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The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine college cis-women’s experiences with gender microaggressions and perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage, how those experiences and perceptions are related, and how each predicts college students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the University. College cis-women (n = 483; 84.3% White) at a private predominantly-White Catholic university in the northeastern United States completed a 153-item survey, the data from which was analyzed using descriptive statistics, t tests, Pearson correlations, and linear regressions.

Gender microaggressions were found to be prevalent at the University, with perpetration by peers more common than perpetration by University employees. Undergraduate college women reported significantly higher rates of gender microaggressions by both peers and University employees and higher levels of institutional betrayal than graduate college women.
Undergraduate and graduate women had similar perceptions of campus climate and levels of institutional courage.

Gender microaggressions by both peers and University employees had a significant positive relationship with institutional betrayal, and peer and employee gender microaggressions both also had a significant negative relationship with campus climate. A significant weak positive relationship was found between institutional courage and gender microaggressions by peers only; no significant relationship was identified between institutional courage and gender microaggressions by University employees.

Through a series of regression analyses, five elements of campus climate—school connectedness, perceptions of campus police, sexual harassment/sexual assault prevention and response, school sexual assault policy and resources, and treatment of sexual assault victims—were found to explain 41% of the variance in college women’s likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the University.

The primary overarching recommendation from this study is that universities conduct an annual campus climate survey with their entire student population that includes questions about sexual victimization across the entire continuum (gender microaggressions, sexual harassment, and sexual assault) and institutional betrayal to better understand and strategically address the specific needs of their students and campus community. In addition, recommendations for future action, directions for further research, and limitations of the study are shared.
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**Author’s note:** This study examines the experiences of college cis-women (i.e., people who were born female and identify as a woman). Before delving into the particulars of the study, it is important to clarify the use of language therein. There is a great deal of conversation currently taking place surrounding the use and connotation of “female” versus “woman” (see, for example, Norris, 2019). Although this study will examine and speak to the experiences of college students who identify as women, the word “female” will be used when citing earlier studies that utilized that terminology. An examination of the changing social definitions of “female” and “woman” are beyond the scope of this paper.

**CHAPTER 1: FRAMING THE PROBLEM OF PRACTICE**

**Gendered Violence Against Women: Historical, Social, and Cultural Perspectives**

At its root, this paper is a discussion of power, privilege, and oppression. We must start here, as it is through this lens that we will conceptualize and discuss sexual violence against women. With a frame of White male privilege, we will discuss and examine the continuum of campus sexual violence (gender microaggressions to sexual harassment to sexual assault), perceptions of campus climate, and institutional betrayal specific to the experiences of cis-women.

Johnson (2018) explained that privilege “bestows the freedom to move throughout your life without being marked in ways that decrease your life chances or detract from how you are seen and valued” (p. 32). Individuals can be “marked” for many different reasons, including race, gender, sexual identity or orientation, and ability. Here, we examine aspects of how gender—specifically, how being a woman—positions someone within the power-driven hierarchy of a U.S. Catholic Institution of Higher Education and influences their experiences, beliefs, and decision-making therein. It is crucial to keep in mind, however, that systemic power and
privilege are more layered and nuanced, with greater power differentials for members of minoritized races, sexual orientations, gender normativity, or other marginalized groups. Members of these group may experience even less power and greater oppression.

Sexual violence has been used as a tactic of exerting power over women in the United States for centuries, dating back to the victimization of slaves and domestic servants (Siegel, 2003). The ways that privilege and oppression occur range from overt to subtle, can be carried out unconsciously or unintentionally, cause both immediate and cumulative damage, and have influence over a person’s sense of self and position within society (Johnson, 2018). In these ways, it mirrors the characteristics of the range of sexual violence. As will be discussed in more depth later in this paper, sexual discrimination and violence against women range in severity and overtness from sexual assault (e.g., attempted or completed rape) to sexual harassment (e.g., unwanted sexual advances or inappropriate sexual jokes) to gender microaggressions (e.g., calling women “sluts”). Each of these is harmful to women – both in the immediate and long-term—and serve to establish and maintain a woman’s place in the hierarchy.

Social acceptability of outright rape and sexual assault has thankfully declined in current times. Sexual harassment, too, has gained wider visibility and formal recognition as wrong. The 1970s and 1980s brought new laws addressing sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination – most notably, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which prohibited discrimination based on a number of factors, including sex, within places of employment and education, respectively. The Anita Hill case in the early 1990s pushed the issue of sexual harassment into the U.S. public consciousness and conversation (for more information on the Anita Hill and other landmark legal cases, see Stein, 1999). High-profile sexual harassment and assault cases have continued to gain prominence in the United
States and worldwide (e.g., the vastly publicized scandals and cases surrounding Jerry Sandusky, Brett Kavanaugh, Larry Nasser, Harvey Weinstein, and numerous Fox News executives and anchors), furthering public awareness and social movements.

This does not mean, however, that gender power and oppression—and its manifestation as sexual violence—are not pervasive realities for women in the United States. Prominent cases continue to surface, and we contend with reinforcing behaviors from our highest governmental leaders (e.g., President Trump’s comments about women in the leaked 2005 Access Hollywood video [Fahrenthold, 2016]; Vice President Pence’s refusal to meet alone with female colleagues, thus limiting their professional access and opportunity [Khazan, 2017]). Over the course of their lifetime, 81% of women will experience sexual harassment or assault (Stop Street Harassment, 2018). As Mangan wrote (2017) in The Chronicle of Higher Education, “across many industries, sexual harassment persists because people (usually men) with clout can get away with it, and victims (typically women) either are disregarded or keep quiet” (p. 4). In other words, those with power—in this context, cis-gendered men—are able to use that power to get away with inappropriate (and even illegal) behavior and maintain their status, image, and position.

**The Higher Education Context**

Male power and dominance are clearly established within the higher education system. The American Council on Education (2017) reports that females hold only 42.4% of full-time tenured faculty positions, 43.6% of chief academic officer positions, and 30.1% of presidencies at U.S. institutions of higher education. These low rates are despite females having the majority of earned advanced degrees (more than 50% of master’s degrees since 1987 and more than 50% of doctoral degrees since 2006). The gender gap within higher education presents itself not just
in the types of positions held (lower level), but also in persistent pay gaps (American Council on Education, 2017).

Consistent with the greater historical and societal contexts, sexual violence and abuse of power abound within institutions of higher education. As will be discussed in more depth later in this paper, sexual violence is a prevalent problem on colleges campuses (Cantor et al., 2015). Although sexual assault is not unique to higher education, it can be distinctively detrimental for college students. In addition to mental health and well-being consequences (e.g., Eisenberg et al., 2016; Hill & Silva, 2005), sexual assault at college can adversely affect academic decisions and outcomes (e.g., Jordan et al., 2014; Reason & Rankin, 2006). In turn, this can lead to longer-term impacts on career trajectory and earning potential (U.S. Department of Labor, 2017; Zhang, 2008). Reason and Rankin (2006) found that the effects of sexual harassment also extend to the greater campus community, with female students prone to increased negative consequences of sexual harassment on campus even when not directly victimized. This means, in effect, that women are both more likely to be victims of sexual violence and are also more prone to victimization from the overall culture of these systems that support and perpetuate White male privilege.

Over the last fifty years, the U.S. government has increased attempts to address the prevalence and severity of sexual assault and harassment through the adoption of legislation and guidelines. The most well-known of these efforts is Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 USC § 1681 et. Seq., 1972), which prohibits colleges that participate in federal financial aid programs from discriminating based on sex. The U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) is tasked with interpreting and enforcing Title IX. Under their interpretation of Title IX, sexual harassment is included as a form of discrimination since it can
“deny or limit the student’s ability to participate in or to receive benefits, services, or opportunities in the school’s program” (U.S. Department of Education: Office of Civil Rights, 2001, p. 2). As such, colleges are required to promptly and fully investigate and respond to incidents of sexual harassment or assault (U.S. Department of Education: Office for Civil Rights, 2001). Several revised Title IX guidelines have been introduced by the OCR over the past 10 years, and new regulations continue to be proposed and adopted (for more information, see Conroy, 2022; Murakami, 2021; U.S. Department of Education: Office for Civil Rights, n.d.a).

Related, the Clery Act promotes transparency by requiring federally-funded universities to report crime rates and information about their policies, procedures and programming aimed at improving campus safety (Violence Against Women Act, 2014). The annual security report produced in compliance with the Clery Act includes crimes from the previous three years that were officially reported to the institution, occur on or immediately-adjacent to university property, and fall into one of these categories: murder, robbery, burglary, arson, liquor law violations, aggravated assault, motor vehicle theft, drug abuse violations, weapons violations, hate crimes, rape, statutory rape, fondling, incest, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

Despite legislation and guidelines, colleges may not be effectively preventing or addressing sexual assault on campus. A key reason for this is the severe underreporting of incidents of sexual assault (see, e.g., Fisher et al., 2016), which will be thoroughly discussed in Chapter 2. Obtaining a more complete and accurate understanding of sexual assault prevalence rates, students’ perceptions, and students’ reasons for not reporting incidents is the first step toward improvement. It is particularly important to have campus-specific data since sexual assault rates, contributing factors, and students’ reasons for not reporting likely vary from
campus to campus (Cantor et al., 2015). Without this data, it is challenging—if not impossible—to devise an effective approach for improvement or measure the impact of those efforts.

Institutions may be reluctant to collect accurate data on the prevalence of sexual harassment out of fear for their reputation and the potential of losing students to competitors. These same fears, as well as the valuation of competing priorities such as donors, athletics, and individual careers, can also lead to sexual violence not being properly acknowledged and addressed. This can result in sexual perpetrators being protected for the sake of the institution’s reputation, essentially permitting them to get away with their abhorrent behavior and continue to victimize others.

Mangan (2017) shares that “colleges and universities have long harbored influential academics who’ve seemed confident that they could target students or junior colleagues and never be held to account. They may have gotten away with it because of their research money, political capital, or prestige” (p. 4). Examples of this include Pennsylvania State University’s refusal to act on reports of child sexual abuse perpetrated by their assistant football coach Jerry Sandusky (CNN Library, 2018) and the Burklee College of Music’s failure to act in multiple cases (Lazar, 2017), including one in which a victimized woman was discouraged by university administration from moving forward with a court case against the professor who sexually assaulted her. These allegations of sexual violence against powerful men were covered up or insufficiently addressed. The victimized individuals, who already held less power than their abusers, were thus silenced and further oppressed.

When considering image and reputational concerns related to the collecting and reporting of accurate campus sexual victimization data, universities should weigh the impact of exposure regarding inaction toward seeking this information. What message does it send to the campus
community, prospective students and families, and other stakeholders when a university is unwilling to obtain the data necessary to adequately address such a serious and pervasive problem known to be harming college students? When institutions do not collect necessary data, that in itself can suggest a lack of earnest commitment to addressing campus sexual violence.

**The Local Context**

Consistent with the demographics of the higher education sector, women are grossly underrepresented within the senior leadership at Catholic University, where this study was conducted. Women hold just 13.3% of University-level senior leadership positions and make up merely 25.9% of the Board of Directors. Leadership gender diversity is marginally better at the school level, with five of the ten schools led by deans who are women.

Catholic University maintains a sexual harassment and sexual misconduct website that provides information on relevant policies, resources for students and employees, contact information for the Title IX coordinator and deputies, instructions on how to seek help or report an incident, a link to the Clery reports, and a list of programming and initiatives. A separate campus safety website provides information about additional resources available to support students’ safety on campus, including a safety escort service, code blue telephones, and emergency alert systems.

The University does not survey students on their sexual victimization experiences or the campus climate. As such, the only available data are from the federally-mandated reporting of Clery Act statistics, which limits the data to a specific list of crimes and only those that are formally reported. In 2021, the University’s Clery Act statistics reported five cases of rape and two cases of forcible fondling (Annual Security and Fire Safety Report, n.d.). Given that studies show that 2.2 – 7.9% of female college students are raped (Krebs et al., 2016), this reported rate
of less than 0.5% of Catholic University’s female student population strongly suggests that many incidents are going unreported to University officials. Further, other acts of sexual assault, sexual harassment, and gender microaggressions are left entirely uncollected and reported, as they do not fall under the Clery Act requirements.

Finally, Catholic University is affiliated with the Catholic Church, which adds another noteworthy contextual layer. The severe imbalance of gender power is evident in the very structure of the Roman Catholic Church. All senior leadership roles—from Priests all the way to Pope—are reserved *exclusively* for males (e.g., Wexler, 2020). And we need look no further than the still-unfolding sexual abuse scandal to see the exploitation and misuse of power demonstrated through the individual acts of sexual abuse as well as through the systemic coverup carried out by the Church (see, for example, Lauer & Hoyer, 2019).

Religious participation is not mandatory at the University, and students of all religious backgrounds are welcomed (for example, an interfaith meditation room offers space and materials for the practice of most major spiritual traditions). However, the institution’s affiliation with the Catholic Church is prominently communicated through its mission to “serve God by serving students,” inclusion of a crucifix in most classrooms, and positions on issues of significance to the Catholic Church, such as sexuality (see, for example, Landau, 2015 and Deto, 2019). It will be important to consider this affiliation with the Catholic Church—and the accompanying weight of the Church’s historical and current influences—when examining the findings of this study.

**The Need for Improvement**

Systems of male privilege and power—such as those discussed here of U.S. society, higher education, and the Catholic Church—are characterized, in part, by their “culture of
silence” and their protection of the status quo (Johnson, 2018). I focus on these two characteristics due to their critical framing and alignment to this study.

**Culture of Silence**

Systems that are strongly rooted in power and privilege often have a greater “culture of silence” (Johnson, 2018). On one end, those with more power (e.g., male university administrators) can create a culture of silence by controlling the conversation (what will be discussed, when, with whom, how, and through what narrative or frame). One way to control the narrative around sexual violence is to influence who is viewed as having responsibility for incidents. As long as sexual violence has existed, so, too, has victim-blaming and barriers to seeking help or legal retribution. Siegel (2003) explains that late 19th-century law “assumed that women in fact wanted the sexual advances and assaults that they claimed injured them” (p. 4) and that “few women were willing to endure the damage to reputation and prospects for marriage that followed from bringing a rape complaint, and if they did, the prospects for vindication of their complaint were remote indeed” (p. 4). Although the contemporary U.S. legal system does not explicitly blame women who are victims of sexual violence, signs of this view and tactic are still evident in the way a woman is questioned about how she was dressed, how much alcohol she consumed, and whether she made “smart” choices (e.g., not traveling alone) leading up to her attack (see, for example, Flood, 2020).

On the other end, this culture of silence is inadvertently perpetuated by those with lower status who may be afraid to speak up against injustices (e.g., college women). As Johnson (2018) explains:

> When subordinate groups get fed up and express rage, frustration, and resentment, there is always the danger that powerful others – men, […] – will not like it and will retaliate
with accusations of being ‘unprofessional’ or ‘malcontents,’ ‘maladjusted whiners,’
‘troublemakers,’ ‘overly emotional,’ ‘bitches,’ ‘out of control,’ ‘male-bashers.’ Given the
cultural authority and the power to harm that such retaliation carries, it can be hard to
defend against, further adding to the burden of oppression and increasing the unearned
advantage of privilege. (p. 52)

Further, a compounding dilemma of marginalized groups’ status is that they may risk
losing their precarious and already-reduced position within society by speaking out against the
realities of their daily oppression (e.g., microaggressions). Thus, they are “incentivized” to play
their role in maintaining the status quo.

**Protection of the Status Quo**

Silence—on the parts of both those with power and those without it—supports the
existing structure of power, regardless of whether that support is real or merely the default
assumption in the absence of explicit objection. “To perpetuate privilege and oppression,”
Johnson (2018) says, “we don’t have to consciously support it. Even by our silence, we provide
something essential for its future, for no system of privilege can continue to exist without most
people’s consent.” (p. 75). This silence feeds directly into the protection of the status quo,
maintaining power with those who already hold it and oppressing those who do not.

The status quo of power inequality is also perpetuated through acts of oppression and
discrimination such as gender microaggressions, sexual harassment, and sexual assault. These
forms of sexual violence, including inappropriate sexual comments, slights, and physical acts, all
remind women of their gender-based inferiority and vulnerability. Johnson (2018) reminds us
that intent is somewhat irrelevant; “whether done consciously or not, discrimination helps
maintain systems of privilege by enacting unearned advantage” (p. 47).
Finally, the status quo can be maintained and reinforced through organizational policies, procedures, and ways of operating that protect the power of the dominant group. The way that a university’s sexual misconduct policy is written and disseminated, for example, can send encouraging or discouraging messages to students considering reporting victimization (Streng & Kamimura, 2017). Similarly, students’ experiences, observations and perceptions of how their university (or perhaps another university making headlines) handles incidents of sexual misconduct could indicate what and whom they prioritize. A university’s decision not to collect necessary data to address campus sexual violence or perceived failure to appropriately hold perpetrators accountable, for example, could show a lack of commitment to protecting students and deter students from reporting sexual victimization.

**Positive Disruption**

We must end the culture of silence and disrupt the status quo of sexual violence against college women by encouraging victimized students to report their experiences and keeping them safe when they do make a report. Overcoming barriers to reporting is critical for victimized students (who need to be connected with resources and services), the greater campus community (from which offenders and inappropriate behaviors need to be removed), and the university itself (which needs accurate data to guide policy, program, and resource decisions). As will be discussed later in this paper, the first step is to regularly collect data to better understand the campus-specific climate and victimization. From there, an appropriate and effective strategy for improving campus climate and preventing and addressing campus sexual violence can be developed and implemented.
The Opportunity for Localized Positive Impact

I have been a member of the campus community at Catholic University for close to 20 years, as both a student and an employee. My love for the University and belief in its sincerity to “serve God by serving students” contribute to my desire to learn more about the barriers that may exist to students sharing their experiences of sexual victimization. By learning more, we can be more effective in reducing those barriers, better protect and care for the victimized students, and take measures to improve the campus climate for all students.

The most recent ten years of my career at this university have been in student services, progressing from an academic advisor to the assistant dean overseeing student services for the school of business. Within the past few years, I also joined the Title IX Programmers group and trained to serve as a panelist for cases of alleged violation of the University’s anti-discrimination and sexual misconduct policies. These roles have provided a closer view of students’ experiences on campus and insights into the university’s operations and decision-making priorities. They have also helped me form strong relationships with cross-campus colleagues working in various capacities to support and serve our students. These relationships and experiences have positioned me well to both conduct this study and share the findings with those who may be able to use the data to drive improvement efforts.

Central Research Questions

This study can serve as a first step toward a better understanding and consequent improvement of the overall campus climate and experiences of students at Catholic University. To this end, I will explore the following research questions:

1. Research Question 1: What are college cis-women’s experiences with gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate, perceptions of institutional betrayal,
and perceptions of institutional courage at Catholic University? Do these experiences and perceptions differ depending on student level (i.e., undergraduate or graduate)?

2. Research Question 2: How are gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by university employees related to perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage?

3. Research Question 3: To what extent do these variables (gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggressions by university employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, institutional courage) predict the likelihood that a college cis-woman will report sexual assault to the University?
CHAPTER 2: ACTIONABLE KNOWLEDGE

Gender Microaggressions, Sexual Harassment, and Sexual Assault: A Continuum of Campus Sexual Violence

When applied to gender, microaggressions are the starting point of a continuum that ultimately leads to sexual harassment and then sexual assault, with considerable overlap between the three (Gartner & Sterzing, 2016). They range low-to-high in terms of single-incident severity, chronicity (how frequently they are experienced), ambiguity (subtle/covert versus overt; universality of agreement over “wrongness”), actionability, and perpetrator’s consciousness or intentionality of harm. Even before microaggressions became prominent in the scholarly discussion of gendered violence against women, researchers were conceptualizing sexual harassment and sexual assault as points on a continuum of oppression and sexual violence against women (e.g., Quina, 1996). Gartner and Sterzing (2016) placed gender microaggressions on that sexual violence continuum, arguing that:

The exclusion of gender microaggressions from the current conceptualization of youth sexual violence (a) creates false impressions that chronic, “low-severity” forms of violence are less harmful than infrequent, “high-severity” forms; (b) fosters environments that ignore or condone gender microaggressions inadvertently normalizing sexual violence against girls; and (c) hinders the identification of upstream prevention strategies targeting gender microaggressions as acts of youth sexual violence before they escalate into legally actionable offenses. (p. 492)

The below graphic, an adaptation of one created by Gartner and Sterzing (2016), depicts the conceptualization of the continuum—and each of the three points along it—utilized in this study. In this modified framework, the entire continuum of campus sexual violence is positioned
within and influenced by a greater system of power and privilege, reinforces that system’s power
dynamics, and forms students’ perceptions of campus climate and institutional responses.

**Figure 1.1**

*Framework for Campus Sexual Violence*

*Note.* This figure is adapted from Gartner and Sterzing (2016).

**Defining the Forms Campus Sexual Violence**

The distinctions between gender microaggressions, sexual harassment and sexual assault
are blurry, given the existing overlap and inconsistencies both within and across the
academic/research, legal, societal, and individual contexts. For this study, I utilize commonly-
adopted definitions with some slight modifications to align with my conceptualization. I will
provide definitions for each of the three constructs—sexual assault, sexual harassment, and gender microaggressions—below.

Although the exact name or label applied to a particular act is crucial in some spaces (e.g., in legal procedures), I encourage us to not latch too strongly onto the definitional differences between gender microaggressions, sexual harassment, and sexual assault within this particular discussion. Any experience along the continuum of campus sexual violence is relevant and impactful, regardless of the precise label that I, as the researcher, may have assigned to it or that you, the reader, may apply to it. Further, numerous studies have found that participants may be unwilling to label an inappropriate behavior as sexual harassment or assault (e.g., Bursik & Gefter, 2011), or may disagree on the label (e.g., Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991). Focusing too heavily on the precise labeling of an act may prevent us from doing the work necessary to examine and address the more holistic issue of campus sexual violence against women.

**Defining Sexual Assault**

The U.S. Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women defines sexual assault as “any nonconsensual sexual act proscribed by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent” (U.S. Department of Justice: Office on Violence Against Women, n.d., para. 2). For this study, sexual assault must involve physical contact. Positioned on the continuum of campus sexual violence, sexual assault is the least frequent and ambiguous but has the highest single-incident severity. Rape—the most extreme form of sexual violence—is included under the definition of sexual assault.

**Defining Sexual Harassment**

Given this study’s focus on college campuses, it is appropriate to use the definition of sexual harassment put forth by the U.S. Department of Education’s OCR, which oversees the
interpretation and enforcement of Title IX. They define sexual harassment as “unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature,” including verbal, nonverbal, physical or other sexual advances or requests and that can “deny or limit the student’s ability to participate in or to receive benefits, services, or opportunities in the school’s program” (U.S. Department of Education: Office for Civil Rights, 2001, p. 2). It is worth noting that the OCR considers sexual violence—including rape and sexual assault—as a form of sexual harassment, covered under their definition of sexual harassment and Title IX jurisdiction. In this study, sexual assault is not a subpart of sexual harassment; it is a separate point on the continuum, with some overlap existing between the two.

**Defining Gender Microaggressions**

Finally, gender microaggressions—the focus of this study and the starting point on the continuum of campus sexual violence—are the most frequent and ambiguous form with the lowest single-incident severity (Gartner & Sterzing, 2016). As described more fully below, microaggressions are broken into three categories: microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations.

Sue et al. (2007), collectively define microaggressions as “brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults” (p. 273). The term was first used in the 1970s by Chester Pierce to describe everyday experiences with racism (see, for example, Pierce, et al., 1977). In their 1977 study, Pierce et al. analyzed and described the microaggressive portrayal of Black people in television commercials. They found that Black people were disproportionally less likely than White people to be shown displaying knowledge or authority, having a stable family situation, or depicting physical attractiveness, and they were more likely to be portrayed as subservient and dependent. These subtle—yet very racist—
messages communicate White superiority (and Black inferiority) and reinforce systemic White power and privilege. Since then, the discussion and study of microaggressions has been extended to other marginalized groups, such as women, people who identify as LGBTQIA+, and persons with disabilities (e.g., Sue et al., 2010a).

The concept and theory of gender microaggressions is preceded and informed by other constructs related to sexism, including overt, covert, and subtle sexism (Swim & Cohen, 1997; Swim et al., 2004), benevolent and hostile sexism (Glick & Fiske, 2001), and objectification theory (Frederickson & Roberts, 1997). As with these other constructs, microaggressions contain subcategories (here, microassaults, microinsults, and microinvalidations) with different but overlapping characteristics and long-term effects.

The first of these subcategories is microassaults. Microassaults are the most deliberate and overt form of microaggression and are typically consciously delivered (Sue, 2010a). They are therefore also most clearly identified by both the target and perpetrator as derogatory and discriminatory. An example of a microassault would be a man calling a woman “bitch” for being assertive (the positively-reframed word often used for a man displaying the same behaviors) or referring to a woman as a “slut” or “whore”—words so exclusively applied to women that their infrequent application to a man must be explicitly clarified through inclusion of the word “man” (e.g., “man whore”). Under Sue’s (2010a) definition, a microassault can by physical (e.g., when a man slaps a woman’s butt as she walks past). In this study, however, physical acts have been excluded from the definition of microaggressions to create a clearer delineation between the two forms of sexual victimization.

Unlike microassaults, microinsults and microinvalidations are likely unconsciously communicated. Microinsults contain layers of double-meaning (e.g., a criticism or derogation
hidden within a compliment), and they may be rationalized or explained away as having held a harmless meaning—as having merely been misinterpreted or misunderstood. Sue (2010a) defines microinsults as “interpersonal or environmental communications that convey stereotypes, rudeness, and insensitivity that demean a person’s racial, gender, sexual orientation, heritage, or identity” (p. 31). For example, complimenting a woman by telling her that she has “beauty and brains” is a microinsult. This “compliment” implies that, while attractiveness is to be expected from women, intellect is not and is therefore noteworthy.

Last, microinvalidations—the most subtle or covert form of microaggression—are those that “exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of certain groups, such as people of color, women, and LGBTs” (Sue, 2010a, p. 37). Women experience microinvalidations when they are not included in conversations and decisions related to their own bodies and when they are assumed to be too delicate or emotional for certain situations or activities (e.g., top-level leadership roles; military combat). Most pertinent to this paper, women also experience microinvalidations when their disclosures of gender microaggressions, harassment and assault are doubted or dismissed as being trivial—something that can be done by an individual or an organization or system (e.g., a university or the Catholic Church).

The Role of Systemic Power and Privilege

The entire continuum of campus sexual violence is undergirded, influenced, and perpetuated by systemic power and privilege. Specific to the inquiry of this study, this power and privilege belongs to men and, factoring in the setting of the study, White men in particular. As every day, oft-unquestioning acts, gender microaggressions reinforce the power of cis-men and oppression of cis-women, a culture that may smooth the way for more severe sexual violence
(i.e., sexual harassment and sexual assault). All three forms of sexual violence help protect and maintain the gender power dynamics and feed directly into students’ perceptions of the campus climate. Finally, the actions and inactions of universities to prevent and appropriately respond to campus sexual violence further reinforce these power dynamics and help to form students’ beliefs about what future actions the university may take to protect them.

Although outside the scope of this study, it is imperative to be mindful of how the experiences, perceptions, and beliefs regarding campus sexual violence may vary for members of different minoritized and marginalized groups. Members of such groups may hold even less power and experience greater oppression. How will this exacerbate the harm of victimization? How might it influence perceptions of campus climate? And, how might observing inappropriate institutional actions or inactions in response to the victimization of someone with more power than they hold influence their beliefs and decision-making in the aftermath of their own victimization? These questions must be asked and considered by institutional leaders, to ensure a complete understanding of how to best protect and support varying and diverse student populations and campus communities.

**Prevalence Rates**

Sexual discrimination and violence against women in all its forms (assault, harassment, and microaggressions) are prevalent on college campuses. I will share below findings from previous studies on prevalence rates. However, it is important to keep in mind that: 1) sexual victimization is historically and routinely under-reported (Cantor et al., 2015; Hill & Silva, 2005; Krebs et al., 2016; Sinozich, 2014; Spencer et al., 2020), and 2) less overt forms of sexual violence (e.g., gender microaggressions) can be particularly difficult to study and quantify given the challenges of identifying them (Basford et al., 2014; Sue et al., 2007). We know more about
contact and explicit forms of sexual victimization, as they are more clearly defined, understood, and identified and have been more widely studied.

When examining campus sexual violence prevalence rates, it is also important not to lose sight of the large disparities between campuses. For example, Krebs et al.’s (2016) study reported rates of undergraduate female sexual assault victimization since entering college ranging from 12% to 38% across their nine participating schools. Similarly, Cantor et al. (2015) found that sexual harassment of undergraduate female students ranged from 49% to 75% across their 27 participating schools. It is impossible to know whether those schools whose students reported more incidents of sexual assault and harassment fostered environments where these behaviors were more acceptable, or where the reporting of said behaviors was more acceptable, or both. What is highlighted by these studies is the need for campus-specific data to accurately understand the nature and scope of the problem before being able to determine appropriate and effective prevention and intervention efforts at a specific university or campus.

Sexual Assault

Commissioned by the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics, Krebs et al. (2016) conducted a nine-school pilot study to develop a campus climate survey. Their study found that 21% of undergraduate female students had been sexually assaulted since entering college, compared to 7% of undergraduate male students. Other self-report studies have found similar prevalence rates. For example, the Association of American Universities (AAU) conducted a campus climate survey on sexual assault and misconduct with 27 colleges and universities, the findings of which were reported in a 2015 article by Cantor et al. They found that 23% of female students had experienced nonconsensual sexual contact since starting at the university, compared to 5.8%
of males. It is worth highlighting that both studies found that female students are much more likely to be sexually assaulted than male students (Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2016).

Rates of sexual assault are highest for all college-aged (18-24 years old) females compared to females in other age groups, regardless of enrollment in an institution of higher education. In fact, Sinozich and Langton (2014) of the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics found that non-student females in this age group experienced rape and sexual assault during the 1995-2013 period at rates 1.2 times higher than their female student counterparts. This is an interesting finding and suggests the need for additional studies and efforts aimed at protecting young women whose victimization is not occurring on college campuses.

**Sexual Harassment**

Perhaps unsurprisingly, Krebs et al. (2016) found that, “sexual harassment appeared to track with sexual assault, in that schools with the highest rates of sexual harassment also tended to have the highest rates of sexual assault, sexual battery, and rape” (p. 139). Their study found that 28% of female undergraduate students had experienced sexual harassment during that academic year, with a range of 14% to 46% across the nine participating schools. Cantor et al. (2015) looked at prevalence rates since entering college and found 61.9% of undergraduate female students and 44.1% of graduate female students had experienced sexual harassment. Also consistent with sexual assault prevalence rates, male students are less likely to experience sexual harassment than female students (Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2016).

As with sexual assault, it appears that sexual harassment rates are elevated for all 18-24-year old women. Coker et al. (2016) found that there were no significant differences in sexual harassment victimization rates of 18-24-year old women who attend college versus those of the same age group who have never attended college. This certainly has implications for future
research and educational and intervention efforts to address sexual harassment in spaces not exclusive to college students.

**Gender Microaggressions**

The subtle nature of microaggressions make them harder to identify. Basford et al. (2014) found that the more explicit the discrimination, the more easily it is recognized as such, and Sue et al. (2007) call attention to the “invisibility” of microaggressions (p.275). Additionally, gender microaggressions have not been as widely studied as other forms of sexual violence (e.g., sexual harassment and sexual assault) (Gartner et al., 2020).

However, we can draw some understanding of prevalence rates from research conducted on other forms of sexual violence. For example, Krebs et al. (2016) found that “sexual advances, gestures, comments, or jokes” was the most frequently-experienced sexual harassment tactic, by a large margin (90.9%, compared to the next highest tactic—"showed or sent you sexual photos or videos”—at 21.6%). Although included in that study under the definition of sexual harassment, these tactics align with the definition of microaggressions and may be telling as to the prevalence rates of gender microaggressive experiences.

**Legal Obligations**

Over the last fifty years, the U.S. government has increased attempts to address the prevalence of sexual assault and harassment through the adoption of legislation and guidelines. The most well-known of these efforts is Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 USC § 1681 et. Seq.), which provides in relevant part that “no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.”
(20 USC § 1681(1)(a)). The Department of Education was then charged with promulgating the regulations that fill in the details of this broadly-stated statute (34 c.f.r. § 106.1et Seq.).

Under Title IX, colleges that participate in federal financial aid programs are prohibited from discriminating based on sex (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). The OCR is tasked with interpreting and enforcing Title IX. Under their interpretation of Title IX, sexual harassment is included as a form of discrimination since it can “deny or limit the student’s ability to participate in or to receive benefits, services, or opportunities in the school’s program” (U.S. Department of Education: Office for Civil Rights, 2001, p. 2). As such, colleges are required to fully investigate and respond to incidents of sexual harassment (U.S. Department of Education: Office for Civil Rights, 2001). Failure to comply with Title IX can jeopardize an institution’s eligibility for federal funding and could open them up to lawsuits with additional financial penalties. It is worth noting that several revised Title IX guidelines have been introduced by the OCR over the past 10 years, and new regulations continue to be proposed and adopted (for more information, see Conroy, 2022; Murakami, 2021; U.S. Department of Education: Office for Civil Rights, n.d.a).

Related, the Clery Act promotes transparency by requiring federally-funded universities to report crime rates and information about their policies, procedures and programming aimed at improving campus safety (Violence Against Women Act, 2014). The annual security report produced in compliance with the Clery Act includes crimes from the previous three years that were officially reported to the institution, occur on or immediately-adjacent to university property, and fall into one of these categories: murder, robbery, burglary, arson, liquor law violations, aggravated assault, motor vehicle theft, drug abuse violations, weapons violations, hate crimes, rape, statutory rape, fondling, incest, domestic violence, dating violence, and
stalking. These crimes are serious, and transparency around their rates are important. However, they do not clearly and fully convey the safety and climate of a campus.

**Prevalence Rates vs. Reported Rates**

Studies consistently find that campus sexual assault victimization is highly underreported to universities. Krebs et al. (2016) found that although many victimized students disclosed their experience to a roommate, friend or family members (64-68%), few made formal reports to the university (4.3-12.5%). Similarly, Hill and Silva (2005) found that 61% of female students who experienced sexual harassment told a friend about the incident, 14% told a parent or family member, and only 9% reported the incident to the university. Comparable reporting rates have been found in numerous other studies, including Cantor et al. (2015) and Spencer et al. (2020).

Fisher et al. (2016) found that, if they are going to report an incident of sexual assault, undergraduate female students were most likely to contact an on-campus resource (90.9% to 98.7% on-campus resource versus 7.3% to 14.7% off-campus resource). The top three on-campus resources those students contacted were counseling (39.1% to 52.7%), victim services (21.3% to 35.2%), and the health center (14.8% to 26.4%) (Fisher et al., 2016). It is worth noting that these are all confidential parties, excluded from mandatory reporting obligations. It is unclear whether this was known to the students and perhaps factored into their choice of disclosure recipient.

There are two additional findings that may be significant and need to be considered. First, several studies (Moore & Baker, 2018; Spencer et al., 2020) found that students are significantly less likely to report sexual victimization that involved someone they know to a university official or police. This is a concerning finding that points to potential challenges in addressing campus sexual violence, given that most students who experience sexual violence are victimized by
someone they know (Krebs et al., 2016; Spencer et al., 2020). Second, Orchowski et al. (2009) found that women who have previously been victimized are less likely to report—to any person or agency—than women without a history of victimization.

**Barriers to Reporting**

Numerous studies have been conducted to better understand why so many victims of campus sexual violence choose not to report their experiences (e.g., Fisher et al., 2016; Sable et al., 2006; Spencer et al., 2017). Fisher et al. (2016) and Spencer et al. (2017) both found that most victims of campus sexual violence chose not to report the incident because they thought it was not serious enough. Other common top reasons students chose not to report sexual victimization were feelings of embarrassment, shame, and guilt, assumptions that they would not be believed or that nothing would be done, fear of retaliation or social consequences, concerns over confidentiality, not knowing who to tell, and not wanting to get the perpetrator in trouble (Sable et al., 2006; Spencer et al., 2017; Fisher et al., 2016).

It seems reasonable to suspect that some of these barriers—not knowing who to tell, concerns over confidentiality, assumptions that nothing would be done, and fear of retaliation—could be reduced through clearly-communicated and enforced policies and procedures. These same barriers, as well as others such as fear of social consequences, could also be reduced through informed and intentional efforts to improve the campus climate. Notably, Spencer et al. (2020) found that students with a positive perception of the overall campus climate were six times more likely to formally report their sexual victimization. This clearly speaks to the importance of improving campus climate as part of efforts being made to reduce barriers to reporting sexual victimization.
Unique Challenges of Microaggressions

One of the dilemmas of microaggressions is the “Catch-22 of responding” (Sue et al., 2007, p. 279). The recipient of a microaggression must first determine whether a microaggression has actually occurred (again, under often-ambiguous conditions), then decide whether to respond (versus doing or saying nothing), and finally determine the best way to respond—all typically within a very short period of time. Choosing to do nothing effectively ensures that neither change nor retribution will occur. However, responding “incorrectly”—such as with potentially-justifiable anger—may be viewed as an overreaction and further evidence of a generalized negative stereotype (e.g., oversensitivity of women). It is no wonder that Sue et al. (2007) describe this dilemma as a “damned if you do, and damned if you don’t” situation (p. 279).

The challenges of responding to microaggressions extend beyond the individual level. Microaggressions can be difficult to discuss because they tend to be emotionally-charged and lead to defensiveness. Further, addressing microaggressions entails confronting the harmful actions of people who neither recognize the harm of the actions nor view themselves as having biases against the marginalized group(s) at whom the microaggression was targeted. As Sue (2010b) so aptly articulates:

Because most people experience themselves as good, moral, and decent human beings, conscious awareness of their hidden biases, prejudices, and discriminatory behaviors threatens their self-image. Thus, they may engage in defensive maneuvers to deny their biases, to personally avoid talking about topics such as racism, sexism, heterosexism, and ableism, and to discourage others from bringing up such topics. (p. 5)
Further, people are not purely or exclusively a victim or a perpetrator of microaggressions. Members of a marginalized group can both experience microaggressions (i.e., be a victim) and enact microaggressions (i.e., be a perpetrator) – either consciously or unconsciously—toward other members of their group and/or members of a different marginalized group over which they hold power. This speaks to the importance of raising awareness for all members of a community on the role they play in creating and maintaining systemic power and privilege.

The Importance of Addressing Campus Sexual Violence

All three forms of gendered violence against women—microaggressions, sexual harassment, and sexual assault—support and perpetuate existing gender power dynamics and societal tolerance of inequity, disrespect, and violence against women (Gartner & Sterzing, 2016). They have all also been found to have serious and lasting negative consequences for women who experience them. We can broadly think about the negative impacts of sexual violence as falling into one of two categories: harm to the individual and harm to the greater campus community and culture. An added layer that needs to be understood, explored, and addressed is institutional betrayal and its anecdote institutional courage. Each of these will be reviewed more in-depth below.

Harm to the Individual

Sexual victimization can have immediate and long-term impact on the student’s mental health and well-being (Marshall et al., 2014; Reason & Rankin, 2006). For example, Pinchevsky et al. (2019) found that both contact and non-contact sexual victimization led to feeling different (20.2% and 31.5%, respectively) and detached from other people, activities, and their surroundings (34.3% and 22.1%, respectively). Krebs et al. (2016) found that “the most common
problems that resulted from both rape and sexual battery incidents were problems with friends, roommates, or peers (such as getting into more arguments or fights than before, the victim not feeling that he/she could trust them as much, or not feeling as close to them as before)” (p. 113). They also found that more severe acts (i.e., rape) caused more problems for the victim than less severe acts (i.e., sexual battery). Additionally, Turchik and Hassija (2014) linked sexual victimization to problematic drinking, increased drug use, and sexual risk-taking behaviors for college women.

Academic performance and decisions, such as class attendance, change of major, and leaving school are also impacted by experiences of sexual victimization (e.g., Jordan et al., 2014; Mengo & Black, 2016; Pinchevsky et al., 2019). Mengo and Black (2016) found that students’ cumulative GPAs declined significantly following a sexual victimization experience. Similarly, both contact and non-contact victimization interfered with academic performance (30% and 16.5%, respectively) and limited ability to participate in school events and activities (18.4% and 15.6%, respectively), according to Pinchevsky et al. (2019). They also found that 15.6% of students who experienced contact sexual victimization thought about leaving the University, as did 9.2% of non-contact victims. Given the impact of undergraduate degree obtainment and major on future career and earning potential (Zhang, 2016), a student’s decision to change majors and/or drop out of college can have longer-term impacts.

Though lower in single-incident severity, microaggressions are by no means harmless. Gartner and Sterzing (2016) point out that, “theory and empirical research point to the mechanisms through which gender microaggressions, while seamlessly benign, bring about outcomes analogous to sexual harassment and sexual assault” (p. 495). A single gender microaggression experience is likely to bring about less severe harm to the victim than a single
incident of sexual assault, or even sexual harassment. However, the harm of microaggressions may lie in their cumulative effect and in the self-doubt and uncertainty caused by their more covert nature. Some researchers have found that their subtle nature actually adds to the harm of microaggressions by adding a layer of self-doubt and dismissal (e.g., Johnson, 2018). Johnson (2018), for example, explains that:

Because a microaggressive act can be defended as “small” and ambiguous (“I was only kidding”), it can have an outsized effect by encouraging members of subordinate groups to doubt themselves—“Am I being too sensitive?”—as they try to figure out what to make of it and its significance. Such moments can accumulate into an exhausting source of distraction, frustration, and anger in the midst of everything else people have to do in their lives. (p. 49)

**Harm to the Campus Community/Culture**

The consequences of campus sexual violence extend beyond the individual victimized student. The larger campus community suffers when sexual harassment becomes pervasive. For example, students may begin to see the campus climate as “sexist,” “hostile,” and “disrespectful” (Reason & Rankin, 2006) and even unsafe (Rosenthal et al., 2016). Interestingly, Pinchevsky et al.’s (2019) multi-institution study of college students found that a non-contact sexual victimization experience (what they referred to as sexual harassment) created a more intimidating and uncomfortable environment than contact sexual victimization. This finding highlights the importance of addressing the subtler forms of campus sexual violence (e.g., gender microaggressions).

It is important to note that these negative views of campus culture and safety are held more commonly by women than men (Reason & Rankin, 2006; Rosenthal et al., 2016). Reason
and Rankin (2006) found that “In general, female students perceived the university less favorably than male students […] and] a significantly greater proportion of female student residents disagreed that the university addressed sexism as compared to male students” (p. 15). This creates a cycle of negative impacts for college women, who are both more likely to be the victims of campus sexual violence (e.g., Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2016) and more likely to be affected by a campus climate of hostility and disrespect.

Reason and Rankin (2006) suggest that some of these perception differences between women and men may have to do with their differing levels of power and privilege.

A power-and-privilege-cognizant interpretation of the disconnect between experiences and climate assessments would suggest that men were able to overlook more subtle incidents of gender harassment because they are not directly targeted. Further, the incidents men did witness did not influence their assessments of the climate as much as the incidents women witnessed. Male privilege allows men to remain oblivious to, ignore, or diminish incidents of sexual harassment because they do not feel personally affected (McIntosh, 1995). (p. 22)

This has concerning implications for addressing campus sexual violence, given that university leaders are most often men (American Council on Education, 2017) and victims of sexual violence are most often women (Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs et al., 2016). Extending this idea, it seems likely that sexual harassment on campus—and the messages about sexual harassment by fellow students and the college—may have even greater effect on the LGBTQ and other more-oft marginalized or disadvantaged populations.
Institutional Betrayal

“What does it mean to find danger in a place where one instead expected to find safety?” (Smith & Freyd, 2014, p. 577).

Betrayal trauma theory (Freyd, 1994, 1996) explains the added harm of an abuse that is perpetrated within a close interpersonal relationship. Freyd and Birrell (2013) found that betrayal traumas—those traumas perpetrated within a close relationship as opposed to by a stranger—are associated with heightened adverse mental health outcomes, such as anxiety, depression, dissociation, and posttraumatic stress disorder. A key aspect of the theory is what Freyd (1997) calls betrayal blindness, an adaptive response that enables a victim to maintain a necessary relationship by suppressing—or being “blind” to—the interpersonal abuse that occurred. This interpersonal relationship is characterized by trust and necessity, in which the perpetrator is someone upon whom the victim depends for safety or survival in some way (e.g., a caregiver). In this way, there is often an inherent power imbalance.

Institutional betrayal extends betrayal trauma theory to the institutional level, examining how the impacts of traumatic experiences are exacerbated by institutional action or inaction (Smith & Freyd, 2014). As Smidt et al. (2019) so aptly put it:

Institutional betrayal occurs when students’ universities and colleges fail to prevent sexual violence on campus (i.e., inaction or by omission), act in ways that may contribute to sexual violence (i.e., by commission), or respond poorly when sexual violence happens on campus. (p. 2)

According to Smith and Freyd (2017), failure to proactively prevent campus sexual violence and creating an environment that makes sexual violence seem common or acceptable were the most common forms of institutional betrayal. Students can experience institutional
betrayal at the individual (e.g., advisor or professor), departmental, and systemic (e.g., administration) level within a university (Linder & Myers, 2017), which is important for universities to keep in mind as they work to create a safe campus environment and prevent sexual violence.

Numerous studies have linked institutional betrayal to increased anxiety, depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, and other adverse mental health outcomes (Andresen et al., 2019; Smidt et al., 2019; Smith & Freyd, 2017; Smith & Freyd, 2013). These outcomes have been found to be unique from the effects of the interpersonal betrayal (i.e., the sexual victimization itself) (Smith & Freyd, 2017), which suggests that “institutions have the power to cause additional harm to assault survivors” through their actions or inactions (Smith & Freyd, 2013, p. 119). Given that many students who experience campus sexual assault also experience institutional betrayal (Smidt et al., 2019) and that institutional betrayal is associated with heightened negative mental health outcomes for victims (Andresen et al., 2019; Smidt et al., 2019; Smith & Freyd, 2017; Smith & Freyd, 2013), it is important for colleges and universities to examine and address institutional betrayal as part of their overall efforts to prevent campus sexual violence.

This sense of institutional betrayal—and thus the likelihood of long-term negative impact—may increase when the perpetrator of sexual harm is viewed as a member of the institution itself. In their study examining the sexual harassment of graduate students, Rosenthal et al. (2016) found that students who were sexual harassed by faculty or staff were 1.76 times more likely to report institutional betrayal. “Our findings suggest that while any instance of sexual harassment can highlight the university’s failure to protect students, harassment by faculty/staff is most strongly associated with institutional betrayal for graduate students” (p.
This level of harm warrants attention to these acts of sexual violence and their effects, despite findings that campus sexual violence perpetration by a university employee is less common than peer perpetration (Reason & Rankin, 2006; Rosenthal et al., 2016). It is also notable that Cantor et al.’s (2016) study involving 27 schools found that graduate students were victimized by faculty at higher rates than undergraduate students (22.4% compared to 5.9%), which suggests that additional focus may be needed to educate and protect this population around university employee-perpetrated sexual violence.

**Institutional Courage**

The concept of institutional courage was introduced by Dr. Jennifer Freyd, Center for Institutional Courage and the University of Oregon (University of Oregon, n.d.). According to Smidt and Freyd (2019), “institutional courage is an institution’s commitment to seek the truth and engage in moral action despite unpleasantness, risk, and short-term cost” (para. 1) and is an answer to institutional betrayal. Smidt and Freyd (2019) outlined 11 steps an institution should take to promote institutional courage (para. 3):

1. Comply with civil rights laws and go beyond mere compliance.
2. Educate the institutional community (especially leadership).
3. Add checks and balances to power structure and diffuse highly dependent relationships.
4. Respond well to victim disclosures (and create a trauma-informed reporting policy).
5. Bear witness, be accountable, apologize.
6. Cherish the whistleblowers; cherish the truth tellers.
7. Conduct scientifically-sound anonymous surveys.
9. Be transparent about data and policy.
10. Use the organization to address the societal problem.

11. Commit on-going resources to 1-10.

In the context of this study’s framework for campus sexual violence (Figure 1.1), a university acting with institutional courage could acknowledge and address systemic privilege, mitigate abuses of power, and positively impact the campus climate and students’ perceptions of institutional responses. As evident in Smidt and Freyd’s (2019) 11 steps of institutional courage (listed above), this is an ongoing process that requires continuous commitment on the part of the university.

**Challenges of Addressing Campus Sexual Violence**

**Challenges of Addressing Covert (and even overt) Acts**

Driven by Title IX, universities focus on combatting sexual assault, the most covert form of campus sexual violence. Considerably less attention, both preventative and responsive, is paid to sexual harassment and even less to gender microaggressions. This could be due to the challenges of recognizing and “proving” more covert forms of gendered violence (e.g., sexual harassment and gender microaggressions), as well as the absence of clear legal guidelines and precedent. Even seemingly straightforward incidents of sexual assault can include challenging debates about consent and compounding factors such as “high-risk” behaviors (e.g., drug and alcohol use). As these types of debates are played out on the public stage, what deterrent messages do victims of sexual violence internalize? And what might someone conclude about the odds of successfully receiving support and justice for less overt forms of sexual violence?

**Resistance to Change**

Systems and people with power want to protect the status quo (as discussed in Chapter 1). Johnson (2018) describes that this can be done through denial or minimization of the problem.
(e.g., a university choosing to avoid collecting—and therefore having to acknowledge—accurately higher sexual victimization rates), calling the problem something else (e.g., reframing a rape as a case of miscommunication or misunderstanding), or blaming the victim. Johnson (2018) contends that victim-blaming is “one of the most common and effective defenses of privilege” (p. 94). These tactics can all serve to absolve an individual or institution of the responsibility to address a problem and also help protect their image.

The leaders of an organization can decide what is discussed, promoted, and acted upon. The problem is that, when organization leaders are members of a more dominant or powerful group (e.g., when university leadership is overwhelmingly comprised of men, as in the context of this study) (American Council on Education, 2017), they can decide whether to acknowledge and address the oppression being experienced by other members of the community (e.g., the sexual victimization of college women, as specific to this study). It is important to note that these actions or inactions are not always driven by malicious intent. Johnson (2018) reminds us that “talking about power and privilege isn’t easy, especially for dominant groups, which is why it is so often avoided” (p. 12). However, this does not release us from our obligation to explore and discuss the critical issue of campus sexual violence. We must work toward the ultimate goal of reducing barriers to reporting so that meaningful and appropriate progress can be made toward creating safer campus communities and helping students who have experienced sexual violence.

**Campus Climate Surveys: An Important Tool**

Any effective approach to preventing and addressing campus sexual violence must begin with an accurate picture of the problem. It is particularly important to have campus-specific data since sexual assault rates, contributing factors, and students’ reasons for not reporting likely vary from campus to campus (see, e.g., Cantor et al., 2015). Without this data, it is challenging—if
not impossible—to devise an effective approach to improvement or measure the success of those efforts.

One way to collect campus-specific data is through a campus climate survey, the use of which is strongly encouraged by both The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014) and scholars. Cantalupo (2014), Gialopsos (2017) and Wood et al. (2017), for example, claim that campus climate surveys are necessary for the development of effective policies and responses to sexual violence, as well as the evaluation of those efforts. Although not yet federally mandated, five states (Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York and Washington) required campus climate surveys at the time of this study (Lannon et al., 2021; Richards & Kafonek, 2016), and a sixth state (Connecticut) was considering legislation that would mandate their use (Watson, 2021).

Some colleges may be reluctant to conduct campus climate surveys for fear that the results will expose higher rates of sexual assault and therefore negatively affect student recruiting and retention, the university’s overall reputation, and the university’s potential for securing donations. As Cantalupo (2014) so aptly concludes, “those counterintuitive effects make a school that is doing more to address sexual violence look less safe, due to its high reports of violence, than a school that is ignoring a campus sexual violence problem […]” (p. 239). Cantalupo (2014) goes on to argue that mandating campus climate surveys at the federal level would eliminate this dilemma. Further, the use of a national survey would provide a more complete picture of campus sexual violence in the U.S. and enable colleges and universities to accurately compare and interpret their own findings.
Concluding Thoughts

Critiques of Microaggression

Some scholars have critiqued Sue and his colleagues’ work on microaggressions. Thomas (2008) refers to the concept as “pure nonsense” (p. 274). He claims that Sue et al. (2007) frame actions as racially-motivated microaggressions that are merely the indignities occasionally experienced by everyone. Thomas further accuses Sue of being overly emotional, calling Sue’s reaction to a personal microaggression experience “excessive” (p. 274) and of encouraging a philosophy of victimization. Sue (2019) claims that such criticisms of microaggression theory are based on several assumptions:

(a) Microaggressions are trivial, relatively harmless, and insignificant offense. (b) They are no different from the everyday incivilities experienced by anyone (regardless of race, gender, or sexual orientation). (c) They imply that the complainants are somehow to blame for making such a fuss and the solution is to “grow up,” develop a thicker skin, and stop “whining.” (p. 232)

Sue (2019) points out that such critiques ignore the unequal status, power and privilege of people who are members of a marginalized group (e.g., racial minorities, females), instead invalidating their experiences and blaming them for their own victimization. Sue also cites Paulo Freire’s (1968) Pedagogy of the Oppressed, in which Freire contends that “naming” acts and systems of oppression is the first step to removing their power over those who are marginalized.

Lilienfeld (2017), in contrast, believes that the theory is worth exploring, but that the popularization of the concept and term “microaggression”—and the resultant rush to find practical applications and solutions to a still-nebulously-defined problem—has outpaced the supporting research and is therefore ripe for misuse and misunderstanding. His critique begins
with a breakdown of the term itself, which he asserts is applied to actions that are not “micro” (in that they can be blatantly and intentionally harmful) or not “aggressive” (in that aggression requires some level of intent), and continues with the claim that the improperly-coined term for the concept has not withstood the scientific scrutiny that would ideally be applied prior to the wholesale adoption by both popular and business culture. Lilienfeld asserts that “although the [microaggression research program] has been fruitful in drawing the field’s attention to subtle forms of prejudice, it is far too underdeveloped on the conceptual and methodological fronts to warrant real-world application” (p. 138).

Gartner et al. (2020) concur that valid and reliable quantitative measures for assessing gender microaggressions are needed to gather critical and as-yet under-available data on prevalence and effects. In their study, they conducted a scoping review of 24 different quantitative measures of gender microaggressions and similar constructs. Their review found that, while there has been a marked increase in the number of measures either including gender microaggression items or focusing exclusively on gender microaggressions, there are not yet any “gold standard measures” (Gartner et al., 2020, p. 302). They intend for their findings to support the development of more solid measures of gender microaggressions—ones that are strongly tied to the theoretical construct, are psychometrically valid, and can be used across diverse populations of women.

**Gaps in Literature & Importance of Additional Research and Action**

Considerable research attention has been paid to sexual assault in recent years. Significantly fewer studies have focused on sexual harassment—which was more heavily researched in the 1980s and 1990s—and even fewer on gender microaggressions. Perhaps this is because microaggressions are more difficult to identify and agree upon due to ambiguity, are
more challenging to study, or are perceived to be less harmful and therefore less urgently in need of attention. Regardless of the reason, Sue et al. (2007) contend that “the power of […] microaggressions lies in their invisibility to the perpetrator and, oftentimes, the recipient” (p. 275), and we must therefore bring visibility to microaggressions through further research in order to increase our collective understanding and reduce their power.

It is important to study gender microaggressions in the context of the broader continuum of sexual violence. Gartner and Sterzing (2016) claim that:

The exclusion of gender microaggressions from the current conceptualization of youth sexual violence (a) creates a false impression that chronic, “low-severity” forms of violence are less harmful than infrequent, “high-severity” forms; (b) fosters environments that ignore or condone gender microaggressions inadvertently normalizing sexual violence against girls; and (c) hinders the identification of upstream prevention strategies targeting gender microaggressions as acts of youth sexual violence before they escalate into legally actionable offenses. (p. 492)

The statistics on sexual assault are alarming, and certainly efforts to prevent and address sexual assault are worthwhile and necessary. However, focusing on sexual assault alone is insufficient, akin to picking the leaves off of a weed rather than pulling it out by the root.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS AND STUDY DESIGN

Overview and Participation

This chapter describes the methodology, measures, and analyses used to address the study’s research questions:

1. Research Question 1: What are college cis-women’s experiences with gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate, perceptions of institutional betrayal, and perceptions of institutional courage at Catholic University? Do these experiences and perceptions differ depending on student level (i.e., undergraduate or graduate)?

2. Research Question 2: How are gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by university employees related to perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage?

3. Research Question 3: To what extent do these variables (gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggressions by university employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, institutional courage) predict the likelihood that a college cis-woman will report sexual assault to the University?

This quantitative study was conducted at a private, coed Catholic university situated at the edge of an urban downtown district in the northeastern United States. Most of campus—including all university housing and most classroom buildings—is self-contained and separate from the public downtown region. As such, when students are on the 48-acre campus, they are generally interacting exclusively with other members of the campus community (i.e., students, faculty, staff).
In the spring 2022 semester, when this study was conducted, the University had just under 8,000 enrolled students (61.46% undergraduate and 38.54% graduate). The student population was predominately White (76.58%), with international (non-resident alien status; 5.40%), Black (4.97%), Hispanic (4.33%), Asian (3.28%), multiracial (3.15%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (.05%), and American Indian/Alaska Native (.04%). All female-identified students (64.89% of the total student population) were invited to participate in this study, with a note that eligibility required that students identify as a woman.

The results of this study are specific to Catholic University and its campus. The findings can be used to better understand the experiences of college cis-women at Catholic University and suggest targeted campus improvements.

**Methods**

All students identified on their University record as female were targeted for potential participation on this study, which ran from February 21, 2022, through March 25, 2022. An Excel list of female-identified students’ (N = 3,998) names and school email addresses was generated using IBM Cognos Analytics (IBM Cognos Analytics, n.d.), the University’s data reporting tool, by the University’s Director of Undergraduate Education and Student Success. The Excel file contained one spreadsheet with the complete list of students and then separate spreadsheets based on students’ academic advisor.

The study invitation email (see Appendix A) and IRB-stamped consent form were sent to the academic advisors by the Director on March 3, 2022, along with a request to disseminate to their listed students and detailed instructions on how to do so. About half of the advisors (13 of the 27) sent the invitation to their students within a day of receiving the request (note: I serve as an academic advisor and sent the survey to my own students). A follow-up message was sent on
March 9, 2022, to the advisors who had not confirmed dissemination to their students, which prompted an additional 12 advisors to send the invitation. One advisor never responded, and one declined the request. For the advisor who declined, I sent the invitation to her students personally (with permission from the Director). Upon my request, some of the advisors sent reminder emails on March 21, 2022.

Participants were also recruited through select student organizations and groups, via a request made on February 21, 2022, to the organizations’ faculty/staff advisor to disseminate the email invitation to their membership. The targeted organizations, selected for their student body breadth and/or mission alignment, were: Commuter Affairs; Graduate and Professional Student Council; Panhellenic Council; Residence Hall Association; Student Government Association; Students Against Sexual Violence; Lambda (Gender Sexuality Alliance); and Women and Gender Studies majors. All but one of the organizations confirmed distribution, most within two days. Since most of these organizations are coed, the invitation email emphasized that only students who identify as a woman are eligible to participate. Any other-identifying students who erroneously completed the survey were filtered out based on their response to the gender identity demographic question.

The invitation email provided an overview of the study and a link to complete the online survey. The online survey was administered through Qualtrics® (Qualtrics®, 2022) and optimized for completion on a computer, phone, and/or tablet, as students utilize a variety of technologies. The survey was anonymous, and no personal identifiers were collected.

The first page of the survey was a consent form (see Appendix B), and students were notified that proceeding to the survey indicated their voluntary consent to participate in the project. Students who chose to continue were then presented with the survey questions (see
Appendix C), which will be discussed in more depth in the following section. At the end of the survey, students were provided with sexual assault resources and offered the opportunity to enroll in a drawing at the end of the survey for a chance to win one of three $100 gift cards (see Appendix D). Gift card entry was done via a re-directing URL to a separate survey, to prevent any personal information from being linked to survey responses.

**Measures**

The final instrument for this study was a 153-item survey administered through Qualtrics® (Qualtrics®, 2022), an online survey software. The survey was comprised of five separate measures: Campus Gender Microaggressions Scale, Campus Climate Survey, Institutional Courage Questionnaire, Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire, and Demographic Questionnaire. A brief description of each measure is provided below, and an overview table is available in Appendix E.

**Measure 1: Campus Gender Microaggressions Scale**

The Campus Gender Microaggressions Scale (CGMS) consists of adapted items from three existing measures: Gender Microaggressions Scale (GMS; Bolte, 2015), Sexist Microaggressions Experiences and Stress Scale (Sexist MESS; Derthick, 2015), and Female Microaggressions Scale (FeMS; Miyake, 2018). These existing measures were identified through Gartner et al.’s (2020) review of gender microaggression measures, which compiled and analyzed quantitative measures that could be used to assess gender microaggressions or related constructs with adult women, and were ultimately selected because they are free to use and have at least one subscale that will help answer this study’s research questions. Items were selected from these existing measures for inclusion in this study’s CGMS based on their fit and alignment with the study’s focus and definition of gender microaggressions. For example, any items about
acts involving physical contact were automatically removed given the misalignment with the study’s definition of gender microaggressions as non-physical contact acts. The final CGMS used in the study is comprised of two subscales: Gender Microaggressions by Peers (GM-Peers) and Gender Microaggressions by University Employees (GM-Employees). The items in each subscale are the same, with the exception of one question that only appears on the Gender Microaggressions by University Employees subscale due to relevance.

The GMS (Bolte, 2015) is a 24-item measure that uses a 5-point scale to assess frequency of gender microaggressions. The items fall into six subscales: second-class citizenship/assumptions of inferiority, sexist language, sexual objectification, assumptions of traditional gender roles, denial of sexism, and environmental microaggressions. Only one subscale—sexist language—was included in the final CGMS measure used in this study. The remaining subscales were either not aligned with the focus of this study or had better-suited equivalents within the other two existing measures included in the CGMS (Sexist MESS and FeMS; both discussed below) and were therefore not utilized.

The Sexist MESS (Derthick, 2015) asks participants to rate both frequency (4-point scale) and stress appraisal (4-point scale) for 44 items that are categorized into seven subscales: leaving gender at the door, sexual objectification, environmental invalidation, invalidation of the reality of women, assumptions of traditional gender roles, expectations of appearance, and inferiority. Two of the subscales (leaving gender at the door and assumptions of traditional gender roles) were not included in the CGMS, due to poor fit with the context and focus of this study. The remaining five subscales were all included, though some individual items were removed due to misalignment with this study’s research questions. Last, participants in this study
were asked only to rate the frequency of their experiences; stress appraisal ratings were not pertinent to this study.

The FeMS (Miyake, 2018) assesses frequency of gender microaggression experiences using a 4-point scale. The 34 items are categorized into eight subscales: traditional gender roles, sexist language, implicit threatened physical safety, explicit threatened physical safety, invalidation of the reality of sexism, assumptions of inferiority/second-class citizen, environmental, and sexual objectification. Selected items from two of these subscales—environmental and invalidation of the reality of sexism—were included in the CGMS. The remaining subscales were either not aligned with the focus of this study or had better-suited equivalents within the other two existing measures included in the CGMS (GMS and Sexist MESS; both discussed above) and were therefore not utilized.

**Measure 2: Campus Climate Survey**

Most campus climate surveys focus heavily on collecting data on student victimization (e.g., sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking) in addition to more general perceptions of the campus climate. While campus-specific victimization rates and data are critical to a university’s comprehensive understanding of sexual violence at their institution, they were not needed for this study. Therefore, this study utilized portions of just the Campus Climate Module from the Campus Climate Survey Validation Study (Krebs et al., 2016), excluding all modules related to victimization. The final Campus Climate Survey measure included six of the 11 sections of the Module (44 total items) that were selected based on applicability to this study: School Connectedness; General Perceptions of Campus Police (Perceptions of Campus Police); General Perceptions of Faculty (Perceptions of Faculty); General Perceptions of School Leadership (Perceptions of School Leadership); Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Sexual
Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (Perceptions of Prevention and Response); Awareness and Perceived Fairness of School Sexual Assault Policy and Resources (Perception of Policy and Resources); Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Treatment of Sexual Assault Victims (Perception of Treatment of Victims); and Likelihood of Reporting. Reliability for these subscales ranged from $\alpha = 0.85$ to 0.92 in previous studies (Krebs et al., 2016).

**Measure 3: Institutional Courage Questionnaire**

The Institutional Courage Questionnaire (ICQ-Individual-Not-Victimized; Smidt & Freyd, 2019) asks participants whether they think various institutional responses would impact their experience of reporting sexual misconduct victimization to the university (14 items; yes or no). It also includes two questions about the extent to which an institution could help or impede recovery following an experience of sexual misconduct (5-point scale). This complete measure was included in the final study survey without any modifications.

**Measure 4: Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire**

The 12-item Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire (IBQ-Climate; Smith & Freyd, 2013) measures students’ perceptions of the university’s policies and attitudes about campus sexual misconduct using a 4-point scale. This complete measure was included in the final study survey without any modifications.

**Measure 5: Demographic Questionnaire**

This brief self-created questionnaire asked students’ age, academic level (e.g., freshman, sophomore, graduate), ethnicity, race, gender identity, sexual orientation, and whether they had experienced gender microaggressions, sexual harassment, and sexual assault at the University. The last six items—race, gender identity, sexual orientation, gender microaggression experience,
sexual harassment experience, and sexual assault experience—including a “prefer not to disclose” response option. The data collected from these questions will be used for the sole purpose of examining differences in experiences and perceptions across various student subpopulations.

**Data Analysis**

All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 28 software. The Demographic Questionnaire responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics to learn about the study participants. The remaining measures (Campus Gender Microaggressions Scale, Campus Climate Survey, Institutional Courage Questionnaire, and Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire) and sub-measures (GM-Peers, GM-Employees, School Connectedness, Perceptions of Campus Police, Perceptions of Faculty, Perceptions of School Leadership, Prevention and Response, Policy and Resources, and Treatment of Victims) were converted into distinct variables, and each variable was tested for outliers using boxplots and for normality using histograms.

Part one of the first research question (students’ gender microaggression experiences and perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage) was answered using descriptive statistics of each variable and their individual items. The second part of the research question (differences based on student level) was answered through an independent *t* test, comparing the mean scores of gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggressions by University employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage for undergraduate student participants to the mean scores of those same variables for graduate student participants. Homogeneity of variance—one of the assumptions of a *t* test—was verified using Levene’s test for equality of variance.

A Pearson correlation analysis was used to answer the second research question (how gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by University employees are
related to campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage), with the assumption of linearity tested using scatterplots. Finally, the third research question (the extent to which each variable predicts students’ likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to the University) was answered through multiple regression models. The regression assumptions of independence of residuals and homoscedasticity were tested for each of the models using residual scatterplots, and the assumption of multicollinearity was checked by calculating tolerance levels.
CHAPTER 4: DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS

Research Questions

This chapter describes the results of the analyses conducted to answer the study’s research questions:

1. What are college cis-women’s experiences with gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate, perceptions of institutional betrayal, and perceptions of institutional courage at Catholic University? Do these experiences and perceptions differ depending on student level (i.e., undergraduate or graduate)?

2. How are gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by University employees related to perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage?

3. To what extend do these variables (gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggressions by University employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage) predict the likelihood that a college cis-woman will report sexual assault to the University?

Measures

The survey participants completed for this study had 153 total questions, consisting of a campus gender microaggressions scale (67 questions), campus climate scale (44 questions), institutional betrayal questionnaire (12 questions), institutional courage questionnaire (20 questions), and demographic questionnaire (10 questions). With the exception of the demographics, the measures used in this study are modified versions of pre-existing measures. A complete overview of the measures (and sub-measures) is provided in Appendix E.
On average, the survey took participants 37.7 minutes to complete (note: this was calculated based only on participants who completed the entire survey). The median completion time was 14 minutes. These completion times are slightly higher than the anticipated 15-20 minutes.

Process

The online survey utilized in this study was administered as outlined in Chapter 3. Once the data collection period had ended, the raw data was exported from the online survey platform, Qualtrics®, into Microsoft Excel. There were 785 total recorded responses. All incomplete responses were removed from the data set. Additionally, anyone who indicated a gender identity on the Demographics Questionnaire other than woman or cis-woman was removed from the data set since they did not meet the criteria for participation. The final data set included 483 participants.

Next, responses were cleaned and coded (see Appendix F). The final cleaned data set was then exported to IBM SPSS Statistics 28 software, where the analyses were run.

Tests of Assumptions

All statistical analyses performed in this study assume the absence of outliers, which was tested using boxplots. There were no outliers for five of the variables and very few outliers for the remaining nine variables (primarily three to eight outliers per variable, with one variable having 12 outliers). Given the large overall sample size (483 participants), the decision was made not to remove outliers. The boxplots for each variable are available in Appendix G.

The $t$ Test, used to answer part of the first research question, carries assumptions of mutual-exclusivity of independent variable groups, continuous dependent variables, normality of dependent variables, homogeneity of variance, and independence of scores. The mutual-
exclusivity of independent variable groups assumption was met because participants could not belong to both groups (i.e., they are either an undergraduate student or a graduate student; they cannot be both). The continuous variable assumption was met because all variables were measured on an interval scale. Normality was checked using histograms (Appendix H) and was met for all variables. Homogeneity of variance was tested using Levene’s test for equality of variance. This assumption was met for all variables except gender microaggressions by employees, and the violation of the assumption for this variable did not affect the results. Finally, the independent scores assumption was met during the data collection phase, since each respondent completed the survey independently.

The additional assumptions for a Pearson correlation (used to answer the second research question) are normality, linearity, continuous variables, and independence of scores. Normality was checked using histograms (see Appendix H) and was met for all variables. Linearity was tested using scatterplots (see Appendix I), and this assumption was met for all variables. The continuous variables assumption was met because all variables were measured on an interval scale. Finally, the independent scores assumption was met during the data collection phase, since each respondent completed the survey independently.

The regression analyses used to answer the third research question assume independence of residuals, homoscedasticity, normality, and multicollinearity. Independence of residuals and homoscedasticity were tested for each of the regression models using residual scatterplots (see Appendix J), and both assumptions were met for all four of the models. Normality was checked using histograms (see Appendix H) and was met for all variables. Multicollinearity was tested for each of the four regression models used in this study. Based on the tolerance values presented
in Appendix K (all < 1), multicollinearity was not a problem in any of the models. Therefore, the variables were independent of one another in every regression model.

Results

Participant Demographics

There were 483 participants in this study, all cis-women at Catholic University. The participants were primarily 18-23 years old (71.1%), White (84.3%), non-Hispanic (95.5%), and identified their sexual orientation as straight (75.6%). There was fairly even representation from both the undergraduate and graduate populations (58% and 42%, respectively) and a mix of participants who lived on campus versus off campus (38.7% and 61.3%, respectively). Three victimization experience questions were also included in the demographics survey: one about gender microaggressions, one about sexual harassment, and one about sexual assault. Through those questions, 61.5% of participants reported having experienced gender microaggressions at Catholic University, 25.3% reported having been sexual harassed, and 10.6% reported having been sexually assaulted. Complete demographics are presented in Appendix L.

Research Question 1

The first research question has two parts: 1) “what are college cis-women’s experiences with gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate, perceptions of institutional betrayal, and perceptions of institutional courage?” and 2) “do these experiences and perceptions differ depending on student level (i.e., undergraduate or graduate)?”

Experiences with Gender Microaggressions and Perceptions of Campus Climate, Institutional Betrayal, and Institutional Courage
I used descriptive statistics to answer the first part of Research Question 1. An overview of the results—tests of central tendency—is available in Table 4.1, and in-depth results are provided in the following sections.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender microaggressions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional betrayal</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional courage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>20.723</td>
<td>3.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a_n = 483\) for each variable.

**Gender Microaggressions**

The Campus Gender Microaggressions Scale (CGMS) had two subparts: Gender Microaggressions by Peers (GM-Peers; 33 items), and Gender Microaggressions by University Employees (GM-Employees; 34 items), both of which were scored on a 5-point scale (0 never, 1 rarely, 2 sometimes, 3 often, 4 always). Each item is an example of a microaggression, and higher ratings indicate that students have experienced that microaggression more often. Here, we will discuss the overall results of students’ experiences with gender microaggressions and also narrow in on experiences with gender microaggressions by peers compared with gender microaggressions by university employees.

The CGMS, overall, had a mean of 1.318 with a standard deviation of .740. The means of the individual items ranged from .27 to 2.94, and the medians ranged from .00 to 3.00 for each item. Additionally, the percentage of students who responded affirmatively to having experienced each microaggression at Catholic University (i.e., they answered “rarely,” “sometimes,” “often,” or “always”) was 65% or higher for almost half of the items (32 of the 67
items), with the highest item (observing that men hold more leadership positions than women) receiving a 96.9% affirmative response rate. In an interesting contrast with these results, only 61.5% of students answered affirmatively to the direct question of whether or not they had experienced gender microaggressions at the University, asked in the demographic questions at the end of the survey.

The GM-Peers sub-measure had a mean of 1.848 with a standard deviation of .871. The means of the individual items ranged from .95 to 2.94, and the medians ranged from 1.0 to 3.0 for each item. Appendix M shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “always” or “often” and the percentage of students who responded “never” or “rarely.”

All but four of the items were experienced always or often by 20% or more students, meaning that 29 examples of gender microaggressions are experienced always or often by one (or more) in five students. The most experienced gender microaggressions was observing that men hold more leadership positions than women (73.5% always or often; $M = 2.94, SD = .00$). In addition to this microaggression, five others were experienced always or often by more than half of the students: a first compliment given being related to appearance ($M = 2.60; SD = 1.15$), hearing adult women referred to as “girls” ($M = 2.48; SD = 1.02$), hearing someone refer to women using derogatory language ($M = 2.35; SD = 1.25$), observing that people excuse men’s behavior ($M = 2.41, SD = 1.20$), and overhearing men being told to “be a man” ($M = 2.35, SD = 1.25$).

The GM-Employees sub-measure had a mean of .804 with a standard deviation of .783. The means of the individual items ranged from .27 to 1.92 and the medians ranged from 0.0 to 2.0. Appendix N shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each
individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “always” or “often” and the percentage of students who responded “never” or “rarely.”

In contrast to gender microaggressions by peers, none of the gender microaggressions by university employees were experienced always or often by 50% or more of students, and 20 were experienced always or often by fewer than 10% of students. The most experienced item was observing that more men hold leadership positions than women (39.8% always or often; $M = 1.92, SD = 1.35$), which was the gender microaggression experienced most frequently by peers, as well. It is encouraging that frequencies were relatively low (6.4-14.3% always or often) for items related to women’s experiences of gender discrimination or sexual harassment being invalidated, not believed, or dismissed and even lower for women being to blame for their sexual victimization (4.9% always or often; $M = .48, SD = .90$) and overhearing others joke about rape (4.7% always or often; $M = .42, SD = .87$).

**Campus Climate**

The Campus Climate Survey consisted of seven subscales: School Connectedness, General Perceptions of Campus Police (Perception of Campus Police), General Perceptions of Faculty (Perceptions of Faculty), General Perceptions of School Leadership (Perceptions of School Leadership), Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (Perceptions of Prevention and Response), Awareness and Perceived Fairness of School Sexual Assault Policy and Resources (Perceptions of Policy and Resources), and Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Treatment of Sexual Assault Victims (Perceptions of Treatment of Victims). All questions were scored on a 4-point Likert scale, where 0 was strongly disagree and 3 was strongly agree. The overall campus climate
measure had a mean of 1.804, with a standard deviation of .466. The mean of individual items ranged from 1.43 to 2.25, and the median ranged from 1.00 to 2.00 for each item.

The School Connectedness sub-measure contained 11 statements, all of which were worded as positive (i.e., higher ratings are more favorable). The sub-measure had a mean of 1.907 with a standard deviation of .555. The mean of individual items ranged from 1.71 to 2.25, and the median was 2.00 for all items. Table 4.2 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree” and the percentage of students who responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

The results indicate that students feel very safe on campus (91.9% agree or strongly agree; $M = 2.25, SD = .65$), and most students are happy to be a student at Catholic University (83.7% agree or strongly agree; $M = 2.06, SD = .74$). However, a higher number of students disagreed with statements that students at Catholic University respect one another (31.7% disagree or strongly disagree; $M = 1.75, SD = .75$) and trust one another (33.7% disagree or strongly disagree; $M = 1.74, SD = .74$). Additionally, students more strongly disagreed with statements that Catholic University is trying hard for all students to be treated fairly (36.6% disagree or strongly disagree; $M = 1.74, SD = .84$) and to protect all students’ rights (37.7% disagree or strongly disagree; $M = 1.71, SD = .84$).
Table 4.2

School Connectedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
<th>% disagree or strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe when I am on CU’s campus.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to be a student at CU.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe CU is trying hard to make sure that all students are safe.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued as an individual at CU.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to people at CU.</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe there is a clear sense of appropriate and inappropriate behavior among students at CU.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I am a part of CU.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that students at CU respect one another.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe students at CU trust one another.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe CU is trying hard to make sure that all students are treated equally and fairly.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe CU is trying hard to protect the rights of all students.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CU = Catholic University.

aPresented in descending order of “% agree or strongly agree”

The Perceptions of Campus Police sub-measure included four statements. Three of the four items are worded favorably, where a higher rating is indicative of a more positive perception. The remaining item is non-favorable, and a higher response indicates a more negative perception. The sub-measure had a mean of 1.920 with a standard deviation of .454. The means of the individual items ranged from 1.63 to 2.06, and the median was 2.0 for all items. Table 4.3 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “strongly
agree” or “agree” and the percentage of students who responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

Agreement with each statement was fairly similar across all four items (~78-82% agree or strongly agree). Students most strongly agreed that campus police are genuinely concerned about their well-being (82.2% agree or strongly agree; \( M = 2.06, \ SD = .72 \)) and agreed the least that campus police treat students fairly (77.7% agree or strongly agree; \( M = 1.97, \ SD = .76 \)). It is also worth noting that the high rate of agreement (78.5% agree or strongly agree) that campus police are more interested in protecting the reputation of the University than protecting students \( (M = 1.63, \ SD = .93) \) is highly unfavorable and suggest that students believe that, while the campus police are concerned about them and working to protect them, they will prioritize protecting the University’s reputation over them when those two pursuits are in conflict.

Table 4.3

Perceptions of Campus Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
<th>% disagree or strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the campus police at CU are genuinely concerned about my well-being.</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the campus police at CU are doing all they can to protect students from harm.</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the campus police at CU are more interested in protecting the reputation of CU than the students they serve.</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the campus police at CU treat students fairly.</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CU = Catholic University.

\( ^a \)Presented in descending order of “% agree or strongly agree”
The Perceptions of Faculty sub-measure included four statements. Three of the four items are worded favorably, where a higher rating is indicative of a more positive perception. The remaining item is non-favorable, and a higher response indicates a more negative perception. The sub-measure had a mean of 1.940 with a standard deviation of .432. The means of the individual items ranged from 1.43 to 2.20, and the medians ranged from 1.0 to 2.0. Table 4.4 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree” and the percentage of students who responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

Students more strongly agreed that faculty are genuinely concerned about their well-being (85.9% agree or strongly agree; $M = 2.20, SD = .72$) and doing all they can to protect students from harm (83.3% agree or strongly agree; $M = 2.13, SD = .71$), compared to campus police. However, students’ belief that faculty are more interested in protecting the University’s reputation than in protecting students was considerably lower than for campus police (40.9% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.43, SD = .92$).
Table 4.4

Perceptions of Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
<th>% disagree or strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the faculty at CU are genuinely concerned about my well-being.</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the faculty at CU are doing all they can to protect students from harm.</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the faculty at CU treat students fairly.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the faculty at CU are more interested in protecting the reputation of CU than the students they serve.</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CU = Catholic University.

*Presented in descending order of “% agree or strongly agree”

The Perceptions of School Leadership sub-measure included four statements. Three of the four items are worded favorably, where a higher rating is indicative of a more positive perception. The remaining item is non-favorable, and a higher response indicates a more negative perception. The sub-measure had a mean of 1.811 with a standard deviation of .493. The means of the individual items ranged from 1.63 to 2.14, and the median was 2.0 for all items. Table 4.5 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree” and the percentage of students who responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

Perceptions of school leadership were less favorable, overall, than those of both campus police and faculty. Students most strongly agreed with the negatively-worded statement: that
school leadership are more interested in protecting the reputation of the University than in protecting its students (76.2% agree or strongly agree; $M = 2.14$, $SD = .87$). The lowest agreements were with the three positively-worded items, particularly the statement about school leadership being genuinely concerned about students’ well-being (58.4% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.63$, $SD = .83$). These results are concerning, in terms of potential implications for barriers to the reporting of incidents of sexual assault.

Table 4.5
Perceptions of School Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
<th>% disagree or strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the President/Deans and other leadership staff at this school are more interested in protecting the reputation of CU than the students they serve.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the President/Deans and other leadership staff at this school are doing all they can to protect students from harm.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the President/Deans and other leadership staff at this school treat students fairly.</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, the President/Deans and other leadership staff at this school are genuinely concerned about my well-being.</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CU = Catholic University.

$^a$Presented in descending order of “% agree or strongly agree”

The Perceptions of Prevention and Response sub-measure included seven statements, all worded as positives about the University (i.e., higher scores are more favorable). The sub-measure had a mean of 1.653 with a standard deviation of .716. The means of the individual
items ranged from 1.44 to 1.96, and the medians ranged from 1.00 to 2.00. Table 4.6 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree” and the percentage of students who responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

Students agreed most strongly that sexual harassment is not tolerated at Catholic University (75.1% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.96, SD = .78$). In a curious potential contradiction, noticeably fewer students thought that Catholic University was doing a good job of preventing sexual assault (58.8% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.65, SD = .83$), investigating incidents of sexual assault (55.5% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.55, SD = .86$), or holding people accountable for committing sexual assault (49.7% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.44, SD = .90$). It is possible that this due to the first statement specifying sexual harassment and the other items pertaining to sexual assault; it is unclear whether students noticed this distinction and or hold distinct opinions about the University’s prevention and response efforts for one versus the other.
### Table 4.6

**Perceptions of Prevention and Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
<th>% disagree or strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment is not tolerated at CU.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU takes training in sexual assault prevention seriously.</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU is doing a good job of providing needed services to victims of sexual assault.</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU is doing a good job of trying to prevent sexual assault from happening.</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU is doing a good job of investigating incidents of sexual assault.</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU is doing a good job of educating students about sexual assault (e.g., what consent means, how to define sexual assault, how to look out for one another).</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU is doing a good job of holding people accountable for committing sexual assault.</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note. CU = Catholic University.*

*Presented in descending order of “% agree or strongly agree”*

The Perceptions of Policy and Resources sub-measure included five items, all worded as positive statements about the University (i.e., higher scores are more favorable). The sub-measure had a mean of 1.573 with a standard deviation of .674. The means of the individual items ranged from 1.46 to 1.69, and the median was you 2.00 for all items. Table 4.7 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree” and the percentage of students who responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”
When looking at the responses on this subscale alongside the responses on the previous subscale (Perceptions of Prevention and Response), it is interesting to note that students thought Catholic University was doing a better job of treating accused perpetrators of sexual assault fairly (66.9% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.69$, $SD = .71$) than of holding perpetrators accountable (49.7% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.44$, $SD = .90$), punishing perpetrators appropriately (51.0% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.46$, $SD = .82$) or providing services to victimized students (60.5% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.65$, $SD = .82$). This could suggest a student perception that the University is more concerned about accused and confirmed perpetrators than victims of sexual assault. It is also notable that only about half of students agreed that they know how the University deals with reported sexual assault (52.4% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.57$, $SD = .93$), where to go for help (54.2% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.57$, $SD = .95$), and what services are available to victimized students (53.4% agree or strongly agree; $M = 1.57$, $SD = .91$).
Table 4.7

Perceptions of Policy and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
<th>% disagree or strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At CU, students who are accused of perpetrating a sexual assault are treated fairly.</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend of mine were sexually assaulted, I know where to take my friend to get help.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what services are available for people who experience sexual assault.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of and understand CU’s procedures for dealing with reported incidents of sexual assault.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At CU, when it is determined that a sexual assault has happened, the perpetrator get punished appropriately.</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CU = Catholic University.

aPresented in descending order of “% agree or strongly agree”

The Perceptions of Treatment of Victims sub-measure included four statements, all worded positively, with higher agreements being more favorable. The sub-measure had a mean of 1.820 with a standard deviation of .725. The means of the individual items ranged from 1.62 to 1.99, and the median was 2.00 for every item. Table 4.8 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “strongly agree” or “agree” and the percentage of students who responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

What stands out most from these results is the considerably lower agreement that Catholic University would enable a victimized student to continue their education without having to interact with the person who assaulted them (56.4% agree or strongly agree; \( M = 1.62, SD = \))
It is unclear whether this perception may have been formed by some action or inaction on the University’s part, or if it is more of a recognition of the challenges of making complete separation between victim and perpetrator possible given the size of campus and of some academic programs.

Table 4.8

Perceptions of Treatment of Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
<th>% disagree or strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I were sexually assaulted, I believe CU would protect my privacy.</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were sexually assaulted, I believe CU would treat me with dignity and respect.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were sexually assaulted, I believe CU would take my case seriously.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were sexually assaulted, I believe CU would enable me to continue my education without having to interact with the person who assaulted me.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CU = Catholic University.

*aPresented in descending order of “% agree or strongly agree”

Institutional Betrayal

The Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire contained 12 statements and was scored on a 4-point Likert scale (0 very false, 1 somewhat false, 2 somewhat true, 3 very true). All of the questions were phrased as negatives, with higher scores being less favorable to the University. The mean of the overall measure was 1.058, with a standard deviation of .702. The mean of individual items ranged from .70 to 1.35, and the median was 1.00 for all items. Table 4.9 shows key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item. The frequency
presented is the percentage of students who responded “very true” or “somewhat true” and the percentage of students who responded “very false” or “somewhat false.”

The statement students most agreed with was that Catholic University suggests that reports of sexual victimization may affect the reputation (47.4% very true or somewhat true; \( M = 1.35, SD = 1.00 \)). This is somewhat consistent with students’ responses to a similar question in the general perceptions of campus police and general perception of school leadership sub-measures (that they are ‘more interested in protecting the reputation of Catholic University than the students they serve’). Encouragingly, a fairly low percentage of students think that the University creates an environment in which sexual harassment and assault seem normal (17.4% very true or somewhat true; \( M = .73, SD = .82 \)) or are more likely to occur (14.1% very true or somewhat true; \( M = .70, SD = .76 \)).
Table 4.9

**Institutional Betrayal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>% very true of CU or somewhat true of CU</th>
<th>% very false of CU or somewhat false of CU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggests reports of sexual harassment and assault might affect the reputation of the University.</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds inadequately to reports of sexual harassment and assault.</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not take proactive steps to prevent sexual harassment and assault.</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers up reports of sexual harassment and assault.</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an environment where continued involvement is difficult for individuals who experience sexual harassment or assault.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denies the occurrence of sexual harassment and assault in some way.</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishandles student conduct processes related to sexual harassment and assault.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes it difficult to report sexual harassment and assault.</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an environment where individuals who experience sexual harassment and assault no longer feel like valued members of the University.</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishes individuals in some way for reporting sexual harassment and assault (e.g., loss of privileges or status).</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an environment in which sexual harassment and assault seems common or normal.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates an environment in which sexual harassment and assault seems more likely to occur.</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aPrompt was, “how much do the following statements apply to Catholic University’s attitudes and policies around sexual harassment and assault?”

bPresented in descending order of “% very true or somewhat true”
**Institutional Courage**

The Institutional Courage Questionnaire contained 20 questions. The first 18 questions were yes/no (0 no – this would not impact my experience, 1 yes—this would impact my experience), and the final two questions were scored on a 5-point Likert scale (0 not at all, 1 a little, 2 a moderate amount, 3 a lot, 4 a great deal). Since this measure contained two different scales, the institutional courage variable was calculated based on a total score, where zero was the lowest total score possible and 26 was the highest total score possible. Institutional courage had a mean of 20.72, with a standard deviation of 3.17.

Tables 4.10 and 4.11 present the key descriptive results of central tendency and frequency for each individual item included in the institutional courage measure. Frequency for the first 18 items (Table 4.10)—those scored as yes/no—is provided for each of the two possible responses. For the final two items (Table 4.11)—those scored on a 5-point scale—the frequency presented is the percentage of students who responded “a great deal” or “a lot” and the percentage of students who responded “not at all” or “a little.”

An overwhelming majority of students indicated that all but three of the items would impact their sexual victimization reporting experience: if someone at the University apologized for what happened (56.9% yes; $M = .57, SD = .50$), if reporting the experience helped the University better itself (55.3% yes; $M = .55, SD = .50$), and if reporting were rewarded in some way (42.4% yes; $M = .42, SD = .50$). Another notable finding was that more students think a university could *impede* their recovery following sexual victimization (56.8% a great deal or a lot; $M = 2.62, SD = 1.15$) than think a university could *help* with their recovery (45.8% a great deal or a lot; $M = 2.39, SD = 1.03$).
Table 4.10

**Institutional Courage 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% ‘Yes – this would impact my experience’</th>
<th>% ‘No – this would not impact my experience’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding adequately to the experience, if reported.</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your university met your needs for educational support and accommodations (e.g., reassigning you to another professor/supervisor if your professor/supervisor perpetrated the sexual harassment; if your peer perpetrated the sexual harassment and shared a classroom or dormitory with you, the peer was moved out of your shared space).</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handled your case well, if disciplinary action was requested.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making it easy to report this experience.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your university created an environment where this type of experience was recognized as a problem.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your university allowed you to have a say in how your report was handled.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not covering up the experience.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an environment where continued education was no more difficult for you than before you reported the experience.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an environment where continued education was no more difficult for you than before the experience occurred.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting you with either formal or informal resources (e.g., counseling, meetings, phone calls, or other services) following your report of this experience.</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your university created an environment where this type or experience was safe to discuss.</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes%</td>
<td>No%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking proactive steps to prevent this type of experience.</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more faculty/staff members or administrators to whom you reported the experience stated or demonstrated they believed your report that the experience happened.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an environment where you felt like a valued member of your university.</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more of your peers (who are not in a position of authority over you) with whom you shared the experience stated or demonstrated they believed you that the experience happened.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more individuals at your university apologized, either formally or informally, for what happened to you.</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggesting that reporting your experience would help your university better itself.</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewarding you in some way for reporting the experience (e.g., a commendation or some other type of formal or informal reward).</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPrompt was, “which of the following do you think would impact your experience of reporting an unwanted sexual experience to a university?”*

*bPresented in descending order of “yes – this would impact my experience.”*
Table 4.11

**Institutional Courage 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>% ‘a great deal’ or ‘a lot’</th>
<th>% ‘not at all’ or ‘a little’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you think an institution’s role could help you recover from your unwanted sexual experience?</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you think an institution’s role could impede your recovery from your unwanted sexual experience?</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences by Student Level**

To determine whether these student experiences and perceptions differed by student level (i.e., undergraduate or graduate), I conducted an independent $t$ test to compare the mean scores of gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggressions by University employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage for participants who identified as undergraduate students to the mean scores of those same variables for participants who identified as graduate students (see Table 4.12). There was no statistical significance between the means of undergraduate students and graduate students for campus climate ($t(481) = -1.855, p = .064$) and institutional courage ($t(481) = -0.707, p = .480$). The mean score for campus climate was not significantly different for undergraduate students ($M = 1.771, SD = .461$) and graduate students ($M = 1.850, SD = .470$), and the effect size was small ($d = -.171 95\% CI [-.352-.010]$).

Additionally, the mean score of institutional courage was not significantly different for undergraduate students ($M = 20.636, SD = 3.207$) and graduate students ($M = 20.842, SD = 3.124$), and the effect size was also small ($d = -.065 95\% CI [-.246-.116]$). These findings indicate that there are no significant differences between the perceptions of campus climate or institutional courage for undergraduate students compared to graduate students.
The results did, however, indicate statistical significance between the means of undergraduate and graduate students for gender microaggressions by peers ($t(481) = 6.111, p < .001$), gender microaggressions by a University employee ($t(481) = 4.046, p < .001$), and institutional betrayal ($t(481) = 2.728, p = .007$). The mean score for gender microaggressions by peers was significantly higher for undergraduate students ($M = 2.046, SD = .809$) than graduate students ($M = 1.573, SD = .881$), and there was a medium effect size ($d = .563 95\% CI [.379-.747]$). Consistently, the mean score for gender microaggressions by University employees was significantly higher for undergraduate students ($M = .925, SD = .817$) than graduate students ($M = 0.637, SD = .701$), and there was a small to medium effect size ($d = .373 95\% CI [.191-.555]$). The mean score for institutional betrayal was also significantly higher for undergraduate students ($M = 1.132, SD = .716$) than graduate students ($M = .957, SD = .670$), and there was a small effect size ($d = .251 95\% CI [.070-.433]$). These findings indicate that undergraduates experience significantly higher rates of gender microaggressions by both peers and University employees than graduate students and have significantly higher perceptions of institutional betrayal.

Table 4.12

Differences by Student Level (Undergraduate vs. Graduate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by peers</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>6.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by Univ. employees</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>4.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate</td>
<td>1.771</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>-1.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional betrayal</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>2.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional courage</td>
<td>20.636</td>
<td>3.207</td>
<td>20.842</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>-0.707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GM = gender microaggressions

*p < .05  **p < .001
Research Question 2

The second research question was, “how are gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by University employees related to perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage?” To answer this research question, I calculated a Pearson correlation coefficient for the relationship of gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by University employees with perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage. The results are shared in the below text and presented in Table 4.13.

Gender Microaggressions by Peers

There was a significant moderate positive correlation between gender microaggressions by peers and institutional betrayal ($r(481) = .363, p < .001$). A significant moderate negative correlation was found between gender microaggressions by peers and campus climate ($r(481) = -.374, p < .001$). Last, a significant weak positive correlation was found between gender microaggressions by peers and institutional courage ($r(481) = .148, p = .001$).

Gender Microaggressions by University Employees

There was a significant moderate positive correlation between gender microaggressions by University employees and institutional betrayal ($r(481) = .311, p < .001$). A significant weak negative correlation was found between gender microaggressions by University employees and campus climate ($r(481) = -.286, p < .001$). Last, the correlation between gender microaggressions by University employees and institutional courage was weak and insignificant ($r(481) = .089, p = .051$).
Table 4.13

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. GM by peers</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GM by University employees</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Campus climate</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>-.374**</td>
<td>-.286**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institutional betrayal</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
<td>-.772**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional courage</td>
<td>20.723</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>.148**</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. GM = gender microaggressions

an = 483 for each variable.

**p ≤ .001 (two-tailed)

Research Question 3

The third and final research question was, “to what extent do these variables (gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggressions by University employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage) predict the likelihood that a college cis-woman will report sexual assault to the University?” I sought to answer this question by conducting a series of multiple linear regressions using responses to the questions on the likelihood to report sub-measure that were specific to reporting to the University.

First, I calculated a multiple linear regression to predict students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault victimization to the University based on their experiences with gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by University employees and their perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage. The regression was significant (F(5,477) = 60.814, p < .001.), with an $R^2$ of .389, meaning that gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggressions by University employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage accounted for 38.9% of the variance in students’
likelihood to report sexual assault to the University. Students’ predicted likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to the University is equal to 
-.324 -.103 (gender microaggressions by peers) -.021 (institutional betrayal) + .040 (gender microaggressions by university employees) + .016 (institutional courage) + .949 (campus climate).

Campus climate and gender microaggressions by peers were the only two significant predictors; gender microaggressions by University employees, institutional courage, and institutional betrayal were not significant predictors. Full calculation outputs are presented in Table 4.14.

**Table 4.14**

*Regression Model 1*¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>- .324</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>-1.109</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>[-.899, .250]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by peers</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-2.481</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>[-.185, -.021]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by University employees</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>[-.048, .128]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>10.015</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>[.763, 1.135]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional betrayal</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>[-.144, .103]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional courage</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1.797</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>[-.001, .033]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²                                      | .389  |
ΔR²                                     | .383  |

*Note.* GM = gender microaggressions; CI = confidence interval; Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Reporting to University

¹Gender Microaggressions by Peers, Gender Microaggressions by University Employees, Campus Climate, Institutional Betrayal and Institutional Courage as Predictors of Likelihood to Report Sexual Assault to the University

Given the above results, I conducted a second multiple linear regression that included only gender microaggressions by peers and campus climate as predictors of students’ likelihood
to report sexual assault victimization to the University (the two significant predictors from the initial test). This regression was significant \(F(2,480) = 149.681, p < .001\), with an \(R^2\) of .384, meaning that gender microaggressions by peers and campus climate explained 38.4% of the variance in students’ likelihood to report sexual assault to the University. Students’ predicted likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to the University is equal to -.071 - .075 (gender microaggressions by peers) + .968 (campus climate).

Both gender microaggressions by peers and campus climate were significant predictors.

See Table 4.15 for complete calculation outputs.

**Table 4.15**

*Regression Model 2*\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>(SE)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.463</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>-.374, .231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by peers</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-2.195</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>[-.143, -.008]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>15.096</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>[.842, 1.094]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(R^2\) .384

\(\Delta R^2\) .382

*Note. GM = gender microaggressions; CI = confidence interval; Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Reporting to University*

\(^a\)Gender Microaggressions by Peers and Campus Climate as Predictors of Likelihood to Report Sexual Assault to the University

Next, I ran a multiple linear regression to more closely examine campus climate – the most significant of all of the previously-examined predictors—as a predictor of students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault victimization to the University. For this calculation, I used the seven campus climate subscales as the independent variables: school connectedness, perceptions of campus police, perceptions of faculty, perceptions of school leadership,
perceptions of prevention and response, perceptions of policy and resources, and perceptions of treatment of victims. The regression was significant \( F(7,475) = 47.574, p < .001 \), with an \( R^2 \) of .412, which means that these campus climate sub-measures accounted for 41.2% of the variance in students’ likelihood to report sexual assault to the University. Students’ predicted likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to the University is equal to \(-.129 + .156 \) (school connectedness) + .294 (perceptions of campus police) - .062 (perceptions of school leadership) - .070 (perceptions of faculty) + .188 (perceptions of prevention and response) + .139 (perceptions of policy and resources) + .286 (perceptions of treatment victims).

School connectedness, perceptions of campus police, perceptions of prevention and response, perceptions of policy and resources, and perceptions of treatment of victims were all significant predictors, while perceptions of school leadership and perceptions of faculty were not significant predictors. See Table 4.16 for full calculation outputs.
### Table 4.16

*Regression Model 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.870</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>[-0.421, 0.163]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School connectedness</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>[0.008, 0.304]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of campus police</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>[0.151, 0.437]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of faculty</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-0.847</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>[-0.232, 0.092]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of school leadership</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-1.760</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>[-0.221, 0.092]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of prevention and response</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>[0.051, 0.325]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of policy and resources</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>[0.034, 0.245]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of treatment of victims</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>4.367</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>[0.157, 0.415]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .412  
ΔR² = .403

*Note.* CI = confidence interval; SH = sexual harassment; SA = sexual assault; Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Reporting to University

*aSchool Connectedness, Perceptions of Campus Police, Perceptions of Faculty, Perceptions of School Leadership, Perceptions of Prevention and Response, Perceptions of Policy and Resources, and Perceptions of Treatment of Victims as Predictors of Likelihood to Report Sexual Assault to the University*

I ran a final multiple linear regression that excluded the two non-significant campus climate subscales (perceptions of school leadership and perceptions of faculty). As such, this test was conducted to predict students’ likelihood of reporting victimization to the University based on their feelings of school connectedness, perceptions of campus police, perceptions of prevention and response, perceptions of policy and resources, and perceptions of treatment of victims. The regression was significant ($F(5,477) = 66.246, p < .001$), with an $R^2$ of .410, which means that 41% of the variance in students’ likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to the University can be explained by school connectedness, perceptions of campus police,
perceptions of prevention and response, perceptions of policy and resources, and perceptions of treatment of victims. Students’ predicted likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to the University is equal to \(-.224 + .119 \text{ (school connectedness)} + .271 \text{ (perceptions of campus police)} + .181 \text{ (perceptions of prevention and response)} + .138 \text{ (perceptions of policy and resources)} + .273 \text{ (perceptions of treatment of victims)}.\)

All of the variables were significant predictors of students’ likelihood to report sexual assault victimization to the University except school connectedness, which was not a significant predictor. See Table 4.17 for complete calculation outputs.

**Table 4.17**

*Regression Model 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(B)</th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>(SE)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>(p)</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-1.726</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>[.132, .410]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School connectedness</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>[.033, .243]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of campus police</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>3.834</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>[.132, .410]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of prevention and response</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>2.637</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>[.046, .315]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of policy and resources</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>[.033, .243]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of treatment of victims</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>[.145, .400]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.410</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Delta R^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CI = confidence interval; SH = sexual harassment; SA = sexual assault; Dependent Variable: Likelihood of Reporting to University*

*aSchool Connectedness, Perceptions of Campus Police, Perceptions of Prevention and Response, Perceptions of Policy and Resources, and Perceptions of Treatment of Victims as Predictors of Likelihood to Report Sexual Assault to the University*

It is worth noting that this research question specifically asks about students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the *University*. The survey measure included two items on the
Likelihood of Reporting Sexual Assault subscale that captured students’ likelihood to report to non-University entities (off-campus police and a non-University affiliated helpline, hospital, or health care center). Given the focus of this research question, those two items were excluded from the above calculations. However, the central tendencies and frequencies for all items in the Likelihood of Reporting Sexual Assault sub-measure are included in Table 4.18. It is worth noting that the findings of this study—that students are more likely to report assault to a non-University entity—are in contrast to Fisher et al.’s (2016) study that found students more likely to report victimization to an on-campus resources than an off-campus resource.

Table 4.18

Likelihood of Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% likely or very likely</th>
<th>% not likely or not likely at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators, faculty, or other University officials.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A crisis center or helpline, or a hospital or health care center at CU.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A crisis center or helpline, or a hospital or health care center not at CU.</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU campus police.</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local police not at CU (e.g., City of Pittsburgh police).</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CU = Catholic University

*Prompt was, “how likely or unlikely would you be to go to or get in touch with the following groups or organization at Catholic University if you were sexually assaulted?”*
Summary of Results

The results of this study are contextualized by its setting and the participant demographics, and this context must remain at the forefront. The study was conducted at a mid-sized, private Catholic university with a coed, predominantly White (76.58%) student population. The 483 cis-women who participated in the study were also predominantly White (84.3%), and the large majority identified their sexual orientation as straight (75.6%). Most participants (71.1%) were 18-23 years old, and there was fairly even representation from both the undergraduate and graduate populations (58% and 42%, respectively).

Gender Microaggressions

Gender microaggressions were widely experienced by women at Catholic University. Over half of the microaggressions were experienced by 65% or more of students, with one microaggression (observing that men hold more leadership positions than women) reported by almost 97% of students. Undergraduate students reported significantly higher rates of gender microaggressions by both peers and University employees than graduate students.

On the Gender Microaggressions by Peers sub-measure, all but four of the microaggressions were experienced always or often by one (or more) in five students. The most experienced peer gender microaggressions were: observing that men hold more leadership positions than women; a first compliment given being related to appearance; hearing adult women referred to as “girls;” hearing someone refer to women using derogatory language; observing that people excuse men’s behavior; and hearing men being told to “be a man.”

Gender microaggressions were less often perpetrated by University employees. None of the employee gender microaggressions were experienced always or often by 50% of more of students, and 20 of the microaggressions were experienced always or often by fewer than 10% of
students. Consistent with peer gender microaggressions, the most experienced was observing that men hold more leadership positions than women. Encouragingly, frequencies were relatively low for employee microaggressions related to women’s experiences of gender discrimination or sexual harassment being invalidated/not believed/dismissed, women being to blame for their sexual victimization, and overhearing others joke about rape.

Campus Climate

Undergraduate and graduate students perceived the campus climate similarly (i.e., there were no significant differences). Students felt very safe on campus, and most reported that they are happy to be a student at Catholic University. However, about 1 in 3 students disagreed that students at Catholic University respect and trust one another and that the University treats fairly and protects the rights of all students.

Students’ perceptions of school leadership were, overall, lower than their perceptions of campus police and faculty. The most agreed-with statements for faculty and campus police were that they are genuinely concerned about students’ well-being and are doing all they can to protect students from harm. In contrast, the highest agreement for school leadership was that the leadership are more interested in protecting the reputation of the University than protecting students. It is worth noting that this sentiment—that protecting the University’s reputation is prioritized over protecting students—also had undesirably high agreements for campus police (78.5%) and faculty (40.9%).

While most students agreed that sexual harassment is not tolerated at Catholic University (75.1%), only about half thought the University was doing a good job of preventing sexual assault, investigating incidents of sexual assault or holding people accountable for committing sexual assault. It is also notable that only about half of students indicated that they know how the
University deals with reported sexual assault, where to go for help, and what services are available to victimized students.

Students reported that they think Catholic University is doing a better job of treating accused perpetrators of sexual assault fairly than of holding perpetrators accountable, punishing perpetrations appropriately, or providing services to victimized students. Additionally, only a little over half of students reported believing that the University would enable them to continue their education without having to interact with the person who assaulted them. These findings may suggest a student perception that the University is more concerned about accused and confirmed perpetrators than victims of sexual assault.

**Institutional Betrayal**

Undergraduate students indicated significantly higher levels of institutional betrayal than graduate students. Overall, students most strongly agreed that Catholic University suggests that reports of sexual victimization may affect the University’s reputation, which aligns with students’ perceptions that campus police, faculty, and school leadership are more concerned with protecting the reputation of the University than protecting students. Encouragingly, a fairly low number of students think that the University creates an environment in which sexual harassment and assault seem normal (17.4%) or are more likely to occur (14.1%).

**Institutional Courage**

Undergraduate and graduate students have similar levels of institutional courage (i.e., there were no significant differences). An overwhelming majority of students indicated that all but three of the items would impact their sexual victimization reporting experience, which provides an actionable list to the University of ways it could positively effect students’ reporting of sexual assault. The lowest three items – if someone at the University apologized for what
happened, if reporting the experience helped the University better itself, and if reporting were rewarded in some way—were still thought to be impactful by about half of the students. Another notable finding was that more students think a university could *impede* their recovery following sexual victimization than think a university could *help* with their recovery.

**Relationships**

Gender microaggressions by both peers and University employees had a significant positive relationship with institutional betrayal, meaning that students who experience more gender microaggressions also experience higher levels of institutional betrayal. Both peer and employee gender microaggressions also had a significant negative relationship with campus climate, indicating that students who experience more gender microaggressions have lower perceptions of the campus climate. This correlation was weaker for gender microaggressions by University employees than for gender microaggressions by peers. A significant weak positive relationship was found between institutional courage and gender microaggressions by peers only; no significant relationship was identified between institutional courage and gender microaggressions by University employees.

**Predictors of Students’ Likelihood of Reporting Sexual Assault to the University**

The first regression model found that gender microaggressions by peers, gender microaggression by University employees, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage accounted for 38.9% of the variance in students’ likelihood to report sexual assault to the University. The two significant predictors from this model – gender microaggressions by peers and campus climate – were used to run a second regression. That second regression model found that gender microaggressions by peers and campus climate explained 38.4% of the variance in students’ likelihood to report sexual assault to the University.
Campus climate was a more significant predictor of students’ likelihood to report sexual assault than gender microaggressions by peers. Therefore, a third regression model was calculated using the seven sub-measures of campus climate (school connectedness, perceptions of campus police, perceptions of faculty, perceptions of school leadership, perceptions of prevention and response, perceptions of policy and resources, and perceptions of treatment of victims). Those sub-measures accounted for 41.2% of the variance in students’ likelihood to report sexual assault to the University. Finally, the significant predictors from the third regression model – school connectedness, perceptions of campus police, perceptions of prevention and response, perceptions of policy and resources, and perceptions of treatment of victims—were used in the fourth regression model and found to explain 41% of the variance in student’s likelihood to report sexual assault to the University. This final regression model enables us to hone in on specific items that will most strongly impact students’ likelihood of reporting.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss the major findings of this study, how they align with the existing literature, and the study’s contributions to the field. I will also share recommended next steps and limitations of the current study. Last, I will provide an overview of how this work has contributed to my personal growth and leadership agenda development.

When considering the results of this study, it is imperative to keep two things in mind. First, the college women who participated in this study were predominantly White, as is the institution at which the study was conducted. As such, the findings cannot be more broadly understood or applied to the experiences of all students or even all college women.

Second, we are talking about positive and adverse experiences of real students. What might appear to be a low percentage (e.g., 20%) may in actuality be quite notable when framed as something that one in five students (to use the same example) is experiencing. We need to ask ourselves, “are we okay with one in five students having this experience or perception of Catholic University?” Most items from this study provide valuable insights on experiences that are affecting a meaningful number of students.

Discussion of Major Findings

Campus Climate and Institutional Responses

Campus climate was found to be the strongest predictor of college women’s likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the University. Specifically, the sub-measures on school connectedness, perceptions of campus police, perceptions of prevention and response, perceptions of policy and resources, and perceptions of treatment of victims accounted for 41%
of the variance in college women’s likelihood of reporting. These are, as such, critical areas on which to focus attention, discussion, and potential improvement efforts.

An overwhelming majority of college women indicated that they feel safe on campus and are happy to be a student at Catholic University. Most also agreed that the campus police and faculty are genuinely concerned about students’ well-being and are doing all they can to protect students from harm. Similarly, a fairly low number of students indicated on the institutional betrayal questionnaire that they think the University creates an environment in which sexual violence seems normal or is more likely to occur. These findings are very favorable and highlight areas of strength for the University.

Student responses were consistently less favorable on items related to the equitable and fair treatment of all students across multiple sub-measures of campus climate. Additionally, responses on several campus climate sub-measures and the institutional betrayal questionnaire revealed that students think the University prioritizes its own reputation over the well-being of their students. The reasons for these student perceptions are unknown. However, it is important to consider the potential impact of several incidents that occurred and were ongoing at the University, as well as how the University responded to those events.

Earlier in the same academic year that this study was conducted, a video of a Catholic University professor using a racial slur in class was posted to social media and spurred public attention and campus discussion (Lindstrom, 2020). The coverage continued into early 2021 (Lindstrom, 2021), just months before this study was conducted. Around this same time, the Black mother of a Catholic University Black student who died in 2018 embarked on a 237-day hunger strike in protest of what she felt were inadequate answers and actions from the
University. She announced the end of her hunger strike in March 2021 (Worthy, 2021), the same month this study was conducted.

These incidents were affecting the campus community and bringing attention to the University and its leadership responses. The leadership responses—many with a focus on defending the intentions and actions of the University—were particularly prominent for current students, as they received update emails from the University’s President. It is important to consider this context, as it may have been influential to students’ perceptions of the University and its leadership. What messages might the University’s responses have communicated about whether the University protects and prioritizes the well-being of students when the University’s reputation is potentially at risk? How might these messages have been received, in particular, by student members of minoritized or marginalized groups who hold differing levels of power and privilege?

Encouragingly, an overwhelming majority of students indicated on the institutional courage questionnaire that all but three potential university actions related to preventing or responding to campus sexual violence would impact their reporting experience. This provides an actionable list to Catholic University of ways it could increase students’ likelihood of reporting and improve their reporting experience. These findings also underscore the critical role of institutional actions and responses. Remarkably, more students indicated that a university could *impede* their recovery following sexual victimization than think a university could *help* with their recovery. This is something the University should keep in mind, as it seeks to help—and not harm—students through its sexual violence prevention efforts and responses.
Importance of Including Gender Microaggressions on the Continuum of Campus Sexual Violence

Gender microaggressions were widely experienced by college cis-gendered women at Catholic University, were significantly associated with lower perceptions of campus climate and increased levels of institutional betrayal, and were a significant predictor of students’ likelihood to report sexual assault to the University (gender microaggressions by peers, specifically). These findings all support Gardner and Sterzing’s (2016) positioning of gender microaggressions as an important part of the larger continuum of campus sexual violence that must be understood and addressed. They also emphasize the need to include gender microaggressions—and how they help form a culture and sustain power dynamics—in universities’ conversations, education, and other programming and activities aimed at promoting a safe environment and reducing campus sexual violence.

The high prevalence rates for gender microaggression experiences at Catholic University are concerning given what we know of the harms microaggressions can cause to the person who experiences them (e.g., Gartner & Sterzing, 2016; Johnson, 2018). Consistent with earlier studies on sexual violence (e.g., Rosenthal et al., 2016), the college women who participated in this study experienced fewer gender microaggressions from University employees than from their peers. When looking at gender microaggressions by peers and gender microaggressions by University employees separately, this study found that undergraduate students were more likely than graduate students to experience both. This finding was unexpected, given Cantor et al.’s (2015) opposing discovery that graduate students were victimized by faculty at a much higher rate than undergraduate students (22.4% vs. 5.9%) across the 27 institutions that participated in their study.
The college women who experienced more gender microaggressions—by either peers or University employees—also had significantly lower perceptions of campus climate and significantly higher institutional betrayal. The correlations were significant for both peer gender microaggressions and gender microaggressions by University employees but were stronger for peer gender microaggressions. The stronger association between institutional betrayal and gender microaggressions by peers was unexpected, given that earlier studies found that it was perpetration by university faculty or staff that more strongly related to institutional betrayal (e.g., Rosenthal et al., 2016). However, the current study examined gender microaggressions rather than sexual harassment or sexual assault, which may account for the difference between its findings and earlier studies.

Gender microaggressions by peers were a significant predictor of college women’s likelihood to report sexual victimization to the University. To date, previous studies have not examined this relationship. As such, this finding contributes to the body of literature on campus sexual violence and also provides support for the importance of educating students about gender microaggressions and working intentionally to reduce them.

Finally, the disparity between students’ affirmative responses on the gender microaggression measure and their report of gender microaggression victimization on the demographic questionnaire support earlier literature on the challenges of recognizing and labeling microaggressions and other less overt forms of discrimination (e.g., Basford et al., 2014; Sue et al., 2007). This provides an explanation for why students did not recognize that they had experienced gender microaggressions, despite having answered affirmatively to individual gender microaggressions measure items. Microaggressions are so subtle, pervasive, and often unchallenged (i.e., accepted) that their inappropriateness may not be recognized or
acknowledged, even internally by the recipient. Given the harm and impact of gender microaggression, this further supports the need for education and awareness of what gender microaggressions are and why they are unacceptable.

**Reducing Barriers and Increasing Likelihood of Reporting**

Previous studies found that very few students report their sexual assault to the university, with ranges of about 1% to 27% (Cantor et al., 2015; Hill & Silva, 2005; Krebs et al., 2016). Students in the current study, however, indicated a much higher likelihood of reporting their sexual assault to the University: 47% of participants indicated that they would be “likely” or “very likely” to contact administrators, faculty, or other University official if they were sexually assaulted, 50.1% to contact campus police, and 61.9% to get in touch with the University crisis center, helpline, or health care center. The finding that the crisis center or healthcare center is the on-campus entity most likely to be contacted following a sexual assault is consistent with Fisher et al.’s (2016) study. It is important to keep in mind that the scale included in the current study asked students about their likelihood of reporting a sexual assault – something that is more hypothetical in nature than the cited earlier studies, which asked victimized students what actions they took in actuality. It is entirely possible that students may feel more confident that they would report a sexual assault when it is only a hypothetical exercise, compared to how they are feeling (and what actions they take) following a real assault.

Peer gender microaggressions and campus climate were both predictors of a student’s likelihood to report sexual assault to the University. Campus climate was the strongest predictor, particularly school connectedness, general perceptions of campus police, perceptions of school leadership for sexual harassment and sexual assault prevention and response, awareness and perceived fairness of school sexual assault policy and resources, and perceptions of school
leadership climate for treatment of sexual assault victims. This is consistent with existing literature, including Spencer et al.’s (2020) findings that students with a positive perception of the overall campus climate were six times more likely to formally report their sexual victimization.

**Increasing Likelihood of Reporting**

Students shared that being protected, believed, supported, and valued by their University would be most impactful to their experience of reporting sexual victimization. They also wanted perpetrators of sexual violence to be held accountable. Students would find a reward for reporting, apology from the University, and suggestion of how reporting helps the University improve much less meaningful or impactful. These findings are valuable to Catholic University, as they consider effects to improve students’ likelihood of reporting sexual victimization.

Students strongly indicated that most of the listed actions a university could take would impact their experience of reporting sexual victimization, which suggests that a university could have a great deal of influence and impact on students’ reporting experiences. Interestingly though, students seem to think that a university has greater potential to impede their recovery than to aid their recovery. This supports Smith and Freyd’s (2013) claim that “institutions have the power to cause additional harm to assault survivors’ through their actions and inactions” (p. 119). This could serve as an important reminder to universities; as they act toward improvement, they should also pay careful attention to their actions or inactions that may be causing perceived or real harm.

**Reducing Known Barriers to Reporting**

Multiple known barriers to reporting were present in the results of this study. First, students reported that they think Catholic University is doing a better job of treating accused
perpetrators of sexual assault fairly than of holding perpetrators accountable, punishing
perpetrations appropriately, or providing services to victimized students. These findings suggest
that students perceive that the University is more concerned about accused and confirmed
perpetrators than about victims of sexual assault. This ties directly to earlier studies that
identified thinking nothing would be done as a common barrier to reporting sexual victimization
(Cantor et al., 2015; Fisher et al., 2016; Spencer et al., 2017).

Additionally, students strongly agreed on the institutional betrayal measure that Catholic
University suggests that reports of sexual victimization may affect the University’s reputation.
This aligns with students’ campus climate perceptions that campus police, faculty, and school
leadership are more concerned with protecting the reputation of the University than protecting
students. These findings further support the reporting barrier of thinking nothing would be done
(Cantor et al., 2015; Fisher et al., 2016; Spencer et al., 2017).

Finally, about half of the students indicated being unsure of how the University deals
with reported sexual assault. About half also indicated that they were unsure of where to go for
help or what services are available to victimized students. This lack of information (i.e., how to
report, where to go, etc.) was identified in several studies as a common barrier to students’
reporting of campus sexual victimization (Fisher et al., 2016; Spencer et al., 2017).

**Contributions to the Field**

There is a large and ever-growing body of work on the sexual victimization of college
students. However, there have been relatively few studies to date exploring campus gender
microaggressions. This study is particularly unique in its effort to examine the relationship
between campus gender microaggressions, campus climate and institutional betrayal and courage
and to identify how each predicts students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault. Given the
extremely low rates of reporting (Cantor et al., 2015; Hill & Silva, 2005; Krebs et al., 2016) and adverse outcomes of campus sexual victimization (Krebs et al., 2016; Marshall et al., 2014; Pinchevsky et al., 2019; Reason & Rankin, 2006), this study’s findings on the relationship between gender microaggressions and campus climate and the strength of the predictive relationship between these two variables and students’ likelihood to report sexual victimization could be strong contributions to the field. Future studies should focus on campus gender microaggressions and campus climate as powerful ways to positively influence culture, decrease victimization rates, and reduce barriers to reporting sexual assault.

**Recommendations & Implications**

**Recommendation 1: Conduct an Annual Campus Climate Survey**

The primary overarching recommendation from this study is that Catholic University—and all institutions of higher education—conduct an annual campus climate survey to obtain the campus-specific data imperative to the undertaking of reducing and appropriately addressing campus sexual violence. This recommendation stems from the number and strength of the findings of the campus climate survey used in the study, as well as the predictive relationship between campus climate and students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the University. Previous studies (Cantalupo, 2014; Gialopsos, 2017; Wood et al., 2017) and The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014) have also recommended the regular use of campus climate surveys.

The survey should be conducted with all students to ensure that a complete and accurate picture of the entire student population is obtained. However, demographic questions should be included that allow for filtered data analysis to better understand the unique experiences and perceptions of targeted student populations (e.g., by racial group, sexual orientation, gender
identify, student level, school of enrollment, etc.). The survey should include questions about gender microaggressions as part of the continuum of campus sexual violence. Finally, both victimization and perpetration questions should be asked to better understand the dual roles of victim and perpetrator that may need to be addressed.

The findings of such an annual campus climate survey should steer the following year’s efforts, addressing identified student needs and vulnerabilities with targeted and intentional educational and improvement efforts geared toward creating and maintaining a safe and inclusive campus community. Results could also provide insight to whether changes made in the previous year were effective in producing positive outcomes. Validated and customizable campus climate measures are available for free use, including the CSVS used in this study (Krebs et al., 2016).

**Recommendation 2: Incorporate Gender Microaggressions, Power, Privilege, and Oppression**

This study’s findings about gender microaggressions—the prevalence, correlation with both campus climate and institutional betrayal, and strength as a predictor of students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assaults to the University—support the need for gender microaggressions to be incorporated into the University’s educational materials, programming, and policies about campus sexual violence. An important focus should be on educating the entire campus community (both students and faculty/staff) about power, privilege, and oppression to create awareness of the harm of microaggressions to the individual recipient and to the larger community, as they help to form and reinforce power dynamics and systemic oppression. These topics can be offered as stand-alone educational programming, targeted courses, and also imbedded across the curriculum.
**Recommendation 3: Consider Programming/Training and Policy/Procedure Improvements**

Only about half of the participating college women thought the University was doing a good job of educating students about sexual assault, knew how the University deals with reported victimization, or knew where to go for help or what services are available to victimized students. Consistently, around half of the students thought the University was doing a good job of preventing sexual assault, investigating incidents, holding perpetrators accountable, or punishing perpetrators appropriately. These findings indicate a need for Catholic University to examine their training, programming, materials, policies, and procedures related to campus sexual violence for potential improvements.

These findings link to known common barriers to students’ reporting of sexual victimization from previous studies (Fisher et al., 2016; Spencer et al., 2017). Additionally, these items were part of the campus climate sub-measures found in this study to be the strongest predictors of college women’s likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the University. Improvements to these areas are therefore likely to be high-impact and should be considered a priority.

**Recommendation 4: Continue to Focus on DEI Improvements**

Catholic University increased their commitment of resources and focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) improvement efforts in the recent few years. The college women who participated in this study consistently responded less favorably on items related to the equitable and fair treatment of all students across multiple campus climate survey sub-measures. These findings validate the University’s decision to work on improvement to DEI on campus. As such, the University is encouraged to continue these efforts.
**Recommendation 5: Reflect on Student Perceptions of Reputation Protection**

A majority of the college women who participated in this study indicated across several sub-measures that they think the University prioritizes its own reputation over the well-being of their students. As discussed above, this perception links directly to a known common barrier to reporting campus sexual victimization: thinking nothing would be done (Cantor et al., 2015; Fisher et al., 2016; Spencer et al., 2017). University leadership are encouraged to reflect on what may be forming and reinforcing these student beliefs and make attempts to shift them for the sake of student well-being and retention.

**Recommendation 6: Review Complete Study Results**

The findings and recommendations shared in this paper are an overarching view of a complex data set. They are by no means comprehensive or all-inclusive, and individual survey items results will likely have specific value and insight for different stakeholders involved in preventing and addressing campus sexual violence. As such, additional passes through the findings should be conducted to identify targeted findings that would benefit specific University departments and stakeholders.

**Future Research Needs**

Finally, additional research is recommended to further explore the complexities of understanding, reducing, and properly addressing campus sexual violence. Following are recommended areas of inquiry, some specific to Catholic University and its improvement agenda and others for the broader body of literature:

- How do intersecting racial, gender, and sexual identities present unique experiences, risk or vulnerability, potential for added harm, and specific support
needs for college students around campus sexual violence, campus climate, and institutional betrayal and courage?

- How do cis-women’s gender microaggression experiences and perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage at Catholic University vary by race and sexual orientation? How does likelihood of reporting differ by students’ race and sexual orientation? What explanations might there be for these differences (e.g., institutional barriers)?

- How do cis-women’s gender microaggression experiences and perceptions differ by undergraduate class year (i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) at Catholic University?

- How do perceptions of campus climate and institutional betrayal vary for Catholic University cis-women who have experienced sexual victimization at the University compared to those who have not? How do these perceptions may vary based on the type of victimization (i.e., gender microaggression, sexual harassment, sexual assault)?

- Is previous sexual victimization at Catholic University is a predictor of cis-women’s likelihood to report sexual assault?

- How do the study variables (gender microaggressions, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage) predict cis-women’s likelihood to report sexual assault to *any* entity (versus just to the University, which was the focus of the current study)?
• What are the reporting experiences of Catholic University students? How do those experiences relate to perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and likelihood of reporting future victimization?

• How are sexual violence and perceptions of campus climate and institutional betrayal at Catholic University changing over time?

Limitations

The COVID-19 global pandemic hit the United States in the spring of 2020, at which time Catholic University—along with most other educational institutions and non-essential businesses and organizations—moved to remote operations. Classes transitioned to online instruction, students moved home (if able), and employees primarily worked remotely. Campus reopened for the fall 2020 term, but with hybrid participation options for students (i.e., students could choose between attending courses in person and joining them remotely), de-densified classrooms and dorms, takeout-only dining options, and revised safety protocols that included wearing masks in public places, social distancing practices (e.g., no large gatherings or events), and an early conclusion to the semester to avoid travel-related heightened risks to the campus community following the Thanksgiving holiday. Additionally, many staff were still working primarily from off-campus. These same practices and operations carried forth for the spring 2021 semester. In short, life on campus and the student experience was drastically different during the 2020-21 academic year than pre-pandemic.

By the time this study was conducted in the spring semester of 2022, Catholic University had fully resumed in-person instruction, lifted the mask mandate, returned to normal capacities in dorms and other campus spaces, and restarted in-person events and gatherings. However, on-campus engagement still seemed drastically reduced. As students’ interactions with their peers,
faculty, student services staff, and general campus community are critical to their perceptions of
campus and experience, it is unknown how this climate may have impacted the results of this
study.

I would conduct this study again in the 2023-2024 academic year, given the opportunity,
to see how the results have already shifted as the University has returned to more normal in-
person campus life. In that second iteration, I would consider reducing the number of items on
the campus gender microaggression scale and also rephrasing some of the items to reduce
potential confusion. Specifically, some statements (e.g., “I have observed that men hold more
leadership positions than women”) may be confusing to think about in terms of who perpetrated
the action (peer versus University employee) as it is not a direct action taken by one person
against another. Additionally, I would open participation up to all students regardless of gender
identify, though gender identity would still be collected for the purposes of examining
differences in findings by gender identity. Finally, I would ask participants’ school of enrollment
(e.g., Business, Law) and whether they had reported their victimization to the University (if they
answered “yes” to victimization) on the demographics questionnaire to enable comparative
analyses based on these variables.

Another limitation is that this study was conducted at a four-year private Catholic
institution with a predominately White student population. As such, the results may not be
generalizable to all students—or even all college women—nor to other colleges and universities.
This limitation is, however, not unique to this study; rather, it is a limitation inherent to campus
climate surveys, as they are a measure of the unique climate and culture of a specific campus.

Last, 295 respondents who did not complete the entire survey were excluded from
participation in the study. Partial responses were recorded for 177 of these, and the remaining
117 recorded launches of the survey did not have any answered questions. What remained was a robust 483 participants. However, the 177 incomplete survey attempts could signal a study limitation. It is possible that the survey length was a deterrent, that the topics were triggering, or that another unknown challenge or study limitation impacted these students’ interest or ability to complete the entire survey.

**Personal Growth and Leadership Agenda**

The ways I have grown and learned through this experience are innumerable. It has confirmed my certainty in the importance of strong relationships in personal and professional spaces, my appreciation for the incredible colleagues I am privileged to work alongside at this great University, and my admiration for our intelligent, compassionate, and generous students. It has also provided a solid foundation of understanding of the research process and targeted knowledge and data regarding the campus experiences of cis-women at Catholic University.

What follows are specific ways I plan to carry what I have learned forward for the hopeful continual improvement of both myself and the University.

Most immediately, I will disseminate key findings from this study to University leadership and targeted campus departments (e.g., Title IX Office). Conversations with University leadership will focus primarily on promoting the value of the study’s findings to the University and its entire community, with a goal of encouraging the University to implement an annual campus climate survey. More granular findings and recommendations will be shared with the relevant office or department (e.g., sharing findings around perceptions of prevention and response efforts with the Title IX Office).

While my role as Assistant Dean of Academic Programs and Student Affairs does not position me to make decisions regarding campus-wide initiatives, I can more directly influence
student activities and programming within my School. Since finishing data collection for this study, I have already put forth a proposal to incorporate required programming on sexual violence/Title IX and related topic such as good citizenship and diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging into business students’ freshman year. Some programming will likely launch in the fall 2023 term, and I will continue to explore ways to promote a safe and inclusive culture within the School of Business.

Finally, student participation in this study far exceeded my hopes and expectations. As such, I am left with a rich data set from which additional valuable findings may be gleaned. This paper focused on answering the research questions set forth for the study. As a next step, I plan to explore the following additional research questions (pulled from the earlier list of recommended future research) that are answerable from the data collected for the current study:

1. How do cis-women’s gender microaggression experiences and perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage at Catholic University vary by race and sexual orientation? How does likelihood of reporting differ by students’ race and sexual orientation?

2. How do cis-women’s gender microaggression experiences and perceptions differ by undergraduate class year (i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) at Catholic University?

3. How do perceptions of campus climate and institutional betrayal vary for Catholic University cis-women who have experienced sexual victimization at the University compared to those who have not? How do these perceptions may vary based on the type of victimization (i.e., gender microaggression, sexual harassment, sexual assault)?
4. Is previous sexual victimization at Catholic University is a predictor of cis-women’s likelihood to report sexual assault?

5. How do the study variables (gender microaggressions, campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage) predict cis-women’s likelihood to report sexual assault to any entity (versus just to the University, which was the focus of the current study)?

Conclusion

Sexual violence against women is a prevalent and serious problem on college campuses. Framing sexual violence as a continuum (gender microaggressions, sexual harassment, sexual assault) positioned within and reinforcing systemic power and privilege, this study sought a deeper understanding of this problem and how to reduce victimized students’ barriers to reporting incidents of sexual assault. Specifically, it explored college cis-women’s experiences with gender microaggressions and perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal, and institutional courage, how those experiences and perceptions are related, and how each predicts students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the University.

Gender microaggressions were found to be prevalent experiences for cis-women at Catholic University, with undergraduate students reporting significantly higher rates than graduate students. The students who experienced more gender microaggressions also experienced higher levels of institutional betrayal and had lower perceptions of campus climate. Campus climate, in turn, was found to have a strong impact on students’ likelihood of reporting sexual assault to the University (five of the sub-measures, in particular). Undergraduate women reported significantly higher rates of gender microaggressions by both peers and University
employees and higher levels of institutional betrayal than graduate women, but both groups had similar perceptions of campus climate and levels of institutional courage.

A large majority of college women at Catholic University feel safe on campus and are happy to be a student at the University, and most agreed that sexual harassment is not tolerated. Only about half of the students, however, thought the University was doing a good job of preventing sexual assault, investigating incidents, holding perpetrators accountable, or punishing perpetrators appropriately. Further, most of the college women indicated that they think the University prioritizes its own reputation over the well-being of its students, and responses were consistently less favorable on items to the equitable and fair treatment of all students. Finally, around half of the students thought the University was doing a good job of educating students about sexual assault, knew how the University deals with reported victimization, or knew where to go for help or what services are available to victimized students.

The findings of this study underscore the need for universities to conduct an annual campus climate survey to collect the data essential to understanding and adequately addressing sexual violence in all of its forms. They also illustrate the importance of including gender microaggressions on the continuum of campus sexual violence, bringing attention to what they are and the harm they cause, and focusing on addressing them. Specific to Catholic University, this study provides numerous actionable items. The University is equipped by these findings to take the first steps toward targeted and data-informed efforts to improve the climate on campus, reduce sexual violence, increase students’ likelihood of reporting sexual victimization, and adequately respond when victimization occurs.

The current study also offers strong contributions to the body of literature in this field. It is a step forward in obtaining a greater understanding of the prevalence of campus gender
microaggressions, the connections between gender microaggressions and institutional betrayal and campus climate, and the predictive relationship between campus climate and likelihood of reporting sexual assault. Key areas for additional research have been identified or reinforced, including: how intersecting racial, gender, and sexual identities present unique experiences, risk or vulnerability, potential for added harm, and specific support needs for college student students around sexual violence and campus climate; how perceptions of campus climate, institutional betrayal and institutional courage may vary by racial or sexual identity; how past victimization influences students’ likelihood of reporting a new sexual assault experience; and how students’ past reporting experiences impact their likelihood of reporting another sexual assault experience.

Campus sexual violence against women will not improve without intervention. This intervention must include the dismantling of the deep-seeded imbalances of power and privilege within institutions of higher education that support the cycle of violence and oppression and silencing of victimized students. The results of this study uncover actional items to be addressed by University leadership and also provide a solid foundation for future research at this institution and more broadly, as we seek to better understand and address campus sexual violence.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Invitation Email

Dear students,

My name is Becky Ellsworth, and I am a doctoral student in Duquesne’s Ed.D. in Educational Leadership program. I am writing to request your participation in a doctoral research study I am conducting to explore college women’s experiences with gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate related to sexual assault, and feelings of institutional courage and institutional betrayal. The ultimate purpose of this study is to better understand potential barriers to reporting incidents of sexual assault.

Here are the key details:

- **Who**: All 18+ year-old Duquesne University students who identify as a woman are eligible to participate
- **What**: An anonymous online survey (15-20 minutes) about your experiences with gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate related to sexual assault, and feelings of institutional courage and institutional betrayal
- **When**: Before March 25th
- **Where**: https://duq.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_1GFfKhQmvwpi88S

The survey is anonymous—no personally-identifiable information will be collected, and your individual responses cannot be linked back to you. Participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you can withdraw at any time by simply exiting the online survey prior to submitting. The full consent form is attached and is also included in the survey.

At the conclusion of the survey, you will have the option of being redirected to a separate, unlinked online form to enter a drawing for a chance to win one of three $100 gift cards. Your response to the gift card survey is in no way linked to your responses on the study survey.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to share your experiences and perspectives. Your participation will greatly assist me in exploring and better understanding the critical issue of barriers to reporting sexual assault victimization.

All my best,
Becky

Rebecca Ellsworth, M.S. Ed.
412.401.3665 | ellsworthr@duq.edu
Appendix B

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

TITLE:
An examination of the relationship between gender microaggressions, campus climate, and institutional betrayal: Implications for universities’ efforts to reduce barriers to reporting of campus sexual victimization

INVESTIGATOR:
Rebecca Suzanne Ellsworth
Assistant Dean & Senior Director of Academic Programs and Student Affairs
Palumbo-Donahue School of Business | Duquesne University
412.401.3665 | ellsworthr@duq.edu

ADVISOR:
Amy Olson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Education | Duquesne University
412.396.5712 | olsona@duq.edu

SOURCE OF SUPPORT:
This study is being performed as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ed. D. in Educational Leadership degree in the School of Education at Duquesne University.

STUDY OVERVIEW:
This study asks 18+ year-old students who identify as a woman to complete an anonymous online survey about their experiences with campus gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate related to sexual assault, and feelings of institutional courage and institutional betrayal. What we learn through this survey will help us better understand potential barriers to reporting incidents of sexual assault.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary and may discontinued at any time by exiting the online survey prior to submitting.

There is no cost associated with this study, and you will not be compensated for your time. However, at the conclusion of the survey, you will have the option of being redirected to a separate, unlinked online form to enter a drawing for a chance to win one of three $100 gift cards. Your responses to the gift card survey will in no way be linked to your responses to the study survey.

PURPOSE:
You are being asked to participate in a research project that is seeking to understand potential
barriers to reporting incidents of sexual assault through investigating the experiences of Duquesne University students who identify as a woman with campus gender microaggressions, perceptions of campus climate related to sexual assault, and feelings of institutional courage and institutional betrayal.

In order to qualify for participation, you must be an 18+ year-old student at Duquesne University who identifies as a woman.

PARTICIPANT PROCEDURES:
If you provide your consent to participate, you will be asked to complete a one-time online anonymous survey. The survey should take you approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

RISKS AND BENEFITS:
There are minimal risks associated with participating in this study, but no greater than those encountered in everyday life. However, it is possible that the questions may trigger upsetting feelings or memories pertaining to gender microaggressions and sexual victimization. Should this occur, you may find the following support services helpful:

- Duquesne University’s Counseling Services: counselingservices@duq.edu or 412.396.6204
- Duquesne University’s Title IX Coordinator & Director of Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response: Alicia Simpson, simpsona8@duq.edu or 412.396.2560
- Pittsburgh Action Against Rape (PAAR): 1.866.363.7273
- National Sexual Assault Hotline: 1.800.656.4673 or online.rainn.org

The benefit of participating in this study is knowing that you are contributing to a body of knowledge that will increase our understanding of college women’s experiences with gender microaggressions and perceptions of campus climate, and may help identify and reduce barriers to reporting of college sexual victimization.

COMPENSATION:
At the conclusion of this survey, you will have the option of being redirected to a separate, unlinked online form to enter a drawing for a chance to win one of three $100 gift cards. Your responses to this gift card survey will in no way be linked to your responses to the study survey.

There is no cost for you to participate in this research project.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Your participation in this study, and any identifiable personal information you provide, will be kept confidential to every extent possible. Data collected are also completely anonymous. You will be asked to complete a survey through Qualtrics, which will not collect your name, IP address, location data, or contact information. Additionally, all written and electronic forms and study materials will be kept secure. Last, any publications or presentations about this research will only use data that is combined together with all subjects; therefore, no one will be able to determine how you responded.
At the conclusion of the survey, you will be given the option to click on a URL to an un-linked online survey to enter a drawing to win one of three $100 gift cards as compensation for participating in the study. The survey to enter the gift card drawing will collect your first name, last name, and email address. This information will be used only for the purpose of randomly generating three winners at the conclusion of the study. Once the winners have been selected, the data from this gift card survey will be destroyed.

**RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:**
You are under no obligation to start or continue this study. You can withdraw at any time without penalty or consequence by simply exiting this survey before submitting. Data from partially-completed surveys will not be used in the study.

**SUMMARY OF RESULTS:**
A summary of the results of this study will be provided at no cost. You may request this summary by contacting the researchers and requesting it. The information provided to you will not be your individual responses, but rather a summary of what was discovered during the research project as a whole.

**FUTURE USE OF DATA:**
Any information collected that can identify you will not be used for future research studies, nor will it be provided to other researchers.

**VOLUNTARY CONSENT:**
I have read this informed consent form and understand what is being requested of me. I also understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, for any reason without any consequences. Based on this, I certify I am willing to participate in this research project.

I understand that if I have any questions about my participation in this study, I may contact Rebecca Ellsworth (412.401.3665 or ellsworthr@duq.edu) or Dr. Amy Olson (412.396.5712 or olsona@duq.edu). If I have any questions regarding my rights and protections as a subject in this study, I can contact Dr. David Delmonico, Chair of the Duquesne University Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at 412.396.1886 or at irb@duq.edu.

**This project has been approved/verified by Duquesne University’s Institutional Review Board.**

Proceeding to the next page indicates your voluntary consent to participate in this project.
Appendix C

Final Study Instrument
Campus Gender Microaggressions Scale

Gender Microaggressions by Peers
For this set of questions, think about what you have observed or experienced with your peers (i.e., other students).

How frequently have you observed or experienced the following from your peers (i.e., other students) at Duquesne University (i.e., while on campus or participating in a University activity)?

(1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Often; 5 = Always)

1. You have heard adult women referred to as “girls.”
2. Someone has used “female” or “woman” as an adjective preceding an occupational or professional title (e.g., female doctor, female athlete, woman scientist).
3. Someone has referred to women using derogatory language (e.g., “sluts” or “bitches”).
4. You have been catcalled or whistled at by a male stranger.
5. The first compliment someone has given you was related to how you look (“you’re so pretty,” etc.).
6. A male stranger has complimented your body.
7. You have received unsolicited comments about your physical appearance.
8. A man has greeted you by saying “hey sexy.”
9. You have noticed someone looking at your body instead of listening to you talk.
10. You have been referred to as a body part (“tits,” etc.).
11. You have overheard other women being referred to as a body part (“tits,” “piece of ass,” etc.).
12. You have been told you are “too pretty” to do something (to frown, to be mad, etc.).
13. You have overheard men talking about other women in degrading terms (“bitch,” “slut,” etc.).
14. You have overheard men being told to “not act like a girl” or to “be a man.”
15. You have observed that women are not believed when they report being sexually harassed.
16. You have observed that people excuse men’s behavior by saying “boys will be boys” (or something similar).
17. You have observed that men hold more leadership positions in society than women.
18. You have been told women no longer experience discrimination.
19. You have expressed concerns about gender discrimination, and you were told that gender discrimination does not exist.
20. You have expressed concern about gender discrimination, and you were told that you were too sensitive, too crazy, or wrong.
21. You have overheard others joking about rape.
22. Someone told you that women are being too sensitive when they say they experience gender discrimination.
23. Someone told you that gender discrimination is no longer an important social issue.
24. You have been told you need to change your body in some way in order to be attractive to men.
25. You have been told you need to watch your weight.
26. You have been told “you would be so pretty if you…” (smiled more, lost weight, changed something about your appearance, etc.).
27. You have been in a setting where the person in charge asked only men to provide feedback.
28. You have been in a setting where a man was automatically allowed to dictate the agenda.
29. Someone has assumed a man was responsible for work you actually did.
30. A man has ignored or dismissed your contribution because you are a female.
31. A man has spoken for you.
32. A male peer or fellow student was the only member praised for group work you contributed to.
33. You have been in a setting where a man automatically assumed the leadership role.

Gender Microaggressions by University Employees
For this set of questions, think about what you have observed or experienced with a University employee (i.e., faculty, staff, or administrator).

How frequently have you observed or experienced the following from a University employee (i.e., faculty, staff, or administrator) at Duquesne University (i.e., while on campus or participating in a University activity)?
(1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Often; 5 = Always)

1. You have heard adult women referred to as “girls.”
2. Someone has used “female” or “woman” as an adjective preceding an occupational or professional title (e.g., female doctor, female athlete, woman scientist).
3. Someone has referred to women using derogatory language (e.g., “sluts” or “bitches”).
4. You have been catcalled or whistled at by a male stranger.
5. The first compliment someone has given you was related to how you look (“you’re so pretty,” etc.).
6. A male stranger has complimented your body.
7. You have received unsolicited comments about your physical appearance.
8. A man has greeted you by saying “hey sexy.”
9. You have noticed someone looking at your body instead of listening to you talk.
10. You have been referred to as a body part (“tits,” etc.).
11. You have overheard other women being referred to as a body part (“tits,” “piece of ass,” etc.).
12. You have been told you are “too pretty” to do something (to frown, to be mad, etc.).
13. You have overheard men talking about other women in degrading terms (“bitch,” “slut,” etc.).
14. You have overheard men being told to “not act like a girl” or to “be a man.”
15. You have observed that women are not believed when they report being sexually harassed.
16. You have observed that people excuse men’s behavior by saying “boys will be boys” (or something similar).
17. You have observed that men hold more leadership positions in society than women.
18. You have been told women no longer experience discrimination.
19. You have expressed concerns about gender discrimination, and you were told that gender discrimination does not exist.
20. You have expressed concern about gender discrimination, and you were told that you were too sensitive, too crazy, or wrong.
21. You have heard someone in a position of authority (e.g., professor, coach, University staff or administrator) say that women are to be blamed when they are sexually assaulted.
22. You have overheard others joking about rape.
23. Someone told you that women are being too sensitive when they say they experience gender discrimination.
24. Someone told you that gender discrimination is no longer an important social issue.
25. You have been told you need to change your body in some way in order to be attractive to men.
26. You have been told you need to watch your weight.
27. You have been told “you would be so pretty if you…” (smiled more, lost weight, changed something about your appearance, etc.).
28. You have been in a setting where the person in charge asked only men to provide feedback.
29. You have been in a setting where a man was automatically allowed to dictate the agenda.
30. Someone has assumed a man was responsible for work you actually did.
31. A man has ignored or dismissed your contribution because you are a female.
32. A man has spoken for you.
33. A male peer or fellow student was the only member praised for group work you contributed to.
34. You have been in a setting where a man automatically assumed the leadership role.

**Campus Climate Survey**

**School Connectedness**
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please provide an answer that best reflects how you feel.

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

1. I feel valued as an individual at Duquesne University.
2. I feel close to people at Duquesne University.
3. I feel like I am a part of Duquesne University.
4. I am happy to be a student at Duquesne University.
5. I feel safe when I am on Duquesne University’s campus.
6. I believe there is a clear sense of appropriate and inappropriate behavior among students at Duquesne University.
7. I believe Duquesne University is trying hard to protect the rights of all students.
8. I believe Duquesne University is trying hard to make sure that all students are treated equally and fairly.
9. I believe Duquesne University is trying hard to make sure that all students are safe.
10. I believe that students at Duquesne University trust one another.
11. I believe that students at Duquesne University respect one another.

**General Perceptions of Campus Police, Faculty, and School Leadership**

The next questions ask your views about three groups at Duquesne University: 1) Campus police, 2) Faculty, and 3) Administrators/Leadership. Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements, and answer as best as you can.

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

1. Overall, the **campus police** at Duquesne University…
   a. Are genuinely concerned about my well-being.
   b. Are doing all they can to protect students from harm.
   c. Treat students fairly.
   d. Are more interested in protecting the reputation of Duquesne University than the students they serve.

2. Overall, the **faculty** at Duquesne University…
   a. Are genuinely concerned about my well-being.
   b. Are doing all they can to protect students from harm.
   c. Treat students fairly.
   d. Are more interested in protecting the reputation of Duquesne University than the students they serve.

3. Overall, the **President/Deans, and other leadership staff** at this school…
   a. Are genuinely concerned about my well-being.
   b. Are doing all they can to protect students from harm.
   c. Treat students fairly.
   d. Are more interested in protecting the reputation of Duquesne University than the students they serve.

**Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response**

The next questions ask your opinion about Duquesne University’s efforts related to sexual harassment and sexual assault. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please answer as best you can when thinking about Duquesne University.

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

1. Sexual harassment is not tolerated at Duquesne University.
2. Duquesne University takes training in sexual assault prevention seriously.
3. Duquesne University is doing a good job of educating students about sexual assault (e.g., what consent means, how to define sexual assault, how to look out for one another).
4. Duquesne University is doing a good job of trying to prevent sexual assault from happening.
5. Duquesne University is doing a good job of providing needed services to victims of sexual assault.
6. Duquesne University is doing a good job of investigating incidents of sexual assault.
7. Duquesne University is doing a good job of holding people accountable for committing sexual assault.

Awareness and Perceived Fairness of School Sexual Assault Policy and Resources
Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, answering as best as you can when thinking about Duquesne University.

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

I am aware of and understand Duquesne University’s procedures for dealing with reported incidents of sexual assault.
1. I know what services are available for people who experience sexual assault.
2. If a friend of mine were sexually assaulted, I know where to take my friend to get help.
3. At Duquesne University, students who are accused of perpetrating a sexual assault are treated fairly.
4. At Duquesne University, when it is determined that a sexual assault has happened, the perpetrator gets punished appropriately.

Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Treatment of Sexual Assault Victims
If I were sexually assaulted I believe Duquesne University would…

(Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)

Take my case seriously.
1. Protect my privacy.
2. Treat me with dignity and respect.
3. Enable me to continue my education without having to interact with the person who assaulted me.

Likelihood of Reporting
How likely or unlikely would you be to go to or get in touch with the following groups or organizations at Duquesne University if you were sexually assaulted?

(Very likely, Likely, Not Likely, Not at All Likely)

1. Administrators, faculty, or other University officials.
2. A crisis center or helpline, or a hospital or health care center at Duquesne University.
3. A crisis center or helpline, or a hospital or health care center not at Duquesne University.
4. Duquesne University campus police.
5. Local police not at Duquesne University (e.g., City of Pittsburgh police).
Institutional Courage Questionnaire

The following are ways in which a university may play a role in unwanted sexual experiences. Which of the following do you think would impact your experience of reporting an unwanted sexual experience to a university?

(Yes- this would impact my experience, No- this would not impact my experience)

1. Taking proactive steps to prevent this type of experience?
2. Making it easy to report this experience?
3. Responding adequately to the experience, if reported?
4. Handled your case well, if disciplinary action was requested?
5. Not covering up the experience?
6. Rewarding you in some way for reporting the experience (e.g., a commendation or some other type of formal or informal award [e.g., a faculty/staff member, administrator, or other individual in a leadership role saying, “that’s brave to do”])?
7. Suggesting that reporting your experience would help your university better itself?
8. Creating an environment where you felt like a valued member of your university?
9. Creating an environment where continued education was no more difficult for you than before you reported the experience?
10. Supporting you with either formal or informal resources (e.g., counseling, meetings, phone calls, or other services) following your report of this experience?
11. One or more individuals at your university apologized, either formally or informally, for what happened to you?
12. Creating an environment where continued education was no more difficult for you than before the experience occurred?
13. One or more of your peers (who are not in a position of authority over you) with whom you shared the experience stated or demonstrated they believed you that the experience happened?
14. One or more faculty/staff members or administrators to whom you reported the experience stated or demonstrated they believed your report that the experience happened?
15. Your university allowed you to have a say in how your report was handled?
16. Your university met your needs for educational support and accommodations (e.g., reassigning you to another professor/supervisor if your professor/supervisor perpetrated the sexual harassment; if your peer perpetrated the sexual harassment and shared a classroom or dormitory with you, the peer was moved out of your shared space)?
17. Your university created an environment where this type of experience was safe to discuss?
18. Your university created an environment where this type of experience was recognized as a problem
19. To what extent do you think an institution’s role could help you recover from your unwanted sexual experience? (Not at all/A little/A moderate amount/A lot/A great deal)
20. To what extent do you think an institution’s role could impede your recovery from your unwanted sexual experience? (Not at all/A little/A moderate amount/A lot/A great deal)

Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire
How much do the following statements apply to Duquesne University’s attitudes and policies around sexual harassment and assault?

Please use the following scale to respond to each item: 1 = very false of Duquesne University; 2 = somewhat false of Duquesne University; 3 = somewhat true of Duquesne University; 4 = very true of Duquesne University.

1. Does not take proactive steps to prevent sexual harassment and assault.
2. Creates an environment in which sexual harassment and assault seems common or normal.
3. Creates an environment in which sexual harassment and assault seems more likely to occur.
4. Makes it difficult to report sexual harassment and assault.
5. Responds inadequately to reports of sexual harassment and assault.
6. Mishandles student conduct processes related to sexual harassment and assault.
7. Covers up reports of sexual harassment and assault.
8. Denies the occurrence of sexual harassment and assault in some way.
9. Punishes individuals in some way for reporting sexual harassment and assault (e.g., loss of privileges or status).
10. Suggests reports of sexual harassment and assault might affect the reputation of the University.
11. Creates an environment where individuals who experience sexual harassment and assault no longer feel like valued members of the University.
12. Creates an environment where continued involvement is difficult for individuals who experience sexual harassment or assault.

Demographic Questionnaire

1. How old are you?
   a. Under 18
   b. 18-19
   c. 20-21
   d. 22-23
   e. 24-25
   f. 26-27
   g. 28-30
   h. 31+

2. What is your current student status?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
e. Graduate or Professional Student

3. Do you live on campus?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. What is your ethnicity?
   a. Hispanic or Latino
   b. Not Hispanic or Latino

5. What is your race? (select one or more)
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native
   b. Asian
   c. Black or African American
   d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   e. White
   f. Other (please specify): ______________
   g. Prefer not to disclose

6. How do you identify your gender (e.g., man, woman, other)? ______________

7. What is your current sexual orientation?
   a. Asexual
   b. Bisexual
   c. Gay
   d. Lesbian
   e. Questioning or Unsure
   f. Straight
   g. Other (please specify): __________
   h. Prefer not to disclose

8. Gender microaggressions are defined as both intentional and unintentional insults and invalidations that communicate hostile, derogatory, or sexist slights toward women. Have you experienced gender microaggressions at Duquesne University?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Prefer not to disclose

9. Sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome verbal or physical sexual conduct that limits ability to benefit from school. Have you experienced sexual harassment at Duquesne University?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Prefer not to disclose
10. Sexual Assault is defined as sexual contact that occurs without explicit consent. Have you experienced sexual assault at Duquesne University?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Prefer not to disclose
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End-of-Survey Message

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If participating in this study triggered upsetting feelings or memories pertaining to gender microaggressions and sexual victimization, you may find the following support services helpful:

- Duquesne University’s Counseling Services: counselingservices@duq.edu or 412.396.6204
- Duquesne University’s Title IX Coordinator & Director of Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response: Alicia Simpson, simpsona8@duq.edu or 412.396.2560
- Pittsburgh Action Against Rape (PAAR): 1.866.363.7273
- National Sexual Assault Hotline: 1.800.656.4673 or online.rainn.org

As a thank you for your time, you may enter a drawing to win one of three $100 gift cards. The gift card entry survey will collect your first name, last name, and email address. This information will be used only for the purpose of randomly selecting and notifying the three winners and can in no way be linked back to your responses on the study survey. If interested, you can enter the gift card drawing at: https://duq.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9o615d1DNjORInc

For questions about this study, please contact Rebecca Ellsworth (412.401.3665 or ellsworthr@duq.edu) or Dr. Amy Olson (412.396.5712 or olsona@duq.edu).
## Appendix E

### Study Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sub-measures</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Gender Microaggressions Scale</td>
<td>1. Gender microaggressions by peers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5-point Likert (0 never, 1 rarely, 2 sometimes, 3 often, 4 always)</td>
<td>Consists of adapted items from three existing measures: Gender Microaggressions Scale (Bolte, 2015), Sexist Microaggressions Experiences and Stress Scale (Derthick, 2015), and Female Microaggressions Scale (Miyake, 2018). Measures students’ experiences with various gender microaggressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate Survey</td>
<td>1. School connectedness</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>The first six sub-measures use a 4-point Likert scale (0 strongly disagree, 1 disagree, 2 agree, 3 strongly agree)</td>
<td>Consists of selected sections of the Campus Climate Module from the Campus Climate Survey Validation Study (Krebs et al., 2016). Captures students’ perceptions of the included aspects of campus climate (see sub-measures) and their likelihood of reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. General perceptions of faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. General perceptions of campus police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. General perceptions of school leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Perceptions of school leadership climate for sexual harassment and sexual assault prevention and response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Awareness and perceived fairness of school sexual assault policy and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The ‘Likelihood of Reporting’ subscale uses a 4-point Likert scale (0 not likely at all, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Perceptions of school leadership climate for treatment of sexual assault victims
8. Likelihood of reporting* 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Betrayal Questionnaire</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4-point Likert scale (0 very false, 1 somewhat false, 2 somewhat true, 3 very true)</td>
<td>Used Smith and Freyd’s (2013) IBQ-Climate without modification. Measures students’ perceptions of the university’s policies and attitudes about campus sexual misconduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Courage Questionnaire</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>The first 18 items are 0 no/1 yes, The last 2 items are a 5-point Likert scale (0 not at all, 1 a little, 2 a moderate amount, 3 a lot, 4 a great deal)</td>
<td>Used Smidt and Freyd’s (2019) ICQ-Individual-Not-Victimized without modification. Assesses whether students think various institutional responses would impact their experience of reporting sexual victimization to the university; also asks to what extent an institution could help or impede recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Questionnaire</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Collects information on participants’ age, student level, on-campus living status,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, and victimization experience. It also included a gender identity question that was used as a screening for study eligibility.

*The Likelihood of Reporting subscale was not included in the Campus Climate variable; it was used as its own variable to answer Research Question 3.
## Appendix F

### Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Disclose</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Likely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Likely</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Little</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Moderate Amount</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very False of DU</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat False of DU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat True of DU</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very True of DU</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional Student</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Disclose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning or Unsure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Disclose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘woman’ or ‘female’ (including ‘cis/cisgender woman/female’)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Anyone who selected or wrote in more than one race was coded as “multiracial.”

\(^a\) Write-in responses included: African, Middle Eastern

\(^b\) Write-in responses included: bisexual/asexual, have no idea, queer, pansexual
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Boxplots for Assumption of Outliers

Figure G1

Gender Microaggressions Boxplot
Figure G2

*Gender Microaggressions by Peers Boxplot*

![Boxplot for Gender Microaggressions by Peers](image)

Figure G3

*Gender Microaggressions by University Employees Boxplot*

![Boxplot for Gender Microaggressions by University Employees](image)
Figure G4

*Institutional Betrayal Boxplot*

Figure G5

*Institutional Courage Boxplot*
Figure G6

Campus Climate Boxplot

Figure G7

School Connectedness Boxplot
Figure G8

Perceptions of Campus Police Boxplot

Figure G9

Perceptions of Faculty Boxplot
Figure G10

Perceptions of School Leadership Boxplot

Figure G11

Perceptions of School Leadership Boxplot
Figure G12

Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Boxplot

Figure G13

Awareness and Perceived Fairness of School Sexual Assault Policy and Resources Boxplot
Figure G14

Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Treatment of Sexual Assault Victims Boxplot

Figure G15

Likelihood of Reporting Boxplot
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Histograms for Assumption of Normality

Figure H1

*Gender Microaggressions Histogram*

![Histogram](image)
Figure H2

*Gender Microaggressions by Peers Histogram*

![Gender Microaggressions by Peers Histogram](image)

Mean = 1.95
Std Dev = .871
N = 403

Figure H3

*Gender Microaggressions by University Employees Histogram*

![Gender Microaggressions by University Employees Histogram](image)

Mean = 80
Std Dev = 783
N = 403
Figure H4

Campus Climate Histogram

Figure H5

School Connectedness Histogram
Figure H6

Perceptions of Campus Police Histogram

Figure H7

Perceptions of Faculty Histogram
Figure H8

*Perceptions of School Leadership Histogram*

![Histogram of Participant Response]

Mean = 1.81  
Std Dev = .493  
N = 463

Figure H9

*Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Histogram*

![Histogram of Participant Response]

Mean = 1.65  
Std Dev = .715  
N = 463
Figure H10

Awareness and Perceived Fairness of School Sexual Assault Policy and Resources Histogram

Figure H11

Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Treatment of Sexual Assault Victims Histogram
Figure H12

Likelihood of Reporting Histogram

![Likelihood of Reporting Histogram](image)

Figure H13

Institutional Betrayal Histogram

![Institutional Betrayal Histogram](image)
Figure H14

Institutional Courage Histogram

Mean = 20.72
Std. Dev. = 3.17
N = 483
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Scatterplots for Assumption of Linearity

Figure 11

*Linearity of Campus Climate and Gender Microaggressions by Peers*
Figure 12
Linearity of Institutional Betrayal and Gender Microaggressions by Peers

Figure 13
Linearity of Institutional Courage and Gender Microaggressions by Peers
Figure I4

Linearity of Campus Climate and Gender Microaggressions by University Employees

Figure I5

Linearity of Institutional Betrayal and Gender Microaggressions by University Employees
Figure I6

*Linearity of Institutional Courage and Gender Microaggressions by University Employees*

![Graph showing the linearity of institutional courage and gender microaggressions by university employees. The graph includes a scatter plot with points representing data, and the equation $y = 2.43 + 0.39x$ is indicated along with an $R^2$ value of 0.008.]
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Residual Scatterplots for Assumptions of Independence of Residuals and Homoscedasticity

Figure J1

*Residual Scatterplot for Regression Model 1*\(^a\)

\(^a\)Gender Microaggressions by Peers, Gender Microaggressions by University Employees, Campus Climate, Institutional Betrayal and Institutional Courage as Predictors of Likelihood to Report
Figure J2

Residual Scatterplot for Regression Model 2

Gender Microaggressions by Peers and Campus Climate as Predictors of Likelihood to Report
Figure J3

Residual Scatterplot for Regression Model 3

School Connectedness, Perceptions of Campus Police, Perceptions of Faculty, Perceptions of School Leadership, Perceptions of Prevention and Response, Perceptions of Policy and Resources, and Perceptions of Treatment of Victims as Predictors of Likelihood to Report
Figure J4

Residual Scatterplot for Regression Model 4

School Connectedness, Perceptions of Campus Police, Perceptions of Prevention and Response, Perceptions of Policy and Resources, and Perceptions of Treatment of Victims as Predictors of Likelihood to Report
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Collinearity Tables for Assumption of Multicollinearity

Table K1

Collinearity for Regression Model 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by peers</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-2.481</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>1.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by University employees</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>10.015</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>1.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional betrayal</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>2.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional courage</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1.797</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aGender Microaggressions by Peers, Gender Microaggressions by University Employees, Campus Climate, Institutional Betrayal and Institutional Courage as Predictors of Likelihood to Report*

Table K2

Collinearity for Regression Model 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM by peers</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-2.195</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>15.096</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>1.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aGender Microaggressions by Peers and Campus Climate as Predictors of Likelihood to Report*
### Table K3

**Collinearity for Regression Model 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.870</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School connectedness</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>2.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of campus police</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>1.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of faculty</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.847</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>1.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of school leadership</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.760</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>2.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and response</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>3.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and resources</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>1.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of victims</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>4.367</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>3.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSchool Connectedness, Perceptions of Campus Police, Perceptions of Faculty, Perceptions of School Leadership, Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response, Awareness and Perceived Fairness of School Sexual Assault Policy and Resources, and Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Treatment of Sexual Assault Victims as Predictors of Likelihood to Report

### Table K4

**Collinearity for Regression Model 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1.726</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School connectedness</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>2.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of campus police</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>3.834</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>1.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and response</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>2.637</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>3.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and resources</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>1.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of victims</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>2.975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSchool Connectedness, Perceptions of Campus Police, Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response, Awareness and Perceived Fairness of School Sexual Assault Policy and Resources, and Perceptions of School Leadership Climate for Treatment of Sexual Assault Victims as Predictors of Likelihood to Report*
# Appendix L

## Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19 years old</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21 years old</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23 years old</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25 years old</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27 years old</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-30 years old</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+ years old</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Status</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning/Unsure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experienced Gender Microaggressions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Sexual Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Sexual Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have observed that men hold more leadership positions in society than women.</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first compliment someone has given you was related to how you look.</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have heard adult women referred to as ‘girls.’</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has referred to women using derogatory language (e.g., sluts or bitches).</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have observed that people excuse men’s behavior by saying ‘boys will be boys’ (or something similar).</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard men being told to ‘not act like a girl’ or to ‘be a man.’</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard man talking about other women in degrading terms (e.g., bitch or slut).</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has used ‘female’ or ‘woman’ as an adjective preceding an occupational or professional title.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told that women no longer experience discrimination.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have observed that women are not believed when they report being sexually harassed.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have received unsolicited comments about your physical appearance.</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told you need to watch your weight.</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told you need to change your body in some way in order to be attractive to men.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been in a setting where a man automatically assumed the leadership role.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone told you that women are being too sensitive when they say they experience gender discrimination.</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been catcalled or whistled at by a male stranger.</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A male stranger has complimented your body.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man has spoken for you.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told ‘you would be so pretty if you…’ (smiled more, lost weight, changed something about appearance).</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been in a setting where a man was automatically allowed to dictate the agenda.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have noticed someone looking at your body instead of listening to you talk.</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told you are ‘too pretty’ to do something (e.g., frown, be mad).</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard other women being referred to as a body part (e.g., tits).</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone told you that gender discrimination is no longer an important social issue.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have expressed concern about gender discrimination, and you were told that you were too sensitive, too crazy, or wrong.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard others joking about rape.</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have expressed concerns about gender discrimination, and you were told that gender discrimination does not exist.</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man has ignored or dismissed your contribution because you are a female.</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has assumed a man was responsible for work you actually did.</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been in a setting where the person in charge asked only men to provide feedback.</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man has greeted you by saying ‘hey sexy.’</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A male peer or fellow student was the only member praised for group work you contributed to.</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been referred to as a body part (e.g., tits).</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPresented in descending order of “% always or often.”*
## Appendix N

Gender Microaggressions by University Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>% always or often</th>
<th>% never or rarely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have observed that men hold more leadership positions in society than women.</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have heard adult women referred to as ‘girls.’</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has used ‘female’ or ‘woman’ as an adjective preceding an occupational or professional title.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been in a setting where a man automatically assumed the leadership role.</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have observed that people excuse men’s behavior by saying ‘boys will be boys’ (or something similar).</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been in a setting where a man was automatically allowed to dictate the agenda.</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man has spoken for you.</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have observed that women are not believed when they report being sexually harassed.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man has ignored or dismissed your contribution because you are a female.</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard men being told to ‘not act like a girl’ or to ‘be a man.’</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A male peer or fellow student was the only member praised for group work you contributed to.</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has assumed a man was responsible for work you actually did.</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first compliment someone has given you was related to how you look.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been in a setting where the person in charge asked only men to provide feedback.</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told that women no longer experience discrimination.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have noticed someone looking at your body instead of listening to you talk.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have received unsolicited comments about your physical appearance.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told you are ‘too pretty’ to do something (e.g., frown, be mad).</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>% always or often</td>
<td>% never or rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have expressed concerns about gender discrimination, and you were told that gender discrimination does not exist.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have expressed concern about gender discrimination, and you were told that you were too sensitive, too crazy, or wrong.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone has referred to women using derogatory language (e.g., sluts or bitches).</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard man talking about other women in degrading terms (e.g., bitch or slut).</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone told you that women are being too sensitive when they say they experience gender discrimination.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told ‘you would be so pretty if you…” (smiled more, lost weight, changed something about appearance).</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone told you that gender discrimination is no longer an important social issue.</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told you need to watch your weight.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A male stranger has complimented your body.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been told you need to change your body in some way in order to be attractive to men.</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard other women being referred to as a body part (e.g., tits).</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have heard someone in a position of authority (e.g., professor, coach, University staff) say that women are to be blamed when they are sexually assaulted.</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have overheard others joking about rape.</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been catcalled or whistled at by a male stranger.</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man has greeted you by saying ‘hey sexy.’</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been referred to as a body part (e.g., tits).</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPresented in descending order of “% always or often.”*