

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1994

Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment: Implications for Leaders in Higher Education

Susan E. Mitchell EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Mitchell, Susan E. EdD, "Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment: Implications for Leaders in Higher Education" (1994). *Dissertations*. 595.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/595>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**CREATING CAMPUS CLIMATES
THAT ARE FREE FROM SEXUAL HARASSMENT:
IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

by

Susan E. Mitchell

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1994

Dissertation Committee

**Mary Scherr, Ph. D., Director
Susan M. Zgliczynski, Ph. D.
Noelia Vela, Ed. D**

**CREATING CAMPUS CLIMATES
THAT ARE FREE FROM SEXUAL HARASSMENT:
IMPLICATIONS FOR LEADERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

MITCHELL, SUSAN ELIZABETH, Ed.D. University of San Diego, 1994,
228 pp.

Director: Mary W. Scherr, Ph.D.

Based upon the preponderance of research which strongly indicates that sexual harassment is a serious problem for females in academia, the purpose of this study was to identify effective strategies for creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. In order to realistically bound the project, the study focused specifically upon the issue as it relates to undergraduate and graduate female students.

The Delphi method, designed to generate solutions to complex problems, was the method of choice. Eighteen identified experts from thirteen campuses of The California State University participated as panelists and completed three rounds of surveys. The surveys were designed to identify 1) changes needed to create campus climates that are free from sexual harassment 2) needed differences for undergraduate and graduate students, 3) strategies being used in higher education to reduce sexual harassment, 4) problems encountered when these strategies are implemented, 5) techniques that have been used to determine the effectiveness of these strategies and, 6) innovative strategies that could be developed for the 21st century.

The results of the study were used to create a model for educational leaders who are committed to establishing campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. The model includes recommendations which address the problem from two levels. The first level addresses the sexual harassment of female students and includes a recommended definition of sexual harassment, suggested policies and procedures, and guidelines for establishing a sexual harassment task force, educating the campus community, and assessing the campus climate regarding sexual harassment. Additionally, recommendations are made on a second broader level which address gender inequities in higher education in general. These recommendations include enhancing the visibility of women on campus, empowering women's voices in academia, and creating non-violent and non-exploitive campus climates.

COPYRIGHT 1994
SUSAN E. MITCHELL

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the memory of my father, Guy C. Mitchell who taught me that there is honor and value in quiet persistence and hard work, and to my mother, Angeline I. Mitchell, who gave me powerful visions of what I could be as a woman that went beyond the stereotypes of a sexist society.

It is also dedicated to those leaders, past and present, who have worked toward a society that may someday be a place where my nieces, Laurie, Erica, Julie, and Jessica, and my nephews, Greg, Andy, and Kyle, can live in a society where men and women will work and learn in true partnership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work would not have been possible without the support of many people. I express my deepest gratitude to my committee members, Dr. Sue Zgliczynski, University of San Diego, and Dr. Noelia Vela, Evergreen Valley College, who provided me guidance and support throughout this project. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Mary Scherr who not only served as the director of my dissertation committee, but also served as my advisor throughout my entire doctoral program. Mary's classes opened up a new world for me, one in which a woman's experience is valued and honored, and which inspired me to undertake this project. I am also grateful for the intellectual challenge and emotional support of my fellow students at the University of San Diego, especially Jackie Freiberg, Anita Buckley-Rogers, and Mary Ann Larson, without whom the journey would have been less memorable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	x
CHAPTER I: STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE.....	1
Sexual Harassment in the American Workplace.....	1
Sexual Harassment in Academia.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Research Questions.....	9
Definition of Terms.....	10
Limitations and Assumptions of the Study.....	13
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	16
Introduction.....	16
Sexual Harassment in the American Workplace.....	16
Sexual Harassment in Academia.....	19
Definitions and Legal Implications of Sexual Harassment.....	22
Explanatory Models of Sexual Harassment.....	30
Perceptions of Perpetrators and Victims.....	34
The Consequences of Sexual Harassment.....	38
Campus Climate and Sexual Harassment in Academia.....	41
Strategies for Creating Campus Climates.....	47
Implications for this Study.....	53

CHAPTER III: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	55
Purpose of the Study.....	55
The Delphi Method.....	56
Identifying Strategies for Creating Alternative Futures.....	56
Historical Development of the Delphi Method	58
Applications of the Delphi Method in Education.....	62
Strengths and Limitations of the Delphi Method	64
Sample and Site Selection.....	71
Data Collection	74
Round Zero.....	74
Instrument Development and Pilot Study.....	75
Data Collection For Rounds One, Two, and Three.....	77
Data Analysis.....	82
Evaluation of the Delphi Method for this Study.....	83
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS OF THE STUDY.....	87
Introduction.....	87
Round Zero.....	88
Panelist Data.....	88
Campus Policies on Sexual Harassment.....	97
Delphi Analysis.....	98
Round One Results	98
Round Two Results- Part I.....	102
Round Two Results- Part II.....	106
Round Three Results- Part I.....	110
Round Three Results- Part II.....	122
Round Three Results- Part III.....	124

Summary of the Results of the Delphi Study	126
CHAPTER V: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	134
Summary of the Study	134
Sexual Harassment in Academia	134
Purpose of the Study.....	136
Methodology.....	137
Findings of the Study.....	139
Panelist Profile.....	139
Research Question Results.....	139
CSU Policies and Procedures Analysis.....	143
Conclusions Regarding the Study.....	144
Micro Level Conclusions.....	144
Macro Level Conclusions.....	147
A Model for Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment	151
Recommendations for Leaders Specific to the Issue of Sexual Harassment	151
A Definition of Sexual Harassment.....	151
Policy Statements Regarding Sexual Harassment.....	153
Procedures for Dealing with Sexual Harassment Complaints.....	154
Establish A Sexual Harassment Task Force.....	154
Educate the Campus Community Regarding Sexual Harassment	156

Educate Students Regarding Sexual Harassment.....	156
Educate Faculty, Staff, and Administrators Regarding Sexual Harassment.....	159
Assess the Campus Climate Regarding Sexual Harassment.....	161
Recommendations for Leaders Regarding Gender Inequities for Women in Higher Education.....	162
Enhance the Visibility of Women on Campus	162
Empower Women's Voices in Academia.....	165
Create a Non-violent, Non-exploitive Campus Climate	166
Implications for Future Research	168
Concluding Remarks.....	171
REFERENCES.....	173

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Institutional Student Enrollment.....	89
2. Panelist Institutions.....	89
3. Campus Areas of Professional Responsibility	91
4. Experience in Higher Education and Addressing Issues of Educational Equity for Women	91
5. Age of Panelists.....	92
6. Academic Degrees	93
7. Doctoral Degrees by Subject.....	93
8. Panelist Experience Dealing With Sexual Harassment	95
9. Typical Panelist Profile Characteristics	96
10. Techniques to Determine the Effectiveness of Reducing Sexual Harassment	104
11. Importance Level of Items as to Inclusion in a Campus Policy Statement	107
12. Importance Level of Items as to Inclusion in Campus Procedures Statements	109
13. What Needs to Change Regarding Sexual Harassment?	111
14. Identification of Current Strategies Regarding Sexual Harassment.....	112
15. Problems Encountered When Strategies Were Implemented.....	114
16. Innovative and Creative Strategies for the 21st Century.....	116

17.	Strategies Generated for Building a Campus Culture that Strongly Supports a Non-Violent, Non-Exploitive Campus.....	117
18.	Items to be Included in Campus Policy Statements Regarding Sexual Harassment	122
19.	Items to be Included in Campus Procedures Statements Regarding Sexual Harassment	123

LIST OF APPENDICES

A.	Demographic Questionnaire	189
B.	Demographic Questionnaire Results	192
C.	Round One Delphi Instrument	197
D.	Round One Letter of Transmittal.....	200
E.	Round One Dunning Letter	203
F.	Round Two Delphi Instrument.....	204
G.	Round Two Letter of Transmittal.....	211
H.	Round Two Dunning Letter.....	213
I.	Round Three Delphi Instrument.....	214
J.	Round Three Letter of Transmittal.....	225
K.	Round Three Dunning Letter.....	226
L.	Thank You Letter to Panelists.....	227
M.	Executive Order 345	228

CHAPTER ONE
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

Sexual Harassment in the American Workplace

Since the Clarence Thomas hearings in 1991 and the charges of sexual harassment which were brought against him by Professor Anita Hill, as well as the Tailhook scandal that has plagued the Navy for well over two years, the issue of sexual harassment has received more public focus than ever before. In fact, in the three months following the Clarence Thomas hearings, formal complaints of sexual harassment against corporate employers filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission jumped to 1,244 compared with 728 during the same period the year prior to the hearings (National Association for Women in Education, 1992). By 1993, the reported numbers had almost doubled again since the increase reported in 1991 figures (Kaplan, 1993).

In 1980, the United States Merit Systems Protection Board, in an effort to determine how widespread the phenomenon was for employees of the federal government, conducted the first comprehensive research study in the United States on sexual harassment (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). In a stratified random sample of federal employees listed in the Central Personnel Data File of the Office of Personnel Management, 23,964 persons were surveyed with 10,644 women in the final sample. Forty

two percent of the women and 15% of the men reported being the target of overt sexual harassment at some point in the two year period covered by the study.

While this study indicated that both men and women are sexually harassed, it also demonstrated that women consistently are much more likely than men to experience such harassment. Subsequent studies, including a follow-up study by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board published in 1988, have continued to support that this phenomenon overwhelmingly is experienced most often by women and in more serious forms and, as a result, is an overwhelming barrier for women workers in this country (Fitzgerald, Shullman, Bailey, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, & Weitzman, 1988; Hill, 1992; Robertson, Dyer, and Campbell, 1988; Tangri, Burt & Johnson, 1982; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988).

Sexual harassment has been a problem in all aspects of the American workplace including the financial industry (Cohen, Power, & Siconolfi, 1992), the United States Navy (Krohne, 1992), and in most other working environments, particularly those that are male dominated (Kantrowitz, 1992).

The most common forms of sexual harassment include behaviors such as jokes, sexual looks, remarks, and teasing; gestures and body language; and sexual touching, cornering, and brushing against. The least frequently experienced types of harassment consist of actual or attempted rape or assault (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

The literature on sexual harassment has consistently indicated that there are specific negative consequences to victims of

harassment. Tangri et al. (1982) found that those who experienced sexual harassment had a worsened emotional or physical condition, a worsened ability to work with others on the job or in school and more negative feelings about work in general. Jensen & Gutek (1982) found that 80 percent of victims surveyed reacted with disgust, 68 percent with anger and 20 percent indicated that they felt depressed.

Just as the problem of sexual harassment invades the lives of women in the workplace and negatively affects their personal and professional lives, it also pollutes the psychological and social environment of women on college and university campuses as well (Stimpson, 1989). The growing interest in sexual harassment in the workplace has led to a parallel interest in studying the problem in institutions of higher education.

Sexual Harassment in Academia

The pollution of the psychological and social environment for female students in academia is demonstrated in numerous accounts of sexual harassment on American college and university campuses as these examples demonstrate:

Dr. P. gave me the creeps. Whenever we took a test, I'd look up from my paper, and there he would be staring at me. He was always looking at my top or my legs. I quit wearing skirts to that class because I was so uncomfortable around him. I felt like I was some kind of freak in a zoo. (Dziech & Weiner, 1984, p. 92)

A group of men regularly sit at a table facing a cafeteria line. As women go through the line, the men loudly discuss the

women's sexual attributes and hold up signs with numbers from one to ten "rating" each woman. As a result, many women skip meals or avoid the cafeteria. (Hughes & Sandler, 1991, p. 1)

I experienced a deep sense of betrayal when I found out that his "genuine friendship" with me was a carbon copy of many others he had had before, during, and after our interaction, relationships with a sexual goal in mind. I was furious with him for manipulating my need for friendship and my respect for his teaching and political skills and for his "feminism" into tolerance of his sexual advances. (Peters, 1990, p. 19)

. . . the Women's Center had a "Take Back the Night" march, consisting of about thirty people. It ended violently when the march proceeded down the street where the social clubs were located, and many club's members, some drunk, were waiting outside to verbally abuse the marchers and throw beer cans at them. They shouted, "The night belongs to Michelob." Several men exposed themselves to the marchers, and were photographed on videotape doing so. . . . Specific participants in the march were continually harassed and threatened by phone, and a group of male students went through a section of campus yelling, "We can rape anybody we want." (Demby, 1990, p. 188)

Group harassment incidents include vandalizing sororities. A student at a large eastern university described her experience: "Do you have any idea how frightening it is to wake up to the sound of breaking glass: Or how frightening it is to have somebody beating on your doors and windows for hours? We've

even had doors kicked in . . . We've had to spend a couple of thousand dollars because of this kind of incident." (Hughes & Sandler, 1991, p. 3)

My experience of being sexually harassed by my counseling professor has changed my life forever. I know that although the trauma has lessened considerably, it will never disappear.

(Anonymous, 1991, p. 506)

These examples illustrate the type of hostile environment in which women must study and work in each year in institutions of higher learning in this country. Numerous authors have documented the incidence of sexual harassment in academia and have reported it to be at epidemic proportions in this country (Brewer, 1982; Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Fitzgerald, et al., 1988; Olson & McKinney, 1989; Paludi & DeFour, 1989). Given the fact that in 1979 women constituted a majority of students for the first time in our nation's history (Touchton & Davis, 1991), the problem of sexual harassment in academia, which affects so large a proportion of the academic community, is a serious one indeed.

It has been documented in numerous studies that even when the problem is limited exclusively to sexual harassment of female students by male faculty, the numbers are shocking. Despite the use of different research techniques and slightly different definitions of sexual harassment, Dziech and Weiner (1984) reported that the results of these various studies are surprisingly similar as they demonstrated repeatedly that 20-30 percent of women students reported they have been sexually harassed by male faculty during their college years. They noted in the fall of 1982 that the National Center

for Educational Statistics reported that 6,374,005 women were enrolled in American colleges and universities. Even if only the lower end of the incidence rates reported in the studies documented by Dziech and Weiner is considered, 20 percent of the women enrolled in 1982 equaled 1,274,800 women.

When the concept of sexual harassment is expanded to include peer harassment, the numbers are even more alarming. Various studies which included assessments of women students who had experienced sexist comments or received unwelcome sexual attention from their peers ranged from 68 percent to 92 percent of those women surveyed (Hughes & Sandler, 1988).

The problem of sexual harassment in academia is not limited only to students as victims. While the preponderance of research has been conducted on students as victims of sexual harassment in academia (Goodwin, Roscoe, Rose, & Repp, 1989), there is a growing body of research on sexual harassment directed toward female faculty, staff, and administrators in studies such as those conducted by Carroll & Ellis (1989), Fitzgerald et al. (1988), Goodwin et al. (1989), Kenig & Ryan, (1986), Parson, Sands, & Duane (1991), and Thorner (1989).

Somers (1982), noted that few laws prohibit sexual harassment specifically; usually these complaints are handled through the structure of sexual discrimination laws which are under Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 for students and Title VII for employees. Title IX states that "No person in the U. S. shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program,

or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (U. S. Congress, 1972, p. a).

Legal precedent has been established for hearing sexual harassment cases under the stipulations of Title IX through the case of *Alexander vs. Yale* (1977). A former Yale student charged that her professor had offered her an "A" grade in exchange for sex. While the case was lost on appeal because of the failure to prove that an improper advance was made or that the student was adversely affected as a consequence, the issues of students' rights to an environment free from intimidation, hostility or offensiveness was established.

The literature on sexual harassment demonstrates that generally three strategies are utilized by organizations and institutions in the attempt to prevent sexual harassment. These are 1) a well-publicized policy statement outlining behaviors which are considered unacceptable by the organization; 2) an educational program for members of the organization, and 3) an effective means of reporting offenses when they do occur (Krohne, 1991).

However, there is very little evidence, if any, to demonstrate that these strategies, in fact, are helpful in lowering incidences rates of sexual harassment. Olson & McKinney (1989) demonstrated that despite efforts at Oklahoma State University to eradicate sexual harassment, that the incidence was as great or greater than reported in earlier research. Robertson, Dyer, & Campbell, (1988) concluded that their study of policies and procedures on sexual harassment at institutions of higher learning showed insufficient evidence to indicate that policies reduce sexual harassment in any manner whatsoever, and, in fact, demonstrate that harassers actually have very little to fear

for their actions in terms of long-term consequences. Thorner (1989), and Parson, Sands, & Duane (1991), questioned the adequacy of policies and procedures to address such a complex issue.

Sexual harassment is a complex and newly emerging social issue which is still in the initial stages of research (Brewer, 1982). The research that has been done thus far has entered into an area that promises fertile ground for future researchers in that so many aspects of the issue still need to be addressed.

Most of the research thus far has been survey research that has focused upon the victims of sexual harassment exploring incidence rates and the effects of sexual harassment, but a broader base of research methodologies and research focus is needed. In light of the apparent inadequacy of current strategies to address the problem, researchers have called for a deeper and more meaningful approach to addressing sexual harassment by challenging the underlying assumptions of our culture which perpetuate gender and sex-role stereotypes (Hoffman, 1986; Rice, 1990; Twombly, 1991).

Further research in this area can inform educational leaders which strategies can best address such a complex issue in higher education. Leaders in higher education need strategies for fundamental organizational and cultural change which address the underlying assumptions of gender-role differences in our society that lead to inequities for women in higher education.

Purpose of the Study

Based upon the preponderance of research which indicates that sexual harassment is an overwhelming problem for females in

academia, the purpose of the study was to identify effective strategies for educational leaders to use in creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment for women. In order to realistically bound the project, the study focused specifically upon the issue as it relates to students. The study included both undergraduate and graduate students in its focus.

Effective strategies were identified by conducting a Delphi research study among a panel of experts in addressing issues of educational equity for women in higher education throughout the California State University system. An anticipated outcome of this project was the creation of a model for college and university campuses for use in effectively addressing this issue in order to create campus climates that are supportive of women achieving their academic goals.

Research Questions

The following questions were central to the purpose of this project:

1. What changes are most needed in order to create campus climates for female students that are free from sexual harassment?
2. Are these needed changes different for undergraduate and graduate female students?
3. What current strategies are being used in higher education to create campus climates that are free from the sexual harassment of female students?

4. What problems are encountered when these strategies are implemented?
5. What techniques have been used or are planned to be used to determine the effectiveness of these strategies?
6. What new and innovative strategies can be identified and developed to create campus climates for the 21st century that are free from sexual harassment of female students?

Definition of Terms

Sexual harassment

In the following review of the literature, the reader will find that one of the major problems hindering effective research on sexual harassment is the lack of a widely accepted definition of the term.

This project utilized the following definition of sexual harassment which consists of four of the five levels of sexual harassment identified by Till (1980). The fifth level, sexual imposition, which includes gross sexual imposition, assault, and rape has been eliminated in order to focus the scope of this study more narrowly.

1. **Gender harassment-** generalized sexist remarks and behavior not designed to elicit sexual cooperation but rather to convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women.
2. **Seductive behaviors-** unwanted, inappropriate, and offensive sexual advances.
3. **Sexual bribery-** the solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by the promise of reward.

4. **Sexual coercion**- the coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment.

Campus climate

For the purpose of this research, this term refers to the general environment or atmosphere that exists on a campus as it relates to the personal, academic, and professional development of female students. It includes anything that either supports or impedes the successful attainment of academic goals for women on campus. Factors which may affect campus climate positively or negatively include interactions with faculty, staff, and other students both inside and outside the classroom; publications and media on the campus such as flyers, posters, and newspapers; appropriate campus activities and programs or the lack thereof; and student services, which support the academic success of female students.

Delphi Study

The Delphi process is essentially a structured group process that was first used in technological forecasting in the defense industry. It consists of a panel of experts who engage in an anonymous debate through a series of questionnaires (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). It is intended to gain the advantages of groups while overcoming the disadvantages and is a process designed to reach consensus about any number of problems or issues. This convergence results from actual transfer of information and interaction among the panel members (Martino, 1983).

Uhl, (1983) noted that the technique can be effective in educational planning in that it has great potential to generate solutions to complex problems.

Expert panel member

For the purpose of this study an expert panel member was a person nominated by a member of the Women's Council of the State University as being an expert in educational equity issues for women and who was currently working in the CSU system. Nominators identified an expert as someone who has worked in higher education for at least five years addressing issues of women's development and/or educational equity for women students, faculty, staff, or administrators in higher education institutions or organizations.

California State University System

The California State University system (CSU) consists of twenty public universities located throughout the State of California. The system is the largest system of higher education in the world.

Women's Council of the State University

This group is composed of representatives from each of the twenty campuses in the CSU system and its purpose is to address issues of special concern to women students, faculty, staff, and administrators in the CSU system.

Limitations and Assumptions of the Study

All research studies operate from basic assumptions and incur certain limitations depending upon the scope and purpose of the project.

Limitations

The use of the Delphi method has some inherent limitations in its utilization. Many of these limitations depend upon the persons selected to serve as expert panelists. First of all, as Uhl noted about using the technique for social research, "there is no way to check the plausibility of expert's responses" (1983, p. 86). Given this limitation, the results may not be generalizable to educators and campuses nationally, but they might prove helpful in generating new and innovative strategies which can be tested on various campuses.

Bunning (1979) also noted that using the Delphi method can have limitations regarding the expertise of panelists. These limitations include 1) understanding of basic societal change is limited, 2) unquestioned beliefs and values limit the ability to foresee basic changes and goals, 3) important possibilities are often overlooked, and 4) the heavy expenditure of time to complete the questionnaires.

Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustavson (1975) noted that three critical conditions are necessary to complete a successful Delphi: 1) adequate time, 2) participant skill in written communication, and 3) high participant motivation. These conditions require that participants be willing to commit to participation in a long-term project lasting several months. This requirement can result in a

higher mortality rate than in studies which require only one survey to be answered.

Finally, the interpretive nature of the data analysis is a limitation.

Assumptions

Numerous assumptions undergirded the basis of this project. First of all, the researcher assumed that leaders in higher education recognize that sexual harassment is a pervasive problem for women students and that they want to create campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. It was also assumed that effective strategies for creating campus climates for students which are free from sexual harassment could be identified through this research process.

The assumption was also made that a minimum of 15 expert panelists would agree to participate for the duration of the study, that they would in fact be experts in the subject area, and that they would give thoughtful consideration to the subject matter while answering the questionnaires and return the questionnaires using the requested timeline. It was also assumed that the researcher's interpretation of the panelists' answers would be objective.

Because the expert panel was asked to provide evaluative information which could be construed as politically sensitive, it was also assumed that strict confidentiality of the participants would be maintained throughout the project. All participants were informed as to the nature of the research and signed a consent form prior to the start of the project indicating that participation was totally voluntary. Participants were also permitted to ask questions about the research throughout the study and to withdraw from the research at any time.

It was assumed that each expert would benefit from participation in the project in that the Delphi process can serve as a clarifying process for participants as to what they think about the issue in question. Additionally, each participant received a complimentary summary report after the completion of the project.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This review summarizes the literature on sexual harassment in the American workplace and higher education and includes discussion of definitions, legal implications, and explanatory models of sexual harassment; perceptions of perpetrators and victims of sexual harassment; and the negative consequences of the issue for victims and organizations. The growing body of literature on campus climate as well as feminist writings explores changes needed in academia in order to create campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. In addition, current strategies being used in higher education to address the issue are presented, as is a final section on the implications for future research.

Sexual Harassment in the American Workplace

"Sexual harassment of working women has been one of the most pervasive but carefully ignored features of our national life" (MacKinnon, 1979, vii). So begins the book, Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination by Catherine MacKinnon that was one of the first to explore the issue of sexual harassment in the workplace. One year earlier, in 1978, Lin Farley's groundbreaking work Sexual Shakedown: The Sexual Harassment of

Women on the Job was published. These two works established the early basis for the study of sexual harassment in the workplace by bringing the invisible issue into the mainstream of public focus.

As more women have entered the workplace in the last two decades, the issue of work-related interactions of men and women has come more into question. As a setting for meeting people, work has several features that make it different from meeting people in social settings (Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen, 1983). First, people at work are there to do their jobs and to support themselves and their families. Second, most people intend to work at a particular place for a considerable length of time and recognize that ongoing relationships at work can be affected by sexual overtures, and third, people in the workplace are often subject to a power hierarchy that affects their freedom to initiate or respond to a sexual overture.

In 1980, as a result of Congressional urging, the first comprehensive research study in the United States was conducted on sexual harassment in a project sponsored by the United States Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB). This study was an effort to determine how widespread the phenomenon is for employees of the federal government by conducting "a thorough and scientific study of sexual harassment in the Federal workplace" (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, p. 1).

In a stratified random sample of federal employees, 23,964 persons were surveyed with 10,644 women in the final sample. Forty two percent of the women and 15% of the men reported being the target of overt sexual harassment during the two year period covered by the study. The majority of Federal employees who had worked

elsewhere reported that sexual harassment was no worse in the Federal workplace than in state and local governments or in the private sector.

In 1986, the Board conducted a follow-up study to determine what changes, if any, had occurred in the Federal Government concerning sexual harassment since the first study. Of the 8,523 employees who responded to the second survey, 42% of all women and 14% of all men reported they experienced some form of sexual harassment during the period of May 1985 through May 1987 (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988).

Despite the fact that the surveys indicated that employees were more aware of policies prohibiting sexual harassment in the second study than in the first, and also that Federal agencies had taken a number of actions to reduce the incidence of sexual harassment after the first study, uninvited and unwanted sexual attention was still experienced by almost the identical proportion of the workforce in 1987 as in 1980.

The MSPB studies also demonstrated that the problem of sexual harassment is a costly one. The first study estimated that the impact and cost of sexual harassment in dollars to taxpayers for the two year period covered by the study was a minimum of \$189 million. The second study estimated that sexual harassment cost the Federal Government \$267 million in a subsequent two-year period. These estimates, considered to be conservative, were calculated by estimating the cost of replacing employees who leave their jobs, of paying sick leave to employees who miss work as a consequence, and of reduced individual and work group productivity. These costs are in

addition to the personal consequences and anguish of the victims which, of course, cannot be adequately quantified.

The MSPB studies clearly demonstrated, on a wide scale, that the problem of sexual harassment is pervasive and widespread throughout the American workforce and that it is also costly, not only to victims, but also to employers as well.

Importantly, they also identified that sexual harassment is experienced more often by women and in more serious forms. Subsequent studies have continued to support these findings (Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Robertson, Dyer, and Campbell, 1988; Tangri, Burt & Johnson, 1982) and lead one to conclude "that sexual harassment constitutes one of the most ubiquitous and damaging barriers to women's career success and satisfaction" (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, p. 154).

Sexual Harassment in Academia

Sandler (1990), noted that sexual harassment is not really a new issue on campus or in the workplace. She stated that:

It's been hidden for years, with women suffering silently and alone. When Yale University was sued in 1977 under Title IX by five students claiming sexual harassment by faculty, Pandora's box was opened: sexual harassment came out of the closet at last (Sandler, 1990, p. 5).

In 1979-80, the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs circulated "a call for information on the sexual harassment of students" (Dziech and Weiner, 1984). The results of

this project, published in 1980, represented the first attempt to examine the problem on a large scale in the realm of higher education.

The late seventies and early eighties began to see higher education institutions conducting research as to incidence rates of sexual harassment on various campuses which demonstrated that it was indeed a problem in higher education (Blanshan, 1983; Brewer, 1982). In 1984, with the publication of The Lecherous Professor: Sexual Harassment on Campus (Dziech & Weiner, 1984), the problem achieved even greater interest in academia.

These researchers reported that even when the problem is limited only to sexual harassment of female students by male faculty, the statistics are shocking. Despite the use of different research techniques and slightly different definitions of sexual harassment, they reported that the results of various studies are surprisingly similar as they repeatedly demonstrated that 20-30 percent of women students reported they had been sexually harassed by male faculty during their college years. In the fall of 1982, the National Center for Educational Statistics reported that 6,374,005 women were enrolled in American colleges and universities (Dziech & Weiner, 1984). Even if the lower end of the incidence rates reported in the studies is considered, well over 1 million women enrolled in 1982 had been sexually harassed by their male professors at some time during their academic career.

Studies also suggest that graduate students are at a higher risk of harassment by their professors than are undergraduate students (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Hotelling, 1991; Paludi, 1990; Sandler, 1990). Sandler (1990), noted that graduate students, more so than undergraduate students, rely on their professors for opportunities to

attend special seminars and workshops and to co-author research papers as well as for introductions to colleagues in the field and recommendations for scholarships and grants. Professors can also be in positions to help or hinder a student in obtaining a position both during one's academic career and after graduation. Graduate students also have less opportunity to transfer to other classes in order to avoid a harasser, and often feel they have little recourse to realistically resolve the situation.

When the concept of sexual harassment is expanded to include peer harassment, the numbers are even more alarming. Various studies of peer sexual harassment, which included assessments of women students who had experienced sexist comments or received unwelcome sexual attention from their peers, ranged from 68 percent to 92 percent of those women surveyed (Hughes & Sandler, 1988).

Male-dominated campuses, like male dominated professions, often have severe peer harassment problems. In 1991, a sophomore at Texas A & M University was attacked by three male cadets when she decided to try out for an elite ceremonial unit within the Corps of Cadets of which only three of the fifty cadets were female. She was struck in the breasts and her back and threatened with a knife if she did not withdraw her application. While disciplinary charges were brought against the cadets, the university found that this was not an isolated incident (Kantrowitz, 1992).

Recent studies have demonstrated that sexual harassment is experienced by women and girls long before they ever reach university campuses. Eighty five percent of girls and 75% of boys in public schools in 8th through 11th grade have experienced some form of

sexual harassment in their school life (American Association of University Women, 1993). Girls reported more negative reactions to harassment, with 33 percent not wanting to go to school as a result of the harassment, compared to 12 percent of the boys. One in four girls reported being harassed by a teacher or other school employee.

In a recently published report by the Center for Research on Women at Wellesley College (Stein, Marshall, & Tropp, 1993) the data generated by a survey of more than 4,000 girls ranging from nine to nineteen years of age revealed that 39% of the girls reported that they had been harassed at school on a daily basis during the last year. Even when girls told a teacher or administrator about the harassment, nothing happened to the harasser in 45% of the incidents reported.

The problem of sexual harassment in academia is not limited only to students as victims. While the preponderance of research has been conducted on students as victims of sexual harassment in academia (Goodwin, Roscoe, Rose, & Repp, 1989), there is a growing body of research on sexual harassment directed toward female faculty, staff, and administrators (Carroll & Ellis, 1989; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Goodwin et al., 1989; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Parson, Sands, & Duane, 1991; and Thorner, 1989). The research indicates that sexual harassment affects all women in the campus community and is a continual and pervasive problem in academia.

Definitions and Legal Implications of Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is a complex and newly emerging social issue which is still in the initial stages of research (Brewer, 1982). Due to the lack of a widely accepted definition of sexual harassment (Somers,

1982), and a conceptual framework to understand or alter this pervasive phenomenon (Kahn & Robbins, 1985), the literature is fragmented and filled with contradictions in some areas (Fitzgerald, 1990), while indicating some developing patterns and strong agreement in other areas.

One of the most pervasive problems in studying sexual harassment since its recognition as a social problem in the late 1970's is the lack of a clear definition (Hotelling, 1991; Lee & Heppner, 1991; Wilson & Kraus, 1983). There is much discussion of what should be included in a definition, such as whether or not specific behaviors should be listed. In a study conducted by Robertson, Dyer, & Campbell (1988), who surveyed 311 institutions representing 9.5 percent of all institutions of higher learning in the United States and its dependencies, they found that campuses were using a wide range of definitions in their policies on sexual harassment. Forty nine percent derived their content from the guidelines issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 1980). The other 51 percent of the institutions were:

a mixture of original formulations: a few that prohibited "sexual harassment" without defining it, and others that contained multiple definitions or definitions using examples of behavior or scenarios. Slightly over a third of the formulations in this category were comparable in content to parts of the guidelines but sufficiently original to deserve a separate category. (p. 805)

Fitzgerald (1990), noted that most definitions of sexual harassment take two forms; the first (Type 1), consists of a general

statement describing the nature of the behavior and sometimes the status relationship of the persons involved, but generally does not list any classes of behavior. The second type (Type 2), consists of a list of specific actions with no formal explication of the theoretical framework from which such a list is derived, although the behavior is usually described as unwanted by the recipient.

Definitions of the first type include all legal and regulatory constructions and explicitly theoretical statements such as the EEOC statement on the Interim Interpretive Guidelines on Sex Discrimination:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment. (p. 23)

Fitzgerald cited as examples of Type 2 definitions that of MacKinnon (1979), which states that "Sexual harassment . . . refers to the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power" (p. 1), and that of Farley (1978) ,who asserts that "Sexual harassment is . . . unsolicited nonreciprocal male behavior that asserts a women's sex role over her function as worker" (p. 14).

Somers (1982), examined the various definitions and policies regarding sexual harassment that academic institutions have developed within the framework of legal and federal guidelines. She noted that few laws prohibit sexual harassment specifically; usually these complaints are handled through the structure of sexual discrimination laws which are under Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972 for students and Title VII for employees.

Until 1986, the Supreme Court had ruled favorably only on cases involving tangible economic losses of the alleged victims. However, the decision in Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson in 1986 dramatically changed the issue of sexual harassment in America when it expanded an employer's liabilities to include behaviors which unreasonably interfere with an employee's work performance or creates an intimidating and/or offensive work environment (Wetherfield, 1990).

In 1991, in the case of Ellison v. Brady, a lower court further expanded the legal definition of sexual harassment when the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit declared that in cases in which a woman has filed a sexual harassment lawsuit that a "reasonable woman's" standard would be more appropriate to use than the traditional male-biased "reasonable man's" perspective (Krohne, 1991). This ruling indicates that the courts are beginning to recognize that there are differences in how men and women perceive socio-sexual behaviors as acceptable conduct in the workplace (Goodman, 1992).

In the case of hostile environment lawsuits, until November 1993, the plaintiff was required to demonstrate that the harassment was sufficiently severe and pervasive to affect seriously the

psychological well being of employees or students. This was demonstrated by the case of Henson v. City of Dundee, (Wetherfield, 1990). However, in a landmark case for working women Harris v. Forklift Systems, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a second consideration of the issue of sexual harassment, unanimously defined sexual harassment as conduct making the workplace environment "hostile or abusive" to a "reasonable person". Justice Sandra Day O'Connor wrote for the court that the federal law takes effect "before harassing conduct leads to a nervous breakdown" (Kaplan, 1993). Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, in her first major case on the Supreme Court, held that the court's test was not whether harassment actually impaired a plaintiff's productivity, but simply made it harder for one sex to perform a job (Kaplan, 1993).

This case is also important in determining how sexual harassment and hostile environment cases affecting students may be evaluated by the legal system in the future, in that both the courts and the U. S Department of Education, which enforces Title IX, look to decisions under Title VII in determining Title IX cases (NAWE, 1994).

In addition to hearing cases under Title VII, legal precedent was established for hearing sexual harassment cases concerning students under the stipulations of Title IX in the case of Alexander vs. Yale (1977) in which the issues of students' rights to an environment free from intimidation, hostility or offensiveness was established when the federal magistrate stated in a preliminary hearing:

It is perfectly reasonable to maintain that academic advancement conditioned upon submission to sexual demands constitutes sex discrimination in education just as questions of job retention or

promotions tied to sexual demands from supervisors have become increasingly recognized as potential violations of Title VII's ban against sex discrimination in employment: (Alexander vs. Yale, 1977).

Sometimes the publicity and/or knowledge of a suit has moved a university to action as in the case of a professor at the University of California at Berkeley who was charged with sexual harassment by six women students who formally complained that they had been harassed and which resulted in an investigation and temporary suspension of the faculty member. A San Jose State University associate professor was dismissed as a result of sexual harassment charges by five female students who accused him of repeatedly touching, embracing, kissing, fondling, and propositioning them (Somers, 1982). A tenured art professor at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee was fired for sexually harassing students (National Association for Women in Education, 1993a).

Another recent legal development concerning sex discrimination is also expected to impact higher education (National Association of Women in Education, 1992). Monetary damages are now available to victims of sexual discrimination, which includes sexual harassment, under both the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and Title IX. Previously, the only sanction available was the removal of federal funding from the university, however federal funds have never been denied to an educational institution because of sex discrimination. In Franklin v. Gwinnett County School District (1992), the U. S. Supreme Court unanimously ruled that victims of sex discrimination, which includes sexual harassment, may be entitled to damage awards under

Title IX. Because complainants may now sue for damages, this change is expected to have a major impact upon colleges and universities with respect to sex discrimination cases.

Under both The Civil Rights Act of 1991 and Title IX, suits may now be tried before juries rather than a judge if requested by either party. Juries are often thought to be more sympathetic to discrimination plaintiffs than judges thus the likelihood of costly damage suits is thought to have increased (National Association of Women in Education, 1992).

No doubt the debate about a legal definition of sexual harassment will continue for some time to come. Some authors have asserted that broad legal definitions are effective in combatting the problem and should include a wide range of behaviors for a legal basis for fighting different degrees of sexual harassment (MacKinnon, 1992; Mezey, 1992; Siegel, 1992; Webb, 1992). Others, however, have proposed that broad legal definitions are, in fact, harmful. McCarthy (1992) indicated that such definitions have two serious consequences: one, that employers are unwilling to hire women because they fear potential lawsuits and two, that women are viewed as fragile and in need of protection. Additionally, some have asserted that such laws are actually discriminatory toward men in that they lead to the curtailment of the freedom of speech (Davidson, 1992; Leo, 1992; Weiss, 1992).

The work of Till (1980) and Fitzgerald et al. (1988) has been helpful in providing a possible conceptual basis for a definition of sexual harassment. Till classified the responses of a national sample of college women into five general categories covering a wide spectrum

of behaviors from sexist comments to rape. In research supported in part by a grant from the United States Department of Education, through the Women's Educational Equity Act, Fitzgerald et al. (1988) built upon Till's work to develop the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ). This instrument was constructed in an effort to provide a standardized survey in order to build a national profile of the frequency of sexual harassment that meets standard psychometric criteria (Fitzgerald, 1990).

These five levels of sexual harassment are:

1. Gender harassment - generalized sexist remarks and behavior not designed to elicit sexual cooperation but rather to convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women.
2. Seductive behaviors - unwanted, inappropriate, and offensive sexual advances.
3. Sexual bribery - the solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by the promise of reward.
4. Sexual coercion - the coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment.
5. Sexual imposition - includes gross sexual imposition, assault, and rape.

Because definitions have varied so much regarding the phenomenon, and researchers have continually used varying definitions in their research, it is difficult to clearly classify the extent of the problem and build a cumulative information base for national comparison and theory building (Brewer, 1982). If more campuses begin to utilize the SEQ and the definition of sexual harassment

outlined by Till, it would be helpful in more fully determining the extent of sexual harassment in academia and what types are most frequent and widespread. Generally, the literature seems to support the concept that the lower the level of harassment, the more frequently it is experienced by women (Hughes & Sandler, 1988; Olson & McKinney, 1989; Paludi & DeFour, 1989) but until a clear definition is established, it is difficult to empirically draw this conclusion.

While many researchers and policy-makers have attempted to more clearly define sexual harassment, there have also been simultaneous studies completed which attempt to provide a conceptual basis for the causes of sexual harassment.

Explanatory Models of Sexual Harassment

Four explanatory models of sexual harassment are most frequently noted in the literature. Three of these were studied by Tangri et al. (1982) when they reanalyzed the results of the 1980 United States Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) study and looked at the three models most frequently identified in the literature and empirically tested them based on the results of the study.

The natural/biological model (Model One) asserted that the behaviors defined as sexual harassment exist, but denied that the intent of the behavior is to harass, dominate, or discriminate. It explained sexual harassment simply as human nature and, therefore, efforts to change it are futile. This model denied the consequences of sexual harassment on women's careers, physical and emotional health, and job security (Tangri et al., 1982).

The organizational model (Model Two) identified the infrastructure of the campus or workplace as the most important factor regarding sexual harassment and contended that institutions provide the opportunity structure and organizational climate that makes sexual harassment possible. This model explained why women may receive less professional support from male colleagues and also supported the concept that women are vulnerable to the physical, emotional, economic and social results of sexual harassment (Tangri et al., 1982).

The sociocultural model (Model Three) viewed sexual harassment as part of the overall culture of our society which manifests cultural enforcement of gender roles and subsequent inequities for women in all avenues of life including the workplace and the academy. This model contended that harassment is another example of men asserting their cultural power over women (Tangri et al., 1982).

The analysis by Tangri et al. (1982) led them to state that Models Two and Three received more empirical support than did Model One. These researchers suggested that the sexual harassment of women seems to conform to a model suggesting intimidation (sociocultural model) while the sexual harassment of men seems to conform more to a model suggesting attraction (natural/biological model).

The fourth model, the sex-role spillover model, is based on a study by Gutek and Morasch (1982) of working adults in Los Angeles County in 1980. Gutek and Cohen (1987) in a later analysis used the

same data. Their sample included 827 women and 405 men who were interviewed over the phone using random digit dialing.

Essentially the model concerned the carryover into the workplace or educational environment of gender-role-based expectations of behavior. The sex-role spillover was of two types: of women who were in nontraditional majors or careers such as engineering and the sciences, and of women in female-populated careers and majors such as nursing and clerical services. The model was predicated on skewed sex ratios in these environments.

In the case of women in nontraditional environments, they were perceived and treated differently. Because her gender was salient to herself as well as to others, women perceived this differential treatment to be discriminatory in general and harassment when the context was sexual. Women were well aware that the differential treatment they received was due to their gender.

In the case where women worked with a high number of other women and experienced sexual harassment (such as waitresses or clerical workers), they were less likely to define it as such if most of the other women in the workplace were being treated the same way. This helps to account for the fact that many times even though women report certain behaviors have been directed to them which are defined by the law or campus policies as sexual harassment, the recipient of such behaviors rarely labels them as such.

While the preceding four models are the most widely referenced in the sexual harassment literature, other models also exist. A model in the gender communication literature views sexual harassment as an interruption of normal communication scripts in our culture (Booth-

Butterfield, 1987). Stimpson's (1989) feminist model proposed that sexual harassment should be viewed as a reinterpretation of the desire of men for women to one of sexual over-reaching. Kenig & Ryan (1986) suggested that attribution theory can provide a conceptual basis for understanding sexual harassment in that sex differences reflect differing perceptions by men and women of their own self-interests within organizations.

Kahn & Robbins (1985) suggested that sex discrimination can best be understood by utilizing Lewin's notion of the psychological life space which contended that growth and development over the life span can be viewed as a process of life-space differentiation, a process that is inherently gender free in that men and women are equally able to differentiate the same number of roles, but that the content of these roles is heavily influenced by sex role socialization.

In the explosion of interest in the topic since the Clarence Thomas hearings in 1991, recent explanations for sexual harassment have also appeared in the literature. These have included concepts such as that many men feel threatened by professional working women and respond to this threat by sexually harassing women on the job (Goleman, 1992), and that capitalism, because it requires that people compete rather than cooperate and encourages those in power, usually men, to oppress those out of power, usually women, is a cause of sexual harassment (Onesto, 1992).

Additionally, Kendall (1992) asserted that sexual harassment is a result of the loosening of morals that resulted during the sexual revolution of the 1960s; Allen (1992) proposed that the extensive use of pornography in America contributes to the problem; and Wolf

(1992) asserted that unclear laws make sexual harassment more prevalent in American society.

Due to the fact that there is no one generally accepted definition or explanatory model of sexual harassment, a great deal of confusion exists as to the problem among perpetrators and victims alike.

Perceptions of Perpetrators and Victims of Sexual Harassment

As noted earlier, the literature consistently asserts that women are the primary victims of sexual harassment by male perpetrators. Also very consistent is the fact that men and women perceive behaviors defined as sexual harassment differently and, as such, the interpretive process in harassment is a critical issue. Women are more likely to define social sexual behavior as harassment (Brusberg, 1989; McCormick, Adams-Bohley, Peterson, & Gaeddert, 1989; Powell, 1986; Tangri et al., 1982), and also have a significantly lower level of tolerance for such behavior (Carroll & Ellis, 1989; Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1992; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Tangri et al., 1982).

Kenig & Ryan (1986), in a study surveying male and female faculty, staff, and students, also documented that there were significant sex differences in defining sexual harassment, as well as sex differences in attitudes toward romantic relationships, in attitudes toward the causation of sexual harassment, and in attitudes regarding the role of university policy. Women were seen to be less accepting of romantic relationships with co-workers, except for women undergraduates who did accept romantic relationships between students and professors who were without direct authority. Women

were also more likely than men to assign a central role to the university for controlling every type of potentially harassing behavior. Since men attributed more responsibility to women victims, it followed that they also minimized the potential responsibility of the organization.

While studies have consistently demonstrated that women have a lower tolerance for sexual harassment, the literature also demonstrates that victims do not consistently define these behaviors as harassment and that general confusion exists as to how to define social sexual experiences. Dziech and Weiner (1984) addressed the issue by noting:

"Sexual harassment" became a commonly used phrase only a few years ago. But the very words "sexual harassment" are ominous to some college women; they seem too legalistic, too political, too combative. Women students resist language that makes them feel set apart from or adversaries of men. Many resist identification with what they consider a "feminist" issue because they aren't comfortable with that label either. Already confused about the uncertain boundaries of male-female and student-teacher relationships, a woman student usually prefaces description of a sexual harassment experience with, "I've never been sexually harassed, but. . ." Then she proceeds to give a classic example of the behavior. (p. 17)

Fitzgerald et al. (1988) also found that same confusion in their study and stated that "One of the more puzzling aspects of sexual harassment is the finding that large numbers of women who have

experienced relatively blatant instances of such behavior fail to recognize and label their experiences as such" (p. 171).

In a study of 441 men and women staff members at Central Michigan University (Goodwin et al., 1989), similar results were found:

Although 39 percent of the women and 19 percent of the men respondents reported experiencing a behavior which constituted sexual harassment, only 12 percent of the women and 6 percent of the men responded affirmatively to a question about whether they had ever been sexually harassed at CMU. (p. 28)

In discussions of why victims do not always perceive these social sexual behaviors as harassment, Fitzgerald et al. (1988) noted that there were significant differences between the graduate and undergraduate women in rates of reporting harassment and that working women were more likely to label their experiences as harassment than students even though the actual experiences of harassment did not differ significantly. "The data suggest that the perception and labeling of one's experience as constituting sexual harassment may be a function of (at least) two variables; the actual event and severity of those experiences and age" (p. 172).

Jensen and Gutek (1982) reported that not all victims assign responsibility for harassment to the harasser and women who have traditional sex-role beliefs are more likely to blame themselves and other victims for being sexually harassed. Paludi (1990) noted that men who are most likely to initiate severe sexual harassment

emphasize male social and sexual dominance and are insensitive to the perspectives of other persons.

Given the importance of understanding the interpretive process in harassment, clearly more research needs to be done on the interpretations of harassing behavior and the assignment of responsibility for such behavior.

Concerning research on perpetrators of sexual harassment, the literature again is not consistent in its findings. Many authors such as Dziech and Weiner (1984) have limited their work to studying only male faculty members as perpetrators in academia perhaps based on the assumption that harassment occurs only in a situation that provides a power difference between victim and perpetrator. While harassment certainly is directed towards female students by male faculty members, other studies have demonstrated that women on campus are harassed as much or more by their male peers (fellow students or co-workers) as they are by male faculty or employers (Goodwin et al., 1989; Hughes & Sandler, 1988; McCormick et al., 1989; Tangri et al., 1982). This research suggested that a specific power situation is not necessary for harassment to occur and that the general cultural norms of our society provide enough power differential between men and women for sexual harassment to occur on such a wide scale (Hoffman, 1986; Olson & McKinney, 1989; Stimpson, 1989). The results of these studies lend support to the sociocultural explanatory model of sexual harassment and suggest that intervention strategies will need to address the societal power differential between men and women.

The Consequences of Sexual Harassment

In addition to the loss of millions of dollars to business and government annually due to sexual harassment in terms of replacing employees who leave their jobs, of paying sick leave for missed work, and of reduced individual and work group productivity (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1988), the literature on sexual harassment has consistently indicated that there are specific negative consequences to victims of harassment. Tangri et al. (1982) found that those who experienced sexual harassment had a worsened emotional or physical condition, a worsened ability to work with others on the job or in school and more negative feelings about work in general. Jensen & Gutek (1982) found in their study that 80 percent of those who experienced sexual harassment reacted with disgust, 68 percent with anger and that 20 percent indicated that they felt depressed.

In what has been identified as "sexual harassment syndrome" (Rabinowitz, 1990), there are emotional and physical symptoms that are generally suffered by victims of sexual harassment. These are:

- general depression, as manifested by changes in eating and sleeping patterns, and vague complaints of aches and pains that prevent the student from attending class or completing work;
- undefined dissatisfaction with college, major, or particular course;
- sense of powerlessness, helplessness, and vulnerability;
- loss of academic self-confidence and decline in academic performance;

- feelings of isolation from other students;
- changes in attitudes or behaviors regarding sexual relationships;
- irritability with family and friends;
- fear and anxiety;
- inability to concentrate;
- alcohol and drug dependency. (pp. 112-113)

Quina (1990) concluded that sexual harassment is a sexual assault that shares important commonalities with rape. She noted that survivors of such assault have described "long-term emotional aftereffects: grief, anger, fear, lowered self-esteem, helplessness, guilt and shame, body image distortion, sexual dysfunction, and problems in other relationships" (p. 97). She observed that underlying these survivor experiences are three common features of the victimization experience: 1) sexual assault is a severe trauma, 2) sexual assault is a violation, and 3) sexual assault causes secondary social losses when family and friends reject, blame, or disbelieve the victim.

From a psychotherapeutic perspective Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, & Stringer (1986) found that victims appeared to progress through several stages of feelings including confusion/self-blame, fear/anxiety, depression/anger, and disillusionment. In terms of successful therapy they found that a group setting was more effective than individual treatment for coping with the specific effects of sexual harassment.

Many studies confirm that victims rarely express their true feelings in sexual harassment situations (Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Kenig & Ryan, 1986) and that most victims

initially try to deny that the unwanted sexual advances took place at all, or when the advances no longer can be denied, victims try to avoid the harasser whenever possible (Rabinowitz, 1990). In fact, studies indicate that victims of sexual harassment are extremely hesitant to report its occurrence to a university official (Hotelling, 1991).

Till (1980) suggested that part of a victim's hesitance to report sexual harassment is that reports or protests will call attention to their gender rather than to their academic work. Other researchers have suggested that additional barriers to reporting sexual harassment consist of confusion as to what constitutes sexual harassment, confusion about uncertain boundaries of relationships in academia, unwillingness to identify with what many perceive to be a feminist issue, and the belief that no action will be taken against the harasser (Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Meek & Lynch, 1983).

Missed educational opportunities are the most obvious loss to students who avoid the harasser as they "quit research teams, drop courses, switch majors, and drop out of college altogether in numbers that we will never know because of what many people perceive as harmless flirtations" (Rabinowitz, 1990, p. 110). Dziech and Weiner (1984) suggest that the extraordinary drop out rates among women in non-traditional majors such as in the sciences and engineering may be due to the high rates of sexual and gender harassment students encounter in those environments.

Recent work on the psychological development of women has suggested that sexual harassment may have other serious consequences for women. Since many women define themselves based upon the relationships in their lives and being connected to

those around them (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Gilligan, 1982; Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991; Josselson, 1990; Miller, 1976), this violation of the relationship, when the harasser is known to the victim, is a painful one. Choosing to avoid a harasser is not an easy choice for a female victim, and is markedly contrary to her development as a person who works hard to maintain and nurture her relationships. This may explain why some victims do not report their harassers and, in fact, according to Dziech and Weiner (1984), frequently expressed great concern over whether the harasser might lose his job or family if such a complaint is filed against him.

Given that recent research "has provided compelling evidence that sexual and gender harassment of students can result in serious psychological, emotional, physical, and economic consequences" and "often forces students to forfeit research, work, and even their career plans" (Paludi, Grossman, Scott, Kinderman, Matula, Ostwald, Dovan, & Mulcahy, 1990), sexual harassment in academia is clearly an issue that is vitally important to address.

Campus Climate and Sexual Harassment in Academia

The growing body of literature regarding campus climate and women in academia is helpful in understanding why sexual harassment exists on our campuses. This literature focuses on the fact that even though men and women students attend the same institutions, share the same classrooms, work with the same advisers, live in the same residence halls, and use the same student services, that women students are often treated differently than men at all educational levels

(American Association of University Women, 1992; Sadker & Sadker, 1982; Hall & Sandler, 1984).

Peterson & Spencer (1990) distinguished between academic culture and climate in that they noted that the culture of a campus consists of the deeply embedded patterns of organizational behavior and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that campus members have about the institution, while climate is the current common patterns of important dimensions of organizational life or its members' perception of and attitudes toward these dimensions. They clarify the two concepts by suggesting that culture is the meteorological zone, such as tropical or arctic, and that climate is the daily weather pattern within a particular zone.

Howard (1991) noted that the American Council on Education defined the role of climate on campus as "those aspects of the institutional atmosphere and environment which foster or impede women's personal, academic, and professional development" (p. 509). Wagner (1990) asserted that some of the unique aspects of the academic setting such as "traditions of mentoring, sanctity of the classroom, and academic freedom can create obstacles to open discussion of sexual harassment and similar unacceptable behavior" (p. 37). Sandler (1990) noted that when sexual harassment occurs on campus, it creates a chilling effect on the learning or working climate.

Two factors which contribute to a "chilly climate" on campus are the pervasive issues of the invisibility and silence of women which are perpetuated in a society in which male values dominate cultural norms. Andersen (1988) asserted that women's culture "is invisible, silenced, trivialized, and wholly ignored in men's construction of

reality. At the same time men's culture is assumed to present the entire and only truth" (p. 37). American culture inherited centuries of history based upon a dominator model of power in which women and various other classes of people have been oppressed by those in power (Eisler, 1987).

One of the the most disturbing results of a dominator society is that ultimately all members of that society are oppressed by the systems that are generated in such an environment. Paolo Freire (1970) found that the result of oppression is the dehumanization, not only of those who are oppressed, but also of those who are the oppressors. As the members of dominant groups oppress the humanity of others, they themselves become dehumanized in the exercise of oppression. Albert, Cagan, Chomsky, Hahner, King, Sargent, & Sklar, (1986), in Liberating Theory, noted that both the dominants and the subordinates are "disfigured" by the process of oppression. As this disfigurement takes place, persons become fragmented and incomplete in that no one is truly free to be a whole person and interact authentically with other persons. Power and domination become the basis upon which people interact instead of mutual caring and empathy for each other as human beings.

Liberation theorists have reported that those who are oppressed may not only suffer the externally evident forms of oppression such as institutional discrimination and a lack of human rights, but that they may also suffer from an even more insidious form of domination which is internalized oppression, the internalization of the ideas of the ruling elite which legitimates the domination internally. There is also the parallel process of internalized domination, which is the incorporation

by individuals within a dominant group of prejudices against others. It is this internalization of oppression and domination, and subsequent psychological legitimization of domination which fosters subservience in the oppressed. This process, in combination with the external forms of domination, block efforts to liberate groups from oppression (Albert et al., 1986; Hawkesworth, 1990; Pheterson, 1988; Shor, 1980).

Even though women students constitute more than one half of students in higher education, women are still virtually invisible in the power structures that dominate our institutions in education (Klein et al, 1985; Moore & Amey, 1988; Shavlik, 1988; Shavlik & Touchton, 1984, 1988). The Clarence Thomas hearings showed the entire nation via television that all of the senators conducting that hearing were male. It was a dramatic illustration of the lack of women in our power structures and what results when the experiences of women are not represented in the decisions which are made that affect both men and women.

In our educational system, women's contributions to civilization and women's experience is virtually ignored in the curriculum resulting in the invisibility of women in the history of the world (Aiken, Anderson, Dinnerstein, Lensink & MacCorquodale, 1988; Andersen, 1985, 1988; Butler, 1985; Rich, 1975; Weiler, 1988). Even in light of the recent explosion in the research of women's reality and the documentation of the critical role of women in history, there are still those that insist they cannot include these issues in the classroom due to the fact that nothing is available; certainly this myth is

debunked with even a cursory review of the literature (Andersen, 1988).

In their articles on the "chilly climate" for women in higher education, Roberta Hall and Bernice Sandler (1982, 1984) have documented the many ways that women are made to feel invisible on college campuses. For example, their research indicated that both female and male faculty called on men more often than women and that faculty gave less eye contact to female students than they did male students. Also the lack of female role models as faculty in most disciplines, particularly in the traditional male disciplines such as science and math, and their resulting invisibility, is another obstacle and discouragement for female students. A recent report of a comprehensive research project by the American Association of University Women (1992) demonstrated how girls in schools through grade twelve are shortchanged in their educational experiences through both subtle and overt forms of sexism resulting in decreased self-confidence and self-esteem.

Many authors have also explored the role of "voice" in the domination of women in the classroom. While the dialectical process can empower students to overcome the "socialization of silence" especially in the presence of authorities, the traditional monologue by a teacher can manipulate language to control the class (Shor, 1980; Weiler, 1988).

Bennett and Shayner (1988) indicated that female high achievers very often sit silently in class and will only approach a professor after class when they can do it privately and not in the more intimidating classroom atmosphere. Aiken et al. (1988) discussed the

common issue of the male domination of discourse in the classroom as did Sandler and Hall (1986) and the negative and chilling effect it often has upon female participation in the classroom.

Penelope (1990) has written about the power of language to oppress women and keep them silent when the language itself excludes the experience of women and legitimates only the experience of men. The preferred descriptions of the world make up a Patriarchal Universe of Discourse (PUD) dividing the world into two; one female, the other male. Penelope asserted that what men find important discourse topics they have named and reserved to themselves and the unimportant has been left for women.

Gilligan (1982), in her groundbreaking work, suggested that women have a different way of experiencing the world than men do which results in women having a different voice from that of men. However, because it is different, it is not always heard as a legitimate voice. Gilligan suggested that this different voice is based upon an ethic of care and responsibility rather than the dominant voice based upon an ethic of justice and rights which currently dominates our society.

Given women's invisibility and silence in academia, it is not surprising that sexual harassment is such a pervasive problem. When a class of persons is seen as second-class citizens, there are those that will abuse the power differential and use it for their own purposes. Perhaps one reason that women are reluctant to report sexual harassment on campus may be because women are socialized to be silent and not to speak up when abused by someone with organizational or cultural power over them.

When women are invisible and silent, the possibility of a society based upon true mutual purposes and a universal common good becomes operationally impossible to achieve. Before we can achieve a genuinely integrated academic community, we must revive the concept of a partnership society (Eisler, 1987) in which both men and women participate fully in all aspects of society, not because men give women the right to participate, which implies it is the privilege of males to do so, but because it is the way the world was meant to be, a place of integration of the realities and experiences of all persons, a place where men and women are full partners. "By institutionalizing the voices of women and men in a structurally equitable fashion, it creates an empowering campus climate" (Neff & Howard, p. 31).

As the President of Cornell University noted, "Sexual harassment is singularly inappropriate anywhere, but especially in a university community dedicated to ensuring basic civility and a respect for the dignity of every individual" (Rhodes, 1990). In light of the moral and legal imperatives to eliminate sexual harassment in academia, how is sexual harassment being dealt with in higher education and are these strategies working?

Strategies for Creating Campus Climates That are Free From Sexual Harassment

The literature on sexual harassment demonstrates that generally three strategies are utilized in the attempt to prevent sexual harassment in various organizations. These are 1) a well-publicized policy statement outlining behaviors which are considered unacceptable by the organization; 2) an educational program for

members of the organization, and 3) an effective means of reporting offenses when they do occur (Krohne, 1991).

However, there is very little evidence, if any, to demonstrate that these strategies, in fact are helpful in lowering the incidence of sexual harassment. Olson & McKinney's (1989) study showed that despite efforts at Oklahoma State University to eradicate sexual harassment, the incidence was as great or greater than reported in earlier research.

Robertson, Dyer, & Campbell, (1988) concluded that their study of policies and procedures on sexual harassment at institutions of higher learning showed insufficient evidence to indicate that policies reduce sexual harassment in any manner whatsoever, and, in fact, demonstrate that harassers actually have very little to fear for their actions in terms of long-term consequences. Thorner (1989), and Parson, Sands, & Duane (1991), also questioned the adequacy of policies and procedures to address such a complex issue. Rhodes (1990) noted that:

policies and procedures alone are not as helpful as they might be. They can have only a limited impact in the absence of a positive human relations climate on campus--a climate that stresses civility, sensitivity to the feelings of others, and the maintenance of a caring community. (p. 2)

In light of the apparent inadequacy of current strategies, researchers have called for a deeper and more meaningful approach to addressing sexual harassment and all other forms of oppression directed toward women, by challenging the underlying assumptions of

our culture which perpetuate gender and sex-role stereotypes (Hoffman, 1986; Rice, 1990; Twombly, 1991).

The type of change which is needed to transform a society based upon a dominator model to one based upon a partnership model is revolutionary in that it challenges the core assumptions upon which all of our current institutions and human relationships are based upon. It is the type of change which Smith (1982) referred to as morphogenetic change: "change of a form that penetrates so deeply into the 'genetic code' that all future generations acquire and reflect those changes" (p, 318). It is the type of change that Harman (1976) called for in which the "whole system must change" (p. 126).

Paludi (1990) suggested that in order to deal effectively with sexual harassment in the academy that "new taboos" must be created rather than new laws:

Creating new taboos in the academy demands that faculty develop new norms, that they not rely on masculine-biased definitions of success, career development, sexuality, and power. Creating new taboos calls for a new ethic that will refuse to blame the victim and that will foster an environment for women students that is free of sexual and gender harassment. (p. 29)

Feminist academicians and critical theorists have also challenged leaders in higher education to look beyond superficial organizational policies and attempt to utilize strategies which call for fundamental transformation of our organizations in which women, and members of other oppressed groups, are no longer invisible and voiceless in a system which perpetuates and reproduces inequities and unbalanced power. They recommend giving voice to those who have

not previously been involved in a powerful manner in their own environments through a dialogical process of empowerment in the classroom and elsewhere (Bruss & Macedo, 1984; Fay, 1987; Freire, 1970; Giroux & Simon, 1984; Penelope, 1990; Shor, 1980), and also by examining the aspects of our culture and organizations which oppress certain groups of people and marginalize them in our society (Anderson, 1989, 1990; Foster, 1986; Hawkesworth, 1990; Pheterson, 1988; Rich, 1975).

Several institutions have initiated programs designed to bring about such fundamental change. At Duke University gender issues programming for men has been initiated with the creation of a group called Men Acting for Change which explores the implications of male privilege, socially constructed sexuality, and power imbalance (Keyes & Simmons, 1992). Cornell University uses actors from its resident professional theater associates program to dramatize incidents of sexism and racism (Rhodes, 1990). After the performances, the actors, still in character, talk with workshop participants about the issues. Attendance at these workshops is required of all employee and faculty supervisors, including the University president and members of the executive staff.

At Hunter College in New York there is a permanent Sexual Harassment Panel that has instituted a number of interventions including a four-part series of workshops on sexual harassment for administrators and faculty that include case studies, role playing and presentations of legal issues (Helly, 1990; Paludi, 1990). At Princeton University, students are trained through the SHARE Program (Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising, Resources, and Education) as peer

counselors who serve as workshop facilitators, counselors, political activists, and as sources of information for the campus community (Hindus, 1990).

Curricular transformation regarding women, which puts women back into history and records the achievements and contributions of women, is another strategy suggested by feminists and women's studies scholars as a method to begin to break down negative images of women in the educational arena and to emphasize the importance of women in society (Aiken et al., 1988; Andersen, 1985, 1988; Butler, 1985; Foster, 1985; Minnich, O'Barr, & Rosenfeld, 1988; Weiler, 1988). These authors noted the resistance that they had faced on their own campuses regarding this strategy yet provided evidence through case studies at universities with inclusive curriculums that students enlarged their worldviews and integrated academic learning into their own experience.

The growing body of literature on the chilly climate in higher education for women, which addresses the micro-inequities that women face each day in the classroom as well as other areas on campus, also offers specific strategies for change to make American campuses a more comfortable and inviting place for women (Allen & Niss, 1990; Hall & Sandler, 1982, 1984; Klein et al., 1985; Neff & Harwood, 1990; Sandler & Hall, 1986; Thorner, 1989). These strategies include adopting a nonsexist language policy, regularly assessing the campus climate for women on campus, recognizing women's accomplishments on a regular basis, training faculty to become more aware of behaviors that express different attitudes and

perceptions based on sex, and publishing an annual report on progress in regard to the climate for women on campus.

Hoffman (1986) discussed the need for women to become involved in the solution process of addressing campus harassment and that until such involvement takes place, policies and procedures will continue to be protectionist toward women rather than empowering for them. Women leaders will need to continue to challenge the status quo at institutions of higher learning and work toward increasing their numbers in academia in order to more successfully meet the needs of higher education's majority population.

In order to increase the number of female leaders in higher education, more attention will need to be given to fostering women's leadership on campus. Strategies for overcoming barriers for women in higher education have been addressed by many authors. They noted that women must work together to achieve equity in leadership positions and provide a reconceptualization of leadership which utilizes the strengths of women rather than the traditional models of leadership which are hierarchical and competition based (Astin & Leland, 1991; Chamberlain, 1988; DiBrito & Batchelor, 1988; Helgesen, 1990; Moore & Amey, 1988; Rost, 1991; Sagaria, 1988; Sagaria & Koogle, 1988; Shakeshaft, 1987; Shavlik & Touchton, 1984, 1988; Solomon, 1985).

Biaggio, Watts, & Brownell, (1990) outlined numerous strategies for addressing sexual harassment on campus which call attention to the problem and make it visible as an issue on campus. These strategies included putting items relating to sexist comments or sexual invitations on teaching evaluations, urging the school

newspaper to publish articles on sexual harassment, having focused discussion about the issue in appropriate classes, or publishing the names of chronic perpetrators.

Implications for this Study

If the problem of sexual harassment is to be effectively addressed in our society and on our college and university campuses, strategies must be found that both deal effectively with the complexity of the problem and bring about significant change that specifically addresses the power differential between men and women in American society. Enzer (1983) noted that few organizations develop "robust" strategies which are strategies that can respond to many possible future environments without incurring severe losses. He asserted that strategic planning processes generally have two weaknesses 1) that they often assume separation from the external environment, and 2) that they often only work with one alternative future.

Given Enzer's concern about the weaknesses of strategic planning processes, leaders in higher education must understand that they cannot separate the issue of sexual harassment from the external environment. Strategic planning concerning sexual harassment must be done within a context of a full understanding of current campus climates in addition to knowledge about emerging changes in the social and legal aspects of our culture.

This study was designed to explore what strategies could be identified and developed for use by leaders in higher education to create campus climates that are more supportive for women students.

The following chapter chronicles the specific research goals of the study and the methodology used to address the research questions.

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

Based upon the preponderance of research which strongly indicates that sexual harassment is a serious problem for females in academia, the purpose of this study was to identify effective strategies for creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. In order to set realistic boundaries, the study focused specifically upon the issue as it relates to undergraduate and graduate students.

The following questions were of primary importance to the purpose of this project:

1. What changes are most needed in order to create campus climates for female students that are free from sexual harassment?
2. Are these needed changes different for undergraduate and graduate female students?
3. What current strategies are being used in higher education to create campus climates that are free from the sexual harassment of female students?
4. What problems are encountered when these strategies are implemented?
5. What techniques have been used or are planned to be used to determine the effectiveness of these strategies?

6. What innovative strategies can be identified and developed to create campus climates for the 21st century that are free from sexual harassment of female students?

In essence, the study was intended to identify strategies for leaders in higher education to use in creating a more positive future to serve as an alternative to the chilly climate that exists for women today at our colleges and universities.

The Delphi Method

Identifying Strategies for Creating Alternative Futures

Futures research began with a study toward the end of World War II which was conducted to identify priority research activities that would prevent the Air Corps from falling behind the military capabilities of other countries. By the mid to late 1960's, technological forecasting was seen as a way to gain a better understanding of the changing social environment as well (Enzer, 1983).

Enzer (1983) distinguished between futures research and strategic planning. He described futures research as research which is concerned with understanding long-term social conditions, their prospects for change, and the direct and indirect consequences of these changes. This type of research also focuses upon understanding how various stakeholders may assess alternative futures for decision making purposes. He emphatically noted that futures research does not predict what will occur in the future, unlike the process of forecasting, but proposes alternative futures that may occur instead.

Strategic planning concerns itself with managing specific mission-oriented social organizations and sets goals in order to pursue a specific mission and allocate resources to achieve organizational goals. Information generated by futures research is often utilized by strategic planners in planning and decision making processes. Enzer (1983) criticized strategic planning for too often assuming separation from the external environment and for primarily working with only one alternative future. He suggested that strategic planners could more fully utilize futures research in considering the alternative futures which emerge in the research to strategize more effectively.

Some futures researchers are now combining their research with strategic planning. These procedures encourage planners to develop "robust strategies" to perform effectively over the full range of uncertainty that is likely to be encountered as they move into the future. Enzer noted that the current priority for futures research is to make its information more relevant to the strategic choices open to organizations. The thrust of such research is toward analytical procedures integrating strategic analysis with alternative futures in ways that clearly elaborate the importance of change to the specific organization (Enzer, 1983). He indicated that to design "robust strategies" planners must fully understand the uncertainty concerning alternative futures and also the process of how a single present emerges from many possible futures. He asserted that:

"a single present emerges from a set of alternative futures via a cybernetic process, in which evolving conditions are periodically affected by uncertain changes. The revised conditions are evaluated by social organizations to determine or change policy

choices; in turn, these change the evolving conditions and set the change for the next cycle" (p. 75).

The process of social change is indeed a complex one and often fraught with conflict and disagreement about what needs to change and how that change should take place. Perhaps more than any other institution in America, colleges and universities require long-range planning that promotes agreement among diverse factions (Wagschall, 1983). "Futuring allows for a systematic consideration of alternative futures in a way that few institutions have yet attempted" (p. 49) and can serve as an effective method for educational planning.

Since this project was focused upon identifying strategies for educational leaders to use in their efforts to bring about significant change regarding campus climates for women students, futures research methodologies were reviewed to identify a methodology that would generate solutions to a complex social problem. Although there are many futures research techniques available such as single trend extrapolation, growth analogy, correlation analysis, trend analysis, etc., the Delphi method was selected for the project due to its consensus building approach and applicability to complex problem solving.

Historical Development of the Delphi Method

"Project Delphi," starting in the early 1950's, was the first study of the application of expert opinion and focused upon U. S. military capabilities (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). Due to the secretive nature of the study, the methodology did not come to the attention of those outside of the defense industry until 1964 where it not only began to

be used across the United States, but also spread to Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and to the Far East as well (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

The method was originally used as a technological forecasting tool and received its name in honor of the most famous of Greek oracles, Apollo's Delphi Oracle (Uhl, 1983). By the mid-seventies it had evolved into three distinct types of Delphis: numeric, policy, and historic (Strauss & Zeigler, 1975). The goal of a numeric Delphi is to specify a single or minimum range of numeric estimates or forecasts on a particular problem and is an example of the earliest Delphis. Policy Delphis define a range of answers or alternatives to current or future policy problems, while historic Delphis explain the range of issues that fostered a specific decision or the identification of the range of possible alternatives that could have been considered against a particular decision made in the past.

The Delphi Method is intended to gain the advantages of groups while overcoming the disadvantages. The method has three characteristics that distinguish it from conventional face-to-face group interaction: 1) anonymity, 2) iteration with controlled feedback, and 3) statistical group response (Martino, 1983).

During a Delphi study, generally the panelists do not know who else is in the group. The interaction of the group members is handled anonymously through the use of questionnaires which avoids the possibility of identifying a particular response with a specific panelist. As a result, panelists may change their minds without publicly admitting they have done so. Also, each statement can be considered on its own merits without consideration of who made the statement or

whether other members of the group have high or low regard for that person.

Group interaction is facilitated by the project coordinator who feeds back relevant information to the panelists that is generated in each round of the study. Each group member is informed of the current status of the group's collective opinion and the arguments for and against each point of view. The effect of this controlled feedback is to keep the group focused on its original objectives rather than self chosen goals.

Typically, Delphi studies provide the participants with statistical information that includes the opinions of the entire group and then the panelists use this information in completing the next round of the survey.

Essentially a conventional Delphi study would proceed as follows (Uhl, 1983):

1. The participants are asked to list their opinions on a specific topic.
2. The panelists are then asked to evaluate the total list using specific criteria.
3. The participants receive the list and a summary of responses to the items. If the participants are in the minority, they are asked to revise their opinions or indicate their reasons for remaining in the minority.
4. The participants again receive the list, an updated summary, minority opinion, and another chance to revise their opinions.

When designing research studies, Uhl (1983) advised that this technique may be an appropriate tool if any or all of the following conditions exist:

1. the resolution of a problem can be facilitated by the collective judgments of one or more groups;
2. those groups providing judgments are unlikely to communicate adequately without an intervening process;
3. the solution is more likely to be accepted if more people are involved in its development than would be possible in a face-to-face meeting;
4. frequent group meetings are not practical because of time, distance, and so forth; and
5. one or more groups of participants are more dominant than another (p. 84).

Delbecq, Von de Ven, & Gustafson (1975) noted that three conditions must exist for Delphi research: "1) adequate time, 2) participant skill in written communication and 3) high participant motivation" p. 84).

As the method gained popularity, researchers began to apply the method not only in the science and technological fields, but also in business, government, industry, medicine, and regional planning. In fact, Linstone & Turoff (1975) noted that "when viewed as a communication process, there are few areas of human endeavor which are not candidates for application of Delphi" (p. 4). By the mid-1960's, the technique was initially being used in education as well.

Applications of the Delphi Method in Education

Helmer (1966) first drew attention to its possibilities for use in education as being applicable "whenever policies and plans have to be based on informed judgment, and thus to some extent to virtually any decision-making process" (p. 1). Uhl (1983) noted that while forecasting the future is the objective of some studies using the Delphi technique,

"the primary purpose of other Delphi studies is to communicate and obtain convergence of opinion. Whether the study is being used to establish priorities, plan a curriculum, identify important goals, or develop solutions to particular problems, one of the usual goals is to reach some agreement among the participants" (p. 87).

In higher education, Delphi studies have been conducted in areas concerning cost effectiveness, cost benefit analysis, educational goals and objectives, consensus on rating scales, values and other evaluation elements; generating solutions to complex problems, and long range planning (Cyphert & Gant, 1971; Ezell & Rogers, 1978; Hartman, 1981; Judd, 1972; Uhl, 1983).

Weaver (1971) noted additional educational applications as being:

1. a method for studying the process of thinking about the future,
2. a pedagogical tool or teaching tool which forces people to think about the future in a more complex way than they ordinarily would, and

3. a planning tool which may aid in probing priorities held by members and constituencies of an organization (p. 271).

Cyphert & Gant (1971) used the method in a study conducted by the School of Education at the University of Virginia using a sample of 421 persons. Hartman (1981) used the method to reach consensus and resolve conflict generated in New Jersey Public Schools over proposed major curriculum developments in the school system's gifted and talented program.

Judd (1970) reported the use of this method for developing the curriculum for a new branch campus of a liberal arts college. He noted that it resulted in a highly innovative and experimental curricular program which was adopted by a very conservative faculty. Jonassen & Stripling (1977) conducted a study to gain information about the role of student personnel services during the coming decade in the public community colleges of Florida; and Vela (1989) identified the responsibilities and competencies of California community college counselors for the 1990's using the method.

Additionally Uhl (1981) performed a study in which solutions were sought to racial problems at a high school. Malley, Gallagher, & Brown (1992) asked university counselors throughout the country to identify the types and frequency of ethical problems that they had experienced and those that had proven most difficult for them to resolve.

In 1985, Tiedemann asked instructional technologists and academic administrators at universities throughout the United States to identify innovative media services and applications of instructional technology, and Grauer (1989) researched the probable future for

international resource development in the local school community in a study conducted in Southern California.

Strengths and Limitations of the Delphi Method

As a research tool, the Delphi has both been lauded and criticized. Proponents of the method insist that it is a viable method for educational planning (Hartman, 1981; Judd, 1972) and other forms of problem solving (Linstone & Turoff, 1975). Critics, such as Sackman (1975), see Delphi as "basically an unreliable and scientifically unvalidated technique in principle and probably in practice (p. 3). Loye (1978) noted that Delphi "was applied with little attention to scholarly concerns, and hence it represents a mixed picture difficult to evaluate for successes and failures" (p. 47).

Delphi has been described by some to be more of an "art" than a science (Dodge & Clark, 1977; Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Weaver, 1971) and the question remains as to how much of a science it should be. Sackman (1975), one of Delphi's most vocal critics, compared Delphi to the standards for psychological instruments set by the American Psychological Association and found it lacking. Others have argued that the APA criteria are not appropriate for the methodology (Dodge & Clark, 1977).

Ezell & Rogers (1978) noted that scientific and technological forecasters can base their forecasts upon their knowledge of the scientific work in progress, but that the social forecasting of education has proven to be much more difficult. They indicated that the Delphi method "is not a technique for producing 'truth' about the future but does represent consensus of opinion about what might be" (p. 125).

Dalkey conducted two experiments to test the validity of the Delphi technique (Loye, 1978). In the first, he assembled eight groups of about twenty persons each and gave them short-range prediction questions. He found that "where answers can be checked against reality, it is found that the median response tends to move in the direction of the true answer" (p. 47). His groups satisfactorily made 32 out of 40 correct predictions (80%) where only 50% of the predictions could be made correctly by individuals.

Another experiment by Dalkey focused upon intelligence quotients and revealed a startling level of potential for the method. A group of engineers with a range of 100 to 120 IQs was found to function in a Delphi survey at a 150 IQ, or 30 IQ points higher than the highest individual score (Loye, p. 47). This seemed to be impressive evidence for the usefulness of the technique in group decision making.

Although critics such as Sackman (1975) called for further testing of the method, surprisingly, there has been limited research on the validity of the method itself, given that it has now been in existence for four decades. Helmer (1983) concluded that there are two primary reasons why relatively few experiments have been conducted on the predictive powers of the Delphi method. The first is that long-range forecasts cannot be verified until a sufficiently long time period has passed, in many instances ten or more years. The second is that the method uses expert opinion, so in order to validate the method, experts would have to be used as scientific subjects. Most experts are already focused upon other endeavors and unlikely to be willing to serve as guinea pigs for such experiments.

While the debate has continued regarding the use of Delphi as a scientific methodology, as a research tool, the technique has the following advantages:

1. Delphi gains the advantages of groups while overcoming the disadvantages in that the total information available to the group is probably many times greater than that possessed by a single group member. It also has a greater capacity to consider a greater number of factors than a single member. This can also be done without the undesirable aspects of group interaction such as the overt dominance of influential individuals in group dialogue even when they may not be the most accurate (Delbecq et al., 1975; Ezell & Rogers, 1978; Helmer & Rescher, 1959; Martino, 1983). Thomas (1981) describes Delphi "as a really quiet, thoughtful conversation, in which everyone gets a chance to listen" (p. 28).
2. In a Delphi study, each individual has the same opportunity to give input because the method facilitates equality of the participants (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Delbecq et al., 1975; Ezell & Rogers, 1978; Hartman, 1981; Judd, 1970).
3. Because the method utilizes anonymity, many psychological barriers to communication are overcome such as reluctance to state opinions or unpopular views, to modify previously stated positions or to disagree with the other panelists (Ezell & Rogers, 1978; Martino, 1983).
4. The method can be a low cost alternative for facilitating the communication of persons scattered geographically rather than

- paying for them to travel to one location (Delbecq et al., 1975; Sackman, 1975; Uhl, 1983).
5. Since Delphi studies are conducted in writing, the method also produces precise documented records of written summaries of both consensus and disagreement. This product is often of value long after the study is complete (Helmer & Rescher, 1959; Strauss & Zeigler, 1975).
 6. The method can be used effectively to facilitate a group position from diverse individual opinions that may otherwise be undetectable (Strauss & Zeigler, 1975).
 7. The technique is relatively simple and advanced statistical skills are not necessary for design, implementation and analysis (Strauss & Zeigler, 1975).
 8. The Delphi technique is thought to be a valid and accurate forecasting and consensus building technique (Dalkey, 1969; Helmer, 1966; Judd, 1972; Strauss & Zeigler, 1975; Uhl, 1983).
 9. The method is helpful in exploring and exposing underlying assumptions of information leading to differing judgements (Turoff, 1975).
 10. The Delphi technique lends itself to more objectives than a conventional group process or individual interviews (Weaver, 1971).
 11. The method provides a flexible time schedule in which participants can respond to the surveys at their own convenience increasing the likelihood that some panelists may participate in this project over having to attend a meeting or

take a survey in one location at a particular time (Delbecq et al., 1975).

12. The method is an educational process for the participants themselves serving as a tool for clarification of individual opinion and understanding of a particular topic and also to develop skills in futures thinking (Helmer, 1966; Judd, 1972).
13. The method provides a sense of accomplishment and closure for the participants (Delbecq et al., 1975).
14. Delphi studies produce a high quantity of ideas for consideration in the development of alternative futures (Malley, Gallagher, & Brown, 1992).
15. The Delphi provides a simple vehicle for formulation development and assessment of new policy options (Strauss & Zeigler, 1975).
16. The method itself is versatile and flexible and can be modified to fit the purpose of the study and the needs of individual decision makers (Delbecq et al., 1975).
17. The Delphi method is helpful in constructing new realities and encouraging participants to ponder their role in creating the future (Ament, 1973; Scheele, 1975).
18. Delphi procedures, built into a decision-making process, can be used as a systematic, rational approach to what could be a haphazard compromise effort (Helmer, 1966).

In addition to its many advantages, the Delphi method, however, also has its limitations:

1. Delphis are slower than some other methods of data collection and take a long period to conduct (Judd, 1970; Strauss & Zeigler, 1975).
2. The group moderator is often on a "crash" schedule in getting the successive questionnaire instruments prepared and distributed (Judd, 1970).
3. It is often difficult to get at the underlying relationships among possible future events (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).
4. Decision making becomes more difficult as uncertainty grows. Most people have difficulty in envisioning the future and occurrences which appear to be far removed from the present are often heavily discounted (Linstone, 1975).
5. The capabilities and expertise of the panelists may be questionable and often experts focus upon the subsystem rather than taking into account the larger system (Helmer, 1967; Judd, 1970; Linstone, 1975).
6. A conventional Delphi offers few explanations for answers except for dissenting opinions. There is no sure method of knowing exactly why one response was selected over others or why the group moves to consensus (Dodge & Clark, 1977; Sackman, 1975).
7. Consensus may or may not have been due to a change in attitude; some respondents may find it easier to agree with the modal response than to write one's reason for a divergent opinion (Sackman, 1975).

8. Typically people forecast by taking one or a few innovations and fitting them into a mental vision of the future which is set in the familiar context of the past and present. People tend to simplify complex social situations (Linstone, 1975).
9. Panelist drop-out rates are high (Sackman, 1975).
10. The method depends greatly upon the motivation of the participants. Due to the length of the study, it is possible that respondents may not participate fully in the study and give hasty answers without adequate thought in order to get the project completed (Harman & Press, 1975; Linstone, 1975).
11. One of the least acknowledged hazards of the Delphi is its potential use for deceptive, manipulative purposes (Linstone, 1975.)
12. The skill of the moderator is also important to the success of the study. Poor techniques of summarizing and presenting the group response and ensuring common interpretations of the evaluation scales utilized in the exercise will lead to its failure (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).
13. The designer must be skilled and creative enough to design a Delphi study that is appropriate to the topic in question, and not use a particular Delphi design that was used for a different type of study (Linstone & Turoff, 1975).

Linstone (1975) noted that given these limitations, the effective Delphi designer must recognize the degree of impact which each limitation has on the project in question and attempt to minimize any that might invalidate the study. He warned that the:

Delphi designer who understands the philosophy of his approach and the resulting boundaries of validity is engaged in the practice of a potent communication process. The designer who applies the technique without this insight or without clarifying these boundaries for the clients or observers is engaged in the practice of mythology.

This Delphi method has developed into an effective tool for educational planning (Heydinger, 1983; Uhl, 1983), and produces a fairly high degree of agreement and consensus. It is particularly suited to applications in higher education which is often beset by factionalism which is a serious obstacle to long range institutional planning (Wagschall, 1983). Knowing that the issue of sexual harassment is very complex and equally controversial, the Delphi method was chosen as the vehicle for generating strategies for future use in creating campus climates that are more supportive for women in the 21st century.

Sample and Site Selection

Sample sizes in Delphi studies have varied greatly. The earliest studies by the RAND corporation used panels from 5 to 30 members (Brown, Cochran, & Dalkey, 1969; Dalkey, 1969; Dalkey, Brown, and Cochran, 1969; Helmer, 1964). Subsequent studies have used panel sizes as small as six (Strauss & Zeigler, 1975) to those with several hundred (Cyphert & Gant, 1971; Judd, 1972).

Delbecq et al. (1975) noted that the larger the expert panel the larger the amount of data that are generated in the study and suggested holding "the number of participants in the Delphi study to a minimally sufficient number of respondents and seek verification of

results through follow-up survey research" (p. 89). Uhl (1983) stated that when opinions are requested, no more than ten experts are necessary in a Delphi study.

What is more important than sample size in Delphi methodology is determining what exactly constitutes an expert panel member for a particular study. Martino asserted that an expert is someone who has special knowledge about a specific subject (1983). Delbecq et al. (1975), stated that it is unrealistic to expect effective participation unless respondents:

1. feel personally involved in the problem of concern to the decision makers;
2. have pertinent information to share;
3. are motivated to include the Delphi task in their schedule of competing tasks; and
4. feel that the aggregation of judgments of a respondent panel will include information which they too value and to which they would not otherwise have access (pp. 87-88).

For the purposes of this study, a potential expert panel member was defined as any person working in the CSU system nominated by a member of the Women's Council of the State University who had worked for at least five years addressing issues of women's development and/or educational equity for women students, faculty, staff, or administrators in higher education institutions or organizations.

The first step in the selection of the expert panel after securing the support of the Co-Chairperson of the Governing Board of Directors of the Women's Council of the State University (WCSU), was in sending

out a letter on May 21st to campus representatives on the Governing Board of the WCSU describing the study and soliciting nominations for the project. This group was chosen as a nominating body because of its active role in the CSU system in addressing educational equity issues for women and the presumption that the Governing Board of Directors would have knowledge of potential panelists working throughout the CSU system. Since San Diego State University was selected to be the site for the pilot study, nominations were not sought from this campus for the final panel. Fifty-three persons were nominated via this process; fifty-one were female and two were male.

Since geographic location does not necessarily determine expertise, the campus location of possible panelists was not as important in generating a wide variety of strategies as was having panelists participate from various organizational areas and at different levels of responsibility of a typical CSU campus in order to provide representative viewpoints from various perspectives of the CSU campus community. The researcher's intention was to initially secure about twenty panelists, knowing that there would inevitably be some panelist drop-out during the project, so that the final group would have at least 12 to 15 participants. Since the panel selection was conducted during the summer, the researcher also realized that many potential panelists would not be on campus when the letter of invitation arrived, so approximately twice as many invitations as the number of participants that were needed were mailed in order to allow for the fact that many would not receive the invitation in time to accept.

After a review of campus department and level of responsibility, during late June and throughout July of 1993, forty-three of the fifty-three nominees were invited to participate in the study via mailed invitational letters using information suggested by Delbecq et al. (1975). The invitational letter explained the project, the nomination process, and the anticipated timelines for the completion of the project in the fall semester of 1993. By July 21st, twenty-one nominees accepted the invitation to participate in the project using the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope which was included with the mailing in order to make it as easy as possible for each nominee to accept the invitation. Neither of the two men nominated in the process accepted the invitation to join the panel, so the final panel consisted of all female members.

Data Collection

The Demographic Questionnaire: Round Zero

Included with the invitational letter to participate in the project, each potential panelist received a consent form and a demographic survey to fill out along with a request to send a copy of their campus policy on sexual harassment to return to the project moderator. As panelists returned these materials, a thank you letter was sent to each with a bookmark of a famous American woman as a small token of appreciation for their willingness to participate in the project. In addition, the researcher's business card with the project title, the address, telephone and fax numbers were included to use as a reference throughout the duration of the project.

The demographic questionnaire (Appendix A) was designed to elicit personal, professional, and campus information about each participant in order to develop an overall profile of the panel. Specific information was gathered regarding each panelist's experience dealing with the issue of sexual harassment in higher education as well as their involvement and leadership experience in organizations that address educational equity for women. Also included was information regarding academic credentials in order to assess related scholarly expertise. The responses to these questions substantiated the panelists' expertise and qualifications to serve as expert panelists for this study.

Instrument Development and Pilot Study

There has been disagreement in the literature about the construction of the round one questionnaire for the study. Some feel that the first survey should essentially be completely unstructured as in a "classical" Delphi and that the panel should basically start with a blank piece of paper. The rationale for this is that the panelists have been selected for their expertise and if the first questionnaire is too structured it might prevent the panelists from discussing an aspect of the issue of which the moderator may not be aware (Martino, 1983). However, some panelists have been uncomfortable with this and find themselves confused by the unstructured situation (Martino, 1983). Delbecq et al. (1975) suggested using a limited number of open-ended questions.

Moderator bias is also a consideration in this debate. Linstone (1978) noted that Gordon and Helmer began their first rounds with a

blank questionnaire in order to minimize the bias of project monitors. Linstone also noted that there is a "right" length for Delphi statements, that is, "a length that leads to a maximum in the amount of information obtained" (p. 296). He added that low and high numbers of words yield low consensus, with intermediate-length statements producing the highest consensus.

Given these considerations, the first questionnaire was developed to provide limited structure so as not to inject undue moderator bias into the instrument, but to provide some structure in order to minimize possible confusion of panelists. Given that the sexual harassment literature demonstrates the lack of a widely accepted common definition (Hotelling, 1991; Lee & Heppner, 1991; Wilson & Kraus, 1983), the definition proposed by Fitzgerald (1988) was used in the first questionnaire.

After soliciting input from the researcher's dissertation committee and based upon the recommendations made by Delbecq et al. (1975), the instrument consisted of seven open-ended questions which were designed to elicit responses specifically related to the research questions for this study and to create item banks for the second round of the project (Appendix C).

In June and July of 1993, a pilot study was conducted using San Diego State University as the pilot test site. Seven persons were invited to participate and all accepted the invitation. These persons included persons in positions in the President's Office, the Affirmative Action Office, the Counseling and Psychological Services Department, the Office of Personnel Services, and the Housing and Residential Life Office and included five women and two men. Five actually responded

to the questionnaire; the two men never returned them even after several attempts were made to encourage their participation.

Respondents were asked to fill out the questionnaires and then provide feedback to the researcher as to the length of time it took to complete the instrument and any comments they might have regarding ambiguity or bias of the questions or the format of the instrument. The range of responses regarding the length of time to take the instrument was 20-35 minutes. One respondent suggested that more room be left on each page for responses, but given that the length of Delphi questionnaires can negatively affect motivation for completion (Dodge & Clark, 1977), the researcher did not make any adjustment to the instrument and left it at three pages. No other suggestions were made regarding the instrument or clarity of the questions.

Respondents were initially sent a thank you letter and a bookmark for their participation. In August, after the questionnaires were compiled, they each received a compilation of the results of the pilot study.

Data Collection For Rounds One, Two, and Three

Since the design of Delphi studies vary dependent upon the focus of the project, the rounds needed for data collection will also vary. Martino (1983) noted that a conventional Delphi will use four rounds, Delbecq et al. (1975) indicated that the number of questionnaires may vary from three to five and Uhl (1983) noted that three rounds are typical in a Delphi study.

The data were collected in this study using three rounds. The first round survey (Appendix C) was mailed with a self-addressed stamped return envelope to participants on August 28 with a letter summarizing the results of the demographic questionnaire which was collected in round zero of the project (Appendix D). As appropriate, a follow-up request was also made in this mailing to those persons who had not returned a signed consent form or a campus policy statement to the researcher.

Two persons formally withdrew from the project before completing the first questionnaire; one for medical reasons and another who did not agree that the project should be focused only upon students. The researcher responded to the panelist's concerns and encouraged her participation in the project, but she did not continue in the study. This left nineteen persons in the project as the first round of the study began, however one respondent never sent in responses for the first two rounds and was therefore dropped prior to the third round. As a result, eighteen panel members participated in the study.

As noted by Delbecq et al. (1975), not all respondents will send their responses in on time and will need some added encouragement. The researcher used their advice and sent a "dunning letter" (Appendix E) approximately two weeks after the first questionnaire was mailed and then followed up with phone calls to those who had not responded. Since this process took longer than the researcher had anticipated, those respondents who had returned their surveys in a timely fashion received a thank you letter shortly after the researcher received those responses in order to let them know that

their timeliness was appreciated and that the next survey would be arriving a little later than originally stated in the letter mailed with the first survey.

Fifteen questionnaires were returned for round one which was 83.3% of the eighteen participants. Two persons never received the first survey (which included the person who was later dropped from the study), even after a second mailing was sent and two asked to be moved into the second round due to unusually heavy workloads.

After analyzing the data collected in the first round, the researcher used this information to design the second questionnaire. This process, by far, was the most difficult design task in the study. Due to the open-ended nature of the first questionnaire, it was a challenge to compile the results generated in the first round into a coherent and simple format and yet also include new sections relevant to the study. Using the recommendation of Erdos (1983), the researcher also kept the length of the survey to a minimum so as not to negatively affect the response rate. As Harman & Press noted (1975), questionnaire design is truly an art.

The last question in the first survey asked what innovative strategies could be developed for use in creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment in the 21st century. One respondent indicated that this was not possible. This response prompted the researcher to add a question in the second round survey which asked panelists to indicate their assessment on a five point Likert scale of the current and future climates for female students in the CSU. Additionally, after analyzing the campus policies, which were returned from the fourteen campuses represented in the study, the researcher

included a second section to the instrument which focused upon current campus policies and procedures. A third section was also added which gave panelists the opportunity to include any comments they had about round two or any aspect of the project thus far.

After many drafts of this instrument, the final result was a six page survey which was mailed to participants on October 7, with a self-addressed stamped envelope to encourage survey returns (Appendix F). (The number of pages is different in Appendix F due to the requirements for the publishing of the dissertation.) The mailing included a letter thanking participants for their first response and included another bookmark and business card with researcher information on it (Appendix G).

Return receipts were sent with three of the surveys since there had been problems communicating with several of the participants on the first round in an effort to increase the response rate on the second survey. A reminder letter was mailed to those participants who had not returned the survey by October 20 and follow-up phone calls were made shortly thereafter (Appendix H). Seventeen surveys were returned in the second round resulting in a response rate of 94.4%. One of the two panelists who did not respond was on vacation and the other, who had not responded to round one or round two was dropped from the study after numerous unreturned phone messages.

The researcher found that the development of the third survey was much simpler than the development of the second survey. After consultation with dissertation committee members, questions that seemed to have reached consensus were removed from the final survey as were items that had very low response rates (either less than

18% or 20%). New items generated by panelists in the second round were added for consideration as were comments generated in the second survey.

A new question was added to the third survey which asked why participants had predicted that campus climates would become either more hostile or more supportive in the future. Panelists were also asked to indicate implementation strategies for the top five strategies identified by the panel from round two. Additionally, participants were asked for any other feedback they may have had about round three or the project in general including their own participation in the project. Lastly, they were asked to suggest future research projects regarding the issues of sexual harassment and campus climates for women in higher education.

The final survey was mailed on November 8 (Appendix I). In order to encourage returns of the final survey, several techniques were used by the researcher. The length of the survey was kept as short as possible (ten pages) and was copied on blue paper so that it would stand out on panelists' desks. The cover letter (Appendix J), copied on pink paper, thanked panelists for their continued support and pointed out that the final page of the survey had a place to indicate which theater the panelists would most like to receive a movie pass for as a token of appreciation for continuing in the project.

A reminder letter was mailed and follow-up phone calls were made to encourage questionnaire response. Sixteen surveys were returned in the last round of the project resulting in an 88.9% response rate.

Data Analysis

Due to the nature of the methodology, the data were compiled and summarized as each round of the survey was completed in order to design and construct the next instrument. Numeric responses were tallied on a modified blank version of each survey and written comments were entered into the computer verbatim for use in the next survey or the final report. The summaries of each round were returned to the panel with the new materials for them to respond to in the subsequent round (see Appendices F and I).

One of the purposes of the Delphi method is to encourage consensus. The measures of central tendency which are generally used to indicate consensus on Delphi questionnaires are either the mode or the median (Loye, 1978). In this study, the researcher determined that consensus was reached when at least 50% of the respondents had chosen a particular response to an item.

Another aspect of the Delphi method is that at times divergent viewpoints will emerge in the study. Due to the complex and controversial nature of the issue, there was disagreement on various items among panel members throughout the study. This disagreement was evident not only in the statistics generated by the data analysis, but also in the comments made by the respondents. The reader is referred to Chapter IV and Appendices F and I for detailed data analysis results.

After the data were analyzed, the information was used to develop recommendations for use by educational leaders in higher education to use in creating campus climates that are free from the sexual harassment that currently plagues female students in academia.

These recommendations are discussed in Chapter V. A summary report of the study was mailed to each participant and the executive officers of the Women's Council of the State University whose Governing Board had served as the nominating committee for the expert panel.

Evaluation of the Delphi Method for this Study

The researcher found that various advantages and disadvantages of the Delphi study emerged during the project as noted in the literature. The advantages of the methodology were numerous. The method appeared to gain the advantages of groups while overcoming the disadvantages in that no single voice dominated the "conversation". Each respondent chose the extent of her participation in each survey and each panel member had the opportunity to say whatever she felt was salient to the issue. Since anonymity is guaranteed to panelists, this method allowed participants to state their views which were sometimes controversial and even critical of the current CSU response to the issue without fear of reprisal.

Additionally, the method allowed for a "meeting of the minds" without actually having the expense and difficulty of physically bringing participants together. One respondent stated that she did not remember ever having been invited to a CSU-system meeting of sexual harassment coordinators, ever seen a newsletter (even on CSUNET), or had the CSU lawyer come do a presentation on the subject, so she was glad to have been asked to participate in the study.

While one of the main objectives of the method is to determine panel agreement and consensus, it was also valuable as a method to

uncover the areas of disagreement as well. For a subject as controversial and emotional as sexual harassment, the disagreement that emerged in the data was as equally valuable as the consensus that also became evident in the study.

As noted by Helmer (1966) and Judd (1972), the method served as an educational process for the participants themselves and served as a tool for clarifying individual opinion and understanding of the topic. More than three fourths (81.3%) of the respondents stated that they found the study interesting, enjoyable, or helpful to them in some way. One panelist mentioned that she felt it was "very interesting to participate in a multi-part survey that provided feedback and new ideas as part of the process". Another panelist stated that she teaches research design and that she found this to be a "great example of Delphi method". Additionally, panelists stated "this has been useful to me because it gives me some idea of what others are doing on their campuses," and the survey "made me think about the issues". Another remarked that "the results can be of value to the present CSU leadership" and another respondent said that she hoped it "helps change things, especially on a new campus".

One of the major advantages of the Delphi method for this study was that the method itself is versatile and flexible. As the project developed, the method lent itself to design modifications throughout the study which led to a richer and more interesting, and hopefully, more relevant study. One specific example of this versatility was the addition of the rating scales as to the current and future campus climates for women in the CSU. The researcher added this item as a direct result of a comment by one of the panelists.

The fact that Delphi studies produce a high quantity of ideas for consideration by the panel was evident in this study in that 84 items were generated in the first round alone for the five sections which asked for such input.

Another major advantage of this methodology was that it provided for the generation of both quantitative and qualitative data. The qualitative responses by the panelists provided a richness and texture to the study that would not have been possible if a only quantitative methodology had been chosen.

There were also some disadvantages to the method which emerged in the study. The most prevalent disadvantage was that participants did not respond on time to the stated deadlines, and, as a result, the researcher had to utilize the methods suggested by Delbecq et al. (1975) to get the surveys returned. While the actual response rates were very high (83.3%, 94.4% and 88.9%), the researcher expended a great deal of effort to achieve this response.

Another disadvantage of the method is that the actual process of soliciting nominations, creating the panel, and completing all of the rounds took six months to complete even moving on the very fastest possible time schedule. It is a credit to each of the panel members that participated over such a long time period, that the mortality rate for the study was not higher. A related disadvantage is that the researcher experienced a great deal of pressure trying to turn the results around in a timely fashion between each round. Given that participants were not timely in their return of the surveys, this increased the difficulty of keeping on a time schedule.

Two other disadvantages are closely related to one another; panelist expertise and panelist motivation. Some respondents returned surveys with minimal comments and/or blank spaces for questions which asked for a written response. It is impossible to assess whether this minimum response was due to a lack of knowledge about a particular item, or a lack of time to respond more thoroughly. Panel member expertise is one aspect of this methodology that will always be difficult to assess and, as a result, the validity of the data may be influenced by the possible marginal competencies of some of the panel members chosen for a project. The validity of the results may also be affected if the panelists answer the questions with minimal effort on their parts.

Also, as noted in the review of the literature, in conversations with panelists, the researcher found that some of the participants had difficulty with the open-ended style of the questions and that they found it somewhat difficult to respond. However, when the researcher assured them that the subsequent questionnaires would be more structured, they responded positively to that information. Given this feedback, it may be helpful in future studies to provide a more structured Round One survey based upon a review of the literature with spaces for additional items generated by the panelists.

After weighing both the advantages and the disadvantages of the methodology, the researcher evaluated the Delphi method as distinctly having more advantages than disadvantages in relationship to this particular project.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to identify effective strategies for educational leaders in higher education to use in creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment for women students. A review of the futures research literature found that the Delphi method has been used effectively as a research tool in education to generate solutions to complex problems (Uhl, 1981), therefore, the researcher selected the Delphi method for this study.

Four "rounds" generated the data for this study. The first, Round Zero, solicited information from the panelists in two areas: one consisted of a demographic questionnaire in order to create a participant profile, and the other was a request for the current campus policy on sexual harassment from his or her campus. Round One consisted of a series of open ended questions which generated item banks for the remaining rounds. Additionally, Rounds Two and Three also provided questions and item banks that were generated from a review of the campus policies and panelist responses from earlier questionnaires. Data collection concluded with the return of the Round Three questionnaire from the respondent panel.

Round Zero:

Demographic Analysis and Sexual Harassment Policy Review

The demographic questionnaire was designed to elicit information about each panelist and his/her institution. The demographic questionnaire was mailed in Round Zero to twenty-one panelists and the summarized information was returned to panel members with the Round One materials. However, two members of the panel officially withdrew from the project prior to Round One and an additional panel member never returned any material from Round One or Round Two and was dropped from the project. The demographic information for each of these persons was removed from the initial analysis of the demographic survey. As a result, eighteen panelists participated in the study. All percentages have been rounded off to the nearest tenth.

Panelist Data

Institutional Information

Thirteen out of nineteen possible campuses participated in the study (68.4%). An additional campus participated in that their current campus policy on sexual harassment was sent to the researcher, but the panelist withdrew from the study due to health reasons prior to the commencement of Round One. As a result, 70.0% of the individual CSU campus policies and procedures on sexual harassment were analyzed by the researcher.

San Diego State University was selected as the pretest site and was therefore, not utilized in the actual study. Overall, fifteen of the twenty campuses (75.0%) participated in some aspect of the study.

See Table 1 as to the size of institutions represented by panelists and Table 2 for campuses participating in the study.

Table 1

Institutional Student Enrollment (FTE, N= 13 Mean= 14,444)

<u>Institutional Enrollment</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Less than 1,000	0.0%
1,001-5,000	5.5%
5,001-10,000	16.6%
10,001-15,000	27.7%
15,001-20,000	33.3%
20,000+	16.6%

Table 2

Panelist Institutions

Institution

California State University, Chico
 California State University, Fullerton
 California State University, Hayward
 Humboldt State University
 California State University, Los Angeles
 California State University, Northridge
 California State Polytechnic University Pomona
 California State University, Sacramento
 San Francisco State University
 San Jose State University
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
 California State University, San Marcos
 Sonoma State University

Gender

All of the 18 participants were women, however, it should be noted that two men were nominated to participate in the study, but neither accepted the invitation. It is also interesting to note that in the pilot study two men were invited to participate, both men accepted the invitation, but neither man turned the survey in even after receiving two messages reminding them of the deadline. As a result, only females actually participated in the project.

Campus Areas of Professional Responsibility

Of the eighteen panelists who participated in the study, 38.8% had positions in Academic Affairs, 22.2% in Business Affairs, 22.2% in Student Affairs and 16.6% in Affirmative Action. This information is broken down into more detail in Table 3.

Experience in Higher Education and Addressing Issues of Educational Equity for Women

The panelists had a mean of 8.3 years in their current positions. The range was 1 year to 20 years.

They had worked a total of 288 years in higher education with a mean of 16.0 years and a range of 6 to 32 years.

The panelists had been working in higher education addressing issues of educational equity for women for 185 years with a range of 2 to 22 years and a mean of 10.3 years. See Table 4 for a breakdown.

Table 3

Campus Areas of Professional Responsibility (N= 18)

<u>Academic Affairs</u>	38.8%
<u>Faculty 22.2%</u>	<u>Administration 16.6%</u>
History	Asst. Vice President for Institutional Research
Political Science	Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs
Health Sciences	Director, Academic Relations
Child Development	
<u>Business Affairs</u>	22.2%
Vice President, Information Resources Management	
Director, Human Resources	
Buyer	
Personnel Administrator	
<u>Students Affairs</u>	22.2%
Associate Director, University Housing Services	
Program Director, Associated Students' Women's Center	
Administrative Secretary	
Publications Coordinator	
<u>Affirmative Action</u>	16.6%
Director (2)	
<u>Affirmative Action Officer</u>	

Table 4

Experience in Higher Education and Addressing Issues of EducationalEquity for Women (N= 18)

<u>Experience</u>	<u>Mean number of years</u>
In current position	8.3
Working in higher education	16.0
Working in higher education addressing	10.3
<u>issues of educational equity for women</u>	

Age

Using weighted answers at the midpoint of each age range, the typical respondent was 44.4 years of age. (See Table 5). An analysis of respondent ages demonstrated that their ages were in keeping with their reported years in higher education which was a mean of 16.0 years. Since most of the respondents had completed at least a Master's Degree and over half had completed a Doctoral Degree, most would have entered the job market in their late twenties or early thirties putting the typical respondent in her mid-forties at the time of the study.

Table 5

Age of Panelists (N=18, mean= 44.4 years)

<u>Age Range</u>	<u>Responses</u>	
20-30	0	0.0%
31-40	6	33.3%
41-50	7	38.8%
51-60	3	16.6%
61-70	1	5.5%
70+	0	0.0%
<u>No response</u>	1	5.5%

Academic Degrees

Bachelor's Degrees were held by 94.4% of the panelists in eleven different areas of study. 72.2% of the panelists had completed a Master's Degree and another 22.2% were in progress on such a degree for a total of 94.4% having been graduate students at the Master's level in eleven different fields of study. 55.5% of participants had

completed a Doctoral Degree in eight different areas of study. Table 6 illustrates data about respondent academic degrees earned and in progress and Table 7 gives a more detailed breakdown of doctoral degrees earned by panelists.

Table 6

Academic Degrees (N= 18)

<u>Bachelors Degree</u>	<u>Master's Degree</u>	<u>Doctoral Degree</u>
94.4%	72.2% completed	55.5%
	22.2% in progress	

Table 7

Doctoral Degrees by Subject (N= 10)

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Number Receiving Degree in Subject</u>
Chemical Engineering	1
English	2
Higher Education Administration	1
History	1
International Business Law (J. D.)	1
Political Science	1
Psychology	2
Public Health	1

Associations with Professional Organizations Which Address Issues of Educational Equity for Women

The 18 panelists held memberships in 34 different organizations which specifically deal with educational equity for

women. They had been members of these organizations for a total of 247 years with a mean average of 13.7 years. Seventeen panelists held offices in 11 different organizations.

Panelists had multiple memberships in four organizations: the American Association of University Women (3); the National Organization for Women (2); the Women's Council of the State University (9); and the Women's Faculty Association (3). The Women's Council of the State University (WCSU) had the largest representation as an organization. This, of course, was no surprise, since the Governing Board of Directors were the persons who had served as the nominating group for the project. Four of the nine members in WCSU participating in the project were also currently serving as officers in the organization at the time of the study.

For more detailed information as to professional association memberships, see Appendix B.

Experience Dealing With the Issue of Sexual Harassment

The section which assessed panelists' experience dealing with sexual harassment demonstrated that the panel had a wide variety of experience dealing with the issue and were, therefore, qualified as expert panel members. The data revealed that more than 55% of panelists had dealt with seven of the original nine items. More than 77% of the panelists had handled sexual harassment complaints/grievances, had counseled victims of sexual harassment, and had been a member of a committee or task force on sexual harassment.

See Table 8 for further details.

Table 8

Experience Dealing With Sexual Harassment (N= 18)

Type of Experience Reported by Panelists	Percentage Responding
Handle sexual harassment complaints/grievances	77.7%
Counsel victims of sexual harassment	77.7%
Member of a committee/task force on sexual harassment	77.7%
Train/educate staff/faculty on issues of sexual harassment	61.1%
Develop policy concerning sexual harassment	61.1%
Conduct research on sexual harassment	55.5%
Train/educate students on issues of sexual harassment	55.5%
Discipline perpetrators of sexual harassment	22.2%
Write articles/books about sexual harassment issues	16.6%
Other (please list):	
<u>Develop sexual harassment training materials</u>	5.5%

Panelist Profile

The typical expert panelist was a 44 year old female with a Master's Degree who was slightly more likely to have a doctoral degree as not (55.5%). She was working on a campus of just under 15,000 full time equivalent students, had been in her current position 8.3 years, and worked in higher education for 16.0 years. She also had been addressing issues of educational equity for women in higher education for 10.3 of those years.

Additionally, the typical panelist currently belonged to two organizations that deal with educational equity for women in higher education, had held memberships in such organizations for 13.7 years and typically served as an officer in one of these organizations.

The panelist was likely to have handled sexual harassment complaints on her campus, counseled victims, been a member of a committee/task force on sexual harassment, and conducted related research. She is also likely to have trained students, faculty, and staff on issues of sexual harassment, as well as been involved in developing campus policy. See Table 9 for a detailed breakdown as to the profile characteristics of a typical panelist.

Table 9

Typical Panelist Profile Characteristics (N= 18)

Panelist Profile Characteristics

1. Female
 2. 44.4 years of age
 3. Works in an institution with 14,444 full time equivalent students
 4. Has been in current position 8.3 years and has worked in higher education for 16.0 years
 5. Has worked in higher education for 10.3 years addressing issues of educational equity for women
 6. Has completed a Master's Degree and more than likely to have also completed a Doctoral Degree (55.5%)
 7. Currently belongs to two organizations that specifically deal with educational equity issues for women in higher education
 8. Currently is an officer of one of these organizations
 9. Has belonged to these organizations a total of an average of 13.7 years
 10. Has typically had experience in dealing with sexual harassment on seven of the nine items listed in Table 8
-

Campus Policies on Sexual Harassment

Each participant was requested to send a current campus policy on sexual harassment to the researcher in Round Zero of the study. Fourteen campuses responded by sending their current policy which included one campus who later was not represented on the panel due to withdrawal because of health reasons. The researcher analyzed the policies and procedures on sexual harassment from 70.0% of the twenty CSU campuses

The analysis revealed that there was a wide variance as to the various policies and procedures used throughout the CSU system regarding sexual harassment even though they were all based upon Executive Order 345, Prohibition of Sexual Harassment, from the Chancellor's Office which was issued on June 1, 1981. Some campus statements also cited Title VII and Title IX as sources. Also included were citations from the California Educational Code (89535) and the Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Some campuses had very short policy statements with little direction as to specific procedures to be used if a complaint should be filed with the university. Other campuses had extensive and specific procedures which were outlined in a step-by-step process that complainants, alleged perpetrators, and campus officials could refer to for clarification as to the process on their campus.

As to behaviors specified as being inappropriate, all of the campuses included levels two, three, and four of Till's definition (1980) which are seductive behaviors, sexual bribery, and sexual coercion. Only three campuses specifically included level one, gender harassment, in their lists of inappropriate behaviors; however, most

mentioned "hostile environment" in the policy, which could cover gender harassment, although not specifically identified.

Only six of the fourteen campus policies which were analyzed (42.8%) included the issue of peer harassment specifically, although the research indicates that female students experience higher rates of peer harassment than any other kind of sexual harassment on campus.

The results of the analysis of the policies and procedures from each of the fourteen campuses were used to create an additional section in Round Two of the study with item banks for panelists to indicate what items they felt were most important to include in ideal campus policies and procedures.

Delphi Analysis:

Rounds One Through Three

Round One Results

The questionnaire for Round One of the study began with several brief statements indicating that:

1. Sexual harassment in academia is a problem,
2. The focus of the study was to identify strategies that can bring about substantive change in higher education to create campus climates for female students which are free from sexual harassment,
3. Panelists should consider all sources of sexual harassment toward female students including harassment from faculty, staff, and administrators, as well as other students, and
4. Panelists should include harassment that women students experience both in and out of the classroom such as in

residence halls, eating areas, and involvement in school related activities and programs.

Panelists were also asked to use the first four levels of the Till (1980) definition of sexual harassment as a common definition for the purposes of this research. These levels were:

1. Gender harassment- generalized sexist remarks and behavior which convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women.
2. Seductive behaviors- unwanted, inappropriate, and offensive sexual advances.
3. Sexual bribery- the solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by the promise of reward.
4. Sexual coercion- the coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment.

In accordance with suggestions made by various researchers as to the construction of the first round questionnaire (Delbecq et al., 1975; Linstone, 1978; Martino, 1983), the first survey provided a limited framework so as not to inject undue moderator bias into the instrument, but still provide enough structure in order to minimize possible confusion or frustration of panelists. The result was seven open-ended questions which solicited panel input regarding the research questions identified by the researcher as central to the focus of the study.

Fifteen panelists returned the Round One survey which was 83.3% of the 18 persons who participated in the study. The panelists generated an item bank for Round Two for each question. See Appendix F for the specific items generated in this process.

As a result of the data analysis of Round One, three significant developments in the project took place. First, the panel thought there was little difference in the changes needed to address sexual harassment for female students in relationship to their class standing. This was also true regarding strategies being used to bring about these changes. Those few items that were different regarding class level were included in Round Two in order to assess and clarify the panelists' responses to the differences generated in Round One.

Only a few items were generated specific to graduate students and they focused upon the fact that graduate students work more closely with their advisors than do undergraduates, and are therefore more vulnerable to the negative effects of sexual harassment. This is due to the fact that graduate advisors have increased power to negatively affect not only the student's academic success, but the prospects for future employment as well.

Second, respondents were generally unaware of techniques that have been used to determine the effectiveness of current strategies used to reduce sexual harassment on their campuses. More than half of the panel, 53.3%, was unable to identify any evaluative efforts that were being conducted on their campuses regarding this issue. The remaining 46.6% identified five techniques being used or planned for use on their campuses:

1. Recording numbers of inquiries, complaints, and resolutions;
2. Evaluating programs and workshops;
3. Designating personnel to oversee the issue;

4. Surveying faculty, staff, and students as to awareness of policy and procedures;
5. Surveying to establish baseline data followed by additional surveys to measure campus change efforts.

While this researcher cannot draw any specific conclusions from this information, one can surmise that either the panelists are unaware of evaluative efforts at their campuses regarding the issue, or that little has been done in the CSU system to evaluate the efforts that have been made to reduce sexual harassment. Three panelists (20.0%) noted that statistics are kept by their institutions regarding sexual harassment complaints, but they are not released to the university as a whole, so feedback is lacking as to what progress, if any, has been made. One panelist noted that since the disposition of the complaints is never made public that "the cases seem to fall into a black hole -- even for the women who lodged the complaints".

The researcher concluded that since so few items had been generated for this question further input from the panel was not needed except to give panelists a final opportunity in Round Two to add any other evaluative strategies/programs that could be applied to this issue.

The third significant development pertaining to the design of the Round Two survey was in response to the question which asked panelists what new and innovative strategies could be developed or explored to create a campus climate for all female students that will be free from sexual harassment in the 21st century. One panelist responded to this item by stating that this was "not possible." This response prompted the researcher to add two new questions as to the

current and future climates for female students on CSU campuses. The researcher wanted to know whether the panel felt that there would be a change in climate for female students in the 21st century, and, if so, whether that change would be toward more hostile or more supportive environments.

In summary, the data analysis of the Round One survey created item banks for the initial seven questions and additionally led to three important developments in the Round Two questionnaire.

Round Two Results- Part I
Strategies for Creating Campus Climates
that are Free from Sexual Harassment

Seventeen panelists returned Round Two surveys for a response rate of 94.4% representing an increase of two responses more than the first round which had fifteen participants (83.3%).

The analysis of Round Two resulted in the creation of the Round Three survey which dropped items in the item banks that had very low consensus (below 20% for Sections I and II and below 18% for Section III) and provided feedback to panelists as to the percentage of respondents who had chosen the remaining items. Selected comments were also included in the Round Three Survey from comments made by panelists in Round Two. These comments represented the various viewpoints which emerged from the analysis of the data generated in the second round. See Appendix I for the items which were included in Round Three.

Section I of the Round Two survey dealt with the question of what most needs to change on campuses regarding sexual harassment.

None of the 26 specific items reached consensus (50%). Sixteen items receiving less than 20% were dropped in the next round in order to focus the panelists on the eleven items which had garnered the highest responses in Round Two in addition to the one new item which was generated by the panel. Comments regarding each item were included in the next round in order for panelists to consider the responses that panelists had made prior to making their final selections regarding these items.

The same process was followed for Section II which dealt with the identification of current strategies regarding sexual harassment. Only one item out of 26 reached consensus by the panel. This item was left in the next round for panel consideration with the remaining seven highest rated items in addition to the inclusion of four new items generated in Round Two by the panel. Seventeen items receiving less than a 20% response rate were dropped in order to focus the panel on the remaining items.

Section III, which focused upon the problems encountered when current strategies were implemented, also achieved consensus on only one item. Six items receiving a response rate below 18% were dropped from the next round. Eight items remained in the third round which included the one item which had reached consensus in Round Two. An additional question was added to the next round which asked panelists to identify any additional strategies that they may have had for addressing these particular problems.

Section IV, which dealt with evaluative techniques used to determine the effectiveness of strategies to reduce sexual harassment, had one new addition which was the suggested addition of a section on

campus annual reports to the CSU Trustees with information regarding complaints and resolutions. No further action was necessary by panelists regarding this issue in Round Three. See Table 10 for a complete review of evaluative techniques.

Table 10

Techniques to Determine the Effectiveness of Reducing Sexual Harassment

Item
1. Recording numbers of inquiries, complaints, and resolutions;
2. Evaluating programs and workshops;
3. Designating personnel to oversee the issue;
4. Surveying faculty, staff, and students as to awareness of policy and procedures;
5. Surveying to establish baseline data followed by additional surveys to measure campus change efforts.

Section V of Round Two used a Likert scale to assess the climate for female students in 1993 on most CSU campuses. One end of the scale was (1) a climate that fosters/encourages sexual harassment and is generally hostile to women students and the other was (5) a climate that is free from sexual harassment and generally supportive of women students. More than three quarters of the panelists, 76.5%, felt that the current climate is a "3" which is a neutral climate for female students. The remaining responses were 5.9% for rating "1" and 17.6% for "2" which indicated ratings on the hostile end of the scale.

As to future campus climates for female students, 70.6% felt in 50 years the climate would be a "4," representing an optimistic view that campus climates will be more supportive for women; 17.6% felt that the climate would be a very supportive "5". The remaining 11.8% felt that the campus climate would still be a hostile "1" or "2". It is interesting to note that none of the panelists chose the neutral "3" rating in predicting future campus climates even though this was the highest rated response from the panel regarding current campus climates.

In order to assess why panelists had chosen these ratings, a question was added to Round Three asking them to share some brief comments as to why they felt that campus climates will be either more supportive or more hostile for female students in the next fifty years.

The final question from Round One sought new and innovative strategies that could be developed for use in creating a new CSU campus in the 21st century that is free from sexual harassment. Fifteen responses were generated in the first round. In Round Two, the data clearly indicated that the panel selected five of these strategies as being the most crucial in bringing about more supportive campus climates for women in the next century. In Round Three, the panel received the top five responses from Round Two with comments made by the panelists regarding each strategy. For Round Three, the researcher added questions related to each item which would solicit additional information from panelists regarding specific ideas as to the implementation and operationalization of each of the five strategies.

Round Two Results- Part II

CSU Policy and Procedures Analysis

Round Two included not only the data generated from Round One, but also data generated in the analysis of the requested CSU campus policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment. The researcher reviewed policies from the Chancellor's Office (Executive Order 345, 1981) and fourteen of the CSU campuses and found a wide variance in what was included in each campus policy statement and the subsequent procedures for handling sexual harassment complaints. While each campus had at least the minimum information required by Executive Order 345, (see Appendix M), there were clear differences in the operationalization of the policy on the individual campuses.

After analyzing the fifteen documents, the researcher created two new item banks for the panel to respond to in Round Two. Section A listed fifteen items regarding policy statements from the various campuses and asked panelists to rate the importance of each item on an importance scale from 1 to 5 with "1" being of "no importance" and "5" being "extremely important". Panel members were also asked to select the three most important items from the list. The researcher chose to use both scales in order to assess not only the importance of each item as to inclusion in a campus policy, but also the relative importance of each item in relationship to each other. The same process was used to assess campus procedures regarding sexual harassment in Section B.

Part II of the survey found that there was a great deal of consensus regarding whether or not items should be included in campus policy and procedure statements. All of the items were rated

"very important" or "extremely important" by 64% to 100% of the panelists. See Tables 11 and 12 for more detailed information. Consensus was reached in these two sections, therefore, no new additional input was needed.

Consensus was not clear, however, regarding the relative importance of each item. The six items receiving a 20% or higher response rate remained in Round Three for Section A. Section B in Round Three included one new item generated by the panel in Round Two which was added to the remaining five items which had 20% or higher response rates. See Appendix I for detailed information as to items in these sections included in Round Three. Comments made by the panel in Round Two were also included below each item for consideration by each panel member. For the subsequent results regarding the relative importance of these items, see Tables 18 and 19 in the section regarding the Round Three Survey, Part II.

In summary, the data analysis of Round Two guided the development of the Round Three instrument.

Table 11
Importance Level of Items as to Inclusion in a Campus Policy
Statement (N= 17)

	<u>Importance Level Scale</u>				
No importance	1	2	3	4	5
Little importance			Very important		
Moderate importance			Extremely important		
1. A specific and clear definition of sexual harassment					
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	0%	0%	11.8%	88.2%
2. Legal implications of sexual harassment					
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	0%	5.9%	11.8%	82.4%

3.	Amorous relationships between faculty and current students				
	1	2	3	4	5
	5.9%	5.9%	17.6%	29.4%	35.3%
4.	Timely and appropriate action when receiving a complaint				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	0%	0%	23.5%	76.5%
5.	Retaliatory action toward anyone filing a complaint				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	0%	5.9%	17.6%	70.6%
6.	Personnel failing to investigate a complaint				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	11.8%	5.9%	23.5%	52.9%
7.	Knowingly making false claims of sexual harassment				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	11.8%	23.5%	29.4%	35.3%
8.	Periodic review of the policy by the President or his/her designee				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	5.9%	5.9%	29.4%	58.8%
9.	Specification of possible penalties for violations of the policy				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	0%	23.5%	35.3%	41.2%
10.	The issue of confidentiality regarding a case				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	5.9%	5.9%	35.3%	52.9%
11.	Using "reasonable woman's standard" to determine cases				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	11.8%	17.6%	47.1%	23.5%
12.	The issue of peer sexual harassment				
	1	2	3	4	5
	5.9%	0%	23.5%	23.5%	41.2%
13.	Specific procedures for dealing with complaints				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	0%	0%	41.2%	58.8%
14.	<u>Mandatory</u> training for administrative and supervisory personnel				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	5.9%	11.8%	29.4%	52.9%
15.	Education of campus community as to policy and procedures				
	1	2	3	4	5
	0%	0%	0%	29.4%	70.6%

Table 12
Importance Level of Items as to Inclusion in Campus Procedures
Statement (N= 17)

	<u>Importance Level Scale</u>				
No importance	1		Very important	4	
Little importance	2		Extremely important	5	
Moderate importance	3				
1. Specific personnel designated to address the issue					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	0%	0%	11.8%	88.2%	
2. Victims may remain anonymous while seeking information					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	0%	23.5%	29.4%	47.1%	
3. A procedurally just framework					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	0%	0%	29.4%	70.6%	
4. Specific timelines for filing and resolving complaints					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	11.8%	11.8%	41.2%	35.3%	
5. One person designated to coordinate complaint information					
1	2	3	4	5	
5.9%	11.8%	17.6%	23.5%	41.2%	
6. Incidence rates should be regularly reviewed by the President					
1	2	3	4	5	
5.9%	11.8%	7.6%	35.3%	41.2%	
7. Alleged perpetrators should be informed of the complaint and given an opportunity to respond.					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	0%	11.8%	41.2%	47.1%	
8. Investigative teams should have both a male and female					
1	2	3	4	5	
5.9%	0%	29.4%	17.6%	47.1%	
9. Informal procedures should be used when appropriate					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	11.8%	11.8%	29.4%	47.1%	
10. Formal procedures should be used when appropriate					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	5.9%	17.6%	29.4%	47.1%	
11. Complainants may choose an advisor or advocate to assist them					
1	2	3	4	5	
5.9%	0%	5.9%	41.2%	47.1%	
12. Clearly stated appeals procedures for victims and perpetrators					
1	2	3	4	5	
0%	0%	0%	23.5%	76.5%	

Round Three Results- Part I
Strategies for Creating Campus Climates
that are Free from Sexual Harassment

Enough consensus was reached on the various aspects of the study to bring the project to conclusion at the end of the third round. An analysis of the data from Round Three found that there was not a high level of overall consensus among panel members for Part I of the study, but that a limited number of items did reach the designated 50%.

In Section I of Part I, which focused upon what needs to change regarding sexual harassment, the panel reached consensus on only three of the total 27 items that were assessed by the group. These three items were: 1) the acceptance of sexual harassment as normal behavior, 2) reporting processes that are not "user-friendly" and, 3) the lack of student awareness of sexual harassment/peer harassment. See Table 13 for a ranking for the top eleven items as to what the panel determined as most needing to change regarding sexual harassment.

In Section II of Part I, which identified current strategies that panelists found to be most salient to addressing sexual harassment, four items reached consensus out of the total 28 items in rounds two and three. These items were: 1) mandated training for faculty/administrators/staff on the topic; 2) educational programming for students on the issue; 3) active and strong support of policies from top levels of administration; and 4) designated personnel to handle complaints. See Table 14 for detailed information as to the ranking of

Table 13

What Needs to Change Regarding Sexual Harassment?

N= 17 for Round Two N= 15 for Round Three NI= New Item

* Items reaching consensus

Final Ranking	Round 2 %	Round 3 %	Item
1	35.3%	66.7%*	Reporting processes that are not "user-friendly"
1	41.2%	66.7%*	Acceptance of sexual harassment as normal behavior
3	35.3%	53.3%*	Lack of student awareness of sexual harassment/peer harassment
4	41.2%	46.6%	Low proportion of female faculty and administrators
5	29.4%	40.0%	Societal attitudes regarding women
5	NI	40.0%	Victim's fear of retaliation by the perpetrator if reported
7	29.4%	33.3%	Lack of faculty/staff awareness of issue of sexual harassment
8	29.4%	20.0%	Behavior of males (faculty, staff, students) toward women
8	41.2%	20.0%	Over-dependence of students on graduate faculty/advisers
10	29.4%	13.3%	Independence of faculty (high level of control over classrooms/ students)
11	29.4%	0.0%	Students' lack of empowerment to take corrective action

Table 14

Identification of Current Strategies Regarding Sexual Harassment

N= 17 for Round Two N= 16 for Round Three NI= New Item

* Items reaching consensus

<u>Final Ranking</u>	<u>Round 2 %</u>	<u>Round 3 %</u>	<u>Item</u>
1	70.6%	87.5%*	Mandated training for faculty/ administrators/staff on the topic
2	47.1%	81.3%*	Educational programming on the issue for students
3	35.3%	62.5%*	Active and strong support of policies from top levels of administration
4	47.1%	56.3%*	Designated personnel to handle complaints
5	41.2%	37.5%	Aggressive campus policies and procedures specific to sexual harassment
6	35.3%	31.3%	Publication of case outcomes while respecting confidentiality issues
7	29.4%	18.8%	Increased numbers of female faculty, staff and administrators
7	NI	18.8%	Docking pay/salary for proven offenses
9	NI	12.5%	Specific reporting and filing procedures
10	NI	0.0%	Incentives for individuals who attend training workshops
10	NI	0.0%	<u>Accessibility of designated personnel for resolving complaints</u>

the strategies assessed as being the most effective in creating campus climates free from sexual harassment.

It is interesting to note that the current strategies identified in Section II directly complement the changes that the panel identified as needed to reduce sexual harassment in Section I. For example, the panel noted that the acceptance of sexual harassment as normal behavior needed to change and also identified educational programming for students and mandated training for campus personnel as needed strategies to bring about such change.

In Section III the panel reached consensus on three of the eight remaining items in Round Two out of the fourteen total items generated by the panel in Round One as to what problems were encountered when the strategies in Section II were implemented. Those items which reached consensus were: 1) socialized acceptance of the behavior, 2) denial that the problem really exists on campus or in a particular department, and, 3) the time consuming nature of dealing effectively with the problem. Table 15 outlines the final rankings of these items.

In Section V in Round Three, respondents were asked to make some brief comments as to why they thought campus climates would either be more supportive or more hostile for female students in the coming years in order to clarify the statistics generated in Round Two indicating that over 70% of the panel was optimistic as to the future of campus climates regarding sexual harassment of women students.

Those that were optimistic as to the future cited two main reasons: 1) growing numbers of women in higher education and 2) an increase in awareness of the issue on a national scale. Another

Table 15

Problems Encountered When Strategies Were Implemented

N= 17 for Round Two

N= 16 for Round Three

*** Items reaching consensus**

Final Ranking	Round 2 %	Round 3 %	Item
1	52.9%	68.8%*	Denial that the problem really exists on campus or in a particular department
2	47.1%	62.5%*	Time consuming nature of dealing effectively with the problem.
3	47.1%	56.3%*	Socialized acceptance of behavior
4	47.1%	43.8%	Active and organized resistance/ hostility of male faculty
5	23.5%	31.3%	Resistance to mandatory training
6	17.6%	18.6%	Lack of university funds to support change efforts
7	17.6%	12.5%	Backlash against women and/or Women Studies programs
8	23.5%	6.3%	Apathy toward the issue

respondent mentioned changing laws and policies as an additional reason for optimism. Of the fourteen respondents answering this question, 71.4% reported that they thought it would be more supportive because more women are entering higher education as both students and as campus personnel and that sheer numbers would begin to make a difference in the climate. One respondent stated "Women are a majority and seeking higher education at all ages. I see women becoming unwilling to be treated as 2nd class citizens and raising male children to respect women".

A little less than half of the panel, 46.7%, mentioned that the national awareness of the issue would contribute to a more supportive environment for women. The 1993 Supreme Court decision regarding Harris v. Forklift Systems was cited as an example of the changing climate for women by 20.0% of respondents. One respondent specifically felt that the addition of another woman to the Supreme Court had made a difference in the outcome of the recent case.

Four respondents (28.6%) were not optimistic about the future for women, however. One panelist stated:

I don't expect much shift. Skirts are getting shorter, women in the workplace continue to be excused as 'having to work due to economic conditions' rather than saying 'adults work, children are dependents'. Three year old girls get Barbie Dolls. . . the socialization continues.

Another panel member stated:

My feelings of optimism-pessimism change frequently depending on what's going on in the news or around me. At this very moment, I feel doubtful about our collective ability to care for each other, and this feeling extends to our ability to be fair and decent to women, ethnic groups, the poor, the disabled, and on and on. Right now, I predict things will get worse.

Also in Section V of Round Three, the panel was given the top five rated strategies for creating a new CSU campus in the 21st century that is free from sexual harassment as identified by the panel in Round Two. (See Table 16). While consensus was reached for only three of the five items in the first assessment, the other two items were also included in the final round in that these five items clearly

emerged within the top responses in the group. In Round Three the panel was asked to explore the possible implementation of these five strategies.

Table 16

Innovative and Creative Strategies for the 21st Century

N= 17 for Round Two

N= 16 for Round Three

* Items reaching consensus

Ranking in Round 2	% of Responses	Item
1	70.6%*	Build a campus culture that strongly supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus
2	52.9%*	Include issue in required General Education courses on basic subjects
2	52.9%*	Use demonstrated commitment to climate issues as a screening tool for campus policies
4	41.2%	Include harassment free models of teaching in new faculty orientation
5	35.3	Give strong support to women who speak up against inappropriate behavior

The first of these five items dealt with building a campus culture that strongly supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus. The panel generated sixteen strategies for bringing about the operationalization of such a campus culture. See Table 17 for these strategies.

Table 17

Strategies Generated for Building a Campus Culture that Strongly Supports a Non-Violent, Non-Exploitive Campus

Establish standards that create an environment in which work takes place and learning occurs, free of sexuality-issues that interfere and upset.

Create campus sexual harassment task forces.

Reinvent the value of a Liberal Arts education that educates the full student.

Provide monetary/scholarship awards to recognize individuals, student organizations or departments that are involved in activities that promote non-violence and non-exploitation on campus.

Decrease the value of college contact sports.

Eliminate the concept of female cheerleaders in short skirts cheering men on to victory.

Encourage and fund women to participate in college sports (contact or not).

Establish centers for mediation and alternative problem solving.

Change the competitive political mode which exists on campuses and educate people to collaborate and work as team members.

Integrate the concept of non-violence and non-exploitation throughout the curriculum.

Hire more women and minorities at all levels of the university.

Establish an alternative non-violent language for use on campus.

Increase male awareness of the benefits to them of a non-violent, non-exploitive society.

Hire founding faculty who are committed to these concepts.

Increase the number of educational programs which focus on the issue and provide funding and staff to support the programs

The most controversial strategy generated by the panel centered around the issue of whether or not contact sports should be eliminated from campus life. Two panelists (12.5%) mentioned that these sports should be eliminated or at least receive less value and focus than they currently receive. Two other panelists (12.5%) however, specifically mentioned that contact sports should not be eliminated. One felt that this seemed too "PC" (politically correct), and the other felt that we could all learn something from the sport of football when dealing with sexual harassment. This panelist felt that what should be abolished is not football, but that women are "side-lines cheerleaders/pom-pom girls in short skirts, reinforcing the image that men do what counts and girls try to use their bodies to attract the winners to them (presumably for mating purposes)." She felt that we could learn how to handle the issue of sexual harassment from studying the game of football in that:

when playing football, they are given a ball, appropriate protective clothing, a clearly marked playing field, well defined rules for when you can make contact, and how, and a referee who calls fouls and penalizes those who break rules. We need to help people know how to dress, how to behave, where the lines are drawn, and to drop flags and declare penalties when they violate the rules".

She added that "we will never learn what we need to know from being pom/pom girls".

Several ideas were rather unique and deserve particular mention in building a campus culture that supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus. One, establish a center of mediation and

alternative problem solving to teach methods for problem resolution that are non-competitive. Two, establish a non-violent language for use on campus and three, change the current politically competitive mode on most campuses to one that fosters team-work and communication instead.

The second strategy identified out of the top five (see Table 16) concerned the implementation of harassment free models of teaching presented in new faculty orientation. In Round Three the researcher asked who might best achieve this strategy and how? Additionally, the panel was asked whether or not faculty should be evaluated by students as to classroom climates.

A majority of respondents (50%) felt that Academic Affairs should be given this responsibility. Two panelists specifically mentioned that Human Resources should not be involved in that it would be best to come from peers. As to the question of whether faculty should be evaluated as to classroom climate, 91.7% of those answering the question (12 responses) felt that they should be, however, 12.5% were somewhat tentative about such evaluation and gave specific suggestions to help ensure that the process be fair and equitable.

The third strategy in the top five was that the issue should be included in required General Education courses on basic subjects. The researcher included follow-up questions in Round Three which assessed how to operationalize this strategy and how faculty effectiveness should be evaluated. Two respondents mentioned that departmental or interdisciplinary groups of faculty should meet together to draft course syllabi to infuse the topic into appropriate

General Education courses. One panelist mentioned that course release time could be given to accomplish this task. Two other respondents stated that this could be included in Freshman Orientation courses. Another respondent suggested that the issue could be included in internship programs throughout the university in that they are now required in many fields and that the topic could be included in appropriate training programs for the internships.

As to evaluating the effectiveness of this strategy, only three panelists gave a specific response. Their responses were to either use regular course evaluations for the process or to survey students at the end of their Freshman year to assess their knowledge of the issue.

The fourth strategy generated by the panel in this section regarded demonstrated commitment to climate issue as a screening tool for campus positions. The researcher added follow-up questions in Round Three. These questions assessed 1) how this commitment would be evaluated in the screening process and 2) how employees could be rewarded for ongoing commitment after they are hired that would encourage them to continue to work toward significant social change in this area? Almost half of the panelists, 43.8%, felt that the reference checks on prospective employees should include questions regarding climate issues and 37.5% stated that the issue should be included in the evaluative process on an ongoing basis.

As to recognition and/or rewards for efforts in this area, 33.3% mentioned that employees should receive such recognition. One suggested that student leaders and their mentors could be recognized for their contributions regarding campus climate and that the students could be asked who has helped them through such salient issues.

Other incentives included recognition at the annual faculty and/or staff awards programs, monetary awards, and course release time.

Three respondents (18.8%) questioned the appropriateness of such awards. One panelist found this too "politically correct" and another poignantly asked "Why do we need a reward for being considerate to one another?"

The last question in this section dealt with the issue of strong campus commitment to women who speak up against inappropriate behavior on their campuses. The researcher asked the panel what campus leaders can do to support women who speak out against sexual harassment and issues regarding campus climate and how backlash against such women could be addressed. Additionally, the panel was questioned as to how these women might be recognized in a positive manner for their risks.

One half of the panel specifically stated that there must be strong assurance of non-retaliation for such "opinion leaders" and that these women must know that their positions are protected. Just under half, (43.8%) indicated that public support was critical for surviving the backlash that many had experienced. One panelist indicated that she is currently the target of backlash. She stated that "women on campus should, if nothing else, let the person under fire know they are behind them".

Several panelists indicated that it is crucial that top administrators must model the desired behavior by speaking up themselves on the issue and making it their issue as well. One respondent suggested that all administrators be evaluated as to their effectiveness in changing the campus climate.

Round Three Results- Part II

CSU Policy and Procedures Analysis

In Part II, those policy (Section A) and procedure (Section B) items which had garnered a 20% or higher rating in Round Two remained in Round Three in order to establish relative importance of the remaining items. Panelist comments and new items generated in Round Two were included in Round Three in order for panel members to consider them before making their final choices. See Tables 18 and 19 for details as to final panel responses.

Table 18

Items to be Included in Campus Policy Statements Regarding Sexual Harassment

N= 17 for Round Two

N= 16 for Round Three

*** Items reaching consensus**

Final Ranking	Round 2 %	Round 3 %	Item
1	70.6%	100%*	A specific and clear definition of sexual harassment
1	64.7	100%*	Timely and appropriate action when receiving a complaint
3	29.4%	43.8%	Legal implications of sexual harassment
4	23.5%	31.2	Mandatory training for administrators, supervisors, and faculty
5	23.5%	18.8	Education of campus community as to policy and procedures
6	23.5%	12.5%	Specific procedures for dealing with complaints

Table 19

Items to be Included in Campus Procedures Statements Regarding Sexual Harassment

N= 17 for Round Two

N= 16 for Round Three

***Items reaching consensus**

Final Ranking	Round 2 %	Round 3% %	Item
1	64.7%	100%*	Specific personnel designated to address the issue
2	35.3%	75.0%*	A procedurally just framework
3	NI	68.8%*	Clear and specific procedures in general (not just appeals procedures)
4	23.5%	31.3%	Investigative teams should have both a male and female
5	23.5%	25.0%	Victims may remain anonymous while seeking information
6	29.4%	6.3%	Alleged perpetrators should be informed of the complaint

In Section A, two items reached consensus and both at 100%. The panel had unanimous agreement that campus policy statements should have a specific and clear definition of sexual harassment and that timely and appropriate action when receiving a complaint must be included. Just below the consensus point of 50% at 43.8% was the item indicating that the legal implications of sexual harassment should also be included.

In Section B, three items reached consensus. The panel was in unanimous agreement on one of the items which was that specific personnel should be designated to address the issue at each campus.

The other two items reaching consensus were 1) that a procedurally just framework should be established and that 2) clear and specific procedures should be implemented.

It is interesting to note that the panelists had a high degree of consensus that all of the suggested items should be included in campus policy and procedure statements, but little consensus as to which items were most important to include. This lack of consensus demonstrates that the process of developing campus policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment will continue to be filled with conflict and varied opinions and that reaching campus consensus will be difficult for policymakers.

Round Three Results- Part III

Additional Comments

In Part III, panelists responded to three questions. The first asked panel members to add any comments they had about any item in Round 3 of the survey. Two panelists made specific comments regarding the survey process. One panel member stated that she had difficulty making selections from a limited number of alternatives because she felt that the options were not really all equivalent. She felt that some were related to macro levels of change while others were related to more specific micro changes.

The second panelist did not like the consensus building aspect of the Delphi process and stated that providing her with the percentage of panel responses put pressure on her "to join the team," "get on board," "fall in line". She questioned the methodology and asked whether it might not negatively affect the outcomes. In the

thank you letter to this panelist, the researcher included more information on the Delphi methodology and invited the panelist to contact the researcher if more information was desired, however, she did not.

The second question in Part III asked respondents about their feedback about the project. More than three fourths (81.3%) of the respondents stated that they found the study interesting, enjoyable, or helpful. One panelist mentioned that she felt it was "very interesting to participate in a multi-part survey that provided feedback and new ideas as part of the process". Another panelist stated that she teaches research design and that she found this to be a "great example of Delphi method". Additionally, one panelist stated "this has been useful to me because it gives me some idea of what others are doing on their campuses" and another said it "made me think about the issues". One optimistic panelist remarked that she thought that "the results can be of value to the present CSU leadership."

The final question in the study asked the expert panel members what suggestions they had for further research projects regarding the issues of sexual harassment and campus climates for women in higher education. Suggestions included:

1. A follow-up to this study in two or three years
2. A project which explores campus racial climates,
3. A detailed study on all of the policies and procedures for the CSU with a compilation on the statistics regarding incidence rates and outcomes of cases at all of the campuses,

4. A survey on what is needed from the CSU system regarding this issue,
5. A project exploring what, if any, differences exist on campus climates at institutions with a female President and Vice Presidents, and,
6. A study exploring how individual campuses are conducting campus climate surveys on this issue.

Summary of the Results of the Delphi Study

An analysis of the data led to the following conclusions which are organized by the six research questions which guided the study. The most significant conclusions are included in this summary.

1. What changes are most needed in order to create campus climates for female students that are free from sexual harassment?

The panel generated 27 items regarding this question and reached consensus on three by the end of Round Three: 1) the acceptance of sexual harassment as normal behavior, 2) reporting processes that are not "user-friendly", and 3) the lack of student awareness of sexual harassment/peer harassment. One panelist's comments were noteworthy regarding this question:

It seems hopelessly simplistic to say that societal attitudes regarding women have to change before the campus climate changes, but it is definitely true. It is just that attitude that allows campuses to have such low

numbers of female faculty and administrators, thus depriving both undergraduate and graduate students of strong female role models. Until the societal devaluing of women is somehow changed, it is going to take aggressive policy and continuing education of students regarding that policy in order to change the climate.

2. Are these needed changes different for undergraduate and graduate female students?

There was little difference noted by the panel between the needs of graduate and undergraduate students regarding sexual harassment except for one item which emerged from round two with a 41% response rate. This item was the over-dependence of students in relationship to graduate faculty/advisers.

However, in Round Three, this item dropped to a response rate of only 20%. One panel member wrote that "both undergraduate and graduate students fear retaliation against them if they pursue harassment or sexual assault against the university. The climate is in a deep freeze." In terms of the overall issue of sexual harassment, the panel did not cite a significant difference for these two groups of students. However, individual panel members did make comments which supported why some female graduate students may feel uncomfortable with faculty or advisers who sexualize their relationships with students. One panelist noted:

Graduate students are much more dependent upon faculty members for their evaluations, academic progress, career

opportunities and references, advancement to candidacy, thesis completion, etc. Faculty tend to think of graduate students as closer to being "colleagues" and to ignore their power-role.

Students do not.

3. What current strategies are being used in higher education to create campus climates that are free from the sexual harassment of female students?

Twenty-eight items were generated by the panel regarding current strategies. Four of these items reached consensus by the end of the third round. These strategies were: 1) mandated training for faculty/administrators/staff on the topic; 2) educational programming for students on the issue; 3) active and strong support of policies from top levels of administration; and 4) designated personnel to handle complaints.

Panel members made clarifying comments regarding these choices. As to mandated training, one respondent stated "With societal attitude as (unfortunately) a given, it is going to take aggressive, mandated training about sexual harassment to make any changes. Unless the awareness training is mandatory, the people who really need the training will continue to avoid it." However, another panel member gave an alternate view "I sympathize with the sentiments for mandatory training, and I don't know it doesn't work; I just think it doesn't work." As to the timing of such training, one respondent noted that there should be a "recommendation for departmental training as part of the resolution of any investigation. Do the training when the

supervisors have the issue fresh in their minds-- just as they finish dealing with a problem." Regarding the active and strong support of policies from the top levels of administration, one panel member wrote that "Item #7 is very important but you can have a dozen policies-- if they aren't enforced they mean nothing."

4. What problems are encountered when these strategies are implemented?

Consensus items included: 1) denial that the problem really exists on campus or in a particular department, 2) time consuming nature of dealing effectively with the problem, and 3) the socialized acceptance of the behavior.

As to strategies for dealing with the socialized acceptance of the issue, panelists mentioned publicizing sanctions received for sexual harassment offenses, publishing commentaries in the school newspaper, and providing training internships to move women up into positions in the administration. In cases where there is denial that the problem really exists, the use of peer pressure was suggested as a possible strategy.

5. What techniques have been used or are planned to be used to determine the effectiveness of these strategies?

Respondents were generally unaware of techniques that have been used to determine the effectiveness of current strategies regarding sexual harassment on their campuses. Initially, 53.3% of the panel was unable to identify any evaluative

efforts that were being conducted on their campuses regarding this issue. The remaining 46.6% identified a total of five techniques currently being used or planned to be used on their campuses. An additional item was generated in Round Two which resulted in a total of six identified techniques.

These evaluation techniques are: 1) recording numbers of inquiries, complaints, and resolutions, 2) program and workshop evaluations, 3) designated personnel overseeing the issue, 4) survey of faculty, staff, and students as to awareness of policy and procedures, 5) survey to establish baseline data followed by additional surveys to measure campus change efforts, and 6) add a section on the CSU individual campus annual reports to the Trustees with information regarding complaints and resolutions.

Two panel members made comments related to the lack of evaluation on their campuses. One said:

I am not aware of any evaluative program on my campus. The attitude here seems to be that these few poorly attended workshops are presented during Fall Conference Week, and then the whole issue of sexual harassment disappears until next September-- unless there is an expensive and well-publicized case during the year.

Another respondent stated:

The missing link I feel is (that) the Women's Center is student run. If we had a Women's Resource Center administered by a university student affairs paid personnel,

I feel it would be a valuable resource to report and distribute surveys to get accuracy in their surveys.

6. What new and innovative strategies can be identified and developed to create campus climates for the 21st century that are free from sexual harassment of female students?

Panel members were assessed as to whether or not they feel that campus climates will remain the same, become more hostile for women, or become more supportive for women in the years to come. The panel assessed the current climate as a neutral one for women in 1993 with a 76.5% response rate and the remaining responses indicating a hostile environment. As to the future, the panel was generally optimistic with 88.2% indicating a more supportive environment for women in the 21st century, however 11.8% still saw a hostile environment for women in the next century.

The top five strategies were: 1) build a campus culture that strongly supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus, 2) include issue in required General Education courses on basic subjects, 3) use demonstrated commitment to climate issues as a screening tool for campus policies, 4) include harassment free models of teaching presented in new faculty orientation, and 5) give strong campus support to women who speak up against inappropriate behavior.

In addition to the six research questions which served as the focus of the study, the researcher also conducted an analysis of current

CSU campus policies and procedures. The analysis revealed that while the Chancellor's Office sent out Executive Order 345 in 1981 as the framework for campus policy and procedure statements regarding sexual harassment, the individual campuses have responded with a wide variance as to the breadth and depth of their own campus documents. Data analysis of these documents, led to the creation of item banks for the panel to indicate the importance level of various items as to inclusion in campus policy and procedure statements.

The panel demonstrated a high level of consensus that all of the items that appeared in these documents should be included in such policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment in that all of the items were rated "very important" or "extremely important" by at least 64.7% of the panel.

The two most important items to be included in a policy statement identified by the panel both reached 100% consensus. These items were a 1) specific and clear definition of sexual harassment and 2) timely and appropriate action when receiving a complaint. The three top rated items as to inclusion in campus procedures statements were 1) specific personnel designated to address the issue, 2) a procedurally just framework, and 3) clear and specific procedures. The panel reached consensus on only these five items of the original twenty-seven regarding campus policies and procedures.

An overall review of the data confirms the complexity and confusion that surrounds the issue of sexual harassment. The issue is embedded in cultural norms which complicate the interactions of men and women in academia. The changing roles of men and women in

the workforce in the last two decades have also caused confusion and frustration on the part of both men and women. This confusion and complexity is evident in the results of this study, particularly in Part I which focused on the six research questions. While consensus was reached on various items as to relative importance, there were often dissenting viewpoints. One panel member described her confusion about the issue at the conclusion of the study:

This study-process has helped me clarify some things, but mostly I'm fuzzy about it all and discouraged. I see these as backlash times for women and people of color. I feel discouraged with my friends and peers. Fear and ignorance and selfishness are all over. I'm sorry to be so negative. I do hope your study is helpful. I haven't given up.

It is unlikely that this complexity and frustration regarding sexual harassment will be easily diminished. As the issue is explored in future research, perhaps clarity regarding sexual harassment will begin to emerge. The optimism, however tentative, of these panelists, who are well aware of the negative consequences of sexual harassment, is cause for hope, as institutions explore strategies to bring about the reduction of sexual harassment in academia.

CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

Sexual Harassment in Academia

The sexual harassment charges brought against Clarence Thomas by Anita Hill in 1991 brought a tremendous increase in public interest in the issue of sexual harassment. In fact, formal complaints of sexual harassment against corporate employers filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission have increased significantly (National Association for Women in Education, 1992) and the issue, brought to the Supreme Court for the second time, received a significant ruling in November, 1993 (Kaplan, 1993).

Many research studies in the last fifteen years, including two large scale studies by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981: 1988), have demonstrated that this phenomenon is experienced most often and in more serious forms by women, and, as a result, is an overwhelming barrier for women workers in this country (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Hill, 1992; Robertson, Dyer, and Campbell, 1988; Tangri et al., 1982; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981; 1988).

The literature on sexual harassment has consistently indicated that there are specific negative consequences to victims of sexual

harassment. Tangri et al. (1982) found that those who experienced sexual harassment had a worsened emotional or physical condition, a worsened ability to work with others on the job or in school and more negative feelings about work in general. Jensen & Gutek (1982) found that 80 percent of victims surveyed reacted with disgust, 68 percent with anger and 20 percent indicated that they felt depressed.

Just as the problem of sexual harassment invades the lives of women in the workplace and negatively affects their personal and professional lives, it also pollutes the psychological and social environment of women on college and university campuses as well (Stimpson, 1989). The growing interest in sexual harassment in the workplace led to a parallel interest in studying the problem in institutions of higher education.

It has been documented in numerous studies that even when the problem is limited exclusively to sexual harassment of female students by male faculty, the numbers are shocking. Dziech and Weiner (1984) reported that the results of various studies are surprisingly similar and demonstrated repeatedly that 20-30 percent of women students reported they have been sexually harassed by male faculty during their college years.

When the concept of sexual harassment is expanded to include peer harassment, the numbers are even more alarming. Various studies which included assessments of women students who had experienced sexist comments or received unwelcome sexual attention from their peers ranged from 68 percent to 92 percent of those women surveyed (Hughes & Sandler, 1988).

The literature on sexual harassment demonstrates that generally three strategies are utilized by organizations and institutions in the attempt to prevent sexual harassment. These are 1) a well-publicized policy statement outlining behaviors which are considered unacceptable by the organization; 2) an educational program for members of the organization, and 3) an effective means of reporting offenses when they do occur (Krohne, 1991). There is very little evidence, if any, to demonstrate that these strategies, in fact, are helpful in lowering incidence rates of sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment is a complex and newly emerging social issue which is still in the initial stages of research (Brewer, 1982). In light of the apparent inadequacy of current strategies to address the problem, researchers have called for a deeper and more meaningful approach to addressing sexual harassment by challenging the underlying assumptions of our culture which perpetuate gender and sex-role stereotypes (Hoffman, 1986; Rice, 1990; Twombly, 1991).

Purpose of the Study

Based upon the preponderance of research which strongly indicates that sexual harassment is a serious problem for females in academia, the purpose of this study was to identify effective strategies for creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. In order to realistically bound the project, the study focused specifically upon the issue as it relates to undergraduate and graduate female students.

The following questions were of primary importance to the purpose of this project:

1. What changes are most needed in order to create campus climates for female students that are free from sexual harassment?
2. Are these needed changes different for undergraduate and graduate female students?
3. What current strategies are being used in higher education to create campus climates that are free from the sexual harassment of female students?
4. What problems are encountered when these strategies are implemented?
5. What techniques have been used or are planned to be used to determine the effectiveness of these strategies?
6. What innovative strategies can be identified and developed to create campus climates for the 21st century that are free from sexual harassment of female students?

In essence, the study was intended to identify strategies for leaders in higher education to use in creating a more positive future which can serve as an alternative to the chilly campus climates that exist for women today at our colleges and universities.

Methodology

Since this project was focused upon identifying strategies in an effort to bring about significant change regarding campus climate for women on college and university campuses, futures research methodologies were reviewed to identify a methodology that would generate solutions to a complex social problem. The Delphi method

was selected for the project due to its consensus building approach and applicability to complex problem solving.

The Delphi method is intended to gain the advantages of groups while overcoming the disadvantages. The method has three characteristics that distinguish it from conventional face-to-face group interaction: 1) anonymity, 2) iteration with controlled feedback, and 3) statistical group response (Martino, 1983). Group interaction is facilitated by the project coordinator who feeds back relevant information to the panelists that is generated in each round of the study. Each group member is informed of the current status of the group's collective opinion and the arguments for and against each point of view. The effect of this controlled feedback is to keep the group focused on its original objectives rather than self chosen goals.

Expert panel members were nominated by the Governing Board of Directors of the Women's Council of the State University in the summer of 1993. Eighteen panelists on thirteen California State University campuses participated in the study. Round Zero, conducted in June and July, collected demographic information on the participants and their institutions, and the three remaining rounds, which were conducted in the Fall of 1993, were used to collect data for the study with response rates of 83.3%, 94.4%, and 88.9% respectively.

After the data were analyzed, the panel members and executive officers of the Women's Council of the State University were each sent a summary report of the study.

Findings of the Study

Panelist Profile

The typical expert panelist was a 44 year old female with a Master's Degree who was slightly more likely to also have a doctoral degree as not (55.5%). She was currently working on a campus of just under 15,000 full time equivalent students and had been in her current position 8.3 years and had worked in higher education for 16.0 years. She had also been addressing issues of educational equity for women in higher education for 10.3 of those years.

She is also highly likely to have handled sexual harassment complaints/ grievances on her campus, counseled victims of sexual harassment, been a member of a committee or task force on sexual harassment, and conducted research on sexual harassment. She is also likely to have trained students, faculty, and staff on issues of sexual harassment, as well as been involved in developing campus policy concerning sexual harassment.

Research Question Results

Six research questions guided the development of this study. An analysis of the data generated in the project resulted in the following:

1. What changes are most needed in order to create campus climates for female students that are free from sexual harassment?

The panel generated 27 items regarding this question and reached consensus on three of these items by the end of Round Three: 1) the acceptance of sexual harassment as normal behavior, 2) reporting processes that are not "user-friendly", and

3) the lack of student awareness of sexual harassment/peer harassment.

2. Are these needed changes different for undergraduate and graduate female students?

There was little difference noted by the panel regarding the needs of graduate and undergraduate students regarding sexual harassment except for one item which emerged from round two with a 41% response rate. This item was the over-dependence of students in relationship to graduate faculty/advisers. However, in Round Three, this item dropped to a response rate of only 20%. One panel member wrote that "both undergraduate and graduate students fear retaliation against them if they pursue harassment or sexual assault against the university. The climate is in a deep freeze." In terms of the overall issue of sexual harassment, the panel did not cite a significant difference for these two groups of students.

3. What current strategies are being used in higher education to create campus climates that are free from the sexual harassment of female students?

Twenty-eight items were generated by the panel regarding current strategies. Four of these items reached consensus by the end of the third round. These strategies were: 1) mandated training for faculty/administrators/staff on the topic;

2) educational programming for students on the issue; 3) active and strong support of policies from top levels of administration; and 4) designated personnel to handle complaints.

4. What problems are encountered when these strategies are implemented?

Fourteen problems were initially generated by the panel. Three items reached consensus in Round Three. These items were: 1) denial that the problem really exists on campus or in a particular department, 2) time consuming nature of dealing effectively with the problem, and 3) the socialized acceptance of the behavior.

5. What techniques have been used or are planned to be used to determine the effectiveness of these strategies?

The study revealed that respondents were generally unaware of techniques that have been used to determine the effectiveness of current strategies regarding sexual harassment on their campuses. Initially, 53.3% of the panel members were unable to identify any evaluative efforts that were being conducted on their campuses regarding this issue; however by Round Three they had identified six techniques: 1) recording numbers of inquiries, complaints, and resolutions, 2) evaluating programs and workshops, 3) designating personnel to oversee the issue, 4) surveying faculty, staff, and students as to awareness of policy and procedures, 5) surveying to establish baseline data followed by additional surveys to measure campus change efforts,

and 6) adding a section on the CSU individual campus annual reports to the Trustees with information regarding complaints and resolutions.

6. What new and innovative strategies can be identified and developed to create campus climates for the 21st century that are free from sexual harassment of female students?

The researcher assessed the panel as to whether or not campus climates will remain the same, become more hostile for women, or become more supportive for women in the years to come. They assessed the current climate as somewhat hostile for women in 1993 with a 76.5% response rate indicating a neutral environment and the remainder indicating a hostile climate. As to the future, the panel was generally optimistic with 88.2% indicating a more supportive environment for women in the 21st century, however 11.8% still saw a hostile environment for women in the next century.

Fifteen strategies were initially generated by the respondents and the top five were presented to the panel in Round Three for additional input regarding how the CSU leadership could go about implementing and operationalizing these strategies. The top five strategies were: 1) build a campus culture that strongly supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus, 2) include issue in required General Education courses on basic subjects, 3) use demonstrated commitment to climate issues as a screening tool for campus policies, 4) include harassment free models of teaching presented in new faculty

orientation, and 5) give strong campus support to women who speak up against inappropriate behavior.

CSU Policies and Procedures Analysis

In addition to the six research questions which served as the focus of the study, the researcher also conducted an analysis of current CSU campus policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment. The analysis revealed that while the Chancellor's Office sent out Executive Order 345 in 1981 as the framework for campus policy and procedure statements regarding sexual harassment, the individual campuses have responded with a wide variance as to the breadth and depth of their own campus documents. Using the data from this analysis of the documents, the researcher created item banks for the panel to indicate the importance level of various items as to inclusion in campus policy and procedures statements.

The panel demonstrated a high level of consensus that all of the items that appeared in these documents should be included in policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment in that all of the items were rated "very important" or "extremely important" by at least 64.7% of the panel.

As to relative importance, two items to be included in a policy statement reached 100% consensus by the panel: 1) specific and clear definition of sexual harassment and 2) timely and appropriate action when receiving a complaint. These were the only two items to reach consensus out of the fifteen items considered, so it was interesting that the panel agreed so greatly as to these two items. As to inclusion in campus procedures statements, one item reached 100% consensus:

that specific personnel be designated to address the issue. Two other items also reached consensus at 75.0% and 68.8% respectively. These items were: a procedurally just framework, and clear and specific procedures. Out of the original twelve items, only these three reached consensus as to relative importance for inclusion in campus procedures for addressing sexual harassment complaints.

Conclusions Regarding the Study

The data generated from this study and the review of the literature suggest that sexual harassment is best approached by leaders in higher education on two levels. The first is on a micro level which deals specifically with the issue of sexual harassment at an institutional level. The second is on a macro level and utilizes strategies to address gender inequities from a broad societal/cultural perspective.

Micro Level Conclusions

Strategies Regarding Sexual Harassment on Campus

The researcher concluded that the data from the study strongly supported the review of the literature that due to the confusion surrounding the issue, a clear definition of sexual harassment must be utilized by an institution in its efforts to effectively address the issue. A definition is suggested in the following section of this chapter.

Clear and strong policies and procedures also must be in place at an institution in order to effectively deal with sexual harassment. The policies must clearly outline the university's expectations of its employees as well as its students. Additionally, educational leaders must demonstrate strong support of both the enforcement of the

policies and the personnel that are charged with their enforcement. Educational leaders must demonstrate their advocacy of the policies via appropriate role modeling behavior as well as giving public endorsement to those who are actively working to bring about changes which support a campus climate that is free from sexual harassment.

Campus procedures for filing grievances should 1) encourage the reporting of incidents of sexual harassment, 2) allow for either informal or formal procedures for filing a complaint and, 3) protects the alleged victim from retaliation by the accuser or the university. The procedures must respect the issue of confidentiality concerning both accuser and accused, stipulate timelines for filing and acting upon a complaint, and establish timelines for appeals processes.

The study also revealed that there is a distinct lack of awareness of the campus community about comprehensive evaluation efforts throughout the CSU system regarding the reduction of sexual harassment. A visible systemwide effort to provide leadership and support to individual campuses in determining the effectiveness of campus efforts to address sexual harassment is needed. Without such data, individuals on the campuses must rely solely upon anecdotal information to assess the extent of the problem and the effectiveness of individual campuses and the CSU in reducing sexual harassment.

In January 1992, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), as a result of a three-year study, recommended in its report Assessing Campus Climate, that all California colleges and universities should plan, develop, and implement an assessment of institutional campus climates (California State University, 1993). The CSU has conducted such ongoing evaluation with the systemwide

administration of the Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS) which measures, every three to five years, student perceptions of the academic and social environment on each campus and identifies areas which need improvement. In addition, individual campuses have administered other surveys which address various aspects of campus climate (CSU, 1993). However, this study demonstrated that few persons in the campus community were aware of such efforts to assess campus climate at either the individual campus level or at the CSU systemwide level.

The researcher concluded that a systemwide evaluative plan is imperative. Such a plan would include baseline data as to the number of incidence complaints and the results of the subsequent investigations. It is also concluded that this data be updated annually and that the results be distributed widely on each campus. The literature indicated that currently there is no survey being used consistently in the country to collect such data. The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ), which has been developed for this purpose and meets standard psychometric criteria, is an appropriate resource. The developers of the survey intended it to be used to gather national baseline data (Fitzgerald et al., 1988).

Given the complexity and confusion regarding sexual harassment, the researcher concluded that educational programs are needed throughout the campus community. These programs should be developed to address the specific needs of those participating in the training, particularly identifying university expectations of those in specific university roles such as students or employees. Additional information should be included in such training such as a definition of

sexual harassment, policies and procedures regarding the issue, legal implications, the differences in perception between victims and perpetrators, the emotional and physical effects of sexual harassment upon victims, and its impact upon the campus community.

Lastly, there must be a concerted institutional leadership effort to bring about the changes necessary to address the specific issues of sexual harassment in academia. Leaders must commit to increasing their own understanding of the issue and be willing to attend training sessions with other campus employees to underscore the importance of such training. Additionally, as one campus president noted (Rhodes, 1990), they must demonstrate institutional commitment to dealing effectively with the issue by "sending a strong and clear message that sexual harassment is an issue serious enough to merit concern and action at the highest level within the University" (p. 1).

Macro Level Conclusions

Strategies Addressing Gender Inequity in Higher Education

A review of the literature, in combination with the results of this study, support the researcher's conclusion that the issue also must be dealt with at a broader level of action than looking only at the specific issue of sexual harassment on a particular campus. It is also necessary for campus leaders to address the broader issue of gender inequity in higher education and the cultural assumptions which support the reality of sexual harassment throughout our society. As Hoffman noted (1986):

In the focus on the elimination of the behavior, the complex and intertwined connection between sexual harassment

in particular and gender inequality in general has been lost. Statements and grievance procedures can provide symptomatic relief, and for those in pain this is indeed important. But in the absence of broader institutional commitments to changing the nature of the environment in which women and men work and learn, the roots of the disorder are left unchallenged (p. 117).

In order to create campus climates that are free from sexual harassment, there must be a radical change in the way that men and women relate to each other in our society, and, subsequently on our college and university campuses. To bring about a truly democratic society and an educational system which supports it, leaders must work together toward a vision in which men and women will not only become partners in more equalized relationships, but will transform the current cultural domination of male power into a societal model based upon an ethic of collaboration and partnership. Sexual harassment will continue to plague academia until such transformative change takes place. The President of Cornell University (Rhodes, 1990), noted that sexual harassment is inappropriate anywhere, "but especially in a university community dedicated to ensuring basic civility and a respect for the dignity of every individual" (p. 1).

The type of organizational and societal change which is necessary to meet such a moral imperative regarding sexual harassment is revolutionary in that it challenges the core assumptions upon which all of our current institutions and human relationships are based upon. It is the type of change in which individuals and organizations must engage in double-loop learning and address the barriers that exist to such learning (Argyris, 1993). It is the type of

change which Smith (1982) refers to as morphogenetic change; "change of a form that penetrates so deeply into the 'genetic code' that all future generations acquire and reflect those changes" (p. 318). It is the type of change that Harman (1976) called for in which the "whole system must change" (p. 126).

Change of such historical significance will not happen by chance, for it will require the synergism of people working together from all aspects of society. It will require changes in our economic, political, and educational systems, as well as massive changes in fundamental concepts such as language, power, and relationships. It will require a challenge to the very legitimacy of the world as we now know it, a challenge that Harman (1988) noted is probably the most powerful force for change to be found in history.

The agenda seems unending in achieving a vision in which men and women are truly partners and women are as voiced and visible as men in all aspects of society. Without women visibly participating in society as involved, vocal and full citizens, the vision is not achievable. Belenky et al. (1986), noted the tremendous power that this process has upon a woman, who, when she finds her voice and uses it to gain control over her life, experiences "the roar which lies on the other side of silence" (p. 4).

As leaders and followers engage in a mutual process of individual and collective transformation, we must encourage women to share their voices in all aspects of society. To achieve such change, leaders in education, economics, philosophy, linguistics, politics, psychology, in fact, in all aspects of life, must simultaneously be working toward the vision of a partnership society.

In education, we must create environments in which all children and adults are encouraged to use their own language and not only the language of the dominator. We must acknowledge that the process of encouraging conflicting voices to be heard is a legitimating process which makes oppression and power conscious in the discourse of the classroom (Weiler, 1988). We must also bring women into our conception of civilization through the study of women's contributions to and achievements in our society. History must become ourstory.

As such change takes place, it can result in a society where both men and women are visible and voiced. When men and women become committed to understanding the realities and experiences of each other, they can work together as partners to achieve the common good.

A Model for Creating Campus Climates That Are Free from Sexual Harassment

Given the results of this study, the review of the literature, and the professional experience of the researcher, the following recommendations are proposed. While these recommendations are focused within the CSU system, they are intended to serve as a model which can be adapted for use at other campuses.

Micro Aspects of the Model: **Recommendations for Leaders Specific to** **the Issue of Campus Sexual Harassment**

The researcher recommends that campus leaders adopt the following definition of sexual harassment, include suggested items in campus policy and procedure statements, establish a sexual harassment task force, educate the campus community, and assess the campus climate regarding sexual harassment.

A Definition of Sexual Harassment

It is recommended that the entire CSU system adopt a uniform definition of sexual harassment. The work of Till (1980) and Fitzgerald et al. (1988) provides a conceptual basis for such a definition of sexual harassment.

Till (1980) classified the responses of a national sample of college women into five general categories covering a wide spectrum of behaviors from sexist comments to rape. In research supported in part by a grant from the United States Department of Education, through the Women's Educational Equity Act, Fitzgerald et al. (1988)

built upon Till's work to develop the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ). This questionnaire was constructed in an effort to have a standardized survey that meets standard psychometric criterion in order to compile a national profile of frequency of sexual harassment (Fitzgerald, 1990).

For the purposes of this study, the researcher limited the definition of sexual harassment to the first four categories of behaviors identified in Till's research and later built upon by Fitzgerald et al (1988). The recommended definition of sexual harassment for use in academia includes these first four levels identified by Till (1980):

1. Gender harassment - generalized sexist remarks and behavior not designed to elicit sexual cooperation but rather to convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women.
2. Seductive behaviors - unwanted, inappropriate, and offensive sexual advances.
3. Sexual bribery - the solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by the promise of reward.
4. Sexual coercion - the coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment.

The fifth category of behaviors, sexual imposition, which includes gross sexual imposition, assault, and rape, was not included within the scope of this study.

Policy Statements Regarding Sexual Harassment

Campus policy statements regarding sexual harassment should clearly address the following aspects of the issue. While individual institutions may address them differently from one another due to the realities of the individual campus climates, each item should be dealt with in a manner which is meaningful for that campus.

1. A specific and clear definition of sexual harassment (see proposed definition in the preceding section)
2. Legal implications of sexual harassment
3. Amorous relationships between faculty and students
4. Appropriate guidelines and timelines for complaint resolution
5. Prohibition of retaliatory actions toward complainants
6. Sanctions against personnel who fail to conduct investigations of complaints
7. False claims of sexual harassment
8. Presidential periodic review of the policy
9. Sanctions for violations of the policy
10. Confidentiality for both alleged victims and perpetrators
11. Using a "reasonable woman's standard" to determine cases in which the alleged victim is a woman
12. Peer sexual harassment
13. Mandatory training for faculty, staff and administrative personnel
14. Education of the entire campus community as to the policy and procedures including contractors/service providers who may have a temporary relationship with the university

Procedures for Dealing with Sexual Harassment Complaints

It is recommended that campus procedures for dealing effectively with complaints of sexual harassment should address the following items:

1. Specific personnel designated to address the issue
2. Anonymity of victims seeking information about procedures for filing complaints
3. Fairness for both alleged victims and perpetrators
4. Specific timelines for filing and resolving complaints
5. The coordination of complaint information to ensure that accurate statistics are being compiled and that repeat harassers are identified
6. Presidential review of incidence rates
7. Rights of alleged perpetrators
8. Gender make-up of investigative teams
9. Informal procedures
10. Formal procedures
11. Advisors or advocates to assist complainants
12. Appeals procedures for both victims and perpetrators

Establish A Sexual Harassment Task Force

Each campus should have an ongoing task force, panel, or committee that is charged with the task of reducing sexual harassment. The task force should consist of faculty, staff, administrators, and students who represent various campus constituencies such as the Faculty Senate, Associated Students, the Women's Resource Center, the Staff Council, and the Human

Resources Department. As needed, group members would be educated on an ongoing basis to effectively perform their roles. Depending on the individual campus and the strategies that may already be in place at a particular institution, this group could be responsible for any or all of the following:

1. Coordinate campus efforts to educate the campus community regarding of sexual harassment
2. Serve as an advisory committee to the campus Affirmative Action Officer or other designated campus employee who has primary responsibility regarding the issue
3. Review individual sexual harassment complaints
4. Compile statistics regarding incidents and outcomes of complaints
5. Provide feedback to the university community as to the disposition of cases such as the annual report distributed at the University of California, Santa Cruz (University of California, Santa Cruz, 1993)
6. Review campus policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment on a regular basis for clarity, fairness, and compliance with legal updates regarding sexual harassment

If a campus is part of a larger system of higher education such as The California State University, then it is recommended that the system establish a similar task force. This group should include legal counsel and appropriate representation from each campus such as the campus Affirmative Action Officer or other employee designated by the campus to have lead responsibility for handling sexual harassment

complaints. The task force would provide the same type of discussion and leadership regarding systemwide strategies for dealing with the issue as the campus task forces would provide for individual institutions. While it would be ideal for this group to meet on a regular basis to address the related issues, the use of E-mail and/or conference calling may need to suffice in an era of tight budgetary constraints.

At a minimum, it is suggested that ongoing system legal counsel, education, and training be provided on a regular basis for individuals designated by their campuses as being responsible to handle sexual harassment complaints in order to ensure that campuses are in compliance with changes in the law as the issue evolves in the legal system in future years.

Educate the Campus Community Regarding Sexual Harassment

All members of the campus community should be educated as to the issue of campus sexual harassment. The following recommendations are made:

Educate Students Regarding Sexual Harassment

1. Widely distribute the campus policy regarding sexual harassment in materials and programs such as:
 - a. The campus catalog
 - b. The campus student activities booklet or pamphlet
 - c. Campus orientation programs
 - d. Campus residence halls, fraternities and sororities
 - e. Classrooms and hall bulletin boards

- f. Student newspaper
2. Train students who work closely with other students regarding the issue. These students include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Resident Advisors
 - b. Campus Orientation Leaders
 - c. Graduate Teaching Assistants
 - d. Student Security Personnel
 - e. Peer Counselors in campus Counseling Centers or Academic Advising Centers
3. Train student leaders in order to increase the numbers of appropriate role models and resource persons. This training could be part of the on-campus status requirements process of each campus. Leaders to be included in this training consist of :
 - a. Associated Student Council members
 - b. Residence hall student government leaders
 - c. Officers in Greek letter groups
 - d. Officers of campus clubs and organizations
4. Include the following information in training for the students identified in #2 and #3 above:
 - a. The definition of sexual harassment
 - b. Verified "stories" of the experiences of persons who have experienced sexual harassment on campus
 - c. Information regarding national incidence rates of student sexual harassment
 - d. The "cost" to individuals, groups, and the campus community due to sexual harassment
 - e. Explanatory models of sexual harassment

- f. Legal issues regarding sexual harassment
- g. The differences between the perceptions of perpetrators and victims of sexual harassment
- h. The physical and emotional symptoms that victims experience (sexual harassment syndrome)
- i. Campus policy and expectations regarding sexual harassment
- j. How to file a complaint
- k. Barriers to reporting incidents of sexual harassment
- l. Resources for emotional or psychological support

The format for these workshops should be interactive in order to create the greatest interest and could include: role playing by actors or participants, the use of a talk-show format, small discussion groups, or appropriate films or videotapes.

5. Include the topic in appropriate General Education and upper division classes, Freshman Success programs, and new student orientation. The topic should be addressed by the appropriate body for inclusion in these programs and/or classes such as the Faculty Senate and/or Dean's Council for academic credit and by the Student Affairs Division for those areas not included in a classroom context. It is also recommended that Academic Affairs and Student Affairs collaborate in their efforts to address this issue since it is experienced both in and outside of the classroom. At Rochester Community College in Minnesota, there is now a requirement that students must attend at least one

hour-long session on sexual harassment or violence in order to graduate (National Association for Women in Education, 1993b).

6. Provide special training for groups such as athletes or fraternities that have been involved in repeated cases of sexual harassment. Several Minnesota institutions now have mandatory training for student athletes (National Association for Women in Education, 1993b).

Educate Faculty, Staff, and Administrators Regarding Sexual Harassment

All employees must be educated regarding this issue for two important reasons 1) sexual harassment has been demonstrated to negatively affect the campus climate, and 2) given the increased likelihood of costly civil suits regarding sexual harassment which are now possible due to recent changes in federal law on this matter. The researcher recommends that employees be made aware of their responsibilities as representatives of the university as outlined below:

1. Provide all employees a copy of the policy regarding sexual harassment and require them to sign a statement that they have read and received a copy of the policy. At Augsburg College in Minnesota, all employees must now do this prior to receiving their annual salary increases (National Association of Women in Education, 1993b).
2. Require all employees to attend sexual harassment training workshops which are geared specifically to the roles of particular employees. All new employees should participate in a workshop that covers all of the items identified in #4 in the

preceding section in addition to legal issues regarding their roles as university employees. Conduct ongoing training to inform employees of legal or theoretical updates related to sexual harassment.

3. Additionally, specific training should be implemented for faculty such as workshops on harassment-free models of teaching and establishing classroom climates that are positive for both men and women. Yale University is now requiring all faculty to attend workshops following two controversial sexual harassment cases in 1992 (National Association of Women in Education, 1993a). Since there will undoubtedly be issues raised as to academic freedom and its relationship to the classroom climate, the researcher recommends that the support of the campus Faculty Senate be sought to identify positive methods for implementation and to assist with possible backlash which may result. On a systemwide level, collective bargaining units for faculty should be included in the plans and/or requirements for implementation of training for faculty.
4. Provide specialized training for any employee designated as a person who may regularly receive complaints or conduct investigations regarding sexual harassment. This additional training should emphasize theoretical perspectives of victimization and a thorough knowledge of university policy and procedures regarding complaints of sexual harassment.
5. Provide all temporary employees/contractors with the policy regarding sexual harassment and have them sign a statement that they have received and read it. Depending upon the nature

and length of the job assignment, it may also be appropriate to require training. In the case of those having a temporary contract with the university, such as building contractors, include a clause in the contract that stipulates that sexual harassment of students/university employees by the contractor or any worker associated with the project will not be tolerated.

Assess the Campus Climate Regarding Sexual Harassment

Establish a comprehensive assessment program regarding sexual harassment at each campus using the following recommendations as a guideline:

1. Establish baseline survey data regarding sexual harassment incidence rates at each campus. The researcher recommends that the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al, 1988), which is a survey which meets standard psychometric criteria, be considered for this purpose.
2. Publish the results of investigations of sexual harassment on a periodic basis and distribute to the campus community.
3. Collect additional survey data regarding other aspects of the issue such as campus community awareness of the campus policies and procedures.
4. Conduct qualitative assessments of the campus climate for women regarding sexual harassment on a regular basis to give additional richness and texture to survey data.
5. Widely distribute the results of assessment activities to members of the campus community for use in addressing issues which emerge from such assessment and evaluation.

6. Require appropriate campus groups or departments to demonstrate how they are addressing issues which emerge from such research.
7. Compile the same type of data at the system level and report by individual institutions on an annual basis to the system's governing body. Make this information available on individual campuses in order to support institutional change efforts.

Macro Aspects of the Model:

Recommendations for Leaders Regarding Gender Inequities for Women in Higher Education

In order to address sexual harassment in higher education from a broad cultural perspective, the researcher encourages campus leaders to enhance the visibility of women on campus, empower women's voices in academia, and create non-violent, non-exploitive campus climates.

Enhance the Visibility of Women on Campus

In order to effectively address the issue of the cultural invisibility of women in academia and to increase the supportive aspects of campus climates for women, the following recommendations are made to educational leaders:

1. If not already in place, establish a professionally staffed Women's Resource Center to address the special needs of women, such as sexual harassment and sexual assault, and to bring visibility to issues of gender inequity in our culture. Provide adequate funding to ensure these services.

2. Identify strategic planning processes and resources to address issues of gender inequity on campus.
3. Provide leadership to ensure curricular transformation which will bring visibility of the contributions and achievements of women to the classroom experience.
4. Hire greater percentages of female faculty and high level administrators who will serve as visible role models for female students to emulate, particularly in areas that are traditionally viewed as male, such as the hard sciences, mathematics, computers, and engineering.
5. Encourage the active mentoring of female students by both female and male faculty in all fields and particularly to women students in areas that are traditionally viewed as male, such as the hard sciences, mathematics, computers, and engineering.
6. Train faculty to recognize gender micro-inequity issues in the classroom.
7. Review recipient lists of scholastic awards and scholarships for inclusion of female students.
8. Review extracurricular programs of the university for educational equity for female students in terms of funding, awards, and other resources.
9. Actively encourage faculty, career counselors, and academic advisors to foster women's interest in pursuing careers in nontraditional fields for women.
10. Ensure that campus media highlight the accomplishments of women on an equitable basis with men and that campus publications be reviewed for appropriate inclusion of women.

11. Monitor student government spending to ensure that funding of campus activities is equitable for men and women.
12. Recognize the accomplishments of women on campus on an equitable basis with men such as at recognition ceremonies, graduation rites, in letters of commendation, and through promotion and tenure.
13. Review cutbacks in staff and programs to assess equity as to gender.
14. Review university leadership positions in the administration and student government, such as high level committees and task forces, as to the equitable inclusion of women.
15. Review opportunities in the campus community such as positions for visiting scholars, alumni awards, and funding for special projects as to gender equity.
16. Give institutional support to those engaged in women's studies research.
17. Encourage employees to avoid making reference to womens' appearance or clothing without similar reference to mens' appearance or clothing.
18. Train campus employees such as counselors, psychologists, Resident Advisors, mentors in campus mentoring programs, or other appropriate campus personnel, to recognize the special needs of women and to deal effectively with victims of sexual assault and harassment.
19. Give visible recognition to women (and men) who take risks to address issues such as sexual assault and harassment and work to bring about gender equity in higher education. Letters of

commendation, awards, and/or release time from other obligations are recommended to support such efforts. When backlash to their efforts surfaces, demonstrate consistent and visible institutional support for these individuals.

20. Conduct a self study of programs and services for women students using the self assessment guide published by the Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs (CAS, 1989). CAS member associations consist of twenty organizations that deal with issues specific to various student services and programs and includes major associations such as NASPA and ACPA.

Empower Women's Voices in Academia

In order to effectively address the issue of the cultural lack of voice of women in academia and to increase the supportive aspects of campus climates for women, the following recommendations are made to educational leaders:

1. Encourage faculty to foster the vocal participation of women in the classroom. Announce the first day of class that both men and women are expected to participate in discussions, point out the common barriers to full and equal participation in the classroom, and use terminology that is inclusive of both genders.
2. Note patterns of interruption in the classroom and in meetings on the campus in order to determine if women are being interrupted more often than men.
3. Intervene when communication patterns shut out the voice of women in a particular campus setting.

4. Notify women of meetings and fully encourage them to participate.
5. Consider women for special opportunities such as serving as guest lecturers or graduation speakers.
6. When women offer comments or suggestions, recognize and validate them for their participation.
7. Encourage women to identify strategies to overcome barriers to having a voice in campus activities and in the classroom, such as learning to continue talking when they are interrupted prematurely.
8. Include campus climate issues in screening processes for employees as appropriate. This could include interview questions which assess understanding of climate issues and reference checks for demonstrated awareness and/or commitment to campus climate issues.
9. Ask women on a regular basis to share their experiences regarding campus climate. This could be done in workshops and presentations, in stories in the campus newspaper, and through inclusion in the ongoing campus climate assessment efforts.

Create a Non-violent, Non-exploitive Campus Climate

In order to enhance the likelihood of creating campus climates that are free of violence and which are non-exploitive of women, the following recommendations are made to educational leaders:

1. Review campus publications as to the use of sexist language or photos which negatively depict women or encourage violence against women.
2. Adopt a campus policy concerning the use of non-sexist language.
3. Give recognition and encouragement to those persons who foster a collaborative approach to problem solving, programming, and strategic planning or who otherwise achieve community empowerment within the institution.
4. Provide recognition and support to those who seek alternatives to solving conflicts through competition such as the use of mediation to settle campus community disputes. Train appropriate members of the campus community in these alternative methods of problem solving.
5. Encourage and support research which explores how to achieve a culture which is non-violent and non-exploitive.
6. Highlight sexual harassment and other issues which currently primarily affect women on campus. Develop and fund programs which promote understanding between men and women and more equitable campus environments.
7. Identify support services for victims of violence such as counseling and psychological services and health services.
8. Hold members of the campus community accountable for acts of violence through appropriate punitive and educational sanctions.

Implications for Future Research

Sexual harassment is a complex social phenomenon which has only recently been challenged in our society. Most of the research thus far has been survey research focusing upon incidence rates and the effects of sexual harassment upon victims. While these topics justify further research, a broader base of research questions and methodologies is needed. Examples include studies which focus upon the effectiveness and results of grievance procedures upon both the victims and perpetrators (Brewer, 1982) and long term studies of organizations attempting to address sexual harassment over time (Kenig & Ryan, 1986).

More studies are also needed on perpetrators of harassment; why do men harass and what is needed to change such behavior? (Goodwin et al., 1989). In addition, more studies that empirically assess the sociocultural model of sexual harassment are needed since this model holds promise of providing a conceptual base for understanding sexual harassment toward women (Tangri et al., 1982). Studies which address the differences of sexual harassment upon women of color, who may perceive the issue and appropriate responses as different from white women, are also needed (DeFour, 1990; Paludi & DeFour, 1989).

Studies which examine the effects of the "chilly climate" upon women in academia both in and outside the classroom are also desirable (Allen & Niss, 1990; Cranston & Leonard, 1990). Baird (1990) noted that information about campus climate is a critical addition to the knowledge of decision makers about their institutions. Further research in this area is needed to help inform the strategic

planning processes of educational leaders as to which strategies can best address such a complex issue in higher education.

Several possible future research projects specifically emerged from this study. Of the 50 persons invited to participate in the pilot study or final research project, 8% (four) were males. Two of them agreed to participate in the pilot study, but did not return the materials. The two men who were invited to serve as expert panelists, did not accept the invitation to participate. A project exploring what barriers might exist for men to participate in research or task forces regarding sexual harassment would be helpful as to the implementation process of the strategies recommended as a result of this project. Further research might also be conducted as a follow-up to this study as to the reactions of male administrators, faculty, staff, and students to the results of this study and what solutions males specifically suggest to create campus climates that are free from sexual harassment.

This project also strongly demonstrated the increased need for more extensive research regarding campus climates in The California State University. The study also revealed a need for the wider dissemination of the results of such research, assessment, and evaluation to the practitioners who are charged with addressing problems related to campus climate such as sexual harassment.

Another related research project would be to identify and explore the effectiveness of current sanctions used by institutions against perpetrators of sexual harassment as well as possible future innovative sanctions which could be employed. For instance, 18.8% of the panelists suggested that institutions dock the salary of employees

with proven offenses. It would be interesting to identify current strategies which exist at campuses such as probation, suspension or expulsion from employee or student status as well as educational sanctions designed to increase awareness of the issue, and to explore their effectiveness in preventing future incidents of sexual harassment by a particular perpetrator. It would also be interesting to explore whether there are any differences in campus climate survey results between institutions which widely disseminate the outcomes, and sanctions if appropriate, of sexual harassment cases and those that do not.

Further research could also be conducted as to whether any differences exist at various campuses as to campus climates for women. For instance, is there a more positive environment for women at campuses with professionally staffed Women's Resource Centers? Is there a qualitative difference for women when the leadership on a particular campus has a higher percentage of women? One of the expert panelists in this study suggested that research be conducted which explores the differences, if any, which exist in campus climates at institutions with females in the top leadership positions.

In terms of implementing the strategies recommended in this report, it might also be interesting to explore what is most effective in terms of the composition of committees or task forces that establish the priorities for creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. If future research indicates that men are reluctant or unwilling to get involved in reducing the incidence of sexual harassment, how might they be convinced of the importance of the

issue and the negative impact it has upon individual victims and the institution as a whole? It might be helpful to assess those campuses that have made progress in reducing incidents of sexual harassment for their recommendations regarding the compositions of such committees as well as the relative success of the various strategies employed.

As further research is conducted regarding sexual harassment, and as leaders in higher education pursue strategies such as those recommended in this study, they must understand that they cannot separate the issue of sexual harassment from the external environment in the surrounding American culture. Institutional strategic planning concerning sexual harassment must be done within a context of a full understanding of campus climate in addition to the external environment which supports and fosters the gender inequity of women in academia.

Concluding Remarks

Sexual harassment is a pervasive problem in higher education and throughout our society. Recent events such as the Clarence Thomas hearing, the Tailhook scandal, and the 1993 Supreme Court ruling regarding Harris v. Forklift Systems, have helped to raise the national consciousness about sexual harassment, however, the issue remains controversial and fraught with conflicting values and opinions.

As leaders manage mission-oriented social organizations such as universities, their strategic planning processes must consider the social environment as part of the external environment that affects an institution. The use of robust strategies in creating the future, which

take into account the realities of conflicting values, will assist leaders in creating a single future which will emerge from many possible alternative futures. As the underlying assumptions which support the current social environment are better understood, leaders will be better prepared to accomplish the complex problem solving which is needed to create campus climates that are free from sexual harassment. Increased understanding of this issue will assist them in identifying what needs to change and what barriers or backlash might exist to bringing about such change.

This is no easy task, in fact, it will take persistent and Herculean effort on the part of leaders who are willing to commit to such a vision. It will take leaders of great perception, great ability and even greater courage working together collaboratively to achieve this mutual vision. Significant and real change will have taken place when women no longer face the anxiety, fear, and humiliation which currently accompany sexual harassment in academia.

Future generations of women will either benefit from becoming voiced and visible, or continue to be silenced and invisible depending upon the success or failure of educational leaders to achieve this vision of a shared and collaborative society. This is the challenge for educational leaders; to create a more supportive learning environment in academia for our daughters so that they may accomplish their dearest and most daring dreams in a world that fosters their self confidence and self esteem, believes in their abilities and skills, and values their womanness and femininity. What tremendous promise and potential exists within these women, who, when they become truly voiced and visible, will become full and equal partners with men.

References

- Aiken, S. H., Anderson, K., Dinnerstein, M. Lensink, & J., Mac Corquodale, P. (1988). Trying transformations: Curriculum integration and the problem of resistance. In E. Minnich, J. O'Barr, & R. Rosenfeld (Eds.), Reconstructing the academy: Women's education and women's studies. (pp. 104-124). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Albert, M., Cagan, L., Chomsky, N., Hahner, R., King, M., Sargent, L., & Sklar, H. (1986). Liberating theory. Boston: South End Press.
- Alexander v. Yale University, 459 F. Supp 1 (D. Conn.), 1977.
- Allen, B. P. & Niss, J. F. (1990, April). A chill in the college classroom? Phi Delta Kappan, pp. 607-609.
- Allen, R. L. (1992). Pornography encourages sexual harassment. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 81-83). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Ament, R. H. (1973). Comparison of Delphi forecasting studies in 1964 and 1969. In F. Tugwell (Ed.), Search for alternatives: Public policy and the study of the future (pp. 164-175). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- American Association of University Women. (1992). How schools shortchange girls: Executive summary. In E. L. Horwitz (Ed.), AAUW Outlook. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women.
- American Association of University Women. (1993). Hostile hallways: The AAUW survey on sexual harassment in America's schools. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women.
- Andersen, M. L. (1985). Women's studies/black studies: Learning from our common pasts/forging a common future. In M. Schuster & S. Van Dyne (Eds.), Women's place in the academy: Transforming the liberal arts curriculum (pp. 62-72). Totowa, N. J.: Rowman & Allanhead.
- Andersen, M. L. (1988). Changing the curriculum in higher education. In E. Minnich, J. O'Barr, & R. Rosenfeld (Eds.), Reconstructing the academy: Women's education and women's studies (pp. 36-68). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, G. L. (1989). Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status and new direction. Review of Educational Research, 59(3), 249-270.

- Anderson, G. L. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26 (1), 38-59.
- Anonymous. (1991). Sexual harassment: A female counseling student's experience. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69(6), 502-506.
- Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action: A guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, H. & Leland, C. (1991). Women of influence, women of vision: A cross-generational study of leaders and social change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baird, L. L. (1990). Campus climate: Using surveys for policy-making and understanding. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), Assessing academic climates and cultures (pp.35-45). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 68. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Bennett, S. B. & Shayner, J. A. (1988). The role of senior administrators in women's leadership development. In M. A. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 27-38). New Directions for Student Services, no. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Biaggio, M. K., Watts, D., & Brownell, A. (1990). Addressing sexual harassment: Strategies for prevention and change. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Blanshan, S. A. (1982). Activism, research, and policy: Sexual harassment. Initiatives, 46(2), 16-22.
- Booth-Butterfield, M. (1987). Communication script analysis: A four-part model for predicting perceptions of sexual harassment. In L. B. Nadler, M. K. Nadler & W. R. Todd-Mancillas (Eds.), Advances in gender and communication research (pp. 43-55). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Brewer, M. B. (1982). Further beyond nine to five: An integration and future directions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 149-158.

- Brown, B., Cochran, S. & Dalkey, N. (1969). The Delphi method, II: Structure of Experiments. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation.
- Brusberg, M. A. (1989). An investigation of sexual harassment, gender orientation, and job satisfaction. In C. M. Lont & S. A. Friedley (Eds.), Beyond boundaries: Sex and gender diversity in communication (pp. 189-203). Fairfax, VA.: George Mason University Press.
- Bruss, N. & Macedo, D. P. (1984). A conversation with Paulo Freire at the University of Massachusetts at Boston. Journal of Education, 166(3), 215-225.
- Bunning, R. L. (1979). The Delphi technique: A projection tool for serious inquiry. The 1979 annual handbook for group facilitators (pp. 174-181). La Jolla, CA: University Associates.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Butler, J. E. (1985). Complicating the question: Black studies and women's studies. In M. Schuster and S. Van Dyne (Eds.), Women's place in the academy: Transforming the liberal arts curriculum (pp. 83-86). Totowa, N. J.: Rowman & Allanhead.
- California State University, (1981). Executive order #345: Prohibition of sexual harassment. Long Beach: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.
- California State University, (1993, July). Campus climate progress report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Long Beach: The California State University, Office of the Chancellor.
- Carroll, L. & Ellis, K. L. (1989). Faculty attitudes toward sexual harassment: Survey results, survey process. Initiatives, 52(3), 35-41.
- Chamberlain, M. K. (Ed.). (1988). Women in academe: Progress and prospects. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cohen, L. P., Power, W., & Siconolfi, M. (1992). Sexual harassment is a serious problem in the financial industry. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 34-39). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

- Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/ Development Programs. (1989). Women student programs and services self assessment guide. College Park, MD: University of Maryland at College Park, Office of Student Affairs.
- Cranston, P. & Leonard, M. M. (1990). The relationship between undergraduates' experiences of campus micro-inequities and their self-esteem and aspiration. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 395-401.
- Cyphert, F. R. & Gant, W. L. (1971). The Delphi technique: A case study. Phi Delta Kappan, 52, 272-273.
- Dalkey, N. C. (1969). The Delphi method: An experimental study of group opinion. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation.
- Dalkey, N., Brown, B. & Cochran, S. (1969). The Delphi method, III: Use of self ratings to improve group estimates. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation.
- Dalkey, N. & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. Management Science, 9, 548-467.
- Davidson, N. (1992). Feminist legal definitions of sexual harassment will result in injustice. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 192-200). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- DeFour, D. C. (1990). The interface of racism and sexism on college campuses. In M. A. Paludi, (Ed.), Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus (pp. 45-52). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustavson, D. H. (1975). Group techniques for programming: A guide to nominal and group Delphi processes. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman.
- Demby, L. (1990). In her own voice: One woman student's experience with sexual harassment. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus (pp. 183-189). Albany: SUNY Press.
- DiBrito, F. G & Batchelor, S. W. (1988). Developing leadership potential through student activities and organizations. In M. A. Sagaria, (Ed.), Empowering women: leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 51-62). New Directions for Student Services, no. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Dietz-Uhler, B., & Murrell, A. (1992). College students' perceptions of sexual harassment: Are gender differences decreasing? Journal of College Student Development, 33, 540-546.
- Dodge, B. J. & Clark, R. E. (1977, April). Research on the Delphi technique. Educational Technology, 58-60.
- Dziech, B., & Weiner, L. (1984). The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Eisler, R. (1987). The chalice and the blade: Our history, our future. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Enzer, S. (1983). New directions in futures methodology. In J. L. Morrison, W. L. Renfro & W. I. Boucher (Eds.), Applying methods and techniques of futures research (pp. 69-83). New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Erdos, P. L. (1983). Professional mail surveys (2nd ed.). Malabar, Florida: Robert Krieger Publishing Company.
- Equal Opportunity Commission. (1980, November). Guidelines on discrimination because of sex. 29 CFR Part 1604. 11(a).
- Ezell, A. S. & Rogers, J. K. (1978). Futuring technologies in education; Delphi technique. College Student Journal, 13, 122-126.
- Farley, L. (1978). Sexual shakedown: The sexual harassment of women on the job. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fay, B. (1987). Critical social science: Liberation and its limits. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990). Sexual harassment: The definition and measurement of a construct. In M. A. Paludi, (Ed.), Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus (pp. 21-44). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32, 152-175.
- Foster, M. (1985). A curriculum for all? The relationship between racism, feminism and schooling: a personal view. In G. Weiner, (Ed.), Just a bunch of girls: Feminist approaches to schooling (pp. 40-49). Philadelphia: Open University Press.

- Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books.
- Foster, W. (1989). Toward a critical practice of leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 39-620). London: Falmer
- Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. & Simon, R. (1984). Curriculum study and cultural politics. Journal of Education, 166(3), 226-238.
- Goodwin, M. P. Roscoe, B. Rose, M. & Repp, S. E. (1989). Sexual harassment: Experiences of university employees. Initiatives, 52(3), 25-33.
- Goleman, D. (1992). Men's insecurity causes sexual harassment. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 66-69). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Goodman, E. (1992). The "reasonable woman" is an effective standard to establish. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 152-154). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Grauer, S. R. (1989). Think globally, act locally: A Delphi study of educational leadership through the development of international resources in the local community. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, San Diego, California.
- Gutek, B. A., & Cohen, A. G. (1987). Sex ratios, sex role spillover, and sex at work: A comparison of men's and women's experiences. Human Relations, 40(2), 97-115.
- Gutek, B. A., Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.
- Gutek, B. A., Morasch, B., & Cohen, A. G. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behavior in a work setting. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22(1), 30-48.
- Hall, R. M. & Sandler, B. R. (1982). The classroom climate: a chilly one for women? Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges.

- Hall, R. M. & Sandler, B. R. (1984). Out of the classroom: A chilly campus climate for women? Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges.
- Harman, A. J. & Press, S. J. (1975). Collecting and analyzing expert group judgment data. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation.
- Harman, W. W. (1976). An incomplete guide to the future. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Harman, W. W. (1988). Global mind change: The promise of the last years of the twentieth century. Indianapolis: Knowledge Systems, Inc.
- Hartman, A. (1981). Reaching consensus using the Delphi technique. Educational Leadership, 38, 495-497.
- Hawkesworth, M. E. (1990). Beyond oppression: Feminist theory and political strategy. New York: Continuum Publishing Co.
- Helgesen, S. (1990). The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Helly, D. O. (1990). Institutional strategies: Creating a sexual harassment panel. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus (pp. 231-250). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Helmer, O. (1964). Convergence of expert consensus through feedback. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation.
- Helmer, O. (1966). The use of the Delphi technique in problems of educational innovations. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation.
- Helmer, O. (1967). Analysis of the future: The Delphi method. Santa Monica, California: The RAND Corporation.
- Helmer, O. (1983). Looking forward: A guide to futures research. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Helmer, O. & Rescher, N. (1959). On the epistemology of the inexact sciences. Management Science, 1, 25-52.
- Heydinger, R. B. (1983). Institutional research and planning: Is futures research the next step? In J. L. Morrison, W. L. Renfro, W. I. Boucher (Eds.), Applying methods and techniques of futures

- research (85-98). *New Directions for Institutional Research*, no. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Hill, A. (1992). Sexual harassment is a serious problem. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 24-27). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Hindus, M. (1990). Peer counseling. Initiatives, 52(4), 47.
- Hoffman, F. L. (1986). Sexual harassment in academia. Harvard Educational Review, 56(2), 105-121.
- Hotelling, K. (1991). Sexual harassment: A problem shielded by silence. Journal of Counseling Development, 69(6), 497-501.
- Howard, S. (1991). Organizational resources for addressing sexual harassment. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69(6), 507-511.
- Hughes, J. O., & Sandler, B. R. (1988). Peer harassment: Hassles for women on campus. Washington, DC: Center for Women Policy Studies.
- Jensen, I. W., & Gutek, B. A. (1982). Attribution and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 121-136.
- Jonassen, E. O. & Stripling, P. O. (1977). Priorities for community college student personnel services during the next decade. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, (2), 83-86.
- Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A. G., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I. P., & Surrey, J. L. (1991). Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Josselson, R. (1990) Finding herself: Pathways to identity development in women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Judd, R. C. (1970). Delphi method: Computerized oracle accelerates consensus formation. College and University Business, 49, 30-34.
- Judd, R. C. (1972). Forecasting to consensus gathering: Delphi grows up to college needs. College and University Business, 53, 35-43.
- Kahn, E. D., & Robbins, L. (1985). Social-psychological issues in sex discrimination. Journal of Social Issues, 41(4), 135-154.

- Kantrowitz, B. (1992). Is sexual harassment a serious problem? In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 16-23). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Kaplan, D. A. (1993, November). New standards for sexual harassment. Newsweek, p. 34.
- Kendall, G. A. (1992). The sexual revolution caused sexual harassment. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 77-80). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. Sex Roles, 15(9/10), 535-549.
- Keyes, L. N. & Simmons, M. A. (1992). Gender issues programming for men. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 274-275.
- Klein, S. S., Russo, L. N., Tittle, C. K., Schmuck, P. A., Campbell, P. B., Blackwell, P. J., Murray, S. R., Dwyer, C. A., Lockheed, M. E., Landers, B., & Simonson, J. R. (1985). Summary and recommendation for the continued achievement of sex equity in and through education. In Klein, S. S. (Ed.), Handbook for achieving sex equity through education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Krohne, K. A. (1991). The effect of sexual harassment on female naval officers: A phenomenological study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Krohne, K. A. (1992). Sexual harassment is a serious problem in the U. S. Navy. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 40-45). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Lee, L. A., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). The development and evaluation of a sexual harassment inventory. Journal of Counseling Development, 69(6), 512-517.
- Leo, J. (1992). Broad definitions of sexual harassment threaten men. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 176-178). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Linstone, H. A. (1975). Eight basic pitfalls: A checklist. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), The Delphi method: Techniques and applications (pp. 573-586). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Linstone, H. A. (1978). The Delphi technique. In J. Fowles (Ed.), Handbook of futures research (pp. 273-300). Westport, CN: Greenwood.

- Linstone, H. A. & Turoff, M. (1975). Introduction. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), The Delphi method: Techniques and applications (pp. 3-12). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Linstone, H. A. & Turoff, M. (1975). Introduction. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), The Delphi method: Techniques and applications (pp. 325-326). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Loye, D. (1978). The knowable future. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1979). Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sex discrimination. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1992). Feminist legal definitions of sexual harassment can be effectively used in the courts. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 155-163). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- McCarthy, S. J. (1992). Current sexual harassment definitions harm women. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 164-166). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- McCormick, N., Adams-Bohley, S., Peterson, S., & Gaeddert, W. (1989). Sexual harassment of students at a small college. Initiatives, 52(3), 15-23.
- Malley, P., Gallagher, R. & Brown, S. H. (1992). Ethical problems in university and college counseling centers: A Delphi study. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 238-244.
- Martino, J. P. (1983). Technological forecasting for decision making (2nd ed.). New York: Elsevier Science Publishing Co.
- Meek, P. M., & Lynch, A. Q. (1982). Establishing an informal grievance procedure for cases of sexual harassment of students. Initiatives, 46(2), 30-33.
- Mezey, S. G. (1992). Broad legal definitions help women fight harassment. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 135-142). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Miller, J. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Minnich, E., O'Barr, J., & Rosenfeld, R. (Eds.). (1988). Reconstructing the academy: Women's education and women's studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Moore, K. M., & Amey, M. J. (1988) Some faculty leaders are born women. In M. A. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 39-50). New Directions for Student Services, no. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Association of Women in Education. (1992). About Women on Campus. 1(3), 4-6.
- National Association of Women in Education. (1993a). About Women on Campus. 2(3), 9-10.
- National Association of Women in Education. (1993b). About Women on Campus. 2(4), 9-11.
- National Association of Women in Education. (1994). About Women on Campus. 3(1), 1-2.
- Neff, L. A., & Harwood, P. C. (1990). Creating empowering campus climates for women. Initiatives, 53(3), 31-39.
- Olson, C. & McKinney, K. (1989). Processes inhibiting the reduction of sexual harassment in academe: An alternative explanation. Initiatives. 52(3), 7-13.
- Onesto, L. (1992). Capitalism causes sexual harassment. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 70-76). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Paludi, M. A. (1990). Creating new taboos in the academy: Faculty responsibility in preventing sexual harassment. Initiatives, 52(4), 29-34.
- Paludi, M. A. & DeFour, D. C. (1989). Research on sexual harassment in the academy; Definitions, findings, constraints, responses. Initiatives. 52(3), 43-49.
- Paludi, M. A., Grossman, M, Scott, C. A., Kinderman, J., Matula, S., Ostwald, J., Dovan, J., & Mulcahy, D. (1990). Myths and realities: Sexual harassment on campus. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Parson, L. A., Sands, R. G., & Duane, J. (1991). The campus climate for women faculty at a public university. Initiatives, 54(1), 19-27.
- Penelope, J. (1990). Speaking freely: Unlearning the lies of the father's tongues. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Peters, L. (1990). A student's experience. Initiatives, 52(4), 17-21.

- Peterson, M. W. & Spencer, M. G. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.) Assessing academic climates and cultures (pp. 3-18).
- Pheterson, G. (1988). Alliances between women: Overcoming internalized oppression and internalized domination. In E. Minnich, J. O'Barr, and R. Rosenfeld (Eds.) Reconstructing the academy: Women's education and women's studies (pp. 139-153). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Powell, G. N. (1986). Effects of sex role identity and sex on definitions of sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 14(1/2), 9-19.
- Quina, K. (1990). The victimizations of women. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.) Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus (pp. 93-102). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Rabinowitz, V. C. (1990). Coping with sexual harassment. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.) Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus (pp. 103-118). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Rhodes, F. H. T. (1990). The moral imperative to prevent sexual harassment on campus. Initiatives, 52 (4), 1-4.
- Rice, J. K. (1990). Separation and the education of women. Initiatives, 53(3), 5-15.
- Rich, A. (1975). Toward a woman-centered university. In F. Howe (Ed.), Women and the power to change (pp. 15-46). A volume of essays sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Robertson, C., Dyer, C. & Campbell, D. (1988). Campus harassment: Sexual Harassment policies and procedures at Institutions of higher learning. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 13(4), 792-812.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York: Praeger.
- Sackman, H. (1975). Delphi critique. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Sadker, M. P. & Sadker, D. M. (1982). Sex equity handbook for schools (2nd ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Sagaria, M. A. (1988). The case for empowering women as leaders in higher education. In M. A. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women:

- Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 5-11). New Directions for Student Services, no. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sagaria, M. A. & Koogle, L., (1988). Greater than the sum of its parts: Strategy and resources. In M. A. Sagaria (Ed.), Empowering women: Leadership development strategies on campus (pp. 89-103). New Directions for Student Services, no. 44. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Salisbury, J., Ginorio, A. B., Remick, H., & Stringer, D. M. (1986). Counseling victims of sexual harassment. Psychotherapy, 23(2), 316-324.
- Sandler, B. R. (1990). Sexual harassment: A new issue for institutions. Initiatives, 52(4), 5-10.
- Sandler, B. R. & Hall, R. M. (1986). The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Washington D. C.: American Association of Colleges.
- Scheele, S. (1975). Reality construction as a product of Delphi interaction. In H. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), Delphi method: Techniques and application (pp. 37-71). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Shavlik, D. & Touchton J. (1984). Toward a new era of leadership: The national identification program. In A. Tinsley, C., Secor, & S. Kaplan, (Eds.), Women in higher education administration (pp. 47-58). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shavlik, D. & Touchton J. (1988). Women as leaders. In M. F. Green (Ed.), Leaders for a new era: Strategies for higher education (pp. 99-116). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.
- Shor, I. (1980). Critical teaching and everyday life. Boston: South End Press.
- Siegel, D. L. (1992). Legal definitions of sexual harassment must be broad. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 143-151). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Smith, K. K. (1982). Philosophical problems in thinking about organizational change. In P. S. Goodman (Ed.), Change in organizations: New perspectives on theory, research, and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Solomon, B. (1985). In the company of educated women. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Somers, A. (1982). Sexual harassment in academe: Legal issues and definitions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 23-32.
- Stein, N., Marshall, N. L., & Tropp, L. R. (1993). Secrets in public: Sexual harassment in our schools. Wellesley, MA: Center for Research on Women at Wellesley College.
- Stimpson, C. R. (1989). Over-reaching: Sexual harassment and education. Initiatives, 52(3), 1-5.
- Strauss, H. & Zeigler, L. H. (1975). The Delphi technique and its uses in social science research. Journal of Creative Behavior, 9, 253-259.
- Tangri, S., Burt, M. R., & Johnson, L. B. Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.
- Thomas, L. (1980). The medusa and the snail. New York: Bantam Books.
- Thorner, P. M. (1989). Toward equity: Starting to thaw the chilly climate for women. Initiatives, 52(2), 1-7.
- Tiedemann, D. A. (1985). Media services in higher education: A Delphi study for the 1990's. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, San Diego, California.
- Till, F. J. (1980). Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students. Washington DC: The National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.
- Touchton, J. G., & Davis, L. (1991). Fact book on women in higher education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Turoff, M. (1975). The policy Delphi. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), The Delphi method: Techniques and applications, (pp. 84-101). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Twombly, S. B. (1991). New directions for studying women in higher education: Lessons from feminist phase theory. Initiatives, 54(1), 9-17.

- Uhl, N. P. (1983). Using the Delphi technique in institutional planning. New Directions for Institutional Research, 37, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- U. S. Congress. (1972). Title IX: Article 981, Education Amendment. Washington D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1980.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem? Office of Merit Systems Review and Studies.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1988). Sexual harassment in the federal government: An update. Office of Merit Systems Review and Studies.
- University of California, Santa Cruz. (1993). Sexual harassment prevention program :1992-93 annual report. University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Vela, N. (1989). A Delphi study of California community college counselors' responsibilities and competencies for the 1990's as perceived by chief student services administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, San Diego, California.
- Wagner, K. C. (1990). Prevention and intervention: Developing campus policy and procedures. Initiatives, 52(4), 37-45.
- Wagschall, P. H. (1983). Judgmental forecasting techniques and institutional planning : An example. In J. L. Morrison, W. L. Renfro & S. I. Boucher (Eds.), Applying methods and techniques of futures research (pp. 39-49). New Direction for Institutional Research, no. 39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weaver, W. T. (1971). Delphi forecasting method. Phi Delta Kappan, 1, 267-271.
- Webb, S. L. (1992). Broad definitions have been successfully used in the courts. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 126-134). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Weiler, K. (1988). Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power. South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.
- Weiss, M. (1992). Sexual harassment definitions discriminate against men. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 179-187). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

- Wetherfield, A. (1990). Sexual harassment: The current state of the law governing educational institutions. Initiatives, 52(4), 23-27.
- Wilson, K. R., & Kraus, L. A. (1983). Sexual harassment in the university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(3), 219-224.
- Wolf, N. (1992). Unclear laws make sexual harassment more prevalent. In B. Leone, (Ed.), Sexual harassment (pp. 84-89). San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

Appendix A
Round Zero
Demographic Questionnaire

**Creating Campus Climates
That Are Free From Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

Your responses to the the following items are requested for the development of an overall profile of the respondents and institutions participating in this Delphi study. Your specific responses will be kept anonymous in the development of the general profile.

1. Name: _____
2. Institution _____
3. Student enrollment at your institution (full time equivalent)
Circle one:

Less than 1,000	1,001-5,000	5,001-10,000
10,001-15,000	15,001-20,000	20,000+
4. Job title _____ Department _____
5. Brief description of major job related responsibilities: _____
6. Years in current position _____
7. Number of years working in higher education _____
8. Number of years working in higher education addressing issues of educational equity for women _____
9. Telephone number(s) (_____) _____ (_____) _____
Best times to reach you _____
FAX number (_____) _____
10. Gender: (circle one) Female Male
11. Age: (circle one) 20-30 31-40 41-50
 51-60 61-70 70+

12. Academic degree(s) you have earned. Please circle all that apply and note your major or specialization.

	<u>Major/specialization</u>
Bachelor's degree	
Master's degree	
Doctoral degree	

13. Please list the names of any organizations that you currently belong to which deal specifically with educational equity for women:

Name of organization	Number of years as a member	Level of involvement (Circle one)	
a. _____	_____	Member	Officer
b. _____	_____	Member	Officer
c. _____	_____	Member	Officer
d. _____	_____	Member	Officer
e. _____	_____	Member	Officer

14. Please note which of the following experiences you have had dealing with the issue of sexual harassment in higher education. Please check all that apply.

- a. _____ Handle sexual harassment complaints/grievances
- b. _____ Counsel victims of sexual harassment
- c. _____ Discipline perpetrators of sexual harassment
- d. _____ Conduct research on sexual harassment
- e. _____ Member of a committee/task force on sexual harassment
- f. _____ Train/educate students on issues of sexual harassment
- g. _____ Train/educate staff/faculty on issues of sexual harassment
- h. _____ Write articles/books about sexual harassment issues
- i. _____ Develop policy concerning sexual harassment
- j. _____ Other (please list):

15. Do you have any current plans for the fall semester to be away from campus for more than one week? If so, please list dates:
16. Please enclose a copy of your current campus policy on sexual harassment.

Thank you for your responses.

Please return this demographic questionnaire with your consent form in the enclosed stamped envelope by July 29, 1993 to:

**Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator
8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, CA 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202**

**Appendix B
Round Zero
Demographic Questionnaire Results**

**Creating Campus Climates
That Are Free From Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

1. Name:

2. Institution: 13 out of 19 possible campuses- 68.4%
(Pretesting was completed using San Diego State University as the pretest site. In all, 14 of the 20 campuses (70%) were represented in the study.)

Chico-3	Fullerton -2	Hayward	San Luis Obispo
Humboldt	Los Angeles	Northridge-2	Pomona -2
Sonoma	San Francisco	San Jose	San Marcos
Sacramento			

3. Student enrollment at your institution (full time equivalent)
Circle one:

Less than 1,000- (0)	0%	1,001-5,000- (1)	5.5%
5,001-10,000 (3)	16.6%	10,001-15,000 (5)	27.7%
15,001-20,000 (6)	33.3%	20,000+ (3)	16.6%

4. Job title:

<u>Academic Affairs</u>	38.8%
<u>Faculty</u> 22.2%	<u>Administration</u> 16.6%
History	Asst. Vice President for Institutional Research
Political Science	Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs
Health Sciences	Director, Academic Relations
Child Development	
<u>Business Affairs</u> 22.2%	
Vice President, Information Resources Management	
Director, Human Resources	
Buyer	
Personnel Administrator	
<u>Students Affairs</u> 22.2%	
Associate Director, University Housing Services	
Program Director, Associated Students' Women's Center	
Administrative Secretary	
Publications Coordinator	
<u>Affirmative Action</u> 16.6%	
Director (2)	
Affirmative Action Officer	

Master's degree: Completed- (13) 72.2%
 In progress- (4) 22.2%
 No answer- (2) 11.1%
 (One person completed two Master's degrees)

Business - 1
 Management/Quantitative Methods
 Chemical Engineering - 1
 Education - 2
 Counseling & Guidance
 Counseling/Student Personnel
 English - 3
 English
 Creative Writing
 English Literature
 History - 1
 U.S. Minority Cultural History
 Jurisprudence and Social Policy - 1
 Political Science - 1
 Psychology - 3
 Psychology
 Cognitive/Developmental
 Counseling
 Public Administration - 2
 Public Health - 1
 Sociology - 1
 Gender, Race, and Ethnic Relations

Doctoral degree: Completed (10) 55.5%
 In progress (0) 0%
 No answer (8) 44.4%

Chemical Engineering - 1
 Education - 1
 Higher Education Administration
 English - 2
 English Literature
 Modern Poetry
 History - 1
 U.S. Westward Movement
 International Business Law (J.D.) - 1
 Political Science - 1
 Psychology - 2
 Social/Personality
 Cognitive/Developmental
 Public Health - 1

13. Please list the names of any organizations that you currently belong to which deal specifically with educational equity for women:

Name of organization	Number of years as a member	Level of involvement	
(Circle one)			
(Numbers in parentheses indicate how many respondents belong to an organization.)			
ACPA/Standing Committee for Women	(1) 2	Member 1	Officer
Ability Connection	(1) 1	Member	Officer 1
American Assoc. for Affirmative Action	(1) 15	Member 1	Officer
American Assoc. for Higher Education	(1) 10	Member 1	Officer
American Assoc. of University Women	(3) 6	Member 3	Officer
Amer Poli Sci Assn/Section on Women	(1) 3	Member 1	Officer
American Society for PA/Women's Issues	(1) 7	Member 1	Officer
CCWHP	(1) 10	Member 1	Officer
CSLA CSW	(1) 4	Member 1	Officer
Calif. Assn. of Affirmative Action Officers	(1) 10	Member 1	Officer
California Concerns	(1) 1	Member	Officer 1
California Faculty Association	(1) 2	Member 1	Officer
California Women in Higher Education	(1) 5	Member 1	Officer
Center for Women/Ethnic Issues	(1) 3	Member	Officer 1
Commission on the Status of Women	(1) 7	Member 1	Officer
Community Affirmative Action Council	(1) 11	Member 1	Officer
Community Local Information Center	(1) 4	Member	Officer 1
CUPA	(1) 16	Member	Officer 1
LA Basin Equal Opportunity League	(1) 13	Member 1	Officer
League of Women Voters	(1) 8	Member 1	Officer
Modern Language Assn. (Female Caucus)	(1) 2	Member 1	Officer
NWPC	(1) 10	Member 1	Officer
National Assn. of Women in Education	(1) 1	Member 1	Officer
National Organization for Women	(2) 11	Member 2	Officer
National Women's Studies Assn.	(1) 14	Member 1	Officer
New Voice (women's newspaper)	(1) 2	Member	Officer 1
Re-entry Council	(1) 3	Member 1	Officer
SLO County Commission/Status of Women	(1) 3	Member	Officer 1
Sexual Harassment Committee, CSU, Chico	(1) 1	Member 1	Officer
Western Assoc. of Women Historians	(1) 19	Member	Officer 1
Women's Center	(1) 3	Member 1	Officer
Women's Council of the State University	(9) 35	Member 5	Officer 4
Women's Faculty Association	(2) 2	Member	Officer 2
Women's Studies at CSU	(1) 3	Member	Officer 1

Respondents currently belong to 34 organizations which deal with educational equity issues.

Respondents currently serve in 17 offices in 11 of these organizations.

Respondents have been members of these organizations for a total of 247 years.

Mean number of years involved in these organizations= 13.7 years

14. Please note which of the following experiences you have had dealing with the issue of sexual harassment in higher education.

Please check all that apply.

a.	14	77.7%	Handle sexual harassment complaints/ grievances
b.	14	77.7%	Counsel victims of sexual harassment
c.	4	22.2%	Discipline perpetrators of sexual harassment
d.	10	55.5%	Conduct research on sexual harassment
e.	14	77.7%	Member of a committee/task force on sexual harassment
f.	10	55.5%	Train/educate students on issues of sexual harassment
g.	11	61.1%	Train/educate staff/faculty on issues of sexual harassment
h.	3	16.6%	Write articles/books about sexual harassment issues
i.	11	61.1%	Develop policy concerning sexual harassment
j.	1	5.5%	Other (please list): Develop sexual harassment training pamphlets and brochures

15. Do you have any current plans for the fall semester to be away from campus for more than one week? If so, please list dates:

16. Please enclose a copy of your current campus policy on sexual harassment.

Fourteen campuses provided campus policies on sexual harassment including one of the respondents who later withdrew from the study.

Appendix C

Round One Delphi Instrument

Creating Campus Climates That Are Free From Sexual Harassment: Implications For Leaders In Higher Education

The literature indicates that sexual harassment in academia in the United States is a widespread and serious problem negatively affecting all women in the campus community. This study is focused upon identifying strategies that can bring about substantive and important change at institutions of higher learning to create campus climates for female students which are free from sexual harassment.

In answering this questionnaire, please consider all sources of sexual harassment toward female students including harassment from faculty, staff, administrators as well as other students. Include all forms of harassment women experience both in the classroom and working on class related projects, as well as in their campus lives outside the classroom such as in residence halls, eating areas, and involvement in school related activities and programs.

For the purposes of this research, please include all of the following behaviors as sexual harassment:

Gender harassment

Generalized sexist remarks and behavior which convey insulting, degrading, or sexist attitudes about women.

Seductive behaviors

Unwanted, inappropriate, and offensive sexual advances.

Sexual bribery

The solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behavior by the promise of reward.

Sexual coercion

The coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment.

Questions for round one of the Delphi study

1. What two or three things most need to change in order to create university and college campus climates for female undergraduate students which are free from sexual harassment?

2. What two or three things most need to change in order to create university and college campus climates for female graduate students which are free from sexual harassment?

NOTE: For those strategies that are the same for undergraduate and graduate students in item number 1, please note the strategy you identified above with a ** symbol to the left of the strategy and it will be included in the answer to this question.

3. What strategies for reducing sexual harassment of female undergraduate students have you observed or heard about in your experience in higher education? These strategies may have been used by a particular institution, organization or a specific individual.

Please list all that you can think of, whether or not you feel that they were effective in addressing the issue.

4. What strategies for reducing sexual harassment of female graduate students have you observed or heard about in your experience in higher education? These strategies may have been used by a particular institution, organization or a specific individual.

Please list all that you can think of, whether or not you feel that they were effective in addressing the issue.

NOTE: For those strategies that are the same for undergraduate students in item number 3, please note the strategy you identified above with a ** symbol to the left of the strategy and it will be included in the answer to this question.

Appendix D

Round One Letter of Transmittal

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

**Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, California 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202

August 28, 1993

Dear project participant,

We are now ready to begin the first round of the Delphi study, but first, you may be interested in reading about the expert panel that has been selected to participate in the study with you. Here is some of the information from the demographic survey each panelist completed earlier this summer:

1. Fourteen out of a possible 19 campuses are represented by the panel (San Diego State University served as a pretest site and is not part of the study).
2. Twenty-one experts have agreed to participate in the project.
3. The panelists have positions in the following areas:
 - a. Nine are in Academic Affairs: six are faculty members (two of which are department chairs) and three are administrators (in institutional research, faculty affairs and academic relations).
 - b. Four work as administrators in non-academic areas such as information systems, finance, and personnel.
 - c. Four work in various student affairs or student services roles.
 - d. Four panelists have their major responsibilities in affirmative action.
4. The 21 panelists have a combined 312 years working in higher education and a combined 209 years working in higher education addressing issues of educational equity.
5. Fifteen Master's Degrees and have been completed by panelists and 5 experts are currently working on a Master's Degree. Twelve of the panelists indicated

completion of a doctorate or terminal degree in eight different academic areas. Psychology (4) and English (2) had more than one response.

6. Panelists identified thirty-five different organizations that they currently belong to that specifically address issues of educational equity for women. Seventeen panelists indicated that they were currently an officer in such an organization.
7. Panelists indicated that they had had experience dealing with the issue of sexual harassment as noted below:
 - a. 17 Handle sexual harassment complaints/grievances
 - b. 17 Counsel victims of sexual harassment
 - c. 4 Discipline perpetrators of sexual harassment
 - d. 12 Conduct research on sexual harassment
 - e. 17 Member of a committee/task force on sexual harassment
 - f. 13 Train/educate students on issues of sexual harassment
 - g. 14 Train/educate staff/faculty on issues of sexual harassment
 - h. 4 Write articles/books about sexual harassment issues
 - i. 14 Develop policy concerning sexual harassment
 - j. 2 Other (please list):

Victim of sexual harassment numerous times, most recently by a male colleague

Develop sexual harassment training pamphlets and brochures

The panel represents a great deal of experience and knowledge about educational equity issues for women, and specifically the issue of sexual harassment. No doubt the panel will generate some innovative and interesting strategies by the end of the study.

Completing the first questionnaire

Enclosed is the "round one" questionnaire in the Delphi study. The pretest group found that it generally took 25-30 minutes to complete this survey. **Please postmark your responses in the enclosed self-addressed envelope or fax your response to me no later than September 10.**

In order to increase the confidentiality of your responses, you have been assigned a code # for the remainder of the study. Your assigned number is _____.

If all goes according to plan, I hope to compile the results of the first survey and send you the second round questionnaire so that you receive it by the end of September. The second round will give you feedback as to the combined responses of the panel and ask you some questions which were generated by the results of the first round.

If you have any questions about the study, please contact me at the number indicated on the letterhead or the enclosed survey. If I am unavailable when you call, please leave me a message with your question and the best time to reach you, and I will get back to you as soon as possible. (This number has Voice Message Service and can be contacted at any time that is convenient for you to call.)

Thank you for your support of this project, I greatly appreciate your time to fill out the survey and return it to me promptly.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

Appendix E Round One Dunning Letter

**Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator**

**Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

**8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, California 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202**

September 15, 1993

Dear project participant,

The first round survey responses of the research project are currently being analyzed. Early returns of the surveys are resulting in some interesting patterns and rich observations and suggestions for dealing with this important issue.

The survey has a small sample of educational leaders; therefore each survey returned is of particular importance to the the completion of the project and the writing of my dissertation.

If your survey has already been mailed, you have my sincere thanks. If not, won't you please fill it out and postmark it or fax it to me in the next few days? Hearing from you within the next week will enable me to include your responses in the compilation of the second round of the survey which will be mailed to participants in approximately two weeks.

Thank you for your continued support of this project.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Mitchell
Doctoral Candidate
University of San Diego

Appendix F Round Two Delphi Instrument

Creating Campus Climates That Are Free From Sexual Harassment: Implications For Leaders In Higher Education

PART A. SUMMARY OF ROUND ONE

Section I:

The first two questions in round one asked what most needs to change regarding sexual harassment. The following lists were generated by the panel; note that most items pertained to both undergraduate and graduate students, but some items were generated that pertained only to graduate students.

- a. Please select four responses from the list below for undergraduate students (UND) and four responses for graduate students (GRAD) that indicate what you feel most needs to change for each group of students.

UND	GRAD	
1. _____	_____	Female toleration of sexual harassment
2. _____	_____	Lack of student awareness of sexual harassment/peer harassment
3. _____	_____	Lack of faculty/staff awareness of issue of sexual harassment
4. _____	_____	Lack of faculty/staff willingness to assist students in confronting harassers
5. _____	_____	Societal attitudes regarding women
6. _____	_____	Lack of aggressive reporting policies and procedures
7. _____	_____	Behavior of males (faculty, staff, students) toward women
8. _____	_____	Reporting processes that are not "user-friendly"
9. _____	_____	Lack of faculty/student amorous relationships policies
10. _____	_____	Lack of incentives/rewards for learning about and/or addressing the issue.
11. _____	_____	Lack of feedback on resolved situations.
12. _____	_____	Lack of peer pressure and open discussion of issue on campus
13. _____	_____	Independence of faculty (high level of control over classrooms/students)
14. _____	_____	Student failure to distinguish between respect of and reverence of faculty
15. _____	_____	Failure to alert students to the dangers of dating/sexual alliances with faculty
16. _____	_____	Low proportion of female faculty and administrators
17. _____	_____	Curriculum primarily focused upon male experiences and perspectives
18. _____	_____	Acceptance of sexual harassment as normal behavior
19. _____	_____	Students' lack of empowerment to take corrective action
20. _____	_____	Lack of general respect for human dignity
21. _____	_____	Lack of strong campus sanctions for exploitation of/acts against women
22. _____	_____	Lack of funding for the support of women's programs, research, etc.
23. _____	_____	Lack of support from administration regarding climate issues
24. _____	_____	Other:

GRAD only

25. _____ Lack of awareness of issue by faculty who teach graduate students
 26. _____ Over-dependence of students in relationship to graduate
 faculty/advisers
 27. _____ Lack of graduate program personnel strongly articulating "no
 tolerance"
 28. _____ Other:

- b. **Please add any clarifying comments you may have for your choices and/or whether or not graduate students and undergraduate students have different needs regarding this issue:**

Section II:

The third and fourth questions in Round One focused upon strategies panel members were aware of regarding sexual harassment. The following lists were generated by the panel; note that most items pertained to both undergraduate and graduate students, but one item was generated that pertained only to graduate students.

- a. **Please select four responses from the list below for undergraduate students (UND) and four responses for graduate students (GRAD) that indicate what strategies you feel are particularly effective.**

UND GRAD

- | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|--|
| 1. | _____ | _____ | Educational programming for students on the issue |
| 2. | _____ | _____ | Printed materials: brochures, flyers, news articles, student handbook, etc. |
| 3. | _____ | _____ | Designated personnel to handle complaints |
| 4. | _____ | _____ | Mandated training for faculty/administrators/staff on the topic |
| 5. | _____ | _____ | Support groups for victims |
| 6. | _____ | _____ | Faculty/student amorous relationships policies |
| 7. | _____ | _____ | Active and strong support of policies from top levels of administration |
| 8. | _____ | _____ | Extensive campus study on the extent of the problem with findings used in presentations, publication materials and policy revisions. |
| 9. | _____ | _____ | Public repudiation of sexual harassment by male/female faculty leaders |
| 10. | _____ | _____ | Increased numbers of female faculty, staff and administrators |
| 11. | _____ | _____ | Accused perpetrators sign agreement which is kept on file at university |
| 12. | _____ | _____ | "Tell Someone" campaign |
| 13. | _____ | _____ | Designated position on campus dedicated to this issue alone |
| 14. | _____ | _____ | Programs on personal power/empowerment |
| 15. | _____ | _____ | Having faculty read policy on sexual harassment in classes |
| 16. | _____ | _____ | Aggressive campus policies and procedures specific to sexual harassment |

17. _____ _____ Strong support for women's studies and a women's center
 18. _____ _____ Workshops on non-harassing communication between men and women
 19. _____ _____ Publicize outcomes of cases while respecting confidentiality issues
 20. _____ _____ Involving unions to inform members that harassment is indefensible
 21. _____ _____ Perpetrator required to meet with supervisor to address the problem
 22. _____ _____ Distribution of printed material on "chilly climate" issues for women
 23. _____ _____ Sexual Harassment Prevention Committee for consultations/training
 24. _____ _____ Other:

GRAD only

25. _____ _____ Grad student organizations where women share information about perpetrators and their experiences to raise student awareness level
 26. _____ _____ Other:

- b. Please add any clarifying comments you may have as to your rationale in selecting these strategies as being particularly effective.**

Section III.

The fifth question inquired of panel members what problems were encountered when the strategies were implemented.

- a. Select the three problems you think are most salient to the issue by circling the number to the left of the item from the list below:**
1. Socialized acceptance of behavior
 2. Lack of university funding to support change efforts
 3. Superficial training sessions
 4. Ineffective intervention options
 5. Denial that the problem really exists on campus or in a particular department
 6. Active and organized resistance/hostility of male faculty
 7. Apathy toward the issue
 8. Legal attacks against procedures implemented on the campus
 9. Time consuming nature of dealing effectively with the problem.
 10. Resultant conflict over the importance of the issue on campus.
 11. Resistance to mandatory training
 12. Backlash against women and/or women studies programs
 13. Women faculty become overworked.
 14. Lack of feedback as to whether people read printed materials

- b. Please add your comments as to what strategies might be employed to address the problems that you selected above.

Section IV.

The sixth question in round one asked what techniques have been used to determine the effectiveness of current strategies. Five types of evaluative techniques are currently being used with the strategies identified in Section II:

1. Recording numbers of inquiries, complaints, and resolutions
 2. Program and workshop evaluations
 3. Designated personnel overseeing the issue
 4. Survey of faculty, staff, and students as to awareness of policy and procedures
 5. Survey to establish baseline data followed by additional surveys to measure campus change efforts
- a. Are there other current evaluative strategies/programs on your campus that could be applied to this issue such as adding sexual harassment items to current annual surveys or questionnaires?
Please comment:

Section V.

- a. Please indicate your assessment as to the current climate for female students in 1993 on most CSU campuses by circling a number on a scale of 1-5 as noted below:

1	2	3	4	5
Climate that fosters/encourages sexual harassment and is generally hostile to women students.				Climate that is free from sexual harassment and generally supportive of women students

- b. Please indicate your assessment as to what you believe the climate for female students on most CSU campuses will be in 50 years by circling a number on the scale of 1-5 as noted below:

1	2	3	4	5
Climate that fosters/encourages sexual harassment and is generally hostile to women students.				Climate that is free from sexual harassment and generally supportive of women students

The last question in round one asked what new and innovative strategies could be developed for use in creating a new CSU campus in the 21st century that is free from sexual harassment. The following were generated by panel members:

1. Build a campus culture that strongly supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus
2. Harassment free models of teaching presented in new faculty orientation
3. No doors on offices (to discourage temptation)
4. Methods for faculty to alert colleagues about perpetrators or possible problems
5. Alert students to dangers of dating and/or sexual relationships with faculty
6. Include issue in required General Education courses on basic subjects
7. Woman-centered curriculum
8. Woman-centered student activities
9. Contractual arrangements with faculty/staff to treat women with respect
10. Elimination of contact sports
11. Demonstrated commitment to climate issues as a screening tool for campus positions
12. Suggest to students that some of their attire is "unprofessional"
13. Sponsor both a women's center and a men's center on campus
14. Interactive video used in classrooms for "distance learning".
15. Strong campus commitment to women who speak up against inappropriate behavior.
16. Other:

- c. Using a futuristic perspective regarding changes you anticipate in higher education in the next fifty years in such areas as demographics, technology, collective bargaining issues, budget concerns, etc., which three strategies above do you feel are most crucial to bringing about more supportive campus climates for women in the next century?

Please identify your choices by circling the number to the left of each item that you select and add any clarifying comments that you may have.

Choice #1:

Choice #2:

Choice #3:

PART II. CSU POLICY AND PROCEDURES ANALYSIS

A review of sexual harassment policies from the Chancellor's Office (Executive Order 345, 1981) and fourteen of the CSU campuses found a wide variance in what was included in these policies and the subsequent procedures for handling sexual harassment complaints.

In the following two sections, the first which focuses upon campus policy statements and the second upon campus procedures, please give your input as to how important it is to include each item in "ideal" campus policies and procedures.

SECTION A. Policy statements

- a. **Indicate the importance of each item as to inclusion in a campus policy on sexual harassment.**

Importance-Level Scale

Circle the numerical value indicating the level of importance below each item.

No importance	1	Very important	4
Little importance	2	Extremely important	5
Moderate importance	3		

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | A specific and clear definition of sexual harassment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Legal implications of sexual harassment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | Amorous relationships between faculty and current students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Timely and appropriate action when receiving a complaint | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Retaliatory action toward anyone filing a complaint | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Personnel failing to investigate a complaint | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Knowingly making false claims of sexual harassment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Periodic review of the policy by the President or his/her designee | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Specification of possible penalties for violations of the policy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | The issue of confidentiality regarding a case | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Using "reasonable woman's standard" to determine cases | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | The issue of peer sexual harassment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | Specific procedures for dealing with complaints | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | <u>Mandatory</u> training for administrative and supervisory personnel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | Education of campus community as to policy and procedures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. | Other: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- b. **Select what you believe are the three most important items by circling the numbers to the left of your chosen items. Please add any clarifying comments you may have about why you feel these particular items are most important:**

SECTION B.**a. Indicate the importance of each item as to inclusion in campus procedures for dealing with sexual harassment:**

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Specific personnel designated to address the issue | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Victims may remain anonymous while seeking information | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | A procedurally just framework | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Specific timelines for filing and resolving complaints | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | One person designated to coordinate complaint information | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | Incidence rates should be regularly reviewed by the President . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Alleged perpetrators should be informed of the complaint and given an opportunity to respond. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Investigative teams should have both a male and female | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Informal procedures should be used when appropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Formal procedures should be used when appropriate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | Complainants may choose an advisor or advocate to assist them | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | Clearly stated appeals procedures for victims and perpetrators | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | Other: _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

b. Select what you believe to be the three most important items by circling the numbers to the left of your chosen items. Please add any clarifying comments you may have about why you feel these particular items are most important:**PART III ADDITIONAL COMMENTS****a. Please add additional comments you may have about any item in round two of the survey or any aspect of this project that you would like to share with other panel members and/or the researcher:**

Thank you for your response to round two!

Please return this survey in the enclosed envelope or send by fax machine by

October 22

to

Susan E. Mitchell

Research Project Coordinator

8503 Summerdale Rd. #371

San Diego, CA 92126

(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202

Appendix G Round Two Letter of Transmittal

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

**Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, California 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202

October 7, 1993

Dear project participant,

Thank you for your response to the round one survey. You will find that the enclosed survey, which is a compilation of the responses from the first instrument, provides very thoughtful and interesting information for the panel to respond to in this second stage of the project.

Due to your expertise on issues of importance to women and the small sample utilized in this methodology, your continued participation in the project is very important. The enclosed instrument is lengthy because of the format used to include all the responses that were received; however, **let me assure you that it will only take about 20 minutes of your time to complete.**

The purpose of Round Two is for the expert panel to rate and rank the responses from the first round survey in order to begin building consensus among the panel. Additionally, I have developed a second section based upon an analysis of CSU campus policies that will give the panel an opportunity to indicate what items are most important to include in campus policies and procedures that undergird a supportive climate for women.

Round Three, which will be the final round of the study, will be mailed to you as soon as Round Two responses are received and summarized. With your prompt assistance, the third round can be mailed to the panel by the first week of November and collected prior to the holidays.

Please fill out the survey at your convenience within the next week and **return it to me** in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed for your convenience, or if you prefer, fax your response to me at (619) 594-6202 **no later than October 22**.

I fully understand what a busy life you lead and greatly appreciate your commitment to the project! As a small token of my appreciation, I have included another bookmark for you featuring Mary Church Terrell, a leader in the women's suffrage movement and a pioneer in civil rights for Black Americans. She is one of many American women who have inspired others to work for a better life for women everywhere.

I look forward to hearing from you by the 22nd.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

Appendix H Round Two Dunning Letter

**Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator**

**Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

**8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, California 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202**

October 20, 1993

Dear project participant,

The second round survey responses of the research project are currently being analyzed. If your survey has already been mailed, you have my sincere thanks. If not, won't you please fill it out and postmark it or fax it to me at the number above in the next day or two? The project has a small sample of educational leaders; therefore each survey returned is of particular importance to the completion of the project and the writing of my dissertation.

Hearing from you within the next week will enable me to include your responses in the compilation of the third round of the survey which will be mailed to participants in approximately two weeks. Early responses thus far have included some interesting "dialogue" and thought provoking comments for the panel to consider in the third round survey.

If you did not receive the second round survey, please contact me at (619) 594-4612 and I will send out another copy immediately. Additionally, if you have any questions about the project, please contact me at the same number.

Thank you for your continued support of this project.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Mitchell
Doctoral Candidate
University of San Diego

Appendix I

Round Three Delphi Instrument

Creating Campus Climates That Are Free From Sexual Harassment: Implications For Leaders In Higher Education

General comments received by panelists in Round 2:

We need to emphasize actions that show we mean business, that this is not some PC "fad".

I'm glad I'm on your project. Your questionnaires cause me to think the process through.

I believe we need overall clarity: a clear definition of harassment, a clear delineation of procedure; one person (preferably female) to coordinate information; and a specific review board (male and female?) to address the issue.

I feel it is important for the CSU system to institute a systemwide sexual harassment policy and that Executive Order 148 (the Disciplinary procedures) be revised to 1993 standards. The Chancellor's Office should also take a more proactive stance.

Our complaint rate went down last year-- so we are about to increase our educational efforts. A decrease in complaints is not necessarily a decrease in incidents.

The missing link on our campus is that the Women's Center is student run. If we had a Women's Resource Center administered by a university student affairs paid personnel it would be a valuable resource to report and distribute surveys to get accuracy in their surveys.

PART I. STRATEGIES FOR CREATING CAMPUS CLIMATES THAT ARE FREE FROM SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Section I. What needs to change?

The first two questions in round one generated item banks regarding what most needs to change regarding sexual harassment. In round two, the panel reviewed those items and selected those that were thought to be most salient. With the exception of Item #26, there was no significant difference in the responses of the panel relating to the undergraduate or graduate status of women students.

Comments made by panelists regarding Section I:

With the exception of #26, grads and undergrads have basically the same problem. Grads, however, have more to lose and are thus less willing to come forward.

Verbal harassment has an added problem of being protected by the 1st amendment.

I feel both undergraduate and graduate students fear retaliation against them if they pursue harassment or sexual assault against the university. The climate is in a deep freeze.

Grad students do differ insofar as there does appear to be a tendency to slip into more intense, asymmetric relationships because of the nature of closeness in collaborating on research and the pervasive acceptance of their relationships as normative since grad students are presumed to be older and acting on their own volition.

In Ph. D. granting institutions, I think the problems may be different --but not in the CSU situation where relationships don't get that much chance to grow.

Directions:

In this section, note that only those items receiving a 20% or higher response rate remain in round three. The percentage of panelists selecting a particular item is printed to the left of the item. Comments from panelists regarding specific items have been included below each item for you to consider when making your final selections from the list below.

Please select **four** responses from the list below by circling the number to the left of the items that indicate what you feel **most needs to change** for female students.

One new item (NI) for Section I was generated in round two and appears as item #24. Please consider it also when making your choices even though it does not have a response rate attached to it at this time.

- 35% 2. Lack of student awareness of sexual harassment/peer harassment
- 29% 3. Lack of faculty/staff awareness of issue of sexual harassment
- 29% 5. Societal attitudes regarding women
Comments:
 It seems hopelessly simplistic to say that societal attitudes regarding women have to change before the campus climate changes, but it is definitely true. Until the societal devaluing of women is somehow changed, it is going to take aggressive policy and continuing education of students regarding that policy in order to change the climate.
 This goes without saying!
- 29% 7. Behavior of males (faculty, staff, students) toward women
- 35% 8. Reporting processes that are not "user-friendly"
- 29% 13. Independence of faculty (high level of control over classrooms/students)
- 41% 16. Low proportion of female faculty and administrators
Comments:
 It is just that attitude (devaluation of women) that allows campuses to have such low numbers of female faculty and administrators, thus depriving both undergraduate and graduate students of strong female role models.
- 41% 18. Acceptance of sexual harassment as normal behavior
- 29% 19. Students' lack of empowerment to take corrective action

- NI 24. Fear of the victims of retaliation by the perpetrator if reported.
- 41% 26. Over-dependence of students in relationship to graduate faculty/advisers
Comments:
 Graduate students are much more dependent upon one faculty member for their evaluations, academic progress, career opportunities and references, advancement to candidacy, thesis completion, etc. Faculty tend to think of graduate students as closer to being "colleagues" and to ignore their power-role. Students do not.
 Graduate students (have a) much heavier dependence on faculty. (They) often fall into traps.

Section II. Identification of current strategies

Round one generated item banks regarding what current strategies panelists were aware of regarding sexual harassment. In round two, the panel selected those that were thought to be most salient. There was no significant difference in the responses of the panel relating to the undergraduate or graduate status of women students.

Comments made by panelists regarding Section II:

We must talk openly about this topic and encourage victims to act. We must create a climate where the university community can see a positive result for those who come forward with legitimate claims.

The behavior will stop when peers stop tolerating it.

Directions:

Note that those items receiving a 20% or higher response rate remain in round three.

Please select four responses from the remaining eleven items that indicate what strategies you feel are currently particularly effective for creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment.

Four new items (NI) for Section II were generated in round two and appears as items #24, 26, 27, and 28. Please consider these items when making your choices even though they do not have a response rate attached to them at this time.

- 47% 1. Educational programming for students on the issue
- 47% 3. Designated personnel to handle complaints
Comments:
 I feel having a designated person in the counseling center on campus will be a great relief. A proposal to administration has been written on our campus for a crisis intervention person in the Women's Center with support from counseling. The provost for Student Affairs turned it down due to the concern of changing laws and liabilities.

- 71% 4. Mandated training for faculty/administrators/staff on the topic
Comments:
 With societal attitude as (unfortunately) a given, it is going to take aggressive, mandated training about sexual harassment to make any changes. Unless the awareness training is mandatory, the people who really need the training will continue to avoid it.
- 35% 7. Active and strong support of policies from top levels of administration
Comments:
 Item #7 is very important but you can have a dozen policies -- if they aren't enforced they mean nothing. ie. the person on my campus whose job it was to investigate sexual harassment (he recently retired) didn't believe there was sexual harassment on campus, so his investigations were half-hearted at best.
- 29% 10. Increased numbers of female faculty, staff and administrators
Comments:
 Increasing the number of women administrators/faculty members alone will not change behavior-- only education can change behavior.
- 41% 16. Aggressive campus policies and procedures specific to sexual harassment
- 35% 19. Publicize outcomes of cases while respecting confidentiality issues
- NI 24. Docking pay/salary for proven offenses
- NI 26. Specific reporting and filing procedures
- NI 27. Provide incentives for individuals who attend training workshops
- NI 28. Accessibility of designated personnel for resolving complaints

Section III. What problems were encountered when implementing these strategies?

The fifth question inquired of panel members what problems were encountered when the strategies were implemented. Fourteen problems were identified by panelists in the first round.

Directions:

Note that those items receiving a 18% or higher response rate remain in round three.

Select the three problems you think are most salient to the issue by circling those numbers to the left of the eight remaining items below. Comments made by panelists as to what strategies might be employed to address each problem appear below those items.

- 47% 1. Socialized acceptance of behavior
Comments:
 Time, education, publicized sanctions.
 To empower women, especially women students, to know their rights and to publish, if they need to, commentaries in school newspaper.

Demand affirmative action.

Set up training internships to move women and minorities up into positions of administration within the campus.

- 18% 2. Lack of university funds to support change efforts
Comments:
 Nothing happens on a university campus without funding. Volunteer efforts are often nothing short of valiant, especially given the demands on faculty and staff time, but they cannot be consistent, and they lack clout without the backing of the highest levels of administration. Money will not be allocated without a strong commitment from administration, and concurrently, once the money is allocated there will exist a stronger commitment to make the policy/training work.
- 53% 5. Denial that the problem really exists on campus or in a particular department
Comments:
 Peer pressure when there is denial.
- 47% 6. Active and organized resistance/hostility of male faculty
Comments:
 Need for strategies, policies and procedures that do not arouse as much suspicion/ defensiveness for men. Perhaps explicitly stating that anyone brought forward accused of sexual harassment is presumed "to be innocent until proven guilty" might help—keeping this nonjudgmental climate might help as cases are deliberated.
 Professionals who are highly trained might be dispatched to perform "counseling" sessions with hostile faculty. This is problematic, of course. Since the most hostile faculty are often the worst perpetrators.
- 24% 7. Apathy toward the issue
- 47% 9. Time consuming nature of dealing effectively with the problem.
- 24% 11. Resistance to mandatory training
Comments:
 Mandatory education for students, faculty, and staff.
 Training should include student reactions to types of behavior. For example: "I couldn't believe he was coming on to me... he's over 40! He's old enough to be my father! It's disgusting!" (Faculty of 40 doesn't see himself as "old".)
 Clear communication from President and other senior administrators.
- 18% 12. Backlash against women and/or women studies programs

Directions:

Please add any additional strategies that you may have for addressing these particular problems:

Section IV. What techniques have been used to determine the effectiveness of these strategies?

The sixth question in round one asked what techniques have been used to determine the effectiveness of current strategies. Five types of evaluative techniques were identified by the panel in round one. An additional one was generated in round two which was adding a section on campus annual reports to the trustees with information regarding complaints and resolutions. **No further action by panelists is necessary for this section.**

Section V. What will the future hold as to strategies for creating campus climates that are free from sexual harassment?

Part A. Campus climates

In round two, the panel was asked to indicate its assessment of the current climate for female students in 1993 on most CSU campuses with one end of the scale (1) being a climate that fosters/encourages sexual harassment and is generally hostile to women students and the other (5) being a climate that is free from sexual harassment and generally supportive of women students.

76% of respondents felt that the current climate is a "3" which is essentially a neutral climate for female students. The remaining responses were 6% for #1 and 18% for #2.

71% felt that in 50 years the climate would be a "4" which demonstrates an optimism for campus climates that will be more supportive for women in the years ahead. 18% felt that the climate would be a "5". The remaining 11% felt that climate would still be a hostile "1" or "2".

Directions:

Please share some brief comments as to why you think campus climates will be either more supportive or more hostile for female students in the coming years.

Part B. Innovative and creative strategies for the 21st century

The last question in round one generated item banks regarding what new and innovative strategies educational leaders could use in creating a new CSU campus in the 21st century that is free from sexual harassment.. In round two, the panel reviewed those items and selected those that were thought to be most salient.

Directions:

Imagine that you are a member of a task force of educational leaders appointed by the Chancellor's Office to successfully address the issue of sexual harassment and campus climate for women and that you have been given strong support to achieve this goal.

The top five rated items appear below and include comments made by panelists. Considering the information generated by the panel in the Sections I, II, and III AND using a futuristic perspective regarding changes you anticipate in higher education in such areas as demographics, technology, collective bargaining issues, budget concerns, etc.; please briefly comment on the question below each item.

1. **Build a campus culture that strongly supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus:**

Comments:

To build a campus culture that supports non-violence, non-exploiteness would be the ideal answer--although in a world moving increasingly toward violence, perhaps impossible.

Such a campus culture would require more women and minorities be hired.

Building a campus culture that supports a non-violent, non-exploitive campus is crucial for our success in the 21st century. Women and minorities are the majority in the future workforce.

Addresses diversity issues as well as harassment.

What a good idea (to eliminate contact sports). Try to build for cooperation instead of competition.

Question: What specific actions can you recommend be taken at the system-wide or campus level to bring about such a culture? Please consider aspects such as campus activities, sports events, campus media and advertising, etc. as well as class related activities.

2. **Harassment free models of teaching presented in new faculty orientation:**

Comments:

Harassment-free models of teaching for new faculty--because it may be the last time we'll have the faculty as a captive audience. If it is required for all new faculty, then perhaps in 50 years, as older faculty retire, we will see a change in attitude.

This is OK, but the problem is found more often in tenured older faculty who are the most difficult to reach and discipline adequately!

Any kind of model would be an improvement.

Question: Who might best achieve this strategy and how? Human resources? Academic affairs? Should faculty be evaluated by students as to classroom climate?

6. Include issue in required General Education courses on basic subjects:

Comments:

I like this idea-- all students would get info and professor's teaching the courses would raise consciousness levels.

Should be team taught by both men and women for both perspectives.

Having an all inclusive curriculum is the wave of the future.

I would lean toward a required GE course, except that I hate to see students have to bear an additional burden--another class-- when I think the problem could be solved administratively by a stronger commitment to harassment-free campuses.

Question: How could this strategy best be operationalized? Would faculty be required to include this issue in their courses, and if so, how would their effectiveness be evaluated?

11. Demonstrated commitment to climate issues as a screening tool for campus positions:

Comments:

Look for results rather than politically correct talking heads who make a good impression in interviews.

Things will not change until it is clear to harassers that it will not be tolerated. This would be a giant step.

So often we ignore climate, sensitivity, and even ability to effectively teach and communicate with the type of students we serve. When we recruit, we want "what Harvard wants".

Question: How would commitment to climate issues be evaluated in the screening process? Are there ways to reward employees for ongoing commitment after they are hired that would encourage them to continue to work toward significant social change in this area?

15. Strong campus commitment to women who speak up against inappropriate behavior:

Comments:

YES!

Many women are afraid to speak out and see the women who do get "labeled" as "troublemakers".

Until we have a more ideal campus world, we owe these women our respect for being brave enough to speak up in a system that seems to be stacked against them.

Too often women who speak up are considered as "uptight", "Libber", "overreacting", etc. That attitude must change for improvement.

As we have more young women of color entering our universities, we are bringing in women often silenced by two factors of life: their gender and their race.

Question: What can the campus leadership specifically do to support women who speak out against sexual harassment and issues regarding campus climate? How might backlash against such women be addressed? How might they be recognized in a positive manner for their risks?

PART II. CSU POLICY AND PROCEDURES ANALYSIS

A review of sexual harassment policies from the Chancellor's Office and fourteen of the CSU campuses found a wide variance. Panelists were asked to rate items currently appearing in CSU policy statements as to their importance on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being of "no importance" and 5 being "extremely important".

All of the items were rated either "very important" or "extremely important" by 64% to 100% of the panelists. Enough consensus was reached in these sections as to importance level so that additional input is not needed in the third round. However, consensus was not as clear regarding the relative importance of each item.

SECTION A. Policy statements

Directions:

In this section, note that only those items receiving a 20% or higher response rate remain in round three.

Please select three responses from the six items below by circling the number to the left of the items that indicate what you feel are the most important items that should appear in a campus policy statement regarding sexual harassment.

Note that #14 now includes "faculty" given input from round two.

- 71% 1. A specific and clear definition of sexual harassment
Comments:
The basis of any policy.
- 29% 2. Legal implications of sexual harassment
Comments:
The legal implications are a must for the institution to avoid law suits and protect the victim.
The basis of any policy.
- 65% 4. Timely and appropriate action when receiving a complaint

- 24% 13. Specific procedures for dealing with complaints
- 24% 14. Mandatory training for administrators, supervisors, and faculty
- 24% 15. Education of campus community as to policy and procedures
Comments:
 This is critical, once a good policy exists.

SECTION B. Campus procedures

Directions:

In this section, note that only those items receiving a 20% or higher response rate remain in round three.

Please select three responses from the six items below by circling the number to the left of the items that indicate what you feel are the most important items to be included in campus procedures regarding sexual harassment complaints.

One new item (NI) was generated in round two and appears as item #13. Please consider it also when making your choices even though it does not have a response rate attached to it at this time.

- 65% 1. Specific personnel designated to address the issue
Comments:
 Yes, but have personnel include faculty or administrators who enjoy respect of campus. If only an outside staff/personnel position, often faculty diminish that person's role since they are not considered a "peer" with equivalent Ph.D. rank/status etc.
- 24% 2. Victims may remain anonymous while seeking information
- 35% 3. A procedurally just framework
Comments:
 Trust in the system on both sides is eroding. This might reverse that.
- 29% 7. Alleged perpetrators should be informed of the complaint
Comments:
 The process should not look like a witchhunt.
- 24% 8. Investigative teams should have both a male and female
Comments:
 Trust in the system on both sides is eroding. This might reverse that.
- NI 13. Clear and specific procedures in general (not just appeals procedures)

PART III: ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- a. **Please add additional comments you may have about any item in Round 3 of the survey:**
- b. **What feedback do you have regarding this project and/or your participation in this study?**
- c. **What suggestions do you have for further research projects regarding the issues of sexual harassment and campus climates for women in higher education?**

A treat for you!

As a small token of my appreciation for your continued support of this project, I would like to treat you to a movie! Please check which of the following movie theatre passes you would prefer to receive.

_____ **Pacific Theatres**

_____ **Edwards Cinemas**

Thank you

for your response to Round 3!

**Please return this survey in the enclosed envelope
or send by FAX machine by**

November 22

to:

**Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator
8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, CA 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202**

Appendix J Round Three Letter of Transmittal

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

**Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, California 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202

November 6, 1993

Dear project participant,

We are finally to the third and last round of the project!! Thank you very much for your response to the round two survey.

The purpose of Round #3 is to give the panel an opportunity to review the results of the research at this stage of the project and to read the comments of the other panelists. It is also the last opportunity to seek final clarification as to any of the sections that still lack a strong consensus and to add any comments that you feel should be considered before bringing the project to a close.

Your continued participation in the project is very important. The enclosed instrument is lengthy because of the format used to include all the responses that were received; however, **let me assure you that it will only take 20 -25 minutes of your time to complete.** Your thoughtful responses will help to determine the final product of this project which is a model for campuses to utilize regarding the creation of campus climates in the 21st century that are free from sexual harassment.

As a token of my appreciation, at the end of the survey you will have an opportunity to let me know which of two theaters would be most convenient for you to **attend a movie as my guest** for your continued support of this research!

Please fill out the survey at your convenience within the next 7 to 10 days and **return it to me** in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope, or if you prefer, fax your response to me at (619) 594-6202 **no later than November 22.**

I fully understand what a busy life you lead and greatly appreciate your commitment to this project! I have again included another bookmark for you featuring an American woman who has made a significant contribution to our country's rich herstory.

I look forward to hearing from you by the 22nd.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

Appendix K
Round Three Dunning Letter

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

**Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, California 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202

November 17, 1993

Dear research panelist,

The third (and final!) round survey of the project was mailed on November 7; if you did not receive a survey, please contact me and I will send out another one immediately. If you have already completed and returned the survey, you have my sincere thanks; if not, won't you please fill it out and postmark it or fax it to me at the number above in the next few days? Due to the small sample participating in the project each survey returned is of particular importance to the completion of the project and the writing of my dissertation.

On the last page of this survey, please be sure to note which movie theater would be most convenient for you to attend a movie as my guest as a small token of my appreciation for your continued participation in this project.

Additionally, if you have any questions about the project, please contact me at the same number.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Mitchell
Doctoral Candidate
University of San Diego

Appendix L
Thank You Letter to Panelists

Susan E. Mitchell
Research Project Coordinator

**Creating Campus Climates that are Free from Sexual Harassment:
Implications for Leaders in Higher Education**

8503 Summerdale Rd. #371
San Diego, California 92126
(619) 594-4612 FAX (619) 594-6202

November 20, 1993

Dear (name),

Thank you, thank you, and thank you again for your support of my dissertation project. I recognize how busy your life is and appreciate your willingness to participate in one more project.

I am currently analyzing the results of the study and when completed, will send you a summary report. In addition, the Women's Council of the State University, who participated in this project by serving as a nominating body for the panelist selection process, will also receive the report. I hope to be able to finish the project in order to mail the summary sometime in late January.

As a final token of my appreciation, a movie pass for the theater you chose in the last survey is enclosed in order for you to enjoy a movie as my guest. In addition, I have also included the remaining bookmarks from a set featuring American women for you to use or to pass along to another colleague or friend.

Appreciatively,

Susan E. Mitchell
Doctoral Student
University of San Diego

Appendix M Executive Order 345

Prohibition of Sexual Harassment June 1, 1981 Supersedes: No Prior Order

It is the policy of The California State University and Colleges that each campus and the Office of the Chancellor maintain a working and learning environment free from sexual harassment of its students, employees and those who apply for student or employee status. All students and employees should be aware that The California State University and Colleges is concerned and will take action to eliminate sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is conduct subject to disciplinary action.

Sexual harassment includes such behavior as sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature directed towards an employee, student, or applicant when one or more of the following circumstances are present:

Submission to or toleration of the conduct is an explicit or implicit term or condition of appointment, employment, admission or academic evaluation;

Submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as a basis for a personnel decision or an academic evaluation affecting an individual;

The conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with an employee's work performance, or creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or otherwise adverse working environment;

The conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with a student's academic performance, creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive, or otherwise adverse learning environment, or adversely affecting any student.

In determining whether conduct constitutes sexual harassment the circumstances surrounding the conduct should be considered.

In order to ensure adherence with The California State University and Colleges policy, the President and the Chancellor shall designate those responsible for receiving complaints of sexual harassment. Once selected, the names and title of those persons shall be publicized.

Established California State University and Colleges disciplinary, grievance or other complaint procedures, as appropriate, will serve as the mechanism for resolving complaints of sexual harassment.

Efforts should be made to publicize such procedures and their application to sexual harassment complaints.

To maintain a learning and working environment free from sexual harassment, the campuses are encouraged to educate the campus community, students, and employees regarding sexual harassment. The Office of the Chancellor will make available training for persons designated to receive complaints of sexual harassment.