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ABSTRACT

This study explores the relationship between professorial awareness of personal power and the likelihood of labeling professor/student dating and repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment. Data from a sample of UNLV teaching faculty (N=276) suggestS that professors who have higher levels of awareness of the personal power which they hold over students were more likely than professors with low levels of power awareness to label professor/student dating as well as repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment. Further it was found that differences in level of power awareness explained away gender differences the labeling of sexual harassment. When controlling for level of power awareness women were no more likely than men to label repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment.
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When I was ten years old, there was this boy who used to follow me on my walk home. He would come up behind me and pull my hair, kick at my legs, and pinch my arms. The next day, when I told my teacher what was happening she said, "Oh, that is just Billy's way of saying he likes you." I tried to believe her, to accept that boys who like us are sometimes mean to us, it is a sign of affection. My mother, always the bearer of more practical advice said, "if you just ignore him, he will stop."

When I was thirteen years old, there was a group of boys who used to surround my friends and I and yell and whistle at us. "come on you know you want it", "fucking bitches", "hey baby!" Ignore them, I tried to tell myself. How does that rhyme go? Sticks and Stones will break my bones, but words will never hurt me. (Or is it Sticks and Stones may break my bones, but words will always hurt me?) I wanted to run, I wanted to hide, I wanted not to be there, I wanted not to be. This time the teacher said, "Oh, they are just having fun... you know boys will be boys." My friends concurred. And from that moment I realized, this type of terrorizing behavior was not unnatural, that it was how boys expressed themselves, how they had fun. And although, perhaps, it was not right it was not wrong either.

When I was in high school, there was a teacher who would "flirt" with his female students. He would pat them on the behind ("he is the basketball coach, just
showing team spirit"), comment on their breast size ("it is done in a complementary manner, it is not harming anyone.").) Ogle, fondle, touch at every opportunity (again, he is a coach, this is all incidental contact.") The boys said, "look at those sluts, see the way they flirt with Mr. P." The girls said the same. The teachers said, "it is none of our business." The administration said, "Unless someone files a complaint, we can do nothing." The parents said, "What a sleaze, I can’t believe he gets away with that." The fathers said, "He had better not try anything with my daughter." And the harassment, the sexual exploitation of teenage girls by an authority figure, was allowed to continue. 

By the time I got to college I had pretty much ingrained in my own mind that it is perfectly natural for men to make sexual advances toward women, and that although sometimes those advances are hurtful, they are made with good intentions. We can not wrong those who did not intend to do us harm. Even though, it can make us feel bad, or insignificant, or worthless, we ought not be offended or strike back because it was probably just a case of miscommunication on our part. Maybe we even did something to bring it on ourselves. Besides, it is just the way things are and nothing can be done about it. And so when an instructor would tell a sexist joke, talk about prostitution as a woman’s natural ability, or rest his hand on the shoulder (a little too close to the breasts) of a female student, I was not surprised. Appalled, frightened, and humiliated, but not surprised.

In October of 1991, as the Clarence Thomas Supreme Court Confirmation Hearings unfolded, a shift in my consciousness around the issue of sexual harassment
took place. As I watched, Anita Hill, a Tenured professor of Law, a graduate of Yale University, a woman whose position wields both respect and credibility, be accused of prudery, of being vindictive, of being a political pawn, and of being unable to discern fantasy from reality, I began to realize extent to which our society distrusts women. What if Anita Hill had been a waitress, a secretary, a housewife? What if she had no social clout? What if she had attended a less prestigious university? What if those who testified on her behalf had no political authority? What if she were young and had not yet made those contacts? What if she were me?

Further, it became all too apparent during the Confirmation Hearings that nobody seemed to know exactly what constitutes sexual harassment. Is it touching, gender based joking, lewd remarks? Is it suggestive comments, physical threats, pornography? Does it have to be overt? Intentional? What? Why, I asked myself, is the definition of such a wide spread, vile social injustice so vague?

It was with these questions in mind that I began my research of sexual harassment. As a white, heterosexual, educated woman having grown up in lower class western patriarchal society, I bring to my research a number of different life assumptions and experiences, some of which are based upon shared systematic oppression, others of which originate in institutionally supported privilege. I have attempted to examine my own privilege as a member of the dominant culture throughout this project and in my daily endeavors with a critical eye, and not to assume that all women are white, European American, and/or heterosexual. As a woman I have a history of personal experience which gives me special insight into the
phenomena of sexual harassment. As a graduate student I am keenly aware of the power differential which exists between professors and students, and the potential that such a discrepancy holds for harassment. As a potential member of the professorship, I would like to work toward a hostile free environment, in which students and professors, both female and male, are free to engage in reciprocal learning processes. As a feminist, I look upon my intimate connection with my research topic, not as a deterrent, but rather, as an asset. As Patricia Hill Collins (1990) tells us, "Because knowledge comes from experience, the best way of understanding another person's ideas was [sic] to develop empathy and share the experiences that led the person to form those ideas" (p. 210).

I write this thesis as an affirmation of all of the voices that have been brutally, wrongfully, and painfully silenced by sexual harassment and the institutions which condone such outrageously malicious behavior.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"Sexual harassment of working women has been one of the most pervasive but carefully ignored features of our national life. As women's liberation makes progress, the facts are beginning to come into the open and the profound implications for our society are beginning to be understood. We have even reached a point where the law may start to do something about the problem." (Emerson 1979. p. vii).

Today, fifteen years after Thomas Emerson wrote these words, the "facts" and "profound implications" of sexual harassment are still just "beginning to be understood." The discourse has expanded to include gender harassment, standards of reasonableness, freedom of speech, office romance, and settings other than the workplace. Several divergent opinions have developed concerning the definition, the causes, and suitable sanctions for sexual harassment. Research has been done by corporations, lawyers, social scientists, and feminist scholars in an attempt to uncover the intricacies of the phenomena. And still there remains much to be learned.

This study seeks to expand upon current sexual harassment literature by exploring the role which a professor's awareness of his or her own structural power over students plays in the decision to label or not to label attempts by a professor to initiate a romantic relationship with a student as sexual harassment. It will make use of a self-administered mail questionnaire which incorporates scenarios that address
issues of student consent, professor persistence and power awareness. Differences in
gender perception in labeling sexual harassment will also be addressed. The
relationship between gender and power awareness, particularity as it pertains to
creating perceptual differences in defining sexual harassment will also be discussed.

It is in the spirit of the feminist strand of inquiry that I take up my study of
sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is seen as a public issue, rather than as an
individual private trouble (Martin 1989; Weeks, Boles, Garbin, and Blount 1986,
MacKinnon 1979). Sexual harassment will be examined as it is supported by the
systemic institutionalized values of patriarchal society. Further it is assumed that:

"understanding sexual harassment requires recognizing that it is central
to maintaining women’s subordinate social, economic, and sexual
statuses and thus is closely related to other feminist issues. Along with
rape, wife beating, prostitution, and pornography, it is one of the ways
in which male control of women’s sexuality shapes women’s
experience" (Martin 1989, p. 57).¹

¹ It is recognized that men may also be the victims of sexual harassment, however
such cases are not sanctioned by the institutions of patriarchal society and may be
considered more personal troubles, rather than the public issues of which I am concerned.
As more women move into positions of power and authority, it remains to be seen
whether more men will become targets of sexually harassing behavior. To this point
research indicates no such trend in that direction, with women continuing to make up the
majority of victims. (Reilly, Lott, and Gallogly 1986; McCormack 1985; Metha and
Nigg 1982)

It is recognized too that not all cases of sexual harassment are heterosexual in
nature; women can and do harass other women, men can and do harass other men. Still
other instances are the result of homophobic attitudes, in which lesbians and gay men are
targeted purely on the basis of sexual identity. Currently the body of literature on the
sexual harassment of gay men and lesbians by other gay men and lesbians and/or by
heterosexuals remains is limited. Unfortunately it is beyond the scope of this project to
focus on all of these issues. Therefore, when I speak of sexual harassment I do so in
terms of male harasser and female target in a context of heterosexual relations.
By creating an intimidating and hostile environment, sexual harassment impedes the progression of women into the public sphere of society. This imposition becomes particularly apparent when one considers the ramifications of sexual harassment in higher education.

"Women students are more and more often now reporting sexual overtures by male professors...Most young women experience a profound mixture of humiliation and intellectual self-doubt over seductive gestures by men who have the power to award grades, open doors to grants and graduate school, or extend special knowledge and training. Even if turned aside, such gestures constitute mental rape, destructive to a woman's ego. They are acts of domination, as despicable as the molestation of the daughter by the father" (Rich 1992, p. 394).

The literature on academic sexual harassment suggests that in addition to reporting feeling humiliated, demoralized, and embarrassed, students who are sexually harassed suffer a number of psychological and physiological side-effects, including insomnia, eating disorders, nausea, mental and physical exhaustion, anxiety attacks, crying spells, anger, fear, severe depression, and feelings of alienation, vulnerability, and helplessness (Koss 1990; Quina 1990; Rabinowitz 1990; Martin 1989). Lacking the structural resources to cope with such problems, many women transfer to different universities, change their majors, drop classes, or drop out of school altogether. Still others avoid classes or working with certain professors out of fear of being subjected to sexual advances (Paludi and Barickman 1991, p. 27). Education can not fully serve as a tool for the economic or intellectual advancement of women in such a context. As Crocker and Simon (1981) have noted, "Formal education is, in the United States, an important factor in an individual's career possibilities and personal
development, therefore stunting or obstructing that person's educational accomplishment can have severe consequences" (p. 542). Thus, to the degree that sexual harassment exists in academic settings, it constitutes a serious barrier to women's career development.

Previous research indicates that there is a high degree of consensus when it comes to identifying certain types of sexual harassment. Those forms that involve a direct threat or punitive measure for refusing to comply with a sexual advance (referred to as quid pro quo sexual harassment) are consistently labeled harassment. There is less agreement on other forms of sexual harassment. For instance, women generally, are more likely than men to perceive subtle behaviors as harassing (Bursik 1992; Fitzgerald 1990; Reily, Carpenter, Dull, and Bartlett 1982). Specifically, the labeling of sexist jokes, repeated requests for dates, and sexually oriented comments as sexual harassment often varies along gender lines with women more likely than men to classify each as harassment (Barr 1993; Jones, Remland, and Brunner 1987; Kenig and Ryan 1986; Popovich, Licata, Nokovich, Martelli, and Zoloty 1986; Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt 1983). Reilly et. al. (1986) attributes this difference to men's greater tolerance for harassment in general. Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnis (1989) suggest that women's tendency to define harassment in terms of "process" and men's tendency to define harassment in terms of "consequences" is the critical factor in explaining these gender differences. Other findings, however, demonstrate little if any gender differences in perceptions of sexually harassing behaviors (Terpstra and Baker 1987; Reilly, Lot and Galloghy 1986). The literature also suggests that
respondents are more likely to rate a behavior as sexual harassment if the perpetrator of the action has more power or authority than the recipient (Bursik 1992; Pryor and Day 1988; Pryor 1985). It is likely then, that those who are more aware of their own power and authority over others will be more likely to rate events as sexual harassment when the perpetrator is similarly situated.

This study is an attempt to examine more closely the role power and gender plays in shaping perceptions of sexual harassment. That is, the study will explore potential factors underlining differential perceptions of actions as being or as not being sexual harassment.

Because of the relatively high consensus in rating Quid Pro Quo (direct threat) behaviors as sexual harassment, a less "severe" and subsequently a less agreed upon behavior will be addressed -- the pursuit of sexual relations with female students by male professors. The study will examine these issues by using a self-administered questionnaire which incorporates scenarios. Sexual harassment is a highly subjective issue in which contextual elements are critical: thus, the use of scenarios which describe situations in more detail than is allowed by the use of simple question sets enhance the ability of the respondent to make an informed decision, one more reflective of their judgment in an actual situations.

Each scenario depicts a male professor attempting to start a romantic relationship with a female student. The scenarios vary by level of consent displayed by the student. In the first scenario she accepts the professor's offer for a date. In the second, she declines his offer. The third scenario proposes one of two
possibilities. In the first version of scenario three, the student declines the professor’s offer but it is known to the respondent that she admires the professor. In the second possibility, the student returns to tell the professor that she admires him after having turned down his request for a date. Scenario four was also divided into two possibilities. In the first, the student offers to massage the professor’s back and neck before he asks her to go on a date with him. In the second, the student offers the massage after she has already declined his first offer.

In addition to addressing issues of power and gender, the inclusion of a variety of "situated" scenarios in the survey will allow questions regarding the perceived appropriateness of professor/student relations and the notion of mutual consent to be discussed.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is a discussion of the literature addressing sexual harassment and professorial power. The first section is a brief overview the incidence rate of sexual harassment in academia\(^2\), section two will explore problems with defining sexual harassment, and section three will look at professorial power.

A. Incidence

In 1976, Redbook magazine proclaimed of sexual harassment, "the problem is not epidemic; it is pandemic--an everyday everywhere occurrence" (Safran 1976, p. 149). Aside from questions of why such a traditionally feminine magazine would recognize the pervasiveness of sexual harassment before feminist scholarship, one is left with questions of why such a "pandemic" problem, effecting the lives of so many women has not been aggressively or even adequately addressed by university policy makers.

\(^2\) Unfortunately there are few current (1990's) studies which seek to determine the frequency with which sexual harassment occurs. There has been a trend since the mid 1980's in sexual harassment research to move away from simple counts of occurrence to focus on perceptual differences and definitional problems concerning sexual harassment. Thusly, the research cited in this section tends to be pulled from the early 1980's. More current information was refer to where possible.
There is little evidence that sexual harassment has diminished in the past 17 years nor is there any indication that it will spontaneously diminish in the next 17. As summarized by Paludi and Barickman (1991, p. 11):

Adams, Kottke, and Padgit (1983)
13% of women students surveyed, reported they had avoided taking a class or working with certain professors because of the risk of being subjected to sexual advances; 17% received verbal sexual advances, 13.6% received sexual invitations; 6.4% had been subjected to physical advances, 2% received direct sexual assault.

15% of the graduate students and 12% of the undergraduate students who had been sexually harassed by their professors changed their major or educational program because of the harassment.

Bailey and Richards (1985)
12.7% of 246 graduate women surveyed reported that they had been sexually harassed; 21% had not enrolled in a course to avoid such behavior; 11.3% tried to report the behavior, 2.6% dropped a course because of it; 15.9% reported being directly assaulted.

Bond (1988)
75% of 229 faculty experienced jokes with sexual themes during their graduate training; 68.9% were subjected to sexist comments demeaning to women; 57.8% of the women reported experiencing sexist remarks about their clothing, body, or sexual activities; 12.2% had unwanted intercourse, breast, or genital stimulation.

Further, Dziech and Weiner (1984) report that 30 percent of undergraduate women are sexually harassed by at least one of their instructors. When sexual harassment definitions include sexist remarks and other forms of gender harassment the incidence rate of undergraduates harassed nears 70 percent (Lott, Reilly, and Howard 1982). The incidence rate for women graduate students and faculty is even higher (Pauludi and Barickman 1991). Based upon their 1988 survey, the United States Merit Protection Board predicted that 85 percent of all working women will be
sexually harassed in their life time. (Rhode 1989).

How is it, I would ask again, has such a widespread, as Carole Sheffield (1984) calls it, "act of sexual terrorism" been allowed to continue year after year, to woman after woman? One of the major obstacles in developing informed sexual harassment policy appears to be the lack of consensus when it comes to defining what exactly sexual harassment is.

**B. Defining Sexual Harassment**

"One of the most persistent and troubling problems in the sexual harassment literature has been the lack of a widely agreed upon definition of the concept, one that was both broad enough to comprehend the variety of experiences to which the construct refers, and yet specific enough to be of practical use" (Fitzgerald 1990, p. 21).

There are two basic categories of definitions of sexual harassment which appear in the literature, those that are theoretical in nature and those that are more grounded in empirical research. Both theoretical and empirical definitions are important in determining what is and what is not sexual harassment. Theoretical definitions enable us to have an abstract concept of what is meant when we talk of sexual harassment. Such definitions allow for the development of legal guidelines and standards for appropriate and inappropriate behavior. Empirical definitions, on the other hand, are developed out of scientific research, they are born of the experiences of actual victims themselves. Together theoretical and empirical definitions help to shape our social conscious regarding sexual harassment.
1. Regulatory Definitions

a. General Nature of Sexual Harassment

Of the more theoretical definitions there are two types. "The first (Type 1) of which consists of a general statement describing the nature of the behavior and (sometimes the status relationship of the persons involved" (Fitzgerald 1990, p. 22, original emphasis). These include legal and regulatory definitions of sexual harassment which typically do not include a listing of behaviors which qualify as sexually harassing. The following are examples of this type of definition (Paludi and Barickman 1991, p. 3):

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s employment; (2) submission to, or rejection of, such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

National Advisory council on Women’s Educational Programs
Academic sexual harassment is the use of authority to emphasize the sexuality or sexual identity of the student in a manner which prevents or impairs that student’s full enjoyment of educational benefits, climate, or opportunities.

Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education
Sexual harassment consists of verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, imposed on the basis of sex, by an employee or agent of a recipient of federal funds that denies, limits, provides different, or conditions the provision of aid, benefits, services, or treatment protected under Title IX.

Not all type 1 theoretical definitions of sexual harassment are regulatory in nature.
For instance, Catherine Mackinnon (1979) writes,

"Sexual harassment...refers to the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power. Central to the concept is the use of power derived from one social sphere to lever benefits or impose deprivations in another...When one is sexual, the other material, the cumulative sanction is particularly potent." (p. 1)

A similar definition is offered by Benson (1979) who states, "Sexual harassment is broader than sexual coercion...(and) can only be understood as the confluence of authority relations and sexual interest in a society stratified by gender" (quoted in Fitzgerald, 1990. p. 23). LaFontaine and Tredeau (1986) suggest

"...sexual harassment is defined as any action occurring within the workplace whereby women are treated as objects of the male sexual prerogative. Furthermore, given that women are invariably oppressed by these actions, all such treatment is seen to constitute harassment, irregardless of whether the victim labels it as problematic" (435).

And Farley (1978) claims "Sexual harassment is...unsolicited nonreciprocal male behavior that asserts a woman's sex role over her function as worker" (14).

Each of these definitions leaves the reader with a different impression. Farley, LaFontaine and Tredeau, and Benson all refer much more explicitly to the social context of gender inequality in which sexual harassment occurs. Benson, with the addition of Mackinnon, and The National Advisory Council on Women’s Educational Programs focus on the structural imbalance aspect of sexual harassment, while, on the other hand, the EEOC and The Office For Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education ignore issues of power altogether. This is no small oversight as power imbalance is at the heart of sexual harassment. By ignoring power, it becomes as likely for those in a structurally inferior position to sexually harass those in a
structurally superior position, as it is for those with authority to sexually harass those without authority. This is an assertion strongly refuted by research (U.S. Merit System Protection Board 1981, Gutek 1985, Fitzgerald et. al. 1988a, Fitzgerald and Weitzman 1990, Paludi and Barickman 1991).

Legally speaking this could become critical in making the distinction between legitimate sexual harassment claims and what Dziech and Weiner (1984) have termed sexual hassle.

"there is too much difference in role and status of male faculty and female students to make flirtation or even seduction by students harassment. "Harassment" suggests misuse of power, and students simply do not have enough power to harass.

Persistent, unwanted attention from a female student can be extremely disruptive to a male professor. It may embarrass, annoy, and anger him; it may cause turmoil in both his private and professional life. But it cannot destroy his self-esteem or endanger his intellectual self-confidence. Hassled professors do not worry about retaliation and punitive treatment; they do not fear bad grades or withheld recommendations from women students. They are not forced to suffer in silence because of fear of peer disapproval. In fact, many men are eager to discuss being sexually hassled. Their talk may be locker room bragging or a self-protective strategy to prevent gossip." (p 24)

Many type one definitions involve the making the distinction between "harassment" and "sexual harassment". "The term 'harass' means to annoy or to coerce. Sexual harassment then, involves action with sexual overtones that are annoying and attempts to coerce sexual activity." (Tuana 1992, Pp. 50-51). Revising the definition provided by National Advisory Council on Women’s Educational Programs Tuana (1992) states:

"Academic sexual harassment is the use of authority to emphasize the sexuality or sexual identity of a student in a manner which is coercive or annoying and which thereby prevents or impairs that student’s full
enjoyment of educational benefits, climate, or opportunities." (p. 50).

However, merely illuminating the power dynamic involved in sexual harassment cases, does little to specify the kinds of behaviors it entails. This is where the second type of theoretical definitions come into play.

b. Sexual Harassment Defined as Behavior

The second type of theoretical definitions of sexual harassment are comprised of lists of specific actions "with no formal explication of the theoretical framework from which such a list is derived, with the general exception that the behavior is usually described as unwanted by the recipient" (Fitzgerald 1990, p. 22). For instance, Catherine MacKinnon (1979) breaks her definition of sexual harassment into two types; Quid Pro Quo and Condition of Work. Quid Pro Quo harassment "is defined by the more or less explicit exchange: the woman must comply sexually or forfeit and employment benefit. The exchange can be anything subtle, although its expression can be euphemistic" (MacKinnon 1979, p. 32). The second type, Condition of Work harassment involves,

"Unwanted sexual advances, made simply because she has a woman’s body...She may be constantly felt or pinched, visually undressed and stared at, surreptitiously kissed, commented upon, manipulated into being found alone, and generally taken advantage of at work--but never promised or denied anything explicitly connected with her job" (MacKinnon 1979, p. 40).

Betts and Newman (1982) claim, "A good definition of sexual harassment...includes the following behaviors:

1. Verbal harassment or abuse;
2. Subtle pressure for sexual activity;
3. Unnecessary patting or pinching;
4. Constant brushing against another person’s body;
5. Demanding sexual favors accompanied by implied or overt threats concerning an individual’s employment status;
6. Demanding sexual favors accompanied by implied or overt promise of preferential treatment with regard to an individual’s employment status” (48).

"Sexual harassment can be any or all of the following: verbal sexual suggestions or jokes, constant leering or ogling, 'accidentally' brushing against your body, a 'friendly pat', squeeze, pinch or arm around you, catching you alone for a quick kiss, the explicit propositions backed by threat of loosing your job, and forced sexual relations" (1).

Project on the Status and Education of Women (1979):
Sexual harassment may take the form of "verbal harassment or abuse, subtle pressure for sexual activity, sexist remarks about a woman's clothing, body, or sexual activities, unnecessary touching, patting, or pinching, leering or implied or overt threats concerning one's job, grades, letters of recommendation, etc., physical assault" (2).

Such definitions have the benefit of supplying a specific laundry list of "don'ts" when it comes to determining what is and what is not considered appropriate conduct. Unfortunately, they are incapable of providing a complete picture of sexually harassing behaviors. It would be impossible to compile such a comprehensive list. Sexual harassment is as much an issue of context as it is of behavior. What might be considered sexual harassment under one set of conditions, would not be under another. Additionally, these listing definitions fail to address the theoretical implications of the actions themselves.

2. Empirical Definitions

The final type of sexual harassment definitions found in the literature are empirical definitions, those based in scientific research. Through content analysis of the self report descriptions of sexually harassing experiences Till (1980) generated five categories of sexual
The first of these categories, or types was labeled *generalized sexist remarks and behavior*—similar in appearance to racial harassment, such behavior is not necessarily designed to elicit sexual cooperation, but rather to convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women. Category 2 consists of *inappropriate and offensive, but essentially sanction-free sexual advances*. Although such behavior is unwanted and offensive, there is no penalty attached to the woman's negative response. The third category includes *solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behavior by promise of reward*, while the fourth covers *coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment*. (It is these "contingency," or quid pro quo situations that appear to be what most people mean when they refer to sexual harassment.) Finally, Till reports instances of *sexual crimes and misdemeanors*, including rape and sexual assault*"* (Fitzgerald 1990, p.25).

Till notes that in such a design,

"categories are not sharply delineated, although they are arranged in a roughly hierarchical continuum. Many of the reported incidents involve several categories, as when a student is promised something in exchange for sexual favors and simultaneously threatened about noncooperation" (Till 1980, p. 8).

Fitzgerald et.al (1988b) refined this scheme by developing the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. Items were constructed to measure five general areas:

1. *Gender harassment*: Generalized sexist remarks and behavior not necessarily designed to elicit sexual cooperate, but to convey insulting, degrading or sexist attitudes about women;
2. *Seductive behavior*: Inappropriate and offensive sexual advances. Although such behavior is unwanted and offensive, there is no penalty explicitly attached to the woman's negative response; nor does this category include sexual bribery;
3. *Sexual bribery*: Solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior (e.g. dating) by promise of rewards;
4. *Sexual coercion*: Coercion of sexual activity, or other sex-linked behavior by threat of punishment;
5. *Sexual imposition*: Sexual imposition (e.g. attempts to fondle, touch, kiss or grab) or sexual assault."

The problem of definition becomes even more challenging when we consider perceptual differences amongst the general population (as presented to in the introductory chapter). It is not only the experts who can not agree on what sexual harassment is, it is the public (the
potential victims and harassers).

Much of the ambiguity created in defining sexual harassment centers around the issue of power. As discussed above, some definitions of sexual harassment consider power differential to be a critical element in determining whether or not an event is sexually harassing, while other definitions ignore the issue of power altogether. As most sexual harassment definitions recognize the subjective element in labeling events as sexual harassment (i.e. sexual harassment is contextual, a behavior considered sexually harassing in one instance, may not be considered sexual harassment in another instance), the omission of power from certain definitions becomes a contradiction of sorts. Power relations between individuals play a significant role in one's definition of the situation and therefore can not be ignored when one considers the subjective element in the labeling of sexual harassment.

**C. The Myth of Consent and the Power of the Professorship**

There exists within American lore, a mythical tale of a young beautiful woman who is swept off her feet and falls madly and passionately in love with an older wiser and irresistibly charming man. In the collegiate world this tale plays itself out in the relations between female students (holders of youth and beauty) and male professors (holders of wisdom and charm). In a setting where professors often work closely with students, spend long working hours with them, it is generally not questioned that romantic liaisons could develop mutually between the two. I do not question whether or not romantic liaisons do develop between professors and their students, what I do question is the degree to which these relationships can be considered mutual.
1. The Power of the Professorship

On college campuses, professors wield much power over students who are dependent upon them for grades, letters of recommendation, job referrals, committee memberships, advising, and research opportunities.

"Ask any graduate student whether his [sic] professors have power over him, and he will laugh at our Naiveté'. Of course the professors have power; the perpetual anxiety of some graduate students as to whether they will be passed or not is proof enough" (May 1972. Pp. 102-103).

In today's shrinking job market, the professor's role as gatekeeper to future career opportunities becomes increasingly important. Students are under more pressure to demonstrate academic excellence, thereby, winning the favor of their instructors. Theoretically the collegiate grading system operates in an objective and fair manner, with students being evaluated according to merit. In practice however, it is the subjective element in the evaluation process which is often most evident.

This subjective element becomes particularly apparent when one considers the grading criteria for evaluating course papers, essay exams, written and oral reports, classroom participation, and the like. Each instructor is likely to have his or her own unique set of standards. Further, as Susan Hubbuch (1990) points out, "Even if students play a major role in the grading process there is still the matter of the standards that will be used to determine those grades" (p. 37). For example, when one considers math and science classes where it might be argued that there exists a more objective criteria for grading course work, the instructor may choose to give or not to give partial credit (or even full credit) for a demonstration by the student of an "honest" or "legitimate" effort to solve the problem.
Even when clear and uniform guidelines are established, elements of the evaluation of student progress are left to the subjective discretion of the instructor. This discretionary freedom leaves students in a precarious situation, with each professor devising her or his own set of standards and expectations. Each student must attempt to decode and meet those elusive standards and expectations. Hubbuch (1990) describes this process succinctly:

"Every student knows that success as a student will be measured by the final grade received for the class, but the student also knows that this grade will be negotiated; it will reflect the outcomes of a series of exchanges with the teacher throughout the term: person-to-person exchanges outside the classroom, exchanges during class discussions, and indirect exchanges through written work like homework, tests, papers. The student and the teacher both will measure the student's success in each of these exchanges according to the degree to which the student's contributions have met with the teacher's expectations" (Pp. 40-41).

It is little wonder that students approach this challenge from many different angles, with some putting extra effort into course work, and others going out of their way to pay the professor complements; every little bit has the potential to help, or at the very least, it couldn't hurt, in the final evaluation. Conversely, amongst all of this effort to get on the good side of a professor, is the attempt to stay off their bad side. It would not be prudent to upset the one who is in control of your future.

Another way the professorship has power over students is through their ability to influence the self esteem of students (Zalk, Dederich, and Paludi 1991; Zalk 1990, Benson and Thomson 1982). They hold the power to either diminish or enhance both the academic and the personal self confidence of students.

"Harsh, belittling criticism, for example, can not only discourage the
student from putting forth more effort but can also cause her [sic] to question her capacity to learn the material at all; constructive criticism, encouragement, praise can not only give the student added incentive to exert herself further but can increase her sense of her own power" (Hubbuch 1990, p. 40).

In this way the professor has the ability to influence the life decisions of her or his students. If one is made to feel inadequate, incapable, and incompetent, one is likely to stop trying altogether, to give up on one’s academic goals and aspirations, and to label one’s self a failure. Encouragement, on the other hand, could lead to that extra effort needed to keep trying, to rise to academic excellence, and to define one’s self in a positive light.

Yet another source of power which professors hold lies in their control of knowledge and wisdom. Presumably college students attend universities to learn the skills deemed necessary to succeed in the highly specialized culture in which they live. With the professor taking the role of expert, the student must take on the role of learner. In such relationships,

"The teacher will be more autonomous by virtue of a knowledge of the subject, an ability to judge when it is being adequately grasped, an awareness of all that must be learned, and actions in laying out and/or carrying out means by which it can be learned. The learner is dependent on the teacher for no other reason than that the teacher has a knowledge or skill which the learner does not have but wishes to have" (Hubbuch 1990, p. 39).

As with the subjective element involved in the evaluation process discussed earlier, professors hold a great deal of discretionary authority when comes to the dissemination of knowledge.

"...the teacher’s role permits a wide latitude in the degree of interaction and helpfulness granted to individual students. An instructor enjoys
considerable discretionary power to provide or withhold academic rewards (grades, recommendations) and related resources (help, psychological support)” (Benson and Thomson 1982, p. 239).

Students therefore, may be placed in the position of competing for the attentions of their instructors, in hopes of receiving invaluable insight and wisdom which will boost their future careers.

Furthermore, the student’s perception of greater knowledge and wisdom being held by the professorship, serves to increase the power of professors over students. "College professors are admired. Many people are aware of us. They think we know more than we do and they think we are smarter than we are” (Zalk 1990, p. 143). This is especially true of those just entering the public world, where adolescent idealism may lead to uncritical acceptance of the professor’s word (Zalk, Dederich, and Paludi 1991).

"The professor "knows" what the student wants to "know", is looked upon by the students as an authority, as smart, as having "proved" him or herself in a way students have yet to realize. The professor is often admired, and students frequently believe they will never be as clever, no matter how much they learn” (Zalk 1990, p. 145).

Students often place professors on a pedestal, seeing them only in terms of the role they occupy. The role of the professor, which combines power and intellect may be attractive to some, "but being attracted to one’s role and consenting to a relationship are vastly different” (Dziech and Weiner 1984. P. 74).

2. The Myth of Consent

The notion of consent is based firmly on the classical liberal assumption that all persons are equal, having equal ability to assert their will. So if a woman
encounters what she finds to be unwanted sexual advances, then she ought to simply
tell the offender to stop. If she does not, then we may presume by her lack of protest
that she has freely consented to the behavior. There is a sexist assumption of male
access to female sexuality at play here: we do not ask what he did to attain consent,
but rather, what she did to convey non-consent. It is presumed she wanted to have
sexual relations unless otherwise stated, rather than, that she did not want to have
sexual relations unless otherwise stated. Further, we do not live in a society where
we all have the equal ability to assert our will. In light of the previous discussion,
there is little reason to believe that a university serves as a utopian setting where
power imbalances do not exist. With the threat of failure, loss of financial resources,
and/or the potential for academic rewards and career advantages looming over a
student’s head, they are unable to make a free choice when approached by a professor
who wishes to pursue a romantic relationship. Roseanne Quinn (1993) writes about
her experience with a male professor who approached her while she was in graduate
school,

"In my case, my professor did not explicitly state that I would reap
academic rewards as a result of following his sexual directives, but he
did not have to. I still had eight weeks left in his course; he was
grading my final project; he was writing my evaluation; he was paying
my research assistant salary - not to mention what he could relate about
me, off the official record, to colleagues at our university and others"
(p. 21).

This feeling of being pressured when being pursued romantically by a professor, is
echoed by the words of a 30 year old graduate student in humanities,

"When I personally was propositioned by a male faculty member, the
man did not covertly try to use his position to pressure me. But I felt
that he had taken advantage of my position as a grad student and as a T.A. After all, he could have served on future committees which would determine whether or not I received financial aid. He could also have tried to put damaging information in my departmental file and I, of course, could do nothing since the files were confidential" (Schneider 1987, p. 46).

These stories illustrate the structural positioning of professors and students; one that does not allow for the development of equal relations between the two.3

"It is not just the distorted aggrandizement by the student or the greater store of knowledge that is granted the professor that frames the student's vision before and during the initial phases of the affair. The bottom line in the relationships is POWER. The faculty member has it and the student does not. As intertwined as the faculty-student roles may be, and as much as one must exist for the other to exist, they are not equal collaborators. The student does not negotiate indeed, has nothing to negotiate with. There are no exceptions to this, and the students know this" (Zalk, Dederich, Paludi 1991, Pp 101-102, original emphasis).

Under these conditions it is improbable, if not impossible, that we can ever know the extent to which a student can act of her own free will, without the fear of punitive measures or the promise of academic reward, when relating to professors on a personal and/or romantic level. Even if she initiates the relationship we can not say that the power imbalance has been eradicated. The point is, as Dziech and Weiner (1984) point out, "Access to a student occurs not because she allows it but because the professor ignores professional ethics and chooses to extend the student-professor

3 In a context of racial and class inequality, it becomes apparent that certain groups of women are more susceptible to the already unequal relations which exist between professors and students. Women of color, ethnic minorities, and lower and working class women are in a position where their relationship to the eurocentric power base is already tenuous at best. Pressure placed upon these women to engage in romantic relationships with professors is magnified by their heightened dependency upon the few rewards doled out by the current social system.
relationship" (p 74).

3. Denial of Power

In his book *Power and Innocence*, Rollo May claims, "there is, among intellectuals, a tendency to deny and renounce power" (1972, p. 102). Sue Zalk (1990) adds, "faculty members are well aware of the imbalance of power, although they commonly deny the relevance of power in their sexual encounters with students" (p. 146). Louise Fitzgerald, Lauren Weitzman, Yael Gold, and Mimi Ormerod (1988) came to the same conclusion in their analysis of qualitative responses to a self-report survey by male professors. These professors indicated the feeling that under certain circumstances romantic relationships between professors and students would be appropriate. Mutual consent, lack of opportunity to evaluate, age or student status (i.e. is the student a graduate or an undergraduate?), the outcome of the relationship (i.e. was it a successful relationship?), and student-initiated relationships, and the outcome of the relationship were all cited by male professors as factors contributing to the appropriateness of professor/student relationships. "Each of these factors appears to represent a misunderstanding of the power dynamics involved in faculty-student relationships" by denying "that there exists an inherent power differential between faculty and students, and that the psychological power conferred by this status differential is equally salient as that of the deriving from the opportunity to grade or evaluate" (Fitzgerald et. al 1988a, Pp. 338-339, original emphasis).

Even the best intentions on the part of a professor to alleviate the power differential between him or herself and the students will not result in the elimination
of that difference. The difference is structural, it is embedded within the role of being a professor and the role of being a student.

"For, no matter how much a professor encourages his female students and colleagues to call him by his first name, engage in confessional office chat, and go to his home for pot-luck dinners - institutional hierarchy will not go away, and neither will the male professor's potential power..." (Quinn 1993, p. 24).

More harmful though, than those who wish to alleviate the power differential, are those who deny its existence all together. Denying the power differential means refusing to recognize the extent to which one has control over one's student's academic future, self-concept, and professional future. When this denial crosses over into the realm of romantic relationships, it means the professor denies the extent to which his student/partner's decisions may continue to be based upon their relationship as professor and student, rather than, upon amorous feelings for one another.

Consequently, the student/partner is placed in a position where she feels she must comply sexually, in order to maintain her academic position. The professor/partner, meanwhile, finds himself in no such dilemma; for him the issue of power is irrelevant to the relationship, for her it is critical.

"The professors' power is even more effective because it is clothed in scholarly garb. It is the power of prestige, status, and the subtle coercion of others from these. This is not due to the professors' conscious aims; it has more to do with the organization of the university and the teacher's unconscious motivations for being part of it. The more powerless the teacher feels himself [sic] to be, the more destructive, even though subtle and covert, will be his influence" (May 1972, p. 103).
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES AND QUESTIONS

A. Research Hypothesis

The following hypotheses were born out of the previous literature addressing sexual harassment and the power of the professorship. These hypotheses will be tested and the results discussed in the chapters that follow.

#1 Women are more likely than men to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment.

#2 Women are more likely than men to label repeated requests by a professor for dates as sexual harassment.

#3 Women are more likely than men to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of the feelings of admiration for the professor displayed by the student.

#4 Women are more likely than men to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of the actions of the student.

#5 Professors will show on average a low awareness of their power over students.

#6 Professors who indicate higher levels of personal power awareness will be more likely to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment than professors who indicate lower levels of personal power.

#7 Professors who show higher awareness of personal power will be more likely to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment than professors who show lower levels of personal power awareness.
Professors who show higher levels of awareness of personal power are more likely than professors who show lower levels of personal power awareness to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of feelings of admiration for the professor displayed by the student.

Professors who show higher levels of awareness of personal power are more likely than professors who show lower levels of personal power awareness to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of "sexually suggestive" actions directed at the professor by the student.

B. Research Questions

Although the literature suggests that professors tend to deny their power over students (Zalk 1990; May 1972), there has been no research which measures this assertion quantitatively. Qualitative approaches have remained similarly limited, with Fitzgerald et. al. (1988) standing alone in the literature. And even this study approached the problem indirectly, through the analysis of commentary written by male respondents regarding questions of when romantic relationships between professors and students might be appropriate. Further, because Fitzgerald et. al. (1988) was limited to the study of male professors no comparisons were possible between men and women. Therefore, One question this research seeks to address is that of gender difference. Are there gender differences in the perception of personal power amongst the professorship? And if so, how do these differences effect the decision to label or not to label certain behaviors as sexual harassment?
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This chapter describes the methodological procedures utilized in this study of power awareness and sexual harassment.

A. Research Design

To explore the issues of professorial awareness of personal power, and its relationship to defining the attempt by a professor to initiate a romantic relationship with a student as sexual harassment or not, this study focuses on teaching faculty at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

The data for this research were gathered through the use of self-administered mail questionnaires. Both open-ended and fixed-choice questions were contained in the survey instrument. Questions were designed to elicit demographic information, as well as information regarding awareness of personal power and the process by which an event is or is not defined as sexual harassment. Although the use of a self-administered mail survey did not allow for the flexibility that might have been offered through the use of indepth interviews, it did allow for a large number of respondents to be reached in a timely and statistically generalizable manor. Further, some of the depth and quality often lost in self-administered survey research was retained through the use of open-ended questions which allowed respondents to illustrate and explain
the criteria which they personally used in defining sexual harassment, thereby, encouraging many insightful and detailed responses. Additionally, fixed-choice items provided respondents with the necessary structure and clarity to work through the questionnaire with relative ease. This allowed for the entire population of 700 UNLV teaching faculty to be surveyed in a concise and easily coded manor.

Unfortunately, mail surveys are not without problems. When compared to other major survey research methods (i.e. face-to-face, Intercept, and telephone), mail surveys tend to produce lower response rates (Fowler 1993; Frey 1989). This is particularly true of subjects which are sensitive in nature. As reported by Mckinney and Maroules (1990) response rates for mailed surveys dealing with sexual harassment in academic populations tend to be relatively low. The self selective nature of mail surveys also leads those who feel they have a greater vested interest in the subject matter to have higher rates of response. Thus women, who are more likely to be the targets of sexual harassment, tend to be over-represented in surveys dealing with academic sexual harassment (Lott et. al. 1983; Mckinney and Maroules 1990). In studies of victims of sexual harassment this over-representation of women is perhaps not such a major enigma. However, when one is concerned with defining sexual harassment from the perspective of potential harassers and/or those who conceivably could be members of committees which determine when an event qualifies as sexual harassment, this over-representation becomes more problematic. Thus, the self-selective nature of the mail survey method serves as a potential limitation to this study. This limitation becomes even more salient in light of some of the comments
which were written at the end of the questionnaire. A few respondents indicated their feeling that the survey instrument was "biased" or "obviously from a female perspective" because it did not include instances in which a female professor attempted to initiate romantic relations with a male student. The inability of survey research to account for every possible dimension of a phenomena is indeed a weakness, but it is a weakness which is shared by all modes of social research and stems from the focus of the research questions (see footnote one) themselves, rather than from questionnaire design. None-the-less, it remains a limitation of this study, insofar as it may have postured some individuals to be on the defensive and respond to questions more negatively than they might have otherwise. In retrospect, in order to defuse such a politically sensitive topic as sexual harassment, it might have been prudent to include scenarios in which female professors attempted to initiate romantic relations with their male students.

Perhaps more damaging to the generalizability of the survey is the unknown number of respondents who opted not to respond to the survey based upon its lack of female professor/male student examples. Although it is recognized that statistically speaking nonresponse is a limitation of this study, if I might speculate as to why particular individuals chose not to respond based upon some of the commentaries of responders at the conclusion of the survey instrument, I would call into play the old adage, "silence speaks a thousand words". Among the majority of the commentaries, there was an unwillingness to recognize that it is women who account for the overwhelming majority of sexual harassment victims. The mere suggestion that this might
be the case produced an unanticipated level of hostility directed at myself and at the questionnaire. One respondent referred to women who claimed to be sexually harassed as "a bunch of hysterical twats crying wolf". Another, told me that I should, "grow up, girl". Two respondents asked if I would "go out" with them. And a third suggested that I "get real or get off of my soapbox. Harassment is gender neutral". If these comments are indicative of those faculty members that chose not to respond the survey, I may have tapped into something more basic than the typical pool of survey nonresponders, that being, a mistrust of research which focuses on women as being the victims of institutionalized sexism. If this is the case, it could prove to be the bigger find of this project.

The scenarios in the questionnaire depicting various professor/student interactions were modeled after similar scenarios found in the sexual harassment literature. Although they are not identical to any pre-tested scenarios, they were relatively analogous in word choice and question response categories, thus decreasing the potential for biased or leading language. Additionally, in the attempt to develop an objectively worded instrument⁴, the survey was pre-tested on a diverse group of male and female instructors from different colleges across the UNLV campus, different academic ranks, and tenure statuses. Pre-tested respondents were encouraged

⁴ Here I am not referring to bias or objectivity in its traditional sense of dispassionate, observer-neutrality, as this position "is blind to the different structural positions men and women occupy" (Gross 1992, P. 364), but rather I am referring to the attempt to alleviate researcher bias by not predisposing the respondent to answer questions according to my own expectations. The voices of research subjects should not be silenced by the researcher’s epistemological assumptions.
to offer a critique of those questions which they felt were ambiguous or slanted. Subsequent discussion with the pre-tested respondents lead to further refinement of question wording, question order and survey instructions.

Keeping in mind that no research method is without bias, the researcher has attempted to adhere to the standards of scientific rigor and the principles of survey research. At the same time, in the spirit of creating subjective knowledge, I have clarified my socio-political position throughout this project, thereby, locating myself in relation to the research subjects and topic.

B. Methods and Procedures

Permission to conduct this study, regarding the use of human subjects, was obtained from the university prior to its mailing. The questionnaire was developed out of an extensive literature review, feedback from earlier pre-tested drafts, and substantive discussions both theoretical and conceptual with knowledgeable colleagues. A mailing list of all teaching faculty at UNLV (a population which includes full, associate, and assistant professors, as well as instructors, both full and part-time) for the 1993-94 academic school year was obtained with permission from the registrar’s office. In light of the relatively low response rates generally obtained from surveys dealing with sexual harassment (McKinney and Maroules 1991) and in consideration of the feasibility, due to budget constraints, of mailing more than one wave of questionnaires, it was decided that in order to obtain a sample size conducive to statistical analysis, that all 700 members of the UNLV teaching faculty would be surveyed.
Four different forms of the survey were generated (differences between forms will be described below). Each survey instrument consisted of four sections. Section one of the survey contained four scenarios, each describing a male professor attempting to start a romantic relationship with a female student. Section two contains questions about power awareness. Section three asks some general questions concerning sexual harassment. The final section seeks demographic information. (See Appendix A and B for cover letter and questionnaire)

The four forms of the survey instrument varied by the first section of the questionnaire. In Form A, the first scenario depicts a situation in which a student agrees to date her professor upon his invitation to dinner. The second scenario depicts a situation in which a student declines the professor’s invitation. In the third scenario the student declines his offer, but the respondent is made aware that the student "has come to admire the intellect and professionalism of the professor". In the final scenario, the student initiates physical contact with the professor prior to his invitation to dinner, which she refuses. Form B of the questionnaire contains the same first two scenarios as Form A, in which the student merely accepts or declines the invitation to dinner. In the third scenario however, the respondent does not learn of the student’s admiration for the professor until after she declines his dinner invitation, and he asks her out again. In the fourth scenario, the student touches the professor after she declines his dinner offer, rather than before. Form C of the questionnaire contains the same first two scenarios as Forms A and B. The third scenario is the same as in Form B, in which the student’s admiration is known only after the date refusal. And
the fourth scenario is the same as in Form A, where the student touches the professor prior to his invitation to dinner. The final form of the questionnaire, Form D, also contains the same first two scenarios as Form A and B. The third scenario is the same as in Form A, where the students admiration is known by the respondent prior to the professor’s invitation. The fourth scenario is the same as in Form B, in which the student touches the professor before he asks her out. Aside from this first section, all four forms of the survey are otherwise identical. Due to the large number of scenarios generated, it was decided that splitting the scenarios in half would reduce respondent burden thereby potentially increasing response rate. The four forms were randomly numbered. Utilizing a random start, UNLV teaching faculty were systematically assigned one of the four survey forms. A cover letter, introducing the researcher and the purpose of the study was attached to complete the mailing packet. The packet, which included a return envelope, was mailed to each of the 700 UNLV teaching faculty on the 24th of November, 1993. One week later a reminder letter was mailed out (see Appendix A for reminder letter), which asked those who had yet to respond to please do so, while thanking those who already had responded for their participation. Two questionnaires were returned with messages that the instructor named was no longer employed at UNLV, they were thusly deemed ineligible. 276 surveys were returned completed, producing a response rate of 39.5% (21% for form A, 31% for form B, 25% form C, and 23% form D). Although such a low response rate is not uncommon for a survey of this nature (Mckinney and Maroules 1991, Mckinney 1990), it can not be overlooked in attempting to establish generalizablity of
the results.

Responses were numerically coded, entered into a computer data file, and statistically analyzed using SPSS-X software.

C. Operationalization of Concepts

1. Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment was operationalized in two ways. The first, a quantitative measure, was elicited by presenting respondents with various scenarios and asking them to evaluate the depicted situations as being or as not being sexual harassment. Specifically, respondents were asked; "At any point in this scenario was [insert name here] sexually harassed?" Responses were nominally measured as "yes" or "No".

Qualitatively, sexual harassment was measured with three open-ended questions; "If yes [to the question of whether she was harassed or not], at what point in the scenario does the harassment occur?", "If no [to the question of whether she was harassed or not], how many more times do you think Dr. B. would have to ask Liz out before his behavior becomes harassing, if ever?", and "Why do or why don’t you feel that [insert name here] was sexually harassed?" Responses to these questions were then evaluated for emergent patterns and general themes. Exemplars of these patterns were used throughout this investigation in order to add richness and depth to quantitative analysis.

2. Consent Indicators

The various levels of student consent were measured by varying the student’s
response to the professor's request for dates in each of the scenarios. In scenario 1, the student accepts the professor's offer. In scenario 2, she repeatedly declines his requests for dates. In scenario 3A, the student declines the professor's request for a date, but the respondent is made aware of the student's admiration for the professor with the inclusion of the following statement: "Jill has come to admire the intellect and professionalism of the professor". In scenario 3B, the respondent is not made aware of the student's admiration until after she declines his invitation to dinner when she returns to tell the professor that "she admires him greatly and wouldn't want to do something which might jeopardize their friendship.") The final measure of consent were the sexually suggestive behavior of the student. The suggestion of a massage was used to indicate sexually suggestive behavior. The test factor of was operationalized by adding "she offered to massage his back and neck". In scenario 4A the massage comes before the professor asks her out. In scenario 4B it comes after she declines his invitation.

3. Power Awareness

The scale measuring professorial awareness of personal power was developed through extensive literature review, wherein academic power was found to have three basic dimensions; formal/structural power, power over self concept, and power by virtue of controlling knowledge and wisdom (see literature review for a more complete discussion). To these three dimensions a fourth, which addresses power in general, was added. In all, the questionnaire included twelve questions designed to measure power awareness. Response categories where on a likert scale of one to four, ranging
from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It was decided to exclude the use of a "neutral" category as there is a tendency for responders to over select this category (Frey 1989; Bishop 1987).

There were two questions specifically addressing formal/structural power:

Q1d  "Grades are a major source of control that I have over students."

Q1f  "Letters of recommendations are not a major source of control that I have over students."

One question addressed Self concept:

Q1a  "I have the ability to enhance a student's self-confidence."

Four questions addressing control of knowledge and wisdom:

Q1c  "I have little control over a student's intellectual growth."

Q1g  "The ability to recognize intellectual accomplishment is a source of control that I have over students."

Q1j  "I have the ability to intellectually motivate my students."

Q1i  "I do not see myself as an intellectual role model for students."

The remaining five questions address power awareness in general:

Q1b  "I have little influence over students while they are taking my classes."

Q1e  "I see myself as an ethical role model for students."

Q1h  "I have had friendships based upon equality with students."

Q1i  "I do not see myself as a personal role model for students."

Q1k  "I have very little influence over students outside of the classroom."

Response categories to negatively worded questions (Q1b, Q1k, Q1f, Q1i, Q1k, and Q1i) were reversed so that "strongly disagree" indicated low levels of power
awareness, while "strongly agree" indicated high levels of power awareness. The scores for each of the Twelve questions indicating power awareness where then added together to create a scale of professorial power awareness which ranged from 22 (low) to 48 (high). In order to make this scale more conducive to statistical analysis, it was further broken down into three relatively equal categories, of high power awareness, moderate power awareness, and low power awareness.

D. Validity and Reliability

Both the validity and the reliability of the sexual harassment measures included in this survey instrument are supported by previous research, insofar as they do not differ greatly in wording, ordering, or content from those measures which have been previously tested in the literature.

As for the power awareness scale, although no comparable scale was found in the literature as such, every effort was made to model the questions after those elements of power awareness deemed relevant via an extensive review of the literature regarding the power of the professorship. Subsequent indepth discussion with pre-tested respondents further lent to the validity of the scale.

E. Data Analysis

The data for this study were analyzed with the assistance of the statistical software program, SPSSx. Because the dependent variable of labeling an event as sexual harassment was measured at the nominal level (either "yes" it was sexual harassment or "no" it was not sexual harassment) statistical analysis were limited to
those tests appropriate for such data. The Phi statistic was used for testing correlations on two by two tables and Cramér’s V was chosen as a correction coefficient of tables larger than two by two. Chi-square was used to test the significance of Phi and Cramér’s V. Chi-square was also utilized to test for significant differences between scores on bi-variate tables and elaboration models. Where 2X2 tables produced expected frequencies of less than 5, Fisher’s exact test for a one-tail research hypothesis was computed to correct for low sample size.
CHAPTER V

RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSES

This chapter will present descriptive data gathered from the survey responses, a discussion of the major variables and their interrelationships, and an analysis of statistical tests utilized to test the research hypotheses. Section A will present relevant demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. Section B summarizes each scenario in terms of whether or not respondents found it to depict sexual harassment. Section C addresses the effects of gender on the likelihood to label the various scenarios as being or as not being sexual harassment. Section D, discusses the general level of power awareness indicated by UNLV teaching faculty. Section E addresses the effects of personal power awareness on the likelihood to label the scenarios as being or as not being sexual harassment. And section F, is a discussion of the effects power awareness has upon the relationship between gender and the labeling of sexual harassment.

A. Demographic Characteristics

Presentation of demographic characteristics allows insight into the background and social positioning of the respondents. This will assist in testing the generalizability of the results by providing a frame of reference by which we might measure the extent
to which the obtained sample is representative of the actual population of UNLV teaching faculty.

1. Gender

As anticipated and discussed in Chapter Four, the sample reflected an over-representation of women teaching faculty. Thirty-eight percent of the sample was comprised of women and 62 percent of the sample was comprised of men. According to the 1992 edition of "Selected Institutional Characteristics" published by The Office of Institutional Analysis and Planning at UNLV, 27.5 percent of UNLV teaching faculty are women and 72.5 percent are men. The difference between the sample dispersion of men to women and the actual dispersion of male and female teaching faculty at UNLV was found to be statistically significant. ($X^2=10.34$, $p < .01$)

2. Age

The respondents ranged in age from 23 to 70 years ($R=47$) with the mean age being 46.3, the median 46, and the mode 50. Percentages by age categories where as follows: 20-25 years, .70 percent; 26-35 years, 14.1 percent; 36-45 years, 29.7 percent; 46-55 years, 33.0 percent; 56-70 years, 22.4 percent.

3. Race and Ethnicity

---

Footnotes:

3 Four respondents failed to indicate their gender.

6 All comparisons of the sample to the actual UNLV teaching faculty population, hereafter will be drawn from this source; the 1992 edition of "Selected Institutional Characteristics" published by The Office of Institutional Analysis and Planning at UNLV.
Eighty-seven percent of the sample was European American, 4 percent Hispanic, .4 percent Native American, 2 percent African American, and the remaining 4 percent indicated "other" as their race or ethnic background. Interestingly, although the percentage differences between European American and Ethnic minorities was not significantly different from the actual UNLV population differences ($X^2 = 16.8$, $P > .05$), significant differences were found between ethnic groups, with Hispanic Americans being over-represented (+ 2.4%) and Asian Americans being under-represented (- 6.3%). The over-representation of Hispanic Americans is possibly reflective of the higher vested interest by structurally disadvantaged groups in issues which exploit inequality as sexual harassment does. The under-representation of Asian Americans, is a possible limitation of the study produced by this researchers inability to foresee and compensate for language and cultural barriers faced by the Asian American teaching faculty at UNLV.

4. College

Twelve percent of the sample was teaching faculty from the college of Business and Economics, 4.3 percent from Communications, 6.9 percent from Education, 5.4 percent from Engineering, 7.6 percent from Fine and Performing Arts, 7.6 percent from Health Sciences, 4.7 percent from Hotel Administration, 5.1 percent from Human Performances and Development, 25.7 percent from Liberal Arts, and 13.4 percent from Science and Mathematics. Comparisons of the sample dispersion of colleges to the actual dispersion of UNLV teaching faculty across colleges, showed no significant differences ($X^2 = 11.82$, $P > .05$).
5. Faculty Rank and Tenure Status

Twenty-two percent of the sample were full professors, 21.7 percent were associate professors, 31.2 percent were assistant professors, and 21.0 percent were instructors, either part or full-time. This dispersion shows a significant over-representation of instructors (+7.2%) as compared to professors ($X^2 = 118.65$, $P < .01$). Seventy-two percent of the sample hold positions that are tenure track, 26 percent are in non-tenure track positions, a difference that is significant ($X^2 = 8.34$, $P < .01$) from the actual population, with non-tenure track faculty being over-represented (+7.73%). The percentage of tenured faculty to non-tenured faculty in the sample did not differ significantly from the actual UNLV population ($X^2 = .05$, $P > .05$), with 46.7 percent of the sample currently holding tenure and 52.3 percent being untenured.

B. Sexual Harassment

Table 5.1 provides a summary of whether or not respondents labeled each of the six scenarios as sexual harassment or not. Table 5.2 summarizes the responses of those who labeled scenarios 2 through 4a as sexual harassment, by indicating when in the scenario the sexual harassment began.

For scenario one, in which the student agrees to date the professor but later shows subtle signs of nervousness (for more detailed description of this scenario see appendix B) 65 percent of the respondents marked "no" indicating the perception that the scene did not depict sexual harassment, 35 percent marked "yes" indicating the perception that the scene did depict sexual harassment (see Table 5.1). Written
comments for this scenario indicate that 54 percent of those who indicated the scenario depicted sexual harassment felt that the harassment began from the moment the professor asked his student to have dinner with him, 26 percent felt the harassment began when the professor asked her to move closer to him, 11 percent felt it started when the professor asked the student to sit on the sofa, and the remaining 2 percent felt the harassment began after she displayed her nervousness by tearing her napkin into small pieces.

Table 5.1

SUMMARY OF SCENARIOS BY SEXUAL HARASSMENT (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>yes (N)</th>
<th>no (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35 (89)</td>
<td>65 (168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54 (140)</td>
<td>46 (121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>56 (75)</td>
<td>44 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>57 (71)</td>
<td>43 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>50 (67)</td>
<td>50 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>29 (34)</td>
<td>71 (83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second scenario, where the student repeatedly declines the professors requests for dates, 46 percent of the respondents indicated that they felt the situation did not depict sexual harassment, 54 percent indicated that they felt the situation did depict sexual harassment. Of the 54 percent that indicated the scenario did depict
sexual harassment, 28 percent felt that the harassment started as soon as the professor asked her out, 49 percent felt the harassment started after the student turns him down and he asks a second time, and 23 percent felt the harassment began after she declines his offer a second time and he asks her out a third time (see Table 5.2).

In scenario 3A, where it is known by the respondent that the student admires the professor prior to his asking her out, 44 percent felt that the student was not sexually harassed and 56 percent felt that she was. Of the 56 percent that indicated the scenario depicted sexual harassment, 26 percent felt that the harassment began as soon as the professor asked her out, 56 percent felt the harassment began after she turns him down one time and he asks her out a second time, and 18 percent felt that the harassment began after she declines his offer a second time and he asks her out a third time (see Table 5.2).

In scenario 3B, where the student returns to tell the professor that she admires him after having turned down his request for a date, 43 percent felt that the student was not sexually harassed and 57 percent felt that she was sexually harassed. Of the 57 percent that indicated the scenario depicted sexual harassment, 25 percent felt the harassment began as soon as the professor asked her out, 50 percent felt the harassment began after she turns him down one time and he asks her out a second time, and 25 percent felt that the harassment began after she declines his offer a second time and he asks her out a third time (see Table 5.2).

Table 5.2 also shows that in scenario 4A, where the student offers to massage the professor’s back and neck prior to his asks her out, 50 percent felt that the student
was not sexually harassed and 50 percent felt that she was sexually harassed. Of the 50 percent that indicated the scenario depicted sexual harassment, 22 percent felt the harassment began as soon as the professor asked her out, 53 percent felt the harassment began after she turns him down one time and he asks her out a second time, and 25 percent felt that the harassment began after she declines his offer a second time and he asks her out a third time.

In scenario 4B, where the student offers the massage after she declines his first request for a date, 71 percent felt that the student was not sexually harassed and 29 percent felt that she was sexually harassed. Of the 29 percent that indicated the scenario depicted sexual harassment, 56 percent felt the harassment began as soon as the professor asked her out, 25 percent felt the harassment began after she turns him down one time and he asks her out a second time, and 19 percent felt that the harassment began after she declines his offer a second time and he asks her out a third time.
Table 5.2  
TABLE INDICATING WHEN SEXUAL HARASSMENT BEGAN  
(in percent)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>First request (N)</th>
<th>Second request (N)</th>
<th>Third Request (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 (36)</td>
<td>49 (66)</td>
<td>23 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>26 (18)</td>
<td>56 (40)</td>
<td>18 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>25 (16)</td>
<td>50 (31)</td>
<td>25 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>22 (14)</td>
<td>53 (35)</td>
<td>25 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>56 (18)</td>
<td>25 (8)</td>
<td>19 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Gender Effects  

1. **Hypothesis One**  

*Women are more likely than men to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment.*  

In order to test this hypothesis, crosstabulation tables were produced for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and gender in scenario 1 which described a situation where a female student accepts the offer of her male professor for dinner at his place (for a more complete description see Appendix B). Forty-three percent of female respondents found the scenario to depict sexual harassment, whereas only 30 percent of the male respondents found the scenario to be depicting sexual harassment (see Table 5.3a). Utilizing the Phi statistic of correlation for a two by two table, gender was found to be significantly correlated with the labeling of scenario 1 as sexual harassment. Women were more likely to label the scenario as being sexual harassment than men were, thereby supporting the research hypothesis that women are
more likely than men to consider professor/student dating to sexual harassment.
(Phi = .18, p = .04)

Table 5.3a

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
(in percent)

SCENARIO 1 STUDENT ACCEPTS PROFESSOR'S REQUEST FOR A DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>43 (41)</td>
<td>30 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>57 (54)</td>
<td>70 (110)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .13, p = .04

2. Hypothesis Two

Women are more likely than men to label repeated requests by a professor for dates as sexual harassment.

In order to test this hypothesis, crosstabulation tables were produced for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and gender in scenario 2 which described a situation where a female student continually declines a male professor's repeated requests for dates. Sixty-six percent of the women felt that the situation depicted sexual harassment, whereas only 46 percent of the men felt that the scenario
depicted sexual harassment. The Phi statistic reflected support for the research hypothesis (see Table 5.3b). Gender was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment, with women being more likely to define the scenario as sexual harassment than men were (Phi = .20 p = .002).

Table 5.3b

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
(in percent)

SCENARIO 2 STUDENT DECLINES PROFESSOR’S REQUEST FOR A DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>66 (65)</td>
<td>46 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>34 (34)</td>
<td>54 (85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .20, p = .002

3. Hypothesis Three

Women are more likely than men to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irrespective of the feelings of admiration for the professor displayed by the student.

In order to test this hypothesis, again crosstabulation tables were produced for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and gender. Scenario 3A
describes a situation in which the female student admires the male professor who is repeatedly asking her out, none-the-less she continues decline his offers. Sixty-five percent of female respondents felt that scenario 3A depicted sexual harassment, 49 percent of the men felt that the scenario depicted sexual harassment (see Table 5.3c). Although it would appear that this result has offered support of the research hypothesis with a higher percentage of women than men labeling scenario 3A as sexual harassment, gender was not found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student is shown to admire the professor (Phi = .16 p=.07).

Table 5.3c

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
(in percent)

SCENARIO 3A STUDENT ADMIRATION BEFORE DATE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment yes</td>
<td>65 (33)</td>
<td>49 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment no</td>
<td>35 (18)</td>
<td>51 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .16, p=.07
In order to test for possible temporal differences in labeling sexual harassment when the student admires the professor, crosstabulation tables were also set up for scenario 3B in which the respondent is not made aware of the student's admiration of the professor until after he asks her out and she declines his offer. Fifty-nine percent of the female respondents felt that scenario 3B depicted sexual harassment and 58 percent of the men felt that the scenario depicted sexual harassment (see Table 5.3d). Again gender was not found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student is shown to admire the professor (\( \Phi = .00, p = .93 \)).

Table 5.3d

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
(in percent)

SCENARIO 3B STUDENT ADMIRATION AFTER DATE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>59 (27)</td>
<td>58 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>41 (19)</td>
<td>42 (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \Phi = .00, p = .93 \)
4. Hypothesis four

Women are more likely than men to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of the "suggestive" actions of the student.

In order to test this hypothesis crosstabulation tables were produced for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and gender for scenarios 4A and 4B. Scenario 4A describes a situation in which a female student offers to massage the neck and back of her male professor prior to his asking her to have dinner with him, she declines his first offer and he continues to ask her out. Scenario 4B describes a situation in which a female student offers to massage a male professor’s back and neck after having declined his request for a date and he continues to ask her out.

Sixty-three percent of the women felt that scenario 4A, in which the student offers to massage the professors neck and shoulders prior to his asking her out, depicted sexual harassment, whereas only 42 percent of the men felt that the scenario depicted sexual harassment (see Table 5.3e). Gender was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student offers a massage prior to the request, with women being more likely than men to define the scenario as sexual harassment (Phi = .20, p=.02).
Table 5.3e

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
(in percent)

SCENARIO 4A  STUDENT OFFERS MASSAGE BEFORE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>63 (32)</td>
<td>42 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>37 (19)</td>
<td>58 (45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .20, p=.02

Thirty-six percent of the women felt that scenario 4B, in which the student offers to massage the professor's neck and back after she declines his offer for dinner, depicted sexual harassment, 25 percent of the men felt that the scenario depicted sexual harassment (see Table 5.3e). However, gender was not found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student offers to massage the professor after having declined his request for a date (Phi = .12, p=.18).
Table 5.3f

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
(in percent)

SCENARIO 4B  STUDENT OFFERS MASSAGE AFTER REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>36 (15)</td>
<td>25 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>63 (26)</td>
<td>75 (57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .12, p=.18

Support for the research hypothesis that women are more likely than men to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of the "suggestive" actions of the student were mixed. When the massage was offered before the request for a date was made, women were more likely to label the repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment. However, if the massage was offered after the first request was declined, women were no more likely than men to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment.
D. Power Awareness

**Hypothesis Five:** Professors will show on average a low awareness of their power over students.

Table 5.4 demonstrates that as a group the sample would appear to have a relatively moderate awareness of personal power, with 68 percent of the sample scoring between 25 and 36 points on the power awareness scale. Thirty-four percent scored more than 36 points indicating high levels of power awareness and only 1 percent scored less 25 points indicating low levels of power awareness. The scale produced a low of score of 22 points, a score 10 points above the lowest score possible by answering negatively to all power awareness questions. The sample mean was 34.7 with a standard deviation of 4.3. Although support for the research hypothesis that professors will show on average a low awareness of their power over students was not found, it was shown that professors are not generally highly aware of their power over students either. Only 12.8 percent of the sample scored 40 points or higher on the scale.

For the purposes of this research the scale was broken down into three categories in which respondents were compared in relationship to one another. Twenty-nine percent of the sample was categorized as having lower levels of power awareness, 38 percent as having moderate levels of power awareness and 33 percent as having higher levels of power awareness.
Table 5.4

CATEGORICAL BREAK DOWN OF POWER AWARENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>level of power awareness</th>
<th>range of scores</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>22-32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>33-36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>37-48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 34.81, S²=4.19

E. Power Effects

1. Hypothesis Six

Professors who indicate higher levels of personal power awareness will be more likely to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment than professors who indicate lower levels of personal power awareness.

In order to test for the effects of professorial awareness of personal power in one's decision to label a professor/student dating as sexual harassment, crosstabulations were constructed for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and level of power awareness in scenario 1, which portrays a male professor and his female student having dinner at his place. In looking at the table for scenario 1 (see Table 5.5a), we find that 52 percent of those with high levels of power awareness have indicated that the situation depicted was sexually harassing, while only 18 percent of those with low levels of power awareness have labeled this scenario as sexual harassment. Support for the research hypothesis was established as power
awareness was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label a date between a professor and a student as sexual harassment, with those professors having higher levels of power awareness being more likely to label the event as sexual harassment (Cramér’s $V = .28$, $p = .0001$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low (N)</th>
<th>Moderate (N)</th>
<th>High (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment yes</td>
<td>18 (12)</td>
<td>33 (31)</td>
<td>52 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>82 (54)</td>
<td>67 (63)</td>
<td>48 (37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramér’s $V = .28$, $p = .0001$

2. Hypothesis Seven

Professors who show higher awareness of personal power will be more likely to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment than professors who show lower levels of personal power awareness.

To test this hypothesis, crosstabulations were again constructed for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and level of power awareness, this time looking at scenario 2, in which a female student continually declines the repeated requests for dates by her male professor. In looking at the table for scenario 2 (see
Table 5.5b), we find that 66 percent of those with high levels of power awareness have indicated that the situation depicted was sexually harassing, while only 45 percent of those with low levels of power awareness have labeled this scenario as sexual harassment. Support for the research hypothesis was again obtained as power awareness was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label a professor's repeated requests of a student for a date as sexual harassment, with those professors having higher levels of power awareness being more likely to label the event as sexual harassment (Cramér's V = .18, p=.02).

Table 5.5b

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY LEVEL OF POWER AWARENESS
(in percent)

SCENARIO 2 STUDENT DECLINES PROFESSOR'S REQUEST FOR A DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Power Awareness</th>
<th>low (N)</th>
<th>moderate (N)</th>
<th>high (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>45 (30)</td>
<td>49 (46)</td>
<td>66 (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>55 (37)</td>
<td>51 (48)</td>
<td>34 (27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramér’s V = .18, p=.02
3. Hypothesis Eight

*Professors who show higher levels of awareness of personal power are more likely than professors who show lower levels of personal power awareness to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of feelings of admiration for the professor displayed by the student.*

In order to test this hypothesis, crosstabulation tables were produced for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and level of power awareness for scenarios 3A and 3B. Scenario 3A describes a situation in which the female student admires the male professor who is repeatedly asking her out, none-the-less she continues to decline his offers. In reading the table for scenario 3A (see Table 5.5c), we find that 70 percent of those with high levels of power awareness have indicated that the situation depicted was sexually harassing, while only 39 percent of those with low levels of power awareness have labeled this scenario as sexual harassment. As predicted, power awareness was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for a date by a professor as sexual harassment even when it is known by the respondent, prior to the professor’s request, that the student admires the professor. Those professors having higher levels of power awareness are more likely to label the event as sexual harassment (Cramér’s V = .25, p=.02).
Table 5.5c

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY LEVEL OF POWER AWARENESS
(in percent)

SCENARIO 3A  STUDENT ADMIRATION BEFORE DATE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Power Awareness</th>
<th>low (N)</th>
<th>moderate (N)</th>
<th>high (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment yes</td>
<td>39 (14)</td>
<td>53 (25)</td>
<td>70 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment no</td>
<td>61 (22)</td>
<td>47 (22)</td>
<td>30 (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramér's V = .25, p = .02

In order to test for possible temporal differences in labeling sexual harassment when the student admires the professor, crosstabulation tables were also set up for scenario 3B in which the respondent is not made aware of the student's admiration of the professor until after he asks her out and she declines his offer. In reading the table for scenario 3B (see Table 5.5d), we find that 63 percent of those with high levels of power awareness have indicated that the situation depicted was sexually harassing and 56 percent of those with low levels of power awareness have labeled this scenario as sexual harassment. Contrary to prediction, power awareness was not found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for a date by a professor as sexual harassment when the student returns to tell the professor that she admires him after declining his request for a date (Cramér's V = .07, p = .75).
4. Hypothesis Nine

Professors who show higher levels of awareness of personal power are more likely than professors who show lower levels of personal power awareness to label repeated requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of "sexually suggestive" actions directed at the professor by the student.

In order to test this hypothesis crosstabulation tables were produced for the bivariate relationship between sexual harassment and gender for scenarios 4A and 4B. Scenario 4A describes a situation in which a female student offers to massage the neck and back of her male professor prior to his asking her to have dinner with him, she declines his first offer and he continues to ask her out. Scenario 4B describes a situation in which a female student offers to massage a male professor's back and neck after having declined his request for a date and he continues to ask her out.

Reading the table for scenario 4A (see Table 5.5e), we find that 61 percent of...
those with high levels of power awareness have indicated that the situation depicted
was sexually harassing and 40 percent of those with low levels of power awareness
have labeled this scenario as sexual harassment. Power awareness however, was not
found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for a
date by a professor as sexual harassment when the student offers to massage the
professor's back and neck prior to his request for a date (Cramér's V = .16, p=.16).

Table 5.5e

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY LEVEL OF POWER AWARENESS
(in percent)

SCENARIO 4A  STUDENT OFFERS MASSAGE BEFORE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>Level of Power Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>40 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>60 (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramér's V = .16, p=.16

Reading the table for scenario 4B (see Table 5.5f), we find that 43 percent of
those with high levels of power awareness have indicated that the situation depicted
was sexually harassing, while only 14 percent of those with low levels of power
awareness have labeled this scenario as sexual harassment. Power awareness in this
case was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label repeated
requests for a date by a professor as sexual harassment when the student offers to
massage the back and neck of the professor after having declined the professor's offer
for dinner, with those professors having higher levels of power awareness being more
likely to label the event as sexual harassment (Cramér's $V = .27$, $p = .02$).

**Table 5.5f**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Harassment by Level of Power Awareness</th>
<th>Level of Power Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ScENARIO 4B  STUDENT OFFERS MASSAGE AFTER REQUEST MADE</td>
<td>low (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramér's $V = .27$, $p = .02$

Mixed results were found in conjunction with support for the hypothesis that
professors who show higher levels of awareness of personal power are more likely
than professors who show lower levels of personal power awareness to label repeated
requests by a professor for dates with a student as sexual harassment irregardless of
"sexually suggestive" actions directed at the professor by the student. When the offer
for the massage occurs before the request for a date, level of power awareness was not
found to be significant in determining whether or not the situation is sexually
harassing. However, when the offer for the massage comes after the student has already declined the request for a date by the professor, level of power awareness was positively correlated with the likelihood to label the situation as sexually harassing.

**F. Gender Differences in Power Awareness**

When testing for significant differences between mean scores on the power awareness scale (see Table 5.6), female professors were found to be more likely to score higher (mean score = 35.9) than male professors (mean score = 34.2) with respect to power awareness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power awareness</td>
<td>35.9, 4.3, 95</td>
<td>34.2, 3.9, 157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 3.32, \ p > .001 \]

**G. Role of Power Awareness on Gender and Sexual Harassment**

In light of the above findings in which level of power awareness was found to play a significant role in one’s decision to label or not to label a situation as sexual harassment and that women were more likely to be aware of personal power, the question is posed; how does power awareness effect the over-all relationship between
gender and sexual harassment? Are differences in awareness of power the critical element in one's decision to label or not to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment or is there some unique quality about being male or female which stands above power awareness differentials? In order to determine the effect power awareness has on the relationship between gender and the labeling of sexual harassment elaboration models, with power awareness as the control variable were constructed for each scenario.

1. **Professor/student dating**

When reading the table 5.7a for scenario 1 in which the student accepts the professor's invitation for dinner, we find that 21 percent of female respondents with low power awareness felt the situation depicted sexual harassment and 17 percent of the male respondents with low power awareness felt the situation depicted sexual harassment. Chi-square tests indicate no significant differences in labeling sexual harassment between men and women with low levels of power awareness ($X^2 = .1197$, $p = .73$). When comparing those respondents with high levels of power awareness, we find similar results. Sixty-two percent of women with high levels of power awareness found the scenario to depict sexual harassment and 44 percent of men with high levels of power awareness found the scenario to depict sexual harassment. Again, no significant differences were found between men and women with high levels of power awareness with respect to labeling the scenario as sexual harassment. Recalling previously obtained results where gender was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood of labeling professor/student dating as sexual harassment (see table
5.4a), it would appear that the partial relationship with power awareness as a control variable has explained away the results of the zero-order relationship, thereby suggesting that it is not gender which determines one’s likelihood to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment, but rather, differences in awareness of personal power. As women are more likely than men to be aware of personal power, they are also more likely to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment.

Table 5.7a

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER CONTROLLING FOR POWER AWARENESS (in percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1</th>
<th>STUDENT ACCEPTS PROFESSOR’S REQUEST FOR A DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>power awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 \text{ (low power awareness)} = .1197, p=.73 \]
\[ X^2 \text{ (moderate power awareness)} = .0128, p=.84 \]
\[ X^2 \text{ (high power awareness)} = 2.627, p=.11 \]
2. Repeated requests for dates

In order to investigate the role which power awareness plays in the relationship between gender and the likelihood of labeling repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment, crosstabulation tables for the trivariate relationship between gender and sexual harassment, controlling for level of power awareness, were created for scenario 2 (see table 5.7b). Fifty-eight percent of female respondents with low power awareness found scenario 2 to be depicting sexual harassment and 38 percent of male respondents with low power awareness found the scenario to be depicting sexual harassment. Sixty-two percent of female respondents with high power awareness found the scenario to be depicting sexual harassment and 44 percent of male respondents found the scenario to be depicting sexual harassment. Although the percentages go in the direction of women being more likely to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment irregardless of power awareness, Chi-square tests indicate no significant differences (p > .05). Once again the result of the elaboration model was one of explanation, whereby the relationship between gender and labeling repeated requests for dates is explained away by the higher level of power awareness shown by women.
Table 5.7b

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
CONTROLLING FOR POWER AWARENESS
(in percent)

SCENARIO 2  STUDENT DECLINES PROFESSOR’S REQUEST FOR A DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>power awareness</th>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>58 (11)</td>
<td>38 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>42 (8)</td>
<td>62 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>61 (20)</td>
<td>43 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>39 (13)</td>
<td>57 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>73 (29)</td>
<td>62 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>27 (11)</td>
<td>39 (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ (low power awareness) = 2.109, p = .15
$X^2$ (moderate power awareness) = 2.771, p = .10
$X^2$ (high power awareness) = 1.075, p = .30

3. **Admiration**

In order to explore the effect power awareness has upon the relationship between gender and the labeling of repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment when the student is known to admire the professor, crosstabulation tables were constructed for the trivariate relationship between gender and labeling sexual harassment, with power awareness as the control variable for scenario 3A. In reading the table, we find that 56 percent of female respondents with low levels of power awareness felt scenario 3A depicted sexual harassment and 31 percent of male respondents with low levels of power awareness felt the scenario depicted sexual
harassment (see Table 5.7c). Of those with high levels of power awareness, 71 percent of the female respondents felt the scenario depicted sexual harassment and 68 percent of male respondents felt the scenario depicted sexual harassment. Chi-square tests indicate no significant gender differences with respect to the labeling of sexual harassment when controlling for power awareness. Recalling the zero-order relationship between gender and the labeling of sexual harassment for scenario 3A, in which gender was not found to be significantly related to the labeling of sexual harassment when it is known by the respondent prior to the professor’s asking his student out that she admires him (see table 5.3c), we find that the partial relationship with power awareness as the control variable has replicated the results of the zero-order relationship thereby strengthening the original finding that gender is not correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment when the student is known by the respondent to admire the professor.
Table 5.7c

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
CONTROLLING FOR POWER AWARENESS
(in percent)

SCENARIO 3A STUDENT ADMIRATION BEFORE DATE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>power</th>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>56 (5)</td>
<td>31 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>44 (4)</td>
<td>69 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>63 (12)</td>
<td>46 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>39 (7)</td>
<td>54 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>71 (15)</td>
<td>68 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>28 (6)</td>
<td>32 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ (low power awareness) = 1.759, p=.18 (Fisher’s One-Tail Exact test)
$X^2$ (moderate power awareness) = 1.272, p=.26
$X^2$ (high power awareness) = .0634, p=.80

As before when testing for the relationship between gender and labeling repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student admires the professor, temporal differences were accounted for by constructing crosstabulation tables for the relationship between gender and labeling sexual harassment for scenario 3B, in which the students admiration of the professor is not known until after she has already declined a date with the professor. Of those with low levels of power awareness, 50 percent of the female and 59 percent of the male respondents labeled scenario 3B as sexual harassment (see table 5.7d). Of those with high levels of power awareness, 56 percent of female and 79 percent of male respondents labeled scenario
3B as sexual harassment. Chi-square tests indicate no significant gender differences in respect to labeling repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when controlling for power awareness ($\alpha > .05$). Once again, gender differences have been explained away by the respondents level of power awareness.

Table 5.7d

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER CONTROLLING FOR POWER AWARENESS (in percent)

SCENARIO 3B STUDENT ADMIRATION AFTER DATE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>power awareness</th>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>50 (5)</td>
<td>59 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>50 (5)</td>
<td>41 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>62 (8)</td>
<td>53 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>38 (5)</td>
<td>47 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>56 (10)</td>
<td>79 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>44 (8)</td>
<td>21 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ (low power awareness) = .2302, $p=.46$ (Fisher’s One-Tail Exact test)

$X^2$ (moderate power awareness) = .2650, $p=.61$

$X^2$ (high power awareness) = 1.849, $p=.16$ (Fisher’s One-Tail Exact test)

4. Suggestive actions by student

Scenario’s 4A and 4B are representative of a situation in which the student acts in what is typically viewed as a sexually suggestive, by offering to massage the
professor's back and neck. In Scenario 4A the offer comes before the professor asks her out. In scenario 4B the offer comes after she has declined his first request for a date.

Table 5.7e is a crosstabulation table of the trivariate relationship between gender and labeling of the situation as sexual harassment, with power awareness as a control variable for scenario 4A. At this point it would be useful to recall the zero-order relationship between gender and labeling the situation sexual harassment for scenario 4A, which found women to be significantly more likely than men to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student offers a massage prior to the professor's requests (see table 5.3e). Recall also that no significant differences were found in the labeling of sexual harassment, with respect to level of power awareness (see table 5.5e). Thus it is likely that controlling for power differences would have no effect on the relationship between gender and labeling sexual harassment, gender should continue to be significant. However, when reading table 5.7e for the trivariate relationship, we find no significant differences between gender and the labeling of sexual harassment when controlling for level of power awareness ($\alpha > .05$). Gender differences have been explained away by differences in power awareness.
Table 5.7e

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
CONTROLLING FOR POWER AWARENESS
(in percent)

SCENARIO 4A  STUDENT OFFERS MASSAGE BEFORE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>power awareness</th>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>44 (4)</td>
<td>36 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>56 (5)</td>
<td>64 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>58 (11)</td>
<td>37 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>42 (8)</td>
<td>63 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>68 (13)</td>
<td>56 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>32 (6)</td>
<td>44 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ (low power awareness) = .1998, $p = .48$ (Fisher’s One-Tail Exact test)

$X^2$ (moderate power awareness) = 2.148, $p = .14$

$X^2$ (high power awareness) = .5511, $p = .46$

For scenario 4B the original zero-order relationship between gender and sexual harassment showed that there were no significant gender differences in the labeling of repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student offers a massage after having declined the professor’s first request, with both being less likely to label the scenario as sexual harassment (see table 5.3f). The zero-order relationship between power and labeling sexual harassment for scenario 4B however, did find significant correlation, with professors who have higher levels of power awareness being more likely than professors with low levels of power awareness to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student offers a massage after having
declined the professor's first request (see table 5.5e).

To explore the effect power awareness has upon the relationship between gender and the labeling of repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment when the student offers to massage the neck and back of the professor after turning him down, crosstabulation tables were constructed for the trivariate relationship between gender and labeling sexual harassment, with power awareness as the control variable for scenario 4A (see table 5.7e). Of those respondents with low levels of power awareness, 38% of female respondents, and 5% of male respondents found the scenario to be depicting sexual harassment. For those respondents with moderate levels of power awareness, 25 percent of female and 21 percent of male respondents found the scenario to be depicting sexual harassment. And of those respondents with high levels of power awareness, 44 percent of female and 41 percent of male respondents found the scenario to be depicting sexual harassment. Chi-square tests indicate no significant gender differences when controlling for level of power awareness with respect scenario 4B as sexual harassment ($\alpha > .05$). The partial relationships for moderate and for high power awareness have replicated the zero-order relationship that there are no significant gender differences when labeling repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student offers a massage after she turns the professor's first request down.
Table 5.7f

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER
CONTROLLING FOR POWER AWARENESS
(in percent)

SCENARIO 4B  STUDENT OFFERS MASSAGE BEFORE REQUEST MADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>power awareness</th>
<th>sexual harassment</th>
<th>female (N)</th>
<th>male (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>38 (3)</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>63 (5)</td>
<td>95 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>25 (3)</td>
<td>21 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>75 (9)</td>
<td>79 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>44 (8)</td>
<td>42 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>56 (10)</td>
<td>58 (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2$ (low power awareness) = 4.929, $p = .06$ (Fisher's One-Tail Exact test)
$X^2$ (moderate power awareness) = .0803, $p = .56$ (Fisher's One-Tail Exact test)
$X^2$ (high power awareness) = .0324, $p = .86$
CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will provide a summary discussion of the major findings of this research project and will offer conclusionary remarks and suggested directions for future research. Section A will discuss the general level of professorial power awareness found amongst UNLV teaching faculty. Section B addresses gender differences in the level of power awareness. Section C looks at gender differences in the labeling of professor/student dating and repeated requests by a professor for dates as being or as not being sexual harassment. Section D discusses the effect levels of personal power awareness has upon the relationship between gender and the labeling of scenarios as sexual harassment. Section E will address limitations of this project. Finally, section F will offer conclusionary remarks.

A. Power awareness

Quantitative measures of power awareness indicated a generally moderate awareness of personal power amongst the teaching faculty surveyed (see chapter 5). That is, most respondents tended to have scores in the middle of the power awareness scale, with few respondents scoring on either extreme. However, comments written in the margins of this section of the questionnaire suggested a greater dispersion in levels of power awareness than was obtained using quantitative measures. Some respondents indicated a basic denial of power with such comments as:
EX1: "Grades are an inducement for students to achieve, not a source of power for faculty to exert."

EX2: "These [giving grades] are things that I do that reflect students work. I can't control their behavior with grades or recommendation, etc. If I could they would all be much better students!"

EX3: "Academically, I expect students to learn the required material and to develop skills of logic and reasoning that facilitate the learning process, I encourage students to utilize my office hours for any help that they may need. Beyond that I make no effort to influence their personal lives."

EX4: "I despise your use of the term Control!"

Further, when responding to the questions of why the various scenarios were not perceived as sexual harassment, many respondents rejected the idea that a power differential between the professor and the student existed or cited the absence of the use of power as the reason sexual harassment did not occur:

EX1: "There is no authority relationship and [there] is no harassment."

EX2: "It would become harassment if he used authority...to 'convince' her."

EX3: "Although persistent, Dr. B. has not (apparently) used his position of authority to coerce."

EX4: "No connection...between invitation and grades."

EX5: "There is no evidence of abuse of power or that her consent was a condition of continued career success."

EX6: "Requests were not linked to his attitude toward her job performance."

Others cited the student's freedom of choice as the basis for their decision not to label a scenario as sexual harassment:

EX1: "She was given a choice."

EX2: "As long as he asks, rather than demands, he is not harassing."
EX3: "It never hurts to ask."

EX4: "He can ask as many times as he wants, she can decline."

EX5: "She wasn’t touched. She wasn’t forced to do anything, she made the choices."

On the other hand, many of the respondents indicated an acute sense of power awareness in referring to the power imbalance between the professor and the student when discussing the sexually harassing nature of a scenario.

EX1: "He is in a position of power over Beth - and therefore this is sexually harassment."

EX2: "Because of the unequal power relation, harassment is inherent in the situation."

EX3: "Dr. A is using his position to set up a relationship with Beth."

EX4: "Her success as a student hinges on her relationship with Dr. A; if she refuses his attention, she may feel that he would in anger thwart her progress."

EX5: "He is her supervisor and should not ask her out in the first place."

EX6: "[Sexual harassment did occur] Because of the power relationship and her firm and consistent refusal."

EX7: "He is in a power position."

EX8: "He’s using his position of power to force her to do something she is obviously uncomfortable with."

EX9: "He is an authority figure who, at least in part, can help or hinder her future."

EX10: "Professors hold nearly absolute power over students - It’s dangerous for a student to turn down any overture. Dr. A should wait until Beth has graduated, then make his move."
EX11: "It's apparently unwelcome conduct per rejections and it is becoming sufficiently frequent given his 'power' to affect her status as his student."

All of these examples suggest a greater dispersion in levels of power awareness among faculty members than was obtained using quantitative measures, thus denoting the need for further refinement of the instrument. This issue will be discussed below.

B. Power Awareness and Gender

One of the more interesting findings was the relationship between power awareness and gender, wherein women were found to be significantly more likely to have a higher level of personal power awareness than men were (t=3.32, p=.001, see table 5.6). One possible explanation of this finding lies in the differences in professional socialization between male and female faculty. Although all professors have power over students regardless of whether they are male or female, the process by which that power was obtained is marked with important differences. Women occupy a much more tenuous position in higher education than men do. As graduate students women are not afforded the same opportunities as men. Their greater responsibility for childrearing, and when married, the geographical constraints of two-career families, the existence of sex discrimination in graduate school polices, and subtle discrimination in the form of disinterest, exclusion, and insults (Schneider 1997, Pp. 47-48) all intensify the power imbalance between women and their professors. Women therefore, enter into the professional world with an acute sense of the authority and power brandished by their newly achieved positions.
C. Gender and Sexual harassment

When the relationship between gender and labeling a scenario as sexual harassment was explored the results were mixed. For instance, gender was found to be positively correlated with the likelihood to label both professor/student dating and repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment (see table 5.3a and table 5.3b), with women being more likely than men to define each as sexual harassment. However, when the student was known to have feelings of admiration for the professor, female respondents were no more likely than male respondents to label the professor’s continued requests for dates as sexual harassment (see table 5.3c). Nor were significant gender differences discovered in the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student returns after having declined a date to tell the professor that she admires him but does not wish to damage their friendship with romantic involvement (see table 5.3d).

Judging from the open-ended responses concerning why this scenario was found or not found to be sexual harassment, it appears that men were as likely as women to view the student’s return to tell the professor that she admired him, but that she did not wish to get romantically involved, as an indication that not only did she not wish to date him, but that she was also becoming uncomfortable with his asking. Several comments by male faculty members illustrate this point:

EX1:  "Her explanation was ignored and countered with invitation."

EX2:  "After she made it clear very politely that she did not wish to go out with him he should have stopped."

EX3:  "She made it clear that future contact was unwanted."
EX4: "**Persisting** in making advances to someone who has made it clear they are unwanted, is harassing that person."

EX5: "She explains her feelings and he keeps asking."

However, we find mixed results when the student acts in a suggestive manner by offering to massage the back and neck of the professor. In scenario 4A, when she offers the massage prior to the professor's first invitation, women were more likely than men to label the repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment (see table 5.3e). Written comments suggest that while women and men both attributed the professor's repeated requests for dates to the student's suggestive offer, men were more likely to offer this explanation. Women, on the other hand were more likely to attribute the students actions to naivete, and charge the professor with responsibility for his actions. For example;

EX1 (male): "She touched him first ["massage"] and he responded."

EX2 (male): "By massaging him, she invited his actions."

EX3 (male): "Rebecca should have never rubbed his neck. This can be construed wrongly by the professor."

EX4 (female): "She should have kept the relationship professional but [the] second time she refused he should have stopped."

EX5 (female): "Potentially some could infer she invited his initial behavior. But her refusal should be enough to keep [the] relationship at [an] appropriate level."

EX6 (female): "She invited some nonprofessional behavior - massaging. He might have misread it and invited her once that's ok -- but don't ask again after being told NO."

However, when the student offered to massage the back and neck of the professor after having declined his request for a date, significant gender differences
were not found in the labeling of the scenario as sexual harassment (see table 5.3f). Both male and female respondents voiced the opinion that the suggestive behavior of the student sent mixed signals and thereby justified the professor's behavior.

EX1 (male): "Anne's massaging Dr. C's back precludes any sexual harassment."

EX2 (male): "If anything, Dr. C was given a message (massage?) that she might be interested in him. Further requests for a date would be understandable."

EX3 (male): "By initiating physical contact with him, she implicated a willingness to become more intimate. Her refusals could be a strategy to heighten his desire."

EX4 (male): "While there was pressure, she made the mistake of physically touching him first."

EX5 (female): "She initiated contact (physical)."

EX6 (female): "She's sending mixed messages, flirting with him."

EX7 (female): "She should not have massaged his back as it sends a mixed message and confuses the issues."

D. Power Awareness and Sexual Harassment

As predicted, those with higher levels of power awareness were more likely than those with lower levels of power awareness to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment (see table 5.5a) and were more likely to view the student's decision to date the professor as implicitly coerced due to power imbalance. Written responses illustrate this finding:

EX1: "Because Dr. A has a position of power towards Beth and she may think her grade and credit for her research depend on seeing Dr. A on a more personal context."
EX2: "She presumably (but it is not made clear) felt she had to do as requested."

EX3: "She’s being coerced into behavior she doesn’t wish to do."

Those with lower levels of power awareness tended to attribute the students acceptance of the professor’s requests to the student’s own freedom of choice.

EX1: "Beth is not forced to do anything against her will. Dr. A was very polite."

EX2: "It is her decision to do as asked."

EX3: "It was her decision to go to dinner with him, that was her mistake."

In fact, the correlation between power awareness and the likelihood to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment was strong enough that when added to the elaboration model as a control variable between gender and the labeling of student/professor dating as sexual harassment, gender differences were explained away (see table 5.7a). That is, when differences in the level of personal power awareness were considered, the relationship between gender and labeling sexual harassment disappeared. Therefore, it is not gender per se which plays the significant role in determining whether or not a respondent will find professor/student dating to be sexual harassment, but rather, differences in power awareness between the genders. In other words, men with high levels of power awareness were as likely as women with high levels of power awareness to label professor/student dating as sexual harassment.

Power awareness was also found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood of labeling repeated requests for dates from a professor as sexual
harassment. Respondents having higher levels of personal power awareness were more likely than those with lower levels of power awareness to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment (see table 5.5b). Further, when controlling for power in the bivariate relationship between gender and sexual harassment, gender differences are again explained away (see table 5.7b). Men with higher levels of power awareness are just as likely as women with higher levels of power awareness to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment.

Power awareness, unlike gender, was also found to be significantly correlated with the labeling of repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student was known to admire the professor before he invited her on the date. Respondents with higher levels of personal power awareness were more likely than those with lower levels of personal power awareness to label the repeated requests as sexual harassment (see table 5.5c). Written comments again suggested that respondents with high levels of power awareness believed to the unequal relationship between professor and student was the major criterion for labeling sexual harassment:

EX1: "As stated before - he could make or break her future."

EX2: "Y. should not have a relationship with a student while she is in his class."

EX3: "Invitation comes from a position of power."

EX4: "Because Dr. Y is in a position of authority and power and insisted even when refused."

However, as with gender, differences in power awareness were not found to be significantly correlated with the labeling of repeated requests for dates as sexual
harassment when the student returns to tell the professor that she admires him but does not wish to pursue a romantic relationship. Here, it would appear that the student's statement of admiration was taken to be adequate clarification of her position. Respondents who based their decision to label the scenario as sexual harassment on the "clarity and finality" with which the student rejected the professor's offer for a date, rather than upon inherent power differentials, were as likely to find the situation to depict sexual harassment as those respondents who based their decision upon power inequality.

EX1: "Dr. F should have enough information now to understand Julie's feelings."

EX2: "On a continuum...after she states her desire to be friends she obviously saw [the] drinks invite as beyond the pail."

EX3: "Julie clearly stated her feelings of NO, yet Dr. F continues to ask."

Interestingly, power awareness, unlike gender, was not found to be significantly related to the likelihood of labeling or not labeling repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the student offered to massage the professor's back and neck before he asks her out (see table 5.7e). It would appear that something in the suggestive nature of a massage, cut across power differences, while not across gender differences. This was not the case, however, when considering scenario 4B in which the massage offer was made after the student declined the professor's initial request for a date. While no significant gender differences were found in judging repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment when the offer for a massage occurs after the student declines the professor's request for a date (see table 5.5f), the level
of personal power awareness was found to be significantly correlated with the likelihood to label the situation sexual harassment (see table 5.7f). In this case, written comments suggest that those with high levels of power awareness who labeled the situation sexual harassment deemed the students "inappropriate" actions as irrelevant in making their decision. The feeling appeared to be that the professor is ultimately responsible for his actions because he is in a position of authority over the student.

EX1: "Since Dr. D is in a position of very substantial power towards Rebecca, there is an implied threat. This behavior would only be appropriate after the dissertation is approved and then only marginally."

EX2: "She was unwise in agreeing to the physical contact (massage). His behavior becomes more inappropriate because he is in more of a power relationship as chair of dissertation committee."

EX3: "Although she acted somewhat inappropriately initially and sent a mixed signal to Dr. S. However, Dr. D should not get involved with students and should know better."

On the other hand those, respondents who did not label the situation as sexual harassment tended to feel that the power difference as well as the "inappropriateness" of his actions became irrelevant once she offered the massage.

EX1: "If anything, Dr. C was given a message (massage?) that she might be interested in him. Further requests for a date would be understandable."

EX2: "Anne opened herself up to pursuit with physical contact of massage."

EX3: "Why should she massage his neck and back if she really does not want to go out with him? (her behavior is inadequate if she doesn’t want to go out with him.)"

EX4: "After the back rub, I’d say it’s only a matter of time until she accepts an invitation."
E. Conclusions

Level of power awareness was found to play a significant role in one’s decision to label or not to label professor student dating and repeated requests for dates by a professor as sexual harassment. Further, the relationship between power awareness and labeling sexual harassment was found to have been responsible for gender differences in the labeling of professor/student dating and repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment or not. This finding could prove to be most significant. If indeed being more aware of one’s personal power as a professor raises the likelihood that particular behaviors would be viewed as sexual harassment, then it follows that those professors with higher degrees of power awareness would be less likely to engage in such activities and more likely to support students who were feeling harassed by the sexual advances of professors, thereby making academia a safer institution for students, one much more conducive to the goals of education. If indeed this the case, one can clearly see the need for raising professors’ awareness of the power that they hold over students.

F. Limitations and suggestions for future research

This project marks the first attempt at the construction of a personal power awareness scale. Although much was learned about the relationship between power awareness and sexual harassment, future research would benefit from further refinement of the scale. The addition of a question set signifying a general understanding of power itself could be advantageous for future research. For instance, is it possible to have power and not use it? Is power inherently negative or
can it be used for honorable purposes? Further, a set of questions which examines professorial relations with students in a more systematic fashion might also be useful. (i.e. In general, when students are angry with me, they feel free to say so to my face, or Students who go out of their way to be polite to me are usually genuine in their friendliness.)

This is not to say that the power awareness scale obtained in this project was not valuable, for there was sufficient diversity in response categories to produce a basic understanding of the level of power that UNLV teaching faculty feel they hold over their students. Further, as predicted, this diversity was shown to be positively correlated with the likelihood to label repeated requests for dates as sexual harassment, thereby contributing to the construct validity of the scale.

As previously stated (Chapter IV), low response rate was also a limitation of this study. It would appear that some non-responders were discouraged from responding because the survey only dealt with cases in which male professors were attempting to initiate a relationship with a female student. Thus response rate might have been boosted by the inclusion of a scenario in which a female professor attempted to initiate a relationship with a male student. Further the over-representation of female teaching faculty must be kept in mind when considering the generalizability of the results of this study. Again, the inclusion of a female professor/male student example might have encouraged more males to respond to the survey. Time and budget constraints further compounded the low response rate.

With additional resources, follow up surveys which have been found to boost response
rates (Frey 1986) could have been mailed out.

Additional research is needed in this area before any solid conclusions can be drawn. As noted above, further refinement of the power awareness scale would be an important step in this direction. The adaptation of such a power awareness scale in research which addresses other forms of sexual harassment would also be useful in evaluating the impact of the findings of this project. For example, does the relationship between personal power awareness and sexual harassment change when considering "more severe" Quid Pro Quo forms of harassment?

While previous research has addressed professorial awareness of their personal power over students, it has been based on largely conjecture and speculation. No attempts have been made to systematically investigate the issue. This project has added to the literature on academic sexual harassment by empirically exploring the issue of personal power awareness and its interconnectedness with gender and the labeling of sexual harassment. It is the hope of this researcher that this project can be used as a foundation upon which further investigation of personal power awareness may take place.
APPENDIX A

APPROVAL, COVER, AND REMINDER LETTERS
TO: Melissa Monson  
FROM: Dr. William Schulze, Director, Office of Research Administration  
DATE: 2 November 1993  
RE: Status of Human Subject Protocol entitled: "Survey of Faculty Attitudes on Conceptual Relationships"

This memorandum is official notification that the protocol for the project reference above has been approved. This approval is for a one year duration. At the end of the year, you must notify this office if the project will be continued.

If you have any questions or require any assistance, please give us a call.
Dear UNLV Faculty Member:

In recent months, there has been much discussion across the academic community concerning consensual romantic relationships between professors and students. Many universities have made no attempt to regulate professor/student relationships in any formal manner. Others have adopted policies which treat such relations as "unwise" but leave the final decision up to the parties involved. Still others, have begun to adopt policies which prohibit such relations all together. In this survey we wish to find out what you think about the appropriateness of romantic relationships between students and professors.

This study is being conducted as part of a Master’s Thesis in Sociology. The questionnaire has been sent to all teaching faculty at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary; however, in order to gather a fair impression about opinions concerning these issues, it is important that as many people as possible respond to the survey. Please be assured that your answers will be kept COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. No records of identification will be kept. Once the survey has been mailed out there will be no way of attaching any given questionnaire to any given respondent. When you have finished, please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope through campus mail to the Department of Sociology. (Mail Code - 5033)

Your participation is much appreciated and I would like to thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Melissa Monson
Graduate Student,
Department of Sociology
Dear UNLV faculty member,

Recently you received a survey regarding consensual relationships between professors and students. This letter is to request those of you who have not yet responded to take a few minutes and fill out the questionnaire. Since I hope to attain a sample representative of UNLV faculty, it is important that everyone have a voice. If you have lost or misplaced the survey please contact Melissa Monson in the Department of Sociology (895-3322) and I will have a new copy sent to you via campus mail. If you have already responded to the survey, I would like to thank you for your participation, your assistance in this project has been invaluable.

A copy of the results will be made available to all interested through a posting in the faculty update.

Thank you again for your time and insight.

Sincerely,

Melissa Monson
Department of Sociology
APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION ONE

This first section of the questionnaire is composed of several short scenarios. Each scenario is followed by a series of questions regarding the appropriate or inappropriateness of the behavior of the actors depicted. PLEASE READ THROUGH EACH SCENARIO AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS WHICH FOLLOW BY CIRCLING THE NUMBER WHICH MOST CLOSELY DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION.

Scenario #1

Beth, a graduate student, has been working closely with Dr. A on a research project for the last couple of months. The two of them have developed a good working rapport. Recently, Dr. A has found himself developing a romantic attraction to Beth. So upon their next meeting Dr. A decides to ask Beth if she would join him for dinner at his place. Beth accepts his offer.

a. I would infer that Beth wanted to go out with Dr. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. A’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Beth’s behavior?
Upon arriving at Dr. A’s home, it becomes apparent that Beth is very anxious. At the table she tears her napkin into tiny pieces, and repeatedly glances at her watch. After finishing their meal, Dr. A invites Beth to come sit on the sofa with him so that they can talk. Beth accepts, but sits on the opposite end of the sofa from Dr. A.

a. I would infer that Beth wanted to sit on the sofa with Dr. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. A’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Beth’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. A jokingly tells Beth that he can hardly see her all the way over there, and requests that she sit a little closer. Nervously, returning his laughter, Beth moves closer to Dr. A. To break the tension, Dr. A asks Beth how her day went. Beth takes a deep breath, smiles and begins to tell him.

a. I would infer that Beth is romantically interested in Dr. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. A's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Beth's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. At any point in this scenario was Beth sexually harassed?

1. Yes 2. No

e. If yes, at what point in the scenario does the harassment occur?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

f. Why do or why don’t you feel that Beth was sexually harassed?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
Scenario #2

Liz, a graduate student, has been working closely with Dr. B on a research project for the last couple of months. The two of them have developed a good working rapport. Recently, Dr. B has found himself acquiring a romantic attraction to Liz. So upon their next meeting Dr. B decides to ask Liz if she would join him for dinner at his place. Liz declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Liz wanted to go out with Dr. B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. B’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Liz’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later Liz returns to his office to pick up some papers she had left earlier. Unconvinced that Liz really did not want to go out with him and still hoping to start a relationship with her, Dr. B says, "You know, Liz, I think you are a very special person, and I just want the opportunity to get to know you better." Apologetically, Liz again declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Liz wanted to go out with Dr. B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. How appropriate was Dr. B's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Liz's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. B accepts Liz's refusal. However the next day, upon seeing her again, Dr. B is compelled to try yet one more time, and he asks Liz if she would care to join him for drinks later that evening. Again Liz declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Liz wanted to go out with Dr. B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. B's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Liz's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. At any point in this scenario was Liz sexually harassed?

1. Yes 2. No
e. If yes, at what point in the scenario does the harassment occur?


f. If no, how many more times do you think Dr. B would have to ask Liz out before his behavior becomes harassing, if ever? _______
(Please explain)


g. Why do you or why don’t you feel that Liz was sexually harassed?


Scenario #3A

Jill is a graduate student in Dr. Y’s class. Her last paper showed academic promise and Dr. Y requested that she come by his office so that they might discuss the possibility of revising in for publication. After working together for a few months, Jill has come to admire the intellect and professionalism of the professor. And recently, Dr. Y finds that he is developing a romantic attraction for Jill. So upon their next meeting he decides to ask her if she would join him at his place for dinner. Jill declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Jill wanted to go out with Dr. Y.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. How appropriate was Dr. Y's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Jill's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unconvinced that Jill really did not want to go out with him and still hoping to start a relationship with her, Dr. Y says, "You know, Jill, I think you are a very special person, and I just want the opportunity to get to know you better." Apologetically, Jill again declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Jill wanted to go out with Dr. Y.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. Y's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Jill's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Y accepts Jill’s refusal. However the next day, upon seeing her again, Dr. Y is compelled to try yet one more time, and he asks Jill if she would care to join him for drinks later that evening. Again Jill declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Jill wanted to go out with Dr. Y.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. Y’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Jill’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. At any point in this scenario was Jill sexually harassed?

1. Yes  2. No

e. If yes, at what point in the scenario does the harassment occur?

__________________________

__________________________

f. If no, how many more times do you think Dr. Y would have to ask Jill out before his behavior becomes harassing, if ever? _______

(Please explain)

__________________________

__________________________
Scenario #3B

Julie is Dr. F’s teaching assistant. As the end of the semester approaches the two of them have been working together more frequently, grading papers and writing exams. Recently Dr. F has found himself developing a romantic attraction to Julie. So upon their next meeting Dr. F decides to ask Julie if she would join him at his place for dinner. Julie declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Julie wanted to go out with Dr. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. F’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Julies’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Later Julie returns to Dr. F’s office saying that she hopes there are no hard feelings, that she admires him greatly and wouldn’t want to do something which might jeopardize their friendship. Unconvinced that Julie really did not want to go and still hoping to start a romantic relationship with her, Dr. F says, "You know, Julie, I think you are a very special person and I just want the opportunity to get to know you better." Apologetically, Julie again declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Julie wanted to go out with Dr. F.

Strongly Agree Neutral Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

b. How appropriate was Dr. F’s behavior?

Very Appropriate Neutral Very Inappropriate
1 2 3 4 5

c. How appropriate was Julie’s behavior?

Very Appropriate Neutral Very Inappropriate
1 2 3 4 5

Dr. F accepts Julie’s refusal. However the next day, upon seeing her again, Dr. F is compelled to try yet one more time, and he asks Julie if she would care to join him for drinks later that evening. Again Julie declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Julie wanted to go out with Dr. F.

Strongly Agree Neutral Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5
b. How appropriate was Dr. F's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Julie's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. At any point in this scenario was Julie sexually harassed?

1. Yes  2. No

e. If yes, at what point in the scenario does the harassment occur?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

f. If no, how many more times do you think Dr. F would have to ask Liz out before his behavior becomes harassing, if ever? _______

(Please explain)

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

___________________________


g. Why do you or why don't you feel that Julie was sexually harassed?

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

___________________________
Scenario #4A

Dr. D is the chair of Rebecca’s dissertation committee. She has been working very closely with Dr. D preparing for her oral defense and putting the finishing touches on her project. During their last meeting when Dr. D complained that the pressures of the office and the classroom were wearing him down, Rebecca offered to massage his neck and back in order to help relieve some of the tension. And recently, Dr. D has found himself developing a romantic attraction to Rebecca. So upon their next meeting he decides to ask Rebecca if she would join him at his place for dinner. Rebecca declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Rebecca wanted to go out with Dr. D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. D’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Rebecca’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unconvinced that Rebecca really did not want to go out with him and still hoping to start a relationship with her, Dr. D says, "You know, Rebecca, I think you are a very special person, and I just want the opportunity to get to know you better." Apologetically, Rebecca again declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Rebecca wanted to go out with Dr. D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. How appropriate was Dr. D’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Rebecca’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. D accepts Rebecca’s refusal. However the next day, upon seeing her again, Dr. D is compelled to try yet one more time, and he asks Rebecca if she would care to join him for drinks later that evening. Again Rebecca declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Rebecca wanted to go out with Dr. D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. D’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Rebecca’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. At any point in this scenario was Rebecca sexually harassed?

1. Yes 2. No
e. If yes, at what point in the scenario does the harassment occur?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

f. If no, how many more times do you think Dr. D would have to ask Rebecca out before his behavior becomes harassing, if ever? ______
(Please explain)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

g. Why do you or why don’t you feel that Rebecca was sexually harassed?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Scenario #4B

Anne, a graduate student, teaches an introductory class under the supervision of Dr. C. The two of them have weekly meetings to discuss the organization and content of the course, as well as any problems or innovations Anne might have. Recently, Dr. C has found himself developing a romantic attraction to Anne. So upon their next meeting he decides to ask Anne if she would join him at his place for dinner. Anne declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Anne wanted to go out with Dr. C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. C’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. How appropriate was Anne's behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later Anne returns to Dr. C's office saying that she hopes there are no hard feelings and begins to massage his neck and back. Unconvinced that Anne really did not want to go out with him and still hoping to start a relationship with her, Dr. C says, "You know, Anne, I think you are a very special person, and I just want the opportunity to get to know you better." Apologetically, Anne again declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Anne wanted to go out with Dr. C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. C’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Anne’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. C accepts Anne’s refusal. However the next day, upon seeing her again, Dr. C is compelled to try yet one more time, and he asks Anne if she would care to join him for drinks later that evening. Again Anne declines his offer.

a. I would infer that Anne wanted to go out with Dr. C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. How appropriate was Dr. C’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. How appropriate was Anne’s behavior?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Appropriate</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. At any point in this scenario was Anne sexually harassed?

1. Yes 2. No

e. If yes, at what point in the scenario does the harassment occur?

f. If no, how many more times do you think Dr. C would have to ask Anne out before his behavior becomes harassing, if ever? ______

(Please explain)
g. Why do you or why don’t you feel that Anne was sexually harassed?

SECTION TWO

In this section of the questionnaire we are interested in the influence that you personally feel you have as a professor in the lives of your students. FOR EACH QUESTION PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH MOST CLOSELY DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION.

Q-1 Please circle the number indicating whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

a. I have the ability to enhance a student’s self-confidence.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree

b. I have little influence over students while they are taking my classes.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree

c. I have little control over a student’s intellectual growth.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree

d. Grades are a major source of control that I have over students.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree
e. I see myself as an ethical role model for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Letters of recommendation are not a major source of control that I have over students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. The ability to recognize intellectual accomplishment is a source of control that I have over students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h. I have had friendships based upon equality with students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. I do not see myself as personal role model for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j. I have the ability to intellectually motivate my students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

k. I have very little influence over students outside of the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I do not see myself as an intellectual role model for students.

Next we are interested in the influence you feel professors in general have upon their students.

Q-2 Please circle the number indicating whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

a. Professors have the ability to intellectually motivate their students.

b. Professors have little control over a student’s self confidence.

c. Students see professors as role models.

d. Students perceive professors as having more knowledge than professors actually have.
e. Professors have the ability to diminish a student's self-confidence.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
   1 2 3 4

f. Professors have less power than students perceive professors as having.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
   1 2 3 4

g. Professors have less influence over graduate students than they have over undergraduates.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
   1 2 3 4

SECTION THREE

In this section of the questionnaire we would like to ask you some general questions concerning sexual harassment. FOR EACH QUESTION PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH MOST CLOSELY DESCRIBES YOUR OPINION.

Q-3 Please circle the number indicating whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

a. Sexual harassment is a serious problem on college campuses.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
   1 2 3 4

b. There is no such thing as sexual harassment.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
   1 2 3 4
c. Sexual harassers are usually aware that they are offending their victims.
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1       | 2        | 3        | 4     |


d. Victims of sexual harassment have usually encouraged the harassing behavior.
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1       | 2        | 3        | 4     |


e. Sexual harassment can be harmful to the victim
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1       | 2        | 3        | 4     |

f. Victims of sexual harassment can stop the behavior if they want to.
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1       | 2        | 3        | 4     |

g. Sexual harassers should be reported to their superiors.
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1       | 2        | 3        | 4     |

h. Most sexual harassment charges are valid.
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1       | 2        | 3        | 4     |

i. Victims should just ignore sexual harassment.
   | Strongly | Disagree | Strongly | Agree |
   | 1       | 2        | 3        | 4     |
j. It is inappropriate for students to make sexual bargains with their teachers.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly
   Disagree Agree
   1  2  3  4

k. An attractive man should expect sexual harassment and learn how to handle it.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly
   Disagree Agree
   1  2  3  4

l. Consenting sexual relationships between a student and faculty members are professional inappropriate.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly
   Disagree Agree
   1  2  3  4

m. An attractive woman should expect sexual harassment and learn how to handle it.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly
   Disagree Agree
   1  2  3  4

n. It is only natural for a student to make sexual advances toward an attractive faculty member.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly
   Disagree Agree
   1  2  3  4

o. Consenting sexual relations between colleagues is inappropriate.
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly
   Disagree Agree
   1  2  3  4
It is only natural for a colleague to make sexual advances toward an attractive colleague.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION FOUR

In this last section we are interested in some information about yourself which will help in the statistical analysis of this study.

a. What is your age? ________________ years

b. What is your sex? 1. Female 2. Male

c. In which category or ethnic background would you classify yourself?
   1. Spanish, Hispanic, or Mexican American
   2. Indian or Native American
   3. African American
   4. Asian American or Pacific Islander
   5. European American
   6. Other (please specify) ___________________________

d. What is your current religious affiliation or preference?
   1. Catholic 4. Latter Day Saint (Mormon)
   2. Jewish 5. None
   3. Protestant 6. Other (please specify) ______

e. How important are religious beliefs in your everyday life?
   1. Very important
   2. Important
   3. Neutral
   4. Not very important
   5. Not at all important
f. What is your marital status:
   1. Single, never married
   2. Single, divorced
   3. Married
   4. Widow
   5. Live with partner, not married

g. On domestic social policy issues, would you consider yourself to be:
   1. Very liberal
   2. Liberal
   3. Middle-of-the-road
   4. Conservative
   5. Very conservative

h. What is your salary before taxes?
   1. Less than $15,000
   2. $15,000 to $24,999
   3. $25,000 to $39,999
   4. $40,000 to $49,999
   5. $50,000 to $59,999
   6. $60,000 to $69,999
   7. $70,000 to $99,999
   8. $100,000 or more

i. Is your position
   1. Full-time, 10 month contract
   2. Full-time, 12 month contract
   3. Other: _______________________________

j. Are you in a position that is:
   1. Tenure track
   2. Non-tenure track

k. Are you currently tenured?
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Does not apply.

l. What is your current faculty rank?
   1. Full Professor
   2. Associate Professor
   3. Assistant Professor
   4. Instructor/Lecturer (full-time)
   5. Instructor/Lecturer (part-time)
m. What College do you belong to?

1. Business and Economics
2. Communication
3. Education
4. Engineering
5. Fine and Performing Arts
6. Health Sciences
7. Hotel Administration
8. Human Performance and Development
9. Liberal Arts
10. Science and Mathematics

Please write any additional comments you would like to make about any of the questions or issues in this questionnaire. Thank you once again for your assistance.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


