

SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON THE YSU CAMPUS

Julie DeGalan

Center for Urban Studies

Youngstown State University

February 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
List of Tables.....	ii
Sexual Harassment On The YSU Campus.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Definitions.....	3
Methodology.....	4
Conclusions.....	32
Appendix: Administrative Procedure For Handling Complaints	34

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1	University Status of Respondents and Type of Survey Used.....	6
2	Student Demographics.....	8
3	Employee Demographics.....	9
4	Respondents Experiencing Sexual Harassment.....	11
5	Female Phone Respondents Experiencing Sexual Harassment.	14
6	Response to Proposition.....	16
7	Taken Measures to Avoid Faculty (or Staff) Advances.....	17
8	Shielding Measures Taken by Employees.....	19
9	Perceived Frequency of Instructor-Suggested Sex-For-Grade Exchange.....	20
10	Exchange of Sex for Favorable Academic Treatment a Serious Problem at YSU.....	21
11	Known Propositions Among Friends and Acquaintances.....	23
12	Thought About Initiating a Relationship.....	25
13	Employees Only How Unwanted Advances Handled.....	26
14	Employees Only Perceived Occurrence of Faculty Approaching Other Employees to Exchange Sex for Promise of Favorable Academic Treatment.....	27
15	Employees Only Thought About Initiating Sexual Relationship With Another Employee.....	29
16	Employees Only Experienced Unwanted Student Advances.....	30

Sexual Harassment On The YSU Campus

Sexual harassment has probably occurred on college campuses as long as there have been students and teachers. Although a perpetual problem, sexual harassment was not considered a major issue confronting college administrators until the mid-1970s when women on campus began to seek legal remedies (Field, 1981). Prior to this time, victims of harassment, because of fear of retaliation or sanction, concern for subsequent promotion or advancement, or feelings of guilt or embarrassment, typically endured abuses or fled to a less hostile environment. Sexual harassment was a "dark secret."

With the increased publicity about sexual harassment on campus, university researchers, women's issue advocacy groups, and other concerned individuals have studied the problem at several colleges or universities across the country. The President's National Advisory Council on Women's Education Programs (NACWEP) reported in a nation-wide survey that sexual harassment on campus was a problem everywhere (Till, 1980). Another researcher reviewing studies of sexual harassment in higher education concluded that the problem is "frighteningly pervasive (Crocker, 1982)."

An emerging issue for colleges and universities appears to be not whether sexual harassment exists--for it probably exists in some form everywhere--but how prevalent it is on campus. Certainly any level of harassment is too much, but most studies suggest that the problem confronts large numbers in the faculty, administration, and student body. At the University of California-Berkeley, a study estimated that between 20 and 30 percent of senior class women had been harassed (Benson and Thomson, 1982).

In a survey done at the University of Rhode Island, six percent of those sampled reported being sexually assaulted (Lott, 1982). At East Carolina University in North Carolina, 30 percent of the women students surveyed said that they had been verbally harassed by male professors (Field, 1981).

The findings in the accumulating literature suggest that the problem could be considered extreme, yet for individual colleges and universities, there appears to be vast differences in prevalence of sexual harassment. In looking closely at these studies, it becomes clear that differences may arise for at least three reasons: (1) there are wide differences in the size, type, and location of the universities and colleges studied, (2) studies conducted have defined sexual harassment in various ways, and (3) researchers have used disparate methodologies (e.g., surveys by telephone, mail, and personal interview) to gather information.

Even though the problem of sexual harassment has been the subject of public debate for several years now, the number of scientific studies of the problem on campus remains small. Given the fact that research has been conducted at separate universities, with different methodologies, according to varying conceptions of harassment, there still remains a need to continue to study harassment. Only then will a clearer picture of the problem, and hopefully of solutions, emerge.

In the Spring of 1985, administrators at Youngstown State University, as part of their continuing program to monitor opinion and preferences in the university community, conducted a study of sexual harassment on campus. The study presented the opportunity to expand our knowledge of sexual harassment in several ways. First, the study was conducted at a medium-sized state university in the Mid-West. Most other studies have been done

at larger campuses on the East and West coasts of the United States. Second, the study incorporated several measures of sexual harassment so that many of its dimensions or levels could be analyzed. Third, the study methodology employed a unique combination of survey methods so that biases in using some methods could be understood by using data from another. A combination of self-administered (in class and mail) and telephone surveys were utilized and targeted at several populations likely to be the victims of sexual harassment.

Definitions

The term "sexual harassment" has many meanings. In the NACWEP call for information on the prevalence of harassment (Till, 1980), the term was not defined--the purpose was to form a victim-based meaning. Using the responses, a definition was formulated:

Academic sexual harassment is the use of authority to emphasize the sexuality or sexual identity of a student in a manner which prevents or impairs that student's full enjoyment of educational benefits, climate, or opportunities.

Five levels of sexual harassment emerged from the comments given on that survey:

1. Generalized sexist remarks and/or behavior;
2. Inappropriate and offensive, but essentially sanction-free sexual advances; sanction-free meaning no promises or threats were made;
3. Solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by promise of rewards;

4. Coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment; and
5. Sexual assaults.

These levels are not clear-cut; sometimes two harassing behaviors may occur during one incident. For example, someone may be promised a reward for compliance and also be threatened. The common threads found in each of these five levels are:

1. Distortion of a formal, sex neutral relationship by an unwelcome, non-reciprocal emphasis on the sexuality or sexual identity of the student; and
2. Infliction of harm on the student.

Sexual harassment in the work place was recognized earlier than harassment in academe. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued guidelines under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlining the liability for sexual harassment in the work place.

The important element in any type of sexually harassing behavior is that the perpetrator has power over the victim--power to fire or give poor evaluations of work performance, or power to give low grades for, or uncomplimentary assessments of, a student's class work or research. This study examined sexual harassment in the work place and in the classroom by involving faculty, staff, administrators, and students (current, withdrawn, and graduated).

Methodology

During Spring Quarter 1985, the Center for Urban Studies at Youngstown State University contacted four groups in the university community, including: (1) currently enrolled students, (2) recent university

graduates, (3) students who had withdrawn, and (4) faculty, staff, and administrators. Currently enrolled students were contacted through selected classes and asked to participate in order to determine the extent of sexual harassment experienced using the five levels described previously. This group constituted the student base. Three target groups of female students were surveyed by phone, and key questions were compared with the student base. Because the literature states that females are sexually harassed more often than males, current female students were chosen as one target group. Graduated and withdrawn females were also targeted in order to determine whether females would answer questions differently once they left the university. These former students might consider themselves out of danger from reprisals for any reports they might make.

All full-time faculty, staff, and administrators were mailed questionnaires and asked to participate to determine the number of individuals affected; the returned surveys constituted the employee base.

Table 1 shows the status group, type of survey, sex, and number of completed questionnaires for each group.

(Place Table 1 Here.)

Surveys were sent to all full-time faculty, staff, and administrators (n=1,472) and 662 were returned, making the response rate for this group 45 percent. Eighty courses out of approximately 1,850 were chosen in a systematic random fashion[11] from the Spring 1985 schedule of classes and surveys from 46 classes were returned, including over 1,100 self-administered surveys. In addition, three groups of women were targeted in the phone survey segment of the research--current, withdrawn, and graduated

Table 1

University Status of Respondents and Type of Survey Used

Status Group	Type of Survey	Women		Men		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Currently enrolled students	Self-administered in class	612	51.8	544	46.0	1,182*	51.3
Currently enrolled students	Phone	200	100.0	0	0.0	200	8.7
Graduates	Phone	98	100.0	0	0.0	98	4.2
Withdrawn students	Phone	145	100.0	0	0.0	145	6.3
Administrators, Faculty, Staff	Self-administered, mailed	325	47.7	337	49.5	681*	29.5
Total		1,380	59.8	884	38.3	2,306*	100.0

*Number of women and men do not equal total because some respondents on the self-administered survey did not indicate their sex.

students. Names of female respondents were drawn from lists provided by the Registrar's Office. Some 200 current student, 98 graduate, and 140 withdrawn student surveys were completed.

Initially, the demographics of the total student population and the sample student group were compared to determine the representativeness of the sample. Males were underrepresented by about 6 percent, and females overrepresented by approximately 4 percent. Two percent didn't indicate their sex. The racial makeup of the student sample was almost identical to the total population. Class rank subpopulations were different from the total student population as follows: 7.9 percent fewer freshmen, 2.0 percent more sophomores, 5.8 percent more juniors, 0.7 more seniors, and 0.5 percent fewer graduate students.

(Place Table 2 Here.)

Employee total and sample populations were also compared. Males were overrepresented, and females were underrepresented by about 5 percent. Racially, there were 4 percent more whites, 2 percent fewer blacks, and 2 percent fewer "other" races in the survey population than in the total population.

(Place Table 3 Here.)

Survey Findings

Five kinds of sexually harassing behaviors including generalized sexist behavior, inappropriate and offensive but sanction-free sexual advances, solicitation of sexual activity by promise of rewards, coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment, and sexual assaults were initially explored.

Females more than males in each of the groups surveyed experienced some form of general sexual harassment.

Table 2

Student Demographics

	Survey Population		University Population	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	544	46.0	7,324	52.3
Female	612	51.8	6,685	47.7
Undetermined	26	2.2	-----	-----
<u>Race</u>				
White	1,046	91.1	12,591	89.9
Black	73	6.4	1,032	7.4
Other	29	2.5	386	2.8
<u>Class Rank</u>				
Freshman	243	20.9	4,041	28.8
Sophomore	284	24.4	3,139	22.4
Junior	288	24.7	2,651	18.9
Senior	267	22.9	3,113	22.2
Graduate	82	7.1	1,065	7.6

Table 3
Employee Demographics

	Survey Population		University Population	
	N	%	N	%
<u>Sex</u>				
Male	337	50.9	591	56.3
Female	325	49.1	458	43.7
<u>Race</u>				
White	608	93.4	935	89.1
Black	32	4.9	71	6.8
Other	11	1.7	43	4.1

Currently enrolled students were asked whether they had experienced any of the following unwanted or objectionable behaviors: a sexual leer or look, sexual comment or suggestion, or physical contact (pinching, hugging). All these behaviors were classified as general sexual harassment and were not necessarily linked to the university staff or environment. Over one-third of the female students (36.8%), and fewer than one-tenth of the male students (7.0%) indicated that they had experienced at least one of these behaviors.

(Place Table 4 Here.)

Employees of the university, including faculty, staff, and administrators, were asked the same question. Female employees responded in approximately the same proportion as the female students; approximately one-third (34.5%) said they experienced general sexual harassment. Almost 9 percent (7.7%) of the male employees had also been subjected to this kind of behavior. These data were analyzed to determine if there were differences in the way female and male students and employees answered the question. For both students and employees, significantly more females than males responded that they had been subjected to general sexual harassment.

The experiencing of four types of behaviors that involve the use of power that may inflict harm, either in academe or the work place, were extracted from questions asked in the survey. These actions included faculty or staff sexual advances that were (1) sanction-free, or (2) involved the exchange of sex for a promise of a better grade, recommendation, employment, or promotion, or (3) involved a threat for non-compliance. Also, respondents were asked about sexual assault believed to be perpetrated by a faculty or staff member.

Table 4

Respondents Experiencing Sexual Harassment

	Students				Employees			
	Females		Males		Females		Males	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
General Sexual Harassment*	225	36.8	38	7.0	112	34.5	26	7.7
Sanction-free Sexual Advance by Faculty [or staff] Member	12	2.0	4	0.7	42	12.9	5	1.5
Advance involved exchange of sex for promise of better grade, recommendation, employment, or promotion	15	2.5	5	0.9	3	0.9	0	0.0
Advance involved threat for non-compliance	3	0.5	0	0.0	3	0.9	3	0.9
Sexual assault believed to be perpetrated by faculty or staff	2	0.3	0	0.0	--	--	--	---
Total population	612		544		325		337	

*At the .05 level, there was a significant difference between the way males and females of both groups answered this question.

Comparatively speaking, very low levels of harmful sexual advances or assault were reported by students and employees of each sex.

Much smaller numbers of people reported experiencing any of these four behaviors. Twelve female students (2.0%) and four male students (0.7%) said that a sanction-free faculty advance had been made. The percentages were higher for employees: 12.9 percent of the females, and 1.5 percent of the males had experienced a sexual advance made by a faculty or staff member. Advances involving the exchange of sex for a promise of a better grade, recommendation, employment or promotion were reported by 15 (2.5%) female students, 5 (0.9%) male students, and 3 (0.9%) female employees. Male employees did not report any such instances. Threats for non-compliance used in advances made by faculty and staff affected 3 (0.5%) female students, 3 (0.9%) female employees, and 3 (0.9%) male employees. Not one male student reported having this experience. Only students were asked whether they had been sexually assaulted by someone they believed or knew to be a faculty or staff member. Two (0.3%) female students reported being assaulted.

Three female target groups also reported very low levels of harmful sexual advances and assault.

Similarly low levels of sexual harassment were experienced by the three target groups: female students who were currently enrolled, or who had left the university by either graduating or withdrawing. These three groups might be expected to report higher levels of sexual harassment because females appear to be harassed more often than males, and because former students might consider themselves out of danger of reprisal for any reports they might make.

Table 5 summarizes the number of people in each of the three groups who responded to key questions contained in the survey. The first question asked about general levels of harassment experienced by the respondent during a given time period, but it did not tie the experiences to the university environment. General harassment included unwanted or objectionable leers or looks, comments or suggestions, and physical contact (pinching, hugging). Six (3.0%) current students, 3 (3.0%) graduates, and 1 (0.7%) withdrawn student indicated that they had encountered these harassing behaviors.

(Place Table 5 Here.)

Female phone respondents also indicated whether any faculty member at YSU had made a sanction-free sexual advance. Three (1.5%) current students, 1 (1.0%) graduate, and 2 (1.4%) withdrawn students said they had experienced this.

A few students indicated that the sexual advance made to them had involved an exchange of sex for a promise of a better grade, recommendation, employment or advancement. The number of people involved were: 4 (2.0%) current, 2 (2.0%) graduates, and 4 (2.8%) withdrawn students.

Few female respondents said that the advance had involved a threat for non-compliance. Two (1.0%) current students and 1 (0.7%) withdrawn student indicated they had experienced a threatening situation.

Respondents were also asked if they had been sexually assaulted by a faculty or staff member, and 1 (0.05%) current student said she had been assaulted.

The numbers of harassed individuals were so small for students, employees, and the three target groups that it could not be determined

Table 5

Female Phone Respondents Experiencing Sexual Harassment

	N	%	Total
General Sexual Harassment			
Current	6	3.0	200
Graduate	3	3.0	98
Withdrawn	1	0.7	145
Sanction-Free Advance			
Current	3	1.5	200
Graduate	1	1.0	98
Withdrawn	2	1.4	145
Exchange Sex for Grade, Recommendation, Employment, Promotion			
Current	4	2.0	200
Graduate	2	2.0	98
Withdrawn	4	2.8	145
Threat for Non-Compliance			
Current	2	1.0	200
Graduate	0	0.0	98
Withdrawn	1	0.7	145
Sexual Assault			
Current	1	0.5	200
Graduate	0	0.0	98
Withdrawn	0	0.0	145

whether there were significant differences in the experiences of males and females with relation to sexual harassment. The details of these encounters will be examined for the group of students as well as employees as a whole.

Students responded to sexual advances by dropping the class, while employees took varied actions.

Students and employees who had experienced a sexual advance were asked how they had responded to it. Eight students answered the question, and 7 said they dropped the class. The other person said he/she changed majors. Employees responded to an advance by moving to another department (4), seeking non-University employment (6), seeking employment at another university (2), or a combination of these (2).

(Place Table 6 Here.)

Some Students and employees said they took measures to shield themselves against sexual advances.

Both groups responded to the question, Do you take any measures to shield yourself against sexual advances from faculty or staff? Approximately one-fourth (25.4%) of the students, and one-third (34.1%) of the employees said that they had taken measures to shield themselves.

(Place Table 7 Here.)

Employees who took shielding measures were asked about specific actions they had taken to avoid advances. Approximately 5 percent said that they pretended not to notice, 6.6 percent indicated that they adopted a cool, guarded manner. Others (22.3%) tried to appear professional, 1.3 percent dressed modestly, and 1.7 percent never permitted themselves to be alone. Most employees (62.9%) said they took some combination of these measures.

Table 6

Response to Proposition

	N	%
<u>Students</u>		
Dropped class	7	0.6
Changed major	1	0.1
	(1182)	
<u>Employees</u>		
Moved to another department	4	0.6
Sought non-University Employment	6	0.9
Sought other university employer	2	0.3
Combination	2	0.3
	(681)	

Table 7

Taken Measures to Avoid Faculty [or staff] Advances

	Students		Employees	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	300	25.4	232	34.1
No	821	69.5	392	57.6
No answer	61	5.2	57	8.4

(Place Table 8 Here.)

Survey respondents were asked how often they thought faculty members at YSU suggest sexual favors to students in exchange for favorable academic treatment. Slightly less than half of the students (45.9%) said it never happened, about one-third (34.2%) thought it seldom occurred, 15.1 percent said it happened occasionally, and 1.3 percent thought it a frequent occurrence. Fewer employees (12.0%) than students said advances for exchanges never happened, and on the average, employees thought behavior of this type happened more often. More employees than students said exchanges were suggested seldomly (49.9%) or occasionally (22.3%). Few workers (1.8%) thought it happened frequently.

(Place Table 9 Here.)

Most respondents who had experienced sexually harassing behaviors were among those answering that instructors suggested sex for promises of favors occasionally or frequently.

The majority of students and employees believe the problem of exchanging sex for favorable treatment is not serious at YSU.

Students and employees indicated whether they considered the suggestion of an exchange of sex for favorable academic treatment a serious problem at YSU. Fewer than one-fifth (16.6%) of the students, and about one-tenth (10.6%) of the employees responded that this behavior is a problem.

(Place Table 10 Here.)

Some students and employees knew of friends or acquaintances who had been involved in a proposition.

Both students and employees were asked how many of their friends and acquaintances had been involved in a proposition. Students indicated the

Table 8

Shielding Measures Taken by Employees

	N	%
Pretended not to notice	12	5.2
Adopted cool, guarded manner	15	6.6
Tried to appear professional	51	22.3
Dressed modestly	3	1.3
Never alone	4	1.7
Combination	144	62.9

Table 9

Perceived Frequency of Instructor-Suggested Sex-For-Grade Exchange

	Students		Employees	
	N	%	N	%
Never	542	45.9	82	12.0
Seldom	404	34.2	340	49.9
Occasionally	179	15.1	152	22.3
Frequently	15	1.3	12	1.8
No answer	42	3.6	21	3.1

Table 10

Exchange of Sex for Favorable Academic Treatment
a Serious Problem at YSU

	Students		Employees	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	196	16.6	72	10.6
No	940	79.5	531	78.0
No answer	46	3.9	78	11.4

number of friends who were propositioned by faculty, and employees gave the number of friends they knew to have propositioned students for sexual favors in exchange for a promise of favorable treatment. Most students (68.3%) did not know anyone that fit into this category and a number of people (15.5%) did not answer the question. Fewer than 10 percent of the students knew of 1 friend, 4.6 percent knew of 2, 2.0 percent were aware of 3, and 1.4 percent had 4 or more friends who had been propositioned. So, a total of 16.4 percent of the students had at least one friend who had been propositioned. When employees were asked about the number of friends or acquaintances who propositioned students, over half of them (56.7%) didn't know of any friends who were approaching students and 25.6 percent did not answer the question. A few employees (3.7%) knew of one friend or acquaintance who had propositioned students, and about an equal number (4.0%) said they had two friends who had done the same thing. A slightly higher percentage of employees (8.1%) said they had several or many friends who propositioned students. A total of 15.8 percent of the employees knew of at least one friend or acquaintance who had propositioned students for sexual favors in exchange for a promise of favorable treatment.

(Place Table 11 Here.)

Both students and employees said they thought about initiating a relationship, but not in hopes of receiving favorable treatment.

Survey participants indicated whether they had thought about initiating a sexual relationship; students were asked about approaching instructors, and employees were asked about approaching students. Less than 10 percent (8.5%) of the students reported thinking about this, and a slightly higher percentage of employees (13.2%) said they had thought about approaching students. When asked if they followed through, very few students

Table 11

Known Propositions Among Friends and Acquaintances

Number of Friend(s)	Students Propositioned by Faculty		Employees Propositioned Students	
	N	%	N	%
0	307	68.3	400	58.7
1	99	8.4	25	3.7
2	54	4.6	27	4.0
3	24	2.0	0	0
4-10	12	1.1	0	0
> 10	3	0.3	0	0
Several, many	0	0.0	55	8.1
No answer	183	15.5	174	25.6

reported that they had (0.9%). A higher percentage of employees (3.2%) said they followed through. Only one student who said he/she followed through with a sexual advance to an instructor indicated that it had been in hopes of receiving a better grade or favorable recommendation. Each employee who reported making a sexual advance to a student said it had not involved an offer of favorable academic treatment in exchange for sex.

(Place Table 12 Here.)

Certain questions were only asked of employees. Anyone who had experienced an unwanted or objectionable sexual advance made by another employee was asked how she/he handled the situation. The majority (2.8%) said they ignored it, while 1.9 percent said they refused the offer. Some people (0.9%) complained to a friend, one person talked to a trusted faculty member. Two people (0.3%) formally complained to the administration. The rest of the people (1.5%) reacted by undertaking some combination of these alternatives.

(Place Table 13 Here.)

Sexual advances involving employee exchanges of sex for favorable treatment were perceived to happen infrequently.

Most (68.5%) faculty, staff, and administrative employees thought that faculty members never or rarely suggest sexual favors to other employees in exchange for favorable academic treatment. Some (11.5%) said it happened occasionally and less than one percent of the respondents thought it happened frequently.

(Place Table 14 Here.)

Table 12

Thought About Initiating a Relationship

	Student With Instructor		Employee With Student	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	100	8.5	90	13.2
No	1,064	90.0	571	83.8
No answer	18	1.5	20	2.9
<u>Followed Through:</u>				
Yes	11	0.9	22	3.2
No	77	6.5	62	9.1
No answer	1,094	92.6	597	87.7

Table 13

Employees Only
How Unwanted Advance Handled

	N	%
Ignored it	19	2.8
Complained to friend	6	0.9
Complained to trusted faculty member	1	0.1
Formally complained to administration	2	0.3
Reported to police	0	0.0
Refused offer	13	1.9
Combination of these	10	1.5
No answer	630	92.5

Table 14

Employees Only
Perceived Occurrence of Faculty Approaching Other Employees
to Exchange Sex for Promise of Favorable Academic Treatment

	N	%
Never	134	19.7
Seldom	332	48.8
Occasionally	85	12.5
Frequently	6	0.9
Don't Know	30	4.4
No answer	94	13.8

When asked whether they had thought about initiating a sexual relationship with another employee, most people (93.7%) said they had not. Over 10 percent responded that they had thought of it; of those employees who had, 27 (4.0%) said they followed through with it, but did not make the advance in hopes of receiving a recommendation, employment, or promotion. It appears that the interest expressed in the other employee was of a personal nature, rather than a bargaining situation.

(Place Table 15 Here.)

Few employees said a student made advances to them seeking a promise of favorable treatment.

Students are also capable of making unwanted or objectionable sexual advances to employees in hopes of exchanging sex for the promise of a recommendation, better grade, employment, or advancement. Faculty, staff, and administrators were asked whether this had ever happened to them at YSU, and most people (91.0%) said it had not. Approximately 7 percent said a student had approached them with this intent. Most employees reporting an incidence said it happened once or twice (7.4%); fewer people (1.8%) indicated that they had been approached by students three or more times.

(Place Table 16 Here.)

Conclusion

Sexual harassment, in the work place and in the classroom, is a serious problem when it occurs. No one should be subjected to behavior that involves his or her sexuality in what should be considered a professional relationship. Some researchers (Benson and Thomson, 1982; Crocker, 1982) believe that sexual harassment is a prevalent institutional practice, but at Youngstown State University this appears not to be the case.

Table 15

Employees Only
Thought About Initiating Sexual Relationship With Another Employee

	N	%
Yes	93	13.7
No	570	83.7
No answer	19	2.6
<u>Followed through</u>		
Yes	27	4.0
No	62	9.1
No answer	592	86.9
<u>Hoped to receive recommendation, employment, promotion</u>		
Yes	0	0.0
No	75	11.0
No answer	606	89.0

Table 16
 Employees Only
 Experienced Unwanted Student Advances

	N	%
Yes	40	5.9
No	620	91.0
No answer	21	3.1
<u>How Many Times</u>		
1	8	1.2
2	8	1.2
3	3	0.4
4+	5	0.7
Many, several	5	0.7
No answer	652	95.7

Several university studies (Kraus and Wilson, 1980; Field, 1981; Benson and Thomson, 1982) report that between 10-30 percent of the female students surveyed were sexually harassed. At YSU, 3 percent or less of the female students, and 1 percent of the male students sampled had experienced any one of four sexually harassing behaviors that involved the use of power: (1) a sanction-free sexual advance by faculty or staff, (2) an advance involving an exchange of sex for a promise of a letter grade, recommendation, employment or promotion, (3) an advance involving a threat for non-compliance, and (4) a sexual assault known or believed to be perpetrated by a faculty or staff member. Low incidence of harassment was also supported by the small number of cases reported through the YSU Affirmative Action Office (see Appendix).

The low levels of harassment reported here challenge the idea that sexual harassment is a major problem at every institution. Differences in the levels of sexual harassment reported at other universities and those reported in this paper may be accounted for, at least in part, by the type of institution reporting harassment. Youngstown State University is a medium-sized, urban commuter university with a fairly small graduate program. Very low levels of sexual harassment are being experienced by employees and students. Other universities reporting higher levels of sexual harassment are different from YSU in at least one of two ways: it has a well-established graduate program, or it has a residential campus. These two factors, which partially describe the type of institution, may have a bearing on the level of harassment being experienced.

The size or extent of the graduate program at any given institution may affect the levels of sexual harassment being experienced because of the

roles that graduate students assume. In one instance, these students may be subjected to harassment by professors or committee chairmen who wield "almost unlimited power over [their] future (Crocker and Simon, 1981)." In another role, some graduate students have the power of grading other students, and may use it to gain sexual favors for themselves. At YSU, the limited size of the graduate program may contribute to the lower levels of harassment reported here.

Student housing arrangements may also affect the number of sexually harassing incidences taking place at an institution of higher education. In a campus community where students live with other students, an employee's perception of the consequences of initiating sexually harassing behavior may be quite different from those perceived by employees of a university where students live with their families. Students living with other students may be less likely to report an incident, so the consequences of sexually harassing someone would not be serious. However, a student living at home with his/her family may present more of a threat, or an increased likelihood that the harassing actions would be made public. Most of the students at YSU live at home with their families and, in many cases, live in the same communities where faculty, staff, and administrators live. Given these conditions, it seems that sexually harassing behavior would not be tolerated.

Before the relationship of these two factors to sexual harassment can be proved or disproved, however, researchers must settle on common purposes and definitions to be used, and survey similar types of university populations. Only then can the true levels of sexual harassment be assessed and remedies explored.

Footnote

1. Approximately 1,850 classes were listed in the Spring 1985 Schedule of Classes. Every 23rd class listed was chosen to participate. It was assumed that the proportions and types of classes listed would be representative of the school, class, and major of the student body.

Appendix: Administrative Procedure for Handling Complaints

Although the reported levels of sexual harassment appear to be very low, it is important to note that there is an established University procedure for handling any complaints that may arise. In August 1983, the Youngstown State University Board of Trustees approved a general policy statement on sexual harassment as it pertains to employees and students of Youngstown State University. The Affirmative Action Office and the Office of Student Services were both designated to handle questions concerning sexual harassment. For complaints involving an employee of the University, the Affirmative Action Office would work with the complainant. For matters concerning students only, Student Services works with those involved.

Pamphlets containing information about sexual harassment and what to do if it is experienced are available around campus; specifically, at the Information Desk in the student center, in the Student Services Office, at the counter where employees pick up paychecks, and in the Affirmative Action Office.

All cases involving harassment are kept confidential, unless the person complaining chooses to pursue additional steps in the process. Initially, the complainant meets with the representative of the Affirmative Action Office to discuss the harassment he/she experienced. The first step towards stopping sexual harassment is to tell the perpetrator that the harassment is unwelcome and that it must stop at once. If the harassment continues, the complainant is advised to keep records of the dates, places, times, witnesses, and nature of the harassment. This information can then be turned over to the Affirmative Action officer, who will arrange to meet with the person accused of harassment. If, after this meeting, the objectionable behavior continues, the officer will meet with the accused harasser's department head or supervisor. If it is warranted, one of the following actions may be taken against the harasser: a verbal reprimand, a written reprimand, probation, or dismissal.

To date, no one has chosen to pursue steps in the process beyond meeting with the Affirmative Action officer to discuss a complaint.