Saudi Journal of Medicine and Public Health

https://saudijmph.com/index.php/pub

https://doi.org/10.64483/202522548

Sexual Harassment Prevention Training as a Core Component of Health Security Systems

Fahad Bakheet Aljohani [(1)] , Nashme Eid Alrashidi [(1)] , MOHAMMED FEHAID ALHARBI [(1)] , YASIR ABDULAAH HAMAD ALABBAD [(1)] , Fawaz Saad Tubruk Alazmi [(2)] , Raed Magbpl Salem Alazmi [(2)] , Tamim Abed B Aloufi [(3)] , Maryam Obaidullah Almutairi [(4)] , AWAD AYIDH AWAD ALRASHIDI [(2)] , Mohammed Muqbil Bakheet Aljohani [(2)] , Abdullah Musaad Owaid Alrashdi [(5)] , MONA SALEEM SHARID ALRASHIDI [(6)] , Mona Zaid Samran Alsahli [(4)] , Abdulkarim marzooq awad Alhejaili [(7)]

(1) Oyun city General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(2) Khaybar General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(3) branch in Madinah, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(4) King Salman Medical City, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(5) Khaibar General Hospital, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(6) Madinah Health Cluster - Najoud Center, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia,
(7) king salman bin abdulaziz medical city, Ministry of Health, Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Background: Sexual harassment in healthcare remains a pervasive issue despite formal policies. It compromises workforce well-being, institutional integrity, and patient safety.

Aim: This study explores sexual harassment as a systemic challenge in healthcare, its impact on health security, and strategies for prevention.

Methods: A comprehensive review of legal frameworks, organizational culture, and empirical evidence was conducted. The analysis included prevalence data, reporting barriers, and intervention models from healthcare and academic medicine.

Results: Findings reveal high rates of harassment among healthcare workers and trainees, with hierarchical structures and cultural norms enabling misconduct. Reporting remains low due to fear of retaliation and lack of trust in systems. Harassment correlates with mental health disorders, burnout, and workforce attrition, undermining health system resilience. Effective prevention requires leadership commitment, robust policies, accessible reporting systems, and bystander intervention training. Organizational culture emerged as the strongest predictor of harassment prevalence.

Conclusion: Sexual harassment in healthcare is not an isolated behavioral issue but a systemic threat to health security. Addressing it demands cultural transformation, leadership accountability, and integrated prevention strategies.

Keywords: Sexual harassment, healthcare workforce, organizational culture, prevention strategies, health security, bystander intervention..

Introduction

Despite the formal adoption of sexual harassment policies and procedural frameworks within healthcare institutions, empirical evidence indicates that sexual and gender-based harassment remains widespread across clinical and academic medical environments. Healthcare settings continue to exhibit patterns of unwanted conduct that undermine professional integrity and workplace safety. This persistence reflects a gap between policy existence and effective implementation. Sexual harassment in healthcare is not an isolated behavioral issue but a systemic challenge that affects workforce stability and institutional performance. Its presence directly compromises staff well-being and erodes trust within multidisciplinary teams. These outcomes ultimately threaten the quality and continuity of patient care delivery. Sexual harassment constitutes a documented occupational risk factor associated with adverse mental health outcomes. Affected individuals report increased levels of stress anxiety depression and burnout. These psychological effects contribute to diminished job satisfaction and reduced professional engagement. Over time exposure to hostile work environments drives skilled healthcare professionals to withdraw from training programs or exit the workforce entirely. Such losses exacerbate staffing shortages and weaken health system resilience [1]. The cumulative impact extends beyond individual harm to organizational inefficiency and compromised health security. Targeted training and structured preventive interventions represent critical

*Corresponding author e-mail: Fabaaljohani@moh.gov.sa (Fahad Bakheet Aljohani).
Receive Date: 07 December 2025, Revise Date: 29 December 2025, Accept Date: 31 December 2025

mechanisms for addressing this challenge. Evidence supports the role of comprehensive education in enhancing awareness of sexually inappropriate behaviors and implicit power dynamics. Training programs strengthen the ability of healthcare workers to identify report and respond to misconduct in a timely manner. Prevention-focused initiatives promote shared accountability and reinforce behavioral norms that support dignity and mutual respect. These measures contribute to the development of inclusive workplaces where professional conduct is actively protected rather than reactively enforced [1].

Recognition of the problem forms the foundation of any effective anti-harassment strategy. Institutional denial or minimization sustains harmful practices and enables covert retaliation. Prevention requires deliberate shifts in organizational culture supported by leadership commitment and transparent governance structures. Changes in institutional approaches can disrupt entrenched hierarchies that often silence victims and protect perpetrators. Senior faculty and clinical leaders play a decisive role through visible engagement modeling ethical behavior and reinforcing zero-tolerance standards. Encouraging bystander intervention further strengthens prevention by distributing responsibility across the workforce and empowering witnesses to report prohibited conduct without fear [1]. Sexual harassment remains particularly entrenched within medical education and training environments. Hierarchical relationships dependence on evaluations and limited reporting protections heighten vulnerability among trainees. These conditions demand urgent attention from healthcare leadership. Failure to address harassment during training stages normalizes misconduct and perpetuates harmful professional cultures. The resulting damage weakens the future healthcare workforce and undermines long-term system sustainability [1]. Addressing sexual harassment through prevention policy review and institutional reform is therefore not optional. It is a strategic necessity for workforce protection professional integrity and health security.

Definitions of Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is formally defined within employment law and professional ethics as a serious violation of individual rights and organizational integrity. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, sexual harassment encompasses unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when such conduct influences employment decisions, interferes with work performance, or creates an intimidating hostile or offensive work environment [See 29 CFR PART 1604]. This definition emphasizes that the determining factor is not the intent of the actor but the impact on the individual subjected to the behavior. In healthcare settings where hierarchical structures and power asymmetries are common this definition holds particular relevance. From an ethical perspective sexual harassment represents an abuse of authority and a breach of professional responsibility. The American Medical Association identifies sexual harassment as an unethical practice that exploits disparities in power and status undermines trust and infringes upon the rights of those affected [See AMA Code of Medical Ethics Opinion 9.1.3]. Such conduct may directly or indirectly influence professional advancement and distort objective decision making. The resulting harm extends beyond interpersonal relationships to institutional credibility and patient safety. When professional boundaries are violated working relationships deteriorate collaboration weakens and clinical performance may suffer. In this context sexual harassment is not only a personal violation but also a systemic risk to healthcare quality [1][2].

The legal framework governing sexual harassment in the United States is grounded in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which is enforced by the EEOC. Title VII prohibits sex discrimination including discrimination based on pregnancy sexual orientation and gender identity and explicitly recognizes sexual harassment and retaliation as unlawful practices. Sexual harassment is therefore classified as a form of sex discrimination under federal law. Since the enactment of Title VII there have been significant cultural and legal shifts including increased institutional accountability reduced tolerance for harassment and greater participation of women in the medical profession [1]. These developments have reshaped expectations regarding professional conduct while also exposing persistent gaps between legal standards and workplace realities. A central element in defining sexual harassment is the concept of unwelcome behavior. Conduct is considered unwelcome when it is not solicited by the recipient or when it is perceived as offensive intimidating or undesirable. Important behavior that begins as consensual or welcome can become unwelcome at any point. Consent is not permanent and may be withdrawn without justification. Once an individual communicates that certain conduct is no longer acceptable continuation of that behavior constitutes harassment. The alleged harasser cannot claim that prior consent or mutual interaction serves as a defense after the boundary has been clearly stated. This principle reinforces individual autonomy and affirms the right to define personal limits within professional environments. The scope of the workplace extends beyond the physical location where employees are formally assigned. The work environment includes any setting in which professional duties are performed or work-related interactions occur. In healthcare this includes

hospitals clinics satellite facilities medical conferences training sessions business travel professional social events and all forms of work-related communication. Digital spaces such as email messaging platforms and social media are also considered part of the workplace when used for professional purposes. A hostile work environment arises when unwelcome conduct creates conditions that are intimidating demeaning or disruptive to an individual's ability to perform their role effectively. The absence of physical proximity does not negate the existence of harassment if the conduct remains connected to the employment relationship [1][2].

Sexual harassment may manifest in verbal nonverbal or physical forms and may be sexual in nature or based on gender [2]. Physical harassment includes deliberate unwanted contact such as touching massaging cornering caressing pinching kissing or hugging. Severe forms include sexual assault and rape which represent criminal acts in addition to workplace violations. Verbal harassment is often more prevalent particularly in healthcare settings. It includes sexually suggestive comments jokes or remarks persistent invitations or proposals inquiries into sexual history fantasies or preferences and derogatory statements about physical appearance. The spread of rumors or false information about an individual's sexual life also constitutes harassment. The use of diminutive or sexualized terms to address women such as doll babe or honey is inappropriate and unprofessional regardless of intent or perceived familiarity. Nonverbal harassment includes gestures or behaviors that convey sexual meaning without words. Examples include suggestive body language repeated winking sexual gestures whistling indecent exposure or the display of sexually explicit materials. Visual and digital forms of harassment have become increasingly prominent. Sending or displaying sexually suggestive images videos messages or written content through letters phone calls text messages emails or online platforms may constitute harassment when the content is unwelcome and work related. In healthcare environments verbal harassment remains the most frequently reported form particularly sexually suggestive jokes comments on appearance and intrusive questions about personal relationships or private life [2]. It is essential to distinguish sexual harassment from conduct that does not meet the legal or ethical threshold for violation. Socially and culturally appropriate compliments that are welcome and respectful do not constitute harassment. Similarly consensual interactions between adults that are mutually desired and freely reciprocated fall outside the definition. The law does not prohibit minor teasing offhand remarks or isolated incidents that lack severity. However, conduct becomes unlawful when it is repeated pervasive or sufficiently serious to alter the conditions of employment or create a hostile or offensive environment. Employment actions that negatively affect hiring promotion compensation training or job security in connection with sexual conduct are particularly significant in determining illegality [2].

The EEOC recognizes two primary categories of sexual harassment claims which are quid pro quo harassment and hostile work environment harassment. These categories reflect distinct mechanisms through which harassment occurs and guide legal analysis and institutional response. Quid pro quo harassment involves an explicit or implicit exchange in which submission to sexual conduct is linked to employment benefits or avoidance of negative consequences. The phrase describes situations where an individual in a position of authority conditions recruitment promotion evaluation training compensation or continued employment on sexual compliance. This form of harassment relies on power imbalance and often leaves victims feeling coerced even in the absence of overt threats. Hostile work environment harassment differs in that it does not require a tangible employment action or a direct exchange. Instead, it arises when unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature interferes with work performance or creates an atmosphere that is intimidating hostile or degrading. In these cases, the perpetrator may be a supervisor coworker subordinate contractor consultant or even a patient. The defining feature is the cumulative effect of the conduct on the work environment rather than a single transactional demand. Examples include persistent sexual jokes repeated unwanted advances offensive imagery or inappropriate physical contact. The focus remains on whether a reasonable person would perceive the environment as hostile and whether the conduct impairs professional functioning. In healthcare settings both forms of harassment present unique challenges due to complex hierarchies close working conditions and frequent interactions with patients and external parties. Trainees and early career professionals may face heightened vulnerability because of dependency on evaluations mentorship and recommendations. Understanding the definitions and classifications of sexual harassment is therefore essential for prevention accountability and enforcement. Clear definitions support consistent reporting fair investigation and effective intervention. They also reinforce the principle that professional environments must be grounded in respect of equality and safety to protect both the workforce and the patients they serve [1][2][3].

Forms of Sexual Harassment: The Tripartite Model

Sexual harassment can be understood through a tripartite model that classifies misconduct into three distinct forms which are gender harassment unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion [3]. This framework clarifies that sexual harassment does not depend on sexual intent or desire. It functions as a

form of gender-based discrimination that reflects unequal power relations and social norms. Gender in this context includes biological sex gender identity and socially constructed roles. The model allows institutions and professionals to identify behaviors that may otherwise be minimized or misclassified and supports consistent assessment across workplace settings. Gender harassment represents the most frequent form within the tripartite model. It includes verbal or physical conduct that expresses hostility exclusion or contempt toward an individual based on gender identity or sexual orientation. Such conduct reinforces stereotypes and signals that certain individuals do not belong or do not merit equal respect. Examples include mocking a man for failing to conform to dominant masculinity norms or asserting that a woman lacks suitability for leadership roles within male-dominated environments. These behaviors communicate inferiority and restrict participation in professional spaces. Gender harassment may also involve objectification marginalization or the assignment of secondary status to specific groups [4]. Sexist or heterosexist jokes comments or language fall within this category and contribute to a climate of disrespect even in the absence of overt sexual behavior [2][5]. Although gender harassment may appear less explicit than other forms it can result in harm comparable to more direct violations. Repeated exposure undermines confidence reduces engagement and affects psychological well-being. Research indicates that under certain conditions a single instance of gender harassment may produce effects similar to those associated with sexual coercion [2]. These finding challenges assumptions that only overt or transactional misconduct warrants serious response. In professional environments such as healthcare where teamwork trust and communication are essential gender harassment disrupts collaboration and weakens institutional culture.

Unwanted sexual attention constitutes the second category in the tripartite model. This form involves behaviors that impose sexual focus on an individual without consent. Examples include comments about physical appearance sexually suggestive remarks spreading sexual rumors or sharing sexualized images through electronic platforms [2]. These actions shift attention from professional competence to sexualized identity. Even when framed as humor or interest such conduct interferes with concentration and creates discomfort. The defining feature is the lack of invitation or welcome by the recipient rather than the severity of the act. Repetition often amplifies harm but a single incident may be sufficient depending on context. Sexual coercion represents the third category and occurs least often but is reported more frequently than other forms [2]. It aligns with quid pro quo harassment and involves pressure to engage in sexual conduct in exchange for workplace benefits or to avoid negative consequences. This form relies on authority and control and directly links sexual compliance to employment outcomes. The clarity of the exchange often leads to formal reporting since the violation is more visible and easier to define. Despite lower prevalence its impact is severe due to the misuse of institutional power and the threat it poses to fairness and safety. The tripartite model demonstrates that sexual harassment exists on a spectrum of behaviors that range from gender-based hostility to explicit coercion. Each form carries consequences for individuals organizations and service outcomes. Understanding these categories supports early recognition effective prevention and informed response.

Scope of the Problem

Sexual harassment in healthcare represents a widespread and persistent problem that affects institutions of varying size structure and function. Evidence from large-scale organizational studies illustrates the depth and complexity of this issue. A prominent example is a large national medical center employing more than 65,000 individuals, including over 4,000 physicians and scientists. Within this setting, a two-year survey involving more than 6,200 healthcare workers across multiple professional roles provided a detailed snapshot of prevalence and reporting patterns. Among physicians who reported experiencing sexual harassment, 12% were women and 4% were men. Approximately half of the alleged perpetrators were physicians themselves, and more than one-third occupied a higher hierarchical position than the affected individual. These findings underscore the role of professional power dynamics in enabling misconduct. Notably, only 40% of those who experienced harassment formally reported the behavior, and 40% of investigations were ultimately not substantiated, highlighting substantial barriers to disclosure and accountability [6]. In a small but significant proportion of cases, slightly more than 3%, patients were identified as the alleged harassers [6]. Patient-to-clinician sexual harassment has emerged as a particularly challenging and underrecognized dimension of the problem. In contrast to institutional data suggesting a limited proportion of patient-related claims, other studies reveal much higher prevalence rates. One investigation found that 67% of clinicians reported experiencing inappropriate behavior from patients. Gender disparities were pronounced, with approximately 84% of female providers reporting some form of sexual harassment by patients compared to 40% of male providers. Among female clinicians, 42% reported repeated episodes occurring over the course of their medical careers. These experiences were most frequently reported in outpatient settings, with Veterans Affairs outpatient clinics demonstrating the highest rates. Inpatient

environments showed comparatively lower reporting levels, possibly reflecting differences in patient supervision structures and clinical workflows [7]. These findings indicate that patient-related harassment constitutes a significant occupational hazard, particularly for women working in ambulatory care settings.

Academic medicine and medical training environments exhibit especially high vulnerability to sexual harassment. According to a report by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, pervasive harassment in medicine undermines the integrity of education research and professional development. Of particular concern to academic leadership is the disproportionate burden placed on medical students. Evidence shows that medical students experience sexual harassment at significantly higher rates than peers in science and engineering disciplines [8]. Approximately 45% to 50% of female medical students reported experiencing sexually harassing behavior perpetrated by faculty members or staff [8]. These early exposures shape professional identity formation and may normalize abusive behaviors within clinical hierarchies. Broader syntheses of the literature confirm that harassment persists across all stages of medical training and early career development. A systematic review found that 33.1% of medical students and 36.2% of residents reported experiences of sexual harassment [9]. Among younger faculty members, the prevalence remained substantial at 30.4% [10]. Variation across specialties further illustrates the influence of workplace culture. Female residents in surgery and emergency medicine reported the highest rates of harassment, a pattern attributed to rigid hierarchical structures and authoritative norms that discourage reporting and reinforce power imbalances [8]. In contrast, pediatric residents reported the lowest prevalence, suggesting that specialty-specific cultures play a critical role in shaping risk. Importantly, recent investigations demonstrate that harassment of medical trainees occurs across countries and educational systems, indicating that the problem is not confined to specific national or institutional contexts [11].

Trends in formal reporting provide additional insight into the scope of sexual harassment beyond healthcare. Following the global attention generated by the #MeToo movement beginning in 2017, sexual harassment charges filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission increased. Between 2018 and 2021, sexual harassment claims accounted for 27.7% of all harassment charges, compared with 24.7% between 2014 and 2017. Women filed the majority of these claims, representing 78.2% of complainants, while men accounted for 21.8% [See EEOC Sexual Harassment in Our Nation's Workplaces]. Despite this increase, reporting remains the exception rather than the norm. Approximately three out of four individuals who experience harassment never report the behavior to supervisors or managers. Common reasons include fear of not being believed in, concern that no corrective action will occur anticipation of blame and fear of social or professional retaliation. Variability in reported prevalence rates reflects differences in survey design and terminology. The EEOC Select Task Force on the Study of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace reported that between 25% and 85% of women experience sexual harassment at work. This wide range is largely explained by how questions are framed. When individuals are asked directly whether they have experienced sexual harassment, affirmative responses are lower. When surveys instead ask about specific behaviors such as unwanted sexual attention or coercion reported prevalence rises substantially, in some cases to 60%. These findings suggest that many individuals experience harassing conduct without labeling it as sexual harassment, which further complicates recognition and intervention.

Recent cross-sectional studies have identified demographic and occupational risk factors associated with increased exposure. Women younger than 55 were found to be at higher risk of sexual harassment or violence compared with women aged 55 to 69 [12]. Sexual minority women, including those identifying as lesbian bisexual or not defined, reported higher frequencies of unwanted behavior than heterosexual women [12]. Work schedules also influenced risk. Women working shifts or irregular hours experienced higher rates of harassment than those working standard daytime schedules. This pattern may be linked to understaffing reduced supervision and increased contact with third-party individuals such as patients clients or vendors during night shifts [12]. Organizational characteristics further shape vulnerability. Institutions characterized by rigid hierarchies male-dominated leadership and tolerance of misconduct by individuals in power are particularly susceptible to sexual harassment. Healthcare organizations commonly exhibit these features due to entrenched professional hierarchies dependence on evaluations and credentialing and historical gender imbalances in leadership roles. Hospitals nursing homes and clinics combine close interpersonal interaction with high stress environments and power asymmetries, creating conditions in which harassment can persist if not actively addressed [13]. Collectively, the evidence demonstrates that sexual harassment in healthcare is not an isolated phenomenon but a systemic issue with deep roots in organizational culture structure and practice.

Issues of Concern

Sexual harassment in medicine persists not only because of its prevalence but also because of systemic barriers that discourage reporting and accountability. One of the most significant challenges lies in the reluctance of affected individuals to disclose their experiences. Fear of not being believed

remains a dominant concern, particularly in environments where authority figures hold substantial influence over training progression evaluations and career advancement. Shame and embarrassment further silence victims, especially when disclosure may become known among peers and colleagues. Many individuals also lack trust in institutional leadership and doubt that reporting mechanisms will lead to meaningful action. In some cases, harmful behaviors are perceived as an unavoidable aspect of professional advancement within hierarchical medical cultures [1]. Additional barriers include fear of retaliation and uncertainty about what behaviors qualify as reportable misconduct. Ambiguity surrounding definitions of sexual harassment leads some individuals to minimize or normalize inappropriate conduct. Complex or opaque reporting procedures further discourage engagement with formal systems [14]. Evidence from surgical training environments illustrates the magnitude of this problem. Nearly half of surgery residents reported experiencing at least one form of sexual harassment during training, yet most did not report the behavior. A majority believed the conduct was harmless, while nearly half viewed reporting as futile [1]. These perceptions reflect a normalization of misconduct and a lack of confidence in institutional responsiveness. Findings from family medicine residency programs reinforce these concerns. Residents identified the absence of trust in reporting systems as the most significant barrier, coupled with fear of embarrassment or reputational harm [15]. These concerns are not limited to trainees. Female physicians who experienced sexual harassment reported remaining silent due to diminished self-worth and internalized blame. Many believed they had somehow provoked the behavior or feared being labeled as disruptive or difficult if they spoke out [15]. Such responses demonstrate how harassment undermines professional identity and reinforces self-censorship.

Patient-related sexual harassment presents additional reporting challenges. Clinicians frequently cited concern about damaging the therapeutic relationship as the primary reason for not reporting harassment by patients [14]. This concern is particularly acute in settings that emphasize patient satisfaction and continuity of care. Clinicians may feel compelled to tolerate inappropriate behavior to avoid complaints or negative evaluations. The presence of psychiatric or cognitive disorders further complicates decision-making. Healthcare professionals often reported a tendency to excuse or tolerate sexually inappropriate conduct from patients with mental health conditions, perceiving such behavior as symptomatic rather than actionable [14]. While clinical nuance is essential, this tolerance may leave clinicians unprotected and unsupported. Hierarchical structures within medicine intensify these barriers. Despite legal protections and organizational assurances, fear of reprisal and long-term career harm remains pervasive. Trainees and junior faculty are especially vulnerable due to their dependence on supervisors for evaluations recommendations funding and promotion [1][14]. Many fear covert retaliation rather than overt punishment. This includes negative commentary in confidential forums such as grant reviews promotion deliberations award nominations and search committee discussions. The opacity of these processes heightens anxiety and reinforces silence. The perception that reporting may irreversibly damage one's career trajectory discourages even those with strong evidence from coming forward. Collectively these barriers reveal that underreporting is not a result of apathy or resilience but a rational response to perceived risk. Addressing sexual harassment therefore requires not only clear policies but also credible protection against retaliation transparent reporting pathways and cultural change that validates reporting as a professional responsibility rather than a personal liability.

Employer Liability

Employer liability in cases of sexual harassment is grounded in the principle that organizations bear responsibility for maintaining safe and respectful work environments. Sexual harassment can affect individuals regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. Victims may include employees nonemployees patients and even witnesses or bystanders who are affected by offensive conduct. Nonemployees encompass individuals who perform services for the organization such as contractors consultants vendors sales representatives and delivery personnel. Importantly the individual bringing a complaint does not need to be the direct target of harassment. Any person negatively affected by a hostile or offensive environment may be considered a victim under the law. Additionally unlawful sexual harassment can occur even in the absence of tangible economic harm or termination. Employers hold a duty to address sexual harassment through prevention investigation and correction. This responsibility applies when harassment is perpetrated by employees nonemployees or patients. In healthcare settings where interactions with third parties are frequent this obligation is particularly significant. Employers must take reasonable steps to prevent harassment before it occurs establish clear reporting mechanisms and ensure prompt and thorough investigation of all complaints. Failure to act not only perpetuates harm but also exposes institutions to legal and ethical consequences. Liability standards vary depending on the status of the perpetrator. Employers are strictly liable for sexual harassment committed by supervisors or managers. This means responsibility applies regardless of whether leadership was aware of the misconduct. The rationale is that individuals in

positions of authority act as agents of the organization and their conduct reflects institutional control. When supervisors misuse their power the organization bears direct accountability. These standard underscores the importance of careful selection training and monitoring of individuals in leadership roles.

When harassment is perpetrated by coworkers nonemployees or patients employer liability depends on knowledge and response. Employers are liable if they knew or reasonably should have known about the harassment and failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action. This includes situations where patterns of behavior were observable or complaints were informally communicated but not addressed. In healthcare environments this standard places responsibility on institutions to respond proactively to patient-related harassment rather than dismissing it as unavoidable or inherent to clinical work. Employer responsibility also extends to protecting individuals from retaliation. Retaliatory actions undermine reporting systems and expose organizations to additional liability. Retaliation may take subtle forms such as exclusion loss of opportunities or negative evaluations. Institutions must ensure that individuals who report or participate in investigations are safeguarded from adverse consequences. Effective enforcement requires confidentiality transparency and accountability at all levels of leadership. Ultimately employer liability reflects a broader obligation to uphold professional standards and human dignity. In medicine where trust teamwork and ethical conduct are foundational sexual harassment represents a direct threat to organizational integrity. Employers that fail to prevent or address harassment risk not only legal consequences but also erosion of workforce morale credibility and patient trust. Addressing liability therefore aligns legal compliance with the core mission of healthcare institutions to provide safe equitable and respectful environments for all [16].

The Role of Bystanders and Changing Bystanders to Upstanders

Bystanders occupy a pivotal position in the dynamics of discrimination and sexual harassment. They are individuals who witness inappropriate conduct and are confronted with a choice to ignore the behavior, implicitly condone it, or intervene to interrupt and challenge it [16]. Their responses shape workplace norms and signal what behaviors are tolerated. An upstander is defined as a bystander who actively takes a stand against harassment or discrimination and provides support to the person targeted [17]. This distinction is critical because organizational cultures are not sustained only by perpetrators but also by the silence or action of those who observe misconduct. When bystanders remain passive, their inaction may be interpreted as approval. Silence reinforces harmful norms and allows misconduct to persist unchecked. In healthcare and other hierarchical professional environments, repeated nonintervention contributes to the normalization of harassment. Over time this creates climates where targets feel isolated and perpetrators feel protected. Encouraging bystanders to intervene therefore represents a strategic approach to prevention. By shifting expectations and equipping individuals with skills and confidence, organizations can transform passive witnesses into active participants in maintaining respectful and inclusive workplaces. Education and motivation are central to this transformation. Many bystanders do not intervene because they feel uncertain about what to do or fear making the situation worse. Others worry about personal risk or social consequences. Training initiatives that clarify roles provide practical strategies and normalize intervention increase confidence and perceived self-efficacy. When individuals understand that intervention does not require confrontation and that support can take many forms, they are more likely to act. These interventions also communicate that preventing harassment is a shared responsibility rather than the sole burden of targets [17].

The concept of bystander intervention must be distinguished from the bystander effect. The bystander effect is a psychological phenomenon in which individuals are less likely to help when others are present due to diffusion of responsibility and social cues that discourage action [16]. In such situations each observer assumes someone else will intervene. Bystander intervention represents the opposite response. It involves deliberate action to counteract diffusion of responsibility and disrupt harmful behavior. Understanding this distinction is essential because it reframes intervention as a learned and supported behavior rather than an instinctive reaction. When bystanders choose to become upstanders, they intervene with the goal of reducing harm and supporting the targeted individual. Intervention does not require direct confrontation in all circumstances. A widely recognized framework for intervention is the Right to Be 5 Ds model which provides structured options for action [See the Right to Be 5 Ds on righttobe.org]. This framework emphasizes de-escalation and safety. It recognizes that not all situations permit direct challenge and that indirect methods may be more effective and less risky. One approach within this framework involves distraction. Distraction interrupts the interaction between the harasser and the target without explicitly addressing the misconduct. This method is particularly useful when the upstander feels unsafe confronting the harasser or anticipates escalation. By redirecting attention or inserting a neutral interruption, the upstander can create an opportunity for the target to disengage. Distraction shifts the immediate dynamics and often stops the behavior without drawing confrontation [17].

Another approach relies on delegation. Delegation involves seeking assistance from others who are positioned to intervene more effectively. This may include supervisors leaders or colleagues who hold authority or social influence. By sharing responsibility and acting collaboratively, bystanders reduce personal risk and increase the likelihood of a successful intervention. Delegation also reinforces collective accountability and signals that harassment is a shared concern rather than an individual problem. Documentation represents a further intervention strategy when safety permits and when someone else is already supporting the target. Recording details of the incident or taking notes can preserve evidence and validate the target's experience. Ethical use of documentation requires respect for the wishes of the person harmed. Consent is essential and documentation should never be shared or used without permission. When done appropriately documentation can support reporting processes and counteract dismissal or minimization of complaints. Delay focuses on post-incident support. Harassment often unfolds quickly and leaves little time for immediate intervention. Checking in afterward provides emotional validation and practical assistance. Expressing that the behavior was witnessed and recognized as wrong helps counter self-blame and isolation. Offering to accompany the individual or assist with reporting further demonstrates solidarity. Delay reinforces that intervention does not end when the incident concludes but continues through sustained support. Direct intervention involves addressing the behavior in clear and concise language when safety allows. This approach communicates boundaries and disrupts normalization. Effective direct intervention avoids debate and prioritizes brevity. The focus remains on stopping the behavior rather than engaging with the harasser's justifications. Direct statements that label conducted as inappropriate or discriminatory can be powerful signals of shared norms. However, this approach requires careful judgment to avoid escalation or harm [18].

Research within institutional settings highlights conditions that encourage bystanders to act. Leadership behavior emerges as a decisive factor. Individuals often look to leaders to determine acceptable conduct and appropriate responses. When leaders intervene promptly and visibly, they legitimize action and reduce fear. Organizational cultures grounded in respect active listening and accountability foster bystander engagement. Observing leaders model upstander behavior correlates strongly with increased direct intervention peer support and confidence among staff [18]. Leadership silence has the opposite effect and reinforces passivity. Clinicians occupy a particularly influential role as bystanders due to their frequent interactions with both staff and patients. They are often present during incidents of harassment and hold professional authority that can be leveraged to interrupt misconduct. Clinicians who act as upstanders demonstrate that intervention aligns with professional ethics and patient-centered values. Importantly bystanders must recognize that intervention does not require confronting the harasser directly. Supportive actions that prioritize the target can be equally impactful [19]. Fear of retaliation remains a significant barrier for bystanders. This fear intensifies when the harasser holds greater institutional power. Trainees fellows and medical students may witness misconduct by senior clinicians who control evaluations and career opportunities. In such contexts intervention carries perceived risk. Yet inaction also carries consequences. Bystanders exposed to repeated misconduct may experience moral distress anxiety and indirect harm from working in hostile environments [20]. Silence may protect short-term safety but contribute to long-term professional and psychological costs.

Bystander actions vary depending on immediacy and risk. In low-immediacy situations where harm is not ongoing, bystanders may provide private support and encourage reporting. They may also address the behavior later or serve as proxy reporters when targets feel unable to come forward. In high-immediacy situations where harm is occurring in real time, bystanders may interrupt the behavior remove the target from the situation and seek immediate assistance [19]. Both forms of intervention play critical roles in prevention and response. Transforming bystanders into upstanders requires sustained institutional commitment. Policies alone are insufficient without cultural reinforcement and skill development. Training programs must normalize intervention clarify protections and emphasize shared responsibility. Leadership accountability and visible action strengthen trust and reduce fear. When bystanders believe they will be supported rather than punished, intervention becomes more likely. Ultimately the shift from bystander to upstander represents a cultural change. It reflects recognition that harassment thrives in silence and diminishes in environments where individuals act collectively. Empowered bystanders interrupt harm validate targets and reinforce professional standards. In healthcare settings where trust safety and collaboration are essential, upstander behavior supports not only individual dignity but also organizational integrity and quality of care [18][19][20].

Organizational Culture – Most Potent Predictor

Accumulating evidence indicates that organizational culture is the strongest predictor of sexual harassment prevalence within workplaces, including healthcare and academic medical institutions. Culture shapes shared expectations regarding acceptable behavior and defines whether

misconduct is implicitly tolerated or explicitly rejected. When employees perceive that harassing conduct is ignored minimized or excused, the likelihood of recurrence increases. Conversely, when intolerance is consistently demonstrated through leadership actions policies and accountability mechanisms, the prevalence of harassment declines [8]. Organizational culture therefore operates not as a background variable but as a central determinant that either enables or constrains harmful behavior. Leaders occupy a decisive position in shaping and transforming organizational culture. Cultural norms are communicated less through written policies than through daily decisions responses and priorities set by those in authority. Concrete organizational measures are required to translate stated commitments into lived practice. These measures include visible enforcement of standards allocation of sufficient resources to prevention efforts and systematic evaluation of workplace climate. Without such actions policies risk becoming symbolic gestures that fail to influence behavior [8]. Effective cultural change requires sustained leadership engagement rather than episodic responses to crises. Senior leadership must initiate and model a workplace culture in which harassment is unequivocally unacceptable. This responsibility rests most heavily at the highest levels of management where authority over resources promotion and institutional priorities is concentrated. Beyond articulating values leaders must establish accountability systems that ensure consistent consequences for misconduct. Harassers must face proportionate and timely corrective action. Equally important individuals who intervene prevent harm or respond appropriately should receive recognition and institutional support. Failure to respond to known misconduct must itself carry consequences. Leadership commitment is demonstrated when time funding and personnel are dedicated to prevention training reporting systems and monitoring mechanisms rather than treated as peripheral concerns [8].

The gender composition of leadership in healthcare adds complexity to these efforts. Despite women constituting a substantial proportion and in many settings a numerical majority of the healthcare workforce men continue to dominate senior leadership roles such as department chairs deans search committee heads and chief executive officers. This imbalance shapes power dynamics and may influence how harassment is perceived addressed or dismissed. While leadership gender alone does not determine culture the concentration of power within homogenous groups can limit perspective and slow reform. Inclusive leadership structures that reflect workforce diversity are therefore relevant to cultural change efforts. Although individual behavioral change can produce localized improvements it is insufficient to address systemic harassment. Sustainable prevention requires comprehensive cultural transformation. Employers must intentionally design workplace cultures grounded in mutual respect inclusion and dignity. This involves clearly articulating behavioral expectations through codes of conduct that explicitly prohibit harassment. Transparency regarding reporting procedures investigative processes and potential sanctions reinforces credibility. A zero-tolerance stance must be communicated not as a slogan but as an operational principle reflected in consistent action [19]. Ambiguity or selective enforcement undermines trust and perpetuates risk. Senior faculty and experienced clinicians play a critical role in reinforcing anti-harassment culture. Their proximity to trainees and junior staff positions them as influential role models. Encouraging senior faculty to intervene when they observe misconduct reinforces norms and signals institutional backing for upstander behavior. Such interventions can prevent escalation validating affected individuals and influence peer behavior. When respected leaders visibly challenge harassment they help dismantle the perception that power shields misconduct.

Archetypes of Leaders Who Inadequately Respond to Sexual Harassment in Medical Education

Despite awareness and policy development some leaders continue to respond inadequately to sexual harassment within medical education. Research identifies five recurring leadership archetypes whose responses undermine prevention and accountability which are avoiders authoritarians dismissers ineffective supporters and enablers [21]. These archetypes illustrate how leadership behavior can perpetuate harm even in organizations with formal anti-harassment frameworks. Avoiders respond to harassment by disengaging or remaining silent. They may acknowledge an incident privately but take no visible action. In clinical training environments avoiders often permit inappropriate patient behavior without intervention thereby conveying that harassment is an unavoidable aspect of medical practice. This response isolates trainees and reinforces the notion that enduring misconduct is part of professional socialization. Avoidance erodes trust and signals institutional indifference. Authoritarians minimize the seriousness of harassment by reframing the problem as an issue of sensitivity or overreaction. They may instruct trainees or clinicians to ignore inappropriate remarks and focus on patient care. In doing so they shift responsibility from the perpetrator to the target and implicitly legitimize misconduct. This approach prioritizes hierarchy and control over safety and dignity [21]. It also discourages reporting by portraying complaints as weakness.

Dismissers acknowledge harassment only when it reaches extreme thresholds such as physical assault or explicit coercion. They discount verbal or

nonphysical misconduct as trivial or inevitable. By narrowing the definition of actionable harm dismissers invalidate many experiences and delay intervention until damage has escalated. This stance contradicts evidence demonstrating that cumulative lower-level behaviors can produce significant harm. Ineffective supporters express concern and moral opposition to harassment but lack practical strategies for response. They may offer sympathy without initiating protective measures or structural change. While well intentioned their inaction leaves targets without meaningful support and allows patterns to continue. Ineffective support can be as damaging as dismissal because it raises expectations without delivering protection [21]. Enablers represent the most concerning archetype. They fail to recognize harassment as problematic or actively participate in it. Enablers may normalize sexualized language jokes or boundary violations and discourage complaints. Their behavior legitimizes misconduct and deters intervention by others. When enablers occupy leadership positions the organization becomes particularly vulnerable to entrenched harassment cultures. Understanding these archetypes is essential for leadership development and institutional reform. Identifying and addressing inadequate response patterns can prevent repetition and guide training efforts focused on effective intervention accountability and ethical leadership [21].

Business Case for Prevention

Beyond ethical and legal imperatives preventing sexual harassment presents a compelling business case. Financial consequences associated with harassment are substantial and measurable. Between 2018 and 2021 the EEOC recovered nearly $300 million for individuals who filed harassment claims [See EEOC Sexual Harassment in our Nation's Workplaces]. These figures reflect only formal resolutions and do not capture indirect costs such as litigation expenses administrative time and reputational damage. The impact of sexual harassment on individuals translates directly into organizational harm. Victims frequently experience psychological distress physical symptoms and economic instability. These outcomes affect performance engagement and retention. At the organizational level harassment correlates with decreased job satisfaction increased absenteeism reduced organizational commitment and elevated turnover intentions. Employees may seek transfers withdraw from teamwork or disengage from discretionary effort. Productivity declines as focus shifts from professional tasks to coping with hostile environments. Empirical studies consistently link harassment exposure to adverse career outcomes. Individuals subjected to harassment may alter career paths abandon leadership aspirations or exit the profession entirely. These losses deplete institutional knowledge and increase recruitment and training costs. In healthcare settings workforce instability can disrupt continuity of care and compromise service quality. The cumulative effect extends beyond single organizations to affect the reputation and sustainability of the profession as a whole [22][23].

Reputational harm represents another significant cost. Organizations perceived as unsafe or unresponsive risk losing public trust patient confidence and competitive standing. Negative publicity may deter prospective employees students and collaborators. In academic medicine institutional reputation influences funding accreditation and recruitment. Failure to address harassment can therefore have long-term strategic consequences. Investment in prevention yields measurable returns. Effective cultural interventions reduce claims improve retention and strengthen organizational commitment. Prevention aligns legal compliance with operational efficiency and ethical responsibility. By prioritizing respectful workplace culture organizations protect their workforce enhance performance and safeguard institutional credibility. In sum organizational culture stands as the most powerful determinant of sexual harassment prevalence. Leadership behavior accountability structures and shared norms define whether harassment persists or declines. Addressing inadequate leadership responses and investing in prevention is not only a moral obligation but also a strategic necessity. Institutions that commit to cultural transformation position themselves to protect individuals sustain performance and uphold the core values of healthcare and medical education [23].

Clinical Significance

Sexual harassment in medicine carries profound clinical significance because its effects extend beyond individual distress to influence workforce stability professional development and quality of care. Workplace sexual harassment, encompassing gender harassment unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion, is recognized as a substantial risk factor for women’s mental health disorders. Empirical evidence demonstrates strong associations between exposure to harassment and higher rates of depression anxiety and psychological distress. Women who experience harassment in medical environments report increased consumption of alcohol and drugs as maladaptive coping mechanisms and show elevated prevalence of eating disorders. These outcomes indicate that harassment functions as a chronic occupational stressor rather than a transient interpersonal conflict. The emotional and psychological consequences are multifaceted. Studies document persistent negative mood states alongside self-blame and erosion of self-esteem. Emotional exhaustion emerges as a frequent response, particularly in high-demand clinical settings where recovery time is limited. Affective reactions such as anger disgust envy and fear are

commonly reported and often coexist with reduced satisfaction with life. These symptoms impair concentration motivation and decision-making. In medicine, where cognitive performance situational awareness and emotional regulation are essential such impairments have direct implications for patient safety and clinical judgment. Importantly sexual harassment has been linked to increased risk of suicidal ideation and behavior as well as severe psychiatric illness [24]. This association underscores the seriousness of harassment as a public health and occupational health issue rather than a purely social concern.

The long-term professional consequences are equally significant. Over time many women reports becoming less trusting in professional environments and more guarded when forming academic or clinical collaborations. This adaptive caution reflects attempts to avoid future harm but may also limit access to mentorship sponsorship and collaborative opportunities. Some women deliberately distance themselves from male mentors or alter communication patterns with colleagues. While these strategies may provide a sense of safety they often weaken professional relationships and reduce integration within academic networks [25]. In hierarchical medical systems where advancement depends heavily on mentorship and informal advocacy such disruptions can have lasting career effects. Responses to harassment vary across individuals and contexts. Some women channel their experiences into scholarly, or advocacy efforts focused on gender equity inclusion and organizational reform. Engagement in policy development research or institutional initiatives may offer a sense of agency and meaning. Others become actively involved in awareness campaigns or professional association efforts aimed at systemic change [25]. While these responses can contribute to positive reform they may also impose additional emotional labor on individuals already affected by harm. Not all victims have the resources or capacity to assume such roles. In contrast some women respond by avoiding environments associated with harassment. This avoidance may involve declining leadership roles turning down research collaborations or rejecting job opportunities perceived as unsafe. Decisions to forgo career advancement are often framed as protective choices but result in constrained professional trajectories [25]. Such outcomes represent a loss not only for individuals but also for institutions and the broader medical profession which forfeits talent expertise and leadership diversity.

Retaliation compounds the harm associated with sexual harassment and represents one of its most damaging consequences. Retaliatory actions may be overt or subtle but consistently produce negative outcomes for victims. Empirical accounts describe scenarios in which individuals were terminated after disclosing harassment denied tenure or promotion pressured to resign from leadership positions or compelled to accept roles at lower-ranked institutions. Others reported withdrawal from major research projects or loss of funding opportunities following disclosure [25]. These experiences reinforce fear of reporting and perpetuate silence within medical culture. The cumulative impact of these effects extends beyond individual careers to influence organizational functioning. Psychological distress and disengagement contribute to burnout absenteeism and turnover. Loss of experienced clinicians and researchers undermines continuity of care academic productivity and institutional memory. Moreover environments perceived as unsafe deter prospective trainees and staff and weaken public trust in medical institutions. In clinical terms sexual harassment represents a threat multiplier. It exacerbates mental health vulnerabilities distorts professional relationships and disrupts career pathways. Its consequences reverberate through healthcare systems affecting teamwork patient outcomes and organizational sustainability. Recognizing these clinical effects is essential for framing sexual harassment as a critical issue in workforce health and patient care rather than a peripheral human resources concern [25].

Other Issues

Strategies to Decrease Sexual Harassment and Retaliation

Prevention remains the most effective approach for eliminating sexual harassment and reducing retaliation within healthcare and academic medical environments. Preventive strategies require intentional construction of workplaces grounded in inclusion safety and psychological comfort where inappropriate conduct is neither normalized nor excused. Sexual harassment does not occur in isolation. It emerges in environments where boundaries remain unclear power differentials go unchallenged and silence is implicitly rewarded. Employers therefore carry a fundamental responsibility to take all reasonable and proactive steps to prevent harassment before it occurs. This responsibility includes openly addressing the issue expressing unequivocal institutional disapproval of developing meaningful sanctions and ensuring that all employees understand how and where to report concerns. Prevention also requires empowering individuals at every level to participate in maintaining respectful professional standards [26]. Evidence-based guidance from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission emphasizes that prevention succeeds when it is systematically sustained and embedded into daily operations rather than treated as a compliance exercise. Best practices identify five interdependent principles that together reduce the likelihood of harassment and strengthen institutional responses. These principles include committed leadership consistent accountability comprehensive policies accessible reporting systems

and regular training that reflects organizational realities [21]. Each principle reinforces the others. When any element is weak the entire prevention framework loses credibility and effectiveness. Leadership occupies a central role in shaping expectations and behavior. Leaders must articulate a clear institutional vision that affirms diversity inclusion and respect as nonnegotiable professional values. This vision must translate into visible conduct. Employees closely observe how leaders speak act and respond to misconduct. When leaders model respectful behavior intervene promptly and allocate resources to prevention efforts they communicate that harassment is incompatible with organizational identity. Conversely silence delay or minimization by leadership signals tolerance even when formal policies state otherwise [26].

Accountability transforms stated values into operational norms. Workplace culture reflects which behaviors receive rewards and which result in consequences. Organizations that respond inconsistently to harassment undermine trust and discourage reporting. Effective accountability requires prompt investigation of complaints fair evaluation of evidence and disciplinary action proportionate to the severity of misconduct. Equally important organizations must recognize and support individuals who report concerns or intervene as bystanders. When employees perceive that reporting leads to protection rather than punishment participation increases and collective responsibility strengthens. Resource allocation signals institutional priorities. Harassment prevention demands time trained personnel and administrative support. Leadership must ensure that prevention efforts receive sustained funding and that managers receive adequate training to respond competently. Identifying harassment risk factors forms an essential component of prevention. High-risk environments often include settings with rigid hierarchies isolated workspaces reliance on trainees or temporary staff and frequent interactions with non-employees. Proactive assessment allows organizations to implement targeted safeguards rather than reactive measures after harm occurs. Continuous monitoring reinforces prevention. A harassment-free environment requires ongoing attention rather than periodic review. Institutions benefit from regular climate assessments open discussions during staff meetings and integration of respect and professionalism into routine communications. Such efforts normalize dialogue reduce stigma and maintain awareness. They also signal that leadership views harassment prevention as an ongoing obligation rather than a one-time initiative. In many institutions dismantling entrenched cultures of impunity represents a necessary step [2]. Cultures that protect senior individuals or high performers regardless of conduct perpetuate harm and silence. Change requires leaders and bystanders to shift from passive observers to active allies. Allyship involves advocating for those subjected to harassment while preserving professional relationships with patients trainees or colleagues. This shift requires institutional backing clear guidance and shared responsibility.

A structured response framework provides practical guidance for addressing harassment when it occurs [21]. This approach emphasizes confronting the offender naming the behavior setting clear expectations supporting the victim and acting proactively to prevent recurrence. Such responses reinforce institutional values and reduce ambiguity. Importantly responsibility for action cannot rest solely with the individual who experiences harassment. Expecting victims to manage misconduct without support perpetuates power imbalances and discourages disclosure. Sustainable change requires collective engagement supported by leadership commitment. While cultural change often begins at senior levels it depends on individual adoption across the organization. Policies and statements alone do not transform behavior. Employees must internalize expectations and observe consistent enforcement. Silence from bystanders allows misconduct to persist. When even one observer intervenes or reports behavior norms begin to shift. Over time collective action reshapes what is considered acceptable. A clearly written harassment policy forms the structural foundation of prevention. Employers should establish comprehensive policies that define expectations outline procedures and apply uniformly across the organization. Accessibility is essential. Policies should be written in clear language and provided in the languages commonly used by employees. Applicability must extend beyond formal employees to include applicants contractors volunteers and non-employees who interact within the work environment. Healthcare settings involve frequent interactions with external personnel such as security staff vendors board members and volunteers. Policies must explicitly cover these relationships to eliminate ambiguity. Effective policies encourage reporting even when individuals remain uncertain whether conduct meets formal definitions of harassment. Early reporting allows intervention before escalation. To support this approach policies should describe both formal and informal avenues for seeking guidance. These may include confidential consultations employee assistance resources or designated advisors. Multiple reporting pathways reduce fear and increase accessibility particularly when power differentials exist [21].

Communication of policy requires consistency. Employees should receive policies upon hire and during regular training. Policies should remain visible through employee handbooks internal websites and common work areas. Regular review ensures that policies reflect legal standards

organizational structure and emerging risks. Static policies lose relevance and credibility over time. Comprehensive policies clearly describe prohibited conduct with concrete examples to reduce misinterpretation. They outline reporting mechanisms that are easy to access and do not rely on a single individual. Policies must assure prompt and thorough investigation followed by appropriate corrective action when misconduct is substantiated. Transparency in process builds trust even when outcomes cannot be publicly disclosed. Confidentiality represents a critical component of effective policy. While absolute confidentiality may not always be possible organizations must protect the privacy of all parties to the extent permitted by law. Clear communication about confidentiality limits prevents unrealistic expectations and reduces anxiety during investigations. A clear and unequivocal prohibition of retaliation remains essential. Fear of retaliation represents one of the strongest barriers to reporting. Policies must state explicitly that retaliation against individuals who report harassment or participate in investigations will not be tolerated and is prohibited under federal law. This assurance must be reinforced through action. Retaliation complaints require the same seriousness and prompt response as initial harassment reports [See EEO Retaliation Law]. Ultimately strategies to decrease sexual harassment and retaliation require alignment between policy leadership culture and practice. Prevention depends on clarity consistency and courage. Institutions that invest in prevention protect not only individual well-being but also professional integrity workforce stability and patient care quality. Sexual harassment is not inevitable. With sustained commitment and systemic action, it can be reduced and addressed effectively [21].

Harassment Complaint Systems

An effective harassment complaint system is a cornerstone of organizational efforts to prevent and address sexual harassment in healthcare and academic settings. Such systems empower individuals who experience harassment, as well as bystanders who witness inappropriate conduct, to report behaviors safely and confidently. When employees understand that reporting is welcomed and that early disclosure is valued, the organization fosters a shared responsibility to maintain a harassment-free workplace. Central to this process is leadership support, which ensures that all personnel responsible for receiving, investigating, and resolving complaints are trained, impartial, and adequately resourced. Complaint systems are only effective when employees trust that their concerns will be taken seriously, that investigations will be objective, and that outcomes will be communicated transparently and fairly [1]. A robust reporting system is multifaceted. While traditional reporting through supervisors or human resources representatives remains essential, complementary mechanisms such as dedicated hotlines, online reporting portals, and multiple designated personnel throughout management and HR enhance accessibility. These avenues should be designed to accommodate varying comfort levels and hierarchical considerations, particularly in environments where power differentials are pronounced. Providing multiple pathways ensures that employees can identify an avenue that feels safe and confidential, thereby reducing barriers to reporting. Leadership must also have a clearly defined role within the reporting process to address concerns that involve senior staff or high-ranking officials, maintaining the credibility of the system while avoiding conflicts of interest. Personnel responsible for receiving complaints must maintain impartiality and demonstrate respect for all parties. Documentation of complaints is critical, capturing each step of the investigative process from initial report to resolution. Such records not only guide corrective action in individual cases but also support organizational learning and preventive efforts. A clear distinction should be maintained between formal harassment complaints and lower-level conflicts that may not constitute harassment but could escalate if left unaddressed. In such cases, designated personnel can facilitate communication, mediate disputes, and implement preventive measures to avoid future escalation, preserving trust and collaboration within the workplace. Confidentiality is central to this process, with all parties understanding their rights and responsibilities within legal boundaries. Equally important is the presumption of innocence for alleged perpetrators until investigations conclusively determine misconduct, ensuring due process and fairness [1]. When complaints are substantiated, organizations must implement both preventative and corrective actions. These measures may include counseling, training, closer supervision, restructuring reporting relationships, or termination in cases of severe or repeated violations. Even when harassment is not fully substantiated, the outcome and rationale should be communicated to all parties to prevent ambiguity and demonstrate organizational accountability. Additionally, organizations must actively safeguard complainants post-resolution, conducting follow-ups to ensure ongoing safety and psychological well-being and confirming that the work environment remains free of retaliatory actions [1].

Harassment Training Programs

Training represents a complementary and essential component of harassment prevention. Regular and comprehensive training programs ensure that employees understand organizational policies, expectations for professional conduct, definitions of prohibited behaviors, potential consequences, and strategies for preventing inappropriate interactions. Respect in the workplace training is particularly effective when designed to enhance awareness, improve interpersonal communication, and reinforce

a culture of inclusivity. Training should also address the nuances of harassment specific to medical and academic environments, including interactions with patients, trainees, and multidisciplinary teams. Supervisors and managers require additional specialized training due to their greater responsibility for maintaining a harassment-free environment. They must be equipped to recognize, respond to, and prevent harassment, and to navigate complaints with fairness and compliance with federal regulations [See EEOC Olguin Task Force Testimony]. Supervisory training should include practical guidance on identifying risk factors, addressing harassment when observed, and reporting behaviors appropriately, ensuring that leaders understand their legal obligations and the protections afforded to individuals under federal law. These protections extend to those who complain about harassment, resist sexual advances, intervening to protect colleagues, or participate in investigations. Training programs should clarify these rights to encourage proactive engagement and reduce fear of retaliation. Senior leadership plays a critical role in the success of training initiatives. Engagement from the CEO, department chairs, and human resources personnel signals institutional commitment and reinforces the importance of adhering to policies. Training should be interactive, tailored to the organizational context, and accessible across hierarchical levels, reflecting the specific challenges faced by different roles. For example, clinicians who interact closely with patients and colleagues may require scenarios emphasizing patient-to-provider harassment and strategies for intervention. Similarly, research faculty may benefit from case-based exercises highlighting mentorship, collaboration, and peer dynamics [1].

Successful training programs integrate instruction on both rights and responsibilities. Employees should learn how to recognize potential harassment, understand reporting processes, and participate safely in dispute resolution or bystander intervention. Training encourages early reporting to prevent escalation, offers guidance on voluntary alternative dispute resolution, and reinforces the importance of confidentiality where legally permissible. Contact information for designated personnel and clear procedures for handling complaints should be readily available to all employees. Bystander involvement, particularly from senior faculty members, enhances training efficacy and strengthens organizational culture. When experienced staff intervene or submit complaints on behalf of others, it demonstrates collective accountability and fosters an environment where harassment is actively discouraged. Faculty participation in reporting reinforces the expectation that harassment will not be tolerated, even when it involves repeated offenders, and models appropriate behavior for junior staff, trainees, and students [1].

Ultimately, harassment complaint systems and training programs function as interdependent mechanisms. Reporting systems provide structured pathways for addressing misconduct, while training ensures that employees and leaders understand their roles in preventing and responding to harassment. Together, they cultivate trust, accountability, and safety within the workplace. When integrated effectively, these approaches not only protect individual employees but also preserve organizational integrity, reduce turnover, enhance productivity, and maintain the professional standards essential for patient care and academic excellence. Organizations that prioritize both robust complaint mechanisms and comprehensive, interactive training send a clear message that harassment is unacceptable, early reporting is encouraged, and systemic support exists for victims and witnesses alike. By implementing multifaceted complaint systems and comprehensive training, healthcare institutions and academic organizations can create a culture where sexual harassment is actively prevented, reported safely, and addressed decisively. Such integration is critical to sustaining professional development, safeguarding mental health, and maintaining safe, equitable environments for all members of the workforce. Through consistent leadership engagement, clear communication, legal compliance, and ongoing evaluation, institutions can ensure that harassment prevention becomes embedded within their organizational culture, ultimately fostering environments where respect, dignity, and inclusivity are paramount [1].

What Should You Do When Harassment Occurs

Experiencing or witnessing sexual harassment in the workplace requires immediate and deliberate action to protect personal well-being, professional integrity, and the work environment. First and foremost, individuals have the right to assertively tell the harasser to stop. The behavior should cease immediately upon request. If the behavior persists, it may constitute illegal conduct, and the individual has the right to escalate the situation through formal reporting channels. Retaliation in response to reporting is prohibited under federal law and should be documented and addressed immediately. Understanding and exercising this right empowers individuals and signals to the harasser that the conduct is unacceptable. Employees also have the right to report sexual harassment through established organizational channels. The appropriate reporting option depends on the severity and context of the behavior. Reporting may involve notifying a direct supervisor, a human resources representative, or any designated individual trained in the organization's complaint resolution process. Reporting should occur as soon as possible to prevent escalation and protect all affected parties. Those who report harassment, participate in investigations, or

assist in the process are legally protected against retaliation. Organizations are obligated to take all complaints seriously and to act in a timely and impartial manner to investigate and resolve issues. Federal law provides an additional layer of protection. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) enforces Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits sexual harassment and retaliation in workplaces with 15 or more employees. Employees may file a charge with the EEOC within 300 days of the incident. The EEOC investigates allegations of harassment, evaluates the evidence, and can offer remedies or facilitate resolution. Once the investigation is complete, complainants may file a lawsuit in federal court if they are dissatisfied with the outcome. The EEOC may also attempt conciliation, a voluntary process designed to resolve disputes without litigation, when reasonable cause exists to believe that a violation occurred [26].

Legal remedies under Title VII aim to restore the affected employee to the position they would have been in if the harassment had not occurred. Remedies can include back pay or compensation for lost benefits, reinstatement, promotions, clearing of personnel records, and, in some cases, punitive damages. Attorney fees may also be recoverable for prevailing complainants. These provisions provide both deterrence and recourse for victims while holding organizations and perpetrators accountable. Individual precautions are equally critical, especially in healthcare settings where team performance directly affects patient outcomes. A safe and functional work environment is essential for medical training and clinical care. When harassment occurs, it disrupts team dynamics and threatens both professional performance and patient safety. Personal protective strategies can vary depending on whether harassment originates from patients, peers, or superiors. When dealing with patients, nonverbal cues, behavioral signals, and direct verbal requests to stop inappropriate conduct are often effective. If the behavior continues, seeking assistance from a colleague or supervisor may be necessary to maintain safety and professionalism. For harassment involving peers, forming alliances with trusted coworkers provides both psychological support and practical intervention options. Directly confronting the individual responsible may be appropriate if initial requests to stop are ignored, particularly when support from coworkers is available. When harassment originates from a superior, intervention may require mediation by a higher-level leadership figure or a trained human resources representative to ensure impartiality and protection from retaliation. Establishing clear, safe, and structured methods for responding to harassment helps maintain professional boundaries and reinforces a culture of accountability. In all scenarios, documenting incidents is essential. Clear, factual records of dates, times, behaviors, witnesses, and responses strengthen reporting credibility and facilitate legal or organizational remedies. Combined with assertive personal measures and formal reporting procedures, these strategies protect individuals, promote safety, and reinforce an organizational culture intolerant of harassment. By proactively addressing harassment, team cohesion is preserved, professional relationships are safeguarded, and patient care remains uncompromised [6][27].

Enhancing Healthcare Team Outcomes

Sexual harassment in healthcare settings represents a significant challenge with profound consequences for individuals, teams, and the organization as a whole. Its effects extend beyond the immediate victims, influencing team cohesion, morale, and patient outcomes. Clinicians must be able to recognize the full spectrum of harassment, including unwanted sexual advances, coercive behavior, and gender-based discrimination, while understanding their personal and professional responsibilities in creating a safe, respectful, and inclusive workplace. Legal frameworks, including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 enforced by the EEOC, provide protection against harassment and retaliation, yet surveys consistently reveal that sexual harassment remains prevalent in healthcare, underscoring the necessity of proactive prevention and intervention strategies [27]. Healthcare environments are complex and often hierarchical, exposing staff to potential harassment from patients, peers, and superiors. Effective strategies for enhancing team outcomes rely on coordinated teamwork and mutual support. Alliances among female colleagues or peers vulnerable to harassment serve as protective mechanisms, fostering both confidence and practical support in confronting inappropriate behavior. Similarly, the involvement of supervisory or senior personnel in mediating situations or intervening on behalf of those affected strengthens institutional accountability and reduces the likelihood of repeated misconduct [27]. Integrating harassment prevention into broader diversity and inclusion strategies ensures that respect, equity, and safety are recognized as core organizational values rather than isolated initiatives. Top leadership commitment is essential for establishing a harassment-free culture. Organizational change begins with senior leaders modeling appropriate behavior, holding individuals accountable for misconduct, and ensuring that the resources, time, and training necessary to prevent harassment are available. Equally important is the engagement of all staff members, across every hierarchical level, in upholding these standards. A coordinated interprofessional management approach, in which clinical, administrative, and human resources teams work together, reinforces consistency in addressing harassment and prevents gaps in accountability [6]. Policies and codes of conduct must be clearly

communicated to all team members, outlining rights, responsibilities, reporting mechanisms, and counseling services. These measures empower staff to identify harassment, intervene appropriately, and maintain a zero-tolerance culture. Reporting harassment should be normalized, with protections explicitly in place to prevent retaliation against those who raise concerns [27].

Training programs play a central role in equipping clinicians with the knowledge and skills necessary to prevent harassment and promote inclusivity. Through interactive education, clinicians learn to identify behaviors that may be sexually offensive or discriminatory, understand the negative impact of harassment on team wellness and patient care, and acquire practical strategies to intervene safely. Training reinforces awareness of organizational policies, clarifies reporting processes, and enhances confidence in addressing misconduct when it occurs. Designated personnel trained in handling complaints impartially and efficiently further strengthen the institutional framework for harassment prevention [6]. The benefits of implementing comprehensive prevention strategies extend beyond compliance and individual protection. A healthcare team functioning in an environment free of harassment demonstrates improved morale, greater interprofessional collaboration, and increased productivity. Trust among colleagues is strengthened, and staff are more likely to contribute fully to patient care without distraction or fear. Patients also benefit indirectly, as a cohesive, well-supported healthcare team is better equipped to deliver safe, high-quality care. By prioritizing prevention, fostering leadership engagement, and promoting a culture of respect and inclusivity, healthcare organizations can reduce incidents of sexual harassment and improve overall clinical and organizational outcomes [27]. Ultimately, addressing sexual harassment is not only a legal and ethical obligation but also a strategic necessity. It requires continuous effort, regular training, robust policies, and active participation from all team members. Clinicians play a pivotal role in both prevention and response, ensuring that the healthcare environment remains safe, equitable, and supportive. Organizations that commit to these principles achieve better team functioning, enhance staff well-being, and more effective patient care. In this way, preventing sexual harassment is integral to achieving excellence in healthcare delivery and sustaining a professional, respectful workplace culture.

Conclusion:

Sexual harassment in healthcare represents a profound ethical, legal, and clinical challenge that threatens workforce stability and patient care. Despite decades of policy development, harassment persists due to entrenched hierarchies, cultural tolerance, and systemic barriers to reporting. Its consequences extend beyond individual harm, producing organizational inefficiencies, reputational damage, and compromised health security. Evidence underscores that prevention cannot rely solely on compliance frameworks; it requires sustained cultural transformation driven by leadership engagement and accountability. Institutions must implement comprehensive strategies, including clear policies, accessible complaint systems, and regular training tailored to healthcare contexts. Empowering bystanders to act as upstanders and ensuring protection against retaliation are critical to dismantling silence and fear. Organizational culture remains the most potent determinant of harassment prevalence, making leadership behavior and resource allocation decisive factors in change. Ultimately, preventing sexual harassment is not optional—it is a strategic necessity for safeguarding professional integrity, promoting inclusivity, and ensuring high-quality patient care. By embedding respect and equity into daily operations, healthcare organizations can create environments where harassment is actively prevented, reported safely, and addressed decisively, thereby strengthening both workforce well-being and institutional resilience.

References:

1. Binder R, Garcia P, Johnson B, Fuentes-Afflick E. Sexual Harassment in Medical Schools: The Challenge of Covert Retaliation as a Barrier to Reporting. Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges. 2018 Dec:93(12):1770-1773. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000002302.
2. Mansour C, Tamirisa KP, Lundberg G, Sharma G, Mehta LS, Mehran R, Volgman AS, Parwani P. Sexual Harassment, Victim Blaming, and the Potential Impact on Women in Cardiology. JACC. Case reports. 2021 Jun:3(6):978-981. doi: 10.1016/j.jaccas.2021.05.002.
3. Papantoniou P. Sexual harassment and organisational silencing in nursing: a cross-sectional study in Greece. BMJ open. 2021 Nov 12:11(11):e050850. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-050850.
4. Viglianti EM, Oliverio AL, Meeks LM. Sexual harassment and abuse: when the patient is the perpetrator. Lancet (London, England). 2018 Aug 4:392(10145):368-370. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31502-2.
5. Schlick CJR, Ellis RJ, Etkin CD, Greenberg CC, Greenberg JA, Turner PL, Buyske J, Hoyt DB, Nasca TJ, Bilimoria KY, Hu YY. Experiences of Gender Discrimination and Sexual Harassment Among Residents in General Surgery Programs Across the US. JAMA surgery. 2021 Oct 1:156(10):942-952. doi: 10.1001/jamasurg.2021.3195.
6. Rihal CS, Baker NA, Bunkers BE, Buskirk SJ, Caviness JN, Collins EA, Copa JC, Hayes SN, Hubert SL, Reed DA, Wendorff SR, Fraser CH,

Farrugia G, Noseworthy JH. Addressing Sexual Harassment in the #MeToo Era: An Institutional Approach. Mayo Clinic proceedings. 2020 Apr:95(4):749-757. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2019.12.021.

7. Notaro E, Pascoe V, Shinohara MM, DeNiro K. Sexual harassment from patient to provider. International journal of women's dermatology. 2020 Jan:6(1):30-31. doi: 10.1016/j.ijwd.2019.09.001.
8. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, Policy and Global Affairs, Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and Medicine, Committee on the Impacts of Sexual Harassment in Academia, Benya FF, Widnall SE, Johnson PA. Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2018 Jun 12
9. Fnais N, Soobiah C, Chen MH, Lillie E, Perrier L, Tashkhandi M, Straus SE, Mamdani M, Al-Omran M, Tricco AC. Harassment and discrimination in medical training: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Academic medicine : journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges. 2014 May:89(5):817-27. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000200.
10. Jagsi R, Griffith KA, Jones R, Perumalswami CR, Ubel P, Stewart A. Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Experiences of Academic Medical Faculty. JAMA. 2016 May 17:315(19):2120-1. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.2188.
11. Chun L, Ye R, Wilby KJ. Exploring discrimination towards pharmacists in practice settings. Pharmacy practice. 2020 Jul-Sep:18(3):1966. doi: 10.18549/PharmPract.2020.3.1966.
12. Jonsdottir SD, Hauksdottir A, Aspelund T, Jakobsdottir J, Runarsdottir H, Gudmundsdottir B, Tomasson G, Valdimarsdottir UA, Halldorsdottir T, Thordardottir EB. Risk factors for workplace sexual harassment and violence among a national cohort of women in Iceland: a cross-sectional study. The Lancet. Public health. 2022 Sep:7(9):e763-e774. doi: 10.1016/S2468-2667(22)00201-8.
13. Jenner S, Djermester P, Prügl J, Kurmeyer C, Oertelt-Prigione S. Prevalence of Sexual Harassment in Academic Medicine. JAMA internal medicine. 2019 Jan 1:179(1):108-111. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.4859.
14. Russell HA, Fogarty CT, McDaniel SH, Naumburg EH, Nofziger A, Rosenberg T, Sanders M, Fiscella K. "Am I Making More of It Than I Should?": Reporting and Responding to Sexual Harassment. Family medicine. 2021 Jun:53(6):408-415. doi: 10.22454/FamMed.2021.808187.
15. Jagsi R. Sexual Harassment in Medicine - #MeToo. The New England journal of medicine. 2018 Jan 18:378(3):209-211. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1715962.
16. Henson B, Fisher BS, Reyns BW. There Is Virtually No Excuse: The Frequency and Predictors of College Students' Bystander Intervention Behaviors Directed at Online Victimization. Violence against women. 2020 Apr:26(5):505-527. doi: 10.1177/1077801219835050.
17. Parrott DJ, Swartout KM, Tharp AT, Purvis DM, Topalli V. Speak Up! Prosocial Intervention Verbalizations Predict Successful Bystander Intervention for a Laboratory Analogue of Sexual Aggression. Sexual abuse : a journal of research and treatment. 2020 Mar:32(2):220-243. doi: 10.1177/1079063218821121.
18. Bond MA, Haynes-Baratz MC. Mobilizing bystanders to address microaggressions in the workplace: The case for a systems-change approach to Getting A (Collective) GRIP. American journal of community psychology. 2022 Mar:69(1-2):221-238. doi: 10.1002/ajcp.12557.
19. Perumalswami CR, Jagsi R. Sexual Harassment in Radiology: Prevalence and Opportunities for Improvement. Journal of the American College of Radiology : JACR. 2020 Feb:17(2):298-303. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2019.09.012.
20. Takeuchi M, Nomura K, Horie S, Okinaga H, Perumalswami CR, Jagsi R. Direct and Indirect Harassment Experiences and Burnout among Academic Faculty in Japan. The Tohoku journal of experimental medicine. 2018 May:245(1):37-44. doi: 10.1620/tjem.245.37.
21. Hawes AM, Gondy K. Sexual Harassment in Medical Education: How We Can Do Better. Journal of general internal medicine. 2021 Dec:36(12):3841-3843. doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-06960-w.
22. Raj A, Freund KM, McDonald JM, Carr PL. Effects of sexual harassment on advancement of women in academic medicine: A multi-institutional longitudinal study. EClinicalMedicine. 2020 Mar:20():100298. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100298.
23. Merkin RS, Shah MK. The impact of sexual harassment on job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and absenteeism: findings from Pakistan compared to the United States. SpringerPlus. 2014:3():215. doi: 10.1186/2193-1801-3-215.
24. Magnusson Hanson LL, Nyberg A, Mittendorfer-Rutz E, Bondestam F, Madsen IEH. Work related sexual harassment and risk of suicide and suicide attempts: prospective cohort study. BMJ (Clinical research ed.). 2020 Sep 2:370():m2984. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2984.

25. Lindquist C, McKay T. Sexual Harassment Experiences and Consequences for Women Faculty in Science, Engineering, and Medicine. RTI Press Policy Brief. 2010
26. McLaughlin H, Uggen C, Blackstone A. THE ECONOMIC AND CAREER EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON WORKING WOMEN. Gender & society : official publication of Sociologists for Women in Society. 2017 Jun:31(3):333-358. doi: 10.1177/0891243217704631.
27. Jenner SC, Djermester P, Oertelt-Prigione S. Prevention Strategies for Sexual Harassment in Academic Medicine: A Qualitative Study. Journal of interpersonal violence. 2022 Mar:37(5-6):NP2490-NP2515. doi: 10.1177/0886260520903130.