



THE PSYCHOLOGICAL APPRAISAL OF CAMPUS CLIMATE AND ITS IMPLICATION ON 'SEX FOR MARKS' SYNDROME

Odunayo Tunde Arogundade

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos, Lagos State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Sexual harassment is a global problem affecting societies, organisations, schools, colleges and universities alike. However, 'sex for marks' otherwise known as 'quid pro quo', 'sexually transmitted grades', or 'transactional sex' is a common form of sexual harassment in the higher educational institutions. This study examines the campus climate with a focus on the prevalence and perception of sexual harassment as well as management disposition to sexual misconduct and campus safety. Thus, a cross-sectional survey research design was adopted, and a battery of psychological test consisting of Campus Climate Scale (CSC) was used to collect data from 654 female participants who were accidentally selected from among undergraduate students of University of Lagos. The data collected were analyzed using simple percentages, One-way Analysis of Variance and Correlation Analysis of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings revealed a significantly high prevalence of sexual harassment on campus; the inverse relationship between students' experience of sexual harassment and campus climate, among others. Thus, these findings substantiate the importance of creating strategies, policies and programmes that will minimize sexual harassment as well as enhance a conducive campus climate to sustain the integrity and standards of the educational system. This study, therefore, recommends a zero-tolerance policy for sexual harassment on campus.

Key Words: Campus Climate, Gender, Sexual Harassment, Marks, Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

Sex-for-grades is otherwise known as 'the quid pro quo', sexually transmitted grades', 'transactional sex' is a common form sexual harassment which entails giving sexual favours to male lecturers in exchange for marks or grades which has the tendency of creating an anxious campus climate (Manuh, Gariba&Budu 2007; Bakari & Leach 2008). According to Dzeich& Weiner (1984), sexual harassment will always exist on campus as long as there will be female students and male professors in the educational institution. Thus, the phenomenon called sexual harassment is not limited to a particular university, workplace, location, county, state or ethnic group instead it is a global phenomenon (Mirsky, 2003, Morley, 2011; Ekore 2012; Phipps & Smith, 2012).

Studies have shown that sexual harassment involves both actual and symbolic violence, but is often hidden, silenced and displaced. It is not limited to physical and Verbal harassment (unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or gestures) but cyberspace and internet harassment which are usually done via text, e-mail, Facebook, or other electronic means (Sagrestano, 2009, Ormerod., Collinsworth., & Perry, 2008).

According to Fitzgerald, Gelfand, and Dragow (1993), sexual harassment can be grouped into three categories, namely: sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention, and gender harassment. Sexual coercion is the demand for sexual favours in return for marks or school-related benefits (Phipps & Smith, 2012). Unwanted sexual attention is unwelcome and unreciprocated verbal and nonverbal behaviours which are considered to be offensive, while gender

harassment refers to a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviours not aimed at sexual cooperation but that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about females (Sagrestano, 2009). Other researchers like, Gruber (1992) proposed a system composed of 11 specific types of harassment, organised into three higher order categories: verbal requests, verbal remarks, and nonverbal displays. Each of these categories contains a subset of the 11 types of harassment (e.g., a verbal request is composed of sexual bribery, sexual advances, relational advances, and subtle pressure/advances) which Gruber (1992) arranged in decreasing order of severity.

In view of the foregoing, this study considers the following acts as different forms of sexual harassment on campus: all unwanted physical such as sexual assault, rape, fondling of breasts, pinching of buttocks, touching, hugging and other sexual activities; Unwelcome verbal and non-verbal behaviour such as dirty or sexual jokes, remarks on physical features, disseminating rumours about or rating others as to their sexual activity or performance, displaying and issuing obscene drawings, pictures, and other unwelcome non-verbal sexual behaviour. Fitzgerald & Ormerod (1991) reported that women experience more sexual harassment than men and have the potential of being more sexually harassed than men. This position was supported by Fitzgerald, Gelfand, and Drasgow (1993), who hold that most female students tend to be victims of sexual coercion in an attempt to get better grade and marks in exchange for sexual favours to the male faculties. Barak et al., (1992) concluded that over 40% of female students have the probability of experiencing one form of sexual harassment or the other in the course of the stay on campus. According to Hill and Silva (2005), sexual harassment is a significant obstacle to females' academic achievement. Most of the time, the victims keep mute for fear of stigmatization and popular haunts, causing them to withdraw from academic pursuits. These practices most commonly are rarely formally reported by female students, for fear of victimisation and stigmatisation. Other scholars have also raised the issue of sex for a grade in Nigerian campus and its negative consequences on the females' self-esteem, health and psychosocial development (Nwadike, 2007; Bakari & Leach, 2007).

The motivation for this study was born out of several recent sexual harassment scandals from some reputable universities in Nigeria which went viral both on the prints and social media with several headlines: This included an article titled 'Sex for marks scandal in OAU' (Punch, 15th April, 2018), 'Sex for marks in Nigerian Universities' (Vanguard News, 12th May, 2018), 'LASU lecturer allegedly caught in another sex scandal' (Pulse.ng, 14th July, 2018), 'UNILAG Prof in Sex for mark scandal' (Sunnewsonline.com 1st June, 2018) gave impetus to this study. Thus, every university management interested in the welfare needs of their students especially the females in the area of sexual harassment and exploitation should be concerned with examining the campus climate in terms of the students' perceptions of the environment, faculty, as well as the administrators' responses to reported cases of sexual misconducts.

Although there is no simple definition of campus climate; Hurtado, Carter, and Kardia (1998) define campus climate as the general atmosphere experienced by the students, faculty, staff and management primarily in terms of their overall comfort, their sense of safety and belonging, and whether they feel valued, treated somewhat with respect and without discrimination. According to Rankin and Reason (2008) campus climate is "the current attitudes, behaviours, and standards and practices of employees and students of an institution," precisely "those attitudes, behaviors, and standards/practices that concern the access for, inclusion of, and level of respect for individual and group needs, abilities, and potential". Vaccaro (2010) holds that the campus climate is the interplay among people, processes, institutional culture, and represent important aspects of an organisation, including perceptions and expectations of the people in the academic community.

According to Harper and Hurtado (2007), understanding the campus climate tends to serve as a foundation for any institutional change where necessary. In the sense that, institutions of higher learning should be genuinely interested in knowing the faculties and student perception of the campus climate especially as it relates with sexual harassment and misconduct, to create a welcoming learning environment as well as enhance the quality and integrity of their

degrees and products. The purpose of the present study, therefore, is to assess the campus climate of a selected university as well as its implication on sexual harassment of students with regards to grades and marks.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Given the objectives of the study, the undernoted research questions were proposed:

1. What is the prevalence of sexual harassment on campus?
2. Will, there be a significant main effect in students' experience of sexual harassment among different faculties of study?
3. Will, there be a significant main effect in students' experience of sexual harassment among the age groups?
4. What type of relationship exists between students' experience of sexual harassment and campus climate?
5. What type of relationship exists between students' experience of sexual harassment and perception of campus safety?
6. What effects will students' perception of Management's response to the report sexual harassment has on campus climate?
7. What will a type of relationship exists between students' experience of sexual harassment and perception of an organisation's response?

HYPOTHESES

The study is designed to test the undernoted hypotheses:

1. There will be a significant prevalence of sexual harassment on campus
2. There will be significant differences in students' experience of sexual harassment among faculties
3. There will be significant difference in students' experience of sexual harassment among various age groups
4. There will be a significant negative relationship between the experience of sexual harassment and campus climate
5. There will be a significant negative relationship between the experience of sexual harassment and perception of campus safety
6. Perception of an organization's response to sexual harassment will positively influence campus climate
7. There will be a significant negative relationship between students' experience of sexual harassment and perception of Management's responses to reported cases of sexual harassment

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is non-experimental and quantitative research. A cross-sectional survey design was adopted. The choice of a cross-sectional method is based on the premise that the data were collected at the same time from all participants irrespective of the demographic variables (such as age and faculty) and no variable was manipulated.

Participants and Procedures

A total number of Six hundred and fifty-four (654) female students were accidentally selected from different faculties within the University of Lagos following their willingness to participate in the study. The socio-demographic details of the participants are shown in Table 1.

All the ethical requirements for conducting research were observed. These include voluntary participation of the respondents; participants were neither compelled nor compensated for completing the psychological tests. Confidentiality of the participants' identity was ensured by not putting their names on the instruments, and the tests were completed in the familiar atmosphere on the campus.

Instruments/Materials

A battery of psychological test consisting of a Bio-data form and Campus Climate Scale (CSC) was used for data collection.

1. *Bio-data form*– was designed to obtain demographic information such as age and faculty of the respondents.
2. Campus Climate Scale (CSC)- The Campus Climate Scale (CSC) was originally developed and standardised by the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) in 2015. The authors provided the original psychometric properties and reported 0.85 internal consistencies. This scale was adapted for this study. The adapted scale consisted of four sub-sections for measuring general campus climate, campus safety, the experience of sexual harassment and perception of Management response to reported cases of sexual misconduct on campus.

DATA ANALYSES

Responses to the psychological tests were scored and coded accordingly into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 on a personal computer. The data were analyzed using simple percentages, Independent t-test, One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Correlation analysis

Table 1: Showing the demographic variables of the participants

Gender	Frequency	Per cent
Females	654	100
Age	Frequency	Per cent
16-20	329	50
21-25	257	39
26-30	53	8
30+	10	2
Blank	5	1
Faculty	Frequency	Per cent
Art	101	15
Education	109	17
Soc. Sciences	90	14
Engineering	39	6
Sciences	15	2
Law	102	16
Others	192	29
Blank	6	1

Table 1 shows the description of the socio-demographic attributes of the participants who took part in the study. In terms of gender, all the 564 participants were female, representing 100%. In terms of the age range of the participants, 50% were within the bracket 16-20, 39% were within the age bracket of 21- 30, 83% within the age bracket of 26-30 while 2% were within the ages of 30 and above. In terms of the faculty of participants, 15% were from Arts, 17% from Education, 14% from Social Sciences, 6% from Engineering, 2% from Sciences, 16% from Law while 29% did not reveal their faculty.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant prevalence of sexual harassment on campus

Table 2: Showing the prevalence of sexual harassment on campus

	Frequency	Per cent
Experienced at least once	313	48
Not Experienced	341	52

Table 2 on the prevalence of sexual harassment on campus revealed that 48% of the respondents had experienced one form of sexual harassment at once on campus. This result confirmed the hypothesis one, which stated that 'there will be a significant prevalence of sexual harassment on campus'. Thus, hypothesis one is accepted.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant difference in students' experience of sexual harassment among faculties. To test this hypothesis, One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed, and the result is shown below.

Table 3: One-way ANOVA statistics of students' experience of sexual harassment among faculties

	Mean	SD	Df	F	P value
Art	23.43	10.78	6	2.23*	$P = 0.039$
Education	26.21	14.60			
Soc. Sciences	22.85	9.04			
Engineering	25.92	11.43			
Sciences	28.00	16.34			
Law	27.97	12.31			
Others	24.78	11.07			

Table 4: Post hoc Multiple Comparison (Tukey HSD) of students' experience of sexual harassment among faculties

(I) FACULTY	(J) FACULTY	Mean Difference (I-J)	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Art	Education	-2.79	-7.61	2.04
	Soc. Sciences	0.57	-4.51	5.65
	Engineering	-2.50	-9.08	4.09
	Sciences	-4.57	-14.24	5.09
	Law	-4.54	-9.46	0.37
	Others	-1.35	-5.65	2.94
Education	Art	2.79	-2.04	7.61
	Soc. Sciences	3.36	-1.63	8.35
	Engineering	0.29	-6.23	6.81
	Sciences	-1.79	-11.41	7.83
	Law	-1.76	-6.58	3.07
	Others	1.43	-2.76	5.62

Soc. Sciences	Art	-0.57	-5.65	4.51
	Education	-3.36	-8.35	1.63
	Engineering	-3.07	-9.78	3.64
	Sciences	-5.15	-14.90	4.60
	Law	-5.12*	-10.19	-0.04
	Others	-1.93	-6.41	2.56
Engineering	Art	2.50	-4.09	9.08
	Education	-0.29	-6.81	6.23
	Soc. Sciences	3.07	-3.64	9.78
	Sciences	-2.08	-12.69	8.54
	Law	-2.05	-8.63	4.54
	Others	1.14	-5.00	7.28
Sciences	Art	4.57	-5.09	14.24
	Education	1.79	-7.83	11.41
	Soc. Sciences	5.15	-4.60	14.90
	Engineering	2.08	-8.54	12.69
	Law	0.03	-9.64	9.70
	Others	3.22	-6.15	12.59
Law	Art	4.54	-0.37	9.46
	Education	1.76	-3.07	6.58
	Soc. Sciences	5.12*	0.04	10.19
	Engineering	2.05	-4.54	8.63
	Sciences	-0.03	-9.70	9.64
	Others	3.19	-1.11	7.49
Others	Art	1.35	-2.94	5.65
	Education	-1.43	-5.62	2.76
	Soc. Sciences	1.93	-2.56	6.41
	Engineering	-1.14	-7.28	5.00
	Sciences	-3.22	-12.59	6.15
	Law	-3.19	-7.49	1.11

*. Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

Table 3 shows that there is a significant main effect in students' experience of sexual harassment among faculties, $F(6) = 2.23, p = 0.039$. Post hoc comparison test in Table 4 further revealed that students' experience of sexual harassment in Law ($M = 27.97, SD = 12.31$) was significantly higher than Social Sciences ($M = 22.85, SD = 9.04$). No significant differences were noticed between Law and other faculties, namely; Art ($M = 23.43, SD = 10.78$), Education ($M = 26.21, SD = 14.60$), Engineering ($M = 25.92, SD = 11.43$), Sciences ($M = 28.00, SD = 16.34$) and others ($M = 24.78, SD = 11.07$). Thus, hypothesis two is accepted.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant difference in students' experience of sexual harassment among various age groups.

To test this hypothesis, One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed, and the result is shown below:

Table 5: One-way ANOVA statistics of sexual harassment among age groups

	Mean	SD	df	F	P value
16-20	23.01	10.27	3	8.44**	$P < 0.01$
21-25	27.28	12.87			
26-30	28.98	13.60			
30+	23.20	12.52			

Table 6: Post hoc Multiple Comparison (Tukey HSD) of sexual harassment among age groups

(I) AGE	(J) AGE	Mean Difference (I-J)	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
16-20	21-25	-4.27*	-6.77	-1.76
	26-30	-5.97*	-10.49	-1.44
	30+	-.19	-9.84	9.46
21-25	16-20	4.27*	1.76	6.77
	26-30	-1.70	-6.31	2.91
	30+	4.08	-5.61	13.77
26-30	16-20	5.97*	1.44	10.49
	21-25	1.70	-2.91	6.31
	30+	5.78	-4.62	16.18
30+	16-20	0.19	-9.46	9.84
	21-25	-4.08	-13.77	5.61
	26-30	-5.78	-16.18	4.62

* Mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

Table 5 shows that there is a significant main effect in students' experience of sexual harassment among age groups, $F(3) = 8.44$, $p < 0.01$. Post hoc comparison test in Table 6 further revealed that students' experience of sexual harassment in 16-20 years ($M = 23.01$, $SD = 10.27$) were significantly lower than 21-25 years ($M = 27.28$, $SD = 12.87$) and 26-30 years ($M = 28.98$, $SD = 13.60$). No significant difference was observed between 16-20 years ($M = 23.01$, $SD = 10.27$) and 30 years and above ($M = 23.20$, $SD = 12.52$).

Hypothesis 4: There will be a significant negative relationship between the experience of sexual harassment and campus climate.

To test this hypothesis, a correlation analysis was computed and the result is shown below:

Table 7: Correlation statistics between experience of sexual harassment and campus climate

	Mean	SD	R	P value
<i>Students' experience of sex. Harassment</i>	25.19	11.85	-.273**	$P < 0.05$
<i>Campus climate</i>	13.34	4.18		

The result from Table 7 shows that there is an inverse relationship between the experience of sexual harassment and campus climate $r = -.27, p < .05$. This means that an increase in experience of sexual harassment will cause a negative perception of the campus climate. Thus, hypothesis 4 is accepted.

Hypothesis 5: There will be a significant negative relationship between the experience of sexual harassment and the perception of campus safety.

Furthermore, a correlation analysis was computed to test the relationship between the experience of sexual harassment and perception of campus safety and the result is shown below:

Table 8: Correlation statistics between the experience of sexual harassment and perception of campus safety

	Mean	SD	R	P value
<i>Students' experience of sex. harassment</i>	25.19	11.85	-.124**	$P < 0.05$
<i>Perception of campus safety</i>	3.33	2.08		

Table 8 shows that there is an inverse relationship between the experience of sexual harassment and perception of campus safety $r = -.12, p < .05$. This means that an increase in experience of sexual harassment will cause a decrease in the perception of campus safety. Thus, hypothesis 5 is accepted.

Hypothesis 6: Perception of Management's response to sexual harassment will positively influence campus climate. A correlation analysis was also computed to test the relationship between perception of management's response to sexual harassment and campus climate and the result is shown below:

Table 9: Correlation statistics between the perception of Management's response to sexual harassment and campus climate

	Mean	SD	r	P value
<i>Perception of Management's response</i>	40.52	8.78	.485**	$P < 0.05$
<i>Campus climate</i>	13.34	4.18		

Table 9 shows that there is a positive relationship between the perception of management's response to sexual harassment and campus climate $r = .49, p < .05$. This means that an increase in perception of management's response to sexual harassment the better perceived the campus climate. Thus, hypothesis 6 is accepted

Hypothesis 7: There will be a significant negative relationship between students' experience of sexual harassment and perception of Management's responses to reported cases of sexual harassment.

Finally, a correlation analysis was computed to test the relationship between students' experience of sexual harassment and the perception of Management's responses to reported cases of sexual harassment.

Table 10: Correlation statistics between students' experience of sexual harassment and perception of Management's responses to reported cases of sexual harassment.

	Mean	SD	R	P value
<i>Students' experience of sexual harassment</i>	25.19	11.85	-.273**	$P < 0.05$
<i>Perception of Management's response</i>	40.52	8.78		

Table 10 shows that there is an inverse relationship between students' experience of sexual harassment and perception of Management's responses to reported cases of sexual harassment $r = -.273, p < .05$ meaning that students' who experienced sexual harassment have negative perception and mistrust in Management's responses to reported cases of sexual misconduct. Thus, hypothesis 7 was accepted.

DISCUSSION

This study examines the prevalence of sexual harassment, perception of campus climate with regards to sexual misconduct and campus safety as well as Management's responses to reported cases of sexual misconducts. The following reflects the summary of findings from this study:

1. There is a significantly high prevalence of sexual harassment of female students on campus.
2. Sexual harassment varies across faculties.
3. Older students experience sexual harassment more than the younger students
4. There is an inverse relationship between sexual harassment and general campus climate
5. There is an inverse relationship between sexual harassment and campus safety
6. Perception of Management's response to sexual harassment has positive influence on campus climate.
7. Female students' who experience sexual harassment tend to have a mistrust in the Management's response to reported cases of sexual misconduct.

The finding of this study agrees with several studies that have researched on sexual harassment on campus. They all agreed on the high prevalence of sexual harassment on campus (Barak et al., 1992; Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Nwadiwe, 2007; Bakari & Leach, 2007; Morley, 2011). It is believed that sexual harassment will always exist on campus as long as there will be female students and male professors in the educational institution (Dzeich & Weiner, 1984).

Although this confirmed that sexual harassment varies across faculties and ages, other studies have shown that sexual harassment is not limited to a particular location or faculty or age bracket, rather, it cut across all faculties, locations and any student of any can be a victim (Mirsky, 2003, Morley, 2011; Ekore 2012; Phipps & Smith, 2012). Furthermore, this study revealed that sexual harassment has a negative effect on campus climate and safety. This was supported by Hill and Silva (2005) who holds sexual harassment affects the psyche of the victims, thereby causing them to have a negative perception of the institution of learning. This study also revealed that female students who experience sexual harassment tend to mistrust the Management's responses to reported cases of sexual misconduct, this may account the reason why most victims keep mute rather than reporting the perpetrators. In addition to fear of stigmatization or labelling. Nwadiwe (2007) and Bakari & Leach (2007) reported that sexual harassment has negative consequences on the females' self-esteem, health and psychosocial development. All these caused the victims to have a negative perception of what an education should be like and thereby making them withdraw from serious academic pursuits.

In conclusion, the university management should state the sexual harassment policies and procedures clearly as well as publicizing them within the campus community to deter potential perpetrator or harassers from harassing and at the same time prevent the victims from being silent and helpless (O'Donohue and O'Hare (1998). Furthermore, the policies should be implemented as appropriate when cases of sexual harassment and misconducts are established beyond reasonable doubt. This will enhance a positive campus climate where learning can take place without any fear of intimidation or sexual harassment of any kind.

Limitations and future research

This study is not without limitations. First, this study adopted a survey research method which is sometimes characterized with response biases. Second, the sample size may not be adequate to generalise the findings to the entire populations of students in the university.

Thus, it is suggested that future researches should consider other methods like qualitative research such as Focus Group Discussions so as to establish authenticity of some of the responses to the questions as well as establish the root causes of and reactions to sexual harassment on campus as it relates to campus climate.

REFERENCES

- Bakari, S., & Leach, F. (2008). "I invited her to my office': Normalising Sexual Violence in a Nigerian College of Education". In M. Dunne (Ed.) *Gender, Sexuality and Development. Education and Society in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Rotterdam/Taipei, Sense, pp. 71-83.
- Barak, A., Fisher, W. A., and Houston, S. (1992). Individual difference correlates of the Experience of sexual harassment among female university students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 187+.
- Dzeich, B., & Weiner, L. (1984). *The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus*. Boston: Beacon Press
- Ekore, J. O. (2012). Gender and Behaviour: Gender differences in perception of sexual harassment among university students. *Gender and Behaviour*, 10 (1), 4358-4369.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M., and Drasgow, F. (1993). Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, Form W (E). Unpublished research scale. Department of Psychology, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. and Ormerod, A. J. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The influence of gender and context. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 281-294.
- Gruber, J. E. (1992). A typology of personal and environmental sexual harassment: Research and policy implications for the 1990's. *Sex Roles*, 26, A41-A
- Harper, S. R., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Nine Themes in Campus Racial Climates and Implications for Institutional Transformation. *New Directions for Student Services*, 120, 7-24.
- Hurtado, S., Carter, D. F., & Kardia, D. (1998). The climate for diversity: Key issues for Institutional self-study. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 98, 53-63.
- Hill, C., and E. Silva. (2005). *Drawing the Line: sexual harassment on campus*. Washington DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation
- O'Donohue, W. and O'Hare, E. A. (1998). Sexual harassment: Identifying risk factors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 27 (6), 561+.
- Ormerod, A. J., Collinsworth, L. L., & Perry, L. A. (2008). Critical climate: Relations among sexual harassment, climate, and outcomes for high school girls and boys. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(2), 113-25.

- Manuh, T., Gariba, S., & Budu, J. (2007). Change and transformation in Ghana's publicly funded universities: A study of experiences, lessons and opportunities. Oxford: James Currey.
- Mirsky, J. (2003). Beyond Victims and Villains: Addressing sexual violence in the education sector. London: The Panos Institute
- Morley, L. (2011). Sex, grades and power in higher education in Ghana and Tanzania. *Cambridge Journal of Education* Vol. 41, No. 1, 101–115
- Phipps, A & Smith, G. (2012) 'Violence against women students in the UK: time to take action'. *Gender and Education* 24(4), 357-373
- Sagrestano, L. M. (2009). Nowhere to hide: A look at the pervasive atmosphere of sexual harassment in Memphis middle and high schools. Memphis, TN: Center for Research on Women.
- Rankin, S., & Reason, R. (2008). Transformational Tapestry Model: A Comprehensive Approach to Transforming Campus Climate. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 1(4), 262-274.
- Vaccaro, A. (2010). What lies beneath seemingly positive campus climate results? Institutional Sexism, racism, and male hostility toward equity initiatives and liberal bias. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 43, 202–215