

Seton Hall University

**eRepository @ Seton Hall**

---

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses  
(ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

---

Spring 3-12-2020

## The Rising Profile of Sexual Harassment on Campus: How Do Faculty Respond Inside and Outside the Classroom

Scott C. Strother

scott.strother@student.shu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#), [Educational Sociology Commons](#), [Human Factors Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Strother, Scott C., "The Rising Profile of Sexual Harassment on Campus: How Do Faculty Respond Inside and Outside the Classroom" (2020). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 2737.  
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/2737>

The Rising Profile of Sexual Harassment on Campus: How Do Faculty Respond Inside and  
Outside the Classroom

By Scott C. Strother

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

College of Education and Human Services

Higher Education Leadership, Management and Policy

Seton Hall University

March 2020

© 2020 Scott C. Strother



SETON HALL  
UNIVERSITY™

ENRICHING THE MIND,  
THE HEART AND THE SPIRIT

---

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT & POLICY

---

**APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE**

Scott C. Strother has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the Ed.D., during this Spring Semester 2020.

**DISSERTATION COMMITTEE**

(please sign and date beside your name)

COMMITTEE:	SIGNATURE	DATE
Mentor: Dr. Martin Finkelstein		3/25/2020
Dr. David Reid		
Dr. Sherri-Ann P. Butterfield		4/1/2020

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation to be bound as page number two.

## **Abstract**

Faculty behavior inside and outside the classroom is one of the many concerns faced by higher education administrators. Inappropriate comments, behavior, or acts engaged in by faculty members have resulted in sexual harassment complaints being filed by students, and in some cases resulted in costly litigation and settlements for some colleges and universities. In the recent news, public figures like actor Bill Cosby and Hollywood director Harvey Weinstein have been openly accused of sexual harassment and/or rape. High publicity matters like these presumably have an influence on awareness of the issue of sexual harassment.

The purpose of this study was to gather information on faculty reactions to the recent heightened publicity regarding sexual harassment. Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment negatively influenced how faculty interact with students? The study set out to determine the extent to which the recent publicity may have heightened faculty awareness, the extent of such faculty awareness, and the extent to which such awareness has increased faculty apprehension and/or worry and translated into behavioral caution in and outside the classroom. The study examined how faculty responses vary based on age, gender, race, professional status, departmental affiliation, and institutional publicity.

To address the research questions, a quantitative design was employed. An anonymous survey was utilized to gather information from a purposeful sample of approximately 1,645 faculty members resulting in 72 study participants. The sample consisted of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenured faculty members at four-year institutions in the United States who belong to and/or are affiliated with four targeted disciplines: history, political science, psychology and sociology. These four disciplines were targeted because of the likelihood that these faculty members would discuss controversial and/or inflammatory material related to gender during their lectures. The sample was derived from institutions that both have and have not been in the news

during the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment of a student by a faculty member. The survey instrument consisted of open-ended questions, closed-ended questions, and Likert-scaled questions. The survey questions addressed the following four major constructs: awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry. Specifically, the questions were designed to address the constructs and utilized to determine the faculty member's level of awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry inside and outside of the classroom. These four constructs were rooted in the Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) study informally known as the "Teacher Apprehension Study" in which they examined the effects of McCarthyism on academia.

The study found information to support the hypothesized linkage between the recent publicity and faculty perceptions and behaviors. Most fundamentally, the study revealed that the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment has had an influence on faculty awareness of the issue. The study further revealed that a relationship exists between faculty awareness and the level of faculty apprehension, the level of faculty caution, and the level of faculty worry. The study also revealed that faculty awareness, faculty apprehension, faculty caution, and faculty worry can be influenced by faculty member's age, gender, race, departmental affiliation, and professional status (tenured, tenure-track, non-tenured).

**Dedication**

**For you B!**

## **Acknowledgments**

I would first like to thank God, for with him and through him all things are possible. I would like to acknowledge and thank my dissertation committee members, Dr. Martin Finkelstein, Dr. David Reid, and Dr. Sherri-Ann Butterfield. As my mentor, Dr. Finkelstein pushed me to conduct, analyze, and report my research from the perspective that only a seasoned researcher who has conducted studies and written articles on faculty behavior could achieve, and for this I am grateful. At first the idea of conducting research in an area for which Dr. Finkelstein is well-known and highly recognized was somewhat intimidating. When I first composed the topic in fulfillment of an assignment as part of Dr. Finkelstein's "Faculty Personnel" Course, it was just that—a completed assignment. However, Dr. Finkelstein saw the potential of the topic. He said to me, "Scott, this is a good topic." My response was, "Okay, glad you like it," while in my mind knowing I had been working on my intended dissertation topic since the beginning of the program. The next class, Dr. Finkelstein said to me, "Scott, your topic is a very good topic. I think you should make it your dissertation topic." My response was, "No, I'm okay. I have my dissertation topic; you can give it to someone else," at which he laughed. The following week in class, Dr. Finkelstein said to me, "Scott, this topic is great! You're doing it!" Here we are, a year and a half later, research conducted and dissertation written, and I am still reflecting on the experience with Dr. Finkelstein. Dr. Finkelstein encouraged, directed, and "corrected" without any reservation or hesitation, and for this too I am grateful. I was afforded an opportunity to study under one of the best. Thank you, Dr. Finkelstein.

Dr. David Reid was the laid-back yet knowledgeable professor who willingly embraced my request to be my second reader. Dr. Reid's "Qualitative Research Course" helped me develop my proposed research methodology of a mixed method study. I learned a lot about qualitative



research as a result of your course, and for that I am grateful. Your teachings made the idea of conducting a qualitative study very appealing. I knew that with your guidance and my professional investigative background, I would be able to obtain a wealth of useful information regarding my topic. Unfortunately, the conducting of a qualitative study of my research topic will have to wait for my continuation of this research. But nonetheless I am appreciative and grateful for all the knowledge you shared, Dr. Reid.

Dr. Sherri-Ann Butterfield was my third reader, faculty personnel specialist, and “fixer” of all things student and faculty related. I thank you for embarking on this journey with me. I chose you to be on my dissertation committee not only because of your professional experience as a faculty member (and now leading faculty members), but also because of your love for our students. The countless conversations we had on how to make the student experience better and safer for our students at Rutgers University-Newark have resonated through my mind time and time again. Your passion, energy, and understanding have afforded me the opportunity to learn from you and to grow as a professional in academia, and for this and for you I am grateful.

To all the faculty and staff whom I have had the pleasure of meeting and interacting with inside and outside the classroom as part of my academic journey at Seton Hall University I say, “Thank you!” Thank you for the knowledge and experience you have imparted. Your sacrifice and dedication are truly appreciated.

To my family, I couldn’t have done this without your patience, love, and support. Thank you. And to my friends, thank you for the endless support and encouragement. “We did it!”

I leave you with the words I heard many times throughout this process from Dr. Finkelstein: “Onward!”

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Background .....	1
Theoretical Framework .....	3
Purpose Statement .....	6
Significance of the Study .....	7
Research Questions .....	7
Organization of the Study .....	8
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature.....	10
Sexual Harassment .....	10
Factors That Are Perceived to Influence Faculty Behavior .....	16
Important Takeaways from the Literature.....	21
Chapter 3: Methodology .....	23
Problem Statement .....	23
Purpose Statement .....	25
Conceptual Framework .....	25
Research Design.....	26
Chapter 4: Results .....	34
Population Demographics .....	35
Respondent Demographics.....	35
Summary of Findings .....	50
Chapter 5: Summary .....	55
Introduction .....	55
Summary of Findings .....	59
Implications for Practice .....	66
Limitations of the Study .....	68
Recommendations for Research.....	69
Conclusion.....	70

References .....	71
Appendix A .....	74
Appendix B .....	81
Appendix C .....	84
Appendix D .....	143

## List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Departmental Affiliation of Total Population in Percentages (N = 1645)</i> .....	35
Table 2. <i>Distribution of Respondents by Professional and Personal Characteristics</i> .....	36
Table 3. <i>Distribution of Faculty Responses Based on the Condition “Publicity” (N=72)</i> .....	38
Table 4. <i>Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Awareness Index for Institutions “In the News,” “Not in the News,” and “Don’t Know”</i> .....	39
Table 5. <i>Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Apprehension Index for Institutions “In the News”, “Not in the News” and “Don’t Know”</i> .....	40
Table 6. <i>Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Caution Index for Institutions “In the News”, “Not in the News” and “Don’t Know”</i> .....	41
Table 7. <i>Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Worry Index for Institutions “In the News”, “Not in the News,” and “Don’t Know”</i> .....	43
Table 8. <i>Multiple Regression Analysis Using Awareness Score as the Dependent Variable</i> .....	46
Table 9. <i>Multiple Regression Analysis Using Apprehension Score as the Dependent Variable</i> ..	47
Table 10. <i>Multiple Regression Analysis Using Caution Score as the Dependent Variable</i> .....	48
Table 11. <i>Multiple Regression Analysis Using Worry Score as the Dependent Variable</i> .....	49

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### **Background**

Faculty behavior inside and outside the classroom is one of the many concerns of higher education administrators. Faculty behavior in the classroom that was perhaps once endured by students has become no longer acceptable. Comments and jokes by faculty members that teeter on the edge of being inappropriate and sexually harassing in nature are no longer being tolerated. One can speculate that the availability of information and awareness of resources regarding sexual harassment on college campuses have provided students with the opportunity to become more knowledgeable about their rights. On the other hand, perhaps the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment has influenced students. The news media and the sharing of stories by victims all over the United States have prompted other victims who were previously silent to speak out against sexual harassment.

Many victims are finding inspiration from the “Me Too Movement,” expressing that they too were victims of sexual harassment and now feel empowered to speak out. In recent news, several famous members of the entertainment community have been accused of committing acts of sexual harassment; specifically, famous actor and comedian Bill Cosby and mega movie producer Harvey Weinstein. Both have been named as alleged perpetrators of sexual harassment and/or rape. We have also seen famous actresses speak out and share their stories of being victims of sexual harassment and rape.

The #MeToo Movement was founded in 2006 in an effort to support young women of color who were subjected to acts of sexual violence. The movement sought to establish a network of advocates and resources led by survivors of sexual violence. On October 15, 2017, the hashtag metoo went viral. According to the organization’s website, the viral #metoo hashtag helped create a national dialogue regarding sexual violence. Millions of supporters have

expressed their commitment to ending sexual violence under the viral #metoo hashtag. In essence, “the galvanizing momentum of the #Metoo campaign has forced many industries to confront widespread sexual harassment and assault in their midst. Academe is no exception” (Gluckman, Read, Mangan, & Quilantan, 2017, p. 1).

At institutions of higher education, students have protection against sexual harassment under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is a federal law that protects individuals from being discriminated against based on sex, in educational programs, institutions, or activities that receive federal financial funding. According to the federal law, “Title IX states that no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). Sexual harassment is considered a form of discrimination based on an individual’s sex.

The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights is the federal agency and governing body that enforces compliance with Title IX. According to the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR), all colleges and universities that receive federal funding are required to comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972. Institutions that are required to comply with Title IX must have an institutional policy in place that outlines the institution’s procedure for addressing allegations of misconduct that fall under Title IX.

To comply with the mandates of Title IX, colleges and universities have established their own institutional policies regarding Title IX. These institutional policies usually mirror the federal law; however, specific information as it relates to their respective colleges and

universities are included in their policies. OCR issued a letter to all institutions that must comply with Title IX explaining what is legally expected of them. The letter was called the “Dear Colleague Letter on Sexual Violence” (DCL). On April 4, 2011, OCR issued the DCL to all institutions and/or activities that are obligated to comply with Title IX. The DCL explains “the requirements of Title IX pertaining to sexual harassment, which also covers sexual violence, and lays out the specific Title IX requirements applicable to sexual violence” (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). With measures in place, most colleges and universities have taken one step toward addressing the sexual harassment complaints filed by students on campus.

According to Twale and De Luca (2008), “incivility in the classroom has risen, but they do not attribute total blame to student brashness or general increases in campus or societal violence” (p. 11). In some cases, students’ perception of faculty behavior such as comments, remarks, or jokes have resulted in complaints of inappropriate behavior being filed against faculty members. A faculty member making a female student uncomfortable by commenting, “That dress is pretty short” or to a male student wearing a dress, “Men don’t wear dresses” can be perceived as being inappropriate and result in a Title IX complaint being filed. But why would these faculty members behave in this manner? Has the current societal climate of outwardly expressing thoughts and beliefs that can be perceived as being discriminatory become acceptable? Has this type of behavior infiltrated the classroom? Do some faculty members consider such behavior acceptable in today’s society? Research has shown that faculty behavior differs based on gender, race, age, and tenured versus non-tenured status.

### **Theoretical Framework**

A half century ago, in a very different social context, Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) found that environmental factors could influence faculty behavior. According to Smith (2011), Lazarsfeld and Thielens studied “a crucial social problem: how the cold war against communism

and radical right-wing extremism engendered a climate of fear at academic institutions; this fear constrained academic freedom and freedom of expression” (p. 30). Lazarsfeld and Thielens focused on professor apprehension and resulting behavioral caution as key components of their study, realizing that social climates, social norms, and societal perception often play a part in what is and what is not acceptable behavior.

For the purpose of this study, the definition of sexual harassment as defined in the Rutgers University Student Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship Violence, Stalking and Related Misconduct was utilized. As stated in the policy, sexual harassment is defined as “unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct or communication of a sexual nature when, submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s education or campus activity; or submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for academic or student life decisions affecting that individual; or such conduct has the effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s education or academic performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, demeaning, or offensive campus, work or living environment” (Rutgers University Policy, 2015, p. 5).

As evident in the recent complaints made public through media outlets and the upward trend in Title IX complaints filed related to sexual violence on college campuses, the issue of sexual harassment has national attention. At this current moment, there is a heightened sense of awareness concerning sexual harassment. In an article written in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, three women formerly students who had experienced being sexually harassed and/or assaulted by professors shared their stories. “While the women spoke of opportunities sacrificed and careers rerouted, they also expressed optimism that the reckoning caused by the #MeToo



movement will have a lasting impact” (Schmalz, 2018, p. 1). In addition to the students who are doing the accusing and the faculty members being accused, higher education administrators are also being directly affected by the heightened sense of awareness from an administrative and compliance perspective.

Administrators are being tasked with making sure the appropriate measures are in place for students to report issues and receive support services. In some cases, administrators must implement interim accommodations<sup>1</sup> while ensuring that allegations are investigated and the proper corrective action is taken. Unfortunately, there is a lack of statistical data on faculty misconduct allegations. According to Braxton, Proper, and Bayer (2011), “the principal reason for the lack of data on the frequency or occurrence of misconduct is that many cases are handled internally within the university, most are considered to be private personnel matters and there is a strong institutional administrative initiative to avoid external publicity of these cases if all possible in order to protect the reputation of the university” (p. 21).

Faculty members who have not been accused of inappropriate behavior can also be directly affected by the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment. Some faculty members may be oblivious to the heightened sense of awareness, whereas other faculty members may have a sense of awareness but are being deliberately dismissive regarding the issue. There may also be faculty members who are aware of the issue and carefully navigating through the heightened sense of social consciousness regarding sexual harassment. Those who are in tune and have a heightened sense of awareness may find themselves struggling with normal everyday interactions with students. Faculty members in disciplines such as history, political science, psychology, and sociology often discuss controversial and/or inflammatory

---

<sup>1</sup> Interim accommodations are measures put in place to allow the complainant to continue in their normal capacity at the institution. If it is a student who filed a complaint against one of his or her professors, the student may be moved to a different section of the same class.

material related to gender during their lectures that can sometimes lead to comments by faculty or students that can be perceived as harassing and/or inappropriate in nature.

Some faculty members are being apprehensive and/or cautious when engaging students inside and outside the classroom. Faculty members struggle with the decision whether to keep their office door open when meeting with a student of the opposite sex or to close it. Also deciding whether or not it is appropriate to give a student of the opposite sex a congratulatory hug after graduation or after a successful dissertation defense. In these situations, the faculty member recognizes that if they close the door when meeting with a member of the same sex or give a hug to someone of the same sex, then their failure to engage in the same behavior with a member of the opposite sex could be perceived as differential treatment and result in a Title IX complaint.

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to gather information on faculty perception of behavior considering the recent heightened publicity regarding sexual harassment. Has the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment negatively influenced how faculty interact with students? The study set out to determine the extent of faculty awareness, the extent to which such awareness has increased faculty apprehension, the extent to which faculty awareness has increased caution in and outside the classroom, and the extent to which faculty awareness has increased worry inside and outside the classroom. The study discusses to what extent faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry are predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member), and faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured).

### **Significance of the Study**

This study makes significant contribution to the study of faculty behavior. Literature that focused specifically on the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment and the perceived influence on faculty behavior inside and outside the classroom could not be found. Therefore, this study can serve as baseline research for future studies to build upon and/or be derived from. The findings of this study are also of benefit to higher education administrators at colleges and universities as they attempt to proactively address the issue of sexual harassment of students by faculty members.

### **Research Questions**

The research questions addressed as part of this study were the following:

1. How has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment affected faculty awareness of the issue?
2. A. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with apprehension inside and outside the classroom?  
  
B. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with caution inside and outside the classroom?  
  
C. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with worry inside and outside the classroom?
3. To what extent are faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member), faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured)?

## **Organization of the Study**

This study is comprised of five chapters which are as follows:

Chapter 1 introduces the topic of sexual harassment and faculty behavior, followed by information on the “Me Too” Movement, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the theoretical framework, the statement of purpose, the significance of the study, and the research questions.

Chapter 2 is a review of the applicable literature. It provides historical information on sexual harassment, the issue of sexual harassment on college and university campuses, the requirements under Title IX, an introduction to the issue of sexual harassment of students by faculty members, and an introduction to factors that are perceived to influence faculty behavior. This chapter also discusses important takeaways from the literature and gaps in the literature.

Chapter 3 provides the research methodology employed for the study. This chapter states the problem, the purpose of the study, the conceptual framework, the research questions, the research design, the data collections, a description of the survey instrument utilized, and a discussion of how the data was analyzed.

Chapter 4 first offers a summary of Chapter 3, followed by tables communicating the study population demographics and respondent demographics. The findings for research question 1 are presented; specifically, the indexes for the constructs (Awareness, Apprehension, Caution, and Worry) and the one-way ANOVA analysis utilized to test the difference in the means among the groups (publicity and awareness, publicity and apprehension, publicity and caution, and publicity and worry). The findings for research question 2 are presented; specifically, the Pearson correlation analysis utilized to test the strength of the relationship between the variables (between Awareness score and Apprehension score, Awareness score and Caution score, and Awareness score and Worry score). The findings for research question 3 are presented;

specifically, the multiple regression analysis to test the predictability of the independent variables (Age, Gender, Race, Departmental Affiliation, Professional Status, and Institutional Publicity) on the dependent variables (Awareness score, Apprehension score, Caution score, and Worry score). This chapter also provides a summary of the findings.

Chapter 5 offers a brief introduction of the issue followed by a summary of the research study, a summary of the research findings, a description of the implications this study has for practice, the limitations of this study, recommendations for future research, and a conclusion that reiterates the importance of the topic and this research.

These chapters are followed by a list of references and appendices. Contained in the appendices are the survey instrument, the demographic information of the respondents, and the survey questions analyzed by age, race, gender, departmental affiliation, professional status, and institutional publicity.

## **Chapter 2: Review of the Literature**

In order to design a study that addresses the research questions it was important that I conduct a review of relevant literature. The literature review discusses historical information on sexual harassment, the issue of sexual harassment on college and university campuses, sexual harassment by faculty members, and a thematic approach to the literature that identifies several factors perceived to influence faculty behavior.

### **Sexual Harassment**

Over four decades ago, harassment based on sex was not an accepted basis for a claim of discrimination. Under the federal law Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, individuals are protected against discrimination in the workplace. The federal law Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 protects individuals from discrimination at any institution or program that receives federal funding. However, discrimination on the basis of a person's sex was not always accepted as a legal basis for a complaint under Title VII. It wasn't until the late 1970s and early 1980s that this changed.

Feminist and legal scholar Catharine MacKinnon advocated for women's equal rights and treatment in the workplace. According to Crittenden (2009), "MacKinnon reasoned sexual harassment is considered a form of sex discrimination because its occurrence is due to the gender of the victim and the acts of sexual harassment occur and recur through the regulation of inferiority based on sex. Such regulation of inferiority of individuals based on their sex or gender is the basis of sex discrimination, and sexual harassment is a tool of sex discrimination to enforce gender superiority" (p. 1).

Supreme Court case *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson*, 477 U.S. 57 (1986), was the first time sexual harassment was recognized by the court as being an issue that required action under the law. According to Cochran (2004), the ruling affirmed that sexual harassment in the

workplace is recognized as a form of sex discrimination under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As per EEOC statistics and following the ruling of *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson*, sexual harassment cases increased from 10 cases per year before 1986 to 624 cases being reported the following year. The Supreme Court's decision recognized sex as a form of gender discrimination and the basis for a legitimate legal cause for sexual harassment litigation.

According to the EEOC (2018), sexual harassment is the unlawful harassment of a person based on the individual's sex. It can include but is not limited to unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature. Although the law doesn't prohibit simple teasing, offhand comments, or isolated incidents that are not very serious, harassment is illegal when it is so frequent or severe that it creates a hostile and/or offensive work or educational environment that can subsequently result in an adverse employment or academic decision.

### **Sexual Harassment on College and University Campuses**

According to a study by Sipe, Johnson, and Fisher (2008), sexual assault on college campuses has gotten national attention. In September 2014, under President Obama the administration partnered with different stakeholders to launch national public awareness campaigns to address interpersonal violence (sexual harassment and sexual assault) on college and university campuses. Campaigns such as "It's On Us" and "Not Alone" have been implemented across the nation at various colleges and universities in recognition of the fact that sexual assault on campuses has become a major concern.

In a study by Runtz and O'Donnell (2003), "three potential sources of variability in university students' perceptions of sexual harassment in hypothetical professor-student scenarios: rater's gender, the gender of the professor and student, and rater's own sexual harassment" were investigated (p. 963). The study revealed that "participants were most likely to

identify the interactions as harassment when they involved a male offender and a female victim. They were less likely to label the behaviors as harassment when they occurred between members of the same gender or between a female professor and a male student. Women were more open to viewing the scenarios as harassment and men were unlikely to view the interactions between a female professor and a male student as harassment” (Runtz & O’Donnell, 2003, p. 963). The study revealed that men and women continue to hold different views of what sexual harassment is despite a heightened sense of awareness about the issue. In addition, “awareness of the possibility for sexual harassment to occur within same-gender relationships as well as the potential for women to harass men in academic settings appears to be lagging behind students’ understanding of the harassment of women by men” (Runtz & O’Donnell, 2003, p. 980). The study further revealed that the fact “that male students are particularly unwilling to acknowledge the potential for sexual harassment to occur within these other types of relationships suggests a need for further education and awareness training of university students in order to increase awareness and sensitivity as well as to prevent and halt sexual harassment in these settings” (Runtz & O’Donnell, 2003, p. 980).

By the researchers’ own admission, the study had limitations. The limitations of the study are as follows: the sampling was not random but rather a convenience sample that did not reflect a variance in age amongst the participants, and the methodology used to determine the extent of training participants had regarding sexual harassment and whether they actually experienced sexual harassment themselves was not addressed in great detail. The researchers only utilized two closed-in questions for both topic areas to identify information crucial to the study. It is my opinion as well that additional questions both open and closed-ended would have helped gather additional information and perhaps identify other unknown or unidentified areas to address.



Having held the position of Title IX Coordinator at two 4-year institutions, I have gained considerable insight on the issue of sexual harassment on college and university campuses, as well as becoming very familiar with the various training programs and methods to educate individuals and address sexual harassment. I agree with Runtz and O'Donnell's finding with respect to the need for further education and awareness training regarding sexual harassment on college and university campuses. In my role as Title IX Coordinator and trainer on sexual harassment, I have personally observed the findings communicated in the Runtz and O'Donnell study. Specifically, I have witnessed the divergent views of males and females when it comes to identifying sexual harassment.

At institutions of higher education students have protection against sexual harassment under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which are addressed by the Title IX Coordinator or comparable designee. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is a federal law that protects individuals from being discriminated against based on sex, in educational programs or activities that receive federal financial funding. "Title IX states that no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). As previously stated, sexual harassment is considered a form of discrimination based on an individual's sex.

The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) is the federal agency and governing body that enforces compliance with Title IX. According to OCR, all colleges and universities that receive federal funding are required to comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972. Institutions that are required to comply with Title IX must have an

institutional policy in place that outlines the institution's procedure on addressing allegations of misconduct that fall under Title IX.

To comply with the mandates of Title IX, colleges and universities have established their own institutional policies regarding Title IX. These institutional policies usually mirror the federal law; however, specific information as it relates to their respective institutions is included in their policies. OCR issued a letter to all institutions that must comply with Title IX explaining what is legally expected of them. The letter was called the "Dear Colleague Letter on Sexual Violence" (DCL). On April 4, 2011, OCR issued the DCL to all institutions and/or activities that are obligated to comply with Title IX. The DCL explains "the requirements of Title IX pertaining to sexual harassment, which also covers sexual violence, and lays out the specific Title IX requirements applicable to sexual violence" (U.S. Department of Education, 2011).

### **Sexual Harassment by Faculty Members**

Sexual harassment complaints being filed against faculty members is not something new to academia. Studies conducted at various colleges and universities and have revealed that students, both undergraduate and graduate, have experienced some form of unwanted sexual attention from an instructor. Several research studies conducted have found that cases involving student against professor sexual harassment allegations usually involve male professors harassing female students. Traditionally, complaints are filed against males more than females regarding sexual harassment. This does not mean that sexual harassment does not occur in which males are the victims. As previously stated, males are less likely to report being sexually harassed by women; therefore, the information and data regarding incidents of sexual harassment are skewed.

According to Braxton, Proper, and Bayer (2011), "the principal reason for the lack of data on the frequency or occurrence of misconduct is that many cases are handled internally

within the university, most are considered to be private personnel matters and there is a strong institutional administrative initiative to avoid external publicity of these cases if at all possible in order to protect the reputation of the university” (p. 21). I am in total agreement with Braxton et al.’s position regarding the lack of data. These matters are considered private personnel or student matters that are protected by laws such as FERPA (The Family Educational Rights & Privacy Act of 1974). FERPA is a federal law that protects the rights of students at institutions that receive federal funding. Disclosing any information that may be a part of a student’s record would be a violation of FERPA.

A study conducted by Cantalupo and Kidder (2018) involved comprehensive inventory and analysis of 300 cases of sexual harassment obtained from media reports, U.S. Department of Education, lawsuits filed by students, and lawsuits by tenure-track faculty fired for sexual harassment. Results revealed that “faculty sexual harassers are not engaged primarily in verbal behavior. Rather, most of the cases reviewed for this study (53%) involved faculty alleged to have engaged in unwelcome physical contact dominated by groping, sexual assault, and domestic abuse-like behaviors. Second, more than half (53%) of cases involved professors allegedly engaged in serial sexual harassment” (p. 672).

Having conducted research and reviewed articles written in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* over the last year on sexual harassment by faculty members at various colleges and universities throughout the United States, I am in support of the findings of the Cantalupo and Kidder (2018) study. In several of the recent articles I read regarding allegations of sexual harassment against faculty members, most of the faculty members accused of engaging in behavior that was perceived as being sexually harassing in nature had more than one accuser; thereby, supporting the notion that these individuals engaged in serial sexual harassment.

However, the study is limited for a few reasons which the researchers acknowledge. The limitations are as follows: the study only analyzed cases for a selected timeframe, the cases reviewed were only the “tip of the iceberg” (meaning there were a lot of relevant cases that are not in the public eye), and the cases reviewed were not randomly sampled. It can be argued that the researchers chose or selected certain cases that steered results in a certain direction. I am not saying this is the case with this study; however, such opposition has been made when studies use selected sampling and not random sampling.

### **Factors That Are Perceived to Influence Faculty Behavior**

From the research conducted, many of the sources reviewed found several different factors that can influence faculty behavior. Most of the sources found that multiple factors can play a part in how faculty behave. Factors such as gender, race, age, and tenured versus non-tenured status were all identified. Lazarsfeld and Thielens’ (1958) study known as the “Teacher Apprehension Study” found that environmental factors had an influence on faculty behavior. Social climates, social norms, and societal perception often determine what is and what is not acceptable behavior, as well as what behavior faculty may engage in inside and outside the classroom.

#### **Social Climates**

Social climates are the perceptions of a group of individuals that are shared among the members of the group. In their study Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) reported that faculty members had a propensity to stay away from other faculty members who were perceived as going against the acceptable norms of the group and the surrounding society.

#### **Social Norms**

Like others, Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) found that social norms also influence faculty behavior. Social norms are the unwritten expectations of how a person should behave.

What is or is not acceptable behavior is defined by members of society. According to Braxton and Bayer (1999), “for professions, norms provide a guide to appropriate and inappropriate behavior with respect to colleagues and clients” (p. 3). According to Braxton et al. (2011), “norms represent shared beliefs within a particular social or professional group about preferred or expected behavior in a given situation or circumstance” (p. 2).

### **Societal Perception**

Lazarsfeld and Thielens’ (1958) study discussed how administrators and the surrounding community viewed faculty members whose publications were seen as being too supportive of communism. Societal perception is how members of the same group and those outside of the group perceive one’s behavior. Theories have evolved from the notion of societal influence with respect to human behavior. For example, the “mob mentality” or “pack mentality” describes how people can be influenced by their peers to engage in behaviors that are socially unacceptable but considered to be normal and/or the norm because they are being engaged in by all the members of the group.

The Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) study has a major limitation that if replicated in 2018 may not be a factor. Their study of faculty behavior with respect to apprehension focused on faculty members’ potential fear of being called a communist or supporting communist views. If replicated today, findings pertaining to faculty apprehension for fear of having certain political views might be different.

Braxton and Bayer’s (1999) study conducted a survey of faculty members at research universities, liberal arts colleges, and two-year community, junior, and technical colleges. The researchers sought to focus on four disciplines—biology, history, mathematics, and psychology—to determine how individual, disciplinary, and institutional differences influence faculty

behavior. The findings revealed that teaching norms are informally defined and observed. The study also revealed that faculty responses to behaviors differed by gender, tenure, and status (professional/organizational status). This was a very key finding. However, a significant limitation of this study is that it only focused on four disciplines. Future research should focus on other disciplines as well. Another limitation is the fact that the study only included select types of institutions. Future research should open up the population to consist of all types of educational institutions. The researchers identified these limitations and a few others as areas for future research.

As previously stated, Braxton and Bayer (1999) revealed key findings with respect to faculty behavior and how responses differed based on gender, tenure, and status (professional/organizational status). Other resources discussed how age and race also could influence how faculty behave.

## **Gender**

Women tend to view acceptable and unacceptable behavior differently than men. Traditionally, the issue of interpersonal violence has been referred to as “a woman’s issue”; however, the matter is now being viewed as a societal issue. Women still appear at the forefront of the movement to end interpersonal violence, although men are actively involved as well. According to Goodwin and Stevens (1993), men and women have different views of what constitutes good teaching. Therefore, perceptions of what is acceptable behavior in and outside the classroom may differ based on gender and/or sexual identification.

Goodwin and Stevens (1993) were “interested in obtaining university faculty members’ views on what they perceived to be the teacher or teaching characteristics that resulted in ‘good’ teaching and on what they perceived to be the appropriate outcomes of ‘good’ teaching” (p. 166). They were attempting to surmise whether the gender of the faculty has an influence on their

perceptions about good teaching and the appropriate outcomes of good teaching. By the researchers' own admission there were two major limitations to the study. The first was a response rate of 35% and the second was the fact they used a "self-reporting" questionnaire. The truthfulness of the responses is questionable. I identified the need for future research to include various universities and not just one network of schools, as this study did. The study was all-encompassing with respect to the fact the population included participants from all disciplines at the colleges and universities.

According to a study by Montgomery, Kane, and Vance (2004), women were found to be more likely than males to identify particular behaviors as inappropriate. They also found that men and women have differing thresholds for inappropriate or uncivil behaviors. Montgomery et al. (2004) also found that an individual's decision on whether or not to side with a victim can be influenced by race or by gender. In my opinion, this could be perceived as a weakness of the study in that participants were not giving their unbiased view of the matter. They sided with the victim based on race and gender.

According to Crittenden (2009), a study by McKinney (1990) to assess beliefs about and tolerance of sexual harassment in academia found, like most studies, that "males are more tolerant of sexual harassment, more likely to agree with statements indicating sexual harassment is natural in a workplace setting, and that attractive people should learn how to handle unwanted sexual attention than are women" (p. 33). The study utilized a self-administered questionnaire that was mailed to the faculty at a large public university in the Midwest and to the entire faculty population at a small public institution in the Western Mountain region.

### **Age**

With respect to age, how a faculty member views a certain behavior can be associated with their age. In the past, faculty members felt at liberty to say whatever they wanted to say and

to conduct themselves however they saw fit. Students were forced to tolerate questionable behavior from faculty. However, in light of the heightened sense of awareness regarding interpersonal violence, what is acceptable or unacceptable behavior by faculty has somewhat changed. In the past, there was an unspoken belief that faculty members held somewhat of a parental role in lieu of parents when children attended college. Therefore as parents, faculty members sometimes made comments that were indicative of having a parental role over students. How faculty members respond to what is acceptable and not acceptable behavior may differ based on age.

According to Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958), “as a professor grows older he is likely to have published more, he becomes better known, and so might feel more secure because he can count on the support of his academic public” (p. 238). The researchers also mentioned that a professor who has many publications and receives outside income may not be in fear of losing employment with their college or university because they have an outside income source to provide temporary financial support. Lazarsfeld and Thielens also found that younger faculty were more apprehensive than older faculty. Although one would think it is due to the lack of tenure, Lazarsfeld and Thielens found little statistical difference between those who had tenure and those who did not. Both groups appeared to be apprehensive, with younger faculty more so than older faculty.

## **Race**

Faculty behavior based on race is different for various races. Often minority faculty members have different experiences than their non-minority peers. According to Liu and Meyer (2005), minority teachers often deal with more student discipline problems than their non-minority colleagues. A study by Hendrix (1997) found that African American teachers’ credibility is more commonly challenged by students compared to the credibility of White



teachers. This type of behavior could lead to incivility in the classroom by both the faculty member and the student.

According to Zhu (2011), information on the perceptions and experiences of minority faculty and their interactions with students is limited. There is also limited information on the influence a faculty member's race has on their experiences in the classroom and their interactions with students. Taking this into consideration, addressing how faculty responses to my survey differ or not based on their individual race can contribute to the research on faculty behavior.

### **Tenured versus Non-Tenured**

Whether the faculty member is tenured or non-tenured can also have an influence on faculty behavior. According to Braxton, Eimers, and Bayer (1996), "faculty holding academic tenure are more likely to take seriously the normative orientations for undergraduate teaching than are faculty not holding tenure. Faculty holding tenure are more likely to have more fully developed views on the types of teaching behaviors that are inappropriate and deserving of sanctioning action" (p. 603).

### **Professional/Organizational Status**

A faculty member's status at the university can also have a determining factor as to how that faculty member may behave. According to Abbott (1983), faculty of higher status tend to follow professional ethics codes more so than those with lower status. Faculty members who had a lot more to lose with respect to their reputation and/or creditability were in most cases mindful of their behavior.

### **Important Takeaways from the Literature**

From the literature I am able to gather that various factors are perceived as having an influence on faculty behavior. The literature that I found most applicable to my research were the studies by Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) and by Braxton and Bayer (1999). The Braxton and

Bayer (1999) study focused on faculty behavior and misconduct. These two studies along with others reviewed identified key variables that I used as part of my study. These include age, race, gender, tenured versus non-tenured status, and professional/organizational status.

### **Gaps in Literature**

I have not found any literature that focused specifically on the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment and the perceived influence on faculty behavior inside and outside the classroom. Sexual harassment by a faculty member is considered misconduct and, depending on the facts of the matter, the complaint could have been filed whether a faculty member was uncivil inside or outside the classroom. Therefore, is my belief that my current research and perhaps my continuation of this research topic in the future from a wider perspective makes significant contributions to the study of faculty behavior.

### **Literature Chosen**

Again, the Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) and the Braxton and Bayer (1999) studies were key to my research. I chose to focus on the literature that I reviewed because the studies offered considerable insight into the study of faculty behavior.

## **Chapter 3: Methodology**

### **Problem Statement**

Faculty behavior inside and outside the classroom is a concern of higher education administrators on college and university campuses. Inappropriate behavior in and outside the classroom by faculty has resulted in sexual harassment complaints being filed by students against faculty members and has led to costly litigation and settlements for colleges and universities. According to Flaherty (2018), the University of California campuses at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Davis paid out nearly \$4.5 million in 20 settlements related to sexual harassment from 2008 to 2017. The administrators tasked with implementing corrective action failed to discipline faculty members accused of sexual harassment.

In some situations, faculty members have completely crossed the “ethical line” and physically touched students in a manner that can be perceived as being inappropriate. In an article written in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* Katherine Mangan described one of several complaints filed against a University of Virginia professor and award-winning author John Casey. According to one of the complaints, “Professor Casey repeatedly touched me and other M.F.A. fiction female students at departmental social functions on our shoulders, lower backs, and butts, as well as making routine comments on our appearance in class, such as when female students looked particularly attractive, remarking that one female student was wearing a low-cut top, and remarking that another female student ‘looked like a streetwalker’” (Mangan, 2017, p. 2).

In another article, “Janet D. Stemwedel, a professor and chair of San Jose State University’s philosophy department, has described being sexually assaulted during graduate school. When I go to conferences, she says, I have to look at the program to see whether the session I want to go to is one where my harasser is one of the speakers” (Schmalz, 2018, p. 2).

Another student mentioned in the article, “Whitney, who asked to use only her first name for fear of online attacks, left her graduate program in the fourth year after a professor kissed and touched her, she says. Immediately after the incident, she says, ‘almost every professor treated me like a pariah’” (Schmalz, 2018, p. 2). According to the article, she now works outside of academe but teaches an online class and keeps up with philosophy, her field of study. A recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* described how “Inder Verma, a renowned cancer and genetics researcher at the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, was placed on administrative leave on April 21 after allegations were made against him by eight women” (Gluckman, 2018, p. 1). In the article, “Monica Zoppè, who was a postdoc in Verma’s lab in 1992, said that after he tried to kiss her, and she rebuffed him, he routinely disparaged her work” (Gluckman 2018, p. 3).

As seen from just a few of the examples communicated above, sexual harassment of students by faculty continues to occur on college and university campuses. In some cases, there are deliberate acts by faculty members. However, in some cases, topics discussed or comments made in the classroom setting have resulted in complaints being filed against faculty members. As previously stated, faculty members in disciplines such as history, political science, psychology, and sociology often discuss controversial and/or inflammatory material related to gender during their lectures. The discussion of such controversial and/or inflammatory material in some cases can lead to comments that can be interpreted by students as harassing and/or inappropriate in nature.

In light of the potential for complaints to be filed regarding comments made in the classroom and amid the broader emergence of the “Me Too” movement, what has been the effect on faculty in their interactions with students? Have faculty shied away from discussing controversial and/or inflammatory material for fear of inciting students’ reactions? Have faculty

tried to directly address these issues in the classroom? Or have these concerns had a chilling effect on academic freedom? Has the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment influenced how faculty behave inside and outside the classroom?

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to gather information on faculty perception of behavior considering the recent heightened publicity regarding sexual harassment. Has the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment negatively influenced how faculty interact with students? The study set out to determine the extent of faculty awareness, the extent to which such awareness has increased faculty apprehension, the extent to which faculty awareness has increased caution in and outside the classroom, and the extent to which faculty awareness has increased worry inside and outside the classroom? The study discusses to what extent faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry are predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member), faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured).

### **Conceptual Framework**

The theoretical framework that most closely related to this research is Lazarsfeld and Thielens' (1958) study in which they found that environmental factors could influence faculty behavior. Informally known as the "Teacher Apprehension Study," Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) "developed a paradigm for contextual analysis that culminated in *The Academic Mind*. Probing the pressing question of the effects of McCarthyism on academia. The investigators asked: How did the climate of fear generated globally by the cold war against communism and

manifested locally on college campuses by attacks on the character of individual teachers because of their alleged political beliefs affect colleges and universities” (Smith, 2011, p. 23).

The research questions addressed as part of this study were the following:

1. How has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment affected faculty awareness of the issue?
2. A. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with apprehension inside and outside the classroom?  
B. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with caution inside and outside the classroom?  
C. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with worry inside and outside the classroom?
3. To what extent are faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven’t been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member), faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured)?

### **Research Design**

To address the research questions, a quantitative study was conducted. An anonymous survey was utilized to gather relevant information. The survey was sent to all faculty members identified on their respective institutions’ websites as being a member of and/or affiliated with the four disciplines focused on in this study. Allowing the survey taker to be anonymous can aid in the truthfulness of the responses. The survey consisted of 21 questions and required less than 20 minutes to complete. The institutions were chosen purposively based on their recent history regarding the issue of sexual harassment and the behavior of a faculty member. Specifically, the

institutions had and had not been in the news recently for an issue regarding sexual harassment and a faculty member's behavior. For the purpose of this study, "in the news" is operationally defined as appearing in newspapers, on television, on the radio, on websites (the *Chronicle of Higher Education*), in internet articles, and/or online using an internet search engine (i.e., Google) to search for the specific topic.

### **Data Collection**

***Population and sample.*** The population for the survey consisted of tenured, tenure-track and non-tenured faculty members at 4-year institutions in the United States who belong to and/or are affiliated with the study's four targeted disciplines (history, political science, psychology, and sociology). These four departments were targeted because of the likelihood of the faculty member discussing controversial and/or inflammatory material related to gender during their lectures. The population and sample also came from institutions that had and had not been in the news during the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment of a student by a faculty member.

An internet search was performed on the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* website in order to identify institutions that had been in the news during the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment of a student by a faculty member. Specifically, "sexual harassment allegations against faculty member" was typed into the search browser on the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* website and the "Content Type" selected was "Articles." The search results listed 66 articles written in the last two years about the topic of faculty members accused of sexual harassment by a student. From these articles, a list of 10 institutions that were in the news in the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment of a student by a faculty member was generated. A secondary search was performed using the same search words, "sexual harassment allegations against faculty member," with the search engine Google. The secondary search

confirmed the information obtained from the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* website. A review of the websites of these 10 institutions was then conducted in order to determine whether the institutions had the specific departments focused on in this study. The review revealed that four of the institutions had the four departments focused on in this study.

A search of the “2019 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education R1 Doctoral Universities” was utilized to identify similarly classified institutions that were not in the news in the last two years. Once a similarly classified institution was identified, an internet search was performed using the search engine Google. The search words used were “sexual harassment allegations against faculty member” and the name of the institution in quotes. A list of 10 similarly classified institutions that were not in the news in the last two years was generated. A review of each institution’s website was performed in order to determine whether the institutions had the specific departments focused on in this study. The review revealed four institutions with the four departments focused on in this study.

After composing the list of institutions that were and were not in the news, the email addresses of the faculty members in the targeted departments were gathered from each institution’s departmental website. In total, a purposeful sample of approximately 1,645 faculty members was utilized for this study. An introductory email explaining my intended research was sent to the potential participants, requesting that they complete my survey. The introductory email contained the link to my survey instrument.

***Survey instrument.*** The survey utilized was a web-based survey composed created using Qualtrics. This method was appropriate for the desired sample comprised of faculty members from 4-year institutions in the United States. Furthermore, the added incentive of utilizing a web-based survey was that identifiable information was not required, which allowed the survey taker



to remain anonymous. “Anonymous survey methods appear to promote greater disclosure of sensitive or stigmatizing information compared to non-anonymous methods. Higher disclosure rates have traditionally been interpreted as being more accurate than lower rates” (Murdoch, Polusny, Bangerter, Grill, Noorbaloochi, & Partin, 2014, p. 1).

The survey instrument consisted of open-ended questions, closed-ended questions, and Likert-scaled questions. The survey also solicited the following key areas that helped in analyzing the responses: age; gender; race; affiliated department; tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenured status; and institutional publicity. The survey questions first inquired about the presence and influence of publicity as it related to the participants’ institutions being in the news or not in the news regarding allegations of sexual harassment made against a faculty member by a student. The survey questions then focused on the following four constructs: Awareness, Apprehension, Caution, and Worry. For the purpose of this study, the definitions of Awareness, Apprehension, Caution, and Worry were acquired from the *Random House College Dictionary Revised Edition*. Awareness is defined as “having knowledge, conscious, cognizant, informed or alert” (Stein, 1975, p. 94). Apprehension is defined as “suspicion or fear of future trouble or evil” (Stein, 1975, p. 66). Caution is defined as “alertness and prudence in a hazardous situation, care or wariness” (Stein, 1975, p. 215). Worry is defined as “to feel uneasy or anxious; fret” (Stein, 1975, p. 1518). It should be noted that it is unclear to what extent respondents interpreted the constructs Awareness, Apprehension, Caution, and Worry as defined. These four constructs were rooted in the Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) study informally known as the “Teacher Apprehension Study” in which they examined the effects of McCarthyism on academia. This study found that environmental factors could influence faculty behavior.

The questions in this study were designed to address the construct Awareness. Specifically, the questions were utilized to determine the faculty member's level of awareness regarding the issue of sexual harassment. The questions regarding Publicity, Awareness, Apprehension, Caution and Worry were utilized to identify the faculty member's level of awareness, apprehension, behavioral caution, and worry inside the classroom. The questions also addressed faculty member's behavior outside the classroom. Some of the survey questions were adopted from and/or have similarity to the questions posed by Lazarsfeld and Thielens in their 1958 study of teacher apprehension. For example, a question to address Caution would be as follows: *"Do you find yourself being more cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?"*

**Analyzing the data.** The responses to the survey were analyzed based on faculty personal characteristics (age, gender, race), faculty professional characteristics (tenured, tenure-track, non-tenured), and institutional publicity (in the news versus not in the news). Indexing was utilized to compile one score from a variety of questions or statements that represented a belief, feeling, or attitude. In order to create the indexes, the survey responses were assigned numeric values which were added together to get a total score for each construct. For example, responses to the questions related to awareness were scored as follows: Having responded "No awareness" the participant received a (0); having responded "Some awareness" or "High awareness" the participant received a (1). Questions soliciting "Yes" and "No" responses were scored 1 for "Yes" and 0 for "No." A total score was calculated for all questions related to awareness for each participant. The participant was then identified on the Awareness index based on their total score. This method was utilized to create indexes for the other constructs as well. An Apprehension index, a Caution index, and a Worry index were all created to represent the survey

participants' responses. These indexes show how each participant scored in relation to other participants; specifically, where individuals scored above and below the median. The indexes also show the percentages of where the participants ranged in relation to other participants.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences ("SPSS") was also utilized to conduct One-Way ANOVA Analysis, Pearson Correlation Analysis and Multiple Regression Analysis. The One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between the means of the independent variables. The Pearson Correlation Analysis was conducted in order to evaluate the strength of the relationship between the independent variables. Multiple Regression Analysis was conducted to determine how much of the variance in the dependent/outcome variable Awareness scores, Apprehension scores, Caution scores, and Worry scores could be explained by the independent/predictor variables Race, Gender, Age, Department, Professional Status, and Publicity.

Again, this study set out to determine the extent the recent publicity had on faculty awareness, the extent of faculty awareness, the extent to which such *awareness* increased faculty *apprehension*, the extent to which faculty awareness increased *caution* in and outside the classroom, and the extent to which faculty awareness increased *worry* inside and outside the classroom. How did the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment affect faculty awareness of the issue? In order to do this, the study addressed the following research questions: To what extent is faculty awareness associated with apprehension inside and outside the classroom? To what extent is faculty awareness associated with caution inside and outside the classroom? To what extent is faculty awareness associated with worry inside and outside the classroom? To what extent are faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news

regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member), faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured)?

In order to address the aforementioned research questions, a solicitation email was initially sent to 1,078 faculty members at various 4-year institutions throughout the United States requesting that they complete an anonymous survey. The targeted response rate was 10% (108 responses). A few days after sending the initial solicitation email, a brief review of the racial makeup of the 1,078 faculty members revealed that 60% of the population were Caucasian men, 25% were Caucasian women, and 15% were faculty of color. These percentages are proportionate to the representation of minority faculty in higher education, which is about 16%. However, due to the fact that race was a component utilized to analyze the responses, it was determined that the study needed more diversity.

In order to address the lack of diversity, a review of the “2019 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education R2 Doctoral Universities” was conducted. Review of the “R2 Doctoral Universities” list revealed similarly classified historically black colleges and universities that had minority faculty on staff. From the list, five schools were identified as similarly classified, had the four targeted disciplines, and had faculty members of color. The same solicitation email was sent to an additional 567 faculty members in an attempt to address the lack of diversity in the population. The solicitation email was sent to a total of 1,645 faculty members with a targeted response rate of 10% (165 responses).

One week after sending the initial solicitation email, a reminder email was sent to the entire population. A few faculty members requested to be removed from the population. After two weeks, a third email was sent to the entire population requesting that they complete the

anonymous survey. After receiving a few email responses from faculty members that seemed to suggest they were opposed to the research, it was decided that the third email would be the last attempt at soliciting participants for the study.

## Chapter 4: Results

As previously stated in Chapter 3, the purpose of this study was to gather information on faculty perception of behavior considering the recent heightened publicity regarding sexual harassment. Has the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment negatively influenced how faculty interact with students? The study set out to determine the extent of the recent publicity on faculty awareness, the extent of faculty awareness, the extent to which such *awareness* increased faculty *apprehension*, the extent to which faculty awareness increased *caution* in and outside the classroom, and the extent faculty to which awareness has increased worry inside and outside the classroom. The study discusses whether responses varied based on age, gender, race, tenured versus non-tenured status, and the department in which the faculty member is affiliated and institutional publicity.

In order to address the aforementioned questions, the following research questions were addressed by this study: To what extent is faculty awareness associated with apprehension inside and outside the classroom? To what extent is faculty awareness associated with caution inside and outside the classroom? To what extent is faculty awareness associated with worry inside and outside the classroom? To what extent are faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member), faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured)?

To gather information to address the research questions, a solicitation email was sent to a total of 1,645 faculty members requesting their participation in this study. A self-imposed time limit of three weeks was allotted to receive survey responses. At the end of the three-week period, a total of 72 faculty members completed the survey, equating to a response rate of 4.38%.

Because a few faculty members sent email responses that seemed to suggest opposition to the research, it was decided that the third email would be the last attempt at soliciting participants for the study. Therefore, the targeted response rate of 10% was not achieved.

### **Population Demographics**

Table 1 shows the distribution by departmental affiliation of the total population who were sent the anonymous survey. Age, gender, race, and professional status were not identified pre-survey.

Table 1.

*Departmental Affiliation of Total Population in Percentages (N = 1645)*

<b>Departmental Affiliation</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>N=1645</b>		
History	472	28.7
Political Science	348	21.2
Psychology	489	29.7
Sociology	336	20.4
Total	1645	100

### **Respondent Demographics**

Table 2 shows the distribution of the respondents (N=72) by departmental affiliation, professional status, age range, gender, and race.

Table 2.

*Distribution of Respondents by Professional and Personal Characteristics*

<b>Department</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
History	18	25
Political Science	17	23.6
Psychology	22	30.6
Sociology	15	20.8
Total	72	100
<b>Professional Status</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Tenured	53	73.6
Tenure-Track	14	19.4
Non-Tenured	5	6.9
Total	72	100
<b>Age Range</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Age 27-37	15	20.8
Age 38-48	12	16.7
Age 49-59	22	30.6
Age 60-70	16	22.2
Age 71-81	4	5.6
Total	69	95.9

Note: Three participants did not disclose their age.



<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Male	36	50
Female	36	50
Total	72	100
<b>Race</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
White (Caucasian)	55	76.4
Black (African American, Haitian American)	8	11.1
Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black)	6	8.3
Total	69	95.8
Note: Three participants did not disclose their race.		

While the distribution of respondents by professional status (tenured, tenure-track, non-tenured) and personal characteristics (Age, Gender, Race) could not be determined prior to completion of the anonymous survey, a comparison of Table 1 to Table 2 revealed that faculty responses were at a minimum closely distributed with regard to departmental affiliation, suggesting no obvious response bias.

**Research Question 1.** *How has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment affected faculty awareness of the issue?*

## Part A. Presence or Absence of Publicity

Table 3.

*Distribution of Faculty Responses Based on the Condition “Publicity” (N=72)*

Condition (Presence of Publicity)	N	Percent
Institution Has Been in the News	25	34.7
Institution Has Not Been in the News	28	38.4
Don’t Know Whether Their Institution Has Been in the News	19	26.4
All	72	100.0

Table 3 above displays the distribution of faculty responses by institutional publicity: whether faculty reported their institution had been in the news, had not been in the news, or they didn’t know. It shows that about equal proportions of the respondents reported that their institution had been in the news (34.7%), had not been in the news (38.4%), and they know if the institution was in the news in the last two years (26.4%) for allegations of sexual harassment made against a faculty member by a student.

In order to test whether the institution’s being in the news influenced awareness, a One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences in awareness levels among the faculty whose institutions had been in the news, had have not been in the news, or they didn’t know whether their institution had been in the news in the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment made against a faculty member by a student. The results of the One-Way ANOVA were as follows:

## Part B. One-Way ANOVA Publicity and Awareness

Table 4.

*Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Awareness Index for Institutions “In the News,” “Not in the News,” and “Don’t Know”*

Awareness Score	N	% “In the News” (N=25)	% “Not in the News” (N=28)	% “Don’t Know” (N=19)
0-1	0	0	0	0
2	21	28	42.9	10.5
3	7	12	3.6	15.8
4	44	60	53.6	73.7
All Levels	72	100	100	100

**Finding.** The results showed that 60% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Awareness scores, compared to 53.6% of faculty who reported their institution had not been in the news and reported high Awareness scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 73.7% of faculty who reported that they didn’t know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Awareness scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significance differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to awareness. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

In order to test whether being in the news influenced apprehension, a One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences in

apprehension levels among the faculty whose institutions had been in the news, had not been in the news, or they didn't know whether their institution had been in the news in the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment made against a faculty member by a student.

### Part C. One-Way ANOVA Publicity and Apprehension

A One-Way ANOVA Analysis was also performed using SPSS to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups with respect to apprehension. The results are as follows:

Table 5.

*Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Apprehension Index for Institutions “In the News”, “Not in the News” and “Don’t Know”*

Apprehension Score 0 = No Apprehension 1 = Moderate Apprehension 2 = High Apprehension	N	% “In the News” (N=25)	% “Not in the News” (N=28)	% “Don’t Know” (N=19)
0	40	40	71.4	52.6
1	25	52	17.9	36.8
2	7	8	10.7	10.5
All Levels	72	100	100	100

**Finding.** The results showed that 8% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Apprehension scores, compared to 10.7% of faculty who reported that their institution had not been in the news and reported high Apprehension scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 10.5% of faculty who reported they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Apprehension scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significance differences between the

means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to apprehension. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

In order to test whether being in the news influenced caution, a One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences in apprehension levels among the faculty whose institutions had been in the news, had not been in the news, or they didn't know whether their institution had been in the news in the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment made against a faculty member by a student.

#### **Part D. One-Way ANOVA Publicity and Caution**

A One-Way ANOVA Analysis was also performed using SPSS to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups with respect to caution. The results are as follows:

Table 6.

*Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Caution Index for Institutions "In the News", "Not in the News" and "Don't Know"*

Caution Score 0 = No Caution 1 & 2 = Low Caution 3 & 4 = Moderate Caution 5 & 6 High Caution	N	% "In the News" (N=25)	% "Not in the News" (N=28)	% "Don't Know" (N=19)
0	19	20	35.7	21
1	15	20	17.9	21
2	10	12	14.3	15.8
3	11	16	17.9	10.5

Caution Score	N	% "In the News" (N=25)	% "Not in the News" (N=28)	% "Don't Know" (N=19)
0 = No Caution				
1 & 2 = Low Caution				
3 & 4 = Moderate Caution				
5 & 6 High Caution				
4	6	12	3.6	10.5
5	8	12	7.1	15.8
6	3	8	0	5.3
All Levels	72	100	100	100

***Finding.*** The results showed that 8% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Caution scores, compared to 0% of faculty who reported their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Caution scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 5.3% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Caution scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significance differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to caution. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

In order to test whether being in the news influences worry, a One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to determine if there were statistically significant differences in apprehension levels among the faculty whose institutions had been in the news, had not been in the news, or they didn't know whether their institution had been in the news in the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment made against a faculty member by a student.

## Part E. One-Way ANOVA Publicity and Worry

A One-Way ANOVA Analysis was also performed using SPSS to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups with respect to worry. The results are as follows:

Table 7.

*Distribution of Faculty Scores on the Worry Index for Institutions “In the News”, “Not in the News,” and “Don’t Know”*

Worry Score 0 = Low Worry 1 = Low Worry 2 = Moderate Worry 3 = High Worry	N	% “In the News” (N=25)	% “Not in the News” (N=28)	% “Don’t Know” (N=19)
0	31	32	42.9	57.9
1	22	40	28.6	21
2	14	16	25	15.8
3	5	12	3.6	5.3
All Levels	72	100	100	100

**Finding.** The results showed that 12% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Worry scores, compared to 3.6% of faculty who reported that their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Worry scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 5.3% of faculty who reported that they didn’t know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Worry scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significance differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to worry. The P values were

not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

Based on the findings for Research Question 1, self-reported exposure to publicity does have some influence on the level of faculty awareness. The additional questions to be addressed sought to determine the strength of the relationship between faculty awareness and the level of faculty apprehension, the level of faculty caution, and the level of faculty worry for this sample. In order to test the relationships between these variables, Pearson Correlation Analyses were employed.

**Research Question 2A.** *To what extent is faculty awareness associated with apprehension inside and outside the classroom?*

A Pearson Correlation Analysis was performed using SPSS to evaluate the strength of relationship between Awareness and Apprehension. A high correlation means that Awareness and Apprehension have a strong relationship with each other, while a weak correlation means that Awareness and Apprehension are hardly related. The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of the relationship between Awareness and Apprehension revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .189$  and  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0357; therefore, 3.57% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Apprehension scores.

**Research Question 2B.** *To what extent is faculty awareness associated with caution inside and outside the classroom?*

A Pearson Correlation Analysis was performed using SPSS to evaluate the strength of relationship between Awareness and Caution. A high correlation means that Awareness and



Caution have a strong relationship with each other, while a weak correlation means that Awareness and Caution are hardly related. The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of the relationship between Awareness and Caution revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .190$  and  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0361; therefore, 3.61% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Caution scores.

**Research Question 2C.** *To what extent is faculty awareness associated with worry inside and outside the classroom?*

A Pearson Correlation Analysis was also performed using SPSS to evaluate the strength of relationship between Awareness and Worry. A high correlation means that Awareness and Worry have a strong relationship with each other, while a weak correlation means that Awareness and Worry are hardly related. The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength in the relationship between Awareness and Worry revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .168$  and  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0282; therefore, 2.82% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Worry scores.

The last question to be addressed was to what extent faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry are predicted by faculty personal characteristics, faculty professional characteristics, and institutional publicity. In order to test the predictability, Multiple Regression Analyses were employed.

**Research Question 3.** *To what extent are faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student*

against a faculty member), faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured)?

Multiple Regression Analyses were conducted to determine how much of the variance in the dependent/outcome variable Awareness scores, Apprehension scores, Caution scores, and Worry scores could be explained by the independent/predictor variables Race, Gender, Age, Department, Professional Status, and Institutional Publicity. The Multiple Regression results are as follows:

Table 8.

*Multiple Regression Analysis Using Awareness Score as the Dependent Variable*

	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error
Constant	4.006	.619
Race: African American	-.584	.431
Race: Other	-.156	.431
Gender: Female	-.240	.266
Age: 27-37	-.084	.725
Age: 38-48	.109	.557
Age: 49-59	-.390	.553
Age: 60-70	-.350	.549
Department: History	.157	.393
Department: Political Science	-.026	.369
Department: Psychology	.232	.372
Professional Status: Non-Tenured	.029	.579
Professional Status: Tenure-Track	-.207	.524
Publicity: Not in the News	-.430	.318
Publicity: In the News	-.377	.327

Dependent Variable: Awareness Score

R Square = .146; Adjusted R Square = -.084

\*Statistically Significant ( $p < .05$ )

\*\*Statistically Significant ( $P < .01$ )

Note: Regarding Age, the range of 71-81 was left out. Regarding Publicity, faculty “Don’t Know” whether their institution was in the news was left out.

**Finding.** Multiple Regression Analysis showed that this model is not statistically significant.

Table 9.

*Multiple Regression Analysis Using Apprehension Score as the Dependent Variable*

	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error
Constant	.493	.383
Race: African American	.082	.267
Race: Other	-.170	.267
Gender: Female	-.509**	.165
Age: 27-37	.419	.448
Age: 38-48	.297	.345
Age: 49-59	.562	.342
Age: 60-70	.403	.340
Department: History	-.230	.243
Department: Political Science	.183	.228
Department: Psychology	-.084	.230
Professional Status: Non-Tenured	-.253	.358
Professional Status: Tenure-Track	-.429	.324
Publicity: Not in the News	-.093	.197
Publicity: In the News	.068	.203

Dependent Variable: Apprehension Score

R Square = .368; Adjusted R Square = .197

\*Statistically Significant ( $p < .05$ )

\*\*Statistically Significant ( $P < .01$ )

Note: Regarding Age, the range of 71-81 was left out. Regarding Publicity, faculty "Don't Know" whether their institution was in the news was left out.

**Finding.** The Multiple Regression Analysis showed that this model is significant at .05 level of significance. The R Square was .368. It also showed that 36.8% of the variability of faculty Apprehension scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .197 or 19.7 % with Standard Error of the Estimate at .570,  $F = 2.159$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -3.089$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Females' Apprehension scores on average were .509 points lower than men's scores.

Table 10.

*Multiple Regression Analysis Using Caution Score as the Dependent Variable*

	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error
Constant	3.283	.965
Race: African American	.974	.672
Race: Other	-.342	.672
Gender: Female	-1.696**	.415
Age: 27-37	.606	1.130
Age: 38-48	.015	.869
Age: 49-59	.052	.862
Age: 60-70	.670	.856
Department: History	-.349	.613
Department: Political Science	-.162	.576
Department: Psychology	-.234	.581
Professional Status: Non-Tenured	-.807	.903
Professional Status: Tenure-Track	-1.618	.817
Publicity: Not in the News	-.386	.497
Publicity: In the News	-.236	.511

Dependent Variable: Caution Score

R Square = .437; Adjusted R Square = .286

\*Statistically Significant ( $p < .05$ )

\*\*Statistically Significant ( $P < .01$ )

Note: Regarding Age, the range of 71-81 was left out. Regarding Publicity, faculty “Don’t Know” whether their institution was in the news was left out.

**Finding.** The Multiple Regression Analysis showed that this model is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. The R Square was .437. It also showed that 43.7% of the variability of faculty Caution scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .286 or 28.6% with Standard Error of the Estimate at 1.44,  $F = 2.888$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -4.082$   $P < .01$ ). Females’ Caution scores on average were 1.7 points lower than men’s scores.

Table 11.

*Multiple Regression Analysis Using Worry Score as the Dependent Variable*

	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error
Constant	1.209	.568
Race: African American	.042	.395
Race: Other	-.595	.395
Gender: Female	-.689**	.244
Age: 27-37	-.158	.665
Age: 38-48	-.272	.511
Age: 49-59	.136	.507
Age: 60-70	-.021	.503
Department: History	.126	.361
Department: Political Science	.668	.339
Department: Psychology	-.222	.341
Professional Status: Non-Tenured	-.941	.531
Professional Status: Tenure-Track	-.177	.481
Publicity: Not in the News	-.110	.292
Publicity: In the News	.105	.300

Dependent Variable: Worry Score

R Square = .357; Adjusted R Square = .184

\*Statistically Significant ( $p < .05$ )

\*\*Statistically Significant ( $P < .01$ )

Note: Regarding Age, the range of 71-81 was left out. Regarding Publicity, faculty “Don’t Know” whether their institution was in the news was left out.

**Finding.** The Multiple Regression Analysis showed that this model is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. The R Square was .357. It also showed that 35.7% of the variability of faculty Worry scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .184 or 18.4% with Standard Error of the Estimate at 845,  $F = 2.064$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -2.819$   $P < .01$ ). Females’ Worry scores on average were .689 points lower than men’s scores.

### **Summary of Findings**

The results of the One-Way ANOVA Analysis are as follows:

Regarding Publicity and Awareness, the results showed that 60% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Awareness scores, compared to 53.6% of faculty who reported their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Awareness scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 73.7% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Awareness scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to awareness. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

Regarding Publicity and Apprehension, the results showed that 8% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Apprehension scores, compared to 10.7% of faculty who reported their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Apprehension scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 10.5% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Apprehension scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to apprehension. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

Regarding Publicity and Caution, the results showed that 8% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Caution scores, compared to no faculty who reported their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Caution scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 5.3% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Caution scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significance differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to caution. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

Regarding Publicity and Worry, the results showed that 12% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Worry scores, compared to 3.6% of faculty who reported that their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Worry scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 5.3% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Worry scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significance differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to worry. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

The results of the Pearson Correlation Analysis are as follows:

The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of relationship between Awareness and Apprehension revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two

variables,  $r = .189$ ,  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0357; therefore, 3.57% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Apprehension scores.

The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of relationship between Awareness and Caution revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .190$ ,  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0361; therefore, 3.61% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Caution scores.

The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of relationship between Awareness and Worry revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .168$ ,  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0282; therefore, 2.82% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Worry scores.

The results of the Multiple Regression Analysis are as follows:

The Multiple Regression Analysis for Awareness scores revealed that the model was not statistically significant. However, the Multiple Regression Analysis for Apprehension scores revealed that the model was significant at .05 level of significance. The R Square was .368. It also showed that 36.8% of the variability in faculty Apprehension scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .197 or 19.7 % with Standard Error of the Estimate at .570,  $F = 2.159$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -3.089$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Females' Apprehension scores on average were .509 points lower than men's scores.



The Multiple Regression Analysis for Caution scores revealed that the model is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. The R Square was .437. It also showed that 43.7% of the variability in faculty Caution scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .286 or 28.6% with Standard Error of the Estimate at 1.44,  $F = 2.888$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -4.082$   $P < .01$ ). Females' Caution scores on average were 1.7 points lower than men's scores.

The Multiple Regression Analysis for Worry Scores revealed that the model is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. The R Square was .357. It also showed that 35.7% of the variability in faculty Worry scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .184 or 18.4% with Standard Error of the Estimate at 845,  $F = 2.064$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -2.819$   $P < .01$ ). Females' Worry scores on average were .689 points lower than men's scores.

### **Discussion of Respondents**

As previously communicated in Chapter 3 and in Chapter 4, the survey was sent to 1,645 faculty members and only 72 responded. The targeted goal of 164 responses was not obtained. Perhaps the sensitivity of the topic in general deterred faculty members from responding at all. Eight faculty members responded and requested to be removed from the population. They offered no explanation as to why they wanted to be removed. Their requests to be removed were honored expeditiously. Again, one can speculate that the sensitivity of the topic could have prompted these faculty members to ask to be removed from the population. Specifically, perhaps they know colleagues who have either been a victim or accused of sexual harassment. Or even

more triggering, perhaps the faculty members themselves were victims or accused of sexual harassment.

Two faculty members sent emails that suggested they were opposed to the research being conducted. One of these two faculty members reported that they had been teaching in academia for over 50 years and had never been apprehensive or cautious when engaging a student inside or outside the classroom. This faculty member also stated that with respect to a few of the survey questions, participants should have been allowed to provide explanation of their responses instead of just responding “yes” or “no.” When asked if they would be willing to be interviewed personally regarding the topic, they did not respond. The second faculty member who was perceived as being opposed to this research sent an email inquiring whether Seton Hall’s IRB knew emails were being sent related to this research. When advised that they would be removed from the population, the individual then sent a second email questioning whether the research study was approved by the IRB. The individual was again sent an email advising that they had been removed from the population, to which they responded with a third email asserting that their question regarding IRB approval of the study had not been addressed. They alluded to the fact that they were going to contact IRB. An email response was sent to the individual communicating that the study was IRB approved.

## **Chapter 5: Summary**

### **Introduction**

Faculty behavior inside and outside the classroom is a concern of higher education administrators on college and university campuses. Inappropriate behavior inside and outside the classroom by faculty has resulted in sexual harassment complaints being filed by students against faculty. In some cases, these complaints have led to costly litigation and/or settlements for colleges and universities. In recent years, the emergence of socially conscious organizations and movements on college and university campuses has created a heightened sense of awareness regarding the issue of interpersonal violence.

Organizations such as “It’s On Us,” “End Rape on Campus,” and “SAFER” were founded to promote awareness and address the issue of interpersonal violence on college and university campuses (Brinlee 2018, p. 1). SAFER (“Students Active for Ending Rape”) “seeks to empower student-led movements aimed at combating sexual violence on college campuses by providing student activists with resources and evidence to help them reform campus sexual assault policies at their schools” (Brinlee, 2018, p. 8). These organizations have helped students become more knowledgeable and aware of their rights under the law, including the right to obtain an education without exposure to comments, behaviors, and actions by faculty members that could be perceived as being sexually harassing in nature.

Students are now exercising their right to object strongly to questionable comments, behaviors, and acts being engaged in by faculty. According to Braxton, Bayer, and Noseworthy (2002), “unfavorable classroom climate negatively affects student course learning” (p. 104). In a recent lawsuit, three female students at the University of North Texas alleged that their professor made inappropriate comments during class that made them feel embarrassed and afraid to speak up in class (Howland 2019). The growth of young eager minds is no doubt causing change and

evolution in academia. So as academia evolves to accommodate these young eager minds, so grows the need to explore and talk about controversial and inflammatory issues and topics in the classroom setting. However, are faculty embracing the need to explore such topics? Has all the news and media coverage about sexual harassment made faculty shy away from such controversial and inflammatory issues and topics?

The aforementioned questions create the need for this study to be conducted. The purpose of this study was to gather information on faculty perception of behavioral change in response to the recent heightened publicity regarding sexual harassment. Has the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment influenced how faculty interact with students? This study set out to determine the extent of faculty awareness, the extent to which such awareness has increased faculty apprehension, the extent to which faculty awareness has increased caution inside and outside the classroom, and the extent to which faculty awareness has increased worry inside and outside the classroom. How has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment affected faculty awareness of the issue?

This study addressed the following research questions: How has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment affected faculty awareness of the issue? To what extent is faculty awareness associated with apprehension inside and outside the classroom? To what extent is faculty awareness associated with caution inside and outside the classroom? To what extent is faculty awareness associated with worry inside and outside the classroom? To what extent are faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member),

faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured)?

To address these research questions, a quantitative design was employed. An anonymous survey was utilized to gather information from a purposeful sample of approximately 1,645 faculty members. The sample consisted of tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenured faculty members at 4-year institutions in the United States who belong to and/or are affiliated with four targeted disciplines (history, political science, psychology, and sociology). These four disciplines were targeted because of the likelihood that these faculty members would discuss controversial and/or inflammatory material related to gender during their lectures. The sample was derived from institutions that have and have not been in the news during the last two years for allegations of sexual harassment of a student by a faculty member.

A solicitation email explaining the intended research and containing the survey link was sent to potential participants, requesting that they complete the anonymous survey. The survey utilized was a web-based survey composed through Qualtrics. The solicitation email was sent to a total of 1,645 faculty members with a targeted response rate of 10% (165 responses).

The survey instrument consisted of open-ended questions, closed-ended questions, and Likert-scaled questions. The survey questions addressed the following four major constructs: Awareness, Apprehension, Caution, and Worry. Specifically, the questions were designed to address the constructs and utilized to determine the faculty member's level of awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry inside and outside of the classroom. For the purpose of this study, awareness was defined as "having knowledge, conscious, cognizant, informed or alert" (Stein, 1975, p. 94). Apprehension was defined as "suspicion or fear of future trouble or evil" (Stein, 1975, p. 66). Caution was defined as "alertness and prudence in a hazardous situation,

care or wariness” (Stein, 1975, p. 215). Worry was defined as “to feel uneasy or anxious; fret” (Stein, 1975, p. 1518). It should be noted that it is unclear to what extent respondents interpreted the constructs Awareness, Apprehension, Caution and Worry as defined.

These four constructs were rooted in the Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) study informally known as the “Teacher Apprehension Study,” in which they examined the effects of McCarthyism on academia. The current study found that environmental factors could influence faculty behavior. The survey also solicited information on the following key areas that helped in analyzing the responses: age; gender; race; affiliated department; tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenured status; and institutional publicity (in the news versus not in the news).

The survey responses were analyzed based on faculty personal characteristics (age, gender, race), faculty professional characteristics (departmental affiliation and tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenured status), and institutional publicity (in the news versus not in the news). Indexing was utilized to compile one score from a variety of questions or statements that represented a belief, feeling, or attitude. These indexes show how each participant scored in relation to other participants; specifically, where individuals scored above and below the median. The indexes also show the percentages of where each participant ranged in relation to other participants.

SPSS was utilized to conduct One-Way ANOVA Analysis, Pearson Correlation Analysis, and Multiple Regression Analysis. The One-Way ANOVA Analyses were conducted to determine whether there were any statistically significant differences between the means of the independent groups. The Pearson Correlation Analyses were conducted in order to evaluate the strength of the relationship among the dependent variables. Multiple Regression Analyses were conducted to determine how much of the variance in the dependent variables (Awareness scores,

Apprehension scores, Caution scores, and Worry scores) could be explained by the independent variables (Race, Gender, Age, Department, Professional Status, and Institutional Publicity).

After the initial solicitation email a reminder email was sent out a week later to the entire population. A few faculty members requested to be removed from the population. After two weeks, a third email was sent to the entire population requesting that they complete the anonymous survey. After receiving a few email responses from faculty members perceived as being non-supportive in nature, it was decided that the third email would be the last attempt to solicit participants for the study. A self-imposed deadline of three weeks was the allotted time to receive survey responses. At the end of the three-week period, a total of 72 faculty members completed the survey, equating to a response rate of 4.4%. Again, due to the non-supportive email responses received from a few faculty members, it was decided that the third email would be the last attempt to solicit participants for the study. Therefore, the targeted response rate of 10% was not achieved.

### **Summary of Findings**

As it pertains specifically to the research questions, the following is a summary of the key findings:

*1. How has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment affected faculty awareness of the issue?*

The study revealed information to support the hypothesized linkage between the recent publicity and faculty perceptions and behavior. Most fundamentally, the study revealed that the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment has had an influence on faculty awareness of the issue. The study found that institutional publicity (in the news versus not in the news for allegations of sexual harassment against a faculty member by a student) did not have a

statistically significant influence on faculty responses regarding awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry.

The publicity regarding the issue of faculty members being accused of sexual harassment by students has created a heightened sense of awareness regarding the issue. Today's society dictates what is and what is not acceptable behavior by faculty members. Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) found that social norms can also influence faculty behavior. Social norms are the unwritten expectations of how a person should behave. What is or is not acceptable behavior is defined by members of society. According to Twale and Luca (2008), "faculty form beliefs from experiences with colleagues, administrators, committee decisions, faculty meetings, institutional rules and norms" (p. 99). Of the 72 participants in the study, 45.8% responded that the recent publicity has made them highly aware of the issue, 20.8% responded that the recent publicity has made them somewhat aware of the issue, and 23.6% responded that the recent publicity has not influenced their awareness of the issue.

### **Statistical Analysis**

Regarding publicity and awareness, the results showed that 60% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Awareness scores, compared to 53.6% of faculty who reported their institution had not been in the news and also reported high awareness scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 73.7% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Awareness scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to Awareness. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.



Regarding Publicity and Apprehension, the results showed that 8% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Apprehension scores, compared to 10.7% of faculty who reported that their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Apprehension scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 10.5% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Apprehension scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to apprehension. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

Regarding Publicity and Caution, the results showed that 8% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Caution scores, compared to no faculty who reported their institution had not been in the news also reporting high Caution scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 5.3% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Caution scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to Caution. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

Regarding Publicity and Worry, the results showed that 12% of faculty who reported that their institution had been in the news also reported high Worry scores, compared to 3.6% of

faculty who reported that their institution had not been in the news and also reported high Worry scores. In comparison to the aforementioned groups, 5.3% of faculty who reported that they didn't know if their institution had been in the news also reported high Worry scores. When the ANOVA Analysis was employed to test for statistically significant differences between the means across the three groups, the One-Way ANOVA Analysis showed no statistically significant difference between the means across the three publicity groups/condition with respect to worry. The P values were not statistically significant at .05 level of significance for this sample. The F was not a statistically significant difference among the means.

*2A. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with apprehension inside and outside the classroom?*

The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of the relationship between Awareness and Apprehension revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .189$ ,  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0357; therefore, 3.57% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Apprehension scores.

*2B. To what extent is faculty awareness associated with caution inside and outside the classroom?*

The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of the relationship between Awareness and Caution revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .190$ ,  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0361; therefore, 3.61% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Caution scores.

2C. *To what extent is faculty awareness associated with worry inside and outside the classroom?*

The Pearson Correlation Analysis to evaluate the strength of the relationship between Awareness and Worry revealed there is a weak positive correlation between the two variables,  $r = .168$ ,  $N = 72$ . The relationship was found to be not significant at .05 level of significance. The coefficient of determination was .0282; therefore, 2.82% of the variation in Awareness scores can be explained by Worry scores.

3. *To what extent are faculty awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry predicted by institutional publicity (institutions that have been in the news versus institutions that haven't been in the news regarding sexual harassment allegations being made by a student against a faculty member), faculty personal characteristics (gender, age, and race), and faculty professional characteristics (tenured versus non-tenured)?*

Like the Braxton and Bayer (1999) study, this study found that faculty responses differed by gender and professional status (tenured, non-tenured, tenure-track). This study also found that age, race, and professional norms can have an influence on faculty behavior as well. Furthermore, faculty responses regarding awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry varied based on age, gender, race, departmental affiliation, professional status, and institutional publicity.

**Age.** This study found that age did not have a statistically significant influence on faculty responses regarding awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry. Faculty members from 49 to 70 years of age (22.2%) responded as being more apprehensive than faculty members from 29 to 48 years of age (12.5%). This is contrary to Lazarsfeld and Thielens' (1958) study, which found that younger faculty were more apprehensive than older faculty.

***Gender.*** This study found that gender had a statistically significant influence on faculty responses regarding apprehension and caution, but was not statistically significant for awareness and worry. Men reported being more apprehensive and cautious than women when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. The discussion of controversial and/or inflammatory gender related topics in the classroom can lead to comments or behaviors that can be perceived as being inappropriate in nature. Men being apprehensive and cautious about discussing such topics seems to imply a heightened sense of awareness. This is contrary to the study by Montgomery et al. (2004), in which women were found to be more likely than males to identify behaviors as inappropriate. The researchers also found that men and women have differing thresholds for inappropriate or uncivil behaviors.

***Race.*** This study found that race did not have a statistically significant influence on faculty responses regarding awareness, apprehension, caution, and worry. Perhaps a different sample might have shown a more significant influence. The study revealed that Caucasians responded as being more apprehensive, cautious, and worried than other races when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. However, it should be noted that 76.4% of the participants in this study were Caucasian. Information about the perceptions and experiences of minority faculty and their interactions with students is limited. There is also limited information about the influence of a faculty member's race on their experiences in the classroom and their interactions with students.

***Professional status.*** This study found that tenured faculty were more cautious than non-tenured and tenure-track faculty. This finding is contrary to the findings of the Braxton et al. (1996) study, which found that "faculty holding academic tenure are more likely to take seriously the normative orientations for undergraduate teaching than are faculty not holding

tenure. Faculty holding tenure are more likely to have more fully developed views on the types of teaching behaviors that are inappropriate and deserving of sanctioning action” (p. 603).

Lazarsfeld and Thielens found little statistical difference between faculty who had tenure and those who did not.

**Professional norms.** Although professional norms were not tested as part of this study, it can be implied from the participants’ responses that professional norms can have an influence on faculty behavior. When faculty were asked as a part of this study, “*Is there anything that you no longer do in the work environment that you did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment?*” (i.e., *compliment a colleague on their physical appearance, give a colleague a hug, etc.*), 76.4% of the participants responded “no” and 19.4% responded “yes.”

Braxton and Bayer (1999) revealed that “for professions, norms provide a guide to appropriate and inappropriate behavior with respect to colleagues and clients” (p. 3). Leaving faculty to their own devices can lead to the inappropriate behavior which sometimes results in sexual harassment complaints. According to Braxton and Bayer (1999), “without norms, faculty members would be free to follow their own unconstrained and idiosyncratic preferences in teaching and research” (p. 3). The ever-changing landscape of professional norms has caused some faculty members to alter their everyday behavior.

### **Statistical Analysis**

The Multiple Regression Analysis for Awareness scores revealed that the model was not statistically significant. However, the Multiple Regression Analysis for Apprehension scores revealed that the model is significant at .05 level of significance. The R Square was .368. It also showed that 36.8% of the variability in faculty Apprehension scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .197 or 19.7 % with Standard Error of the Estimate at .570,  $F = 2.159$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age,

department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -3.089$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Females' Apprehension scores on average were .509 points lower than men's scores.

The Multiple Regression Analysis for Caution scores revealed that the model is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. The R Square was .437. It also showed that 43.7% of the variability in faculty Caution scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .286 or 28.6% with Standard Error of the Estimate at 1.44,  $F = 2.888$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -4.082$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Females' Caution scores on average were 1.7 points lower than men's scores.

The Multiple Regression Analysis for Worry scores revealed that the model is statistically significant at .01 level of significance. The R Square was .357. It also showed that 35.7% of the variability in faculty Worry scores are explained by this regression model. The Adjusted R Square was .184 or 18.4% with Standard Error of the Estimate at 845,  $F = 2.064$  ( $P < .01$ ). It further showed that when controlling for race, age, department, professional status, and publicity, gender is the only statistically significant contributor to the model Gender ( $t = -2.819$ ,  $P < .01$ ). Females' Worry scores on average were .689 points lower than men's scores.

### **Implications for Practice**

The continued study of this research topic has the potential to make significant contribution to the study of faculty behavior. Literature that focused specifically on the heightened sense of awareness regarding sexual harassment and the perceived influence on faculty behavior inside and outside the classroom could not be found. Therefore, this study can serve as baseline research for future studies to build on and/or be derived from.

This study also shows the need for institutional transparency and/or messaging when an institution has been in the news regarding allegations made against a faculty member. Findings revealed that 26.4% of the participants responded that they did not know whether their institution had been in the news in the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexual harassment by a student. Being informed that a colleague has been accused of sexual harassment can cause others to reflect on their individual behavior inside and outside the classroom and/or promote an enhanced sense of awareness. Therefore, when a faculty member is faced with such allegations and the institution is informed by media outlets that the matter is going to be covered in the news, that institution should consider making all faculty aware of the matter without sharing any information or breaching any confidentiality in the administrative process to address the allegations.

This study revealed that older faculty members were more apprehensive about discussing inflammatory and/or controversial gender-related topics than younger faculty members. It also found that tenured faculty were more cautious when discussing inflammatory and/or controversial gender-related topics than non-tenured and tenure-track faculty. Based on these research findings, colleges and universities may want to consider concentrating on older faculty members and tenured faculty members regarding their apprehension, caution, and worry regarding student engagement inside and outside the classroom. According to Blackburn and Lawrence (1995), “faculty and staff need to be educated about uncivil behavior, its context, and its consequences to the workplace and how it evolves into a bully culture” (p. 157). Educating “junior and senior faculty on the matter appears necessary so that they can pass it along to the next generation of faculty. Faculty can learn civil behavior in the same way they learn uncivil behavior” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 157). Also, training older faculty members and

tenured faculty members on how to discuss inflammatory and/or controversial gender-related topics without being apprehensive, cautious, or worried in a time of heightened sensitivity to such topics can prove to be beneficial. It can be beneficial in the sense of faculty providing a well-rounded educational experience for the young eager minds that are willing to discuss any and all topics. “For the most part, decisions about course content are left up to individual faculty members and faculty members express high levels of satisfaction with this discretion” (Finkelstein, Conley, & Schuster, 2016, p. 295). Faculty members who avoid such topics afford students limited dialogue in the classroom. To that end, faculty who are uncomfortable having such dialogue should be trained on how to safely and adequately engage in such dialogue.

### **Limitations of the Study**

This study had several notable limitations. The first was the population size, which consequently impacted the study’s sample size. Unfortunately, when researching such a sensitive and controversial topic, individuals are apprehensive about participating. I believe the anonymity of the study helped to secure the individuals who participated in the study. The second notable limitation was the non-response bias. The survey was sent to 1,645 faculty members and only 72 responded. Eight faculty members requested to be removed from the population and offered no explanation for why they wanted to be removed. Two faculty members sent emails that seemed to indicate opposition to the research being conducted. One of these two faculty members reported having taught in academia for over 50 years without being apprehensive or cautious when engaging a student inside or outside the classroom. The second faculty member perceived as being opposed to this research sent an email inquiring whether Seton Hall’s IRB knew that emails related to this research were being sent. When advised that they would be removed from the population, the individual then sent a second email questioning whether the research study was approved by IRB. The individual was again sent an email advising that they had been



removed from the population, to which they responded with a third email asserting that their question regarding IRB approval of the study had not been addressed. They alluded to the fact that they were going to contact IRB. An email response was sent to the individual, communicating that the study was IRB approved.

The third notable limitation was the fact that personal interviews were not used in conjunction with the survey approach. The personal interviews would have provided the opportunity to probe the participants with respect to their responses and obtain descriptive data with respect to faculty responses. Lastly, the fourth notable limitation was the fact that it is unclear to what extent respondents interpreted the constructs Awareness, Apprehension, Caution, and Worry as defined. For the purpose of this study, awareness was defined as “having knowledge, conscious, cognizant, informed or alert” (Stein, 1975, p. 94). Apprehension was defined as “suspicion or fear of future trouble or evil” (Stein, 1975, p. 66). Caution was defined as “alertness and prudence in a hazardous situation, care or wariness” (Stein, 1975, p. 215). Worry was defined as “to feel uneasy or anxious; fret” (Stein, 1975, p. 1518). It cannot be determined whether the participants were able to draw and maintain the same fine distinction with respect to the constructs as defined by this study.

### **Recommendations for Research**

Future researchers should consider researching the same topic but employing a qualitative approach, a study that involves interviewing five to 10 faculty members from various institutions but the same targeted disciplines. This approach is different from the larger quantitative approach in that it affords the researcher the opportunity to obtain information they may not obtain by just utilizing an anonymous survey, and it addresses the issue of non-response bias as well.

Future researchers should also consider researching the same topic but employing a mixed method approach. A mixed method study with personal interviews in addition to the anonymous survey would afford the researcher the opportunity to ask probing questions with respect to participants' responses. The anonymous survey proved very helpful in gathering foundational information for this study; however, adding personal interviews to the study could provide further insight on faculty responses. Nevertheless, I learned that utilizing an anonymous survey was an effective method to obtain information on this sensitive topic.

### **Conclusion**

In closing, this study like many others that preceded it has concluded that faculty behavior can be influenced by a number of factors. Faculty personal characteristics (age, gender, and race), faculty professional characteristics (departmental affiliation and professional status of tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenured), and institutional (in the news versus not in the news) are only a few factors that should be taken into consideration when studying faculty behavior. How and why faculty behave in a certain way at a particular time will forever be one of the many areas of study as it relates to human behavior in the workplace. Some predictors of human behavior will at times be accurate while others will fall short; therefore, there will always be a need to study why individuals behave the way that they do, especially when the behavior conflicts with societal norms and expectations.

## References

- Abbott, A. (1983). Professional ethics. *American Journal of Sociology*, 88, 855-85.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Braxton, J. M., & Bayer, A. E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Braxton, J. M., Bayer, A. E., & Noseworthy, J. A. (2002). Students as tenuous agents of social control of professional misconduct. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 77(3), 101-124. doi:10.1207/S15327930PJE7703\_6
- Braxton, J. M., Eimers, M. T., & Bayer, A. E. (1996, November-December). The implication of teaching norms for the improvement of undergraduate education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 603-25.
- Braxton, J. M., Proper, E., & Bayer, A. (2011). *Professors behaving badly: Faculty misconduct in graduate education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brinlee, M. (2018). These campus sexual assault organizations need your support with DeVos Title IX proposal. Retrieved from <https://www.bustle.com/p/these-campus-sexual-assault-organizations-need-your-support-with-devos-title-ix-proposal-13158910>
- Cantalupo, N. C., & Kidder, W. C. (2018) A systematic look at a serial problem: Sexual harassment of students by university faculty. *Utah Law Review*, 2018(3), Article 4.
- Cochran, A. B. (2004). *Sexual harassment and the law: The Mechelle Vinson case*. University Press of Kansas.
- Crittenden, C. (2009). *Examining attitudes and perceptions of sexual harassment on a university campus: What role do myths and stereotypes play?* (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Tennessee, Chattanooga.
- Finkelstein, M. J., Conley, V. M., & Schuster, J. H. (2016). *The faculty factor: Reassessing the American academy in a turbulent era*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gibbs, J. (1981). *Norms, deviance, and social control: Conceptual matters*. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Gluckman, N. (2018, April 27). Famed cancer researcher placed on leave after sexual-harassment accusations. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- Gluckman, N., Read, B., Mangan, K., & Quilantan, B. (2017, November 13). Sexual harassment and assault in higher ed: What's happened since Weinstein. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

- Goode, W. J. (1957). Community within a community. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 194-200.
- Goodwin, L. D., & Stevens, E. A. (1993). The influence of gender on university faculty member's perceptions of good teaching. *Journal of Higher Education*, 64, 166-85.
- Hendrix, K. (1998a). Black and white male professor perceptions of the influence of race on classroom dynamics and credibility. *The Negro Educational Review*, 49(1), 37-52.
- Howland, J. (2019). UNT professor was accused of inappropriate comments about female students: He's suing. Retrieved from <https://www.star-telegram.com/news/local/education/article235927287.html>
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Thielens, W., Jr. (1958). *The academic mind*. The Free Press.
- Liu, X. S., & Meyer, J. P. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of their jobs: A multilevel analysis of the teacher follow-up survey for 1994-95. *Teacher College Record*, 107, 985-1003.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sex discrimination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Mangan, K. (2017, November 22). Prominent creative-writing professor at UVA is accused of sexually harassing students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.
- McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. *Sex Roles*, 23(7/8), 421-438.
- Montgomery, K., Kane, K., & Vance, C. M. (2004). Accounting for differences in norms of respect: A study of assessments of incivility through the lenses of race and gender. *Group & Organization Management*, 29(2), 248-268.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601103252105>
- Murdoch, M., Simon, A. B., Polusny, M. A., Bangerter, A. K., Grill, J. P., Noorbaloochi, S., & Partin, M. R. (2014). Impact of different privacy conditions and incentives on survey response rate, participant representativeness, and disclosure of sensitive information: A randomized controlled trial. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 14, 90.  
[doi:10.1186/1471-2288-14-90](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-14-90)
- Runtz, M. G., & O'Donnell, C. W. (2003). Students' perceptions of sexual harassment: Is it harassment only if the offender is a man and the victim is a woman? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33(5), 963-982.
- Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. (2015, October). *Student policy prohibiting sexual harassment, sexual violence, relationship violence, stalking and related misconduct*.
- Schmalz, J. (2018, May 11). My professional world has gotten smaller. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

- Sipe, S., Johnson, C. and Fisher, D. (2009). University students' perceptions of sexual harassment in the workplace: A view through rose-colored lenses. *Equal Opportunities International*, 28, 336-350. doi:10.1108/02610150910954791
- Smith, R. B. (2011). *Multilevel modeling of social problems: A casual prospective*. Springer Netherlands.
- Stein, J. (1975). *The Random House college dictionary* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Random House.
- Twale, D., & Luca, B. (2008). *Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it* (1st ed.). The Jossey-Bass higher and adult education series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- United States Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. (2011). Dear colleague letter. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201104.html>
- United States Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. (2014). Violence against women act. 34 CFR Part 668. Retrieved from <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2014-10-20/pdf/2014-24284.pdf#page=33>
- United States Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. (2017). Title IX and sex discrimination. Retrieved from [https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix\\_dis.html](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/tix_dis.html)
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2018). Sexual harassment. Retrieved from [https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual\\_harassment.cfm](https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm)
- Zhu, Y. (2011). The impact of race and interactions between student-faculty on undergraduate student learning and multicultural perceptions. Retrieved from <https://www.aaup.org/report/freedom-classroom>

**Appendix A**  
**Faculty Perception Survey Instrument**

---

**Start of Block: Demographic Information**

Q1 What is your race?

☐ Click to write Choice 1 (1) \_\_\_\_\_

-----

Q2 What is your gender?

☐ Male (1)

☐ Female (2)

☐ Other (3)

-----

Q3 What is your age?

☐ Click to write Choice 1 (1) \_\_\_\_\_

-----

Q4 What department are you affiliated with at your current institution? Note: At certain institutions the four departments identified below may be called something different. From the choices below please chose the department that would categorize your academic discipline.

- ☐ History (1)
  - ☐ Psychology (2)
  - ☐ Political Science (3)
  - ☐ Sociology (4)
- 

Q5 What is your professional status at your current institution?

- ☐ Tenured (1)
  - ☐ Non-Tenured (2)
  - ☐ Tenure-Track (3)
  - ☐ Not Applicable (4)
- 

**Construct: Awareness**

Q6 Has the institution that you are currently affiliated with been in the news (TV, Internet, Print Media, etc.) in the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student?

- ☐ Yes (1)
  - ☐ No (0)
  - ☐ Don't know. ()
-

**Construct: Awareness**

Q7 How aware would you say you are regarding the issue of sexual harassment?

- ☐ Highly Aware (2)
- ☐ Somewhat Aware (1)
- ☐ Not Aware (0)

**Construct: Awareness**

Q8 How aware would you say you are regarding the issue of sexual harassment on college and university campuses?

- ☐ Highly Aware (2)
- ☐ Somewhat Aware (1)
- ☐ Not Aware (0)

---

**Construct: Awareness**

Q9 Would you say that the recent publicity regarding the issue of sexual harassment has influenced your awareness of the issue?

- ☐ Yes (1)
  - ☐ No (0)
-



**Construct: Awareness**

Q10 How has the recent publicity regarding the issue of sexual harassment influenced your awareness of the issue?

- ☐ Made me highly aware (2)
  - ☐ Made me somewhat aware (1)
  - ☐ Has not influenced my awareness (0)
- 

**Construct: Apprehension**

Q11 Do you find yourself being apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?

- ☐ Yes (1)
  - ☐ No (0)
- 

**Construct: Caution**

Q12 Do you find yourself being cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?

- ☐ Yes (1)
  - ☐ No (0)
-

**Construct: Worry**

Q13 Do you find yourself avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

---

**Construct: Worry**

Q14 In light of the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment, do you find yourself worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

---

**Construct: Worry**

Q15 Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how you conduct yourself in the classroom when interacting with students?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

---

**Construct: Caution**

Q16 Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how you interact with a student outside of the classroom (i.e., running into a student at a social event, local eatery, etc.)?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

**Construct: Caution**

Q17 Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced your decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student (i.e., during scheduled office hours or an individual appointment with a student)?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

---

**Construct: Caution**

Q18 Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced your decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug (i.e., after a successful dissertation defense, at a ceremony honoring a student, etc.)?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

---

**Construct: Caution**

Q19 Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced your decision whether to be alone with a student?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

---

**Construct: Caution**

Q20 Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how you interact with colleagues?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

**Construct: Apprehension**

Q21 Is there anything that you no longer do in the work environment that you did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment (i.e., compliment a colleague on their physical appearance, give a colleague a hug, etc.)?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (0)

End of Block: Demographic Information

---

## Appendix B

### Demographic Information

The age ranges, gender, race, professional status, departmental affiliation, and institutional publicity of the 72 faculty members who completed the survey are as follows:

#### *Age Ranges of Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey in Percentages*

<b>Age Range (N=72)</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey</b>
Ages 27-37	20.83%
Ages 38-48	16.67%
Ages 49-59	30.56%
Ages 60-70	22.22%
Ages 71-81	5.56%

The 72 faculty members who completed the survey were comprised of 15 faculty members between the ages of 27-37, 12 between the ages of 38-48, 22 between the ages of 49-59, 16 between the ages of 60-70, and four between the ages of 71-81. *It should be noted that three faculty members chose not to identify their age. It should also be noted that the age ranges utilized for this study were based on the responses given by the participants. The age ranges needed to include all the ages communicated by the participants.*

#### *Gender of the Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey, Distribution of Faculty Respondents in Percentages*

<b>Gender (N=72)</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey</b>
Male	50%
Female	50%

The 72 faculty members who completed the survey were comprised of 36 male faculty members and 36 female faculty members.

*Racial Makeup of Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey in Percentages*

<b>Race (N=72)</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey</b>
White (Caucasian)	76.39%
Black (African American, Haitian American)	11.11%
Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, or Biracial White and Black)	8.33%

The 72 faculty members who completed the survey were comprised of 55 faculty members who self-identified as White (White or Caucasian), eight faculty members who self-identified as Black (African American or Haitian American), and six faculty members who self-identified as Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, or Biracial White and Black. It should be noted that for the purpose of this study, Other was utilized to group a number of faculty members in which the number of responses received were not sufficient to warrant the group being identified individually. It should also be noted that three faculty members chose not to identify their race.

*Professional Status of Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey in Percentages*

<b>Professional Status (N=72)</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Members Who Completed the Survey</b>
Tenured	73.61%
Tenure-Track	19.44%
Non-Tenured	6.94%

The 72 faculty members who completed the survey were comprised of 53 faculty members who self-identified as tenured, 14 faculty members who self-identified as tenure-track, and five who self-identified as non-tenured at their respective institutions.

*Departmental Affiliation of Faculty Members Who Completed Survey in Percentages*

<b>Departmental Affiliation</b>	<b>Number of Completed Faculty Responses</b>
<b>(N=72)</b>	
History	25%
Political Science	23.61%
Psychology	30.56%
Sociology	20.83%

The 72 faculty members who completed the survey consisted of 18 faculty members who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions, 17 faculty members who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions, 22 faculty members who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions, and 15 faculty members who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions.

*Publicity in Percentages (N=72)*

<b>Number of Faculty Members Who Reported Their Institution Had Been in the News</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Members Who Reported Their Institution Had Not Been in the News</b>	<b>Number of Faculty Members Who Reported Not Knowing Whether Their Institution Had Been in the News</b>
34.72%	38.39%	26.39%

## Appendix C

### Survey Questions Analyzed by Age, Race, Gender, Departmental Affiliation, Professional Status, and Institutional Publicity

*Q6: Has the institution that you are currently affiliated with been in the news (TV, Internet, Print Media, etc.) in the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

#### *Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 6*

(N=72)	Responded Yes	Responded No	Responded Don't know
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>34.71%</b>	<b>34.73%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>
27-37	9.72%	4.17%	6.94%
38-48	6.94%	4.17%	5.56%
49-59	6.94%	15.28%	8.33%
60-70	8.33%	9.72%	4.17%
71-81	2.78%	1.39%	1.39%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>34.72%</b>	<b>38.89%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>
Male	22.22%	15.28%	12.5%
Female	12.5%	23.61%	13.89%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>33.34%</b>	<b>36.11%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>
White	22.22%	33.33%	20.83%
Black	5.56%	1.39%	4.17%
Other	5.56%	1.39%	1.39%



(N=72)	Responded Yes	Responded No	Responded Don't know
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>34.72%</b>	<b>38.88%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>
History	8.33%	12.5%	4.17%
Political Science	9.72%	6.94%	6.94%
Psychology	13.89%	12.5%	4.17%
Sociology	2.78%	6.94%	11.11%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>34.73%</b>	<b>38.89%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>
Tenured	27.78%	29.17%	16.67%
Tenure-Track	5.56%	6.94%	6.94%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	2.78%	2.78%

Of the 72 faculty members who completed the survey, 25 responded that their institution had been in the news in the last two years, 28 responded that their institution had not been in the news, and 19 responded that they did not know.

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, seven participants responded *yes*, three responded *no*, and five responded *don't know*. In the age range of 38-48, five participants responded *yes*, three responded *no*, and four responded *don't know*. In the age range of 49-59, five participants responded *yes*, eleven responded *no*, and six responded *don't know*. In the age range of 60-70, six participants responded *yes*, one responded *no*, and one responded *don't know*. In the age range of 71-81, two participants responded *yes*, none responded *no*, and none responded *don't know*. It should be noted that three participants didn't disclose their age.

**Gender:** Sixteen male participants answered *yes*, 11 answered *no*, and nine answered *don't know* regarding their respective institutions being in the news the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student. Nine female participants answered *yes*, 17 answered *no*, and ten answered *don't know*.

**Race:** Sixteen participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes*, 24 responded *no*, and 15 responded *don't know*. Four participants who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes*, one responded *no*, and three responded *don't know*. Four participants who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes*, one responded *no*, and one responded *don't know*. It should be noted that three participants did not identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Six participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes*, nine responded *no*, and three responded *don't know*. Seven participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *yes*, five responded *no*, and five responded *don't know*. Ten participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *yes*, nine responded *no*, and three responded *don't know*. Two participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *yes*, five responded *no*, and eight responded *don't know*.

**Professional Status:** Twenty participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes*, 21 responded *no*, and 12 responded *don't know*. One participant who identified themselves as non-tenured at their institution responded *yes*, two responded *no*, and two responded *don't know*. Four participants who identified themselves as tenure-track at their respective institutions responded *yes*, five responded *no*, and five responded *don't know*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 27-37 were the highest; 9.72% responded *yes*. Male participants were higher than females; 22.22% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 22.22% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of Psychology were the highest; 13.89% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 27.78% responded *yes*.

*Q7: How aware would you say you are regarding the issue of sexual harassment?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 7*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Highly aware</i>	Responded <i>Somewhat aware</i>	Responded <i>Not aware</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>73.62%</b>	<b>20.84%</b>	<b>1.39%</b>
27-37	16.67%	4.17%	
38-48	11.11%	5.56%	
49-59	26.39%	2.78%	1.39%
60-70	15.28%	6.94%	
71-81	4.17%	1.39%	
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>77.78%</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	<b>1.39%</b>
Male	36.11%	12.5%	1.39
Female	41.67%	8.33%	
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>75.0%</b>	<b>19.45%</b>	<b>1.39%</b>
White	61.11%	15.28%	
Black	8.33%	1.39%	1.39%
Other	5.56%	2.78%	

(N=72)	Responded <i>Highly aware</i>	Responded <i>Somewhat aware</i>	Responded <i>Not aware</i>
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>77.77%</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	<b>1.39%</b>
History	19.44%	5.56%	
Political Science	19.44%	4.17%	
Psychology	26.39%	4.17%	
Sociology	12.5%	6.94%	1.39%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>77.78%</b>	<b>20.84%</b>	<b>1.39%</b>
Tenured	56.94%	16.67%	
Tenure-Track	15.28%	4.17%	
Non-Tenure track	5.56%		1.39
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>79.16%</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	
In the News	26.39%	8.33%	
Not in the News	33.33%	5.56%	
Unaware if in the News	19.44%	6.94%	

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, 12 participants responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. In the age range of 38-48, eight participants responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. In the age range of 49-59, 19 participants responded *highly aware*, two responded *somewhat aware*, and one responded *not aware*. In the age range of 60-70, 11 participants responded *highly aware*, five responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. In the age range of 71-81, three participants responded *highly aware*, one responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. It should be noted that three participants did not disclose their age.

**Gender:** Twenty-six male participants responded *highly aware*, nine responded *somewhat aware*, and one responded *not aware*. Thirty female participants responded *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Race:** Forty-four participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *highly aware*, 11 responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Six participants who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *highly aware*, one responded *somewhat aware*, and one responded *not aware*. Four participants who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *highly aware*, two responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Fourteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Fourteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Nineteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Nine participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, five responded *somewhat aware*, and one responded *not aware*.

**Professional Status:** Forty-one participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, 12 responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Four participants who identified themselves as non-tenured at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, none responded *somewhat aware*, and one responded *not aware*. Eleven participants who identified themselves as tenure-track at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Institution in the News:** Nineteen participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Institution Not in the News:** Twenty-four participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Fourteen participants who didn't know if their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *highly aware*, five responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 26.39% responded *highly aware*. Female participants were higher than males; 41.67% responded *highly aware* compared to 36.11% of males. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 61.11% responded *highly aware*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of Psychology

were the highest; 26.39% responded *highly aware*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 56.94% responded *highly aware*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were not in the news were the highest; 33.33% responded *highly aware*.

*Q8: How aware would you say you are regarding the issue of sexual harassment on college and university campuses?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 8*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Highly aware</i>	Responded <i>Somewhat aware</i>	Responded <i>Not aware</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>69.45%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>	
27-37	16.67%	4.17%	
38-48	13.89%	2.78%	
49-59	23.61%	6.94%	
60-70	11.11%	11.11%	
71-81	4.17%	1.39%	
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>73.61%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>	
Male	36.11%	13.89%	
Female	37.5%	12.5%	
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>70.83%</b>	<b>25.01%</b>	
White	58.33%	18.06%	
Black	6.94%	4.17%	
Other	5.56%	2.78%	

(N=72)	Responded <i>Highly aware</i>	Responded <i>Somewhat aware</i>	Responded <i>Not aware</i>
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>73.61%</b>	<b>26.40%</b>	
History	19.44%	5.56%	
Political Science	18.06%	5.56%	
Psychology	25%	5.56%	
Sociology	11.11	9.72	
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>73.62%</b>	<b>26.39%</b>	
Tenured	52.78%	20.83%	
Tenure-Track	15.28%	4.17%	
Non-Tenured	5.56%	1.39%	
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>73.61%</b>	<b>26.38%</b>	
In the News	25%	9.72%	
Not in the News	30.56%	8.33%	
Unaware if in the News	18.06%	8.33%	

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, 12 participants responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. In the age range of 38-48, 10 participants responded *highly aware*, two responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. In the age range of 49-59, 17 participants responded *highly aware*, five responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. In the age range of 60-70, eight participants responded *highly aware*, eight responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. In the age range of 71-81, three participants responded *highly aware*, one responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age.



**Gender:** Twenty-six male participants responded *highly aware*, 10 responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Twenty-seven female participants responded *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Race:** Forty-two participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *highly aware*, 13 responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Five participants who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Four participants who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *highly aware*, two responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Fourteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Thirteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Eighteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Eight participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, seven responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Professional Status:** Thirty-eight participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, 15 responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Four participants who identified themselves as non-tenured at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, one responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*. Eleven participants who identified themselves as tenure-track at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Institution in the News:** Eighteen participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *highly aware*, seven responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Institution Not in the News:** Twenty-two participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Thirteen participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and none responded *not aware*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 23.61% responded *highly aware*. Female participants were slightly higher than males; 37.5% responded *highly aware* compared to 36.11% of males. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 58.33% responded *highly aware*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of

Psychology were the highest; 25% responded *highly aware*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 52.78% responded *highly aware*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were not in the news were the highest; 30.56% responded *highly aware*.

*Q9: Would you say that the recent publicity regarding the issue of sexual harassment has influenced your awareness of the issue?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 9*

(N=72)	Responded Yes	Responded No
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>66.67%</b>	<b>29.17%</b>
27-37	15.28%	5.56%
38-48	13.89%	2.78%
49-59	19.44%	11.11%
60-70	13.89%	8.33%
71-81	4.17%	1.39%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>66.67%</b>	<b>33.33%</b>
Male	37.5%	12.5%
Female	29.17%	20.83%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>65.29%</b>	<b>30.56%</b>
White	54.17%	22.22%
Black	5.56%	5.56%
Other	5.56%	2.78%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>66.68%</b>	<b>33.33%</b>
History	18.06%	6.94%
Political Science	18.06%	5.56%
Psychology	16.67%	13.89%
Sociology	13.89%	6.94%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>66.67%</b>	<b>33.33%</b>
Tenured	50%	23.61%
Tenure-Track	12.5%	6.94%
Non-Tenured	4.17%	2.78%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>66.66%</b>	<b>33.34%</b>
In the News	20.83%	13.89%
Not in the News	22.22%	16.67%
Unaware if in the News	23.61%	2.78%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, 11 participants responded *yes* and four responded *no* regarding the recent publicity having influence on their awareness. In the age range of 38-48, 10 responded *yes* and two responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, 14 responded *yes* and eight responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, 10 participants responded *yes* and six responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, three participants responded *yes* and one participant responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age.

**Gender:** Twenty-seven male participants answered *yes* and nine answered *no* regarding the recent publicity having influence on their awareness. Twenty-one female participants answered *yes* and fifteen answered *no*.

**Race:** Thirty-nine participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and sixteen responded *no* regarding the recent publicity having influence on their awareness.

Four participants who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and four responded *no*. Four participants who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and two responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Thirteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and five responded *no* regarding the recent publicity having influence on their awareness. Thirteen participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and four responded *no*. Twelve participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and ten responded *no*. Ten participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and five responded *no*.

**Professional Status:** Thirty-six participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 17 responded *no* regarding the recent publicity having influence on their awareness. Three participants who identified themselves as non-tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and two responded *no*. Nine participants who identified themselves as tenure-track at their respective institutions responded *yes* and five responded *no*.

**Institution in the News:** Fifteen participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually

harassing a student responded *yes* and ten responded *no* regarding the recent publicity having influence on their awareness.

**Institution Not in the News:** Sixteen participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and twelve responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Seventeen participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and two responded *no*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 19.44% responded *yes* regarding the recent publicity having an influence on their awareness of the issue. Male participants were higher than females; 37.5% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 54.17% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the disciplines of history and political science were tied for the highest; 18.06% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 50% responded *yes*.

*Q10: How has the recent publicity regarding the issue of sexual harassment influenced your awareness of the issue?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 10*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Made me highly aware</i>	Responded <i>Made me somewhat aware</i>	Responded <i>Has not influenced my awareness</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>45.83%</b>	<b>20.85%</b>	<b>23.62%</b>
27-37	6.94%	5.56%	5.56%
38-48	9.72%	4.17%	2.78%
49-59	15.28%	5.56%	9.72%
60-70	11.11%	4.17%	4.17%
71-81	2.78%	1.39%	1.39%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>45.83%</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	<b>27.78%</b>
Male	26.39%	11.11%	9.72%
Female	19.44%	9.72%	18.06%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>43.06%</b>	<b>20.84%</b>	<b>26.40%</b>
White	37.5%	15.28%	18.06%
Black	4.17%	1.39%	5.56%
Other	1.39%	4.17%	2.78%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>45.83%</b>	<b>20.84%</b>	<b>27.78%</b>
History	9.72%	8.33%	6.94%
Political Science	15.28%	1.39%	4.17%
Psychology	12.5%	5.56%	12.5%
Sociology	8.33%	5.56%	4.17%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>45.84%</b>	<b>20.84%</b>	<b>27.78%</b>
Tenured	38.89%	13.89%	18.06%
Tenure-Track	5.56%	4.17%	6.94%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	2.78%	2.78%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Made me highly aware</i>	Responded <i>Made me somewhat aware</i>	Responded <i>Has not influenced my awareness</i>
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>45.84%</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	<b>27.78%</b>
In the News	16.67%	8.33%	9.72%
Not in the News	16.67%	4.17%	15.28%
Unaware if in the News	12.5%	8.33%	2.78%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, five participants responded that the recent publicity has made them *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and four responded *not influenced their awareness* of the issue. In the age range of 38-48, seven participants responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and two responded *awareness not influenced*. In the age range of 49-59, eleven participants responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and seven responded *awareness not influenced*. In the age range of 60-70, eight participants responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and three responded *awareness not influenced*. In the age range of 71-81, two participants responded *highly aware*, one responded *somewhat aware*, and one responded *awareness not influenced*. It should be noted that three participants did not disclose their age. It should also be noted that four participants did not answer this question.

**Gender:** Nineteen male participants responded that the recent publicity regarding the issue of sexual harassment has made them *highly aware*, eight responded *somewhat aware*, and seven responded *awareness not influenced*. Fourteen female participants responded *highly aware*, seven responded *somewhat aware*, and 13 responded *awareness not influenced*. It should also be noted that four participants did not answer this question.



**Race:** Twenty-seven participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded that the recent publicity has made them *highly aware*, 11 responded *somewhat aware*, and 13 responded *awareness not influenced*. Three participants who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded that the recent publicity has made them *highly aware*, one responded *somewhat aware*, and four responded *awareness not influenced*. One participant who for the purpose of this study was identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and two responded *awareness not influenced*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race. It should also be noted that four participants did not answer this question.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Seven participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded that the recent publicity has made them *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and five responded *awareness not influenced*. Eleven participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, one responded *somewhat aware*, and three responded *awareness not influenced*. Nine participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and nine responded *awareness not influenced*. Six participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, four responded *somewhat aware*, and three responded *awareness not influenced*. It should also be noted that four participants did not answer this question.

**Professional Status:** Twenty-eight participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded that the recent publicity has made them *highly aware*, 10 responded *somewhat aware*, and 13 responded *awareness not influenced*. One participant who identified themselves as non-tenured at their institution responded *highly aware*, two responded *somewhat aware*, and two responded *awareness not influenced*. Four participants who identified themselves as tenure-track at their respective institutions responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and five responded *awareness not influenced*. It should also be noted that four participants did not answer this question.

**Institution in the News:** Twelve participants responded that the recent publicity has made them *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and seven responded *awareness not influenced*.

**Institution Not in the News:** Twelve responded *highly aware*, three responded *somewhat aware*, and 11 responded *awareness not influenced*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Nine participants responded *highly aware*, six responded *somewhat aware*, and two responded *awareness not influenced*. It should also be noted that four participants did not answer this question.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 15.28% responded *highly aware*. Male participants were higher than females; 26.39% responded *highly aware*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 37.5% responded *highly aware*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of political science were the highest; 15.28% responded *highly aware*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 38.39% responded *highly aware*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institution was in the news and participants whose institution was not in the news were tied; 16.67% responded *highly aware*.

*Q11: Do you find yourself being apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 11*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>34.72%</b>	<b>58.34%</b>
27-37	5.56%	12.5%
38-48	6.94%	9.72%
49-59	12.5%	18.06%
60-70	9.72%	12.5%
71-81	0	5.56%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>34.72%</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
Male	23.61%	25%
Female	11.11%	37.5%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>33.34%</b>	<b>59.73%</b>
White	30.56%	43.06%
Black	0	11.11%
Other	2.78%	5.56%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>34.72%</b>	<b>62.51%</b>
History	6.94%	18.06%
Political Science	6.94%	15.28%
Psychology	16.67%	12.50%
Sociology	4.17%	16.67%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>34.72%</b>	<b>62.51%</b>
Tenured	31.94%	41.67%
Tenure-Track	1.39%	15.28%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	5.56%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>34.72%</b>	<b>62.50%</b>
In the News	15.28%	19.44%
Not in the News	11.11%	25%
Unaware if in the News	8.33%	18.06%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, four participants responded *yes* and nine responded *no* when asked if they found themselves apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. In the age range of 38-48, five responded *yes* and seven responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, nine responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, seven responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, none responded *yes* but four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Gender:** Seventeen male participants answered *yes* and 18 answered *no* when asked if they found themselves apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Eight female participants answered *yes* and 27 answered *no*. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Race:** Twenty-two participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 31 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. None who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* but eight responded

*no*. Two participants who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Five participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 13 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Five who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. Twelve who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. Three who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Professional Status:** Twenty-three participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 30 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. One who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and four responded *no*. One who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Institution in the News:** Eleven participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 14 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves

apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom.

**Institution Not in the News:** Eight participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 18 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Six who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 12.05% responded *yes* when asked if they were apprehensive when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Male participants were higher than females; 23.61% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 30.56% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of psychology were the highest; 16.67% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 31.94% responded *yes*.

*Q21: Is there anything that you no longer do in the work environment that you did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment (i.e., compliment a colleague on their physical appearance, give a colleague a hug, etc.)?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 21*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>19.44%</b>	<b>76.39%</b>
27-37	1.39%	19.44%
38-48	1.39%	15.28%
49-59	9.72%	20.83%
60-70	6.94%	15.28%
71-81	0	5.56%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>19.45%</b>	<b>80.55%</b>
Male	16.67	33.33
Female	2.78	47.22
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>16.67%</b>	<b>79.16%</b>
White	12.5%	63.89%
Black	4.17%	6.94%
Other	0	8.33%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>19.46%</b>	<b>80.56%</b>
History	5.56%	19.44%
Political Science	5.56%	18.06%
Psychology	2.78%	27.78%
Sociology	5.56%	15.28%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>19.44%</b>	<b>80.56%</b>
Tenured	16.67%	56.94%
Tenure-Track	1.39%	18.06%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	5.56%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>19.45%</b>	<b>80.55%</b>
In the News	8.33%	26.39%
Not in the News	5.56%	33.33%
Unaware if in the News	5.56%	20.83%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, one participant responded *yes* and 14 responded *no* when asked if there was anything they no longer do in the work environment that they did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment. In the age range of 38-48, one responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, seven responded *yes* and 15 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, five responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, none responded *yes* but four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age.

**Gender:** Twelve male participants answered *yes* and 24 answered *no* when asked if there was anything they no longer do in the work environment that they did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment. Two female participants answered *yes* and 34 answered *no*.

**Race:** Nine participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 46 responded *no* when asked if there was anything they no longer do in the work environment that they did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment. Three who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. None who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* but six responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Four participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 14 responded *no* when asked if there was anything they no longer do in the work environment that they did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment. Four who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*. Two participants who identified



themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 20 responded *no*. Four participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*.

**Professional Status:** Twelve participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 41 responded *no* when asked if there was anything they no longer do in the work environment that they did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment. One who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and four responded *no*. One who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and thirteen responded *no*.

**Institution in the News:** Six participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 19 responded *no* when asked if there was anything they no longer do in the work environment that they did prior to the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment.

**Institution Not in the News:** Four participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 24 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Four participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 15 responded *no*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 9.72% responded *yes*. Male participants were higher than females; 16.67% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 12.5% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the disciplines of history, political science, and sociology were tied; 5.56% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 16.67% responded

yes. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news were the highest; 8.33% responded yes.

*Q12: Do you find yourself being cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 12*

(N=72)	Responded Yes	Responded No
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>54.17%</b>	<b>38.89%</b>
27-37	11.11%	6.94%
38-48	9.72%	6.94%
49-59	15.28%	15.28%
60-70	16.67%	5.56%
71-81	1.39%	4.17%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>55.56%</b>	<b>41.67%</b>
Male	34.72%	13.89%
Female	20.83%	27.78%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>54.18%</b>	<b>38.90%</b>
White	43.06%	30.56%
Black	5.56%	5.56%
Other	5.56%	2.78%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>55.55%</b>	<b>41.66%</b>
History	13.89%	11.11%
Political Science	13.89%	8.33%
Psychology	19.44%	9.72%
Sociology	8.33%	12.5%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>55.55%</b>	<b>41.67%</b>
Tenured	45.83%	27.78%
Tenure-Track	6.94%	9.72%
Non-Tenured	2.78%	4.17%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>55.55%</b>	<b>41.67%</b>
In the News	22.22%	12.5%
Not in the News	22.22%	13.89%
Unaware if in the News	11.11%	15.28%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, eight participants responded *yes* and five responded *no* when asked if they found themselves cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. In the age range of 38-48, seven responded *yes* and five *no*. In the age range of 49-59, 11 responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, 12 responded *yes* and four responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, one responded *yes* and three responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Gender:** Twenty-five male participants answered *yes* and 10 answered *no* when asked if they found themselves cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Two female participants answered *yes* and 34 answered *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Race:** Thirty-one participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 22 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Four who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and four responded

*no*. Four who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and two responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Ten participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and eight responded *no* when asked if they found themselves cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Ten who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and six responded *no*. Fourteen who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and seven responded *no*. Six who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Professional Status:** Thirty-three participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and ten responded *no* when asked if they found themselves cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Two who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and three responded *no*. Five who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and seven responded *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Institution in the News:** Sixteen participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and nine responded *no* when asked if they found themselves

cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom.

**Institution Not in the News:** Sixteen participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Eight participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 60-70 were the highest; 16.67% responded *yes* when asked if they were cautious when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Male participants were higher than females; 34.72% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 43.06% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline psychology were the highest; 19.44% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 45.83% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news and participants whose institutions were not in the news were tied; 22.22% responded *yes*.

*Q17: Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced your decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student (i.e., during scheduled office hours or an individual appointment with a student)?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 17*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>30.56%</b>	<b>51.39%</b>
27-37	4.17%	16.67%
38-48	4.17%	12.5%
49-59	6.94%	9.72%
60-70	13.89%	8.33%
71-81	1.39%	4.17%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>30.55%</b>	<b>69.45%</b>
Male	22.22%	27.78%
Female	8.33%	41.67%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>29.17%</b>	<b>66.67%</b>
White	22.22%	54.17%
Black	4.17%	6.94%
Other	2.78%	5.56%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>30.54%</b>	<b>69.44%</b>
History	6.94%	18.06%
Political Science	9.72%	13.89%
Psychology	6.94%	23.61%
Sociology	6.94%	13.89%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>30.56%</b>	<b>69.45%</b>
Tenured	27.78%	45.83%
Tenure-Track	1.39%	18.06%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	5.56%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>30.55%</b>	<b>69.45%</b>
In the News	11.11%	23.61%
Not in the News	9.72%	29.17%
Unaware if in the News	9.72%	16.67%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, three participants responded *yes* and 12 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student. In the age range of 38-48, three responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, five responded *yes* and seven responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, 10 responded *yes* and six responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, one responded *yes* and three responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age.

**Gender:** Sixteen male participants answered *yes* and 20 answered *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student. Six female participants answered *yes* and 30 answered *no*.

**Race:** Sixteen participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 39 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student. Three participants who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. Two who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Five participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 13 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student. Seven who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*. Five who identified themselves as

belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 17 responded *no*. Five who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*.

**Professional Status:** Twenty participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 33 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student. One who identified himself as non-tenured at their institution responded *yes* and four responded *no*. One who identified himself as tenure-track at their institution responded *yes* but 13 responded *no*.

**Institution in the News:** Eight participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 17 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to keep the door open when meeting with a student.

**Institution Not in the News:** Seven participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 21 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Seven participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 60-70 were the highest; 13.89% responded *yes* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether



to keep the door open when meeting with a student. Male participants were higher than females; 22.22% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 22.22% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of political science were the highest; 9.72% responded *yes*. It should be noted that the other three disciplines were tied; 6.94% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 27.78% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news were the highest; 11.11% responded *yes*.

*Q18: Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced your decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug (i.e., after a successful dissertation defense, at a ceremony honoring a student, etc.)?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 18*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>36.11%</b>	<b>58.33%</b>
27-37	4.17%	15.28%
38-48	6.94%	9.72%
49-59	11.11%	19.44%
60-70	11.11%	11.11%
71-81	2.78%	2.78%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>36.11%</b>	<b>62.50%</b>
Male	29.17%	19.44%
Female	6.94%	43.06%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>34.73%</b>	<b>59.72%</b>
White	27.78%	47.22%
Black	5.56%	5.56%
Other	1.39%	6.94%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	34.72%	65.28%
History	11.11%	13.89%
Political Science	9.72%	15.28%
Psychology	11.11%	19.44%
Sociology	2.78%	16.67%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	36.11%	62.51%
Tenured	31.94%	41.67%
Tenure-Track	2.78%	15.28%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	5.56%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>36.11%</b>	<b>62.50%</b>
In the News	15.28%	19.44%
Not in the News	9.72%	27.78%
Unaware if in the News	11.11%	15.28%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, three participants responded *yes* and 11 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug. In the age range of 38-48, five responded *yes* and seven responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, eight responded *yes* and 14 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, eight responded *yes* and eight responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, two responded *yes* but two responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age. It should also be noted that one participant did not answer the question.

**Gender:** Twenty-one male participants answered *yes* and 14 answered *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug. Five female participants answered *yes* and 31 answered *no*. It should also be noted that two participants did not answer the question.

**Race:** Twenty participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 34 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug. Four who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and four responded *no*. One who for the purpose of this study was identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race. It should also be noted that one participant did not answer the question.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Eight participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 10 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug. Seven who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. Eight who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department responded *yes* and 14 responded *no*. Two who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*. It should also be noted that one participant did not answer the question.

**Professional Status:** Twenty-three participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 30 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity

regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug. One participant who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and four responded *no*. Two participants who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. It should also be noted that one participant did not answer the question.

**Institution in the News:** Eleven participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 14 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug.

**Institution Not in the News:** Seven participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 20 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Eight participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. It should also be noted that one participant did not answer the question.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age ranges of 49-59 and 60-70 were tied for the highest; 11.11% responded *yes* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to give a student a congratulatory hug. Male participants were higher than females; 29.17% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 27.78% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the disciplines of history and psychology were tied for the highest; 11.11% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 31.94% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news were the highest; 15.28% responded *yes*.

*Q19: Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced your decision whether to be alone with a student?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 19*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>27.79%</b>	<b>68.06%</b>
27-37	4.17%	16.67%
38-48	5.56%	11.11%
49-59	5.56%	25%
60-70	9.72%	12.5%
71-81	2.78%	2.78%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>29.17%</b>	<b>70.83%</b>
Male	25%	25%
Female	4.17%	45.83%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>27.78%</b>	<b>68.06%</b>
White	20.83%	55.56%
Black	5.56%	5.56%
Other	1.39%	6.94%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>29.16%</b>	<b>70.84%</b>
History	11.11%	13.89%
Political Science	8.33%	15.28%
Psychology	6.94%	23.61%
Sociology	2.78%	18.06%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>29.17%</b>	<b>70.84%</b>
Tenured	25%	48.61%
Tenure-Track	1.39%	18.06%
Non-Tenured	2.78%	4.17%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>29.16</b>	<b>70.83%</b>
In the News	13.89	20.83
Not in the News	6.94	31.94
Unaware if in the News	8.33	18.06

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, three participants responded *yes* and 12 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to be alone with a student. In the age range of 38-48, four responded *yes* and eight responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, four responded *yes* and 18 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, seven responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, two responded *yes* but two responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age.

**Gender:** Eighteen male participants answered *yes* and 35 answered *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to be alone with a student. Three female participants answered *yes* and 33 answered *no*.

**Race:** Fifteen participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 40 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to be alone with a student. Four who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and four responded *no*. One who for the purpose of this study was identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian,

Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Eight participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 10 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to be alone with a student. Six who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. Five who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department responded *yes* and 17 responded *no*. Two who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*.

**Professional Status:** Eighteen participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 35 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to be alone with a student. Two who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and three responded *no*. One who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*.

**Institution in the News:** Ten participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 15 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to be alone with a student.

**Institution Not in the News:** Five participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 23 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Six participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 60-70 were the highest; 9.72% responded *yes* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced their decision whether to be alone with a student. Male participants were higher than females; 25% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 20.83% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of history were the highest; 11.11% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 25% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news were the highest; 13.89% responded *yes*.

*Q16: Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how you interact with a student outside of the classroom (i.e., running into a student at a social event, local eatery, etc.)?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 16*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>29.17%</b>	<b>66.67%</b>
27-37	1.39%	19.44%
38-48	2.78%	13.89%
49-59	13.89%	16.67%
60-70	11.11%	11.11%
71-81	0	5.56%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>30.55%</b>	<b>69.44%</b>
Male	23.61%	26.39%
Female	6.94%	43.06%



(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>29.17%</b>	<b>66.67%</b>
White	22.22%	54.17%
Black	4.17%	6.94%
Other	2.78%	5.56%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>30.55%</b>	<b>69.45%</b>
History	9.72%	15.28%
Political Science	6.94%	16.67%
Psychology	8.33%	22.22%
Sociology	5.56%	15.28%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>30.56%</b>	<b>69.44%</b>
Tenured	27.78%	45.83%
Tenure-Track	0	19.44%
Non-Tenured	2.78%	4.17%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>30.55%</b>	<b>69.45%</b>
In the News	11.11%	23.61%
Not in the News	11.11%	27.78%
Unaware if in the News	8.33%	18.06%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, one participant responded *yes* and 14 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with students outside of the classroom. In the age range of 38-48, two responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, 10 responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, eight responded *yes* and eight responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, none responded *yes* but four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age.

**Gender:** Seventeen male participants answered *yes* and 19 answered *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with students outside of the classroom. Five female participants answered *yes* and 31 answered *no*.

**Race:** Sixteen participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 39 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with students outside of the classroom. Three who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. Two who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Seven participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 11 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with students outside of the classroom. Five who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*. Six who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department responded *yes* and 16 responded *no*. Four who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*.

**Professional Status:** Twenty participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 33 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with students outside of the classroom. Two who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and three responded *no*. None who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* but 14 responded *no*.

**Institution in the News:** Eight participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 17 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with students outside of the classroom.

**Institution Not in the News:** Eight participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 20 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Six participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 13.89% responded *yes* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment has influenced how they interact with students outside the classroom. Male participants were higher than females; 23.61% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 22.22% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of history were the highest; 9.72% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 27.78% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news and participants whose institutions were not in the news were tied; 11.11% responded *yes*.

*Q20: Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how you interact with colleagues?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 20*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>20.84%</b>	<b>75.01%</b>
27-37	4.17%	16.67%
38-48	2.78%	13.89%
49-59	6.94%	23.61%
60-70	5.56%	16.67%
71-81	1.39%	4.17%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	<b>79.17%</b>
Male	12.5%	37.5%
Female	8.33%	41.67%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>19.45%</b>	<b>76.38%</b>
White	15.28%	61.11%
Black	2.78%	8.33%
Other	1.39%	6.94%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	<b>79.17%</b>
History	8.33%	16.67%
Political Science	5.56%	18.06%
Psychology	1.39%	29.17%
Sociology	5.56%	15.28%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>20.84%</b>	<b>79.17%</b>
Tenured	15.28%	58.33%
Tenure-Track	4.17%	15.28%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	5.56%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>20.83%</b>	<b>79.17%</b>
In the News	6.94%	27.78%
Not in the News	5.56%	33.33%
Unaware if in the News	8.33%	18.06%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, three participants responded *yes* and 12 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with colleagues. In the age range of 38-48, two responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, five responded *yes* and 17 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, four responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, one responded *yes* and three responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age.

**Gender:** Nine male participants answered *yes* and 27 answered *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with colleagues. Six female participants answered *yes* and 30 answered *no*.

**Race:** Eleven participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 44 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with colleagues. Two who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and six responded *no*. One who for the purpose of this study was identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Six participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 12 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how

they interact with colleagues. Four who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*. One who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department responded *yes* and 21 responded *no*. Four who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*.

**Professional Status:** Eleven participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 42 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with colleagues. One who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and four responded *no*. Three who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*.

**Institution in the News:** Five participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 20 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they interact with colleagues.

**Institution not in the News:** Four participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 24 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Six participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 13 responded *no*.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 6.94% responded *yes* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment has influenced how they interact with colleagues. Male participants were higher than females; 12.5% responded *yes* it has influenced how they interact. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 15.28% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of history were

the highest; 8.33% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 15.28% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants who were unaware of their institution in the news were the highest; 8.33% responded *yes*.

*Q14: In light of the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment, do you find yourself worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 14*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>44.45%</b>	<b>48.61%</b>
27-37	9.72%	8.33%
38-48	4.17%	12.5%
49-59	16.67%	13.89%
60-70	12.5%	9.72%
71-81	1.39%	4.17%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>44.45%</b>	<b>52.78%</b>
Male	30.56%	18.06%
Female	13.89%	34.72%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>41.67%</b>	<b>51.38%</b>
White	37.5%	36.11%
Black	2.78%	8.33%
Other	1.39%	6.94%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>44.44%</b>	<b>52.78%</b>
History	15.28%	9.72%
Political Science	8.33%	13.89%
Psychology	13.89%	15.28%
Sociology	6.94%	13.89%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>44.44%</b>	<b>52.77%</b>
Tenured	36.11%	37.5%
Tenure-Track	8.33%	8.33%
Non-Tenured	0	6.94%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>44.45%</b>	<b>52.78%</b>
In the News	18.06%	16.67%
Not in the News	16.67%	19.44%
Unaware if in the News	9.72%	16.67%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, seven participants responded *yes* and six responded *no* when asked if they found themselves worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. In the age range of 38-48, three responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, 12 responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, nine responded *yes* and seven responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, one responded *yes* and three responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age. It should also be noted that two participants did not respond to the question.

**Gender:** Twenty-two male participants answered *yes* and 13 answered *no* when asked if they found themselves worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Ten female



participants answered *yes* and 25 answered *no*. It should also be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Race:** Twenty-seven participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 26 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Two who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and six responded *no*. One who for the purpose of this study was identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race. It should also be noted that two participants did not respond to the question.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Eleven participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and seven responded *no* when asked if they found themselves worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Six who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*. Ten who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. Five who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department responded *yes* but 10 responded *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not respond to the question.

**Professional Status:** Twenty-six participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 27 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves

worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. None who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and five responded *no*. Six who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and six responded *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not respond to the question.

**Institution in the News:** Thirteen participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 12 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom.

**Institution Not in the News:** Twelve participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 14 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Seven participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*. It should be noted that two participants did not respond to the question.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 16.67% responded *yes* when asked if they found themselves worrying about the comments that could be potentially made by students when discussing controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Male participants were higher than females; 30.56% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 37.5% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of history were the highest; 15.28% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 36.11% responded *yes*. In terms of

institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news were the highest; 18.06% responded *yes*.

*Q13: Do you find yourself avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 13*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>13.90%</b>	<b>80.56%</b>
27-37	1.39%	18.06%
38-48	2.78%	13.89%
49-59	5.56%	25%
60-70	2.78%	19.44%
71-81	1.39%	4.17%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>15.27%</b>	<b>83.34%</b>
Male	8.33%	41.67%
Female	6.94%	41.67%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>13.89%</b>	<b>80.55%</b>
White	11.11%	63.89%
Black	2.78%	8.33%
Other	0	8.33%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>15.28%</b>	<b>83.32%</b>
History	4.17%	20.83%
Political Science	2.78%	20.83%
Psychology	8.33%	20.83%
Sociology	0	20.83%

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>15.28%</b>	<b>83.33%</b>
Tenured	13.89%	59.72%
Tenure-Track	0	18.06%
Non-Tenured	1.39%	5.56%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>15.27%</b>	<b>83.34%</b>
In the News	6.94%	27.78%
Not in the News	6.94%	30.56%
Unaware if in the News	1.39%	25%

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, one participant responded *yes* and 13 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. In the age range of 38-48, two responded *yes* and 10 responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, four responded *yes* and 18 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, two responded *yes* and 14 responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, one responded *yes* and three responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age. It should also be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Gender:** Six male participants answered *yes* and 30 answered *no* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Five female participants answered *yes* and 30 answered *no*. It should also be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Race:** Eight participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 46 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Two who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and six responded *no*. None who for the purpose of

this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* but six responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race. It should also be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Three participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 15 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Two who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department responded *yes* and 15 responded *no*. Six who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department responded *yes* and 15 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. None who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department responded *yes* but 15 responded *no*. It should be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Professional Status:** Ten participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 43 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. One who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and four responded *no*. None who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* but 13 responded *no*. It should be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Institution in the News:** Five participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing

a student responded *yes* and 20 responded *no* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom.

**Institution Not in the News:** Five participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 22 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** One participant who reported not knowing if their institution was in the news responded *yes* and 18 responded *no*. It should be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age range of 49-59 were the highest; 5.56% responded *yes* when asked if they found themselves avoiding controversial and/or inflammatory gender-related topics in the classroom. Male participants were higher than females; 8.33% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 11.11% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of psychology were the highest; 8.33% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified themselves as tenured were the highest; 13.89% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news and participants whose institutions were not in the news were tied for the highest; 6.94% responded *yes*.

*Q15: Has the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how you conduct yourself in the classroom when interacting with students?*

Among the 72 participants who completed the anonymous survey the following responses were given:

*Faculty Responses (in Percentages) to Survey Question 15*

(N=72)	Responded <i>Yes</i>	Responded <i>No</i>
<b>Age Total</b>	<b>27.78%</b>	<b>66.67%</b>
27-37	4.17%	16.67%
38-48	4.17%	12.5%
49-59	9.72%	19.44%
60-70	9.72%	12.5%
71-81	0	5.56%
<b>Gender Total</b>	<b>30.56%</b>	<b>68.06%</b>
Male	25%	25%
Female	5.56%	43.06%
<b>Race Total</b>	<b>27.78%</b>	<b>66.67%</b>
White	20.83%	54.17%
Black	4.17%	6.94%
Other	2.78%	5.56%
<b>Departmental Affiliation Total</b>	<b>30.56%</b>	<b>68.06%</b>
History	9.72%	15.28%
Political Science	4.17%	19.44%
Psychology	13.89%	16.67%
Sociology	2.78%	16.67%
<b>Professional Status Total</b>	<b>30.56%</b>	<b>68.06%</b>
Tenured	23.61%	48.61%
Tenure-Track	4.17%	15.28%
Non-Tenured	2.78%	4.17%
<b>Institutional Publicity Total</b>	<b>30.55%</b>	<b>68.05%</b>
In the News	12.5	22.22
Not in the News	11.11	26.39
Unaware if in the News	6.94	19.44

**Age:** In the age range of 27-37, three participants responded *yes* and 12 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they conduct themselves in the classroom when interacting with students. In the age range of 38-48, three responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. In the age range of 49-59, seven responded *yes* and 14 responded *no*. In the age range of 60-70, seven responded *yes* and nine responded *no*. In the age range of 71-81, none responded *yes* but four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to disclose their age. It should also be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Gender:** Eighteen male participants answered *yes* and 18 answered *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they conduct themselves in the classroom when interacting with students. Four female participants answered *yes* and 31 answered *no*. It should also be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Race:** Fifteen participants who identified themselves as White or Caucasian responded *yes* and 39 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they conduct themselves in the classroom when interacting with students. Three participants who identified themselves as Black (African American, Haitian American) responded *yes* and five responded *no*. Two who for the purpose of this study were identified as Other (Latinx, Mexican American, European, Euroamerican, Asian, Biracial White and Black) responded *yes* and four responded *no*. It should be noted that three participants chose not to identify their race. It should also be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Departmental Affiliation:** Seven participants who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the history department at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 11 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how



they conduct themselves in the classroom when interacting with students. Three who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the political science department responded *yes* and 14 responded *no*. Ten who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the psychology department responded *yes* and 12 responded *no*. Two who identified themselves as belonging to and/or affiliated with the sociology department responded *yes* but 12 responded *no*. It should be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Professional Status:** Seventeen participants who identified themselves as tenured at their respective institutions responded *yes* and 35 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they conduct themselves in the classroom when interacting with students. Two who identified themselves as non-tenured responded *yes* and three responded *no*. Three who identified themselves as tenure-track responded *yes* and 11 responded *no*. It should be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Institution in the News:** Nine participants who reported that their respective institutions were in the news over the last two years regarding a faculty member being accused of sexually harassing a student responded *yes* and 16 responded *no* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they conduct themselves in the classroom when interacting with students.

**Institution Not in the News:** Eight participants who reported that their respective institutions were not in the news responded *yes* and 19 responded *no*.

**Unaware of Institution in the News:** Five participants who reported not knowing if their respective institutions were in the news responded *yes* and 14 responded *no*. It should be noted that one participant did not respond to the question.

**Key Findings:** Participants in the age ranges of 49-59 and 60-70 were tied for the highest; 9.72% responded *yes* when asked if the recent publicity regarding sexual harassment influenced how they conduct themselves in the classroom when interacting with students. Male participants were higher than females; 25% responded *yes*. With regard to race, White participants were the highest; 20.83% responded *yes*. Regarding departmental affiliation, participants in the discipline of psychology were the highest; 13.89% responded *yes*. Participants who self-identified as tenured were the highest; 23.61% responded *yes*. In terms of institutional publicity, participants whose institutions were in the news were the highest; 12.5% responded *yes*.

## Appendix D

### Institutional Review Board Approval Letter



April 8, 2019

Scott C. Strother

Dear Mr. Strother,

The Research Ethics Committee of the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board office has reviewed and approved as submitted under expedited review your research proposal entitled "The Heightened Sense of Awareness Regarding Sexual Harassment & the Perceived Influence on Faculty Behavior Inside and Outside the Classroom."

Enclosed for your records is the signed Request for Approval form.

Reflecting the process for federally funded research, there will be no longer be a continuing review. Informed Consent documents and recruitment flyers will no longer be stamped.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Mary F. Ruzicka, Ph.D.  
Professor  
Director, Institutional Review Board

cc: Dr. Martin Finkelstein

Please review Seton Hall University IRB's Policies and Procedures on website <http://www.setonhall.edu/IRB> for more information. Please note the following requirements:

**Adverse Reactions:** If any untoward incidents or adverse reactions should develop as a result of this study, you are required to immediately notify in writing the Seton Hall University IRB Director, your sponsor and any federal regulatory institutions which may oversee this research, such as the OHRP or the FDA. If the problem is serious, approval may be withdrawn pending further review by the IRB.

**Amendments:** If you wish to change any aspect of this study, please communicate your request in writing, with revised copies of the protocol and/or informed consent where applicable, and the Amendment Form to the IRB Director. The new procedures cannot be initiated until you receive IRB approval.

Office of Institutional Review Board  
Presidents Hall • 430 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, NJ 07079 • Tel: 973.433.614 • Fax: 973.275.2561 • [ase@shu.edu](mailto:ase@shu.edu)

A HOME FOR THE MIND, THE HEART AND THE SPIRIT

**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION OR  
RELATED ACTIVITIES INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS**

All material must be typed.

PROJECT TITLE: The Heightened Sense of Awareness Regarding Sexual Harassment & The Perceived Influence  
on Faculty Behavior Inside and Outside the Classroom

H2019.3.2

**CERTIFICATION STATEMENT:**

In making this application, I (we) certify that I(we) have read and understand the University's policies and procedures governing research, development, and related activities involving human subjects. I (we) shall comply with the letter and spirit of those policies. I(we) further acknowledge my(our) obligation to (1) obtain written approval of significant deviations from the originally-approved protocol BEFORE making those deviations, and (2) report immediately all adverse effects of the study on the subjects to the Director of the Institutional Review Board, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ 07079.

Scott C. Strother, Doctoral Candidate

RESEARCHER(S)

\*\*Please print or type out names of all researchers below signature.  
Use separate sheet of paper, if necessary. \*\*

My signature indicates that I have reviewed the attached materials of my student advisee and consider them to meet IRB standards.

Dr. Martin Finkelstein

RESEARCHER'S FACULTY ADVISOR [for student researchers only]

\*\*Please print or type out name below signature\*\*

The request for approval submitted by the above researcher(s) was considered by the IRB for Research Involving Human Subjects Research at the March 2019 meeting.

The application was approved ☒ not approved ☐ by the Committee. Special conditions were ☐ were not ☒ set by the IRB. (Any special conditions are described on the reverse side.)

Mary J. Ruzicka, Ph.D.  
DIRECTOR,  
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL  
REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH

Seton Hall University  
3/2005