment is more prevalent in workplaces than ever before. He explained quid pro quo and hostile environment, the two forms of harassment prevalent today as well as the legal consequences for the accused harasser. There are strong links between the concepts of harassment and bullying. According to Carrie et al. (2007), harassment is sometimes considered a subset of the more widely used term of bullying. They are related to the power play that takes place in the office environment. It is a systematic way of targeting women which are generally vulnerable from harassment by abusing the power by people who are at authority. Gruber et al. (1982) define that organisational violation comprises of sexual harassment, bullying and physical violence. This is where the culture of an institution makes it possible for individual employees to be treated abusively or with disrespect. In an institution infested with the climate of disrespect, certain inappropriate behaviors can be taken for granted, leading to the creation of an ‘incivility spiral’, where uncivil behavior becomes routine and regarded as the norm. This affects every individual in the organization and not just the victim and the harasser. Harassment can appear in many forms, from sexually explicit remarks and jokes, to harassment over the telephone and via email, to sexual assault (Gutek, Barbara A. 1985).

According to Rutherford et al. (2006), women are reluctant to directly answer about sexual harassment in terms of whether they had been harassed, or whether they even believed that they had. Instead, women were asked whether they had experienced specific behaviours which is termed as 'sexualised behaviours'. Literature is filled with the negative impacts to the society caused by harassment. The potential psychological effects of a harassment incident include lowered self-esteem, difficulty with interpersonal relations, increased stress, depression, frustration, and anxiety (Paludi and Barickman, 1991). Those who are sexually harassed display common coping strategies; i.e. indirect expression of anger, denial or minimization of the incident, and compliance; as well as feelings of powerlessness, aloneness, fright, humiliation, and incidence of post-traumatic stress disorder (Willness et al., 2007). The fact that sexual harassment creates negative impact on self-esteem of victims has also been concurred by Diaz and McMillin (1991), one victim who encountered sexual harassment at workplace remarked “we are only warm bodies in white shoes filling a spot.”

Sexual harassment has wide ranging psychological effects and also affects the work performance. Glomb et al. (1999) suggest that sexual harassment can have a very detrimental effect on both morale and satisfaction. The indirect business outcomes of sexual harassment have been estimated to be far more costly (Glomb et al., 1999). Outcomes include decreased productivity, low morale, turnover, and absenteeism not only on the part of the harassed employee but also co-workers who may witness and be distracted by the situation (Fitzgerald et al., 1997). As the frequency of sexual harassment increases within an organisation, it is increasingly likely to be recognised as an unwelcome form of behaviour but one that is likely to recur. A study by Barling et al. (1996) which examined the organisational and personal consequences of workplace sexual harassment confirmed that frequency of sexual harassment has a direct impact on negative attitudes towards work and professional
relationships between colleagues and superiors.

Given its potential impact on the health of those who have been harassed and its contribution to work-related stress for those involved both directly and indirectly, sexual harassment is also a health and safety issue and has been recognised by the Health and Safety Executive as a potential health risk or hazard in organisations. Self-reported physical symptoms of sexual harassment have also been reported and include: gastrointestinal disturbances, headaches, inability to sleep, nausea, loss of appetite, and weight loss (Gutck, 1985). Furthermore, studies have shown that it can be linked to serious mental health problems such as depression (Gutck, 1985) and posttraumatic stress disorder (Kilpatrick, 1992).

Prevention (also known as the primary intervention stage) refers to activities which can be implemented to prevent sexual harassment from occurring. These activities may include having effective policies and procedures, training programmes and awareness raising campaigns, monitoring, running organisational health checks and identifying potential risk factors. According to Quick (1999), preventive measures aim to address the root cause of the problem, thus preventing it from developing, however, empirical research documenting the efficacy of sexual harassment policies preventing or reducing sexual harassment is scarce (Bell et al., 2002). Thomas (2004) advocates the importance of designing and developing a strong sexual harassment policy to provide all employees with a clear statement of the types of conduct and behaviour which may constitute harassment and make it clear that harassment is not tolerated within the organisation.

A formal sexual harassment policy can set behavioral guidelines which should deter potential harassers, and encourage those who experience sexual harassment to report it (Gruber and Smith, 1995). A strong zero tolerance perspective towards sexual harassment is an important factor and it is essential that this is communicated to, and understood by, all employees. A good policy will fully cover the rights and dignity of the individual and set out clear guidelines for what is and is not acceptable behaviour, and the relevant procedures. With a strong policy in place, someone who faces harassment will feel more empowered to challenge behaviour that they feel is offensive knowing they have the support of their institution.

Byers and Rue (1991) state, “training must be directed toward the accomplishment of some organisational goal.” In other words, institutions must develop a clear policy statement relating to sexual harassment as a first step, before training takes place. Training is an effective method to employ at the primary intervention stage and it should meet two main objectives: to raise staff awareness and clarify any misconceptions regarding what constitutes sexual harassment; and to inform managers of their roles and responsibilities when attempting to provide a harassment-free working environment for all employees (Laabs, 1995; York et al.,1997). It should also help to equip individuals and managers with the necessary skills to deal with sexual harassment if it occurs.

The policy enables the internal audit and check on harassment cases to all institutions whether public or private as well as the civil society by developing a self check mechanism. The policy mandates that all institutions implement this Code. The code requires the management to change the environment and culture of their institutions so that both men and women can work in a dignified environment without
the fear of being harassed. All citizens are equal according to our national policy and this Code tends to implement this at our workplaces. The Constitution of Pakistan in its article 25, 26 and 27 enacts the non discrimination on the basis of gender at public and workplaces recognizing the principles of equal opportunities for men and women so that they can earn their livelihood in a dignified manner. Henceforth, in addition to existing provisions, the policy creates a better working environment and increases productivity by creating a safe and pleasant working environment that is free of harassment, abuse and intimidation.

STUDY DESIGN

The study is focused to analyse three main factors i.e; effectiveness of Harassment Policy, its awareness amongst faculty and administrative staff within higher education institutions, and organisational response to adopt Harassment Policy to counter this threat. Effectiveness of Harassment policy is taken as dependent variable where as awareness about harassment policy amongst faculty and administrative staff within higher education institutions and organisational response to adopt Harassment Policy to counter this threat are taken as independent variables.

Besides demographic information section, the questionnaire contains 17 items divided into three groups to address each factor including 5 items for measuring awareness about harassment policy, 6 items depicting organisational response and support towards the harassment policy and 6 items to measure the effectiveness of harassment policy after its implementation. The respondents are asked to endorse their responses using five-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagreed, 2= disagreed, 3= not known, 4= agreed and 5= strongly agreed). The collected data was tabulated and analysed using SPSS.

2. Methodology

Social structure in Pakistan is based upon conservative and religious culture, where open discussions and studies on sexual matters are very rare and discouraging. Respondents are even not willing to participate in such surveys to provide evident materials to conduct any such study; however higher education sector is more literate, open and vocal to speak about these sensitive issues, therefore careful methodological and ethical considerations help to overcome these issues in collection of data. To address this constraint, while conducting a social survey, the researcher decided to maintain the confidentiality of the respondents and various organizations involved in the process.

A pilot study is conducted to validate the questionnaire with a sample of n=30. The questionnaire was made in both English and Urdu for easy understanding of the respondents. The translated version is crossed examined by fellow researches and rigorous translation procedures, including both forward and backward processes, have been applied to ensure the relevance of this instrumentation in different contexts. Few essential corrections are made on the basis of pilot study and feedback of respondents.

Sampling

This research was based on a non-probability sampling technique, in which the convenience sampling technique was used. Faculty members, administrative staff and lower service and clerical staff of higher education institutions were selected as target population for collection of data. The sampling frame comprised of 6 higher education institutions located at Rawalpindi and Islamabad. 3x higher education institutions each from public and private sector are selected for administrating the questionnaire. A total of 900 self completed questionnaires were distributed through mails, emails and
3. Data Collection and Analysis

After taking consents, participants were assured that the information provided by them would be kept confidential and would only be used for the research purpose. Participants were pursued through repeated requests to provide requisite information for the study.

Out of 900 questionnaires, only 404 responses received, out of which 13 responses found incomplete and half filled. Thus a total of 391 complete responses were received, making an active response rate of 43%. Out of which 43% are male respondents with a total number of 168 respondents and 57% are female respondents with a total number of 223 respondents. The details of male and female respondents according to age category and designation of present status in higher education institutions and university type are shown in Table 1. Response rates by occupational groups in higher education institutions were as follows: faculty, 52% (females, 58%; males, 44%); administration, 31% (females, 26%; males, 37%); service and clerical workers, 17% (females, 16%; males, 19%). Response rates of males and females by age category wise were as follows: 24-32 years, 27% (females, 31%; males, 22%); 33-45 years, 40% (females, 47%; males, 31%); respondents of 46 years and beyond, 33% (females, 22%; males, 47%). According to the type of university belonging to public or private sector, the response rates were as follows: Public sector respondents, 49% (females, 59%; males, 36%) and private sector institutions respondents, 51% (females, 41%; males, 64%).

Table 1: Gender * Designation, Age Category and University Type Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>University Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Service and clerk staff</td>
<td>24-32 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Male   | Count Percentage | 62 | 74 | 32 | 37 | 52 | 79 | 60 | 108 | 168%
| Female | Count Percentage | 58 | 129 | 36 | 70 | 104 | 49 | 131 | 92 | 223%
| Total  | Count Percentage | 120 | 203 | 68 | 107 | 156 | 128 | 191 | 200 | 391%

Awareness about Workplace Harassment Policy within Higher Education Institutions

The Cronbach’s Alpha calculated from the items of the survey questionnaire related to the awareness about workplace harassment policy is 0.724, which is acceptable and shows that the data is considered reliable to proceed with the analysis. Mean response on the basis of five-point Likert scale is shown in Table 2.
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics - Awareness about Workplace Harassment Policy within Higher Education Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Percentage Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness to access monitoring body for complaint</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People complain about unwanted attention or harassment</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles in seeking justice from courts for legal rights</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have appropriate awareness about the legal rights</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative mean response</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the statistical analysis as mentioned in Table 2, it is very much evident that since the awareness to access monitoring body for complaint, people have awareness to complaint, accused face any obstacle in seeking legal rights and people awareness about legal rights have mean response of 2.48 (SD= 1.21), 2.67 (SD= 1.23), 2.91 (SD=1.01) and 2.18 (SD=.862) respectively, with an cumulative mean response of 2.56, which is less than the $\mu = 3.00$. This shows that people working in higher education institutions are not well aware about workplace harassment policy in true letter and spirit.

The respondents from public and private sector higher education institutions are asked through a set of questions regarding awareness about work place Harassment Policy in place. The mean response received from private sector higher education institutions is 3.00, which is 57% as compared to mean response of 2.10, which is 43% of public sector higher education institutions. This indicates that private sector institutions are more committed as compared to public sector institutions towards keeping the employee informed about harassment policies in practice, but both are failing to achieve desired standards to provide adequate awareness amongst its employees.

Organisation’s Response towards Workplace Harassment Policy implementation within Higher Education Institutions

The Cronbach’s Alpha calculated from the items of the survey questionnaire related to the organisation’s response towards workplace harassment policy implementation in higher education institutions is 0.824, which shows that the data is considered reliable to proceed with the analysis. Mean response on the basis of five-point Likert scale is shown in Table 3.
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics – Organisation’s response towards Workplace Harassment Policy within Higher Education Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics- Organisation Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undue favors are awarded</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations have any monitoring body</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining the issue results in job at stake</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation encourage people to openly discuss occurrences</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars, workshops and open forums conducted for awareness</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment policy 2010 is displayed on notice boards or websites</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative mean response</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the statistical analysis as mentioned in Table 3, it is very much evident that since the cumulative mean response is 2.64, which is less than the \( \mu = 3.00 \) This means that organizations and higher education institutions are not playing effective role in implementation of workplace sexual harassment policy within their institutions to fight against harassment incidents.

The respondents from public and private sector higher education institutions provided different response when it was asked about the effective role of their organizations to support the implementation of harassment policy in their workplace environments. The mean response received from private sector higher education institutions is 2.83, which is 53% as compared to mean response of 2.46, which is 47% of public sector higher education institutions. This indicates that private sector institutions are more responsive and committed as compared to public sector institutions to eliminate and control the harassment incidents through implementation of workplace harassment policy in place, but both are failing to achieve desired standards in provisioning of adequate support for implementation of workplace harassment policy in its working environments.

Effectiveness of Workplace Harassment Policy within Higher Education Institutions

The Cronbach’s Alpha calculated from the items of the survey questionnaire related to the effectiveness of workplace harassment policy implementation in higher education institutions is 0.724, which shows that the
data is considered reliable to proceed with the analysis. Mean response on the basis of five-point Likert scale is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics – Effectiveness of Workplace Harassment Policy within Higher Education Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment policy 2010 defines all forms of harassment</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment policy 2010 a pathway towards human rights</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendency of sexual harassment is on increase</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment Policy 2010 provide adequate protection against harassment</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant reduction in harassment cases due to Harassment Policy 2010</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with the effectiveness of workplace Harassment Policy 2010</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative mean response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.94</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the statistical analysis as mentioned in Table 4, it is very much evident that since the cumulative mean response is 2.94, which is less than the $\mu = 3.00$, this means that workplace sexual harassment policy in higher education institutions has not proved itself effectively implemented after its emergence in 2010 in Pakistan.

The respondents from public and private sector higher education institutions provided different response when it was asked about the effectiveness of workplace harassment policy in their workplace environments. The mean response received from private sector higher education institutions is 3.07, which is 52% as compared to mean response of 2.81, which is 48% of public sector higher education institutions. This indicates that workplace harassment policy is more effectively implemented in private sector institutions as compared to public sector institutions to eliminate and control the harassment incidents in workplace environments. Public sector higher education institutions need to improve in effective implementation of workplace harassment policy in its working environments.
4. Findings and Discussion

On the basis of mean responses the three variables measured above i.e; awareness about harassment policy among employee, organisational supportive response to implement the policy and effectiveness of workplace harassment policy in higher education institutions, it is found that the population under survey do not agree with the three prepositions. The low mean responses show that the workplace harassment policy has not proved itself and desired results have not been achieved after the policy has implemented as an Act after 2010.

**Table 5:** Socio-demographic wise response about awareness, organisational response and effectiveness of Workplace Harassment Policy within Higher Education Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Awareness about Harassment Policy</th>
<th>Organisational response towards Harassment</th>
<th>Effectiveness of Harassment Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and clerk staff</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-32 yrs</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-45 yrs</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 yrs and above</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A clear visible trend in Table 5 predicts a relationship between awareness, organisational response and effectiveness of workplace Harassment policy in higher education institutions. Gender wise analysis shows that since male respondents are more responsive as compared to female respondents about awareness and more supportive towards organisation policies, therefore workplace harassment policy is more effective according to male respondents. Occupation and designation wise analysis shows that since administration department respondents are more responsive as compared to other designation respondents about awareness and more supportive towards organisation policies, therefore workplace harassment policy is more effective according to administration department respondents.

According to age category, the analysis shows that since respondents of ‘46 years and above’ are more responsive as compared to other age groups about awareness and more supportive towards organisation policies, therefore workplace harassment policy seems more effective according to respondents of age group of ‘46 years and above’. According to university type, the analysis shows that since respondents of private sector institutions are more responsive as compared to public sector institutions about awareness and more supportive towards organisation policies, therefore workplace harassment policy seems more effective in private sector higher education institutions.
To further validate this trend, a regression analysis is used to explore relationship between awareness about harassment policy among employees, organisational supportive response towards implementation of policy and effectiveness of workplace harassment policy in higher education institutions.

The regression analysis between awareness about harassment policy among employees and effectiveness of workplace harassment policy in higher education institutions, revealed that all factors of awareness about harassment policy are significantly related with effectiveness of workplace harassment policy in higher education institutions at p < 0.0001 level. Model fit indicates that 29 percent variability in dependent variable (effectiveness of harassment policy) is accounted by the independent variable (Awareness about harassment policy). All the coefficients show a positive significant relationship which implies that since there is less awareness amongst employee, due to which the victims do not report to the authorities regarding any occurrences. With more awareness about harassment policies, the effectiveness of this policy will be enhanced.

The regression analysis between organisational response towards implementation of policy and effectiveness of workplace harassment policy in higher education institutions, revealed that all factors of organisation’s response towards harassment policy are significantly related with effectiveness of workplace harassment policy in higher education institutions at p < 0.0001 level. Model fit indicates that 50 percent variability in dependent variable (effectiveness of harassment policy) is accounted by the independent variable (organisation support towards harassment policy). All the coefficients show a positive significant relationship which implies that since there is less supportive role and dedication of higher education institutions for effective implementation of workplace harassment policy in working environments, due to which the effectiveness seems lacking. The effectiveness of workplace harassment policy will improve with enhance awareness amongst employees and with more effective role of organizations.

5. Recommendations

Based on the findings deduced from the statistical analysis, and results drawn from research question testing, a number of recommendations seem important to make the workplace harassment policy, a success story in the society in general and in work place environment of higher education institutions in particular. Some of these recommendations are suggested at various levels of action to enhance the impact of Harassment policy. It is a great contribution of the Parliament that it passed a very useful harassment policy which is the need of the time. Formulation of laws and policy is one major milestone in a civilized society but true implementation is more important. Implementation of this policy does not seem effective at national level. Few recommendations are:

Government should adopt a consistent approach to make people aware about the law and sexual harassment policy, so that people can understand their legal rights. Committee should be designated to hear such cases and victims must be encouraged to lodge a complaint in such cases. Media campaigns should be launched to highlight key factors of the policy. Government should ensure that the institutions are following the code of conduct as described by the policy and salient features of the policy should be displayed on notice boards. More over institutions must be made responsible that each worker in the work place should have the knowledge of the harassment policy and the channel of reporting in case of any untoward incident. Government should make HEC responsible for strict compliance of harassment incidents in the work place environment of higher education institutions.

As an autonomous apex body, HEC is responsible for fund allocation from the federal government to
universities and degree awarding institutions and accredit various degree programmes running at the
institutions. HEC is also responsible to have a check on the universities and ensures that universities are
following a proper code of conduct as prescribed by HEC, it should ensure that higher education
institutions make a proper code of conduct on the basis of harassment policy and ensure its true
implementation within the institutions. To curb the tendency of harassment in work place environment of
higher education institutions, HEC should accord due weight age to this aspect while assessing the
standards of the institutions while awarding ranks to the universities on the basis of annual performance. It
should display this policy on official website to make the faculty and administration aware about the
severity and serious repercussions of harassing.HEC should make each higher education institution
responsible for formulation of a disciplinary committee to address any type of harassment within the work
place. It should arrange frequent seminars, discussions, debates or special day to make the people aware
about the sensitivity of the issue and discourage people to commit such illegal actions. A strict disciplinary
policy should be made to make the accused black list for a certain period of time and ensure that no other
institutions should hire him till the accused is under penalty.

Higher education institutions (HEIs) are the immediate effective body to ensure compliance of
harassment in the work place environment. Institutions should encourage the employees including
faculty and administration to discuss such incidents openly with other colleagues or management so
that concrete disciplinary steps should be taken to eliminate this distressing phenomenon. Heads
should arrange open seminars, discussions and trainings to make people aware about the sensitivity of
the issue and discourage people to commit such illegal actions.
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