

Sexual harassment in the university:  
A study of faculty women at Iowa State University

by

Loraine M. Reesor

A Thesis Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department: Professional Studies in Education

Major: Education (Higher Education)

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa  
1987

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Statement of Purpose	4
Research Questions	5
Statement of Assumptions	6
Statement of the Hypotheses	6
Variables	7
Limitations of the Study	7
Operational Definitions	8
Organization of the Remainder of the Study	10
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Introduction	11
Previous Research Designs	12
Legal Responsibility	14
Importance of Establishing a Policy	15
The Issue of Power	16
Barriers to Reporting	17
Impact and Costs	18
Summary	19

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	21
Survey Procedures	21
Subjects	27
Data Analysis	33
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS	34
Introduction	34
Research Questions	34
Frequency of less severe behaviors	34
Initiators of less severe behaviors	35
Detrimental effect of less severe behaviors	36
Frequency of more severe behaviors	38
Characteristics and positions of initiators	39
Detrimental effect of more severe behaviors	41
Reporting of harassment	43
Satisfaction level of ISU services used by victims	43
Actions taken by victims	47
Reasons for not taking action	47
Hypotheses	47
Hypothesis 1	47
Hypothesis 2	51
Summary of Responses to Comments Sections	53
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS	55
Summary of the Study	55
Discussion of the Results	57
Frequency of behaviors	57
Detrimental effect of harassment	58
Issue of power	59
Actions taken	59
Discrimination	61

Conclusions	61
Recommendations for Future Research	63
REFERENCES	65
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	68
APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER	69
APPENDIX B: SURVEY	71
APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP NOTICE	78
APPENDIX D: SURVEY BY ADAMS, KOTTKE, & PADGITT (1983)	80
APPENDIX E: ISU'S SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY	86

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1. Description of population	29
Table 2. Return by college	30
Table 3. Return by faculty rank	31
Table 4. Characteristics of respondents	32
Table 5. Frequency of less severe behaviors	35
Table 6. Initiators of less severe behaviors	36
Table 7. Detrimental effect of less severe behaviors	37
Table 8. Summary of comments to open-ended question	38
Table 9. Frequency of more severe behaviors	39
Table 10. Characteristics of initiators of more severe behaviors	40
Table 11. Positions of initiators of more severe behaviors	41
Table 12. Detrimental effect of more severe behaviors	42
Table 13. Summary of comments to open-ended question	43
Table 14. To whom the victims talked to about the harassment	44
Table 15. Satisfaction with ISU services	46
Table 16. Actions taken by victims	48
Table 17. Reasons why victims did not take any action	49
Table 18. Summary of comments	54

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

According to a recent study, women comprise half of all students in higher education in the United States (Scully, 1986). Significant progress has been made in the number of women in nontraditional areas such as architecture, business, and law, although there is still a large difference between women and men enrolled in other fields such as the sciences and engineering.

Little progress, however, has been made in the ratio of faculty women to men. While the proportion of faculty women has increased, women are still concentrated in a small number of fields such as nursing and home economics. In addition, they are in the lower ranks, paid less, and less likely to be tenured. Women are still underrepresented in high-level administrative positions especially at public, co-educational institutions (Etaugh, 1984).

Social norms designate administrative positions in higher education as male (Lafontaine & McKenzie, 1985). When a female occupies an administrative post, she is seen as a woman first and then as an administrator. Women are still viewed and exist as "outsiders" in the life of academe (Lafontaine & McKenzie, 1985).

While some advancement has taken place, equality between women and men in educational settings has yet to be achieved. Social norms and barriers still exist that prevent this equality from occurring. One such barrier is sexual harassment.

In 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission incorporated case law into a set of guidelines which defined sexual harassment, identified criteria for considering it discrimination, and discussed employer's responsibilities. Federal courts have ruled sexual harassment as illegal sex discrimination and employers are liable under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Sexual harassment is also recognized as a violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments Act.

In June 1986, the United States Supreme Court made a landmark decision in the case of Meritor Savings Bank, FSB v. Vinson recognizing that an offensive sexual environment can constitute sexual harassment under Title VII. Although the court did not explicitly determine employer's liability in such cases, it alerted them that employers may be strictly liable for the sexual harassment inflicted by supervisors. Colleges and universities are recommended to design procedures which encourage their employees and students to report complaints in order to protect people from sexual harassment and limit the institution's liability should it occur (Cole, 1986).

The literature includes studies conducted to determine the occurrence of sexual harassment in a particular environment (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Metha & Nigg, 1983). These studies concluded that sexual harassment does occur on campuses with a pattern of 20-30 percent of women students reporting harassment by male faculty members (Dziech & Weiner, 1984). No information was found that studied faculty women exclusively. If faculty members were studied, they were included in a sample of all female employees and/or with students.

Some authors had respondents identify what they considered to be sexual harassment (Adams, Kottke, Padgitt, 1983; Wilson & Kraus, 1983) and their attitudes toward and acceptance of these behaviors (Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982). Schneider (1982) examined whether a woman's sexual identity (heterosexual or lesbian) affected her experiences and interpretations of interactions at work. Also, authors examined whether individuals reported the incidences and the effect they had on the individual.

Conflicting views exist on the issue of power in sexual harassment. Some authors (Blanshan, 1983; Greenlaw & Kohl, 1981) feel harassment is more likely to occur when a supervisor has organizational power over an employee. Thus, due to the increase of women in supervisory roles, harassment of men by women is predicted to increase. Others, especially feminist theorists, feel the issue of power is related to the gender differences and attitudes that exist within the organization itself and society as a whole (Hoffman, 1986; Benson & Thomson, 1982).

Due to the recent Supreme Court ruling in 1986, colleges and universities are beginning to examine their policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment. This study was undertaken to examine the issue of sexual harassment of faculty women at Iowa State University. The purpose is to provide educators with a methodology to examine the sexual harassment of faculty women at their own college or university. The study may also provide ISU administrators some direction when they examine their policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment. Lastly, this research may educate more women and men about sexual harassment in order to prevent any individual from experiencing it.



### Statement of the Problem

Information on sexual harassment has been provided through research conducted by businesses, government agencies, colleges, and universities. Much of this research looked at the occurrences of harassment among employees or students and their perceptions of sexual harassment.

At Iowa State University, a university committee studied the issue of sexual harassment among undergraduate, graduate, male, and female students (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983). As a result of this study, recommendations to strengthen the sexual harassment policy were made to the university administration. In 1983, ISU adopted its current policy statement, prohibiting sexual harassment of employees or students. (See Appendix E.) No follow-up study has been done to see if the policy change has had any impact.

In addition, no other groups have been studied at ISU to determine the problem among its employees. Informal complaints of harassment demonstrate that the problem still exists. In order to eliminate this problem, a clear understanding of its actual occurrence and effect on the victim should be reached.

### Statement of Purpose

The purposes of this study are:

1. to determine the perceived incidence rates of the various behaviors of sexual harassment of ISU faculty women.
2. to determine the perceived personal characteristics of the harasser and the victim.

3. to determine what action(s) the victims took and the level of satisfaction if any on-campus services were used.
4. to determine the victim's reasons for not reporting the incidences of sexual harassment.
5. to determine the detrimental effect, if any, the occurrence of sexual harassment had on the victim's career and well-being.

#### Research Questions

1. How often have the eight behaviors of sexual harassment occurred to women faculty members during the last three years at ISU or since joining the ISU faculty, whichever is shorter?
2. What are the common characteristics of the harassers?
  - a. Sex
  - b. Age
  - c. Marital Status
  - d. Position at ISU
3. What is the relationship between the harassers and the victims?
4. Who did the victims talk to about the incidences that occurred?
5. If the victims used any services on the ISU campus, what were their satisfaction levels with these services?
6. What formal and/or informal actions did the victims take?
7. If the victims did not take any action(s), what were their reasons?
8. What effect(s) did the occurrence of sexual harassment have on the personal and professional life of the faculty member?

9. What are the common characteristics of the respondents?
  - a. Faculty Rank
  - b. Primary College
  - c. Percentage of male faculty in department
  - d. Age Group
  - e. Marital Status
  - f. Years at ISU

#### Statement of Assumptions

This study assumes the following:

1. The respondents will answer the questions honestly and to the best of their ability.
2. The people who respond are similar to those who chose not to respond.
3. The eight categories of sexual harassment behavior are clear and understood by the respondent.

#### Statement of the Hypotheses

1. Sexual harassment will occur more frequently when:
  - a. the harasser is male than when the harasser is female;
  - b. the harasser is older than the victim than when the harasser is the same age or younger than the victim;
  - c. the harasser is in a higher position than the victim than when the harasser is in the same or lower position than the victim.

2. As the incidences of behavior of sexual harassment, according to the definitions used in this study, get more severe,
  - a. the actions taken by the victim decrease;
  - b. the number of persons reporting the behavior decreases;
  - c. the perceived degree of detrimental effect increases.

### Variables

#### Dependent variables:

1. frequency of sexual harassment
2. a. actions taken by the victim
  - b. frequency of sexual harassment behaviors
  - c. degree of detrimental effect

#### Independent variables:

1. a. sex of harasser
  - b. age of harasser
  - c. position of harasser
2. severity of categories of sexual harassment

### Limitations of the Study

1. All the respondents will be female faculty members who voluntarily participated.
2. The study will be limited to individuals living in the United States.

3. The study will be limited to Iowa State University, which is a major research institution of 26,000 students, located in the mid-west, and specializes in science and technology.

### Operational Definitions

Various definitions exist for the term sexual harassment. Broadly defined, "sexual harassment consists of unwelcome sexual conduct that interferes with a worker's employment or student's education" (Chamallas, 1985, p. 1). It includes sexual behaviors that are usually repeated, unwelcomed, and/or unwanted. The behaviors may be accompanied by a threat or punishment if the person refuses to comply (Brandenburg, 1982).

Many colleges and universities adapted the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) guidelines to their educational settings (Crocker, 1983). According to EEOC, sexual harassment is defined as "unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature" (EEOC, 1980, p. 74677).

In most cases, sexual harassment is viewed as a variety of behaviors that fall along a continuum. The value of using a continuum is it presents a broad spectrum of actions that require individuals to be accountable. In addition, it makes individuals aware that they do not have to tolerate a variety of experiences. It also "officially acknowledges the fact that abuses ranging from verbal comments to rape can occur and have a damaging impact" (Crocker, 1983, p. 699).

Sources basically agree as to what behaviors may constitute sexual harassment (Biles, 1981; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Maihoff & Forrest, 1983;

Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983). The various behaviors include: sexist comments; sexual remarks, jokes, questions, or teasing; pinching, touching, or fondling; uninvited pressure for dates or sexual favors; propositions of sex in exchange for a grade or recommendation; and actual or attempted rape or assault. At times these behaviors were clumped into groups and categorized as less severe, severe, and most severe (Biles, 1981). The problem with these categories is they tend to diminish the importance of some of the less severe behaviors, which may influence the reactions to their occurrences.

For the purpose of this study, eight categories of behavior have been identified which may constitute sexual harassment. These behaviors and definitions were adapted from previous surveys, especially the one done by Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983). (See Appendix D.) The eight behaviors are as follows:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Examples</u>
sexist comments	comments or jokes that are stereotypical or derogatory to members of one sex
sexual comments	<u>unwanted</u> jokes, questions, teasing, or remarks that are sexual in nature; inquiries of sexual behaviors or values
undue attention	sexually suggestive looks or gestures; leaning over; leering at one's body; cornering
invitations	unwanted, repeated pressure for personal dates; pressure for personal (non-professional) letters or phone calls

physical advances	kissing, hugging, pinching, fondling, patting, grabbing
sexual propositions	clear invitations for sexual encounter but involving no threats or promises
sexual bribery	explicit sexual propositions which include or strongly imply job-related rewards or punishments
sexual assault	actual or attempted rape

### Organization of the Remainder of the Study

Chapter II discusses the review of the literature. It includes some of the major studies conducted on sexual harassment as well as the laws related to sexual harassment. In addition, it discusses policy procedures, the power issue, and reasons that prevent victims from reporting incidences of harassment. Finally, it discusses the costs and impact of sexual harassment on the victim and employer of the victim and harasser.

The methods and procedures for the study are discussed in Chapter III. It includes a description of the procedures, the subjects, and the data analysis.

Chapter IV discusses the results of the data analysis.

Chapter V is comprised of a summary of the study. Conclusions from the results are included. In addition, recommendations for future research are presented.

## CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

### Introduction

The literature search for this study included books, journals, and ERIC documents. The findings revealed materials available on the subject of sexual harassment are limited. The previous studies included either business, government, or higher education individuals as their subjects. The research that involved persons from higher education institutions primarily consisted of students or a sample of all the different female populations on the campus. This study was concerned with faculty women but no studies were found that specifically dealt with this subject group.

Federal and state courts have determined that sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination and is illegal under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It is important to review the laws relating to harassment. In addition, as a form of discrimination, the occurrence of harassment may have serious implications on the victim as well as the organization that employs the victim and/or harasser.

This chapter will summarize the major findings of previous research studies related to the focus of this study. It will discuss the laws and policies relating to sexual harassment. In addition, the reasons women do not report the occurrence of harassment and the effect the occurrences have on the victim and employer will be included.



### Previous Research Designs

In 1979, the University of California-Berkeley conducted a survey of undergraduate women. The purpose was to estimate the frequency of harassment on campus, to determine how serious the problem would be if a woman was harassed, and to see if they knew of any women who had experienced harassment at the institution. Twenty percent of the students in this study experienced unwanted touches, propositions, or sexual remarks from professors (Benson & Thomson, 1982).

A study was also done at Arizona State University in 1980 (Dziech & Weiner, 1984). The objectives were to determine women's perceptions, experiences, and knowledge about resources at the university. A sample of women students, staff employees, and faculty were questioned. The results were that approximately 13 percent of the students, 11 percent of the staff, and 14 percent of the faculty said they had been harassed. Two faculty women reported being assaulted by undergraduate male students (Metha & Nigg, 1983).

In 1980, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asked the Merit Systems Protection Board to study the issue of sexual harassment in the Federal workplace. They examined a variety of issues relating to the topic. They included: the types of behaviors that constitute sexual harassment and their frequency of occurrence, characteristics of the victims or perpetrators, the impact of harassment on its victims and morale or productivity of the work environment, and the awareness of remedies available to victims (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

Over 20,000 male and female Federal employees completed the questionnaire, which resulted in an 85 percent response rate. Three major

categories of harassment were used. The first category included the less severe behaviors such as sexual remarks, suggestive looks, and deliberate touching. Twelve percent of the women experienced this type of harassment within the last two years of their employment. The second category included pressure for dates, pressure for sexual favors, and letters and calls, which 29 percent experienced. The last category, most severe, was defined as actual or attempted rape or assault, and 1 percent of the victims had experienced this (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

Iowa State University surveyed a sample of undergraduate and graduate students, both men and women, in 1981. Eight behaviors were listed which may constitute sexual harassment from a faculty member. Of the women students who responded, 7 percent experienced physical advances; 14 percent had been invited for a date; 17 percent received verbal sexual advances; 34 percent experienced sexual body language or leering; 43 percent received undue attention or flirting; and 65 percent experienced sexist comments (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983).

According to one source, the pattern shows that 20-30 percent of women students report being sexually harassed by male faculty members (Dziech & Weiner, 1984). In 1982, the National Center for Educational Statistics reported 6,374,005 women enrolled in colleges and universities in the United States. If the average 20 percent of women students are victims of harassment, then 1,274,300 women experienced some degree of sexual harassment in 1982 (Dziech & Weiner, 1984).

### Legal Responsibility

In 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission incorporated case law into a set of guidelines that discuss sexual harassment. The guidelines define sexual harassment, identify criteria for considering it as discrimination, and discuss the responsibilities of the employers in dealing with such cases. These guidelines do not constitute law but are often referred to by judges handling sexual harassment cases (Livingston, 1982).

Federal courts have determined that sexual harassment is illegal sex discrimination and employers are liable under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin (Schupp, Windham, & Draughn, 1981). In addition, sexual harassment is also recognized as a violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments Act, which prohibits sex discrimination in federally assisted programs (Benson & Thomson, 1982). Most states have followed the direction of the federal courts in defining sexual harassment as discrimination and have determined that employers are responsible (Livingston, 1982). The Iowa Civil Rights Act of 1965 has been interpreted to prohibit sexual harassment in the state of Iowa.

Until recently, the courts determined sexual harassment to be illegal discrimination if the victim has suffered either economic or psychological damage as a result of that behavior (Livingston, 1982). In June 1986, the United States Supreme Court made a landmark decision in the case of Meritor Savings Bank, FSB v. Vinson that altered the previous statement. The Court determined that sexual harassment is illegal even if the victim does not receive

a loss in pay or job (Mauro, 1986). The Court also recognized that an offensive sexual environment can constitute sexual harassment, and employers may be strictly liable for the sexual harassment inflicted by supervisors (Cole, 1986).

### Importance of Establishing a Policy

Some authors emphasize the importance for colleges and universities to establish a formal policy on sexual harassment in order to protect themselves from litigation as well as strive for a harassment-free environment (Academe, 1983; Livingston, 1982; Brandenburg, 1982). The policy should include definitions of the term sexual harassment, as well as descriptions of grievance procedures and support systems for the victim.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) states that sexual harassment is unprofessional conduct and threatens the academic freedom of others. In its recommendation of a policy, AAUP states that such conduct is abusive of others, creates a hostile environment, and should not occur between members of the academic community. Universities have an ethical responsibility to eliminate sexual harassment behaviors on their campuses (Academe, 1983).

A strong policy against sexual harassment helps create an environment that supports the success of women. It is critical to the success of women that they receive recognition and promotion on the basis of the quality of their work and that they receive the same support and guidance as their male co-workers (Rowe, 1981).

"Harassment goes beyond the obvious -- the violation of the integrity and dignity of a human being -- to the betrayal of the basic assumptions of mutual

trust and respect on which the entire enterprise of education must be based" (Maihoff & Forrest, 1983, p. 3). It is the responsibility of the university to educate itself concerning the issue of sexual harassment and develop policies and programs to cope with it effectively.

### The Issue of Power

As alluded to in earlier sections, sexual harassment is often an issue of power. The typical scenario is the supervisor harassing the employee or the professor harassing the student. Some research shows, however, that the harassers are often not supervisors. This suggests that other mechanisms beside organizational power may contribute to sexual harassment (Gutek & Morasch, 1982).

Sexual harassment is an expression of dominance that stems from the patriarchal system. The ideal of male dominance and female subservience is deep-rooted in American society as well as in the workplace. Changes need to occur in general sex-role beliefs and attitudes if any progress is to be made in eliminating harassment (Miller & Miller, 1982).

Along with changes in attitude toward women, structural changes need to occur. In order to deal effectively with sexual harassment, it must be considered within a larger framework of inequitable power among women and men (Livingston, 1982). Rather than reacting to a problem within the structure that created it, structural changes are vital. In other words, instead of trying to remedy individual problems, changes need to occur in the inequitable distribution of power that encourages harassment (Livingston, 1982).

Research related to violence against women has been applied to sexual harassment (Gutek & Morasch, 1982; Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Schneider, 1982). Gutek and Morasch (1982) show the similarities between rape and sexual harassment. Rape is unwanted intercourse whereas sexual harassment is unwanted sexual attention. In rape, men's greater physical strength is used to impose sexual activity with women. In sexual harassment, men use their superior organizational power to obtain sexual favors from women. Both are a form of violence against women using different strategies to obtain the goal of oppression.

#### Barriers to Reporting

As mentioned previously, it is important to establish formal grievance procedures for when sexual harassment occurs. However, studies indicate that victims are hesitant to make formal reports when they are harassed (Meek & Lynch, 1983; Simon & Forrest, 1983; Miller & Miller, 1982). Numerous reasons were cited.

As in cases of rape and battery, women are hesitant to report the incidence of sexual harassment due to fear of retaliation, embarrassment or resignation (Miller & Miller, 1982). Victims are concerned about not being believed. They also question their own behavior. They begin to examine their style of dress and behavior around others, becoming self-conscious of their actions in order to prevent the harassment from occurring again. Often times they blame themselves rather than the harasser (Jensen & Gutek, 1982) which may result in a sense of powerlessness.

Victims often assume the institution lacks support and sensitivity to such a traumatic experience. They may be unaware of the laws that protect them, the responsibility of the university, and services available to meet their needs (Simon & Forrest, 1983). This lack of information emphasizes the importance for the university to educate people about sexual harassment so victims can receive the support they need.

### Impact and Costs

If sexual harassment occurs, it can be costly to the institution or company. Over a two-year period, the federal government estimated a loss of \$189 million due to job turnover, medical insurance claims, absenteeism, and reduced productivity resulting from sexual harassment of its employees (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). It is important that officials are aware of these costs as another incentive to eliminate harassment from the work setting.

Organizational and personal costs can incur from turnover, absenteeism, litigation, loss of federal contracts, and a non-productive work atmosphere (Thurston, 1980). When harassment does occur, it often creates a higher level of stress and anxiety for both the victim and the harasser. A continuous stressful environment can reduce productivity and result in psychological care, medical treatment, and sick leave.

Employee turnover is often a result of sexual harassment. One management consultant believes that more women are refused employment, fired, or forced to quit their jobs as a result of sexual demands than any other single cause (Thurston, 1980). In addition, women often have the view that sexual harassment cannot be changed. If harassment does occur, rather than

challenge the issue, they quit their jobs in hope that the same thing will not happen at their next job.

It is apparent that sexual harassment can be a major expense, especially in litigation costs or loss of federal contracts. The other impact of harassment is on the victim. The issue of how the occurrence of sexual harassment affects the victim's self-esteem and career also needs to be examined.

For an employee, various consequences may occur. Often, a victim may lose her job or choose to leave. If she does stay, she may have a lower concentration span, diminished ambitions, or social isolation from peers (Blanshan, 1983). In addition, her personal well-being may be affected by lower self-esteem; depression; disillusionment with men; and physical symptoms such as insomnia, stomach, neck, and backaches (Miller & Miller, 1982). All of these effects will have an impact on her job productivity and self-worth as a human being.

Some course of action should be taken to alleviate some of the organizational and personal costs of sexual harassment. One possible solution is to form women's networks or support groups within the organization. Another idea is to publicize literature so all employees are aware of what sexual harassment is, its impact and costs to the individual and institution, and what support systems are available.

#### Summary

The literature demonstrates that sexual harassment still exists even though courts have determined it is a form of sex discrimination and illegal. Studies also show that if harassment does occur, the victims often fail to report it due



to fear of losing their job, being blamed or embarrassed. Because harassment exists yet often goes unreported, some authors stressed the need for universities to establish formal policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment.

Conflicting views on the power issue of sexual harassment were found. Some authors (Greenlaw & Kohl, 1981) feel harassment is most likely to occur when a supervisor has organizational power over an employee. Others (Livingston, 1982; Gutek & Morasch, 1982) feel the issue of power is related to the gender differences and attitudes that exist within the organization itself and society as a whole. In order to eliminate the occurrence of sexual harassment, these authors feel stereotypical attitudes toward women must cease and equality between the sexes must be achieved.

### CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

The purposes of this study were to determine the incidence rates of sexual harassment, the action(s) the victims took, and the detrimental effects incurred by the victims if any. This chapter describes the survey procedures, the subjects, and the data analysis used.

#### Survey Procedures

The original intent of this study was to survey a sample of the women employees on the Iowa State campus, including the groups of faculty, professional and scientific (P & S), and merit. Because of the diversity of these categories and the large numbers involved, it was decided to select just one group. Due to the number of faculty women employed at the university, it was feasible to do the entire population of this group as opposed to samples of the others.

A mail survey was selected as the most appropriate method for gathering information from the large number of faculty women. Appendix A contains a copy of the cover letter, Appendix B a copy of the survey instrument, and Appendix C a copy of the follow-up reminder printed in University News.

The introduction to the survey quoted ISU's policy on sexual harassment as stated in the 1984 ISU Faculty Handbook. (See Appendix E.) It also listed the eight categories of behavior which may constitute sexual harassment. Examples or definitions were also provided for each category. These behaviors and definitions were adapted from previous surveys, especially the one done by

Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983). (See Appendix D.) The respondents were instructed to refer to these categories when completing the questionnaire.

The survey instrument may be divided into four main sections. The first section's items were based on questions about the less severe behaviors of sexual harassment (sexist comments, sexual comments, undue attention, and invitations). The second section had questions about the more severe behaviors (physical advances, sexual propositions, sexual bribery, and sexual assault). The third section combined all eight behaviors and had questions about the actions the victims took, and the last section asked demographic questions about the respondents.

The first question in section one (#1) asked the respondents if any of the following behaviors had been directed toward them during the last three years at ISU or since they joined the ISU faculty, whichever is shorter. The four behaviors were sexist comments, sexual comments, undue attention, and invitations. They were asked to circle the number that corresponded with the frequency for each behavior. The choices of frequency were: never; once; once a month or less; two to four times a month; and once a week or more. If the respondent checked "never" to all four categories, they were asked to skip the next two questions.

The second question (#2) asked who typically initiated the behaviors they said occurred in the first question. A list of choices was provided and they were to circle "yes" or "no" for each one. They were to indicate all that applied. The list ranged from immediate administrator to faculty members of various ranks to an ISU student. An "other" category was provided to allow the respondents to write an answer not provided.

The third question (#3) asked the respondents to indicate the detrimental effect the behaviors they said occurred may have had on their career, emotional or physical well-being, or quality of work. They were to circle a response for each and the choices were none, minimal, some, and major. Space for additional comments was also provided to allow the respondents to further describe the effects of the incidences.

Section two's first question (#4) asked the respondents if any of the following behaviors had been directed toward them during the last three years at ISU or since they joined the faculty, whichever is shorter. The four behaviors were: physical advances, sexual propositions, sexual bribery, and sexual assault. They were asked to circle the number that corresponded with the frequency for each behavior. The choices of frequency were: never; only once; once a year; two to five times a year; six or more times a year. If the respondents checked "never" to all four categories, they were to skip the next five questions.

For the next four questions, a chart was provided to allow the respondent to answer each question for each behavior (physical advances, sexual propositions, sexual bribery, and sexual assault), describing the typical initiator of those behaviors. The first question (#5) asked the sex of the initiator. The choices were male, female, or some male and some female. The next question (#6) asked the age of the initiator. The choices were older, same age, younger, or a variety of ages. The next question (#7) asked the marital status of the initiator. The choices were: single (never married); married; separated, divorced, or widowed; or some married and some not married. The last question

(#8) asked the position of the initiator. The eight choices ranged from ISU administrators to ISU faculty members to ISU students. An "other" category was provided to allow the respondent to write an answer not provided.

The last question (#9) for this section asked the respondents to indicate the detrimental effect the behaviors they said occurred may have had on their career, emotional or physical well-being, or quality of work. They were to circle a response for each and the choices were none, minimal, some, and major. Space for additional comments was also provided to allow the respondent to further describe the effects of the incidences.

The third section of the survey combined the eight behaviors according to the level of severity. A chart was again provided so that the respondents could respond to each question for each group of categories. The behaviors were put in the following groups: (a) sexist comments, sexual comments; (b) undue attention, invitations, physical advances; (c) sexual propositions; (d) sexual bribery, sexual assault. The respondents were only to fill out this section if they answered positively to receiving any of the behaviors in question #1 and #4. The respondents were instructed that if the behaviors occurred more than once, their answers should reflect how they typically responded.

The first question in this section (#10) inquired to whom the respondents talked to about the incidences. They were to choose all the responses that applied. The fifteen choices included no one, various university officials, various ISU services, outside contacts, or friends and relatives. An "other" category was provided for the respondent to write an answer not given in the list.

If the respondents used any of the sources available at ISU to report incidences of harassment, they were asked to express their satisfaction level

with the service in the next question (#11). The services listed were department, college, or university administrator; Affirmative Action Office; Personnel Office; Employee Assistance program; and Women's Center. An "other" category was provided to write a service that was not listed. The respondents were to evaluate the services with the following answers: strongly satisfied; satisfied; neutral; dissatisfied; strongly dissatisfied; and not used.

The next question (#12) asked if the respondents took any of the following specific actions. They were to indicate all that applied. The eight choices ranged from confronting the harasser to requesting an investigation to filing a grievance report to did not take any action. An "other" category was provided to write an action not listed.

The last question of this section (#13) asked if they said they did not take any action in the previous question (#12) to state their reasons. They were asked to indicate all that apply. Ten choices were given that included: I did not know what actions to take; I saw no need to report it; or I did not think anything would be done. An "other" category was provided to write a reason not listed.

The last section of the survey asked the respondents to answer closed form, multiple-choice questions on characteristics about themselves. The first one (#14) asked for their faculty rank. The choices were: temporary faculty; adjunct faculty; nontenured tenured-track faculty; tenured faculty. The second question (#15) inquired about their primary college. The choices were: Agriculture, Business, Design, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, Sciences & Humanities, and Veterinary Medicine.

The third question (#16) asked for the percentage of males among the faculty in their department. They could choose from: 90 percent or more; 50-89 percent; less than 50 percent. The fourth question (#17) inquired about their age group. The choices were: 30 or below; 31-40; 41-50; 51-60; 61 and above. The next question (#18) asked them to state their marital status as single (never married); married; or divorced, separated, or widowed. The final question (#19) asked how many years they have been at ISU. The choices were: less than one; 1-5; 6-10; 11-20; and more than 20.

At the end of the survey, a statement was included that encouraged the respondents to write any additional comments in the space below. They were then asked to return the completed questionnaire through campus mail to the name and address provided.

The first version of the survey was evaluated by approximately ten women and men employed by the university. These individuals were chosen for their interest in the subject and/or their research skills. Special effort was made to avoid contact with faculty women to prevent biases. Adjustments were made to the survey. A female graduate student and female P & S employee were asked to pilot test the instrument. The participants in the pilot testing completed the survey in approximately ten minutes. Upon their ease of completion without any problems, the survey was finalized. The questionnaire, as well as the study itself, was approved by the ISU Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research.

The mailing took place on February 13, 1987. The completed surveys were asked to be returned through campus mail by February 25, 1987. On February

27, 1987 a notice was printed in University News, a newsletter distributed to ISU employees. The notice stated: "The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs encourages women faculty to return the questionnaire on sexual harassment" (University News, 1987, February 27). (See Appendix C.) By March 5, 1987, 248 surveys (50.3 percent) had been returned.

Follow-up letters were not sent to individuals who did not return their questionnaires. In order to assure confidentiality because of the sensitivity of the subject, the surveys were not coded. Thus, there was no way to determine who specifically did not return her survey. The possibility of sending a follow-up letter to the whole population, thanking those who completed the survey and requesting others to return it, was contemplated. However, potential problems arose if people lost their survey and needed another one. It would be difficult to prevent duplication from occurring. Since the committee was satisfied with a 50.3 percent return rate, no additional follow-up was conducted.

### Subjects

The subjects chosen for this study were faculty women at Iowa State University. It was decided to study the population as opposed to a sample. The Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs provided a computer listing of the names and campus addresses of all the faculty women, a total of 503. Nine persons on the list either were on leave of absence or had no addresses. For those on leave, the appropriate departments were contacted to see if the individual was in the area. Of the six on leave, only one was picking up her mail at ISU. Since the others were out of state, their names were dropped



from the population for purpose of the study. In addition, four names had no accompanying addresses. After trying to locate these addresses without success, the four persons were dropped from the population also. Thus, 494 faculty women comprised the population for this study.

The faculty women were divided into four categories according to their rank: temporary, adjunct, nontenured tenured-track, and tenured. In addition, they were categorized by the Colleges of Agriculture, Business, Design, Education, Engineering, Home Economics, Sciences and Humanities, and Veterinary Medicine. Tables describing the population according to college and faculty rank, a comparison of the number of subjects and return rate, and characteristics of the respondents follow.

Table 1 describes the population according to college and faculty rank. The colleges of Home Economics and Sciences and Humanities employ the most faculty women. The College of Home Economics has the most tenured women faculty and the College of Sciences and Humanities has the most temporary faculty women. The remaining five colleges are fairly similar in number with the College of Engineering employing the fewest women.

Table 1. Description of population according to college and faculty rank

---

<u>College</u>	<u>Temporary</u>	<u>Adjunct</u>	<u>Nontenured</u>	<u>Tenured</u>
Agriculture	7	2	6	7
Business	8	2	2	1
Design	9	4	6	14
Education	15	10	10	14
Engineering	4	2	4	4
Home Economics	8	11	20	75
Sciences & Humanities	75	26	25	56
Veterinary Medicine	0	12	4	9

---

Table 2 describes the return of surveys according to the woman's college. The College of Agriculture had the highest rate of return and the College of Design had the lowest. No pattern seemed to exist with the College and return rate. One might think the return rate would be influenced if the College was traditional or non-traditional for women but this didn't seem to be the case here.

Table 2. Return by college

---

	<u># in pop.</u>	<u># of returns</u>	<u>%</u>
Agriculture	22	20	90.9
Business	13	5	38.5
Design	33	11	33.3
Education	49	31	63.3
Engineering	14	8	57.1
Home Economics	114	62	54.4
Sciences & Humanities	182	98	54.4
Veterinary Medicine	25	11	44.0

---

The return rate according to the woman's rank were similar as shown in Table 3. The percentage was highest for tenured women and lowest for temporary although the difference was relatively little.

Table 3. Return by faculty rank

---

	<u># in pop.</u>	<u># of returns</u>	<u>%</u>
Temporary	126	55	43.7
Adjunct	73	34	46.6
Nontenured tenured-track	90	41	45.6
Tenured	203	117	57.6

---

Table 4 describes some of the general characteristics of the respondents. Approximately 40 percent (105) of the women said they worked in departments in which 50-89 percent were male. Almost 41 percent (101) of the respondents were between 31-40 years of age. Most of the women were married (62.9 percent). Approximately 80 percent of the women have been employed at Iowa State University from 1-20 years, with the most respondents (30.6 percent) saying they have been employed from 1-5 years.

Table 4. Characteristics of respondents

Percentage of males in department:


---

	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
90% or more	46	18.5
50-89%	105	42.3
Less than 50%	92	37.1
No Response	5	2.0

Age Group:

30 or below	30	12.1
31-40	101	40.7
41-50	61	24.6
51-60	43	17.3
61 and above	10	4.0
No Response	3	1.2

Marital Status:

Single	58	23.4
Married	156	62.9
Divorced, separated, or widowed	30	12.1
No Response	4	1.6

---

Table 4. Continued

---

<u>Years at ISU:</u>		
Less than one	24	9.7
1-5	76	30.6
6-10	69	27.8
11-20	54	21.8
More than 20	22	8.9
No Response	3	1.2

---

### Data Analysis

The data collected were coded. The information was then key punched for statistical analysis. After the coding errors were corrected, the data were analyzed using SPSS-X procedures (SPSS, Inc., 1983). Frequencies procedures were used to address the research questions and hypotheses of this study.

## CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

### Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analysis of the data in order to examine the issue of sexual harassment of faculty women at Iowa State University. The results are organized according to the research questions and hypotheses presented earlier in this study.

### Research Questions

#### Frequency of less severe behaviors

The frequency of the eight behaviors of sexual harassment varied somewhat depending upon the behavior (Table 5). The less severe behaviors occurred more frequently than the more severe behaviors. More than half of the respondents said they received sexist comments once or more during their last three years at ISU, with 31.5 percent receiving sexist comments at least once a month or less. Of the women receiving sexual comments, 14.9 percent said they have received them once a month or less. Approximately 16 percent of the women experienced undue attention only once, or once a month or less. The highest frequency of invitations received was 2.0 percent of the women receiving invitations only once during the past three years.

As the severity of behavior increased, so did the percentage of women that said it had "never" occurred to them. The frequency of women that said they had never received sexist comments was lower than expected. Due to the

sexist attitudes and stereotypes that exist for women today, it is hard to believe that 45.6 percent, or 113 women, said they have never heard a sexist comment.

Table 5. Frequencies (and percentages) of less severe behaviors

---

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Once A Month or Less</u>	<u>2-4 Times A Month</u>	<u>Once A Week or More</u>
Sexist Comments	113 (45.6)	22 (8.9)	78 (31.5)	22 (8.9)	9 (3.6)
Sexual Comments	174 (70.2)	20 (8.1)	37 (14.9)	3 (1.2)	1 ( .4)
Undue Attention	192 (77.4)	21 (8.5)	18 (7.3)	1 ( .4)	1 ( .4)
Invitations	222 (89.5)	5 (2.0)	2 ( .8)	1 ( .4)	1 ( .4)

---

(Rows do not add up to 100% due to percentages of missing data.)

---

#### Initiators of less severe behaviors

If the respondents stated that they received any of the four less severe behaviors of sexual harassment (sexist comments, sexual comments, undue attention, or invitations), they were asked to state the typical initiator of the behavior(s) (Table 6). The most common initiator was another faculty member. Of those individuals that identified a faculty member, 28.6 percent said it was a person in their department of higher rank; 18.5 percent a person in their



department of the same or lower rank; and 24.6 percent a faculty member outside their department. Almost 16 percent of the respondents stated the initiator was a student.

Table 6. Frequencies (and percentages) of initiators of less severe behaviors

---

	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Immediate administrator	20	8.1
Other higher level administrator	29	11.7
ISU faculty member in department of higher rank	71	28.6
ISU faculty member in department of same or lower rank	46	18.5
Other ISU faculty member not in department	61	24.6
Non-faculty ISU employee	27	10.9
ISU student	39	15.7
Other	6	2.4

---

#### Detrimental effect of less severe behaviors

The majority of women felt the occurrence of the four less severe categories had no detrimental effect on their career or well-being (Table 7). Only 2.2 percent of the respondents said the harassment had a major

detrimental effect on their feelings about their career and emotional well-being. Almost 35 percent felt the harassment had a minimal detrimental effect on their emotional well-being and 15.1 percent felt it had some detrimental effect. When given the opportunity to elaborate on the effect the harassment had, some of the respondents wrote that they were angry, frustrated, and annoyed. A few women felt that they must work harder than men and that the occurrence of harassment affected their promotion and salary merit (Table 8).

Table 7. Frequencies (and percentages) of detrimental effect of less severe behaviors

	<u>None</u>	<u>Minimal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Major</u>
Feelings about Career	86 (61.9)	31 (22.3)	19 (13.7)	3 (2.2)
Emotional Well-Being	67 (48.2)	48 (34.5)	21 (15.1)	3 (2.2)
Physical Well-Being	116 (86.6)	15 (11.2)	2 ( 1.5)	1 ( .7)
Quality of Work	111 (80.4)	20 (14.5)	6 ( 4.3)	1 ( .7)

Table 8. Frequencies (and percentages) of summary of comments to open-ended question

<u>Comments</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Anger	7	2.8
Frustrated	5	2.0
Lose respect for harasser	3	1.2
Feel women must work harder	3	1.2
Affected promotion and salary merit	2	.8
Uncomfortable to talk to harasser	2	.8
Annoying	2	.8
Embarrassment	1	.4
Affected morale of unit	1	.4
Discouraged	1	.4
Used to comments	1	.4
Irritating	1	.4
Feel like don't belong	1	.4

Frequency of more severe behaviors

Twenty-two women experienced the more severe categories of harassment, which included physical advances, sexual propositions, sexual bribery, or sexual assault (Table 9). However, not one individual reported experiencing sexual assault although four people did not respond to the question. A total of 5.6

percent of the respondents received physical advances either only once or up to more than six times a year, 2.4 percent experienced sexual propositions, and .8 percent received sexual bribery.

Table 9. Frequencies (and percentages) of more severe behaviors

---

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Only Once</u>	<u>Once a Year</u>	<u>2-5 Times a Year</u>	<u>6 or more Times a Year</u>
Physical Advances	234 (94.4)	8 (3.2)	1 (.4)	4 (1.6)	1 (.4)
Sexual Propositions	240 (96.8)	3 (1.2)	0	3 (1.2)	0
Sexual Bribery	242 (97.6)	1 ( .4)	0	1 ( .4)	0
Sexual Assault	244 (98.4)	0	0	0	0

---

(Rows do not add up to 100% due to percentages of missing data.)

---

#### Characteristics and positions of initiators

The respondents were asked to identify characteristics about the typical person who initiated the four more severe behaviors of harassment (Table 10). The typical harasser was a married man who was older than the victim. However, three women said they were harassed by another woman. The position of the harasser was usually of higher rank than the victim. Of the victims receiving physical advances, 85.7 percent said the harasser was a supervisor, administrator, or faculty member of higher rank in their departments. Three

Table 10. Characteristics of initiators for more severe behaviors

	<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>			<u>Marital Status</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Older</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Younger</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Divorce, Separ., Widowed</u>	<u>Some Older, Some Younger</u>
Physical Advances	13 (86.7)	2 (13.3)	10 (71.4)	2 (14.3)	0 (0)	8 (57.1)	3 (21.4)	0 (0)
Sexual Propositions	5 (83.3)	1 (16.7)	3 (50.0)	2 (33.3)	0 (0)	2 (33.3)	1 (16.7)	1 (16.7)
Sexual Bribery	2 (100)	0	2 (100)	0	0	2 (100)	0	0
Sexual Assault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 11. Position of initiators for more severe behaviors

<u>Behavior</u>	<u>Position</u>						
	<u>Immed Admin</u>	<u>Other higher level Admin</u>	<u>ISU fac higher rank in dept</u>	<u>ISU fac same or lower rank in dept</u>	<u>Other ISU fac not in dept</u>	<u>Non-fac ISU Employee</u>	<u>Other ISU Student</u>
Physical Advances	3 (21.4)	2 (14.3)	7 (50.0)	0	0	0	2 (14.3)
							0
Sexual Propositions	3 (50.0)	0	1 (16.7)	1 (16.7)	0	0	1 (16.7)
							0
Sexual Bribery	1 (50.0)	0	1 (50.0)	0	0	0	0
Sexual Assault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

women reported receiving physical advances and sexual propositions from ISU students. (See Table 11.)

Detrimental effect of more severe behaviors

The victims were asked to determine the detrimental effect the harassment had on their career or well-being (Table 12). Most women felt that the harassment affected mostly their emotional and physical well-beings although 31.3 percent and 26.7 percent respectively felt the effect was minimal. Only 13.4 percent and 18.8 percent of the victims felt any detrimental effect to their feelings about their careers and quality of work respectively.

Table 12. Frequencies (and percentages) of detrimental effect of more severe behaviors

	<u>None</u>	<u>Minimal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Major</u>
Feelings about Career	13 (86.7)	0	1 ( 6.7)	1 ( 6.7)
Emotional Well-Being	5 (31.3)	5 (31.3)	3 (18.8)	3 (18.8)
Physical Well-Being	9 (60.0)	4 (26.7)	1 ( 6.7)	1 ( 6.7)
Quality of Work	13 (81.3)	0	0	3 (18.8)

(Rows do not add up to 100% due to percentages of missing data.)

Table 13. Frequencies (and percentages) of summary of comments to open-ended question

	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Questioned own behavior	1	33
Fear	2	67

#### Reporting of harassment

If the respondents said that they had received any type of harassment, they were asked if they had talked to anybody about it (Table 14). They were allowed to select more than one response if appropriate. Almost half of the victims of sexist comments, sexual comments, undue attention, invitations, physical advances, or sexual propositions said they talked to friends or relatives. The other more frequent answers included no one, other ISU faculty member, or other ISU employee. Very few (only four) individuals chose to talk to persons from ISU services such as the Affirmative Action Office, Personnel Office, Employee Assistance Program, or Women's Center.

#### Satisfaction level of ISU services used by victims

Those individuals who said they talked to an ISU administrator or an employee of an ISU service about the harassment were asked to evaluate the service they received (Table 15). Since this question was not applicable to many people, the frequencies were low. Most of the feedback was neutral to positive. In addition, as the severity of the categories of harassment increased, the satisfaction level with the services used became more positive.



Table 14. To whom the victims talked to about the harassment

	<u>No one</u>	<u>Dean of College</u>	<u>Dean of Harasser's College</u>	<u>Dept. Chair</u>	<u>Dept. Chair of Harasser</u>	<u>Other ISU Admin.</u>	<u>Other ISU fac. Member</u>
Sexist Comments & Sexual Comments	42 (32.1)	2 (1.5)	1 ( .8)	10 (7.6)	4 (3.1)	6 (4.6)	38 (29.0)
Undue Attention, & Invitations, & Physical Advances	14 (35.9)	1 (2.6)	1 (2.6)	2 (5.1)	2 (5.1)	2 (5.1)	7 (17.9)
Sexual Propositions	1 (16.7)	0	0	1 (16.7)	0	1 (16.7)	2 (33.3)
Sexual Bribery & Sexual Assault	1 (100.0)	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 14. (Continued)

	<u>Affirmative Action Office</u>	<u>Personnel Office</u>	<u>Employee Assistance Coordinator</u>	<u>Women's Center</u>	<u>Other ISU Employee</u>	<u>Contact Outside ISU</u>	<u>Friends, Relatives</u>	<u>Other</u>
Sexist Comments & Sexual Comments	1 (.8)	0	1 ( .8)	2 (1.5)	25 (19.1)	2 (1.5)	63 (48.1)	6 (4.6)
Undue Attention, & Invitations, & Physical Advances	0	0	1 ( 2.6)	0	9 (23.1)	0	20 (51.3)	0
Sexual Propositions	0	0	1 (16.7)	0	1 (16.7)	0	3 (50.0)	0
Sexual Bribery & Sexual Assault	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 15. Satisfaction with ISU services

	<u>Strongly Satisfied</u>	<u>Satisfied</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Dissatisfied</u>	<u>Strongly Dissatisfied</u>
<u>Sexist or Sexual Comments:</u>					
a) Department, College, or University Administrator	0	1	6	3	0
b) Employee Assistance Program	0	1	1	0	0
c) Women's Center	1	0	0	0	0
d) Other	0	0	1	0	0
<u>Undue Attention, Invitations, or Physical Advances:</u>					
a) Department, College, or University Administrator	2	1	1	0	0
b) Employee Assistance Program	0	1	0	0	0
<u>Sexual Propositions:</u>					
a) Department, College, or University Administrator	1	0	0	0	0
b) Employee Assistance Program	0	1	0	0	0
<u>Sexual Bribery or Sexual Assault:</u>					
No services used.					

### Actions taken by victims

Table 16 contains results of the actions taken by the victims of harassment. Almost two-thirds of the victims did not take any action. Fifty-three women confronted the harasser but only three required an investigation by their department.

### Reasons for not taking action

As indicated by Table 17, victims chose a variety of reasons for not reporting the occurrence of sexual harassment. For the less severe behaviors, the most frequent response was that they saw no need to report it. Victims were also concerned that if they did report the harassment, it would either make their work situation unpleasant or be held against them. The responses are a similar pattern for victims of the various behaviors except for the victim of sexual bribery that responded to this question. Even though her harassment was the most severe, she saw no need to report it.

## Hypotheses

### Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis stated that sexual harassment will occur more frequently when (a) the harasser is male than when the harasser is female; (b) the harasser is older than the victim than when the harasser is the same age or younger than the victim; and (c) the harasser is in a higher position than the victim than when the harasser is in the same or lower position than the victim.

Table 16. Actions taken by victims

<u>Behaviors</u>	<u>Actions</u>						
	<u>Confronted Harasser</u>	<u>Invest. by Dept.</u>	<u>Invest. by Outside Agency</u>	<u>Grievance Report with Admin.</u>	<u>Griev. Report w/ Aff. Action</u>	<u>Discrim. Complaint or Lawsuit</u>	<u>Did Not Take Any Action</u> <u>Other</u>
Sexist Comments & Sexual Comments	43 (34.1)	2 (1.6)	0	0	0	0	83 (65.9)      8 ( 6.3)
Undue Attn, Invitations, & Physical Advances	8 (21.6)	1 (2.7)	0	0	0	0	25 (67.6)      5 (13.5)
Sexual Propositions	2 (33.3)	0	0	0	0	0	4 (66.7)      1 (16.7)
Sexual Bribery & Sexual Assault	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100.)      0

Table 17. Reasons why victims did not take any actions

	<u>Did Not Know Actions To Take</u>	<u>Saw No Need To Report</u>	<u>Did Not Want To Hurt Harasser</u>	<u>Too Embarrassed</u>	<u>Did Not Think Anything Would be Done</u>	<u>Too Much Time and Effort</u>	<u>Thought Would Be Blamed</u>	<u>Make Work Situation Unpleasant</u>	<u>Would Be Held Against Me</u>	<u>Other</u>
Sexist Comments, Sexual Comments 11	11 (10.4%)	66 (62.3%)	4 (3.8%)	5 (4.7%)	25 (23.6%)	12 (11.3%)	6 (5.7%)	30 (28.3%)	23 (21.7%)	10 (9.4%)
Undue Attention, Invitations, Physical Advances 2	2 (6.5%)	17 (56.7%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	7 (23.3%)	2 (6.7%)	2 (6.7%)	11 (36.7%)	8 (26.7%)	3 (10.7%)
Sexual Propositions 0	0	2 (33.3%)	1 (16.7%)	0	3 (50.0%)	0	1 (16.7%)	4 (66.7%)	3 (50.0%)	2 (33.3%)
Sexual Bribery 0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual Assault 0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The first two parts of this hypothesis can only be tested with the behaviors of physical advances, sexual propositions, sexual bribery, and sexual assault because only these behaviors had questions about gender and age of the harasser. Most of the harassers were male, 86.7 percent, 83.3 percent and 100 percent respectively for the three behaviors. (No incidences of sexual assault occurred.) In addition, 71.4 percent, 50 percent, and 100 percent of the victims said the harasser was older than she. For the victims of physical advances, 14.3 percent said that the victim was the same age and 14.3 percent said he/she was younger. For those who received sexual propositions, 33.3 percent said the harasser was the same age and 16.7 percent said he/she was younger.

In regard to the issue of power, this section will need to be analyzed by categories of behavior. The victims of the four categories of sexist comments, sexual comments, undue attention, and invitations answered one question about the initiator of all of those behaviors. They were asked to choose the typical initiator of the behavior(s) and were allowed to choose more than one response if necessary. Of those who responded, 48.4 percent said the harasser was in a higher position, either an immediate administrator, other higher level administrator, or an ISU faculty member of higher rank in their department. Almost 19 percent said the harasser was a faculty member in their department in the same or lower rank.

The number of women who experienced physical advances, sexual propositions, and sexual bribery is far less than the the number of women who experienced the other four behaviors. The results are similar, however, in that most of the harassers are in a higher position than the victim. For victims of

physical advances, 85.7 percent of the harassers were an immediate administrator, other higher level administrator, or an ISU faculty member of higher rank in their department. For the two cases of sexual bribery, both harassers were in a higher position than the victim.

### Hypothesis 2

The second hypothesis stated that as the behaviors of sexual harassment, according to the definitions used in this study, get more severe, (a) the actions taken by the victim decrease; (b) the number of persons reporting the behavior decreases; and (c) the perceived degree of detrimental effect increases.

Due to the limited number of people who reported taking any action, it is difficult to determine if a pattern exists. Only three people requested an investigation by their department about the harassment that occurred. The only other action that victims took was confronting the harasser. Forty-three individuals, or 34.1 percent, confronted the user of sexist and/or sexual comments. The number decreased drastically as the severity of the behavior increased. However, the number of incidences decreased also. Of the victims experiencing sexual propositions, 33.3 percent confronted the harasser.

When examining whether the number of persons reporting harassment decreased as the behaviors became more severe, the question about whom the victim talked to was used. Again, as the behaviors became more severe, the frequency decreased, so it is difficult to compare between less severe and more severe categories. By combining categories, as the behaviors get more severe, the percentage of victims reporting it to administrators increases, contrary to



the hypothesis. The columns of Dean of College, Dean of harasser's College, department chair, department chair of harasser, and other ISU administrator are combined into one. For sexist and sexual comments, 17.6 percent of the victims talked to administrators about the harassment; 20.5 percent talked to them about undue attention, invitations, and/or physical advances; and 33.4 percent reported their sexual propositions to them. Since these administrators are in a position of authority, it is assumed that when the victim said she talked to this person, it is a form of reporting the behavior.

It was hypothesized that as the categories of behavior became more severe, the detrimental effect on the victim would increase. The same problem arose with this part of the hypothesis as the others. It is difficult to compare between behaviors due to the low number of frequencies in the four more severe categories.

The patterns varied depending upon the effect on the victim's career, well-being, or quality of work. More women who experienced the less severe behaviors (38.2 percent) felt the harassment had a detrimental effect on their feelings about their career than those who experienced the more severe forms of harassment (13.4 percent). However, the victims of the more severe behaviors felt more detrimental effect on their emotional and physical well-beings than the victims of less severe behaviors. The percentages were similar for both groups in regard to the detrimental effect on the quality of their work. So the only increase of detrimental effect for the victims of more severe behaviors occurred on their emotional and physical well-beings.

### Summary of Responses to Comments Section

There were three sections on the survey that gave the respondent an opportunity to express any comments. The first two followed the questions on detrimental effect of the harassment. These comments were summarized previously in this chapter. The last section was at the end of the survey. It was an open-ended statement that allowed respondents the chance to write any additional comments.

The purposes of this statement were to allow the respondent to elaborate on any harassment they had experienced, to provide additional information about harassment in general, or to express their opinions of this study. Approximately forty people chose to write additional comments. Some of the comments can be categorized into a few areas (Table 13).

The first and most frequent issue mentioned is not on sexual harassment but other forms of discrimination that the respondents feel exists at ISU. These comments ranged from being ignored or excluded to examining the inequity in salaries, teaching loads, decision-making, or promotions. Ten women wrote comments on these other areas of discrimination, often recommending research be done in this area.

While numerous people praised the study and were glad it was being done, others commented that the wrong group may have been studied. One person said she could tell a lot of incidences about the harassment of students and sexist teaching in the classrooms. Others commented on their own experience of sexual harassment as a student either at ISU or another institution.

The last category was further details explaining the harassment the person received. Other random comments included harassment the faculty members experienced at other institutions. Another person said she was harassed more than three years ago at ISU. Finally, three people did comment about the positive relationship they have with the men in their department and that sexual harassment was not a concern.

Table 18. Summary of Comments

---

<u>Subject</u>	<u>#</u>
Other forms of discrimination that exist at ISU	10
Appreciation that survey was done	8
Comments on survey design	5
Further details on incidences that occurred	4
Other incidences of harassment either as student or at other institutions	4
Positive experiences with male colleagues	3
Suggest study harassment of students	1
Miscellaneous	5

---

## CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a brief summary of the study, discuss the results reported in Chapter IV, and present conclusions based on those results. It also includes recommendations for future research.

### Summary of the Study

The population of faculty women at ISU (N=494) was studied to determine the perceived incidence rates of the various behaviors of sexual harassment. The purposes of this study were to determine these incidence rates, the actions the victims took, and the detrimental effects incurred by the victims if any.

A survey was designed and implemented to the population of faculty women to address the research questions and hypotheses presented in Chapter III. Frequencies procedures were used to analyze the results.

The frequency of the sexual harassment behaviors varied somewhat depending upon the behavior. The ranges of frequency were combined to present a total number of women who experienced harassment. The following results are the total number of women who experienced the behavior at least once: sexist comments, 131 or 52.9 percent; sexual comments, 61 or 24.6 percent; undue attention, 41 or 16.6 percent; invitations, 9 or 3.6 percent; physical advances, 14 or 5.6 percent; sexual propositions, 6 or 2.4 percent; sexual bribery, 2 or .3 percent; sexual assault, 0.

The first hypothesis stated that sexual harassment will occur more frequently when (a) the harasser is male than when the harasser is female; (b)

the harasser is older than the victim; and (c) the harasser is in a higher position than the victim than when the harasser is in the same or lower position than the victim.

For the four more severe categories of behavior (physical advances, sexual propositions, sexual bribery, and sexual assault), 86.7 percent (13), 83.3 percent (5), and 100 percent (2) of the harassers were male. (No incidences of sexual assault were reported.) In regard to age, 71.4 percent (10), 50 percent (3), and 100 percent (2) of the victims said the harasser was older than the victim for each behavior respectively. In regard to the position of the harasser, 48.4 percent (120) of the victims of the four less severe categories (sexist comments, sexual comments, undue attention, and invitations) said the harasser was in a higher position. For the victims of physical advances, 85.7 percent (12) of the harassers were in a higher position. For victims of sexual propositions, 66.7 percent (4) said the harasser was in a higher position and both of the harassers of sexual bribery were also.

The second hypothesis stated that as the behaviors of sexual harassment, according to the definitions used in this study, get more severe, (a), the actions taken by the victim decrease; (b) the number of persons reporting the behavior decreases; and (c) the perceived degree of detrimental effect increases.

Due to the limited number of people who reported any action, this part of the hypothesis could not be accurately tested. A total of only three people requested an investigation by their department about the harassment. The only other action that victims took was confronting the harasser. Forty-three persons (34.1 percent) confronted the harasser of sexist and/or sexual comments.

for the victims of undue attention, invitations, and/or physical advances, eight (21.6 percent) confronted the harasser. For victims of sexual propositions, two (33.3 percent) confronted the harasser.

When examining the number of persons reporting harassment, the second part of the hypothesis was not true. As the categories became more severe, the percentage of victims reporting it to administrators increased. For sexist and sexual comments, 17.6 percent (23) of the victims talked to administrators about the harassment; 20.5 percent (8) talked to them for undue attention, invitations, and/or physical advances; and 33.4 percent (2) reported their sexual propositions.

The last part of the hypothesis examined the detrimental effect the harassment had on the victim. Four areas were questioned. They included feelings about career, emotional well-being, physical well-being, and quality of work. The only areas that increased in detrimental effect as the categories of behavior became more severe were emotional and physical well-being. The other two areas, feelings about career and quality of work, did not increase in detrimental effect as the categories of behavior became more severe.

## Discussion of the Results

### Frequency of behaviors

The frequency of behaviors of sexual harassment was lower than expected. For example, due to the sexist attitudes and stereotypes that exist for women, it is hard to believe that 45.6 percent or 113 women said they have never heard a sexist comment in their last three years at ISU. There may be a few reasons

for this number. One may be that men are becoming more sensitive to sexist comments and attitudes and are changing their behavior. Another reason may be that women have become "numb" to these comments, accepting them as a fact of life and thus not registering them as inappropriate. As one respondent wrote, "we will be far down the road when sexist remarks are no longer heard!"

As the behaviors of harassment became more severe, the frequency rates decreased. Six women reported sexual propositions and two women reported sexual bribery. No accounts of sexual assault were reported. Even though the numbers appear small, as these authors stated, one case of sexual harassment is enough (Dziech & Weiner, 1984).

#### Detrimental effect of harassment

The results of the study showed that an average of 69 percent of the women felt the occurrence of the four less severe behaviors (sexist comments, sexual comments, undue attention, invitations) had no detrimental effect on their feelings about their career, emotional well-being, physical well-being, or quality of work. Only eight women, or an average of 1.45 percent, said the harassment had a major detrimental effect.

For those that experienced the more severe behaviors (physical advances, sexual propositions, sexual bribery), forty women, or an average of 64.3 percent, said the harassment had no detrimental effect on their feelings about their career, emotional well-being, physical well-being, or quality of work. As with the less severe behaviors, eight women, or an average of 12.75 percent, said the harassment had a major detrimental effect.

These results were lower than expected. Miller and Miller (1982) stated that women often experience tremendous emotional impact as a result of harassment. The occurrence of harassment may also cause physical ailments and affect job productivity. Most of the women in the study who experienced harassment, however, felt the harassment had minimal or no detrimental effect. This may be because the women have a high tolerance for such behaviors. It could also be due to low self-esteem of the victim and the feeling that she did something to encourage it. It may be that it just did not affect them.

#### Issue of power

It was hypothesized that sexual harassment will occur more frequently when the harasser is male and in a higher position than the victim. The results supported this. This may support the theory that harassment is more likely to occur when a person has organizational power as well as gender power.

#### Actions taken

Almost half of the victims said they talked to friends or relatives about the harassment. Very few individuals chose to talk to persons from ISU services, including the Affirmative Action Office. An average of 23.8 percent said they talked to an administrator (i.e., Dean or department chair) about the harassment. An average of 23.2 percent said they talked to no one about the incidences that occurred.

These results show that when harassment does occur, either no one knows about it, or it is a friend or family member that is told, who most likely has no authority to do anything. The administration is only hearing about approximately one quarter of the incidences that occur. The Affirmative Action



Office, which is one of the main offices that handles harassment complaints, was talked to about only one incidence. The problem with this is that the administration and the Affirmative Action Office may not have an accurate picture of the harassment problem. Thus, it may be difficult for them to address the problems and concerns of sexual harassment if they do not know to what extent it exists.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents said they did not take any actions after the harassment occurred. Some confronted the harasser and three investigations were requested by the department. Again, these results mislead the administration about the extent of the harassment problem. Also, if no action is being taken, there seems to be little incentive or encouragement for the harasser to stop his/her behavior, especially if he/she has not been told that it is inappropriate.

When victims were asked why they did not report the harassment, numerous reasons were cited frequently. The most common reason was that they saw no need to report it. The other reasons cited most frequently were: it would be held against me; it would make my work situation unpleasant; and I did not think anything would be done.

Simon and Forrest (1983) said that victims often assume the institution lacks support and sensitivity to the harassment issue. In addition, victims may be unaware of the laws that protect them and the responsibility of the university. The results of the study partially support these ideas. However, only thirteen women felt they did not know what actions to take. So, it doesn't seem that a lack of information was the problem. Rather victims are fearful it

will be held against them and make their work situation unpleasant. So even though the laws technically protect them, in reality, victims do not seem to think this will happen.

### Discrimination

The most frequent comment written by the respondents was that they felt other forms of discrimination exist at ISU. This supports the research cited in Chapter I (Etaugh, 1984) that faculty women are in the lower ranks, paid less, and less likely to be tenured. The fact that this was mentioned so frequently shows there may be a need to look at some of the other areas of discrimination.

### Conclusions

In synthesizing the above findings, it seems reasonable to conclude that sexual harassment does occur to faculty women at Iowa State University. The extent of it varies depending upon the category of behavior and the frequencies of its occurrence. At least one incidence was reported for every behavior except sexual assault. The initiators of these behaviors were more likely to be men in a higher position than the victims. However, women did say that they were harassed by persons in the same or lower positions as well as by students.

If the harassment did occur, little action was taken. Some victims confronted the harasser and some reported it to an administrator. However, many of the victims did not take any action, which includes not telling any one about the incidences. This lack of information exchange may affect administrators' perceptions as to the extent the problem exists.

The victims seemed to know what actions they could take but chose not to do so. One reason was because they saw no need to report it. Other victims seemed to fear the repercussions that may occur if they did report it. It may be suggested that even though laws and policies exist that protect the victim, no actions will be taken if the environment is not supportive.

Women seemed to be aware of their choices when harassment occurred. However, many chose to do nothing about it. This may suggest that disseminating information about policies and procedures is not enough. The university may need to strive to create an environment that encourages victims of harassment to exercise their rights. If victims are not reporting the harassment, it is difficult for the university to effectively eliminate it.

Some ideas may be to continue to empower women to take control of their lives. It also may mean training administrators, deans, and department chairs on how to be more sensitive and responsive to the issue of sexual harassment. They are all related. The university needs to create an environment that not only discourages and forbids harassment from occurring but that will support the victims when it does occur.

The frequency of harassment seemed lower than expected when compared with other research. However, from the comments written on the survey, harassment may be only one part of the total discrimination issue. Rather than sexual harassment being a major concern at ISU, it seems to be just one of the many barriers that prevent women from being equal with their male colleagues. As one author stated, in order to deal effectively with sexual harassment, the larger framework of inequitable power among men and women must be examined (Livingston, 1982).

### Recommendations for Future Research

As stated in earlier sections, ISU studied the issue of sexual harassment of undergraduate and graduate students in 1981. Five years later, faculty women are studied. One recommendation is to also survey the merit women and professional and scientific (P & S) women to determine the problem with these groups. Also, the issue of harassment of students should be studied again. One reason is to follow-up on the initial survey to see if the strengthening of the sexual harassment policy and recent laws have had any effect. Another reason is that due to the comments received from the respondents of this study, it seems that harassment of students still exists.

When further research on harassment is conducted, the following questions are worthy of study:

1. Do victims feel the environment/setting is supportive of women and encourages them to take some form of action when harassment occurs?
2. Is the victim's level of self-esteem related to the amount of detrimental effect she feels from the harassment?
3. Do a woman's sex-role beliefs and levels of feminist attitudes affect her perceptions of incidences of sexual harassment, the detrimental effect, or the actions she takes?
4. If a victim takes no action and says it is because she saw no need to report it, why did she see no need to report it?
5. If services are available for support for harassment victims, what are the reasons for not using them?

6. Should some forms of programming on harassment as well as training for person in administrative roles be conducted?

If it is accurate that harassment is just one way that women are discriminated against, another recommendation is to determine what other forms of discrimination exist. This may include examining salaries, promotions, tenure, committee assignments, as well as subjective forms such as being ignored or excluded from informal interactions. This would allow for colleges and universities to examine the role of women and the problems that prevent equality from occurring.

Replications and modifications of this study need to be performed at other institutions, especially ones that are smaller in size, private, or community colleges. By continuing research on the discrimination of women, valuable information can be provided to college and university administrators to encourage them to eliminate these barriers and ultimately achieve equity between men and women.

## REFERENCES

- Academe. (1983). Sexual harassment: Suggested policy and procedures for handling complaints. Academe, 69(2), 15a-16a.
- Adams, J. W., Kottke, J. S., & Padgitt, J. S. (1983). Sexual harassment of university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(6), 484-490.
- Benson, D. J., & Thomson, G. E. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest and gender stratification. Social Problems, 29(3), 236-251.
- Biles, G. E. (1981). A program guide for preventing sexual harassment in the workplace. Personnel Administrator, 26(6), 49-56.
- Blanshan, S. A. (1983). Activism, research, and policy: Sexual harassment. Journal of NAWDAC, 46(2), 16-22.
- Brandenburg, J. B. (1982). Sexual harassment in the university: Guidelines for establishing a grievance procedure. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8(2), 320-336.
- Chamallas, M. E. (1985). Sexual harassment. Unpublished manuscript, College of Law, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Cole, E. K. (1986). Recent legal developments in sexual harassment. The Journal of College and University Law, 13(3), 267-284.
- Crocker, P. (1983). An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8(4), 696-707.
- Dziech, B. W., & Weiner, L. (1984). The Lecherous Professor--Sexual Harassment on Campus. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Guidelines on discrimination because of sex. (1980). Federal Register, 45(219), 74676-74677.
- Etaugh, C. (1984). Women faculty and administrators in higher education: Changes in their status since 1972. Journal of NAWDAC, 48(1), 21-25.
- Greenlaw, P. S. & Kohl, J. P. (1981). Sexual harassment: Homosexuality, bisexuality, and blackmail. Personnel Administrator, 26(6), 59-62.
- Gutek, B. A. & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.
- Hoffman, F. L. (1986). Sexual harassment in academia: Feminist theory and institutional practice. Harvard Educational Review, 56(2), 105-121.

- Jensen, I. W., & Gutek, B. A. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility of sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 121-136.
- Lafontaine, E., & McKenzie, B. J. (1985). Being out on the inside in higher education administration: Women's responses to role and status incongruity. Journal of NAWDAC, 43(2), 19-25.
- Livingston, J. A. (1982). Responses to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational, and individual actions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 5-22.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M., & Howard, D. R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case study. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8(2), 296-319.
- Maihoff, N., & Forrest, L. (1983). Sexual harassment in higher education: An assessment study. Journal of NAWDAC, 46(2), 3-8.
- Mauro, T. (1986, June 20-22). Court lowers boom on sex harassment. USA Today, p 1A.
- Meek, P. M., & Lynch, A. Q. (1983). Establishing an informal grievance procedure for cases of sexual harassment of students. Journal of NAWDAC, 46(2), 30-33.
- Metha, A., & Nigg, J. (1983). Sexual harassment on campus: An institutional response. Journal of NAWDAC, 46(2), 9-15.
- Miller, J., & Miller, M. (1982). Hands off! Perspectives: The Civil Rights Quarterly, 14(1), 30-33.
- Rowe, M. P. (1981). Dealing with sexual harassment. Harvard Business Review, 59(3), 42-46.
- Schneider, B. E. (1982). Consciousness about sexual harassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 75-98.
- Schupp, R., Windham, J., & Draughn, S. (1981). Sexual harassment under Title VII: The legal status. Labor Law Journal, 32(4), 238-252.
- Scully, M. G. (1986, September 17). Women account for half of college enrollment in U. S., 3 other nations. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 33(3), pp. 1, 42.
- Simon, L. K. & Forrest, L. (1983). Implementing a sexual harassment program at a large university. Journal of NAWDAC, 46(2), 23-29.

- Somers, P. (1983). Sexual harassment and employment: Why college counselors should be concerned. Journal of NAWDAC, 46(2), 43-46.
- SPSS Inc. (1983). SPSS-X User's Guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thurston, K. A. (1980). Sexual harassment: An organizational perspective. Personnel Administrator, 25(12), 59-64.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1972). Conducting Educational Research. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). Sexual harassment in the Federal workplace--Is it a problem? Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Wilson, K. R., & Kraus, L. A. (1983). Sexual harassment in the university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24,(3), 219-224.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Daniel C. Robinson for his continual guidance and patience throughout my graduate program. His sincere caring for me and my work are appreciated more than he will know.

I am also grateful to my other committee members, Dr. Mary E. Huba and Dr. Jean W. Adams, for their commitment and time to an important and sensitive subject; to the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs for their financial support and commitment to the study; and to the Margaret Sloss Women's Center staff, especially Peg Lonnquist for helping me see the importance of educating both women and men about sexual harassment.

I want to thank my family, especially my grandparents, Alice and Sterling Reesor. They have always helped me believe I had the ability to accomplish any goal I set. Also, special thanks go to Margi Healy, a friend and mentor, who continually offered me feedback, encouragement, and motivation to continue; to Lyn Wallen for her support and friendship; to Amy Anderson for her editing skills; and to Donna Samuels who shared with me the frustrations and joys of going through graduate school and whose friendship I will always appreciate.

APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER

# IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education  
Professional Studies  
N243 Lagomarcino Hall  
Ames, Iowa 50011

Telephone 515-294-4143

February 11, 1987

Dear ISU Faculty Member:

Sexual harassment threatens the integrity and educational values of an academic institution. The purpose of this survey is to gather information about your experiences with sexual harassment while a faculty member at Iowa State University. Data will be used as a part of my graduate thesis research. The results of this study will help to determine the occurrence of sexual harassment on this campus and may suggest changes needed in policies and services.

The results of this survey will be compiled in a manner that will protect the identity of each individual. To insure anonymity, no identification system is being used. While this ensures confidentiality, I have no way of recontacting those who fail to respond. It is important that I obtain your responses in order to accurately assess the occurrence of sexual harassment toward faculty women and its impact on the individual.

I ask you to take about 20 minutes now and complete the questionnaire. Please return the completed survey through campus mail to the Department of Professional Studies, Attention: Lori Reesor, N243 Lagomarcino Hall by February 25, 1987. A summary of the results will be available in the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs at the end of spring semester.

Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Loraine M. Reesor  
Graduate Student  
Department of Professional Studies

Jean W. Reesor  
Associate Dean  
College of Sciences & Humanities

lmc/ms

APPENDIX B: SURVEY

### Introduction to Survey

In 1983, Iowa State University adopted the current policy statement prohibiting sexual harassment of employees or students. This policy defines sexual harassment as "any attempt to coerce a person into a sexual relationship or to subject a person to any unwanted sexual attention or to punish a refusal to comply with sexual demands. Sexual harassment may consist of requests or demands for sexual favors, unwelcome physical advances, or conduct (verbal or physical) of a sexual nature that is intimidating, demeaning, hostile, or offensive. Whether a specific incident constitutes sexual harassment is not always clear-cut. Some behaviors -- such as a demand for sexual favors in exchange for a promotion or a better grade -- are clearly prohibited, and one such incident shall be grounds for disciplinary action. Other behaviors -- such as touching or joking in a sexual manner -- are inappropriate behaviors and may constitute sexual harassment if the behavior persists despite an indication by the recipient that it is unwelcomed" (ISU Faculty Handbook, 1984, p. 17).

Often sexual harassment is viewed as a variety of behaviors that fall along a continuum. For the purpose of this study, eight categories of behavior have been identified which may constitute sexual harassment. These eight categories and descriptions are listed below. Please refer to these categories when completing the questionnaire.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Examples</u>
sexist comments	comments or jokes that are stereotypical or derogatory to members of one sex
sexual comments	<u>unwanted</u> jokes, questions, teasing, or remarks that are sexual in nature; inquiries of sexual behaviors or values
undue attention	sexually suggestive looks or gestures; leaning over; leering at one's body; cornering
invitations	unwanted, repeated pressure for personal dates; pressure for personal (non-professional) letters or phone calls
physical advances	kissing, hugging, pinching, fondling, patting, grabbing
sexual propositions	clear invitations for sexual encounter but involving no threats or promises
sexual bribery	explicit sexual propositions which include or strongly imply job-related rewards or punishments
sexual assault	actual or attempted rape

Directions: Please answer all questions on this survey concerning your experiences in your capacity as a faculty member at Iowa State University.

73

1. Have any of the following behaviors been directed towards you during the last three years at ISU or since you joined the ISU faculty, whichever is shorter?  
(Please circle the appropriate answer for each type of behavior.)

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Once</u>	<u>Once a Month or Less</u>	<u>2-4 times a Month</u>	<u>Once a week or More</u>
Sexist Comments	1	2	3	4	5
Sexual Comments	1	2	3	4	5
Undue Attention	1	2	3	4	5
Invitations	1	2	3	4	5

(If you answered "NEVER" to ALL the categories, then skip to Question #4.)

2. Who typically initiated the behaviors you said occurred in Question #1?  
(Indicate all that apply.)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Your immediate administrator	1	2
Other higher level administrator	1	2
ISU faculty member in your department of higher rank than you	1	2
ISU faculty member in same or lower rank than you in your department	1	2
Other ISU faculty member not in your department	1	2
Non-faculty ISU employee	1	2
ISU student	1	2
Other (Please specify. _____)	1	2

3. For each category listed below, please indicate the detrimental effect the behaviors you said occurred in Question #1 may have had on your career, emotional or physical well-being, or quality of your work.

Degree of Detrimental Effect

	<u>None</u>	<u>Minimal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Major</u>
My feelings about my career	1	2	3	4
My emotional well-being	1	2	3	4
My physical well-being	1	2	3	4
The quality of my work	1	2	3	4

Please write any additional comments which describe the effects the incidences had on yourself and career.

---



---



---



---

4. Have any of the following behaviors been directed towards you during the last three years at ISU or since you joined the ISU faculty, whichever is shorter?  
(Please circle the appropriate answer for each type of behavior.)

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Only Once</u>	<u>Once a Year</u>	<u>Two to five times a year</u>	<u>Six or more times a year</u>
Physical Advances	1	2	3	4	5
Sexual Propositions	1	2	3	4	5
Sexual Bribery	1	2	3	4	5
Sexual Assault	1	2	3	4	5

(If you answered "NEVER" to ALL the categories, then skip to Question #10.)

Directions: Using your responses from Question #4, please complete the following chart by writing the appropriate letter in each blank. For the next three questions, please describe the typical person who initiated the behavior(s) that you said occurred in Question #4.

74

	<u>Physical Advances</u>	<u>Sexual Propositions</u>	<u>Sexual Bribery</u>	<u>Sexual Assault</u>
5. Typically, the <u>sex</u> of the initiator(s) was: A = Male B = Female C = Some male and some female	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Typically, the <u>age</u> of the initiator(s) was: A = Older than you B = Same age as you C = Younger than you D = A variety of ages	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Typically, the <u>marital status</u> of the initiator(s) was: A = Single (never married) B = Married C = Separated, divorced, or widowed D = Some married, and some not married	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Position(s) of the initiator(s) involved in these incidences included: (Please indicate <u>all</u> that apply.) A = Your immediate administrator B = Other higher level administrator C = ISU faculty member in your department of higher rank than you D = ISU faculty member in same or lower rank than you in your department E = Other ISU faculty member not in your department F = Non-faculty ISU employee G = ISU student H = Other (Please specify. _____)	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. For each category listed below, please indicate the detrimental effect the behaviors you said occurred in Question #4 may have had on your career, emotional or physical well-being, or quality of your work.				

Degree of Detrimental Effect

	<u>None</u>	<u>Minimal</u>	<u>Some</u>	<u>Major</u>
My feelings about my career	1	2	3	4
My emotional well-being	1	2	3	4
My physical well-being	1	2	3	4
The quality of my work	1	2	3	4

Please write any additional comments which describe the effects the incidences had on yourself and career.

---



---



---



---

Directions: For the next section, the eight previously used behaviors have been combined according to the level of severity. Please complete the following chart on the next page by writing the appropriate letter in each blank. If more than one response is appropriate, please put all the letters in the blank.

75

10. Who did you talk to about the incidents that you said occurred in Questions #1 and #4?  
If the behaviors occurred more than once, please answer how you typically responded.

(Please indicate all that apply.)

- A = No one
- B = The Dean of my College
- ~~C~~ = The Dean of the harasser's College
- D = My department chair/head
- E = Department chair/head of harasser
- F = Other ISU administrator
- G = Other ISU faculty member(s)
- H = Affirmative Action Office
- I = Personnel Office
- J = Employee Assistance Coordinator
- K = Women's Center
- L = Other ISU employee
- M = Contact outside of ISU (e.g. lawyer, civil rights group)
- N = Friends, relatives
- O = Other (Please specify. \_\_\_\_\_)

11. If you chose to use any of the services available at ISU to report or discuss the incident(s), how satisfied were you with the service?

A=Strongly Satisfied B=Satisfied C=Neutral D=Dissatisfied E=Strongly Dissatisfied  
F=Not Used

- a) Department, College, or University Administrator
- b) Affirmative Action Office
- c) Personnel Office
- d) Employee Assistance Program
- e) Women's Center
- f) Other (Please specify. \_\_\_\_\_)

12. Did you take any of the following specific actions? If the behaviors occurred more than once, please answer how you typically responded. (Indicate all that apply.)

- A = I confronted the harasser.
- B = I requested an investigation by my department.
- C = I requested an investigation by an agency outside ISU.
- D = I filed a grievance report with my administrator.
- E = I filed a grievance report with the Affirmative Action Office.
- F = I filed a discrimination complaint or lawsuit.
- G = I did not take any action.
- H = Other (Please specify. \_\_\_\_\_)

13. If you did not take any of the action(s) listed in Question 12, were any of the following your reasons? (Indicate all that apply.)

- A = I did not know what actions to take.
- B = I saw no need to report it.
- C = I did not want to hurt the person who harassed me.
- D = I was too embarrassed.
- E = I did not think anything would be done.
- F = I thought it would take too much time and effort.
- G = I thought I would be blamed.
- H = I thought it would make my work situation unpleasant.
- I = I thought it would be held against me.
- J = Other (Please specify. \_\_\_\_\_)



<u>Sexist Comments and/or Sexual Comments</u>	<u>Undue Attention Invitations, and/or Physical Advances</u>	<u>Sexual Propositions</u>	<u>Sexual Bribery and/or Sexual Assault</u>
---	--	----------------------------	---

10.	_____	_____	_____
-----	-------	-------	-------

11.	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

12.	_____	_____	_____
-----	-------	-------	-------

13.	_____	_____	_____
-----	-------	-------	-------

Please provide the following information about yourself by putting the appropriate letter in the blank:

77

14. Your faculty rank: \_\_\_\_\_  
A = Temporary faculty    B = Adjunct faculty    C = Nontenured tenured-track faculty  
D = Tenured faculty
15. Your primary college: \_\_\_\_\_  
A = Agriculture    B = Business    C = Design    D = Education    E = Engineering  
F = Home Economics    G = Sciences and Humanities    H = Veterinary Medicine
16. The percentage of males among the faculty in your department: \_\_\_\_\_  
A = 90% or more    B = 50-89%    C = Less than 50%
17. Your age group: \_\_\_\_\_  
A = 30 or below    B = 31-40    C = 41-50    D = 51-60    E = 61 and above
18. Your marital status: \_\_\_\_\_  
A = Single (never married)    B = Married    C = Divorced, separated, or widowed
19. Years at ISU: \_\_\_\_\_  
A = Less than one    B = 1-5    C = 6-10    D = 11-20    E = More than 20

Please feel free to write any additional comments in the space below.

Please return the completed questionnaire through campus mail to:

Department of Professional Studies  
N243 Lagomarcino  
Attn: Lori Reesor

Surveys due by February 25, 1987.

Thank you for your cooperation!

APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP NOTICE



published weekly for members of the  
faculty, professional and scientific  
staff and merit staff of Iowa State University

# university news

Edited by Information Service for the Office of the Vice President for  
Academic Affairs. Address communications to 109 Morrill Hall.

Vol. XXIII, No. 23  
February 27, 1987

THE NEXT ISSUE OF University News will be published March 13 -- no issue is planned for March 6. Deadlines for the March 13 newsletter are 8 a.m. Tuesday, March 10, for Campus Events and Academic Lectures, Seminars, Colloquia and Discussions, and noon Tuesday, March 10, for material to be included in the main body of the publication.

ALL WOMEN WORKING in the university system face many similar situations, opportunities and challenges. This year, for the first time in Iowa State's history, a women's conference is being sponsored for all women at ISU -- Merit, Professional and Scientific, and Faculty. The conference which will be held Tuesday, May 5, at the Memorial Union, is being sponsored by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Training and Development/Personnel Office.

The conference will focus on opportunities for change. The purpose of the conference is to offer all university women an opportunity to 1) move toward career advancement and personal development, 2) to meet with other university women to establish networks and 3) to improve women's knowledge of the university.

The conference will begin with an informal breakfast followed by 16 different morning workshops. After a noon luncheon, Roxanne Conlin, attorney-at-law, will share her personal views on prospects for change. During the afternoon, participants can attend two workshops of their choice. The conference will conclude with a social hour featuring Kate Kasten, a local comedian, who will share a one-woman show.

Supervisors are asked to urge and sponsor Merit, Professional and Scientific, and Faculty women to attend this conference. Early registration is essential as it is anticipated the conference will be well attended. A nominal charge will be made to cover costs of the conference and lunch. A detailed program and registration form will be available within a few weeks.

THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT for Academic Affairs encourages women faculty to return the questionnaire on sexual harassment.

REID CRAWFORD, assistant to the president, will hold a discussion on legislative issues today, Feb 27. The discussion will be held in 209 Beardshear from 4 to 5 p.m. Interested faculty, staff and students are invited to attend.

THE STATE BOARD OF REGENTS will meet Wednesday and Thursday, March 11-12, on campus at the Memorial Union. The ISU portion of the docket will be available from the Information Service, 109 Morrill, after 1 p.m., Monday, March 9.

P & S COUNCIL will meet Thursday, March 5, in the Memorial Union Gold Room. The council will convene at 11:30 a.m., break for lunch at 11:45 a.m. and reconvene at 1 p.m. Committee meetings will be held from 10:30 to 11:30 a.m. and will include: Policies and Procedures, Cranny; Elections and Representation, Nook; and Communication and Development, Gold Room.

THREE APPOINTMENTS WERE APPROVED by the State Board of Regents at its February meeting. They are:

Michael Crow, assistant director of the Ames Laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy, has also been appointed director of science policy affairs and research for ISU.

Margaret Healy has been appointed acting director of financial aid and student employment, through June 30 or until a permanent director is named.

William Whitman, director of the ISU Physical Plant, has been appointed associate vice president for business and finance. The regents also approved the reorganization of the university's physical facilities planning under the Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance.

APPENDIX D: SURVEY BY ADAMS, KOTTKE, & PADGITT (1983)

## The Cover Letter and Questionnaire Sent to ISU Students

Dear ISU Student:

81

Recently, what has been referred to as "sexual harassment" has received nationwide attention. While most discussions have been related to employment situations, educational institutions are also concerned about the extent to which sexual harassment occurs in academic environments in order to develop policies to discourage it.

In an effort to learn more about such harassment on this campus, Iowa State University's Committee on Women has developed the attached questionnaire. The Committee on Women is appointed by the Office of Academic Affairs and charged with making policy recommendations to Vice President Christensen.

To help the Committee, we request that you take about 20 minutes to complete this questionnaire. By doing so, you will help us obtain an accurate assessment of the extent to which sexual harassment of students by faculty members occurs on this campus, the forms of such harassment, and student attitudes toward such behavior. We are interested in obtaining this information from both male and female students and from those who have not, as well as those who have, experienced sexual harassment. Because this questionnaire is being sent to only a small, randomly selected sample of students, it is important that we obtain a high response rate.

Your participation in the study is voluntary, and the questionnaire respondents will be anonymous. While this ensures confidentiality, we have no way of recontacting those who fail to return the survey. We hope you agree that our efforts are important to both students and to the University and will promptly complete and return the questionnaire. We would appreciate receiving your questionnaire within a week; if this is not possible, please return it as soon as you can. When you have completed the questionnaire, please put it in the enclosed addressed envelope and drop it in a U.S. mail box; the postage is pre-paid.

If you have any questions about the study or wish to receive a summary of the results, please write or call Jean Adams, Dept. of Economics, 275 East Hall (294-7395). Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Jean W. Adams, Chair  
University Committee on Women

### INTRODUCTION

Because there is only limited agreement on what is sexual harassment, we have identified eight categories of behavior which may constitute sexual harassment. These eight categories, along with illustrative examples, are listed below. You may wish to refer to these categories and examples when completing the questionnaire.

<u>Category</u>	<u>Examples</u>
sexist comments	jokes or remarks that are stereotypical or derogatory to members of one sex
undue attention	flirtation; being overly helpful, too friendly, or too personal, but short of sexual inquiries
verbal sexual advances	general verbal expressions of sexual interest; inquiries of sexual values or behaviors, but short of a proposition
body language	leering at one's body; standing too close
invitations	personal invitations for dates or to one's house or apartment, but where sexual expectations are not stated
physical advances	kissing, hugging, pinching, fondling
explicit sexual propositions	clear invitations for sexual encounter but containing no threats or promises
sexual bribery	explicit sexual propositions which include or strongly imply promises of rewards for complying (e.g., higher grades, better recommendations) and/or threats of punishment for refusing (e.g., lower grades, poorer recommendations)

For purposes of this study, let the term "faculty member" refer to professors, teaching assistants, instructors, academic advisors, and department chairpersons.

\*Some of these categories and examples are modifications of concepts used by Benson and Thomson, University of California-Berkeley, in their studies of sexual harassment of students (unpublished paper presented at 1980 American Sociological Association meetings).

**Directions:** Please circle the number that most closely corresponds to your answer.

1. When directed towards a student by a faculty member, which, if any, of the following categories do you consider to be sexual harassment?

	<u>YES, IT IS</u>	<u>NO, IT IS NOT</u>	<u>NOT SURE</u>
a) sexist comments . . . . .	1	2	3
b) undue attention . . . . .	1	2	3
c) verbal sexual advances . . . . .	1	2	3
d) body language . . . . .	1	2	3
e) invitations . . . . .	1	2	3
f) physical advances . . . . .	1	2	3
g) explicit sexual propositions . . . . .	1	2	3
h) sexual bribery . . . . .	1	2	3

2. How frequently do you think most female and male students at ISU experience such behavior from faculty members of the opposite sex? (For each category, circle one number for female students and one number for male students.)

	<u>FEMALE STUDENTS</u>			<u>MALE STUDENTS</u>		
	<u>NEVER</u>	<u>ONCE OR A FEW TIMES A YEAR</u>	<u>MANY TIMES A YEAR</u>	<u>NEVER</u>	<u>ONCE OR A FEW TIMES A YEAR</u>	<u>MANY TIMES A YEAR</u>
a) sexist comments . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3
b) undue attention . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3
c) verbal sexual advances . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3
d) body language . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3
e) invitations . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3
f) physical advances . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3
g) explicit sexual propositions . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3
h) sexual bribery . . . . .	1	2	3	1	2	3

3. How frequently has such behavior by ISU faculty members been directed toward you personally?

	<u>NEVER</u>	<u>ONLY ONCE</u>	<u>ONCE A YEAR</u>	<u>SEVERAL TIMES A YEAR</u>	<u>MANY TIMES A YEAR</u>
a) sexist comments . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
b) undue attention . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
c) verbal sexual advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
d) body language . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
e) invitations . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
f) physical advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
g) explicit sexual propositions . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
h) sexual bribery . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5

4. By approximately how many different ISU faculty members have you personally experienced such behavior?

	<u>FROM NO FACULTY MEMBERS</u>	<u>FROM ONE FACULTY MEMBER</u>	<u>FROM SEV- ERAL (2-5) FACULTY</u>	<u>FROM MANY (more than 5) FACULTY</u>
a) sexist comments . . . . .	1	2	3	4
b) undue attention . . . . .	1	2	3	4
c) verbal sexual advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4
d) body language . . . . .	1	2	3	4
e) invitations . . . . .	1	2	3	4
f) physical advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4
g) explicit sexual propositions . . . . .	1	2	3	4
h) sexual bribery . . . . .	1	2	3	4

5. For any of the behaviors you have experienced as an ISU student, what was the sex of the faculty member or members involved?

	<u>MALE ONLY</u>	<u>FEMALE ONLY</u>	<u>BOTH MALE AND FEMALE</u>
a) sexist comments . . . . .	1	2	3
b) undue attention . . . . .	1	2	3
c) verbal sexual advances . . . . .	1	2	3
d) body language . . . . .	1	2	3
e) invitations . . . . .	1	2	3
f) physical advances . . . . .	1	2	3
g) explicit sexual propositions . . . . .	1	2	3
h) sexual bribery . . . . .	1	2	3

6. If you were to encounter the following behaviors by a faculty member of the opposite sex, which, if any, do you feel would offend you and/or interfere with your academic progress and career development?

	<u>NOT OFFEND AND NOT INTERFERE</u>	<u>OFFEND BUT NOT INTERFERE</u>	<u>NOT OFFEND BUT INTERFERE</u>	<u>OFFEND AND INTERFERE</u>
a) sexist comments . . . . .	1	2	3	4
b) undue attention . . . . .	1	2	3	4
c) verbal sexual advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4
d) body language . . . . .	1	2	3	4
e) invitations . . . . .	1	2	3	4
f) physical advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4
g) explicit sexual advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4
h) sexual bribery . . . . .	1	2	3	4

7. If you personally have experienced physical advances, explicit sexual propositions, or sexual bribery by a faculty member, what was the primary academic relationship between you and the faculty member (or members) at the time of the incident (or incidents)? (Circle all that apply.)

	<u>PROFESSOR/TEACHER</u>	<u>GRAD. STUDENT TEACHING ASST.</u>	<u>ACADEMIC ADVISOR</u>	<u>DEPT. CHAIRPERSON</u>	<u>OTHER (please specify in margin)</u>
physical advances . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
explicit sexual propositions . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
sexual bribery . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5

8. Below is a list of statements about aspects of student-faculty relationships. By circling a number for each statement, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

	<u>STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>NOT SURE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>
a) Joking and talking about sexual matters occur frequently in the classroom . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
b) Many male faculty members give a preference to attractive female students in awarding grades . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
c) Many female faculty members give a preference to attractive male students in awarding grades . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
d) Many female students would consider sexual advances by a male faculty member to be a compliment . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
e) Graduate students are more likely to experience sexual harassment than undergraduate students . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
f) Graduate teaching assistants are more likely to make sexual advances to students than are professors . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5



STRONGLY  
AGREEAGREENOT  
SUREDISAGREESTRONGLY  
DISAGREE

- g) If a female student is asked by an instructor to engage in sexual relations, it's probably because she did something to encourage it . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- h) Female students who experience sexual advances from faculty members should have done something to prevent it . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- i) Consenting sexual relationships between a student and a teacher are professionally inappropriate . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- j) Encouraging a faculty member's sexual interest is frequently used by female students to get better grades . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- k) Encouraging a faculty member's sexual interest is frequently used by male students to get better grades . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- l) Many female students would be afraid to resist sexual advances from male faculty members . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- m) Most female students would be reluctant to report a case of sexual harassment to an administrator . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- n) Most male students would be reluctant to report a case of sexual harassment to an administrator . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- o) The amount of sexual harassment (of any kind) at ISU is greatly exaggerated . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
- p) It is only natural for a male faculty member to make sexual advances to a female student he finds attractive . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5
9. Have you ever avoided taking a class from or working with an ISU faculty member whom you knew or had heard made sexual advances to students? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_
10. As an ISU student, have you offered sexual favors in exchange for a better grade? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_
11. To whom, if anyone, would you report an incident of physical advances, explicit sexual propositions, or sexual bribery by a faculty member? (Check all that apply.)
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> I WOULD NOT REPORT IT  | <input type="checkbox"/> AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICER            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ADVISOR                | <input type="checkbox"/> OFFICE OF STUDENT LIFE                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON | <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATOR; _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ANOTHER FACULTY MEMBER | (please specify)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> HALL ADVISOR OR HOUSE  | <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER; _____                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MOTHER                 | (please specify)   |
12. If you were to report an incident of physical advances, explicit sexual propositions, or sexual bribery by a faculty member, what do you think would happen to you? (Check all that apply.)
- ☐ I'D BE TOLD THAT IT WOULD BE ADDRESSED.
- ☐ I WOULDN'T BE BELIEVED.
- ☐ I WOULD BE TREATED AS IF I DID SOMETHING TO CAUSE IT.
- ☐ I WOULD BE TOLD TO IGNORE IT AND NOT TAKE IT SERIOUSLY.
- ☐ I'D SUFFER RETALIATION. \_\_\_\_\_
- (please specify)
- ☐ OTHER. \_\_\_\_\_
- (please specify)

13. If you were to report an incident of physical advances, explicit sexual propositions, or sexual bribery by a faculty member, what do you think would happen to the person you were reporting?

☐ NOTHING

☐ THE FACULTY MEMBER WOULD BE WARNED NOT TO CONTINUE SUCH BEHAVIOR.

☐ THE FACULTY MEMBER WOULD BE SUSPENDED OR FIRED.

☐ A REPORT WOULD BE PUT IN THE FACULTY MEMBER'S FILE.

☐ OTHER; \_\_\_\_\_

(please specify)

14. An ISU student, have you ever dated one or more of your teachers? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

If yes: a) Who first initiated these dates? (check one) ☐ I DID

☐ THE TEACHER DID

☐ WE BOTH DID

b) When did the dates occur?  
(Check all that apply.)

☐ PRIOR TO ENROLLING IN THE COURSE

☐ WHILE ENROLLED IN THE COURSE

☐ AFTER THE COURSE WAS COMPLETED

15. If you have experienced physical advances, explicit sexual propositions, or sexual bribery by a faculty member at Iowa State University,

a) with what department or departments were the faculty members associated? \_\_\_\_\_

b) when did the harassment occur?

☐ PRIOR TO ENROLLING IN THE COURSE

☐ WHILE ENROLLED IN THE COURSE

☐ AFTER THE COURSE WAS COMPLETED

☐ THE PERSON WAS NOT ONE OF MY TEACHERS

c) what actions, if any, did you take? \_\_\_\_\_

Please provide the following information about yourself:

16. Year in school (please check one): ☐ FRESHMAN ☐ SOPHOMORE ☐ JUNIOR  
☐ SENIOR ☐ GRADUATE STUDENT ☐ SPECIAL

17. Academic major (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

18. Sex (please check one): ☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE

19. Age (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

20. Marital status (please check one): ☐ SINGLE (NEVER MARRIED) ☐ MARRIED  
☐ DIVORCED, SEPARATED OR WIDOWED

If you would like, feel free to write comments on the back of the cover letter.

Please put the completed questionnaire in the enclosed addressed envelope and drop it in the U.S. mail.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX E: ISU'S SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

## Sexual Harassment

Iowa State University reaffirms and emphasizes its commitment to provide a professional working and learning environment that is fair and responsible; that supports, nurtures, and rewards educational and employment growth on the basis of relevant factors such as ability and performance; and that is free of discriminatory, inappropriate, and disrespectful conduct or communication. Sexual harassment threatens this environment in that it compromises institutional integrity and corrupts traditional academic values. Equally important, sexual harassment inhibits the individual's ability to function effectively as a student or employee and violates acceptable standards of interrelationships. For these reasons, the university will not tolerate sexual harassment and will make every effort to eliminate it if it appears.

The university's policy prohibiting sexual harassment is consistent with federal statutes that prohibit sex discrimination against employees (Title VII) and that require equal and fair treatment of students (Title IX). Thus the policy presented here applies to students as well as to employees. All staff members at every level, including graduate assistants, will be expected to comply with this policy.

### University Responsibilities

Iowa State University—its officers and its employees—are responsible for maintaining a working and learning environment free from sexual harassment. The administration is responsible for making widely known that sexual harassment is prohibited both legally and by this policy, and that appropriate procedures for dealing with allegations of sexual harassment are available. Students, staff, faculty, and administrators should know that the university is concerned about such behavior and is prepared to take preventive and corrective action, and also that individuals who engage in such misconduct are subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including suspension and termination. University officials who do not respond to sexual harassment complaints brought to their attention will be in violation of this policy.

The primary goal of the university's policy prohibiting sexual harassment is to stop the objectionable behavior whenever it occurs. Violations can be dealt with in various ways. The individual who feels that he or she is being harassed may bring the problem to the attention of his or her immediate supervisor, or may discuss the problem informally with other university personnel. Formal allegations of sexual harassment shall be handled by appropriate grievance and disciplinary procedures. Sanctions and other corrective actions will be determined by the nature and frequency of the incidents.

Retaliation against a person who initiates an inquiry or complaint is prohibited, and any such action will be further cause for disciplinary action.

### Definition of Sexual Harassment

For the purposes of implementation of this policy, sexual harassment is defined as any attempt to coerce a person into a sexual relationship or to subject a person to unwanted sexual attention or to punish a refusal to comply with sexual demands. Sexual harassment may consist of requests or demands for sexual favors, unwelcome physical advances, or conduct (verbal or physical) of a sexual nature that is intimidating, demeaning, hostile, or offensive. Whether a specific incident constitutes sexual harassment is not always clear-cut. Some behaviors—such as a demand for sexual favors in exchange for a promotion or a better grade—are clearly prohibited, and one such incident shall be grounds for disciplinary action. Other behaviors—such as touching or looking in a sexual manner—are inappropriate behaviors and may constitute sexual harassment if the behavior persists despite an indication by the recipient that it is unwelcome.

Often sexual harassment involves an authority relationship in which the person who is subjected to the harassment is vulnerable with respect to employment or academic status, so that failure to tolerate or comply with the offensive behavior or demands may have negative consequences. Sexual harassment is also operating, however, when

## 18

the kinds of behaviors previously mentioned interfere with the individual's work experience or the student's educational experience, or where the employee or student is denied full and equal participation and opportunities.

### Dealing with Instances of Sexual Harassment

Anyone who believes that she or he has been subjected to sexual harassment should make this known to university personnel so that the behavior can be evaluated and, if the allegation is upheld, appropriate action can be taken. Since a determination that a given incident or series of incidents constitutes sexual harassment may depend to some extent on the perception of the person toward whom the behavior is directed, a charge of sexual harassment should be carefully reviewed to determine whether the conditions in the above definition have been met.

Because sexual harassment may involve a wide range of behaviors, the way in which a given incident is best handled depends on its effect on the recipient, as well as on the specific behavior itself. For example, simply informing the instigator, through either verbal or written communication, that the behavior is unwelcome and should cease, may be sufficient to end it. On the other hand, the situation may be such or the behavior may be so extreme that the recipient may be unwilling or unable to deal with it in this way. To help the recipient determine how best to handle sexual harassment, as well as to insure that appropriate measures are taken when warranted, anyone who believes herself or himself to have been subjected to sexual harassment may make use of both formal and informal channels in pursuing the issue. Both channels will operate under the general principles of due process and confidentiality.

### Informal channels

A student subjected to sexual harassment may bring it to the attention of the faculty member's department chair or the staff member's supervisor, who may be able to resolve the problem directly. The student may, however, prefer to discuss it with the dean of student life who, with the student's concurrence, may be able to effect a resolution directly with the faculty staff member or through the chair/supervisor. Other sources of help for students are the professional staff of the Student Counseling Service, the Office of Student Life, and the Affirmative Action Office.

An employee subjected to sexual harassment may bring it to the attention of an administrative officer responsible for that unit, who may be able to resolve the problem directly. The employee may prefer, however, to discuss it with a staff member of the university's Affirmative Action Office who, with the employee's concurrence, may be able to effect a resolution directly with the source of the harassment or through an appropriate administrator. Faculty and staff members may also seek guidance from the Employee Assistance Program, the Personnel Office, and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The person with whom the individual discusses the situation informally will help to clarify whether sexual harassment appears to have occurred. If the recipient wishes, the staff member consulted will help the person to resolve the problem informally, perhaps by intervening directly with the individual or his/her supervisor or by referring the recipient to a more appropriate university resource.

The informal channels are available to be used as a prelude to filing a formal charge of sexual harassment, or as an alternative. It is not necessary that they be used. Anyone

who believes that she or he has been the victim of sexual harassment may proceed directly to file a formal complaint through the procedures described below, without making use of the informal channels first. Until a formal complaint is filed, no institutional action with respect to the complaint will be taken without the concurrence of the complainant.

#### **Formal channels**

A complaint of sexual harassment may be reviewed through either of two avenues, depending on the wishes of the complainant. If the complaint is directed against a supervisor or against a faculty member, the complainant may use the procedures established for handling employee or student grievances. These procedures basically involve administrative review of the complaint, with the option of appeal to a higher administrative level if the grievance isn't resolved. The specific grievance procedure for students is described in the *ISU Information Handbook*; the specific grievance procedures for faculty, professional and scientific staff, and Merit System staff are described in the *Faculty Handbook*, the *P & S Handbook*, and the *Merit System Handbook*, respectively.

As an alternative, a charge of sexual harassment may be filed directly with the university's Affirmative Action Office. To file a formal charge, the student or staff member should submit a written statement to the Affirmative Action Office describing the incident or incidents as completely as possible. Specific guidelines for the submission of a complaint may be obtained from the Affirmative Action Office, and the complainant may visit with a staff member of that office prior to filing a formal complaint.

Once a charge is filed with the Affirmative Action Office, it will be investigated thoroughly by an AAC staff member. This investigation will include interviews with both the complainant or complainants and the person against whom the complaint is addressed, as well as anyone else who

might have information that would be helpful. Based on this investigation, the Affirmative Action Office will submit a summary of the facts, as well as a recommendation with respect to action, to the vice president for academic affairs. A decision as to what action, if any, should be taken with respect to the complaint is ultimately the responsibility of the vice president for academic affairs, who will respond in writing to the complainant. The vice president's decision may be appealed to the president of the university and ultimately to the State Board of Regents.

#### **External actions**

In addition to the university's channels, a person who believes she or he has been subjected to sexual harassment may file a charge under the various jurisdictions of the Iowa Civil Rights Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, or the U.S. Office of Civil Rights. Information on filing charges with any of these agencies may be obtained from the university's Affirmative Action Office.

## **Appointment Procedures**

The head or chair of a department initiates a proposed new appointment after consultation with members of the department. New appointments are recommended on the basis of education, experience, competence in teaching and research, recognition in the field, and in some cases prior experience at other institutions.

The recommended appointment must then be approved by the dean or the college, the vice president for academic affairs, the president, and the State Board of Regents before becoming effective. Releases concerning such appointments, where appropriate, are made only by the president after the approval process has been completed.