

booster club). By excluding these two members from the Panther Lounge, the university in effect has withdrawn some support from the team.

Secondly, the Panther Lounge lost a lot of money because the hockey team wanted to celebrate together as a team along with their fans. With two members excluded from the student lounge, it was only common sense that the celebration would be moved.

I can understand the need for authority and punitive actions, but there is an exception to every rule.

Signed,

A Hockey Fan who celebrated at Myron's

A reply to Rahman

To the Editor;

After the smoke from all the fiery rhetoric, innuendo, and guilt by association has been cleared away,

there appear to be several points worth mentioning in response to Prof. Rahman's article about our research:

(1) To Prof. Rahman, sexual harassment, except in its most extreme, coercive forms is a nonproblem. Almost all sexually intrusive behaviour is either a reflection of poor taste or bad manners (for example, offering to exchange sex for better grades, or repeated unwanted touching by a faculty member). We disagree... so do the federal and provincial governments and most of the universities in Canada.

Given Rahman's position on sexual harassment generally, one would suspect that no research into this topic would stand up to his scrutiny. Apparently, Prof. Rahman simply does not wish to see this topic looked at, and he would presumably criticize any research that did. Case closed.

(2) One serious charge Rahman levels is that the information provided by our respondents may not be confidential, and that our assurance of confidentiality may have been "a hint/invitation/encouragement] to provide names and other specific details." What Rahman fails to mention is that we specifically asked respondents not to give names in the event that they related a specific incident—and in fact, none did. It seems ludicrous to suggest that when a questionnaire is mailed to individuals by name, one should do anything other than assure both anonymity and confidentiality.

(3) Prof. Rahman suggests that our research is unethical. This is a serious allegation as he well knows. Actually, he says our research is "consistent with ethically questionable practices" because we "sneaked in" questions unrelated to sexual harassment. What Rahman precisely objects to, is that in a section of our questionnaire headed "Attitudes", we asked questions about attitudes toward men and women ("feminism") and didn't tell people why. This is deceptive and ethically questionable, he says. But, in addition to "sneaking in" these attitude questions, we also asked students their age, sex and year at the university. Was this also deceptive? Unethical? Would it be if we had the idea that sexual harassment might increase with year at the university? Would Rahman be raising ethical questions if we had "snuck in" questions about extraversion, sociability or attitudes toward authority? Is it the inquiry into attitudes toward "feminism" that bothers him so?

(4) We are not the only targets of Rahman's criticisms. There are also the 215 students who completed our questionnaire. According to Rahman, anyone who did fill out the survey without questioning what our "sneaky" attitude questions were doing there (i.e. the large majority of our respondents) is simply so gullible and suggestible that their answers to our questions are not to be taken seriously. In addition, Rahman must also have

a fairly low opinion of the local granting body for funding our "costly" (a phrase he uses more than once) research.

So much for our response to the content of Prof. Rahman's article.

But it seems to us that there are other issues raised by this article that have little to do with us personally. We are deeply offended by this article. It makes serious charges about our academic competence and ethics. Our reputations have been questioned and our ability to carry out our research programme potentially jeopardized. But we think it would be unfortunate if this incident was only seen as an issue between Prof. Rahman and ourselves. We believe that it raises questions that need to be addressed by all sectors of the university. What should relations between people be like at a university? Of course, the right to speak one's mind freely, to teach and write what you believe is essential at a university, but what role, if any, should respect for other persons play in this process?

How does referring to people's work as bad nonsense, bantering about its pseudo-scientific qualities and cavalierly challenging their ethics relate to the idea of academic freedom? How responsible should the criticism of others' work be; how well informed need critics be about the work they criticize.

Substantive debate and discussion about research and ideas plays a vital role in the life of the univer-

sity. At the Faculty Seminar we gave on Jan. 29 we provided a public forum where such debate could take place, where criticisms could be voiced and responded to. At this presentation, we discussed what we saw as the limitations and problems of survey methodologies. But Prof. Rahman did not attend, choosing The Gem instead, where a direct and immediate response to his comments would not be possible.

We believe that the questions we have raised are important ones that should be relected upon widely and commented upon. A nonresponse on the part of the academic community will only reflect acceptance of this kind of criticism. The issue here (perhaps like the issue of sexual harassment itself) is not simply what kind of behaviour is permissible within academic community when it comes to questions of academic freedom, but what the kinds of behaviour are desirable... not just what you can get away with, but how people ought to be with others.


And finally: What does the nature of Prof. Rahman's criticisms of our work tell our students about what academic debate should be like? And what would silence to Rahman's article tell our students about how they should relate to people who hold opinions different from their own?

Don Mazer & Beth Percival

UPEI Psychology Dept.

SMITH CORONA
TOMORROW'S TECHNOLOGY AT YOUR TOUCH.

JUST WRITE FOR ANY COURSE... Smith Corona On Campus



XL 2000 Electronic Typewriter with Spell-Right™ Electronic Dictionary... The Affordable Portable — Perfect for Back-to-School

- Spell-Right™ electronic dictionary checks spelling of 50,000 words.
- WordFind™ locates errors.
- Full line memory correction allows correction from one character to an entire line.
- WordEraser® removes an entire word with one tap of a key.
- Other features include bold print, auto return, auto center, auto halfspace, auto super/subscript, end of page warning, and more.

Save \$40.00 **\$309.95**
or Rent to Own
\$39.95 month (x9)

XL 1000 Electronic Typewriter

Save \$30.00 **\$259.95**
or Rent to Own
\$34.95 month (x9)

Carter & Co. Ltd.
74 Queen St.
566-4260

Life With Shari

