Biannual Scientific Review, Autumn 2023, volume 18, issue 2

Social Cohesion and Development
Κοινωνική Συνοχή και Ανάπτυξη

36 Εξαμηνιαία Επιστημονική Επιθεώρηση, Φθινόπωρο 2023, τόμος 18ος, τεύχος 2

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΔΙΟΝΙΚΟΣ

A Foucauldian discourse analysis of sexual harassment in Greek academic community

Aggeliki Kiriazopoulou , Kimon Athanasiadis , Triantafyllia Iliopoulou

doi: 10.12681/scad.37480

To cite this article:

A Foucauldian discourse analysis of sexual harassment in Greek academic community

Aggeliki Kiriazopoulou, *University of West Attica*
Kimon Athanasiadis, *University of West Attica*
Triantafyllia Iliopoulou, *University of West Attica*

Μια Φουκωϊκή ανάλυση λόγου της σεξουαλικής παρενόχλησης στην Ελληνική ακαδημαϊκή κοινότητα

Αγγελική Κυριαζοπούλου, *Πανεπιστήμιο Δυτικής Αττικής*
Κίμων Αθανασιάδης, *Πανεπιστήμιο Δυτικής Αττικής*
Τριανταφυλλιά Ηλιοπούλου, *Πανεπιστήμιο Δυτικής Αττικής*

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the views and perspectives of Greek undergraduate students upon sexual harassment in academic community. The sample was 6 students and the data were analysed with the use of the Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. Four main themes emerged from the analysis: The "gen-der blind" vulnerability discourse, the power as a driving force, patriarchy as a developmental factor for the male perpetrator and power relations in the academic community. Patriarchy constitutes a developmental factor for the male perpetrator thus moralising practices and behaviours that develop fear and a culture of silence. Regarding the academic community, power relations are built on the concepts of prestige, profit and on the high ranking position thus interpreting power relations as gender relations.

KEY WORDS: Greek education, financial crisis, reforms, Max Weber, new governance, egucational reform, rationalisation.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Η παρούσα έρευνα διερευνά τις απόψεις των Ελλήνων προπτυχιακών φοιτητών για τη σεξουαλική παρενόχληση στην ακαδημαϊκή κοινότητα. Το δείγμα ήταν 6 μαθητές και τα δεδομένα αναλύθηκαν με τη χρήση της Φουκωϊκής Ανάλυσης Λόγου. Τέσσερα βασικά θέματα προέκυψαν από την ανάλυ-ση: Η ευαλωτότητα των «τυφλών φύλων», η εξουσία ως κινητήριος δύναμη, η πατριαρχία ως ανα-πτυξιακός παράγοντας για τον άνδρα θύτη και οι σχέσεις εξουσίας στην ακαδημαϊκή κοινότητα. Η πατριαρχία αποτελεί αναπτυξιακό παράγοντα για τον άνδρα θύτη, ηθικοποιώντας έτσι πρακτικές και συμπεριφορές που αναπτύσσουν τον φόβο και την κουλτούρα της σιωπής. Όσον αφορά την ακαδη-μαϊκή κοινότητα, οι σχέσεις εξουσίας βασίζονται στις έννοιες του κύρους, του κέρδους και στην υ-ψηλή θέση, ερμηνεύοντας έτσι τις σχέσεις εξουσίας ως σχέσεις μεταξύ των φύλων.

ΛΕΞΕΙΣ-ΚΛΕΙΔΙΑ: Ελληνική εκπαίδευση, εκπαιδευτικές μεταρρυθμίσεις, χρηματο-πιστωτική κρί-ση, τυπική ορθολογικότητα, Μαξ Βέμπερ, απρο-σωποποίηση θεσμικών σχέσεων, 'απο-σύνδεση' μέσων και σκοπών.

1. Background

The depiction of women has changed over the years and especially after the influence of the femi-nist approach. Although women have found their position in the society in terms of equality and rights, the phenomenon of sexual harassment still prevails. According to Lister (2007) sexual har-assment is reflected upon the revival of "traditional" male power to the detriment of women. This phenomenon constitutes an attitude or a behaviour that operates as an indication of women being repudiated from the public sphere through undermining their dignity (Lister, 2007). The legal framework of sexual harassment seems to be diverse and varies through-out different countries. For instance, in Australia sexual harassment is classified under the civil law, although certain behaviours or acts regarded as sexual harassment are punishable under criminal law - such as stalking or persis-tent and obsessive attempts to communicate - while the court recognizes that the majority of victims are females (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2008). Furthermore, research has shown that men do not consider sexual harassment as a serious problem probably because they cannot relate with the victims (Berdahl, Magley & Waldo, 1996). Garlick (1994) reports that in specific situations men perceive sexual harassment differently than women, as women consider more behaviours under the sexual harassment threshold than men.

According to Foucault, sexuality constitutes an integral part of the individual's identity (Stein & Plummer, 1994), which interacts with the concept of "power" based on a sex-pleasure relationship (Lothian, 2013). Foucault argues that if sexuality takes precedence, then it can be used as a mean of control on subordinating forces, while at the same time gender in combina-tion with power gives in-dividuals the power to determine their own lives and the lives of others (Lothian, 2013). For exam-ple, according to the evolutionary perspective, men use their power to achieve reproduction (Browne, 1997). However, such attempts to gain sexual access result in more coercive sexual behav-iours such as rape (Ward, Hudson & Keenan, 1998). From the psy-chodynamic perspective Costopoulos και Junie (2018) argue that sexual harassment constitutes a consequence of the norma-tive ideology of masculinity. Men who are afraid of emotional at-tachment and have diminished ex-perience in sexual relationships, can be led to isolation, low self-esteem, intense stress and other fea-tures often associated to sexual harassment. On the con-trary, Ridge, Plummer and Peasley (2006) point out that portrayals of masculinity and how they are defined are crucial for the way that indi-viduals will promote their social acceptance within the society. Also, Ravenhill and de Visser (2017) focus on male privileges, which include the social power as it stems from stereotypical masculinity and can be indicated by appearance and behaviours. Likewise, Hoffmann (1986) argues that sexual harassment against women from men functions as a form of social control and reflects the interac-tion between socially constructed definitions of male and female sexuality and the position socially aligned to the sexes along with the dominance of concepts of power and authority in various con-texts and institutions.

The male power is nurtured by the patriarchal family model where the man decides and the rest are obliged to obey, thus normalising practices and behaviours that nurture fear and silence among those who tolerate such behaviours (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994). Indeed, as Hollway et al. (1984) point out, a socially patriarchal system promotes the image of a man who must cre-ate fear and even when he feels insecure he must project aggression so as not to lose his power. Sexual harassment moves beyond the sexual dominance while according to patriarchal capitalist theory, sexual harass-ment is a reflection of social and economic male domination that seeks to oppress women (Noah, 2008). Men seem to be so soaked in this patriarchal system that they do

not realise their actions as being harmful. It seems that based on the standard normalisation of socially expected gender behav-iours in sexual harassment cases, men consider their behaviours as being normal and justified while women are victimised (Vaux & Hobfoll, 1993). Sometimes not even the victims realise their own victimization. van Dijk's (1989) theory of power describes that someone who wishes to control an-other person must have control over his/her desires, wishes, plans, and beliefs and then perhaps the other person may accept or agree these terms. This constitutes the social power which is usually indi-rect and operates through the "minds" of people implying this kind of "mental control" which is typ-ically exercised through persuasion (van Dijk, 1989). This theory reflects Twemlow's (1999) classi-fication of abusers of sexual harass-ment which includes among others the abuser-helper who does favours to another person in order to receive a sexual profit and another type who uses directly his position of power to harass someone. In contrast to all the above, Pina et al. (2009) argue that sexual harassment is not a normative social phenomenon since most men do not sexually harass.

According to an earlier and traditional form of the social system, society is presented as a set of asexual objects and subjects of analysis (Lister, 2007). The term "power" refers to the negotiat-ing perspective throughout all social relationships and functions as a vague energy on which the exist-ence of resistance depends on (Foxhall, 1994). In particular, power is involved in all social conven-tions, thus explaining the social processes, the changes, and the ways according to which human re-ality, autonomy and efficiency are experienced. According to Mcwhorter (2004), power is not ex-clusively a negative manifestation of human action, on the contrary, it shapes, creates and sets the limits of human reality. The theoretical scheme described above agrees with the organizational theo-ry, which views sexual harassment as a result of the power provided and it arises from positions of power observed at all levels of social, public, and private life (Cleveland & Kerst, 1993). The regula-tory environment that has been formed and sets the limits and rules in Western societies reflects the existence of "strong" and "weak" individuals that organizes and determines the relations between them which must be accepted by everyone (Lips, 1991). Tangri, Burt, and Johnson (1982) argue that sexual harassment is used in order to mold gender interac-tions according to the prevailing social norms, emanating from the demands of the biological sex, and thus maintaining the hegemonic male dominance with bullying strategies, which discourage women from professional and social evolu-tion. According to the theory of the four factors, a basic condition for sexual harassment is that the perpetrator accesses his moral inner limitations and then, within the pre-allowed place of action, he violates the victim's boundaries (O'Hare & O'Donohue, 1998). According to Burr and Dick (2017), power correlations mainly refer to how a person's social status gives him more power/dominion over other people, affecting his self-im-age. Twigg (2004) associates the individual's identity to the way the individual perceives himself regarding his body. As Foucault indicates, the body functions as a mean of enforcing power as we cannot speak of submission of the mind and spirit without including the body (in Αλεξιάς, 2006, pp. 42-43). Stokely and Hamilton (1967) describe about institutional discrimination including all forms of inequality, such as gender inequality, economic and social ine-quality, inequalities due to power differences, etc. Discrimination is characterized by disadvantaged treatment towards individuals and groups that are considered different from those who obtain the normative and dominant position. Discrimination occurs in almost all areas of the individual's social life in a refined or less refined way and in the educational context (Πανταζής, 2015). Institutional dis-crimination deals with entrenched discrimination in the hegemonic dominant processes of orga-

nized structures of society. According to Allport (in Πανταζής, 2015) institutional discrimination is rooted in the causal relationship of the social representations and the processes of the institutions. In fact, Willness, Steel and Lee (2007) note that a significant factor for the perpetuation of such be-haviours, is tolerance which is projected by the framework of power. The scope of power consists moral values, rules and policies that are defined as institutional behavioural processes according to which, the organized context allows harassment behaviours to manifest. A central institutional body is, among others, the academic community.

According to all the above, this research constitutes an effort to investigate the perspectives and views of Greek undergraduate and postgraduate students regarding the phenomenon of sexual har-assment in order to understand in depth how the phenomenon is constructed and how it manifests itself within the Greek academic community.

2. Method

Data were collected by conducting six interviews. The subjects were one male and six female Greek students. Anastasis (20 years old) and Eirini (19 years old) live in Athens and they are at an under-graduate level. Maria (20 years old) is also at an undergraduate level but she lives in the countryside. Eve (25 years old) and Alice (26 years old) have finished their undergraduate studies and live in Athens whereas Ariadni (25 years old) is postgraduate student and also lives in Athens. The sample was collected via an invitation as uploaded to specific undergraduate and postgraduate students groups in social media.

The analytic approach used for the analysis was the Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). FDA was initially developed by Michel Foucault who was interested in understanding how power and knowledge are shaped and used in societies (Burr, 2015). A Foucauldian scheme uses discourses as standardized systems that give meaning to historical and cultural events or contexts specifying what is considered natural and normal among societies and cultures (Hook, 2001). FDA focuses on how language is used to talk about discourses, how people have knowledge and feelings of a certain dis-course, and how people talk about or how they act according to a discourse (Willig, 2013). Discourses in turn create subject positions that allow people to behave and think in certain ways (Willig, 2013). In addition, some discourses may have more power and dominate over other discourses in order to be viewed as common-sense knowledge (Burr, 2015). In particular, when social issues such as sexual harassment arise, FDA provides the epistemological framework for understanding and perhaps resisting to hegemonic dominant discourses (Δαφέρμος, 2008).

The epistemology of FDA is social constructionism (Willing, 2013). In the light of social construc-tionism, knowledge and meanings are social constructs and reality becomes unstable depending on the historical and cultural perspective (Burr, 2003). It further assumes that through social interac-tion, language and knowledge of the world is constantly being constructed and not objective with the language being an important factor since it is used every day and within a specific culture it fa-cilitates the way a person thinks and how meanings are provided to them (Burr, 2015). In hence, constructs about the world are not discovered but created and they are based on an individual's sub-jective experience (Andrews, 2012).

For the analysis of the extracts the six steps as developed by Willing (2013) were followed and these analytic steps are: 1) discursive constructions, 2) discourses, 3) action orientation, 4) positionings, 5) practice, and 6) subjectivity.

3. Analysis

Theme 1: The "gender blind" vulnerability

This theme focuses on the vulnerability of the victims indicating that all genders may be potential victims of sexual harassment thus forming a "gender blind" vulnerability.

Extract 1: *"I believe that everyone can be sexually harassed, not that I can rule out a group… neither gays nor lesbians, all sexes"* (Alice, lines 117-120).

Extract 2: *"I believe that we all may be sexually harassed, there is no particular individual who is more vulner-able"* (Ariadne, lines 189-191).

Extract 3: *"I do not rely on the gender dimension of the phenomenon just because it is not heard that a boy will be harassed BUT TODAY IT IS EQUALLY POSSIBLE"* (Eve, lines 1133-134).

    All subjects suggest that vulnerability is not associated to the gender dimension indicating the "gender blind" vulnerability discourse. An individual may be a victim of sexual harassment regard-less gender identity or sexual orientation. Alice's position agrees with the traditional form of the social system as interpreted in social policy according to which society is viewed as a set of asexual objects and subjects of analysis (Lister, 2007). Ariadne expresses the view that harassment is a situa-tion that can be experienced by both men and women without attributing a certain degree of vulner-ability to one of the two sexes (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2008). On the other hand, Eve believes that the victimisation of men is not known because it is not fre-quently mentioned. Af-ter all, men do not express their feelings openly regarding annoyance and harassment due to the context of enhancing their social manhood (Twigg, 2004). Moreover, men compared to women weigh differently the cases of sexual harassment (Berdahl, Magley & Waldo, 1996) while another important factor is the fact that women receive harassment more frequently than men (Garlick, 1994). In hence, none vulnerability prediction may stand since everyone is at stake of being har-assed. According to the extracts all genders are positioned as potential victims of sexual harassment whereas power is strongly held by the perpetrators.

Theme 2: Power as a driving force

This theme indicates power as a driving force for the sexual harassment. Power is expressed through prestige or manipulation and it is marked on the victim's body thus creating the bound-aries of reali-ty whereas whereas power is also genderdized as being male.

Extract 1: *"Basically I can not explain it in detail. Lets' say "look at me, I have prestige, power and so I can impose myself on you and I can do whatever I want with you, I can control your body" and that's it"* (Alice, 170-174).

Extract 2: *"What we need to fight against is the framework of power…the framework of power is an important factor for sexual harassment"* (Anastasis, lines 58-60).

Extract 3: *"Something like manipulation but his main weapon was that he was a man and so he had the power"* (Eirini, lines 135-139).

    All three participants indicate the power discourse as a driving force for the sexual harass-ment. Al-ice's word reflects the Foucauldian theory which argues that sex and power combined provide the power to an individual so to determine not only his own life but also the lives of others (Lothian, 2013). The term power refers to the negotiating perspective of all social relations and functions as a vague energy on which depends the existence of resistance (Foxhall, 1994).

In hence, power shapes, crates and sets the boundaries of reality (Mcwhorter, 2004). For Alice power is expressed through prestige which socially imposes itself on the subject willing to control it. According to Burr and Dick (2017) power relations mainly refer to how an individual's social status gives him more power than other people. This disposition of power and control has no limits as Alice argues, and the initia-tion of this power relationship which is declared as vulner-ability, is marked on the body. Αλεξιάς (2006) presents Foucault's position that the body operates as a mean of enforcing power since we can not speak about the submission of the mind and the spirit without including the body. So, in the case of sexual harassment the submission begins from the body and expands to the mind.

Anastasis highlights the frameworks of power and their contribution to the sexual harassment. In western societies the regulatory environment has been formed in a way that reflects the percep-tion of the existence of "weak" and "powerful" individuals that consequently organise and deter-mine the hierarchy which must be accepted by everyone (Lips, 1991). Willness, Steel and Lee (2007) ar-gue that tolerance constitutes a significant factor for the perpetuation of such behaviours which is projected by the framework of power and as Anastasis says, this framework should be fought.

On the other hand, Eirini not only indicates power as a driving force but also genderdizes power as being male. In this extract power and biological discourse are detected. Men are seen as biologically powerful that may use this power for conquering and possessing. Therefore, ac-cording to the evolu-tionary perspective, men use their power in order to achieve reproduction (Browne, 1997). After all, as Ridge et al. (2006) point out, men perpetuate the traditional pat-tern of a masculine man due to his dominance and power as attributed to him by the society. The subject positions adopted in the ex-tracts is that the perpetrator is the powerful one either because of his social status either because he adopts the role of the traditional masculine man as was given to him by the society. The power is mainly held by the perpetrator although Anastasis believes that this power should be challenged and fought.

Theme 3: Patriarchy as a developmental factor of the male perpetrator

In this theme patriarchy is indicated as a developmental factor of the male perpetrator. The patriar-chal family model according to which men are raised to conquer creates a culture in which normal sexuality is defined through the superiority of men over women thus suggesting that sexual harass-ment is a reflection of social and economic male domination that seeks to oppress women.

Extract 1: *"Men are the strong ones and they can make other genders to do what they want without their will and the others respect them because they are afraid of them….without a doubt we see that in the fam-ilies where man has the first and the last word in the family"* (Eirini, lines 148-152).

Extract 2: *"I generally believe that such a system has been set up, a patriarchal system that generally raises girls with worries that they should be careful…I have been taught to be directly and indirectly afraid of men and from my experiences, they are the ones responsible for such experiences without this be-ing restrictive"* (Mary, lines 109-116).

The participants point out the patriarchy discourse. Eirini's perspective adopts a typical fea-ture of the patriarchal family model where the man decides and the rest are obliged to obey, thus normalis-ing practices and behaviours that nurture fear and silence among those who tolerate such behaviours (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994).

For Maria there is a socially patriarchal system that promotes the image of a man who must create fear and even when he feels insecure he must project aggression so as not to lose his power (Holl-way, Henriques, Venn & Walkerdine, 1984). This concept of "man" is also projected in feminist theories although Pina et al. (2009) argue that sexual harassment is not a normative social phenome-non since most men do not sexually harass. However, feminist theories focus on the objectification of women and on the perception of male sexuality as insatiable, uncontrollable and over-promoted that create a culture in which normal sexuality is defined through the superiority of men over wom-en (Hoffmann, 1986). According to patriarchal capitalist theory, sexual harassment is a reflection of social and economic male domination that seeks to oppress women (Noah, 2008). Thus, according to Hoffmann (1986), sexual harassment functions as a form of social control that reflects the inter-action of socially constructed definitions of male and female sexuality along with the socially as-signed position to gender and the dominance of concepts of power and authority in various contexts and institutions. In hence, patriarchal system that stills prevails in various social cultures constitutes a factor for the formation of an abusive man. From a very young age the boy internalises the values of patriarchy and he learns to dominate at the expense of the opposite sex and to impose his desires with or without the consent of others, because he has learned that it is a right granted to him by his male privilege (Ravenhill & deVisser, 2017). In this system the position of the woman is weakened and she is objectified on the altar of satisfaction of this insatiable and uncontrollable male sexual desire. The power is attributed to the patriarchal system that formulates abusive men and some men are willing to take up this role whereas women are left to adopt the position of the victim or of the submissive one. Such a deep rooted patriarchal system cannot be easily challenged since everyone is taught to behave accordingly and so it is not challenged by the subjects.

Theme 4: Power relations in the academic community.

This theme indicates the social power discourse according to which power relations between a pro-fessor and a student are unequally powerful and built on the concepts of prestige and profit whereas the high ranking position at university is strongly associated to power relations which are interpreted as gender relations.

Extract 1: "A professor exactly because he has prestige and power he believes that he can con-trol you over anything and that he can impose himself on you" (Alice, lines 30-31)

Extract 2: "Because of the prestigious position that he holds [the professor] he believed that he would win but I also believe that the girl had thought that she may gain something from all this. So he believed that the girl would succumb because she would think "yes, I want to get a better grade in his module so I will" (Ariadni, 274-277)

Extract 3: "In most universities it is men who hold a high ranking position so I feel that it is more difficult for the victims to file a complaint against them. In hence the gender dimension is reinforced in the power relations and it is expressed mostly through bribing since he tried to bribe me in various ways and in a very natural way as if he was certain of what he was doing or as if he has done this before" (Eve, 155-159)

In the above extracts the social power discourse is detected. Alice describes how the power rela-tions between a professor and a student are unequally powerful because of the prestige that the pro-fessor holds and because of his power of imposition over students implying a universal authority and power. This universal power indicates an intentional disposition to enforce power as if this power enforcement is viewed as a normative practice of control within the academic

community. Alice's position agrees with Hoffmann (1986) who argues that sexual harassment against women from men functions as a form of social control and reflects the interaction between socially con-structed definitions of male and female sexuality and the position socially aligned to the sexes along with the dominance of concepts of power and authority in various contexts and institutions. This culture is perpetuated and reproduced through the educational system and through the operating mechanisms of the working environment.

Ariadni argues that power relations regarding the academic community are built on the concepts of prestige and profit. Twemlow (1999) argues that according to the his classification of the perpetra-tors of sexual harassment, there is one who uses directly his position of power to harass someone. These power relations are observed at all levels of social, public and private life (Cleveland & Kerst, 1993) including the academic life. The fact that a girl may succumb to her professor reflects van Dijk's (1989) theory of power according to which someone in order to control another person must have control over his/her desires, wishes, plans, and beliefs and then perhaps the the other person may accept or agree these terms. van Dijk (1989) explains that social power is usually indirect and operates through the "minds" of people implying this kind of "mental control" which is typically ex-ercised through persuasion. In Ariadni's example, the girl accepts the social power of her professor without even realising her victimisation and the mental control that the professor exercises on her through persuasion.

Eve associates the high ranking position at university thus genderdizing power and it seems that power relations depend on and are interpreted as gender relations. In other words males in high rank ing position at university are protected by their gender and by the position that they hold. Here an-other type of offender is reflected and that is the abuser-helper who does favours to another person in order to receive a sexual profit (Twemlow, 1999). Also, according to Eve's experience with her professor, it seems that based on the standard normalisation of socially expected gender behaviours in sexual harassment cases, men consider their behaviours as being normal and justified while wom-en are victimised (Vaux & Hobfoll, 1993).

Power in all extracts is strongly held by the male professors who are at the highest ranking position at university while students are positioned as helpless in front of the social power which is exercised over them. This social power may be accepted or rejected but not challenged.

4. Discussion

Sexual harassment constitutes a phenomenon that still prevails regardless the fact that women have found their position in the society in terms of equality and rights. Sexual harassment con-stitutes an attitude or a behaviour that operates as an indication of women being repudiated from the public sphere through undermining their dignity (Lister, 2007). This research investigated in depth the phenomenon in Greek academic community with the use of the Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. Three main themes emerged from the analysis. The first theme indicates the "gender blind" vulnera-bility discourse suggesting that all genders may be potential victims of sexual ha-rassment. All sub-jects confirm that no specific gender is more at stake than other genders reflect-ed the view that har-assment is a situation that can be experienced by both men and women with-out attributing a certain degree of vulnerability to one of the two sexes (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2008) alt-hough it is suggested that the victimisation of men is not known because it is not frequently men-tioned. After all, men do not express their feelings openly regarding an-noyance and harassment due to the context of enhancing their social manhood (Twigg, 2004).

The second theme indicates the power discourse as a driving force for the sexual harass-ment. Through the extracts power shapes, crates and sets the boundaries of reality (Mcwhorter, 2004) which can be expressed in many ways such as through prestige which socially imposes itself on the subject willing to control it. The disposition of power is limitless and it is marked on the body. In-deed as Αλεξιάς (2006) argues, the body operates as a mean of enforcing power since we can not speak about the submission of the mind and the spirit without including the body. So, in the case of sexual harassment the submission begins from the body and expands to the mind. In this theme power is genderdized as being male suggesting that men perpetuate the traditional pattern of a mas-culine man due to his dominance and power as attributed to him by the society (Ridge et al., 2006) whereas the society in general constitutes a regulatory environ-ment which has been formed in a way that reflects the perception of the existence of "weak" and "powerful" individuals that consequently organise and determine the hierarchy which must be accepted by everyone (Lips, 1991).

The third theme reflects the patriarchy discourse according to which the patriarchal family model where the man decides and the rest are obliged to obey contributes to the normalisation of practices and behaviours that nurture fear and silence among those who tolerate such behav-iours (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994). All subjects indicate that patriarchy constitutes a shaping factor of the male per-petrator. After all, the boy from a very young age internalises the values of patriarchy and he learns to dominate at the expense of the opposite sex and to impose his desires with or without the consent of others, because he has learned that it is a right granted to him by his male privilege (Ravenhill & deVisser, 2017). In hence, sexual harassment is a reflection of social and economic male domination that seeks to oppress women (Noah, 2008).

In the last theme the social power discourse is detected. Power relations between a profes-sor and a student are unequally powerful because of the professor's prestige thus indicating that this power operates as a normative practice of control within the academic community. Indeed, as Hoffmann (1986) argues, sexual harassment against women from men functions as a form of social control and reflects the interaction between socially constructed definitions of male and female sexuality and the position socially aligned to the sexes along with the dominance of con-cepts of power and au-thority in various contexts and institutions. In hence, it seems that this culture is perpetuated and reproduced through the educational system. Power relations in the academic community are also built on the profit and are associated to the the high ranking posi-tion of the professor. The fact that a girl may succumb to her professor reflects van Dijk's (1989) theory of power according to which someone in order to control another person must have con-trol over his/her desires, wishes, plans, and beliefs and then perhaps the the other person may accept or agree these terms thus exercising a kind of "mental control" through persuasion. In addition, power relations depend on and are interpreted as gender relations since males in high ranking position at university are protected by their gender and by the position that they hold. In conclusion, based on the standard normalisation of socially expected gender behaviours in sexual harassment cases, men consider their behaviours as being normal and justified while women are victimised (Vaux & Hobfoll, 1993).

In the first three themes power is strongly held either by the perpetrators or by the patri-archal sys-tem that formulates abusive men whereas women or other genders are left to adopt the position of the victim or of the submissive ones. Such a deep rooted patriarchal system cannot be easily chal-lenged since everyone is taught to behave accordingly and for that rea-son it is not challenged by the subjects. In the last theme power is strongly held by the male

professors who are at the highest rank-ing position at university while students are positioned as helpless in front of the social power which is exercised over them. This social power may be accepted or rejected but not challenged.

This research constitutes an effort to investigate the perspectives and views of Greek under-graduate and postgraduate students regarding the phenomenon of sexual harassment in order to understand how the phenomenon manifests itself within the Greek academic community. For a more in depth understanding of the phenomenon further research is suggested focused on students - victims of sexual harassment by a professor or focused on the views and perspectives of the professors of Greek academic community.

Bibliographic References

Alexias, G. (2006). *Sociology of the body from Neanderthal man to exterminator.* Greek Letters (in Greek).

Andrews, T. (2012). What is social constructionism?. *Grounded Theory Review*, 11(1), 39-46.

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2008, October). *Effectively preventing and responding to sexual harassment: A Code of Practice for Employers*. https://humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/content/sexualharassment/quickguide/QuickGuide_2008_web.pdf

Berdahl, L.]., Magley, V., & Waldo, C. R. (1996). The Sexual Harassment of Men ?:Exploring the Concept with Theory and Data. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(4), 527-547.

Browne, K.R. (1997). An evolutionary perspective on sexual harassment: seeking roots in biology rather than ideology. *Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues,* 8, 5–77.

Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism.* Routledge.

Burr, V., & Dick, P. (2017). Social constructionism. In B. Gough (Ed.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Social Psychology* (pp. 59-80). Palgrave McMillan,.

Cleveland, J. N., & Kerst, M. E. (1993). Sexual harassment and perceptions of power: An under-articulated relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 42(1), 49– 67.

Cornwall, A., & Lindisfarne, N. (1994). *Dislocating masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies.* London: Routledge.

Costopoulos, J. S., & Juni, S. (2018). Psychoanalytic Understanding of the Origins of Sexual Violence. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Research and Practice,* 18(1), 57-76.

Foxhall, L. (1994). Pandora unbound: a feminist critique of Foucault's History of Sexuality in A. Comwall and N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), *Dislocating masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies* (pp. 133-146). Routledge.

Garlick, R. (1994). Male and female responses to ambiguous instructor behaviors, Sex Roles. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 5(86), 135-158.

Hoffmann, F. (1986). Sexual Harassment in Academia: Feminist Theory and Institutional Practice. *Harvard Educational Review,* 56(2), 105-122.

Hollway, W., Henriques,]., Venn, C., & Walkerdine, V. (1984). *Gender difference and the production of subjectivity.* Methuen.

Hook, D. (2007). Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis. In *Foucault, psychology and the analytics of power* (pp. 100-137). Palgrave Macmillan.

Lips, H. M. (1991). *Women Men and Power.* Mayfield Pub Co.

Lister, R. (2007). Το φύλο και η ανάλυση της κοινωνικής πολιτικής. In Ο. Στασινοπούλου (Ed.) *Κοινωνική πολιτική μία άλλη προσέγγιση* (pp. 44-60). Gutenberg.

Lothian, A. (2013). *Foucault on Biopower.* Indiana University.

Mcwhorter, L. (2004). Sex, Race, and Biopower: A Foucauldian Genealogy. *Hypatia: Journal of Feminist Philosophy,* 19(3), 38–62.

Noah, Y. (2008). Experience of sexual harassment at work by female employees in a Nigerian work environment. *International NGO Journal,* 3(7), 122-127.

O'Hare, E. A., & O'Donohue, W. (1998). Sexual harassment: Identifying risk factors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior,* 27(6), 561–580.

Pantazis, B.A. (2015). *Antiracist Education.* Association of Greek Academic Libraries (in Greek).

Pina, A., Gannon, T., & Saunders, B. (2009). An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: Perpetrator, theory, and treatment issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 14, 126-138.

Ravenhill, J. P., & de Visser, R. O. (2017). There are too many gay categories now: Discursive constructions of gay masculinity. *Psychology of men and masculinity,* 18(4), 321-330.

Ridge, D., Plummer, D., & Peasley, D. (2006) Remaking the masculine self and coping in the liminal world of the gay "scene". Culture, Health & Sexuality: An International Journal for Research, *Intervention and Care*, 8(6), 501-514.

Stein, A., & Plummer, K. (1994). 'I can't even think straight': 'Queer' theory and the missing sexual revolution in sociology. *Sociological theory,* 12(2), 178-187.

Stokely, C, & Hamilton, C.V. (1967). *Black power: The politics of liberation in America.* Random House.

Tangri, S.S., Burt, M.R., & Johnson, L.B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory modes. *Journal of Social Issues,* 38(4), 33-54.

Twemlow, S. W. (1999). A Psychoanalytic Dialectical Model for Sexual and Other Forms of Workplace Harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies,* 1(3), 249-270.

Twigg, J. (2004). The body, gender, and age: Feminist insights in social gerontology. *Journal of Aging Studies,* 18(1), 59-73.

Van Dijk (1989). Structures of discourse and structures of power. *Annals of the International Association,* Communication Yearbook 12, 18-59.

Vaux, A. & Hobfoll, S. E. (1993). Social support: Social resources and social context. In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), *Handbook of stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects* (pp. 685–705). Free Press.

Ward, T., Hudson, S. M., & Keenan, T. (1998). A Self-Regulation Model of the sexual offence process. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of research and treatment,* 10, 141-157.

Willig, C. (2013). Foucauldian discourse analysis. *Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology* (pp. 129-142). McGraw Hill Education.

Willness, C.R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology,* 60(1), 127-162.

Biographical Notes

Aggeliki Kiriazopoulou is a social worker at the Chronic Care Foundation (NGO), graduate in So-cial Work at University of West Attica and currently a postgraduate student in Counseling at Na-tional and Kapodistrian University of Athens majoring in social work.

Kimon Athanasiadis is a social worker, graduate in Social Work at University of West Attica and currently a postgraduate student at the Department of Medical School at National and Kapodis-trian University of Athens.

Triantafyllia Iliopoulou is an accredited lecturer of the Department of Psychology at Derby Uni-versity at Mediterranean College and a tactical member of the Hellenic Society of Daseinsanaly-sis. She has worked as an associate Lecturer at University of West Attica and at National and Kapodis-trian University of Athens. Her research interests are on criminality, psychotherapy and counselling. Contact: felinahliop@googlemail.com