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Introduction
In 2000-2001, the Prevention, Education, and Advocacy on Campus and Community (PEACC) Program established a multi-faceted approach to prevention and intervention regarding incidents of violence against women on campus. An important component of the PEACC Program was a violence awareness campaign that began in fall, 2000. In order to establish baseline data faculty, staff, and students were invited to complete the same survey during fall 2000 and spring 2001 semesters. The fall 2000 and spring 2001 surveys differ only in the types of demographic information requested, specifically questions regarding classes. These surveys measured the following concepts:

- perceptions of safety on campus,
- knowledge about crime prevention and related services that are already in place on campus,
- previous contacts with the University’s Department of Public Safety and evaluation of those contacts,
- attitudes toward the range of types violence against women,
- incidents of violence on campus whether or not officially reported previously,
- suggestions for improving safety and related services on campus
- Adversarial Sexual Beliefs (ASB) Scale which measures the attitudes regarding a sexual relationship
- Rape Myth Acceptance Scale which measures a person’s beliefs regarding rape
- Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) which measures relationship violence
- Sexual Experience Survey (SES) which measures sexual aggression and victimization

Follow-up Surveys
In the spring 2010 semester, the Office of Institutional Research distributed 3 different surveys to UofL faculty and staff (approximately 7,500 people). The rationale behind the stratification was to reduce the chances of faculty and staff receiving multiple surveys during a semester. These 3 representative samples of UofL faculty and staff were selected by racial/ethnical codes (IPEDS) and then distributed by UofL PEACC, UofL Campus Climate, and the Chronicle for Higher Education Great Colleges to Work. The focus of this particular report is on the survey distributed online via email by UofL PEACC to approximately 2,372 faculty and staff. Three hundred ninety-nine responses were received for a highly effective response rate of 17%. This report cannot be considered representative of the UofL faculty and staff based on race and ethnicity.
RESULTS

PEACC Survey Sample
The faculty and staff respondents (N = 399) were 68% female and 29% male. According to UofL Just the Facts 2010 – 2011, the demographic make-up of faculty and staff at the time of the PEACC survey distribution was 56% female and 44% male. The following variables in the sample description were not available in the Just the Facts 2010-2011 for comparison.

Sample Description
Sixty-one percent (61%) of the faculty and staff reported they are married, 9% are not married but live with someone, 7% are divorced and 6% are single. Ninety-six percent (96%) of respondents have been in a dating or marital relationship at some point in their lives. Six percent (6%) of the respondents report they have a physical or mental disability. When respondents were asked how they identified themselves in regards to sexual orientation, 89% reported being heterosexual, 2% are bi-sexual and approximately 2% are lesbian/gay. When the respondents were asked to describe themselves politically, 41% selected moderate, 33% liberal and 19% conservative. In regards to their religious affiliation, 34% described themselves as Protestant, Catholic (22%), Other (18%), and No Affiliation (17%).

Data show that in a given work day, respondents spend a majority (58%) of their time on Belknap Campus. Additionally, 93% respondents are on campus weekdays from 8 to 5. Thirty-nine percent of female respondents spend most of their time on Belknap Campus compared to 18% of males. Thirty-one percent of females spend most of their time on HSC compared to 10% of males (see Figure 1).
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Respondents by Campus and Gender
**Perception of Feeling Safe on Campus**

Faculty and staff were asked how safe they feel or did not feel on campus. A 5-item Likert scale response was used with 10 questions indicating 1 = very unsafe, 2 = somewhat unsafe, 3 = neither safe nor unsafe, 4 = reasonably safe and 5 = very safe. Table 1 includes items that apply to the perception of feeling safe.

A majority of survey respondents felt Reasonably Safe or Very Safe during daylight hours regardless of their campus location. It is important to note that 17% of respondents feel Very Unsafe or Somewhat Unsafe in campus parking lots or garages during the day, 14% waiting alone for public transportation and 10% walking alone (see Table 1).

After dark or in the evening, 64% of respondents felt Very Unsafe or Somewhat Unsafe walking alone and 69% also felt Very Unsafe or Somewhat Unsafe waiting alone for transportation. Sixty-six percent (69%) of respondents feel Very Unsafe or Somewhat Unsafe walking alone in campus parking lots or garages after dark and 43% feel Very Unsafe or Somewhat Unsafe working in the library stacks. The majority (54%) of respondents feel Reasonably Safe or Very Safe in the student activity center after dark.

**Table 1**

*Degree of Perception of Feeling Safe on UofL Campus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and Respondents (n)</th>
<th>1 = Very Unsafe</th>
<th>2 = Somewhat Unsafe</th>
<th>3 = Neither Safe or Unsafe</th>
<th>4 = Reasonably Safe</th>
<th>5 = Very Safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daylight Hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking alone (393)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting alone for public transportation (230)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking alone in parking lot or garages (383)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student activity center (264)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Dark/Evening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking alone (362)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting alone for transportation (236)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>69%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking alone in parking lots or garages (361)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>66%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in the library stacks (154)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student activity center (175)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone in classrooms (220)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Safety Score.** The 10 questions with 5-item Likert scale responses were computed to determine a “Safety Score”. The Safety Score is a proxy for overall safety perception on campus for each respondent. Computing a Safety Score allows for additional statistical analysis and comparison of the survey data. The Safety Score gives a range from the lowest score of 10 (feeling very unsafe) to a high score of 50 (feeling very safe). The average Safety Score was 23.11 (sd = 10.09), the median was 23.00 and the mode was 16. Figure 2 reflects an approximate normal distribution of the Safety Score.

![Safety Score Distribution](image)

**Figure 2**
Safety Score Distribution

**Group Differences on Safety Score.** The Safety Score was examined by group differences and is presented in Table 2 on the next page. A t-test was run by gender demonstrating that males (M = 28.38, sd = 10.39) feel safer than females (M = 20.91, sd = 9.05) and this was found to be statistically significant. Therefore, it can be interpreted that male’s perception of safety while on campus is higher than the average and much higher than females.

Respondents on Belknap feel safer (M = 26.45, sd = 9.61) than respondents on the HSC campus (M = 18.59, sd = 8.87) and Shelby Campus respondents feel the least safe (M =15.80, sd = 5.11). These differences are statistically significant (p < .05). Therefore, it can be interpreted that the perception of safety of the respondents on Belknap is higher than the average and significantly higher than the HSC and Shelby campus respondents.

As noted in the sample description, 92% of faculty and staff identified as heterosexual and less than 5% as bisexual, lesbian or gay. Because of the small representation of bisexual, lesbian, or gay faculty and staff, group differences could not be established on the Safety Score. Political and religious affiliation was also examined and due to small representations in some categories, group differences could not be established on the Safety Score.
Table 2  
*Safety Score by Gender and Campus Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups (n)</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (272)</td>
<td>20.91 (9.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (114)</td>
<td>28.38 (10.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belknap (222)</td>
<td>26.45 (9.616)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC (159)</td>
<td>18.59 (8.875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby (5)</td>
<td>15.80 (5.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Sample Safety Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>M = 23.11 (sd =10.1)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Areas on campus where you don’t feel safe.* Even though the survey was conducted in 2010 the results below were shared with Wayne Hall, Director of the UofL Department of Public Safety. Hall and his staff reviewed the comments in detail and provided feedback as noted in quotations below. The qualitative responses of the survey were analyzed and the following themes were identified:

**Belknap Campus**
- Areas in and around 3rd and 4th streets – “*There is currently major construction in this area. Once construction is completed a lighting survey will be conducted to determine lighting level*”.
- Speed School parking lot – “*This will be taken addressed with improved lighting in the gravel lot by the Intramural field*”.
- Between Ekstrem Library and Business School
- Anywhere on Belknap at night
- Need for an increase in overall campus lighting.
- The blue faculty/staff lot near PNC bank
- Around the intramural/practice fields – “*The lighting could be improved in the gravel parking lot. An estimate is currently being put together to determine the cost for improving the lighting*”.
- Underpass going from Eastern Parkway to Speed School
- Perimeter of the Belknap Campus
- Parking lots near railroad tracks – “*The parking lots along 3rd and 4th streets near the tracks are affected by construction. Once the construction is completed a lighting survey will be conducted to determine whether the lighting needs improvement*”.
- MITC area after help desk closes at 2 a.m. – “*Physical Plant has been asked to take this into account once funding becomes available*”.
- 2nd Street behind fraternities
- Behind Betty Johnson Hall
- Walking from Humanities to lot by Fairfax

**Health Sciences Center (HSC) Campus**
- Anywhere on HSC at night
- Around University Hospital – “*This lighting is not university lighting. However, several street lights are out in the area and Louisville Metro will be asked to replace the bulbs*”. 
- Chestnut Street and 620 parking garage – “The lighting could be improved on south side of garage. An estimate is being prepared to determine cost”.
- Around Med Center One – “The light on rear of building is out. The landlord will be notified”.
- Med Center One Broadway parking lot – “The landlord will be asked to review lighting for improvement”.
- Near Dosker Manor and Wayside – “This is not university lighting. However, several street lights are out in the area and Louisville Metro will be asked to replace the bulbs”.
- Walking to the 620 garage – “Several street lights are out in the area and Louisville Metro will be asked to replace the bulbs”.
- Abraham Flexner near the K-wing – “Several street lights are out in the area and Louisville Metro will be asked to replace the bulbs”.
- MDR building – “Several street lights are out in the area and Louisville Metro will be asked to replace the bulbs”.

It is important to note that some of the areas mentioned are considered city property and not the responsibility of UofL.

While there were safety concerns on both campuses most people commented on safety concerns that related to the Health Sciences Center Campus. Additionally, many respondents expressed concern about their safety in the Chestnut Street garage since it has public access.

Disability
As stated previously, 6% of respondents reported that they have a physical or mental disability. Women are 71% of those with physical or mental disabilities. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the 6% with disabilities are employed on the Belknap Campus. Comments related to disabilities include: handicap parking on HSC is difficult to find, mobility issues, and bicycle safety – clearly marked bike lanes and yield signs. Respondents offered suggestions for improving safety such as: increase police foot, bike and patrol cars across both campuses and use undercover police officers.

![Pie chart showing percentages of employees with disabilities]

*Figure 3*
Percentage of Employees with Disabilities
Campus Service Utilization
Respondents were asked if they utilized campus services related to safety issues, sexual harassment, or sexual assault and their level of satisfaction. Thirty-eight percent (38%) of respondents have used campus police and 5% have used the Women’s Center. It is important to note that at the time the survey was released, people assumed that PEACC was part of the Women’s Center, so their responses for receiving assistance from the Women’s Center may be responses regarding PEACC. The campus police maintain the safety of faculty, staff and students as well as property within the University environment and the Women’s Center assists in promoting issues related to women on campus. The PEACC Program provides Prevention, Education, and Advocacy on Campus and in the Community on issues of interpersonal violence prevention and intervention. PEACC has been a part of Campus Health Services since 2008.

Students Seeking Assistance
Respondents were asked if students have approached with requests for assistance in dealing with violence related issues such as dating violence or stalking. Ten percent (10%) of respondents had been approached by students. The following list indicates the type of request and corresponding percent of the 10%:

- Sexual harassment on campus – 13%
- Dating violence – 13%
- Sexual harassment not on campus – 11%
- Stalking on campus – 10%
- Stalking not on campus – 10%
- Verbal threats of violence on campus – 9%
- Verbal threats of violence not on campus – 9%
- Sexual assault on campus – 8%
- Sexual assault not on campus – 7%
- Physical violence not on campus – 5%
- Physical violence on campus – 3%
- Rape not on campus – 3%
- Rape on campus – 2%
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**Top Three Categories of Reasons for Seeking Student Assistance**
Response to Students Seeking Assistance. Respondents countered to students request for assistance in the following manner:

- 14% referred to the student to counseling available on campus
- 11% suggested that the student contact the campus police
- 9% referred the student
  - to the campus police
  - to off campus police
- 9% consulted their supervisor/department chair
- 7% referred the student to
  - the Women’s Center on campus
  - to the PEACC Program
- 5% referred the student to
  - outpatient health care services
  - counseling available off campus
  - another colleague on campus
  - other
- 4% referred the student to the Center for Women and Families
- 3% referred the student to
  - off campus police
  - the hospital
- 2% referred the student to
  - campus ministry
  - made no referrals

Campus Violence Awareness

- Fifty-two percent (52%) of respondents reported they would be Very Likely or Somewhat Likely to attend training on issues relating to violence against women and availability of campus services.

- Eighteen percent (18%) of respondents attended a faculty or staff orientation during Summer 2009, Fall 2009 or the beginning of Spring 2010. When asked how much information they received about violence against women issues 4% did not receive any information on violence against women issues, 7% each received a little or some information and 1% received much information.

- Almost 40% of respondents have reported an incident to campus police.

- Fifteen percent (15%) of respondents indicated an experience of physical violence/abuse, sexual violence/abuse and/or emotional violence/abuse. Forty-nine percent (49%) of these incidents occurred during the time of employment at UofL.
Attitudes toward Sexual Relationships and Relationship Violence

**Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale** (Burt, 1980)
The Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB) is a nine item scale which measures the attitudes regarding a sexual relationship and was developed by Burt in 1980. The scale “will vary directly with scores on the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale”. Five of the 9 items were used as part of this survey with Likert responses of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The higher agreement with each item indicates a higher degree of antagonistic sexual beliefs. The survey results show that all employees regardless of gender have a low degree of adversarial sexual beliefs (see Table 3). However, males rank a higher level of adversarial sexual beliefs than females on 4 of the 5 items.

Due to the unequal numbers of women and men, nonparametric analysis was conducted. Specifically a Mann-Whitney test was conducted on gender by item. On average, men indicated higher agreement on all items, indicating a higher degree of adversarial beliefs. The resulting Z tests were significant at p ≤ 0.0001 (2-tailed) for three of the five times. The responses were not statistically significant for “Men are out for only one thing” and “A lot of women seem to get pleasure from putting a man down”.

**Table 3**
**Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Item Response Agreement by Employees Overall and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man’s got to show the woman who’s boss right from the start.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1.18 (.525)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are usually sweet until they’ve caught a man, but then they let their true self show.</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.44 (.722)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.30 (.562)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are out for only one thing.</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1.73 (.820)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of women seem to get pleasure from putting a man down.</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.63 (.808)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Rape Myth Acceptance Scale** (Burt, 1980)
The Rape Myth Acceptance Scale measures a person’s beliefs about rape. It has been found to show that men who commit sexual assault typically score higher. Rape myths are defined as prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists and contribute to creating a hostile climate for rape victims. Five items from the scale were used as a part of this survey with Likert responses of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Greater agreement on items indicates greater acceptance of rape myths. The opposite of this holds true for the item “Any female can get raped” and reverse coding was done on this item before the statistical analysis. The survey results show that all employees regardless of gender have a low acceptance of rape myths (see Table 4). However, males rank a higher level of acceptance than females on 4 of the 5 items.

Due to the unequal numbers of women and men, nonparametric analysis had to be conducted. Specifically a Mann-Whitney test was conducted on gender by item. Men indicated more endorsement of rape myths on all items except “any female can get raped”. The resulting Z tests were significant at p ≤ 0.0001 (2-tailed) for four of the five times. The results for one item “A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex” were not statistically significant.

**Table 4**
*Rape Myth Item Response Agreement by Employees Overall and Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1.61 (.868)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any female can get raped</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>4.28 (1.076)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1.56 (.783)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1.22 (.582)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she’s just met there, she should be considered “fair game” to other males at the party who also want to have sex with her whether she wants to or not.</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.18 (.575)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conflict Tactics Scale (Gelles & Straus, 1979; Straus, 1979)
The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) measures specific behavioral measures which correspond to relationship violence. Ten items were adapted for this survey and introduced with “Has anyone?” and asking for a Yes or No response. The CTS was used with this survey to measure only physical assaults. The 10 items on this survey were ranked in hierarchical order of preferred social desirability. The authors’ reasoning to this approach is that it would encourage self-disclosure of violent acts by allowing the respondent to first show all else had been tried.

Table 5 reflects the percentage of female and male employees who report they have experienced these types of incidents. There was not sufficient data collected in order to determine if incidents occurred on or off campus.

**Table 5**
Conflict Tactics Scale Item Response by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Tactics Scale</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has anyone . . . . ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accused you of having affairs or flirting with others</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened to hit you or throw something at you</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threw, smashed, or kicked something</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threw something at you</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushed, grabbed, shoved you</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked, bit, or hit you with a fist</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat you up</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choked you</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened you with a gun or knife</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a gun or knife on you</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982)
The Sexual Experience Survey (SES) measures sexual aggression and victimization. Eight of the original 12 items on the SES were used for this survey asking for a Yes or No response. The items on this survey were presented in gender neutral terms and reported in Table 6.

Female employees reported experiencing a total of 192 incidents on the SES compared to 28 reported by males. Forty-two percent (42%) of female employees have had someone misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy they desired while 24% of males experienced misinterpretation. Fifteen percent (15%) of females have been in a situation where some degree of physical force was used to try to make her engage in kissing or petting when they did not want to. Six percent (6%) of females had a partner that threatened physical force in order to have intercourse but it did not occur. Seven percent (7%) of females have experienced physical force by their partner in order to have intercourse but it did not occur.

Table 6
Sexual Experiences Survey Item Response by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Experiences Survey Item</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Male Employees</th>
<th>Female Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>% Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had someone misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been in a situation where your partner used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn’t want to?</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tried to have sexual intercourse with you when you didn’t want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn’t cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to get you to have sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional results of the Sexual Experiences Survey outlined below are in narrative format because males stated that they did not experience any of these situations.

- Twenty-six (7%) female employees stated they have been raped. A higher percentage (15%) of female employees responded that they had been raped when given the behavioral description of rape as part of the SES (i.e., having sexual intercourse as a result of threat or actual use of physical force) then when simply asked, “Have you ever been raped?”
  - One of the 26 rapes was reported to have occurred on campus.
- Six percent (6%) of female employees had sexual intercourse with their partner even though they didn’t really want to because their partner threatened to end the relationship.
- Three percent (3%) of female employees had intercourse with their partner when they didn’t want to because their partner threatened to use physical force if they did not cooperate.
- Six percent (6%) of females had sexual intercourse with their partner when they didn’t want to because their partner used some degree of physical force.

Summary
In conclusion the survey identified the following themes:

- A majority of survey respondents felt Reasonably Safe or Very Safe during daylight hours regardless of their campus location.
- After dark or in the evening, 64% of respondents felt Very Unsafe or Somewhat Unsafe walking alone and 69% also felt Very Unsafe or Somewhat Unsafe waiting alone for transportation.
- The average Safety Score was 23.11 (sd = 10.09), the median was 23.00 and the mode was 16. The score ranges from 0 – 50 with a higher score indicating a higher level of feeling safe.
- Male’s perception of safety while on campus is higher than the average and much higher than females.
- The perception of safety of the respondents on Belknap is higher than the average and significantly higher than the HSC and Shelby campus respondents.
- Women are 71% of those with physical or mental disabilities.
- Thirty-eight percent (38%) of respondents have used campus police.
- Ten percent (10%) of respondents had been approached and reported that students have sought assistance in dealing with violence related issues.
- Fifteen percent (15%) of respondents indicated an experience of physical violence/abuse, sexual violence/abuse and/or emotional violence/abuse. Forty-nine percent (49%) of these incidents occurred during the time of employment at UofL.
• Males have a slightly higher degree of antagonistic sexual beliefs on the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale and a higher level of acceptance of rape beliefs on the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale than women on all items.

• Females reported almost 5 times as many incidents than males on the Conflict Tactics Scale.

• Females reported almost 7 times as many incidents than males on the Sexual Experience Survey.

• According to the Sexual Experiences Survey 42% of female employees have had someone misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy they desired while 24% of males experienced misinterpretation.

• A higher percentage (15%) of female employees responded that they had been raped when given the behavioral description of rape as part of the SES (i.e., having sexual intercourse as a result of threat or actual use of physical force) then when simply asked, “Have you ever been raped?”

In conclusion, while the survey was conducted almost 3 years ago it is hoped that the information will provide some insight into the safety concerns and violent behaviors some faculty and staff have experienced. This report sheds some light on defining a culture of gender conflict at UofL. It can be said that males have a higher perception of feeling safe than females. From this survey it can also be said that males have a slightly higher social attitude condoning violence or conflict as demonstrated by the ratings on the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale and the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. This difference in social attitude is shown to have statistical significance as presented in Tables 3 and 4. This study provides preliminary evidence of a need for employee training related to sexual harassment and conflict resolution. In particular, the training should include raising awareness of male and female social tendencies to intimidate the other in specific situations. The PEACC Program has been working on campus since 2000 and is available for consultation for implementation of initiatives on violence prevention, education and advocacy for faculty/staff/students at UofL.