WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY'S CAMPUS QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY:

PRELIMINARY RESULTS*



Report Prepared by Drs. Walter S. DeKeseredy, Amanda Hall-Sanchez, and James Nolan Research Center on Violence at West Virginia University

*Contact the Research Center on Violence at WVU at www.edu for requests to use the survey instrument included in this report. The Center is willing for you to use the Campus Quality of Life Survey (CQLS) for non-profit and educational purposes, as long as appropriate attribution is given. Note that some of the questions included in this survey were adapted, with permission, from the Campus Attitudes Toward Safety (C.A.T.S.) Survey. Copyright 2014 University of Kentucky. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	2
1. The Historical, Social and Political Context Of the WVU Campus Quality of Life Survey (CQLS)	5
2. The Development of the CQLS Instrument	11
3. Sample and Data Collection	17
4. Preliminary Results	22
5. Conclusions	41
Appendix A: Survey Instrument	43
Appendix B: Recruitment Poster	65
Rafarancas	67

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The seeds of the West Virginia University (WVU) Campus Quality of Life Survey (CQLS) were partially sown by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. Created on January 22, 2014, its mandate is to "strengthen and address compliance issues and provide institutions with additional tools to respond to and address rape and sexual assault." However, the key driving forces behind the development and administration of the CQLS were former Interim Deans of WVU's Eberly College of Arts and Sciences Rudolph P. Almasy and Maryanne Reed, Provost Joyce McConnell, President Gordon Gee, Associate Vice President for Creative and Scholarly Activities Melanie Page, Director of Equity Assurance and Title IX Coordinator James Goins, Vice President for WVU and Head of the Division of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion David M. Fryson, and Department of Sociology and Anthropology Chair Jeralynn (Lynne) Cossman.

Since the mid 1980s, when the true extent of sexual assault on college campuses was first discovered in this country by Dr. Mary Koss and her colleagues, ¹ leading experts in the field correctly and repeatedly asserted that effective campus-based prevention, control, and counselling strategies must be created. However, to do so, administrators must first develop the will to take action against violence against women on campuses, as well as other crimes that occur in these places and their immediate surroundings. In other words, college administrators need to publicly acknowledge the various types of victimization occurring on their campuses and that they fully intend to develop a set of norms and goals that establish the unacceptability of sexual assault and other abusive behaviors that cause many students much pain and suffering. Rather than grudgingly willing to admit that a "few" stranger-to-stranger assaults occur here at

-

¹ See Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987).

WVU, the above leaders have put considerable money, time, and expertise into dealing with much more common forms of victimization described in this report. They recognize that a public statement of the will to take action is not enough and that it does little, if anything, to inspire confidence among students that their campus administrators care about their well-being. Indeed, action speaks louder than words and the aforementioned WVU administrators, together with many others members of the WVU community, have formulated and implemented widely considered effective policies to curb sexual assault and other crimes. But, they also want to know if they work and if more or different resources are necessary, which is one of the key reasons for the creation and administration of the CQLS.

In all of our years of studying of the violent victimization of college students, prior to coming to WVU, we have never worked with such a supportive and dedicated group of administrators such as those named here. We thank them for their exemplary leadership and for promoting a welcoming and caring community.

Creating and administering a survey like this one requires the assistance of many other people. Of course, the data presented here would not be available without the aid of nearly 6,000 students who participated in our study. They are true Mountaineers and their courage, support, and honesty will always be remembered. The help of undergraduate and graduate students who participated in focus groups organized to help us craft our questionnaire is also deeply appreciated and led us to examine issues that we would have otherwise overlooked. As well, we would be remiss if we did not send out a very special thank you to all of the interns affiliated with the Research Center on Violence at WVU. They "wanted this thing to happen" and they worked tirelessly to help us get where we are today.

Many WVU faculty, counsellors, and other employees were important parts of the research team. They frequently reminded students about the CQLS and the importance of giving voice to their experiences. Space limitations preclude listing all of these people, but it is essential to give tribute to WVU's Wellness and Health Promotion staff. Their assistance went beyond the call of duty, and so did that of some of the fitness trainers at WVU's Student Recreation Center.

On top of being blessed by being part of a very supportive WVU community, we are very fortunate to have colleagues like Drs. Corey Colyer (WVU), William F. Flack Jr. (Bucknell University), Diane Follingstad (University of Kentucky), Douglas Myers (WVU), Adam Pritchard (University of Central Florida), Callie M. Rennison (University of Colorado, Denver), Martin D. Schwartz (George Washington University), and M. Cecil Smith (WVU). They were essential in the development of the research design and in the analysis of some of the data we collected. Barbara Reiprich, Administrative Assistant in WVU's Department of Sociology and Anthropology was of invaluable support on a wide variety of tasks, and we truly appreciate her very important contributions.

Last, but certainly not least, we thank City of Morgantown Police Officer Troy Ball for providing us with important information about legislation related to some of the data elicited by the CQLS.

The CQLS was sponsored by the Offices of the Provost and the Dean of Eberly College of Arts and Sciences. The views expressed in this report, however, are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the sponsors. Moreover, the authors assume full responsibility for the material presented in this report.

1

The Historical, Social and Political Context of the WVU Campus Quality of Life Survey

Institutions of higher learning are commonly seen as places where students, faculty, administrators, and support staff constantly strive to provide "practical solutions to the problem of the day" (Strong-Boag, 1996, p. 105). Due to the ongoing efforts of feminist coalitions' lobbying and education initiatives, the establishment in 2014 of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, the widespread viewing of Kirby Dick's 2015 documentary The Hunting Ground on college campuses across North America, and the creation of the federal Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE) in 2013, many people now view sexual assault and other crimes against women as the current "problems of the day" on college campuses and their immediate surroundings (DeKeseredy, 2017). However, the reality is that North American college campuses have a long history of high levels of crime (Fisher & Sloan, 2013; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Sloan & Fisher, 2011). For example, more than 170 years ago, Harvard University complained that students frequently committed "crimes worthy of the penitentiary" (Shenkman, 1989, p. 135). Since then, college students have steadily engaged in a host of crimes, with violence against women being one of the most common (Daigle, Mummert, Fisher, & Scherer, 2015).

Campus violence against women survey research in the United States dates back to Kirkpatrick and Kanin's (1957) self-report sexual assault study, but it was not until the results of Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski's (1987) path-breaking national representative sample survey

were published that this crime started to garner national attention. Many surveys on a wide range of violent behaviors experienced by female undergraduates have since been conducted, including another national U.S. project and a Canadian country-wide study (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010). Like their predecessors, the bulk of more recent studies estimate that at least one out of four undergraduate women is victimized by some type of sexual assault and that approximately the same number is targeted by physical assault during their college careers (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2013). Moreover, the vast majority of perpetrators are not strangers. Rather, they are either male acquaintances, classmates, friends, "hook up" partners, boyfriends, or former boyfriends (Krebs et al., 2007; McOrmond-Plummer, Easteal, & Levy-Peck, 2014).

Violence against women on the college campus is now extensively discussed and debated, with many commentators asserting that U.S. institutions of higher learning are experiencing an *epidemic* of woman abuse. Actually, the concept of epidemic is out of place here. To health officials, an epidemic is a disease that devastates a population before eventually subsiding. Yet, violence against women, as demonstrated by decades of sound research, is deeply entrenched in the North American population. Thus, if woman abuse on the college campus is a disease, then it is in its endemic phase, possibly to be compared with methamphetamine use among rural residents of the U.S.A.

MAIN OBJECTIVES OF THE

WVU CAMPUS QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY

Though we know much about violence against women enrolled at other North American post-secondary schools, what we do not know is how many female WVU students have experienced variations of this problem. Thus, one of the main objectives of the Campus Quality

of Life Survey (CQLS) is to provide policy-relevant data on the extent and distribution of various types violent victimization. As well, the CQLS measures other abusive experiences that all WVU students may have experienced since starting here. Furthermore, consistent with other campus surveys, the CQLS was crafted to focus on students' perceptions of the campus' social and cultural climate, their knowledge of and involvement in support services, and their perceptions of how WVU would handle a situation in which a student reported an incident of sexual misconduct.

THE PLANNING STAGES OF THE CQLS

Passed by Congress three years ago as part of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), the Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE) requires incidents of "domestic, dating violence, and sexual assault, and stalking" to be revealed in the yearly campus crime statistics report starting in 2014 and includes procedures survivors should follow if they have been harmed by these crimes. What is more, SaVE dictates that campuses must have ongoing primary prevention education programs, such as bystander intervention, and policies on disciplinary procedures.

In addition to creating the above laws, under VAWA, congress authorized the U.S.

Department of Justice's Office of Violence Against Women to implement the Grants to Reduce Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking on Campus Program. Also referred to as Campus Program grants, funds are awarded to institutions of higher learning that develop a comprehensive, coordinated, response to these harms. WVU received one of these grants² for a three-year period (10/2013 to 9/2016). The approach taken at WVU is multipronged and consists of the following initiatives:

-

² Grant No. 2013-WA-AX-0002

1. Coordinated Campus Response Team (CCRT)

- a. Members from throughout the campus and community are charged with advising on policy, developing protocols and ensuring appropriate services and advocacy for victims on campus.
- b. Through the CCRT's community partner (Morgantown's Rape and Domestic Violence Information Center), WVU student volunteers are trained to help survivors navigate the medical and legal system with the addition of information related to navigating the school's processes and system. Particular attention is paid to recruiting graduate students to serve as victim or survivor advocates.

2. Prevention Education

- a. Online Campus Clarity learning module for all incoming students (see https://home.campusclarity.com/).
- b. On-going programming (including defining consent, self-defense, how to support a peer who has been victimized, risk reduction strategies).
- c. Bystander education.

3. Law Enforcement Training

 Responding to survivors of power-based interpersonal violence with an emphasis on best practices and not re-traumatizing them.

4. Judicial Conduct Training

 Training specific to working with survivors of power-based personal violence and the processes of Title IX.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to accurately determine whether WVU's current programs have reduced the rate of sexual assault and other types of violence among WVU

students because baseline data were not gathered prior to their creation. However, WELLWVU staff and WVU's Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI), which is where Title IX Coordinator James Goins is based, want to know whether or not a sizeable portion of WVU students are familiar with sexual assault resources, as well as students' perceptions of how WVU's handles situations in which students report incidents of sexual assault. WellWVU and ODEI personnel also want more accurate data on the prevalence of sexual assault among WVU students because research done since Koss et al.'s (1987) national survey consistently shows that most college women, regardless of the quality and quantity of campus services provided, do not report their sexual victimization to college police departments and other campus social support services.

The concerns of these officials are shared by the entire university. This is why, in the Spring Semester of 2014, James Goins and WELLWVU Health Education Specialist Alison Tartaglia arranged a formal meeting with two co-authors of this report (Drs. Walter DeKeseredy and Amanda Hall-Sanchez) to discuss the possibility of conducting a campus survey. Given their extensive experience studying various types of violence against women, including campus sexual assault,³ and more importantly, their concern about the health and well-being of WVU students, DeKeseredy and Hall-Sanchez immediately expressed their commitment to doing the work described here.

Unlike some other schools that expect some of their faculty to conduct similar surveys without any financial support, WVU's Office of the Provost and the Dean of Eberly College of Arts and Sciences committed the funds necessary to conduct a survey that meets the highest

-

³ Walter DeKeseredy conducted the Canadian national survey of woman abuse in university and college dating. See DeKeseredy and Schwartz (1998) for the results of this study.

disciplinary standards and the first stage of development occurred in the Fall of 2015. From the very beginning of this project, senior WVU administrators emphasized the importance of the CQLS and the research team was granted total autonomy to design and administer it.

WVU's commitment was not based solely on legal requirements stated previously.

Rather, President Gee, Provost McConnell, and other campus officials made explicit to us two chief concerns. The first was WVU doing its very best to promote a welcoming and caring community. The second was a key point made 20 years ago by the National Research Council's (1996) Panel on Research on Violence Against Women: "Policy decisions – such as how many resources to allocate to service delivery – require solid data about the incidence and prevalence of violence against women" (p. 39).

In designing and implementing a study, policy, or program at any given college or other institution of higher learning, those involved in such efforts are often encouraged to "avoid reinventing the wheel." Thus, as stated on the title page of this report, on behalf of all affiliates of the Research Center on Violence at WVU, we would like end this section of our report by stating that we grant you permission to use the CQLS for non-profit and educational purposes as long as proper attribution is given.⁴ Please contact us at wvvv.edu for requests to adapt or replicate the work described in this report.

_

⁴ This is consistent with the approach taken by colleagues at the University of Kentucky's Center for Research on Violence Against Women who designed the Campus Attitudes Toward Safety survey (C.A.T.S.).

2

The Development of the CQLS Instrument

To meet the objectives described in Chapter 1, we crafted the instrument included in Appendix A. The research team used standardized measures of all the issues examined and we are especially grateful for the assistance of Drs. Diane Follingstad (Director of the University of Kentucky's Center for Research on Violence Against Women) and William (Bill) Flack Jr. (Department of Psychology, Bucknell University). Dr. Follingstad is the Executive Director of the University of Kentucky's (UK) Center for Research on Violence Against Women. She is also the Principal Investigator of the UK Campus Attitudes Toward Safety (C.A.T.S.) Survey (2014), which was administered by the Center. Dr. Flack has years of experience conducting campus sexual assault studies. As well, he played a key role in the development of the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative's (ARC3) (2015) sexual misconduct survey. In the true spirit of collegiality, they sent us copies of their instruments and we used some of the measures included in both of them. The first step, though, was to revisit the extant social scientific literature on sexual assault, intimate violence, harassment, bullying, and stalking among North American college students to identify the best measures that are currently used by leading experts in the field.

The tools provided by our two colleagues confirmed what we learned from our literature review. Yet, we wanted to ensure that we were not overlooking any important issues of central concern to the WVU community. Thus, we took the next step prior to crafting the first draft of the instrument in Appendix A.

PREPARATORY RESEARCH

To design a study that effectively and sensitively addressed the complexities of the WVU campus climate, the authors included a "preparatory component of qualitative investigation" (MacLean, 1992, p. 355). This involved several meetings, e-mail exchanges, and in-depth telephone conversations with leading researchers in the field, WVU service providers and those based outside the university, students, city police officers, and others with a vested interest in curbing the problems uncovered by the CQLS. Not only did these people strongly support this study, but also they sensitized us to key issues not yet adequately addressed in the social scientific literature on campus crime, such as the importance of using timely measures of gender identity and addressing the often hidden violent experiences of nontraditional students (e.g., members of the LGBTQ community). As well, some WVU colleagues, such as Dr. Lynne Cossman, took time out their busy schedules to comment on drafts of our questionnaire.

Four focus group sessions (two with graduate students and two with undergraduates) were also included in our preparatory research. Each session was approximately 75 minutes long and all of them took place shortly after the development of the second draft of our questionnaire. As well, 250 undergraduates participated in pre-tests of our instrument and they were all encouraged to verbally provide us with their suggestions for improvement and their criticisms. The research team explicitly, sincerely, and publicly recognizes that students are the leading experts on campus life and they made our study much better than it otherwise would have been without their keen insight.

MEASURES

Consistent with other successful campus climate surveys, our goal was to construct one that would take no more than 25 minutes, on average, to complete. Thus, difficult decisions

about what to measure and what not to measure had to be made. Yet, there was no debate surrounding the fact that widely used and validated measures had to be selected to meet the highest scientific standards and for comparative purposes. What is more, the research team was mandated by SaVE to gather data about behaviors such as stalking, dating violence, and sexual assault. Below, in the order they were presented to WVU students in the survey, are the measures employed.

- Perceptions of Safety⁵
- Demographics⁶
- Perceptions of Campus Atmosphere for Non-Traditional Students⁷
- Peer Norms⁸
- Hate-and Bias-Motivated Assaults⁹
- Stalking¹⁰
- Sexual Harassment¹¹
- Dating Physical Violence¹²
- Sexual Violence¹³

⁵ Derived from Beatty et al.'s (2005) fear of crime measures.

⁶ Modeled after questions included in the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault Climate Survey (2014) and the Rutgers University (2014) Campus Climate Survey.

⁷ Slightly modified versions of items included in The Prejudice Institute's (1995) Model Questionnaire for Assessing Campus Climate.

⁸ Slightly modified male peer support items developed by DeKeseredy (1988).

⁹ Modified items included in The Prejudice Institute's (1995) questionnaire.

¹⁰ Derived from items included in Centers for Disease Control's National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (Black et al., 2011).

¹¹ Items included in the C.A.T.S. survey (Center for Research on Violence Against Women, 2014).

¹² Items included in the C.A.T.S. survey.

¹³ Modified items included in Koss et al.'s (2007) revised Sexual Experiences Survey and the ARC3 (2015) instrument.

- Student Involvement in Campus Violence Prevention Programs¹⁴
- Student Bystander Intervention¹⁵
- General Perceptions of the Campus Climate¹⁶
- Perceptions of Institutional Responses to Sexual Misconduct¹⁷
- Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources¹⁸

MINIMIZING UNDERREPORTING

As the late Michael D. Smith (1987) correctly pointed out, "Obtaining accurate estimates of the extent of woman abuse in the population at large remains perhaps the biggest methodological challenge in survey research on this topic" (p. 185). The same can be said about other violent or abusive behaviors measured by the CQLS. There are a wide variety of reasons for why victims might not disclose incidents. These include embarrassment, fear of reprisal, "forward and backward telescoping," deception, and memory error (DeKeseredy & Rennison, 2013). Others suggest that underreporting can come from the reluctance or inability to recall traumatic incidents and the belief that violent or other types of abusive behaviors (e.g., racist comments) are too trivial or inconsequential to mention (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Smith, 1994).

These problems are difficult to overcome and are not likely to be eliminated in the near future. Nevertheless, attempts to minimize these sources of underreporting are necessary

14

¹⁴ Modified items included in the C.A.T.S. survey (Center for Research on Violence Against Women, 2014).

¹⁵ This was measured using the ARC3's (2015) modified version of Banyard, Plante, and Moynihan's (2005) bystander attitude's scale.

¹⁶ Slightly modified versions of items used in DeKeseredy and Perry's (2006) Campus Life Ouestionnaire.

¹⁷ Modified versions of items included in the Rutgers University (2014) Campus Climate Survey.

¹⁸ Modified items included in the Rutgers University (2014) Campus Climate Survey.

because the development of effective prevention and control efforts requires accurate data. Therefore, researchers have created several techniques of eliciting more accurate estimates of victimization, such as the following supplementary open-ended question located at the end of our questionnaire: 19

We really appreciate the time you have taken to complete this survey. And, we'd like to assure you that everything you have told us will remain <u>strictly anonymous</u>.

We realize the topics covered in this survey are sensitive and that many WVU students are reluctant to talk about their own campus experiences. But we're also a bit worried that we haven't asked the right questions.

So now that you have had a chance to think about the topics covered in this survey, would you like to provide us with any additional information about the quality of life on WVU's campus. If so, please use the box below.

Like the rest of your responses to this survey, any information you provide is anonymous and will only be reported grouped with all other comments.

On top of giving respondents more opportunities to disclose events, supplementary openended questions like the above build researcher-respondent rapport. According to Smith (1994):

For one thing, an open format may reduce the threat of a question on violence, because it allows the respondent to qualify her response, to express exact shades of meaning, rather than forcing her to choose from a number of possibly threatening alternatives. For another, open questions may reduce the power imbalance inherent in the interviewer situation (the relationship between researcher and researched parallels the hierarchical nature of traditional male-female relationships) because open questions encourage

-

¹⁹ This is a modified version of one of Smith's (1987) supplementary questions.

interaction and collaboration between interviewer and respondent.... The less threatening the question and the more equal the power relationship, the greater the probability of rapport, and in turn, of eliciting an honest answer to a sensitive question on violence (p. 115).

Of the 5,718 students who participated in the CQLS, 807 (14.11%) answered the supplementary open-ended question. Analyzing the responses is a time consuming task and thus an in-depth overview of these results cannot be provided here. However, the rich qualitative data we uncovered add much texture and context to the quantitative data and will be reported in subsequent publications on the CQLS.

PRE-TEST OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT

In early March 2016, as stated before, the research team pre-tested the survey with 250 students enrolled in two undergraduate courses to ensure that the instrument included in Appendix A was error-free and was highly intelligible to WVU students. As well, the team wanted to be sure that the electronic means of distributing survey described in the next chapter was fully functional. No major problems were uncovered and the pre-test participants assured us that the survey was ready to be administered.

3

Sample and Data Collection

The data presented in this report and to be released in subsequent publications are derived from an electronic survey of 30,470 WVU main campus students conducted in the Spring of 2016. Again, a total of 5,718 students responded, which is nearly 20% of the entire main campus student population. Described in Table 3.1, the sample is, for the most part, representative of the total WVU main campus population. Furthermore, the number of participants is much higher than those elicited by the bulk of similar recent campus surveys administered across the United States. There are several reasons for this and one is the multi-pronged publicity strategy described in the next section. Still, some readers may be quick to point out sex discrepancies in Table 3.1. Survey response and non-response studies show that trends in who answers surveys do, in fact, exist, with women typically being more likely to participate than men.²⁰ What is more, the relevance of the survey topic also influences response rates (Groves, Singer, & Corning, 2000). Thus, since women are much more likely than men to experience many of the harms examined in this study, it is not surprising that the CQLS elicited a higher percentage of women than that of the general WVU population, as well as a lower percentage of men than that of the broader WVU student community. Related to this point is that eliciting a higher percentage of female compared to male respondents is endemic to campus sexual assault survey research. In sum, the sample we generated is not unorthodox for this type of research.

-

²⁰ See Smith (2008) for a review of the literature on this issue.

TABLE 3.1

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERICS OF THE

WVU MAIN CAMPUS POPULATION AND THE CQLS SAMPLE

	POPULATION	SAMPLE
Status	N = 30,470	n = 5,718
Undergraduate	77.3	78.9
Professional	4.6	5.1
Graduate	18.2	15.9
Sex		
Female	48.6	57.2
Male	51.4	37.1
Other	Not recorded	1.1
Race/Ethnicity		
Black/African American	6.7	4.4
White	86.5	83.8
Asian	6.4	6.0
Hawaiian /Pacific Islander	0.5	0.2
Native American	1.4	0.4
Hispanic	3.8	3.1
Other (including mixed race)	Not recorded	<u>2.0</u>
Age		
Average age	23.3	22.1

^{*} The ethnic category "Hispanic" was considered separate from race in the population column and so the total exceeds 100%.

PUBLICITY STRATEGY

The publicity strategy was a campus-wide effort and involved the following techniques, some of which were heavily guided by the advice of interns affiliated with the Research Center on Violence at WVU:

 The CQLS was electronically advertised on MIX, Mountaineer ENEWS, and the Research Center's social media web sites.

- Posters about the study (see Appendix B) were scattered throughout WVU's main campus.²¹
- Many, albeit the exact number is unknown, faculty encouraged students to participate in the survey.
- Affiliates of various campus resource centers (e.g., the Title IX office) publicly encouraged students to complete the survey.
- Research Center interns announced the survey in all of their classes.
- President Gee sent out a campus-wide electronic message to all students requesting them to participate in the survey.

Another integral component of the publicity strategy was the inclusion of incentives. More specifically, every mode of publicity entailed informing students of the opportunity to be randomly selected to receive one of 20 \$50.00 VISA gift cards. This was also noted in the survey itself (see Appendix A). The literature on Internet surveys shows that lotteries are widely used in Web surveys and are often more effective than other forms of incentives (Couper & Bosnjak, 2010).

DATA COLLECTION

The CQLS was a Web survey. As Couper and Bosnjak (2010) remind us, "Much work remains to be done to figure out how best to reach sampled persons and get them to accept, open, read, and act upon the survey request. [T]he optimal strategy may well depend on the sampling frame, the nature of the relationship between the sender and recipient of the invitation, and other factors" (p. 539). The work done to achieve a sample size of 5,718 involved the aforementioned

19

²¹ Note that the font sizes in this poster are smaller than those found on those scattered throughout the WVU campus.

tasks, as well as sending email invitations to complete the survey to 30,000 students, with the first of four weekly invitations sent out on March 28, 2016. Each email invitation included a link to the survey, which was administered using Qualtrics software. After clicking the link to the survey in the email invitation and then clicking the bubble to agree to participate, respondents were taken to a screen containing a consent form. Students who indicated that they did not want to participate were removed from the email reminder list.

Participants were asked to confirm that they were at least 18-years-old and a current WVU student. They were also informed that any information they provide will be kept completely anonymous. As well, it was made explicit that student confidentiality is a priority and that any information they share cannot be associated with them. Moreover, they were informed that the research team cannot access their IP addresses or link the survey to their names, student IDs, or email addresses. Furthermore, under the research protocol, students were told that participation in this study is strictly voluntary and that they can skip any question and stop at any time.

Regardless of what they chose, all participants were provided with information on free professional support from counselling services listed at the end of the questionnaire. Located below this list was the option for students to enter their email addresses in a draw for a \$50.00 VISA gift card. To further preserve students' confidentiality, spreadsheets containing participants' responses are securely stored by Qualtrics and are only accessed by the research team.

Following the first email invitation, three reminders were sent out (one a week) for a total of four weeks of data collection. Couper and Bosnjack (2010) contend that "much of the nonresponse occurs at the early stages before we have a chance to convince them of the

importance of the study" (p. 539). This was not the case with the CQLS. In fact, close to 2,500 students completed the survey within five days of the first email invitation. As stated earlier, supplementing the reminders were those offered by colleagues affiliated with other faculty departments and offices at WVU.

Regardless of the methods used, survey researchers will always have to face the fact that many students will not want to participate in their studies and that some respondents will simply refuse to disclose violent or abusive experiences. Perfect campus climate surveys are not possible, but good ones can and should be done. The methods used in the CQLS constitute an important step toward achieving this goal.

4

Preliminary Results

The CQLS data set is rich with policy relevant information, much of which cannot be reported in a short report. Still, the preliminary results described in this chapter are indicative of students' experiences with, and perceptions of, key issues related to their safety. How safe do they generally feel on the WVU campus? It is to answers to this question that we first turn.

PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY ON THE WVU CAMPUS

Many people would strongly agree with Henslin and Nelson's (1996) assertion that "The first criterion for a good education is security, to guarantee students' physical safety and freedom from fear" (p. 498). Most of the students sampled *do not worry* about being targeted on the WVU campus by the harms listed in Table 4.1. Vandalism is the crime that elicited the highest percentage of worried students (35%), followed by being sexually assaulted by strangers (28%). There is ample scientific evidence showing that the risk of being physically and sexually assaulted by someone you know is markedly higher than the risk of being targeted these ways by strangers, but Table 4.1 shows that higher percentages of students were worried about being attacked by strangers. This is likely due, in part, to the fact that many young people view popular mass media, which typically distort levels of "stranger danger" that exist in people's communities (Beirne & Messerschmidt, 2014).

TABLE 4.1
PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY ON THE WVU CAMPUS

TYPE OF CRIME	% NOT WORRIED	% WORRIED
Having your home broken	75.2	24.8
into and something stolen		
Being mugged and robbed	74.3	25.7
Being sexually assaulted by	72	28
strangers		
Being physically attacked by	71.7	28.3
strangers		
Being physically attacked	91.5	8.5
because of your skin color,		
race/ethnic origin or religion		
Vandalism to your home or	65.1	34.9
car		
Being physically attacked by	93.3	6.7
someone you know		
Being sexually assaulted by	91.2	8.8
someone you know		

As criminologists routinely note, fear of crime is also associated with other factors, such as one's sex, race/ethnicity, social class, gender identity, and so on. Consider CQLS data on gender identity and perception of safety on campus. We found that overall, men are much less worried about the harms presented in Table 4.1 than are women and members of sexual minority groups.²² This may be a function of variations in risk of victimization, an issue to be examined in further data analyses. Certainly, we know that heterosexual women are much more likely to be sexually and physically assaulted by someone they are intimately involved with or were involved with than are heterosexual men. This possibly explains the male-female percentage differences in the last two categories in Table 4.1. For example, 12.1% of the women in the sample worried about being sexually assaulted by someone they know compared to 3.6% of the men. Moreover,

_

 $^{^{22}}$ No transmale students answered this question and the number of transmale students (n = 3) who participated in this study was very small to begin with.

7.9% of the women worried about being physically assaulted by someone they know compared to 4.8% of the males.

PERCEPTIONS OF CAMPUS ATMOSPHERE FOR NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS

The percentages of students who reported that people behaved toward the non-traditional students listed in Table 4.2 in an unfriendly fashion are markedly smaller than the percentages of students who reported friendly behavior. This, at first glance, is a strong indicator of a welcoming atmosphere. However, three cautionary notes are required. First, most of the students in the sample are white (84%) and heterosexual (87%). The same can be said about the general WVU population. Thus, their perceptions may be heavily influenced by being in positions of privilege and therefore relatively immune to hate or bias crimes. Second, as noted in Table 4.2, sizeable portions of students answered "without much feeling one way or another," which could be interpreted in different ways. For example, students of similar demographic backgrounds may spend more time with each other and thus have fewer opportunities to observe the mistreatment of those who do not share their demographic characteristics. On the other hand, an unknown number of students may spend very little time interacting socially with other students and thus they, too, have fewer opportunities to observe mistreatment.

Third, close to 30% of students reported that people were unfriendly to Muslims and to transgender people, and nearly 25% stated that people were unfriendly to feminists. Possibly, this is a reflection of the broader political atmosphere in which the survey was administered. For example, the Presidential election featured some strong anti-Muslim rhetoric and many people incorrectly equate Islam with terrorism. Furthermore, there was a major backlash against transgender people using bathrooms based on their gender identities. As well, there continues to be a strong anti-feminist backlash in this country (DeKeseredy, Fabricius, & Hall-Sanchez, 2015;

Dragiewicz & Mann, 2016). Further analyses of the data, though, are necessary prior to making strong conclusions.

TABLE 4.2

PERCEPTIONS OF BEHAVIOR TOWARD

NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS

SOCIAL GROUP	% FRIENDLY	% UNFREINDLY	% WITHOUT MUCH FEELING ONE WAY OR ANOTHER
American Indian people	68.6	6.8	24.7
People of color	73.4	9.4	17.3
Jews	71.1	4.3	28.9
Asians	70	6.4	30
Muslims	50.6	28.6	20.9
Transgender people	48.4	27.4	24.2
Gay men/Lesbians	58.1	18.9	23
International students	65.1	12.8	22.1
Feminists	50.6	23.9	25.6
People with disabilities	76.5	5.6	17.9

Turning to responses to other questions about perceptions of the campus atmosphere, it is important to note more than one-third (35%) of the sample stated that racism on the WVU campus is a problem and almost 40% reported that they believed women on the WVU campus experience discrimination. Furthermore, slightly more than 14% think that professors, administrators (e.g., Deans), and other people employed by WVU favor some social groups over others. Worth noting as well is that approximately 80% of the sample reported that, since they started at WVU, they had seen or heard about one or more of the things listed in Table 4.3 that they thought were offensive to other people because of their race/ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, or political orientation.

TABLE 4.3

REPORTS OF VIEWING OR HEARING THINGS

THAT STUDENTS CONSIDERED OFFENSIVE

SEEN OR HEARD	% YES	% NO
Jokes	65.58	26.74
Leaflets or posters	11.42	85.59
Spray-painted signs, slogans,	18.29	73.82
or graffiti		
Comments on campus radio,	23.31	68.78
TV, bulletin boards, or social		
media sites		
Articles or cartoons in	7.33	84.73
campus newspapers or		
magazines		
General comments or stories	57.71	34.42
that you heard or were told		
about		

In sum, the CQLS preliminary results presented in this section strongly suggest that the campus climate is more comfortable for some groups than others and that more attention should be devoted to effectively dealing with certain types of discrimination. Stronger empirical support for this recommendation is found in the data on hate-motivated assaults.

HATE- AND BIAS-MOTIVATED ASSAULTS

Unfortunately, since they started at WVU, close to 60 % of the sample reported being the victims of one or more of the 16 behaviors listed in Table 4.4 because of their real or perceived race/ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, or political orientation. Table 4.4 shows that bias incidents are more common on WVU than hate crimes. Bias assaults are not crimes in the strict legal sense of the word but still can have the same hurtful and divisive consequences as hate crimes (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2010).

TABLE 4.4

HATE- AND BIAS-MOTIVATED ASSAULTS

TYPE OF ASSAULT	% YES	% NO
Verbal assaults	30.38	59.51
Offensive phone calls, letters,	8.52	81.36
or email		
Unwillingly exposed to racist,	17.30	72.56
sexist, or other offensive		
online images		
Had personal property	13.94	75.97
damaged or stolen		
Had objects thrown at you	10.42	79.42
Been chased or followed by	5.30	84.49
people intent on hurting you		
Been spat upon	2.54	87.30
Been threatened with physical	13.05	76.71
assault		
Been physically assaulted	5.79	83.86
Been threatened with	10.83	78.86
unwanted sexual behaviors		
Been verbally sexually	25.53	64.22
harassed		
Been touched sexually when	18.07	71.72
you didn't want to be touched		
Been forced to have	4.30	85.40
unwanted sexual intercourse		
Been threatened with a	3.35	86.39
weapon		
Been attacked with a weapon	1	88.34

The most common assaults reported by CQLS participants are as follows:

- verbal assaults (30.38%);
- been verbally sexually harassed (25.53%);
- been touched sexually when you didn't want to be touched (18.07%); and
- unwillingly exposed to racist, sexist, or other offensive online images (17.30%).

To be viewed as just as serious are these statistics: 13.05% of the sample was threatened with physical assault; 10.8% were threatened with unwanted sexual behaviors; 10.42% had

objects thrown at them; and 4.30% percent were survivors of forced unwanted sexual intercourse. This is not to say, however, that the other hate- or bias-motivated behaviors in Table 4.4 not discussed here are trivial or inconsequential. Though not as common, they can cause considerable pain and suffering and should treated as equally serious.

That one in three participants reported verbal assaults and that one in four reported being verbally sexually harassed should also be treated as major warning signs because, as pointed out by the U.S. Department of Justice, "A campus culture in which the use of slurs becomes commonplace and accepted soon becomes an environment in which slurs can escalate to harassment, harassment can escalate to threats, and threats can escalate to physical violence" (cited in the Southern Poverty Law Center, 2010, p. 4). The relationship between verbal assaults, sexual harassment, and other harms listed in Table 4.4 will soon be examined by the research team.

STALKING

Stalking is defined here as "the willful, repeated, and malicious following, harassing, or threatening of another person" (Melton, 2007, p. 4). It involves a variety of fear-inducing behaviors, such as unwanted phone calls and e-mails, showing up at a person's home or car to let her or him know that the offender was there (Black et al., 2011). Table 4.5 includes responses to eight stalking items included in the CQLS. *Thirty-eight percent* of the sample were victimized by at least one of these behaviors since enrolling at WVU. Students were also asked to think about one stalking situation that had the greatest effect on them and to provide information on the perpetrator. Not surprisingly, of those who experienced any of the items in Table 4.5, the majority (44%) stated that the offender was male, compared to 10% who identified the stalker as female. However, the percentage who reported that they were victimized by a stranger (25%) is

nearly equal to that of the total percentage (30%) who reported that the stalker was someone they know is surprising because most stalking quietly occurs in our own neighborhoods and typically involves men targeting current or former intimate female partners (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2013). Eight percent of the stalking victims reported that this was the case (3% current partners and 5% former partners), which is still a significant number.

In response to a question asking if the perpetrator was a WVU student, 35% answered "yes," 10% answered "no," and 14% responded "I don't know." Thirty percent of victims stated that the one situation that had the greatest effect on them occurred on the WVU campus and 25% stated that it did not happen there. Moreover, the perpetrators' use of alcohol or drugs prior to the incident was reported by a sizeable portion of respondents (23%).

TABLE 4.5
STALKING VICTIMIZATION

TYPE OF STALKING	% YES	% NO
Watched or followed you	10.7	89.3
from a distance, or spied on		
you with a listening device,		
camera, or GPS		
Approached you or showed	14.7	85.3
up in places, such as your		
home, workplace, or school		
when you didn't want them to		
be there		
Left strange or potentially	3.1	96.9
threatening items for you to		
find		
Sneaked into your home or	2.8	97.2
car and did things to scare		
you by letting you know they		
had been there		
Sent you unwanted electronic	21.7	78.3
messages such as texts, voice		
messages, emails, or through		
social media apps.		

Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to	5.2	94.8
Made rude or mean comments to you online	18.8	81.2
Spread rumors about you online, whether they were true or not	13.4	86.6

Contemporary technologies ranging from smart phones to drones are extensively used throughout the world today to achieve numerous positive objectives, such as remaining in constant contact with friends and relatives and to write student term papers, or just to provide exceptionally faster communications through e-mail, messaging, video messaging, or many other means. There are now many examples of humanitarian deeds made possible in recent years only by using newer technologies, such as crowdsourcing funding for good ideas, paying the medical bills of heroes, or bringing together people to support good work.

Still, as described in Table 4.5, there is another side to the recent use of new technology. For example, the highest rates of stalking victimization are found in the categories that involve the use of what Dr. Jordan Navarro (2016) refers to as "low-tech" and "high-tech" methods. Low-tech methods should not require that the stalker obtain particularly sophisticated technological knowledge, and for that reason the use of such methods is more widespread and common. The examples of such low-tech stalking included in Table 4.5 are using smart phones and electronic mail to threaten, harass, or insult people, as well as going online to make rude or mean comments or to harm someone's reputation.

High-tech methods may be used instead of low-tech ones, or may be used in combination with various low-tech techniques. The responses (10.7%) to the first item in Table 4.5 reveal that a sizeable portion of students were spied on with a listening device, camera, or GPS, which are

defined by Navarro (2016) as high-tech means of stalking. Certainly, much higher percentages of students were victimized by low- and high-tech types of stalking than they were by most of the non-electronic methods. Still, a relatively high rate (14.7%) were victimized by someone approaching them or showing up in places such as their homes, workplaces, or schools when they didn't want them to.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Sexual harassment in schools such as WVU is "the unwanted and unwelcomed behavior of a sexual nature that interferes with one's right to receive an equal educational opportunity" (Stein, 2008, p. 664). Table 4.6 provides five examples of such victimization, with 46.4% of the sample reporting experiencing at least one of these harms one or more times since starting at WVU. Note that the CQLS asked respondents to only reveal whether the behaviors listed in Table 4.6 were done by people who were not intimate partners (e.g., dating partners or spouses). As well, the above estimate parallels those uncovered at other institutions of higher learning (Morgan & Gruber, 2011).

TABLE 4.6
SEXUAL HARASSMENT VICTIMIZATION

TYPE OF HARASSMENT	% YES	% NO
Said sexual things to you that	37.8	62.2
you did not want to hear		
Sent sexual messages or	16.2	83.8
pictures that you did not want		
(including porn)		
Asked or pressured you for a	26	74
date, hook up, or sexual		
favors even though you had		
already said no		
Made unwanted sexual	24	76
gestures, imitated sexual		
motions, or touched you		
sexually when you did not		
want them to		
Exposed genitals or sex	11.3	88.7
organs to you		

Several things stand out in Table 4.6. First, no item generated a percentage lower than 11%. Second, more than one out of every four students in the sample experienced two of the above harms and more than one in three were targeted by someone who said sexual things they did not want to hear. Finally, it is safe to conclude that sexual harassment is pervasive among the WVU student body.

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Intimate partner violence is one of the world's most pressing social problems. It is also common among college students and those attending WVU are no exception, with nearly 20% of the CQLS sample reporting experiencing at least one of the eight behaviors in Table 4.7 one or more times since starting at WVU. This figure is consistent with estimates uncovered at other colleges across the country.

TABLE 4.7
INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE VICTIMIZATION

TYPE OF VIOLENCE	% YES	% NO
Shoved, shook, pinched or	11.7	88.3
scratched you, or pulled your		
hair		
Slapped you	8.4	91.6
Threw something at you that	8	92
could hurt you		
Bent your fingers or twisted	5.4	94.6
your arm		
Hit, punched, kicked, or bit	7.7	92.4
you		
Dragged you by your hair,	2	98
threw you down the stairs or		
out of a car, or threw you		
around		
Burned you, choked you, or	2.6	97.4
tried to strangle or suffocate		
you		
Used, or threatened to use, a	2.7	97.3
weapon against you		

Table 4.7 shows that every violence item elicited a rate of at least 2%; however, what many people regard as "less lethal" forms of intimate violence occurred more often. This is consistent with most of the earlier North American research. Even so, there is a problem with rank-ordering dating violence behaviors in a linear fashion and assuming that the first two items in Table 4.7 are less injurious than those below them. For example, a shove can lead to someone falling down the stairs and ending up with major head trauma. What is more, a slap can break teeth or draw blood (DeKeseredy & Hinch, 1991; Dobash & Dobash 1988; Smith, 1987). It is unclear from this study if such outcomes did, in fact, occur, but it is clear that the behaviors listed in Table 4.7 were not done in a joking or playful manner because respondents were explicitly asked not to report those that were done in such a fashion.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

CQLS data further confirm that sexual assaults on college students constitute a major nation-wide problem. Slightly over 25% (25.2%) of respondents experienced one or more of the five assaults listed in Table 4.8 since enrolling at WVU, all of which are explicit *violations of West Virginia's sexual assault laws*. Moreover, all of these acts were committed without the victims' consent, 23 and the last four are, under West Virginia law, examples of Sexual Assault in the Second Degree, while the first item constitutes Sexual Abuse in the First Degree. A cautionary note, though, is necessary. It is unclear from the data whether or not the victims of the last four crimes in Table 4.8 experienced attacks that involved the infliction of bodily injury or the use of a deadly weapon. Those that did would thus, under West Virginia law, be recognized as victims of Sexual Assault in the First Degree. Of great significance here, too, is that, if convicted of any of the crimes in Table 4.8, perpetrators would be legally defined as guilty of a felony and face imprisonment.

The sexual assault data described here yield two important conclusions. First, a comparison of the figures reported here with those collected by other schools shows that the problem of sexual assault among WVU students is just as serious as it is among students at other U.S. colleges. Second, due to issues related to underreporting discussed earlier, the high figures are *underestimates* and are not likely to decrease without the commitment of much time, energy, and money devoted to curbing one of the most significant threats to women's health and safety. It should also be noted that of those who responded to a question asking if they agreed with the statement "The institution tolerates a culture of sexual misconduct," 75% either agreed or

-

²³ The words "without my consent" were included in each sexual assault question.

strongly agreed. What is more, 54% agreed with the statement "The Institution tolerates a culture of substance abuse."

TABLE 4.8
SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMIZATION

TYPE OF SEXUAL	% YES	% NO
ASSAULT		
Someone fondled, kissed, or	18.42	67.14
rubbed up against the private		
areas of my body (lips,		
breast/chest, crotch or butt) or		
removed some of my clothes		
without my consent (but did		
not attempt sexual		
penetration)		
Someone had oral sex with	5	80.69
me or made me have oral sex		
with them without my		
consent		
Someone put their penis,	5.37	47.24
fingers, or other objects into		
my vagina without my		
consent		
Someone put their penis,	3.53	81.86
fingers, or other objects into		
my butt without my consent		
Even though it didn't happen,	9.86	75.60
someone TRIED to have oral,		
anal, or vaginal sex with me		
without my consent		

In response to the question "Where did your unwanted sexual experiences occur?," the highest percentages are reported for two places: off-campus housing that is not university-owned (8%) and off-campus at a bar (8%). Further, 66 % of the sexual assault survivors reported that they were victimized by another WVU student or WVU employee, while 34% stated that they were assaulted by a person with no connection to WVU or they were unsure if the perpetrator was connected to WVU. Four percent reported being harmed by WVU student who was a "friend

with benefits" or someone they were "hooking up with," while 2% were assaulted by a WVU student they were dating or who was a spouse/partner and the same percentage were victimized by people who fall into the response category "other." In sum, then, as is the case for the vast majority of sexual assaults on adults that occur at other schools and throughout society, most WVU sexual assault survivors were harmed by someone they know. The reality is that what many people erroneously define as "real rape" – the assault by a stranger hiding in the alleyways or bushes – accounts for very few sexual assaults.

The sexual assault and other victimization data presented in this report warrant considerable attention. However, the CQLS also found that numerous WVU students are actively involved in attempts to create a high level of *collective efficacy* on campus. In other words, they are working to create "mutual trust among neighbors combined with a willingness to act on behalf of the common good" (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998, p.1), specifically to prevent violence on the WVU campus and its immediate surroundings. It is to this issue that we now turn.

STUDENTS' EFFORTS TO HELP PREVENT VIOLENCE

More than one-third of the sample (32%) were involved in one or more of four campus programs listed in the CQLS. One in four (21%) participated in alcohol and substance abuse programs, 7% received Green Dot training, 14% were involved in other violence/sexual assault prevention programs, and 9% participated in bullying/harassment programs. That such a high number of students received such training is possibly strongly related to the fact that 74% used one or more of the bystander intervention strategies presented in Table 4.9 while they were attending WVU. This will be empirically determined in subsequent analyses of CQLS data. However, what is clear is that many WVU students are looking out for their peers' safety.

TABLE 4.9
USE OF BYSTANDER INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

STRATEGY	% YES	% NO
Walked a friend who has had	83.8	16.2
too much to drink home from		
a party, bar, or other social		
event		
Talked to the friends of a	79.4	20.6
drunk person to make sure		
they don't leave him/her		
behind at a party, bar, or		
other social event		
Spoke up against sexist jokes	60.6	39.4
Tried to distract someone	50	50
who was trying to take a		
drunk person to another room		
or trying to get them to do		
something sexual		
Ask someone who looks very	78.7	21.3
upset at a party if they are		
okay or need help		
Intervene with a friend who	48.5	51.5
was being physically abusive		
to another person		
Intervene with a friend who	58.6	41.4
was being verbally abusive to		
another person		

In all of the situations featured in Table 4.9, at least 48% of the students intervened. The highest rates of intervention are found in the first two categories, which could be related to the fact that the highest rate of student involvement in campus programs was for those who participated in alcohol and substance abuse programs. Still, that high percentages of students who intervened in other situations is also, again, a sign that other programs may, too, be having a positive effect.

Some sociologists would interpret the data presented in Table 4.9 as being indicative of high levels of collective efficacy in the WVU community. Other indicators are these findings:

- 87% stated that people on the WVU campus help each other;
- 97% stated that this is a friendly campus;
- 70% reported that people on the WVU campus can be trusted; and
- 85.4% either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement "People on this campus do not get along with each other."

Ironically, nearly 50% of the sample stated that people on the WVU campus do not share the same values and only 53% stated that people on the WVU campus will call campus police if suspicious people are hanging around. It is, at this point in time, unclear why such high percentages of students have these perceptions, but further analyses of CQLS data are likely to provide relevant information.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF WVU'S

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

The CQLS asked students some questions about how they think WVU would handle a situation in which a student reported an incident of sexual misconduct. Sexual misconduct was defined in the preamble to the items about perceptions of WVU's institutional responses as "physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence."

Table 4.10 shows that most respondents have a positive view of how WVU would handle sexual misconduct. Yet, significant percentages of students who share the opposite view are found in each item in Table 4.10, and a substantial number of students provided neutral responses. Further analysis of the data may offer some explanations for why this is the case.

TABLE 4.10
STUDENTS PERCEPTIONS OF WVU'S

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

RESPONSE	% AGREE	% DISAGREE	% NEUTRAL
WVU would take the	69.4	11.8	18.8
report seriously			
WVU would maintain the	76.4	6.7	17
privacy of the person			
making the report			
WVU would do its best to	68.1	10.4	21.5
honor the request of the			
person about how to go			
forward with the case			
WVU would take steps to	70.9	9.6	19.5
protect the safety of the			
person making the report			
WVU would support the	64.5	10.3	25.1
person making the report			
WVU would provide	53.7	18.8	27.5
accommodations to			
support the person (e.g.,			
academic, housing,			
safety)			
WVU would take action	62.1	14.8	23
to address factors that			
may have led to the			
sexual misconduct			
WVU would handle the	61.9	11.7	26.5
report fairly			
WVU would label the	20	58	22.2
person making the report			
a trouble maker who			
made the report			
WVU would have a hard	21.5	54.1	24.4
time supporting the			
person who made the			
report			
WVU would punish the	16.4	65.6	18
person who made the			
report			

Only 35% of the sample know where to go to help on the WVU campus if they or a friend experienced sexual misconduct. Ten percent more (45%), though, know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct on the WVU campus and 50% understand what happens when a student reports a claim of sexual misconduct at WVU. Typically, most students, unless

they directly or indirectly experienced sexual misconduct, are unaware of campus services and thus these statistics should not be viewed as indicative of problematic campus programming.

5

Conclusions

In this report on the preliminary results of the CQLS, we presented the first WVU data of their kind. The estimates of the harms examined in this study, as is the case with all campus climate surveys, are underestimates because of issues related to underreporting discussed in an earlier section of this report. Even so, these statistics suggest that some crimes happen regularly and are common among WVU students. The next steps in the research process are to examine similarities and differences among certain groups of students (e.g., males and females) and to identify the key sources or *risk factors* associated with the types of victimization uncovered by the CQLS. Risk factors are typically defined in the social scientific violence literature as attributes of a couple, victim, or perpetrator that are associated with an increased probability of victimization (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). They may be causes, co-occurrences, or consequences of victimization (Smith, 1990).

Risk factor data will help the WVU community enhance its efforts to enhance students' health and well-being. Still, regardless of the initiatives developed, there are no simple solutions to the problems examined by the CQLS. We must work toward developing a "multiagency" approach (Jones, MacLean, & Young, 1986). This strategy calls for actions that are interdisciplinary, collaborative, and focused on the "attitudinal, physical, financial and systemic barriers to access, equity, and safety for students in our post-secondary education system" (Stark-Adamec, 1996a, p. 145).

What, specifically, is to be done about the hurtful behaviors examined in this report? It is far beyond the scope of this chapter to describe the profusion of progressive policies advanced by North American academics, campus administrators, and student organizations. Actually, several books on this topic are available, and we urge readers to peruse them for more detailed discussions on how to make unsafe learning environments safer. Rather than provide a superficial overview of the strategies described in these and other sources, we want to conclude this report by again emphasizing that the very first step to be taken must be publicly acknowledging that various types of victimization occur on the WVU campus and its immediate surroundings and that the WVU community fully intends to develop a set of norms and goals that establish the unacceptability of these harms.

Since the WVU community was never aware of the true extent of the problems covered by the CQLS, faculty, administrators, students, and others may have much to learn about preventing and responding to these behaviors. No doubt, there will be challenges, including resistance from people uncomfortable with necessary policy changes. Nevertheless, one of the most important points to consider here is to avoid oversimplified solutions. Often, they do more harm than good and fail to address the many and complex sources of sexual assault, stalking, intimate violence, sexual harassment, and hate and bias crimes. These problems cannot be stopped unless all institutions of higher learning develop a *collective* responsibility for achieving this goal (Stark-Adamec, 1996b).

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

Campus Quality of Life Survey



This survey was developed by Drs. Walter DeKeseredy and Amanda Hall-Sanchez. Contact The Research Center on Violence at West Virginia University at WVUCRV@mail.wvu.edu for use requests. The Research Center is willing for you to use our campus quality of life survey for non-profit and educational purposes, as long as appropriate attribution is given.

WVU CAMPUS QUALITY OF LIFE SURVEY



WVU is dedicated to promoting a welcoming and caring community. You have been <u>randomly</u> selected to participate in a survey of your campus experiences since you enrolled at WVU. Many questions focus on your perceptions of safety on or near the campus, including your personal safety. The survey should take you 25 minutes to complete. Note that completing this questionnaire makes you eligible to enter in a draw for one of <u>TWENTY \$50.00 VISA gift cards</u>.

This study is sponsored by the Offices of the Provost and the Dean of Eberly College of Arts and Sciences and is being conducted by WVU Professors Walter DeKeseredy and Amanda Hall-Sanchez.

Please read the instructions for each section carefully and answer each question as honestly as you can. You must be at least 18 years old to participate. Please note that any information you provide will be kept completely anonymous. Your confidentiality is a priority, and whatever information you share on this survey cannot be identified: we cannot access your IP address or link your survey to your name, student ID, or email address.

Participation in this study is also *strictly voluntary*. Some of the questions will ask about private, personal, or potentially upsetting experiences. You do not have to answer any question you do not want to and you can stop at any time. But all of your answers are important to us, so take your time and be as honest as possible. We think you will find this questionnaire interesting.

For information regarding your rights as a research subject, to discuss problems, concerns, or suggestions related to the research, to obtain information or offer input about the research, contact the Office of Research Integrity & Compliance at (304) 293-7073.

The results of this survey will be made widely available and hopefully used to improve WVU's quality of campus life. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Walter DeKeseredy at walter.dekeseredy@mail.wvu.edu or at (304) 293-8846.

Clicking this bubble shows that you fully understand the purposes and procedures for this study and that you agree to participate.

1. First, we would like to ask you how safe you generally feel on the WVU campus. Could you tell us how worried or not worried you are about the following happening to you?

	Not at all	Not very	Fairly	Very worried
	worried	worried	Worried	
Having your				
home broken				
into and				
something				
stolen				
Being				
mugged and				
robbed				
Being				
sexually				
assaulted by				
strangers				
Being				
physically				
attacked by				
strangers				
Being				
physically				
attacked				
because of				
your skin				
color,				
race/ethnic				
origin or				
religion				
Vandalism to				
your home or				
car				
Being				
physically				
attacked by				
someone you				
know				
Being				
sexually				
assaulted by				
someone you				
know				

information will allow us to compare your responses to other WVU students. Please click the bubble which best represents your answer. Where there are blanks, please type the answer. Please note that your responses will be kept completely anonymous. How old are you?_____ a. What is your current gender identity? b. ___ Woman ____ Man ___ Transwoman ____ Transman ___ Genderqueer/gender non-conforming ____ A gender not listed here (*Please identify* _____) Are you an international student? c. ___ Yes (From which country? ____) ___ No Which racial/ethnic group do you identify with? Please check the box that best d. represents your answer. ___ Native American or Alaskan Native ____ Black/African ____ American White/Caucasian ___ Hispanic or Latino/a ____ Asian or Asian American ___ Middle Eastern (e.g., Saudi Arabia, Israel) ____ Hawaiian or Pacific Islander ____ A race/ethnicity not listed here (Please specify _____) e. What is your sexual orientation? ____ Heterosexual/straight ___ Gay ___ A sexual orientation not listed here ___ Lesbian (Please specify _____) ____ Bisexual Asexual f. What year of school are you in? ____ rirst year
____ Second year
____ Third year First year ____ Fourth or more year undergraduate ___ Graduate (e.g., M.A., Ph.D., or MBA program) ____ Professional school (e.g., law, medicine, dentistry) What is your major? _____ g.

Now, we would like to ask you some general background questions. This

2.

Honor society of pFraternity (pledge	or member)	oup related to	your major o	field of study	
Sorority (pledge or	,				
Intercollegiate athle					
Intramural or club					
Political or social a					
Student governmen					
Media organization		•	nagazine)		
Other student orga	nization or gro	oup			
Which of the following	best describes	s your curren	t living situatio	n?	
On campus residen		ory			
On campus apartm	ent				
Fraternity house					
Sorority house					
Off-campus univers					
Off-campus housin	-	•	ned		
At home with pare	nt(s) or guardia	an (s)			
Other off-campus					
trmes of poorle Di					
types of people. Ple experience. Where Do people behave tow generally friendly, or w	ethere are b	olanks, plea	ways that are	answer.	endly,
experience. Where Do people behave tow	ethere are be ard the following without much for Generally unfriendly	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
Do people behave tow generally friendly, or w	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was	ways that are ay or another?	answer. generally unfri	Generally
Do people behave tow generally friendly, or we have a superior of the superior	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
Do people behave tow generally friendly, or we have a superior of the color of the	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
Do people behave tow generally friendly, or we have a series of color Jews	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
Do people behave tow generally friendly, or we have a superior of the color of the	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
Do people behave tow generally friendly, or we have a series of color Jews	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
Do people behave tow generally friendly, or we see that the second of th	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
American Indian people People of color Jews Asians Muslims Transgender people Gay men/Lesbians	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
American Indian people People of color Jews Asians Muslims Transgender people Gay men/Lesbians International students	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly
American Indian people People of color Jews Asians Muslims Transgender people Gay men/Lesbians	ethere are beard the following without much for Generally unfriendly towards	ng groups in eeling one was Moderately unfriendly	ways that are ay or another? Without much feeling	answer. generally unfri Moderately friendly	Generally friendly

b.	Do you believe that racism on campus is a problem?
	Yes No
c.	Do you believe that women on this campus experience discrimination?
	Yes No
d.	Do you believe that lesbians, gay men, and bisexual, transgender, and queer people experience discrimination on this campus because of their sexual identity?
	Yes
	No
e.	Do you think that professors, administrators (e.g., Deans), and other people employed by this school generally treat all people the same regardless of their race/ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, physical or mental disability, or political orientation?
	Treat all the same Favor some groups over others (Please identify these groups)
	Don't know

ť	ollowing on campus that you think were offensive to oth heir race/ethnicity, national origin, religion, sex, sexual of mental disability, or political orientation?		
		Yes	No
	Jokes		
	Leaflets or posters		
	Spray-painted signs, slogans, or other graffiti		
	Comments on campus radio, TV, bulletin boards, or social media sites		
	Articles or cartoons in campus newspapers or magazines		
	General comments or stories that you heard or were told about		

Since you started at WVU, have you personally seen or heard about any of the

f.

- 4. The next questions are about the information your current friends may have given you concerning how to deal with problems in intimate or romantic relationships. When the word <u>"date"</u> is used, please think of anyone with whom you have or have had a romantic or sexual relationship short or long term. Please click the bubble which best represents your answer.
- a. To the best of your knowledge, did any of your friends tell you that:

	*7	T NT
	Yes	No
You should respond to your		
dates' challenges to your		
authority by using physical		
force, such as hitting or		
slapping?		
It is alright for someone to hit		
a date in certain situations		
Your dates should have sex		
with you whenever you want		
When you spend money on a		
date, the person should have		
sex with you in return		
You should respond to your		
dates' challenges to your		
authority by insulting them or		
putting them down		
You should respond to your		
dates' sexual rejections by		
using physical force to have		
sex		
It is alright to physically force		
a person to have sex under		
certain conditions		
a person to have sex under		

b.	To the best of your knowledge, how many of your friends have ever made physically forceful attempts at sexual activity with dates which were disagreeable and offensive enough that the dates responded in an offended manner such as crying, fighting, screaming or pleading?
	None
	One or two
	Three to five
	Six to ten
	More than ten
	Don't know
c.	To the best of your knowledge, how many of your friends have ever used physical force, such as hitting or beating, to resolve conflicts with their dates?
	None
	One or two
	Three to five
	Six to ten
	More than ten
	Don't know

d.	To the best of your knowledge, how many of your friends insult their swear at them, and/or withhold affection?	dates,	
	None		
	One or two		
	Three to five		
	Six to ten		
	More than ten		
	Don't know		
a.	have happened to you since you started at WVU. And we assure you that everything you tell us will remain strictly. Since you started at WVU, have any of the following incidents happen	y anonymo	
a.	campus because of your (real or perceived) race/ethnicity, national orientation, physical or mental disability, or political orientation each item.	gin, religion,	sex,
		Yes	No
	Had verbal assaults directed at you		
	Gotten offensive phone calls, letters or e-mail		
	Been unwillingly exposed to racist, sexist, or		
	other offensive online images		
	Had personal property (e.g., laptop computer) damaged		
	or stolen		
	Had objects thrown at you		
	Been chased or followed by people intent on hurting you		
	Been spat upon Been threatened with physical assault		
	Been physically assaulted		
	Been threatened with unwanted sexual behaviors		
	Been verbally sexually harassed		
	(e.g., unwanted sexual comments about you)		
	Been touched sexually when you didn't want to be touched		
	(e.g., your breasts, rear end or genitals)		
	Been forced to have unwanted sexual intercourse		
	Been threatened with a weapon Been attacked with a weapon		

b. How many times have one or more people done the following things to you since you enrolled at WVU?

	None	1-2	3-5	6-8	More than 8
Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS [global positioning system]?					
Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want them to be there?					
Left strange or potentially threatening items for you to find?					
Sneaked into your home or car and did things to scare you by					
letting you know they had been there?					
Sent you unwanted electronic messages such as texts, voice					
messages, emails, or though social media apps?					
Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew					
you didn't want them to?					
Made rude or mean comments to you online?					
Spread rumors about you online, whether they were true or not?					

IF YOU HAVE NEVER EXPERIENCED ANY OF THE ABOVE EVENTS, PLEASE GO THE QUESTION (ITEM D) THAT FOLLOWS THE ONE BELOW.

c.	Think about the situations that have happened to you that involved the experiences you marked on the last screen. Now think about the <u>ONE SITUATION</u> that had the greatest effect on you and answer the following questions. 1. The other person was a:
	ManWomanOther
	2. What was your relationship to the other person?
	stranger acquaintance friend romantic partner former romantic partner relative/family member
	faculty/staff

	3.	Was the other person a student at WVU?
		YESNOI DON'T KNOW
	4.	Did this happen on campus?
		YESNO
	5.	Had the other person been using alcohol or drugs prior to the incident?
		YesNoI don't know
	6.	Had you been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?
		I had been using alcoholI had been using drugsI had been using both alcohol and drugsI had not been using either alcohol or drugs
d.		you started at WVU, how often has someone (NOT someone you are dating or a e/partner) done any of the following to you?

	Never	Once	Sometimes	Often	Choose
	(0	(1	(2-5 times)	(6+	not to
	timers)	time)		times)	answer
Said sexual things to you that you					
did not want to hear?					
Sent sexual message or pictures that					
you did not want (including porn)?					
Asked or pressured you for a date,					
hook up, or sexual favors even					
though you had already said no?					
Made unwanted sexual gestures,					
imitated sexual motions, or touched					
you sexually when you did not want					
them to?					
Exposed genitals or sex organs to					
you?					

e. We are particularly interested in learning about your intimate or romantic relationships. Since you started at WVU, how many times has someone you were dating or a spouse/partner done the following physical things to you **that were NOT done in a joking or playful manner**?

	Never	Once	Sometimes	Often	Choose not
	(0	(1	(2-5 times)	(6+	to answer
	times)	time)		times)	
Shoved, shook, pinched or scratched					
you, or pulled your hair?					
Slapped you?					
Threw something at you that could					
hurt you?					
Bent your fingers or twisted your					
arm?					
Hit, punched, kicked, or bit you?					
Dragged you by your hair, threw you					
down stairs or out of a car, or threw					
you around?					
Burned you, choked you, or tried to					
strangle or suffocate you?					
Used, or threatened to use, a weapon					
against you?					

6.	The following questions concern unwanted sexual exmay have had since you enrolled at WVU. We know personal questions, so we don't want your name or o information. Your answers are completely confident this helps you feel comfortable answering each questions.	that these other identitial. We ho	are ifying pe that
a.	Since you enrolled at WVU, did any of the following happen to you?		
		Yes	No
	Someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of my body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of my clothes without my consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration).		
	Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent.		
	IF YOU ARE A MALE, GO TO THE NEXT ITEM Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my vagina without my consent.		
	Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my butt without my consent.		
	Even though it didn't happen, someone TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with me without my consent.		
BEH	OU HAVE NEVER EXPERIENCED ANY OF THE LAVIORS, PLEASE SKIP THIS QUESTION AND GESTION NUMBER 7.		
a.	Where did your unwanted sexual experience(s) occur? Select all	that apply.	
	On campus residence hall/dormitory On campus apartment Fraternity house Sorority house Off-campus university-owned apartment Off-campus housing that is not university-owned During WVU Study Abroad Off campus at a bar Off campus on a WVU trip Other (<i>Please specify</i>)		

b.	Who was the person with whom you experienced unwanted sex? Select all that apply.
	WVU student you were dating or a spouse/partner
	WVU student who was a "friend with benefits" or I was "hooking up" with
	WVU student (NOT including Teaching/Research Assistants and Resident Advisors
	Person who is a WVU employee
	Person with no connection to WVU (or don't know if connected to WVU)
	Other (Please specify)

7. Were you involved in any of the following campus programs since you started at WVU? Please check all that apply.

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Choose not to
				answer
Green Dot training				
Other				
Violence/Sexual				
Assault Prevention				
Programs				
Alcohol and				
Substance Abuse				
Program				
Bullying/Harassment				
Program				

8. When these situation arose while you were attending WVU, how often did you do any of the following?

	Never	Sometimes	A Few Times	Most of the time	Always	Not Applicable
Walked a friend who has had too						
much to drink home from a party,						
bar, or other social event.						
Talked to the friends of a drunk						
person to make sure they don't leave						
him/her behind at a party, bar, or						
other social event.						
Spoke up against sexist jokes.						
Tried to distract someone who was						
trying to take a drunk person to						
another room or trying to get them						
to do something sexual.						
Ask someone who looks very upset						
at a party if they are okay or need						
help.						
Intervene with a friend who was						
being physically abusive to another						
person.						
Intervene with a friend who was						
being verbally abusive to another						
person.						

9. The next few questions are about your relations with students and other members of the campus community. For each of the following statements, please tell us if you <u>strongly disagree</u>, <u>disagree</u>, <u>agree</u>, <u>strongly agree</u>, or <u>don't know</u>. Please check the bubble that best represents your answer.

	Strongly	Disagree	Agree	Strongly	Don't Know
	Disagree			Agree	
People on					
this campus					
help each					
other					
This is a					
friendly					
campus					
People on					
this campus					
can be					
trusted					
People on					
this campus					
do not get					
along with					
each other					
People on					
this campus					
do not share					
the same					
values					
People on					
this campus					
will call					
campus					
police if					
suspicious					
people are					
hanging					
around					

10.	How often do you get together with other students who attend WVU in either the places they live or where you live? Please click the bubble that best represents your answer.					
	Every day					
	Every day A few times a week					
						
	Once a week					
	A few times a month					
	Once a month					
	Once a year					
	Hardly ever					

11. Now, we would like to ask you some questions about how you think WVU would handle a situation in which a student reported an incident of sexual misconduct.

<u>Sexual misconduct</u> refers to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, dating violence, and sexual violence.

The following statements describe how WVU might handle it if a student reported an incident of sexual misconduct. Using the scale provided, please indicate the likelihood of each statement.

	Very	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely	Very
	Unlikely				Likely
WVU would take the report seriously					
WVU would maintain the privacy of the person					
making the report					
WVU would do its best to honor the request of the					
person about how to go forward with the case.					
WVU would take steps to protect the safety of the					
person making the report					
WVU would support the person making the report.					
WVU would provide accommodations to support					
the person (e.g. academic, housing, safety).					
WVU would take action to address factors that may					
have led to the sexual misconduct.					
WVU would handle the report fairly					
WVU would label the person making the report a					
troublemaker who made the report.					
WVU would have a hard time supporting the person					
who made the report.					
WVU would punish the person who made the report.					

12. Now, we would like to ask you about your knowledge of campus sexual misconduct resources. Using the scale provided please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Please check the bubble that best represents your answer.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
If a friend or I experienced sexual					
misconduct, I know where to go to get help					
on campus.					
I understand what happens when a student					
reports a claim of sexual misconduct at					
WVU.					
I would know where to go to make a report					
of sexual misconduct.					
The institution tolerates a culture of					
substance abuse.					
The institution tolerates a culture of sexual					
misconduct					

13. We would like to get some information about your exposure to sexual misconduct information education. Please respond to the following questions.

a.

b.

	Before coming to WVU, had you received any information or education that did not come from WVU about sexual misconduct?
	Yes No
	Since you came to WVU, which of the following have you done? Please check all that apply.
_	Discussed sexual misconduct/rape in class
_	Discussed the topic of sexual misconduct with friends
_	Discussed sexual misconduct with a family member
_	Attended an event or program about what you can do as a bystander to stop sexual
	misconduct
	Attended a rally or other campus event about sexual misconduct or sexual assault
	Seen posters about sexual misconduct (e.g., raising awareness, preventing rape, defining
	misconduct)
	_Seen or heard campus administrators or staff address sexual misconduct
	_Seen crime alerts about sexual misconduct
	Read a report about sexual violence rates at WVU
	_Visited a WVU website with information on sexual misconduct
	_Volunteered or interned at an organization that addresses sexual misconduct

_	_Seen or heard about sexual misconduct in a student publication or media outlet _Taken a class to learn more about sexual misconduct
14.	We really appreciate the time you have taken to complete this survey. And, we'd like to assure you that everything you have told us will remain <u>strictly anonymous</u> .
	We realize the topics covered in this survey are sensitive and that many WVU students are reluctant to talk about their own campus experiences. But we're also a bit worried that we haven't asked the right questions.
	So now that you have had a chance to think about the topics covered in this survey, would you like to provide us with any additional information about the quality of life on WVU's campus? If so, please use the box below.
	Like the rest of your responses to this survey, any information you provide is anonymous and will only be reported grouped with all other comments.
anxie	to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, emotions, memories and ties from recent or past traumas may have been triggered. We encourage you

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, emotions, memories and anxieties from recent or past traumas may have been triggered. We encourage you to contact WellWVU Carruth Center for Psychological and Psychiatric Services at at 304-293-4431, WVU Title IX Office at 304-293-5600, Rape and Domestic Violence Information Center's (RDVIC) 24-hour Hotline at 304-292-5100, and/or the Monongalia County Victim Assistance Program at 304-291-7286.

Thank you for taking the time and effort to complete this questionnaire.

Please, if you wish, click the bubble to enter in a draw for a \$50.00 VISA gift card. WE AGAIN ASSURE YOU THAT NO ONE EVER WILL BE ABLE TO LINK YOUR NAME TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Appendix B

Recruitment Poster



WIN 1 of 20 \$50.00 VISA GIFT CARDS!

Simply take the 100% CONFIDENTIAL 15-20 minute survey to be entered for a chance to win!

HOW?

Check your email for a link to the "Campus Climate Survey"

WHEN?

After Spring Break

WHY?

To improve WVU's quality of life on campus!

WHAT?

This survey asks questions about:

- Personal safety
- Campus experiences
- On and off campus safety

HELP MAKE YOUR CAMPUS SAFER!

References

- Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3). (2015). ARC3 survey of campus climate regarding sexual misconduct. Georgia State University, ATL: Author.
- Amundsen, B., & Lie, E. (2013). Fewer willing to participate in surveys. Research Council of Norway. Retrieved from http://sciencenordic.com/fewer-willing-participate-surveys
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). *Rape prevention through bystander intervention*. Final report to the National Institute of Justice for grant 2002-WG-BX-0009. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf
- Beatty, C., Grimsley, M., Lawless, Manning, J., & Wilson, I. (2005). Fear of crime in NDC areas: How do perceptions relate to reality? Sheffield, UK: Center for Regional Economic and Social Research, Sheffield Hallam University.
- Beirne, P., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2014). *Criminology: A sociological approach* (6th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J. et al. (2011). *The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Couper, M. P., & Bosnjak, M. (2010). Internet surveys. In P. V. Marsden & J. D. Wright (Eds.), Handbook of survey research (2nd ed.) (pp. 527-550). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Daigle, L. E., Mummert, S., Fisher, B. S., & Scherer, H. L. (2015). Sexual victimization on college campuses. In T. Richards & C. D. Marcum (Eds.), *Sexual victimization: Then and* now (pp. 83-102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (1988). Woman abuse in dating relationships: The role of male peer support.

 Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

- DeKeseredy, W. S. (2017). Explaining campus violence against women: An examination of male peer support and unhealthy masculinity. In C. Kaukinen, M. Hughes Miller, & R. A. Powers (Eds.), *Addressing and preventing violence against women on college campuses*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., Fabricius, A., & Hall-Sanchez, A. (2015). Fueling aggrieved entitlement:

 The contribution of women against feminism postings. In W. S. DeKeseredy & L.

 Leonard (Eds.), *Crimsoc report 4: Gender, victimology & restorative justice* (pp. 1-33).

 Hampshire, UK: Waterside Press.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Hinch, R. (1991). Woman abuse: Sociological perspectives. Toronto:

 Thompson Educational Publishing.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Perry, B. (2006). Campus life questionnaire. Oshawa, ON: Authors.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (1998). Woman abuse on campus: Results from the Canadian national survey. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2013). *Male peer support & violence against women:*The history & verification of a theory. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1988). Research as social action: The struggle for battered women.

 In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 51-74). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dragiewicz, M., & Mann, R. M. (2016). Fighting feminism organized opposition to women's rights: Guest editors' introduction. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 5, 1-5.
- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., & Cullen, F. T. (2010). *Unsafe in the ivory tower: The sexual victimization of college women*: Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Fisher, B. S., & Sloan, J. J. (2013). *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (3rd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Groves, R. M., Singer, E., & Corning, A. (2000). Leverage-saliency theory of survey participation. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *64*, 299-308.
- Henslin, J., & Nelson, A. (1996). A down to earth approach to sociology: Canadian edition.

 Scarborough, ON: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hotaling, G., & Sugarman, D. (1986). An analysis of risk markers and husband to wife violence:

 The current state of Knowledge. *Violence and Victims*, *1*, 102-124.
- Jones, T., MacLean, B. D., & Young, J. (1986). The Islington crime survey. London: Gower.
- Kirkpatrick, C., & Kanin, E. J. (1957). Male sex aggression on a university campus. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 52-58.
- Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R. et al. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *31*, 357-370.
- Koss, M. P. Gidycz, C., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 162-170.
- Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2007). *The campus sexual assault (CSA) study*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice: National Institute of Justice.
- MacLean, B. D. (1992). A program of local crime survey research for Canada. In J. Lowman &
 B. D. MacLean (Eds.), *Realist criminology: Crime control and policing in the 1990s* (pp. 336-365). Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.

- Melton, H. (2007). Predicting the occurrence of stalking in relationships characterized by domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 13-25.
- McOrmond-Plummer, L., Easteal, P., & Lewvy-Peck, J. Y. (2014). The necessity of appropriate service response to intimate partner sexual violence. In L. McOrmond-Plummer, P. Easteal, & J.Y. Levy-Peck (Eds.), *Intimate partner sexual violence* (pp. 18-29). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Morgan, P., & Gruber, J. E. (2011). Sexual harassment: Violence against women at work and in schools. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, & R. Kennedy Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (2nd ed.) (pp. 75-92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- National Research Council. (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. Washington, D.C.:

 National Academy Press.
- Navarro, J. N. (2016). Cyberabuse and cyberstalking. In J. N. Navarro, S. Clevenger, & Marcum,
 C. D. (Eds.), The intersection between intimate partner abuse, technology, and
 cybercrime: Examining the virtual enemy (pp. 125-139). Durham, NC: Carolina
 Academic Press.
- Prejudice Institute. (1995). *Model questionnaire for assessing campus climate*. Towson, MD: Author.
- Research Center on Violence Against Women. (2014). *Campus attitudes toward safety* (*C.A.T.S.*) *survey*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky.
- Rutgers University. (2014). *Rutgers campus climate survey*. Retrieved from http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/libraries/VAWC/new_doc_to_upload_for_ispeak.sflb.ashx
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1998). *Neighborhood collective efficacy: Does it help reduce violence?* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W.S. (1997). Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shenkman, R. (1989). Legends, lies, & cherished myths of American history. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sloan, J.J., & Fisher, B. S. (2010). *The dark side of the ivory tower: Campus crime as a social problem*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, M. D. (1987). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Toronto. *Violence and Victims*, 2, 173-187.
- Smith, M. D. (1990). Sociodemographic risk factors in wife abuse: Results from a survey of Toronto women. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *15*, 39-58.
- Smith, M. D. (1994). Enhancing the quality of survey data on violence against women: A feminist approach. *Gender & Society*, 18, 109-127.
- Smith, W. G. (2008). Does gender influence online survey participation?: A record-linkage analysis of university faculty online survey response behavior. San Jose, CA: San Jose University. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED501717.pdf
- Southern Poverty Law Center. (2010). 10 ways to fight hate on campus: A response guide for college activists. Montgomery, AL: Author.
- Stark-Adamec, C. (1996a). Collaboration and responsibility. In C. Stark-Adamec (Ed.), Violence: A collective responsibility (pp. 143-150). Ottawa: Social Science Federation.
- Stark-Adamec, C. (1996b). Violence and responsibility. In C. Stark-Adamec (Ed.), *Violence: A collective responsibility* (pp. 1-9). Ottawa: Social Science Federation.
- Stein, N. (2008). Sexual harassment in schools. In C. M. Renzetti & J. L. Edleson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of interpersonal violence* (pp. 664-665). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Strong-Boag, V. (1996). Too much is not enough: The paradox of power for feminist academics working with community feminists on issues related to violence. In C. Stark-Adamec (Ed.), *Violence: A collective responsibility* (pp. 105-115). Ottawa: Social Science Federation of Canada.
- White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2014). Climate surveys:

 Useful tools to help colleges and universities in their efforts to reduce and prevent sexual assault. Retrieved from https://www.notalone.gov/assets/ovw-climate-survey.pdf