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INTRODUCTION

During my Junior year at Ball State University I first became personally aware of the problem of sexual harassment on the job. Unfortunately, at the time I did not know the term "sexual harassment," nor was I aware that it was illegal-- a violation of Title VII (1964 Civil Rights Act). What I did know was that a victim felt guilty, felt fearful that others at work would find out, felt ill at the sight of the perpetrator, got frequent headaches (especially on the job or before going in), and eventually (in more cases than not) decided to quit rather than continue working in such an oppressive atmosphere.

That Spring and following Summer I began to notice articles about sexual harassment in women's and news magazines. I became very interested in investigating the topic further, so in the Fall, while enrolled in a Political Science class called, "Women in Politics," I wrote a short paper on the issue of sexual harassment on the job.

What I found out was that to date, several court cases have established that sexual harassment in the workplace is a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act because it is discrimination in employment on the basis of sex. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, in response to a need for employers and employees to have sexual harassment defined for them, issued a set of guidelines early in 1980. These guidelines specified "that employers cannot refuse to hire, refuse to promote, or fire employees only because they resist sexual advances; nor can they create an 'offensive working environment' through verbal or physical harassment."
Much controversy surrounds the definition of what legally constitutes an act of sexual harassment. What one woman interprets as harmless joking or flirting may drive another woman to tranquilizers. Karen Sauvigne, program director for the Working Women's Institute, has said that she knows of no objective criteria for sexual harassment. However, she has defined it as "repeated and unwanted sexual advances." Sauvigne also says, "(Sexual) harassment is not limited to grabbing and pinching. It's also an atmosphere loaded with sexual innuendoes and jokes."

The E.E.O.C. guidelines for sexual harassment on the job easily transfer to sexual harassment in the schools. Title VII and Title IX (1972 Education Amendment, which protects students from sex discrimination in education) are the principal Federal legal protections students have. In addition, some states have laws which are "anti-sexual harassment of students," and students could also opt for filing a civil suit or a criminal suit against a professor.

In my research I also found that very little attention was being paid to the problems of students who were being harassed by their professors. Catherine A. McKinnon, author of the book *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*, says of sexual harassment in the schools, "Sexual harassment can destroy even the possibility of learning."

My interest in this aspect of the issue was heightened when I presented my paper to the Women in Politics class, as more than one student expressed having had personal experiences with harassment from professors at Ball State.
I was determined, then, to find out how widespread the sexual harassment of students by professors at Ball State was. Since I needed a topic for my Senior Honors Project, I decided that I would take a survey of Ball State students by confidential questionnaire, report the results, and come up with an Honors Project. In this way, I could complete my Honors requirement and satisfy my own curiosity at the same time.

In the following months, the Ball State Daily News covered the case of Betsy Bier, a Ball State student who had decided to report a professor who had sexually harassed her. This coverage revealed that Ball State was lacking adequate grievance procedures for students who had problems of this nature. As a result, the Muncie chapter of the National Organization for Women formed a Sexual Harassment Task Force. This task force met regularly to explore alternatives for handling the problem of sexual harassment at a university.

The members of the N.O.W. task force gave me encouragement and many suggestions for the questions I ultimately chose to include in my survey of Ball State students on sexual harassment by professors of students. Dr. Dorothy Rudoni of the Political Science Department agreed to be my advisor for the project. The Political Science and English Departments, and the Honors College provided funding for the project. All were very helpful and supportive.
Objectives and Limits of the Study

As no similar research has ever been conducted at Ball State University, my objective was to gather information that would merely give a rough estimate and a preliminary indication of the extent to which Ball State has a problem with sexual harassment of its students by the faculty, or if there is indeed a problem at all. I do not suggest, by any means, that my project is an exhaustive study of the problem at Ball State, for I am aware that it is not. The project could be criticized for being shallow, but again I point out that I consider my project to be the preliminary study done on this issue. It is my hope that another study will be conducted on this campus by another researcher in the near future.

This paper will be a description of the method, sample, the questions, and the results. A full analysis of significant relationships will follow at a later date in a separate article.

Method and Sample

The method of gathering the data was a survey by confidential questionnaire of 2.5% of the total number of students enrolled in classes at Ball State University. The data were collected over a one and one half week period from May 7, 1981 to May 18, 1981.
I decided that my sample would be taken from students enrolled in classes in the College of Sciences and Humanities, since all students who attend Ball State must take several courses from that college in order to receive a degree. One professor from each department in the College of Sciences and Humanities was to be asked to allow the students in his or her classes to participate. These students were typical of students who would normally be enrolled in these courses. All the questionnaires were given in a classroom environment. In all cases except one, they were given during regularly scheduled class meeting time.

The reason for choosing this method was that it was the best method for the sake of the anonymity of the subjects that also allowed for a minimum cost to the investigator and for the maximum speed in gathering the data.

The professors were contacted by phone or in person for consent to have their classes participate. Seven of the twenty-one departments in the College of Sciences and Humanities were unable to participate, either because no one could be reached by phone or because the professor returned the data past the due date.

Once the professor agreed to allow his or her class to participate, he or she received an envelope containing the questionnaires, the appropriate number of Scan-Tron form 882 answer sheets, and a cover letter with instructions which the professors were to read to the students.

My final sample size was 441 students from fourteen departments in the College of Sciences and Humanities.
The Questions

At the top of the questionnaire (see app. 41) I gave a definition of sexual harassment which I base primarily on the article from *McCalls* and the article from *Newsweek* (see bibliography). I did not use other studies on this topic from other institutions as I felt that Ball State had unique problems and I wanted the questionnaire to thus be unique. Working closely with members of the N.O.W. task force, I formulated a nine part questionnaire with thirty-seven questions, which could be answered yes or no.

Before the students began the questionnaire, the professors were to read the instructions to the class. An important paragraph to be read to the students concerned a clarification of the definition of sexual harassment that was given at the top of the questionnaire. This paragraph reminded students that in many classes it becomes necessary to include an academic consideration of sexual topics because of the nature of a given course. The paragraph further explains that one might consider a discussion or lecture harassing if, without a logical basis for such an inclusion in a discussion or lecture, the professor tells sexually connotative jokes or instigates a sexually "loaded" discussion with either an entire class or an individual student (see app. 40).

When completing a questionnaire, the students first identified themselves as either male or female. Then Part A, consisting of fourteen yes or no questions, was to be answered by all students. This section asked if the student believed that he or she had experienced any of the behaviors that had been defined as sexual harassment from a professor while enrolled in a class at Ball State. For each of the seven categories of
behavior, the student was also to indicate whether or not he or she had a friend who had had this experience. The purpose for this question was to determine an awareness on the part of the students of the problem of sexual harassment. My findings would then show that a percentage of the students are familiar personally with sexual harassment or know someone who has been harassed. In this way, I would have a total number of students who are aware of the problem in some way, a number indicating a personal experience, and a number indicating an awareness that it exists.

Next, the students who answered yes to any question in Part A continued with the questionnaire to Parts B through I. The students who answered no to all questions in Part A skipped Parts B through G and continued with Parts H and I.

Part B, questions fifteen through eighteen asked in what type of situation the harassment occurred. It gave three choices, each to be answered yes or no, and had a space for other. The choices were: in front of the class, in front of a few people, alone, or other.

In Part C, questions nineteen through twenty-four, the subjects were asked how they handled the situation. Six solutions, including other, were given, each to be marked yes or no. The solutions were: dropped the class, indicated to the professor you were not interested, reported the incident to other professors, reported the incident to the department head, contacted a university official—Affirmative Action or the Provost, and other. A question which was contained also in Part C asked why the student chose the solution he or she did. This was not recorded on the Scan-Tron sheets.
Part D asked for the year in school the student was when the harassment occurred and for the student's age at the time. This Part was also not included on the Scan-Tron.

Part E asked for the sex of the professor who harassed the student. This question, number twenty-five, was recorded on the Scan-Tron as A for male and B for female.

Part F was also not recorded on the Scan-Tron, as it asked the students to name the department of the harassing professor.

The students, in question twenty-six, identified the professor to be in either an age range from the twenties to the forties (choice A), or the forties to the sixties (choice B), for Part G.

Part H, which all subjects were to complete, asked what sort of action the students felt ought to be taken against professors who sexually harass students. The choices, questions twenty-seven through thirty-one, which were to be answered yes or no, were: a salary cut for the professor, for the professor to be fired, for the professor to be fined, for no action to be taken, or other.

In the final Part, Part I, the students were asked how widespread they thought the sexual harassment of students on the Ball State campus was. The students were to indicate a yes or no answer to each choice. The choices were: nine out of ten students, seven out of ten, five out of ten, three out of ten, one out of ten, or zero out of ten. Part I covered questions thirty-two through thirty-seven.

The answers which could not be recorded on the Scan-Tron sheet were recorded directly on the questionnaires.

The average amount of time it took for a student to complete a questionnaire was about six minutes.
The Results

Before running the data through the Scan-Tron machine, I divided the data into four groups. The first division was male and female. Then I divided the females into "female yes" (if the female had answered yes to any question in Part A), and "female no" (if the female had answered no to all the questions in Part A). I did the same with the males. I further divided the male and female groups into those who had answered yes to "you" and those who had answered yes only to "friend."

Table 1 shows the number of males and females reporting harassment of themselves. Of a total sample size of 441 students, ninety-three (20.09%) reported that they had been sexually harassed by a professor at Ball State. Fourteen of the 179 males who were surveyed (or 7.82% of the males) said that they had been harassed. Seventy-nine of the 262 females who were surveyed (or 30.15% of all females) indicated that they had been sexually harassed at Ball State.

Table 2 demonstrates the number of males and females reporting the harassment of a friend. This indicates only that these students are aware that harassment occurs at Ball State, since some of the students could be reporting the harassment of the same person or the harassment of a person who already reported his or her own harassment to the survey. Of all the sample, 103 students out of 441 reported knowledge of a friend's harassment (23.36% of 441). Twenty-nine of the 179 males (16.20%), and seventy-four of the 262 females (28.24%) reported the harassment of a friend.

For Part A, then, using only the data from subjects who were reporting harassment of themselves, we find the results for questions one through fourteen in tables 3 and 4.
Table 3 covers the types of behavior that the harassed males experienced. The males indicated that 35.71% of them had experienced inappropriate sexual remarks, 35.71% had experienced touching, 14.28% had experienced closeness or hovering, 71.42% had been leered or stared at, 7.14% had experienced sexual advances such as grabbing or pinching, 7.14% had had requests for sexual favors, and 14.28% had been threatened by a professor to submit or there would be consequences to his grade.

The types of behavior that the harassed females experienced are reported in table 4. Inappropriate sexual remarks were reported by 39.24% of the harassed females. Touching was indicated by 18.99%, closeness or hovering by 44.30%, leering or staring by 59.49%, sexual advances by 6.33%, requests for sexual favors by 7.59%, and threats by 5.06% of the harassed females.

Part B, which asked for the situation in which the harassment occurred, is covered in table 5. For question fifteen, in front of a class, 71.42% of the males and 34.18% of the females cited this situation. In question sixteen, in front of a few people, 14.28% males and 32.11% females had this problem. Alone with the harasser was reported by 7.14% males, 44.30% females, and other was reported by 21.42 of the males and 12.66% of the females. Though the males who answered "other" did not indicate what other situation did occur, the females did share some of their situations. The situations reported by the harassed females were: not alone, but others in vicinity; came to my apartment thirty-five miles away; wrote inappropriate sexual remarks on my paper; harassed me at a national conference away from campus; in a bar where I was waitress.
Part C, questions nineteen through twenty-four, which asked how the harassed students handled the situation, is covered in table 6. This table shows that 7.14% of males and 7.59% of females dropped the class, 28.57% of males and 50.63% of females indicated their non-interest to the professor, 0 of the males and 6.33% of the females reported the incident to other professors, 0 of the males and 6.33% of the females reported the incident to the department head, 7.14% of males and 3.80% of females contacted a university official such as Affirmative Action or the Provost, and 35.71% of the males and 30.38% of the females reported that they chose another solution not listed on the survey. All of these "other" answers from the males indicated that they chose to ignore the harassment. Most of the female "other" answers also showed this tendency to ignore the situation. They also reported that they avoided the professor, kept as far away from him or her as possible, and one female said that she simply started to bring her brother to class with her and that seemed to work.

The reasons why the harassed students chose the solutions they chose in Part C were many. The males indicated that they were confused and upset, but felt they chose the right solution for themselves. A few said they felt complimented by the harassment, but felt that it was morally wrong. The females gave more responses to the question of "why" than did the males. Most of the females reported a good deal of anxiety over what to do. The females who chose to ignore the situation did so because it solved the problem, because it seemed to be the easiest way out, because they were too afraid to confront the professor either because of a fear of reprisal or because of embarrassment.
There is no table for Part D. There did not appear to be any considerable tendency for a particular age group or class to be harassed more than another. For the males the ages they were when they were harassed ranged from eighteen to twenty-six years old. The classes were freshman, sophomore, junior and senior. The females fared similarly. The age ranges for females at the time of their harassment were eighteen to twenty-seven, and they were in the same classes as the males plus one report of a graduate student's harassment.

Part E concerned the question of what sex the harassing professor was. Table 7 shows the percentages of male and female students harassed by either male of female professors. A male professor was cited as harassing male students in 42.86% of the male sample, and a male professor was cited as harassing a female student in 77.22% of the female sample. Male students reported that they were harassed by a female professor for 57.14% of their sample. Female professors were the harassers of female students in 22.78% of the female sample.

Table 8 reports the number of times that a department was named as the department of a harassing professor. Since the reports of those who had friends is also included in this table there is always the chance that a department may have been named by more than one person for the same incident. As the table indicates, English was named the most number of times with seven. Then History, Psychology, and Sociology follow with five citings each. Twenty-eight departments in all were named and two offices, Counseling and an office in the administration, were also named. Fifty-seven respondents did not specify which department the harassing professor was a member of. One response did not specify the department or the sex of the professor. The total of 136 responses equals the sum of all males and females who answered yes to any question in Part A (males n=43,
females n=93, total n=136).

Table 9 illustrates the age ranges of the professors, and was the question covered in Part G. The students identified their harassing professors to be in an age range from either the twenties to forties, or the forties to sixties. 42.86% of the harassed males said they were harassed by a professor in his or her twenties to forties. 31.65% of the females reported that they were harassed by professors in their twenties to forties. Professors in their forties to sixties harassed 57.14% of the male sample and 55.70% of the female sample.

Part H, illustrated by table 10, reports the attitudes of harassed and non-harassed males toward action that should be taken by the university against professors who sexually harass their students. The non-harassed males and females are those who answered no to all questions in Part A. So, the students who reported a friend's harassment are not part of this graph. 28.57% of the harassed males and 31.61% of the non-harassed males felt that a salary cut for the professor was appropriate action for the university to take against a professor who sexually harasses his or her students. 42.85% of harassed males and 67.64% of non-harassed males felt it was appropriate to fire the professor. 14.28% of harassed males and 45.49% of non-harassed males agreed that a professor should be fined. 14.28% of harassed males and 5.14% of non-harassed approved of no action being taken. 21.42% of the harassed males and 41.18% of the non-harassed males designated their choice to be "other." Some of the alternatives suggested by males who gave suggestions were: castration of the offending male, a jail sentence (both, I assume, are suggested tongue-in-cheek), publicizing the name of the harassing professor, and punishments suitable to the circumstances of the incident.
The female responses to Part H are illustrated in table 11. A salary cut for the professor was favored by 22.78% of the harassed females and 39.64% of the non-harassed females. 55.70% of the harassed females and 80.47% of the non-harassed females felt that the professor should be fired. 35.44% of the harassed females and 46.75% of the non-harassed females think a professor should pay a fine for harassing students. That no action should be taken was the opinion of 3.80% of the harassed females and 4.73% of the non-harassed females. 29.11% of the harassed females and 27.81% of the non-harassed had their own solutions. Some of those solutions were making the offense publicly known, getting counseling for the offending professor, having the department head talk to the professor and if there is no improvement punish the professor, have a system for review and observation, warning and punishment, put an offense of sexual harassment on the professor's permanent record, and most said that the rules ought to be flexible because the punishment needs to depend on the circumstances.

In table 12 is the illustration of the opinions of harassed and non-harassed males on how widespread sexual harassment of students by their professors is on the Ball State campus. This is the final section of the questionnaire-- part I. None of the harassed or non-harassed males agreed that nine out of ten students were victims of sexual harassment. None of the harassed males and .73% of the non-harassed males thought that seven out of ten students were harassed. None of the harassed males and 2.94% of the non-harassed males felt that five out of ten students were harassed. 28.57% of the harassed males and 16.18% of the non-harassed males agreed that three in ten students were victims. 71.42% of the harassed males and 59.56% of the non-harassed males indicated on the survey that they thought
Table 1.

Number of males and females reporting harassment of themselves.
**Table 2.**
Number of males and females reporting harassment of a friend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23.36%)</td>
<td>(28.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 (16.20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions
1. Inappropriate sexual remarks
   \[ n=5 \] 35.71%

3. Touching
   \[ n=5 \] 35.71%

5. Closeness or hovering
   \[ n=2 \] 14.28%

7. Leering or staring
   \[ n=10 \] 71.42%

9. Sexual advances: grabbing, pinching
   \[ n=1 \] 7.14%

11. Requests for sexual favors
    \[ n=1 \] 7.14%

13. Threats to your grade if you refuse to submit
    \[ n=2 \] 14.28%

Table 3.
1. Inappropriate sexual remarks
   \( n=31 \) 39.24%

3. Touching
   \( n=15 \) 18.99%

5. Closeness or hovering
   \( n=35 \) 44.30%

7. Leering or staring
   \( n=47 \) 59.49%

9. Sexual advances: grabbing, pinching
   \( n=5 \) 6.33%

11. Requests for sexual favors
    \( n=6 \) 7.59%

13. Threats
    \( n=4 \) 5.06%

Table 4.
Table 5. Situation in which harassment occurred; males and females.
Table 6. How the situation was handled
Table 7. Percent of male and female students harassed by male and female professors
### Table 8. Departments named by harassed students and by friends of harassed students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th># times female named harassment</th>
<th># times male named harassment</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Prof</td>
<td>Female Prof</td>
<td>Male Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography/Geology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th># times female named harassment</th>
<th># times Male named harassment</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Prof</td>
<td>Female Prof</td>
<td>Male Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department not specified</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part G

Age Range

20's - 40's

n=6 42.86%

n=25 31.65%

40's - 60's

n=8 57.14%

n=44 55.70%

Table 9. Percent of professors in their 20's-40's or 40's-60's who harassed male or female students.
Table 10. Attitudes of harassed and non-harassed males toward action that should be taken by the university against professors who sexually harass their students.
Attitudes of harassed and non-harassed females toward action that should be taken by the university against professors who sexually harass their students.
Table 12. Opinion of harassed and non-harassed males of how widespread sexual harassment of students by their professors is on the Ball State campus.
Table 13. Opinion of harassed and non-harassed females of how widespread sexual harassment of students by their professors is on the Ball State campus.
NOTES

1 Cindy Schweich, "New Protection Against Sexual Harassment," McCall's, August 1980, p. 60.


5 Newhall, et. al., p. 82.
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1. Title of Project: Sexual Harassment of Students at Ball State

2. Name of Investigator: Emily R. Huston, student; ph. 286-4342

3. Name of sponsoring agency: This is my Senior Honors Project. My sponsors would be the Honors College and/or my advisor, Dr. Dorothy Rudoni.

4. Abstract: I plan to survey by questionnaire a percentage of students enrolled in courses in the College of Sciences and Humanities to discover the frequency of sexual harassment of students by professors.

5. The research will be counted as my Honors Project. Since no one has conducted similar research on this campus, the objective would be to gather information which would provide a rough and preliminary idea of the extent of the problem of sexual harassment of students by professors and to determine if this problem even exists.

6. The dates of the research will be over the next two weeks with the final deadline for submission of the results to be May 18.

7. Protection of Human Subjects: The procedure as it relates to human subjects will consist of a paper and pencil questionnaire which the subjects will complete.

8. The risks for the subject will be extremely minimal. Obviously, since the subject will be merely writing answers to questions on a piece of paper, the physical risks would be non-existent. The psychological risks could possibly be embarrassment for the subject if the individual felt uncomfortable with the questions. Social injury might possibly become a risk if someone were to decide to report a case of sexual harassment as a result of taking the questionnaire.

9. There is no literature available which suggests that by merely filling out a questionnaire a subject will suffer at all. There has been no evidence to the contrary, either. The benefits to the subject will be intangible benefits. Perhaps the subject will feel a sense of security that someone is concerned about the issue, for instance.

10. This is the best method for the sake of anonymity of the subjects that will also allow for a small cost for the investigator and for speed in the gathering of information.

11. The subjects will be students enrolled in courses in the College of Sciences and Humanities. At least one professor in each of the College's departments will be asked to participate. The professor will never touch or see any of the questionnaires before or after the subjects have completed them. The relevant characteristics would simply be that the subjects are enrolled in courses in this College and would be typical of students who would take these courses. The number of subjects involved would be 862, since that is 5% of the total number of students enrolled at B.S.U. and each student must take several classes in the College of Sciences and Humanities to graduate.
12. The environment will be a classroom during regularly scheduled class time. The surroundings will be familiar and therefore more comfortable for the subjects. Privacy will be only the privacy of the subject's own desk.

13. Emily Huston will be the only person to see the actual data gathered as far as I know. My advisor, Dr. Dorothy Rudoni will be the only other person in addition I can think of. The professors who assist in administering the questionnaires will not see any of the written data. They will only see that the subjects who wish to participate receive a questionnaire.

14. Confidentiality will be guarded closely, as this study is of a sensitive nature. The questionnaires will not be coded. There will be no chance that I will be able to trace any questionnaires back to the subject. The selected professors who will allow students in their classes to participate will be given a campus mail envelope, pre-addressed to me, that will contain the questionnaires. The subjects who agree to participate will remove a questionnaire from the envelope. The subject will fill out the questionnaire and then return it to the envelope. No information regarding which class the envelope came from will be known to me.

15. All subjects will participate of their own free will. No professor is to require his or her students to complete a questionnaire. By filling out the questionnaire the students are consenting to participate. The anonymity of the subjects participating protects them from injury. No formal consent form be used, but the procedures and the risks will be outlined in a cover letter for the questionnaires which the professor will read to the class before any of the questionnaires are filled out.

16. Should the principal investigator find it necessary and/or desirable to change procedures affecting the human subjects participating in the study, approval of the IRB will be sought and obtained before the changes are implemented.

Enclosed is a sample of a few questions the subjects will be responding to.
List of Participating Departments

1. Biology
2. English
3. Foreign Language
4. History
5. Journalism
6. Math
7. Philosophy
8. Physics and Astronomy
9. Physiology/Health Science
10. Political Science
11. Psychology
12. Social Work
13. Sociology
14. Speech and Theatre
Study on Sexual Harassment at Ball State

Cover Letter and Instructions for Professors and Students

For her senior Honors Project, Emily Huston, senior Political Science major and Humanities minor, is researching sexual harassment of students by professors at Ball State. The project is being funded by the English Department, the Political Science Department, and has the approval of the Honors College.

The research will be carried out by administering a questionnaire to 862 of the students enrolled in courses in the 22 departments of the College of Sciences and Humanities.

The growing concern both nationally and locally that a problem of sexual harassment exists on the college campus is the basis for this research. An estimation of the extent of this problem at Ball State is the objective of this project.

Students cannot be required by the professor to participate in this project. Participation is totally voluntary and by completing a questionnaire the student is giving his or her informed consent to participate. Students who choose not to participate will not be penalized in any way. They will be allowed to engage in an alternate activity while other students are doing the questionnaires. Students who have already completed a questionnaire in another class are asked not to complete an additional one.

The anonymity of students completing questionnaires will protect them from injury since there will be no method of tracing questionnaires back to groups or individuals. Participants may feel confident that the confidentiality of the information they provide will further be protected, as professors will have absolutely no contact with the questionnaires. Contact will be avoided because of the way the questionnaires will be distributed and collected.

Students who choose to participate will be helping a senior to graduate this Spring. These students may also have questions concerning any aspect of this research. Students with questions or who wish to speak with Emily personally may contact her at 286-4342 or 285-6055.

* * * * *

Those students who wish to participate should remove a questionnaire from the envelope. The professor will NOT touch the answer sheets or the questionnaires for ANY reason. After all volunteers have received a questionnaire, the professor will proceed with the instructions. If a participant at any time changes his or her mind and decides not to participate any longer in the research he or she may simply write "withdrawn" across the top of the answer sheet and the questionnaire.

* * * * *

* * * * * * *
Instructions

The answer sheet is to be completed with a number 2 pencil only. All objective answers must be recorded on both the answer sheet AND the questionnaire. Subjective information must be recorded on the questionnaire ONLY. Further comments are welcome, and participants may write them on the back of the questionnaire.

Before beginning the questionnaire, participants should note the definition of sexual harassment given at the top of the questionnaire. Something which may need to be clarified is the statement concerning classroom remarks of a sexual nature. This does not apply to class discussions which may include an academic consideration of sexual topics because of the nature of the course, i.e. literature, biology, psychology, etc. The author of the questionnaire recognizes a necessity for examining sexuality on an academic and scientific basis as it may apply to the objectives of a course. She is concerned only with those situations where, without a logical basis for such an inclusion, a professor might tell sexually comotative jokes or instigate a sexually "loaded" discussion with either an entire class or an individual student.

All participants should complete Part A. Those who answer NO to ALL questions in Part A should proceed to Parts H and I. Those who answer YES to ANY questions in Part A should proceed to Part E and each Part thereafter. Answer yes or no to each question. No is the same as "not applicable."

After completing the proper sections, the participants should paperclip the the answer sheets to the questionnaires and return them to the envelope.

Please be completely honest. Thank you for your help.
Questionnaire on Sexual Harassment at B.S.U.

Definition:
According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission sexual harassment is a violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The E.E.O.C. has defined sexual harassment as behavior on the part of an employer which creates an offensive working environment for the employee through verbal or physical harassment. Recently court cases involving harassment of students by professors have been filed on the premise that sexual harassment by professors of students creates an offensive and inhibiting learning environment for the student. Behaviors which have been cited are inappropriate sexual remarks and suggestions; unwanted and unreciprocated advances such as unnecessary hovering, closeness, or touching; leering or staring; requests for sexual favors; and threats to the victim grade if these advances are not accepted.

*SEX: Male Female (circle one)

PART A
Have you or a friend of yours experienced any of the following behaviors from a professor while enrolled in a course at Ball State?

1. Inappropriate sexual remarks and/or suggestions
2. Touching
3. Closeness or hovering
4. Leering, staring, or "checking you out"
5. Sexual advances: grabbing, pinching
6. Requests for sexual favors
7. Threats to your grade if you refuse to submit

PART B
In what type of situation did the harassment occur?

15. In front of a class?
16. In front of a few people?
17. Alone with the harasser?
18. Other?

PART C
How did you handle the situation?

19. Dropped the class
20. Indicated to the professor you were not interested
21. Reported the incident to other professors
22. Reported the incident to the department head
23. Contacted university official: Affirmative Action, Provost
24. Other

Why did you choose the solution you chose?
Part D
What age and year in school were you when the incident occurred? Age ___ Yr. ___ (Jr., Sr., etc.)

Part E
What sex was the professor? ———————————— ———————————— 25. male female

Part F
What department was the professor? Department _______________________

Part G
What age range was the professor? ———————————— ———————————— 26. 20's-40's 40's-60's

Part H
What sort of action do you feel should be taken by the university against those professors who sexually harass students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Salary cut</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Fire him or her</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Fine him or her</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. No action should be taken</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Other ___</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I
In your opinion, how widespread is sexual harassment of students on the Ball State campus? How many out of 10 students are victims of harassment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. 9 of 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 7 of 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 5 of 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 3 6 of 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. 1 of 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. 0 of 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Don't forget this section!