

Issues with Report Bias and Misrepresentation

This document highlights instances within the HR Report that appear to reflect sexist, patriarchal views or manipulate facts to unfairly support the findings of the investigation. These biases and framing issues contribute to the dismissal of legitimate complaints made by female students.

1. Dismissal of Women's Concerns as "Annoyances" Rather Than Harassment:

- The report repeatedly characterizes the behavior of male students, particularly Mr. Eta, as "annoying" or "immature," rather than acknowledging the consistent pattern of harassment reported by female students.
 - Framing the issue as "annoyances" trivializes the lived experiences of female students and suggests a bias towards minimizing their concerns rather than recognizing them as legitimate harassment.
-

2. Focus on Intentions Rather Than Impact:

- The investigation frequently emphasizes the intent behind the male students' behavior rather than the impact it had on the victims.
 - Statements made by male students (e.g., Mr. Eta claiming "missing context" or claiming jokes were "banter") are given more credibility than the feelings of discomfort and fear expressed by female students.
 - This approach reflects a patriarchal bias that excuses harmful behavior if the perpetrator can justify it as unintended or non-malicious.
-

3. Blaming Victims for Their Reactions:

- The report implies that female students are "overreacting" or misinterpreting the situation by pointing out that Mr. Eta felt "attacked" or "bullied" during disagreements.
 - This framing subtly shifts blame to the victims for allegedly creating a hostile environment, rather than addressing the harmful behavior that prompted their responses.
-

4. Disregarding the Power Dynamics:

- The report minimizes the impact of power dynamics in the lab by portraying male students' retaliation and manipulation of narratives as "miscommunication" or "misunderstandings."
 - By framing these issues as mutual disagreements rather than abuse of power, the report fails to acknowledge the harmful effects of retaliation and coercion against female students.
-

5. Lack of Credibility Assessment for Male Students' Testimonies:

- The report appears to take male students' explanations at face value, often citing "missing context" or "misinterpretations" as valid reasons for dismissing their behavior.
 - Meanwhile, female students' reports are framed as "perceptions" rather than credible evidence of misconduct.
 - This inconsistency highlights an inherent bias that favors male perspectives over female experiences.
-

6. Failure to Acknowledge Gender-Based Harassment:

- The report's conclusion that there were "no violations" of University policy fails to consider the ongoing pattern of sexist comments, harassment, and intimidation documented by female students.
 - By downplaying these issues as "equity and professionalism" concerns rather than acknowledging them as gender-based harassment, the report minimizes the seriousness of the complaints.
-

7. Insufficient Accountability for Retaliatory Behavior:

- Male students who engaged in spreading harmful narratives about female students were not held accountable.
 - The report fails to address how these retaliatory actions contribute to a hostile environment and actively harm the reputations and well-being of female students.
-

Conclusion:

The report exhibits clear biases that favor the perspectives of male students while undermining the credibility and seriousness of the concerns raised by female students. These biases must be addressed to ensure a fair and accurate assessment of the situation.

