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The Safety of Women on College Campuses: Implications of Evolving Paradigms in Postsecondary Education

A Two-Volume Special Issue

Carol E. Jordan

Evolutions in the Academy: The Face of Today’s Higher Education

Institutions of higher learning in the United States today face major challenges as they adapt to a global society; increasing diversity and a substantial shift in the demographics of students; an exponential growth of new knowledge; and an infusion of technologies never envisioned by academics of prior decades. While adapting to this newer educational landscape, universities concurrently struggle with a global recession and attendant decreases in state and federal funding support, rising tuition, increasing expectations of stakeholders, and calls for increased accountability and affordability (Miller, 2006). This is occurring at a time when the number of students seeking higher education is substantially increasing. Between 2000 and 2010, enrollments at institutions of higher education increased 37 percent, from 15.3 million to 21.0 million students; that growth including both full-time (45% increase) and part-time students (26% increase) (NCES, 2012). During the same time period, the number of females rose 39 percent, while the number of males rose 35 percent (NCES, 2012). In addition to more students, universities are experiencing an evolving student population that includes learners who are older, more diverse, and multi-lingual (Keller, 2001). The needs of this new generation of students is
also different as many see their future education built almost entirely around technology, and increasingly want to design their own curricula such that they can learn in their own style (Subbaswamy, 2010).

To embrace this new face of post-secondary education while managing reduced resources, public and private colleges and universities are devoting a significant percentage of their missions and resources to the discovery of new knowledge, the development of innovative applications of these discoveries, and to creation of entrepreneurial opportunities to apply these innovations in an awaiting marketplace (Duderstadt, 2000, 2007). They are investing in internationalization programs, technology-infused curricula, and the education of non-traditional students. While the attention of the nation’s universities are drawn to these enormous challenges, in the darker background of higher education exists a growing problem that threatens the well-being of students, faculty, and the integrity of the institutions themselves. While universities attend to the evolving paradigms of higher education, university women face high rates of victimization where they live and learn.

“Since the 19th century the term “ivory tower” has been used to designate a world space where intellectuals engage in pursuits that are disconnected from the practical concerns of everyday life. Far removed from what troubles the ordinary pedestrian, and certainly not touched by crime. This image runs counter to the reality of what many women experience when they walk onto college or university campuses in the United States, as rates of violence occurring in the confines of the ivory tower are high.”

Jordan, 2014
University Attention to the Victimization of College Women: Making the Case

To surmount the flurry of academic and demographic pressures noted above that cross the desks of 21st century academic leaders, a compelling case must be made for why the victimization of college women should be a priority. Perhaps the first point in making such a case is found in measurement: how many women and how victimization impacts their academic careers. First, any issue that is empirically demonstrated to harm as many students as does victimization should grab the undivided attention of even the most distracted or harried university president. Bonnie Fisher and her colleagues put it succinctly when describing the prevalence of rape against college women: women at a college that has 10,000 female students could experience more than 350 rapes a year (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). In addition to the large scale of the problems of rape and other forms of sexual violence, studies on violence against college women also document physical violence (e.g., Leonard, Quigley & Collins, 2002; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003) and stalking victimization (e.g., Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2002; Jordan, Wilcox, & Pritchard, 2007); and make clear the substantial harm that each of these forms of victimization have on targeted women. Physical health harms and mental health sequelae such as post-trauma reactions, disordered eating, anxiety, depression, and suicidality have been documented among adolescents and adults exposed to intimate forms of victimization (e.g., Ackard & Neumark-Sztainer, 2002; Amar & Gennaro, 2005; Campbell, et al., 2009; Ullman & Najdowski, 2009). Substance use disorders have also been widely explored with respect to the relationship between alcohol (e.g., Abbey 2002; Ross, Kolars, Krahm, Gomberg, Clark, & Niehaus, 2011), drug use (e.g., Raj, Silverman, & Amaro, 2000) and victimization. Additionally, for universities concerned about the retention of their students and improving rates of graduation, the negative impact that victimization has on academic performance and dropping out is notable
(e.g., Jordan, Combs, & Smith, this issue; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003). Beyond the broad scope of victimization and its harsh consequences on the physical and mental health, and academic well-being of students, those who advise university leadership on risk management must also attend to the legal issues that accompany the perpetration of violence on campuses (Cantalupo, this issue), the disciplinary codes that guide student behavior (Koss, Wilgus, & Williamsen, this issue); and the overall university response to these crimes.

The Prevalence of Rape, Intimate Partner Violence, Stalking, and Fear of Crime Among College Women

For three decades, researchers have documented the startling high number of college women whose academic careers are interrupted by rape and sexual assault, intimate partner violence, and stalking. In fact, repeated studies have reported that college women are at greater risk of certain forms of criminal victimization compared to similarly aged, non-college counterparts (Baum & Klaus, 2005; Fisher & Cullen 2000; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998). In the same way that the first empirical studies of violence against community women focused on rape, early studies on violence against college women focused on sexual victimization. In one of the earliest studies, Mary Koss and her colleagues found that one in ten

“Colleges are supposed to be safe havens – places in which young adults mature through scholarly study and by leading social lives in which risk youthful indiscretions...do not have enduring consequences. Tragic victimizations thus are unnerving and prompt us to wonder how such things could ever happen here.”

Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010, page 1
female students had experienced an attempted or completed rape in the twelve months preceding the study (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Over the lifetime of academic careers, studies have since documented that the percentage reaches up to one third of women (12.7% in Combs-Lane & Smith, 2002; 21.9% in Crawford, Wright, & Birchmeier, 2008; 35.3% in Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; 23% in Marx, Calhoun, Wilson, & Meyerson, 2001; and 36.5% in Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2007).

In addition to sexual forms of assault, studies now show that between 15 percent and 40 percent of adolescents and young adults experience physical dating violence (Avery-Leaf, Cascardi, O’Leary, & Cano, 1997; Foshee, Linder, MacDougall, & Bangdiwala, 2001; Jackson, 1999; Leonard, Quigley, & Collins, 2002; Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). In a study by White and Koss (1991), for example, over one-third of the women had experienced physical dating violence in their adolescent and college years.

The decade of the 1990s brought with it increased awareness of the behavior and creation of the crime of stalking. In the National Violence Against Women study, Tjaden & Thoennes (1998) found that over half of stalking victims reported being between 18 and 29 years of age, the typical time span of college years. And indeed, prevalence rates coming out of studies on university campuses range from six to 41 percent of college students (Coleman, 1997; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2002; Jordan, Wilcox, & Pritchard, 2007; Levitt, Silver, & Franco, 1996; Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000; McCriddy & Dennis, 1996; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999; Tjaden, 2003; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). In more recent years, with the growth of technology and social networking has come technology-based coercive behavior (Jones, Mitchell, & Finklehor, 2012; Thompson & Morrison, 2013).
The objective experience of violence against college women is now documented (although with varying thoroughness dependent upon the type of abuse being discussed). What is less thoroughly studied but also impactful to a young woman’s academic career is the subjective experience, her fear of crime. If women are fearful of crime on their college campuses, that could certainly impact large-scale choices such as where to go to school or where to live on campus; to smaller decisions such as whether to go to a library to join a study group on a particular evening; whether to socialize with other students whom she does not know; and more. The literature has long characterized a fear of crime among general populations, and has indicated that women typically have higher levels of fear of crime than do men (Ferraro, 1995, 1996; Warr, 1984, 1985). Women’s heightened levels of fear of crime victimization has been studied as a paradox, for while they express higher fear, their actual levels of victimization risk are objectively lower than they are for men. Emerging from this evident contradiction has been a theorized “shadow of rape” whereby women’s higher level of fear of overall crime are, in fact, attributed to their very intense fear of the specific crime of rape (Ferraro, 1996; May, 2001). Interestingly, the fear of rape has been found to even influence women’s fears of non-sexual crime (Ferraro, 1995). As noted by Ferraro, “Rape may operate like a ‘‘master offense’’ among women, especially younger women who have the highest rates of rape, heightening fear reactions for other forms of crime” (Ferraro, 1995, page 87).

Among college women, the fear of crime has been studied less, but the studies that do exist reveal similar patterns. In a study with a national sample of college students, women’s risk perceptions and daytime fear levels for these violent crimes were significantly higher in comparison to perceived risk and daytime fear levels for these same violent crimes among their male counterparts; a gender difference that grew more stark when isolating on the nighttime fear
of rape (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). In a more recent study, Wilcox, Jordan, and Pritchard (2006) explored fear of crime among a population of college women that included a specific differentiation by type of crime offender. In short, college women surveyed were most fearful of crimes perpetrated by strangers rather than those offenders most likely to harm them, acquaintances or intimate. This was especially true for sexual assault (Wilcox, Jordan, & Pritchard, 2006).

The Response of Universities to the Victimization of College Women

Historically, the response of colleges and universities to crimes on their campuses has been notable by its absence, and in fact, a disincentive has existed for disclosure of crimes by institutions of higher learning. As has been described, universities have purposively drawn a protective veil of secrecy starting at the borders of the campus as they worried about parents’ concerns and drops in student application rates if the presence of victimization became known publicly. It was the story of a young woman in Pennsylvania that finally began to chip away at this practice.

In April of 1986, Jeanne Clery was a nineteen year old freshman at Lehigh University. Her rape and murder by another university student in her campus resident hall was appalling on its face, but stirred further outrage when it was learned that almost forty violent crimes had been perpetrated on the Lehigh campus in the three years before Jeanne’s murder, and yet had remained undisclosed to the campus community. The outrage became advocacy and resulted in federal legislation that required all colleges and universities that participate in federal financial aid programs to collect and disseminate information about crimes that occur on or near their campuses. Specifically, the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus
Crime Statistics Act or Clery Act is now a federal statute codified at 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f). While the Clery Act has brought important public awareness regarding victimization risk on college campuses across the nation, it has not been implemented without some criticism (see Cantalupo, this issue). This is true, in part, because Clery reporting is primarily limited to incidents that have been reported to campus police officers resulting in an underrepresentation of the actual number of rape and domestic violence cases (Fisher, Hartman, Cullen, & Turner, 2002). In addition to the Clery Act, the introduction of federal funds through the U.S. Department’s Grants to Reduce Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking on Campus Program (Campus Program) has significantly expanded the ability of colleges and universities to adopt comprehensive, coordinated responses to domestic violence, intimate or dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Today universities are called upon to offer education and prevention programs to a broad range of students; and advocacy and counseling services to those who are harmed by one or multiple forms of abuse. They are also challenged to strike a balance between a strong police presence and disciplinary approach advocated by some with a more decriminalized approach urged by others (Koss, Wilgus, & Williamsen, this issue).

As difficult as the problem of violence against women on college campuses has been in prior decades, the evolution of the nation’s higher education system brings challenges anew. The increase in student enrollment, particularly among women, means that universities must attend to the needs of even more potential victims. The push for on-line learning and social network connections is occurring at a time when technology-based stalking and abuse are on the rise. Internationalization is among the answers universities have to the globalization of the U.S. economy, but that emphasis is occurring without assessment regarding whether international students are at greater risk on American campuses or whether U.S. students face risk abroad. As
more freshmen students are encouraged or required to live on campuses, and living/learning communities are created as a means of improving academic retention, conversations are taking place without commiserate planning related to implications for student risk.

As the higher education community across the nation nears the end of the third decade since the murder of Jeanne Clery, it is time to recommit to understanding the size and nature of victimization of college women; and to recommit to ending its scourge.

A National Scientific Meeting and Two-Volume Special Issue

University social scientists and legal scholars with an empirical interest in rape, stalking, and intimate partner violence are uniquely positioned to advance the field of knowledge, but simultaneously to contribute to ending violence on their own campuses. In the same way that hospitals and clinics serve as laboratories for clinician scientists; residence halls, Greek housing, athletic buildings, campus pathways, classrooms, student centers, and neighborhoods surrounding campuses serve as locations for research on the prevalence and nature of rape, intimate partner violence, and stalking. The combination of faculty with student affairs counselors and advocates; disciplinary staff and attorneys; academic advisors; health providers; and law enforcement officers; in combination with students themselves makes any university a laboratory to explore the presence and damaging impact of violence and how to end it.

To further advance a conversation on the state of safety of women on college campuses, in June 2013, the Center for Research on Violence Against Women at the University of Kentucky hosted a scientific meeting of scholars, each of whom possessed unique expertise on some aspect of violence against college women.¹ The scholars were joined by students, student affairs professionals, and community advocates and came together to assess the current state of
the literature and give recommendations related to the future direction of research. The result is a two-volume special issue of this journal, encompassing seventeen main papers and discussant responses.

Volume 1 of the special issue appears here. Its first papers address the construct of violence itself, beginning with a stimulating manuscript by Sherry Hamby in which she evaluates the current status of knowledge on intimate partner violence and sexual violence with a particular focus on the measurement of gender patterns and a discussion of college students specifically. Callie Rennison and Lynn Addington follow Hamby with a creative paper that identifies limitations in the current definitions used in the field and speaks to how addressing these limitations could inform future research and policy. Their paper also outlines a research agenda that includes short- and long-term goals and discusses the policy implications of conducting this work. Christopher Krebs offers an extremely useful discussant response to the Rennison and Addington paper that highlights the debate involved in current methodological research. To the discussion on types of violence, Joanne Belknap and Nitika Sharma add a paper with the provocative concept of “stealth violence” and its impact on college women. The first volume also includes a paper addressing how the academic performance of college students is impacted by sexual victimization that I will offer with Jessica Combs and Gregory Smith.

Volume 1 also includes a focus on the response of universities. Three major papers and a discussant response fill this section, including a review paper that centers on campus service and policy responses to sexual assault and dating violence. This first paper, authored by Chiara Sabina and Lavina Ho, raises the point that sexual assault and dating violence are generally not reported to the police or campus authorities, and that services provided by universities are most often not utilized by students. The Sabina and Ho review further explore correlates of service
utilization and reasons for not seeking services. The second paper on services in Volume 1 is authored by attorney Nancy Chi Cantalupo and brings together the legal literature and research to recommend a thought-provoking amendment to the federal *Clery Act* or creation of new Department of Education regulations mandating that all higher education institutions survey their students approximately every five years about students’ experiences with sexual violence. Mary Koss, Jay Wilgus, and Kaaren Williamsen then aid the field by offering a legal and regulatory perspective in another paper that recommend a restorative justice model to university responses to intimate forms of violence against women.

The second volume of the special issue will appear in October 2014 and commences with attention to risk and protective factors associated with the victimization of college women. Papers will begin with a review of the association of substance abuse and victimization offered by Antonia Abbey and her team of Rhiana Wegner, Jacqueline Woerner, Sheri Pegram, and Jennifer Pierce. Following that paper, further discussions of risk and protective factors will appear in a main paper by Catherine Kaukinen and discussant replies by both Heather Littleton and Martie Thompson. Volume 2 will close with a series of papers and discussant responses on self-defense and prevention models. That section will begin with a manuscript on virtual reality in application to victimization research co-authored by Tracey Kniffin, Charles Carlson, Antonio Ellzey, Tory Eisenlohr-Moul, Kelly Battle Beck, Renee McDonald, and Ernest Jouriles. Chris Gidycz and Christina Dardis will then offer a critique of self-defense courses now offered on college campuses, followed by a discussant response from Walter Dekeseredy. Volume Two will close with a timely review of prevention programs and models provided by Vicki Banyard with Tameka Gillum authoring a discussant response.
This special issue and the national scientific meeting from whence it came are credited to the contributions of many people. First and foremost, thanks go to the authors of papers. They not only contributed their written work, they participated in the scientific meeting and its stimulating conversation. So too did students, student affairs professionals, and advocates from both the community and campus setting. The scientific meeting was planned with guidance and leadership from Center faculty Charles Carlson, Ann Coker, Diane Follingstad, and Claire Renzetti; and additional thanks goes to Bonnie Fisher for her seminal work on the issues around which the scientific meeting was based, and for her input on the meeting itself. This Director is always pleased to also acknowledge with great appreciation the Center staff Laurie Depuy, Emily Lane, and Erika Kalem. Anonymous peer reviewers helped shape all of our papers; and final thanks must go to Editor Jon Conte who always stands ready for this journal to offer an engaging platform for scholarly conversation across the field.

The contribution made by this special issue will not be measured upon its first reading, but rather by the future research and changes in university policy and practice that it provokes. Today’s college students are awaiting both.


Cantalupo, N. (this issue). Institution-Specific Victimization Surveys: Addressing Legal & Practical Disincentives to Gender-Based Violence Reporting on College Campuses. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*


Research Institute.


---

1 At the time of the June 2013 national scientific meeting and the preparation of this special issue, Carol E. Jordan served as Director of the Center for Research on Violence Against Women at the University of Kentucky.