



University of Kentucky
UKnowledge

Theses and Dissertations--Kinesiology and
Health Promotion

Kinesiology and Health Promotion

2014

Dating Violence on Small Rural College Campuses: Are Administrator and Student Perceptions Similar?

Jean Allen Oldham
University of Kentucky, jaoldh1@uky.edu

[Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.](#)

Recommended Citation

Oldham, Jean Allen, "Dating Violence on Small Rural College Campuses: Are Administrator and Student Perceptions Similar?" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations--Kinesiology and Health Promotion*. 16.
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/khp_etds/16

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Kinesiology and Health Promotion at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations--Kinesiology and Health Promotion by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu.

STUDENT AGREEMENT:

I represent that my thesis or dissertation and abstract are my original work. Proper attribution has been given to all outside sources. I understand that I am solely responsible for obtaining any needed copyright permissions. I have obtained needed written permission statement(s) from the owner(s) of each third-party copyrighted matter to be included in my work, allowing electronic distribution (if such use is not permitted by the fair use doctrine) which will be submitted to UKnowledge as Additional File.

I hereby grant to The University of Kentucky and its agents the irrevocable, non-exclusive, and royalty-free license to archive and make accessible my work in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known. I agree that the document mentioned above may be made available immediately for worldwide access unless an embargo applies.

I retain all other ownership rights to the copyright of my work. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of my work. I understand that I am free to register the copyright to my work.

REVIEW, APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE

The document mentioned above has been reviewed and accepted by the student's advisor, on behalf of the advisory committee, and by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS), on behalf of the program; we verify that this is the final, approved version of the student's thesis including all changes required by the advisory committee. The undersigned agree to abide by the statements above.

Jean Allen Oldham, Student

Dr. Richard S. Riggs, Major Professor

Dr. Heather Erwin, Director of Graduate Studies

DATING VIOLENCE ON SMALL RURAL COLLEGE CAMPUSES:
ARE ADMINISTRATOR AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS SIMILAR?

DISSERTATION

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
College of Education
at the University of Kentucky

By
Jean Allen Oldham

Lexington, Kentucky

Director: Dr. Richard S. Riggs

Lexington, Kentucky

2014

Copyright © Jean Allen Oldham 2014

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

DATING VIOLENCE ON SMALL RURAL COLLEGE CAMPUSES: ARE ADMINISTRATOR AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS SIMILAR?

In recent years dating violence has become more and more prevalent on college campuses. Reports of the range of dating violence vary widely, with studies reporting from 20% to 85% of college women experiencing dating violence. However, almost all research has been conducted among urban and/or large colleges and universities, with virtually no attention to what is happening on small and/or rural college and university campuses.

When a possible 20% of college women have experienced dating violence on college campuses, there becomes a crucial need for administration at a college to have an accurate assessment of the college's liability, and of the adequacy of the college's programs and policies relative to dating violence. This study sought to determine whether administrators and female students on small rural college campuses have the same perceptions of the type and incidence of dating violence on their campus, and of the programs and policies the college has put into place to prevent and respond to dating violence. Two domains of perceptions were addressed, dating violence beliefs and experience, and dating violence policy knowledge. The same question was examined to determine if perceptions of resident and commuter students were the same, and if perceptions of under and upper class students were the same. The investigator surveyed 52 college administrators and 306 female students at a total of four small rural college campuses to determine whether administrator and female student perceptions of dating violence incidence/type and dating violence program/policy knowledge at the college were similar.

Results were that administrators tended to have similar perceptions to students as regards dating violence beliefs and experience, although not specific types of dating violence. Students did not exhibit a strong knowledge of dating violence policy. Resident and commuter students displayed similar perceptions to each other, as did under class and upper class students.

KEYWORDS: Dating violence, Sexual assault, Post-traumatic stress disorder, Small rural colleges

Jean Allen Oldham

July 21, 2014

DATING VIOLENCE ON SMALL RURAL COLLEGE CAMPUSES:
ARE ADMINISTRATOR AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS SIMILAR?

By

Jean Allen Oldham

Dr. Richard S. Riggs
Director of Dissertation

Dr. Heather Erwin
Director of Graduate Studies

June 16, 2014

Dedicated to my advisor, Dr. Richard Riggs, my committee, and to
my parents, my pets, and St. Catharine College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Dr. Melody Noland, Dr. Melinda Ickes, Dr. Lori Garkovich and outside examiner Dr. Patricia Burkhart for their advice, help, insight, and patience.

Thank you to Dr. Yong Wang and Dr. Lisa Kay, Eastern Kentucky University, for their many hours put into helping with statistical issues.

Thanks to Dr. Angie Shaughnessy, SCN, for your encouragement and support.

I appreciate the input and support from Dr. Joe Oldham, Ms. Nora Hatton, Dr. Mansim Okafor, and Ms. Susan Phillips.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	iii
List of Tables	vi
Chapter One: Introduction and Statement of the Problem.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	9
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions.....	14
Definition of Terms	15
Summary	15
Chapter Two: Review of Literature	17
Section One: Dating Violence Defined	18
Health impacts of dating violence experienced by victims	18
Current status of dating violence on college campuses	19
What’s being done about dating violence on campuses	23
Reporting rape	26
Section Two: Definition of a “Small Rural College”	27
Barriers faced by small rural colleges	30
Section Three: Dating Violence Predictors	34
Section Four: Justification for Study/Further Research Needed	38
Use of the Health Belief Model	43
Section Five: Prevention of Dating Violence	44
Chapter Three: Methods	47
Subject Selection & Recruitment.....	49
College selection.....	49
Participant Selection	51
Administrators	51
Students.....	52
Methods	53
Measures	53
Procedures.....	59
Informed consent	66
Analysis of Data.....	66
Summary	69
Chapter Four: Results and Discussion	71
Results	71
Response Rates and Characteristics of the Sample	73
Demographics	75
Students.....	75
Administrators	75
Dating Violence Beliefs and Experience	79
Research question #1	79
Research question #2	80
Research question #3	80
Dating Violence Policy Knowledge	84
Research question #4	85

Research question #5	86
Research question #6	87
Hypothesis Testing	90
Application of Health Belief Model	95
Discussion	95
Demographics	95
Dating violence beliefs and experiences.....	95
Differences in groups of respondents	99
Knowledge of college policy	101
Differences in groups of respondents	103
Application of Health Belief Model	106
Summary	110
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research.....	111
Summary	111
Conclusions.....	115
Limitations of the Study	118
Recommendations.....	121
Suggestions for Further Research.....	125
Appendices	
Appendix A: Letter of request to administer survey on subject campus	129
Appendix B: Survey Introductory Page.....	132
Appendix C: Survey Questions for Administrators.....	134
Appendix D: Survey Questions for Students.....	141
Appendix E: Consent to Participate in Research Hypotheses	148
Appendix F: IRB Letter of Approval.....	168
References.....	169
Vita.....	181

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Source of Survey Questions.....	57
Table 2: Statistical Tests and Research Questions.....	67
Table 3: Surveys Distributed and Response Rates for Students by College and Total	74
Table 4: Surveys Distributed and Response Rates for Administrators by College and Total	74
Table 5: Demographics (Students).....	76
Table 6: Demographics (Administrators)	77
Table 7: Percentage of Dating Violence Experienced by Students	81
Table 8: Behaviors Experienced on Dates	81
Table 9: Agreement/disagreement with beliefs about rape.....	82
Table 10: Percentage of students reporting dating violence	83
Table 11: Reasons given for students not reporting dating violence	84
Table 12: Type of security available on campus	87
Table 13: Who would a student call for help if date were violent.....	87
Table 14: Percent of students who know how to reach security	88
Table 15: Who provides dating violence information on campus.....	88
Table 16: How is information provided.....	88
Table 17: Does this campus have a dating violence policy	89
Table 18: Where would you find a campus dating violence policy.....	89
Table 19: Familiarity with the Clery Act.....	89
Table 20: Statistical test and p-values for beliefs and experiences.....	92
Table 21: Statistical tests and p-values for dating violence policy knowledge	93

Chapter One

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

This chapter will begin with a discussion of college violence in general, then provide an introduction to the study of college dating violence, establish the significance of and rationale for the study, and state the purpose of the study. Additionally the chapter will state research questions and reference the hypotheses, and finally provide a definition of terms used in this study.

According to a study conducted by the FBI in conjunction with the Department of Education and the Secret Service (FBI website, 2010) there had, by 2009, been 271 incidents of college violence. Reports of college violence of all types seem to hit the news at a rate that not only is alarming in itself, but is alarming in how fast it is increasing. In 2007, in probably the worst college violence incident, a student at Virginia Tech fatally shot 32 people and wounded 15 people (Carr, 2008), but even as far back as 1966, Charles Whitman introduced the country to campus violence when he shot and killed 14 people and wounded 31 at the University of Texas in Austin (Nevin, 1966; LaVergne, 2007). These two incidents captured attention and are still somewhat well-known because of the large number of fatalities. Examples such as these make the news, but many college violence incidents do not because the conflict is personal violence between two students, not a mass murder spree.

As horrific as those campus violence sprees are, what has emerged as a major public health issue is dating violence (CDC, 2009), which was the focal point of the current study. Specifically, dating violence, date rape, and acquaintance rape are reported as particular problems for college-aged (18-24 years old) women (Daley & Noland, 2001; Iconis, 2013). Dating violence can include physical, sexual, or psychological abuse. Documented dating violence at a college began occurring as early as 1909, when a former student killed his girlfriend and then himself (Drysdale, Modzeleski, Simons, 2010), and continues today at a rate of 20-25% (CDC, 2009).

One manifestation of dating violence is sexual assault. Various forms of sexual assault have been studied since the women's movement of the 1970s (Carmody, Ekhomu, & Payne, 2009), but college women are more likely than other women to be victims of the form of sexual assault known as dating violence (Carmody, et al., 2009; Fisher, Cullen & Daigle, 2005). More specifically, dating violence is described by the Dating Violence Resource Center as the physical and/or psychological abuse of one person by another, when the two parties are neither married nor related by blood, but are known to each other and share a social/sexual/emotional relationship (Dating Violence Resource Center, 2002). The abuse can run the gamut of bullying or criticizing, up to and including severe beating, sexual assault, rape, and the use of date rape drugs.

The incidence of dating violence on college campuses is frightening: McMahon (2008) states that approximately 1 in 5 college women report having been sexually assaulted during college (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Karjane, Fisher, Cullen, 2005). Even the less academic, more 'popular' media have begun weighing in on dating violence, as illustrated by Cosmopolitan Magazine's Campus Accountability Project database, in which readers are solicited to publish their college's sexual assault policy (Tuder, 2012). With all the focus on dating violence in recent years, a decrease would seem likely, but it does not appear to have happened.

Despite all efforts to reduce campus dating violence, there has been no reported decline in the last twenty years (McMahon, 2008). In fact, as all types of campus violence have increased drastically since the 1950s (Drysdale, Modzeleski & Simmons, 2010), it is not unreasonable to expect that dating violence on college campuses has also increased.

For the college administration to address dating violence on campus successfully, the administrators might begin by determining the type and incidence of dating violence on the campus, and investigating what the students say about dating violence. College administration may seek new ways to address dating violence. A conceptual framework that potentially would facilitate this determination is the Health Belief Model (HBM), a disease model addressing

perceptions of risk, severity, barriers and self-efficacy of change of a behavior. Therefore, the Health Belief Model (HBM) was utilized to provide some constructs to this study, although it should be noted that for this study these constructs and the model were used as a guide; the study was not based entirely upon the theory.

The Health Belief Model was applicable to this study in two ways to determine perceptions of administrators and students: 1) to determine if the students believe they are susceptible to dating violence and if so, what are the barriers to lessening that susceptibility; and 2) to determine if the health of the institution, in this case the subject college, is susceptible to tangible or intangible negative results of dating violence, as indicated by administrator perceptions. Further, if the college is found to be susceptible to damages from dating violence incidents, what are barriers would prevent that damage and what perceived institutional self-efficacy of policies could be designed to reduce dating violence? The study surveys were used to address the perceptions of students and administrators as to their susceptibility and barriers to prevention of dating violence.

With currently approximately 17.8 million college students in the United States (Drysdale, et al., 2010), dating violence on college campuses has reached critical mass. Specifically, sexual assault of college women suggests a need for increased deterrent policies and programs, for the benefit of the students and of the colleges. Thus, a crucial question becomes “Do the college administrators know the college’s liability, and are the college’s programs sufficient for addressing dating violence?” An illustration of how college violence (including dating violence) can affect colleges follows: after the Virginia Tech student had completed his 2007 murder spree there were calls for the removal of both the president and the police chief of Virginia Tech. One such headline, used on MSNBC, FOX, and CNN websites read “Did Virginia Tech’s Response Cost Lives?” which suggests that colleges need to do everything possible to have a plan in place for prevention of, and response to, any type of violence (LaVergne, 2007).

Yet just three years later, when University of Virginia student Yeardley Love was murdered by her boyfriend, the University of Virginia president appeared surprised to learn that the college did not have in place any system to warn him, or the student, that the perpetrator (also a student at the school) had previous arrests for threats. What is equally sad is that the same couple had a dating violence incident a few months earlier, but it was not reported (Canning, Friedman & Netter, 2010). A more recent headline was “55 Colleges under investigation for handling of sexual assault claims” (Anderson, 2014), a federal list from the Department of Education, of colleges being investigated for open sexual assault violations.

The damage to a college when violence occurs is immediate and obvious, and is played out in the media at length. In what may be a disturbing sign of the times, at least one of the subject colleges in the current study now provides in-service training to faculty on what to do if gunshots are heard on campus. In May 2014 the U.S. Department of Education released a list of 55 colleges under investigation for handling of sexual assault allegations (Anderson, 2014) In addition, all colleges are required to report crime statistics to the federal government via the Clery Act, passed in 1990 to ensure that college-specific crime statistics are available to the public (Higher Education Law, 2010). Dating violence injuries might be prevented, if a college is exercising due diligence to protect its students. To exercise that due diligence college administration must determine how much dating violence is occurring, what type of dating violence occurs, why students do or do not report dating violence, and what students know about the policies and programs in place to protect them.

Physically, female victims of dating violence, like their sister victims of partner violence or date rape, are subject to a variety of potential negative health concerns: bruises, cuts, broken bones, back or pelvic pain, headaches (CDC 2009), along with vaginal infections and digestive pain (Campbell, et al., 2002). Other physical symptoms reported by abused women included sexually transmitted diseases, vaginal bleeding, painful intercourse, pelvic pain, urinary tract

infection, loss of appetite, abdominal pain, and facial injuries (Campbell, et al., 2002).

Additionally there are the dangers of vaginal or anal tearing or trauma, pregnancy, and pelvic inflammatory disease (Resnick & Acierno, 1997).

Longer-term conditions resulting from intimate partner violence can include fibromyalgia, irritable bowel syndrome, gynecological disorders, pregnancy difficulties, central nervous system disorders, gastrointestinal disorders, and heart or circulatory conditions (CDC, 2009). Victims of rape can also be subject to a variety of sexually transmitted diseases, up to and including Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV). Although HIV rates have declined, and pharmacological treatment has improved, the victim still must live with the fears both of contracting HIV and of unintentionally spreading it to a partner. Given that dating violence is a form of intimate partner violence, and that date rape is a form of rape, it seems likely these conclusions would also be applicable to dating violence and date rape.

While cuts, bruises, scrapes, and scratches are common and not life-threatening or incapacitating, they are hard to hide and can be embarrassing. But physical damages usually heal, while psychological damage resulting from a rape or assault can plague the victim for much longer, especially the fear resulting from the attack. According to Amar and Alexy (2005) college student victims of dating violence have reported feeling “dissed” by dating violence, or a feeling of being disrespected. Within that paradigm are emotional distress (anger, guilt, self-blame, fear, depression, betrayal, emotional breakdowns), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) with its accompanying flashbacks and nightmares, distrust, life disruption, and feelings of being disempowered. Psychological damage runs the gamut of anxiety, depression, fear (whether it be of AIDS, pregnancy, intimacy, being alone, or being in proximity to the perpetrator or anyone else who appears threatening), lack of trust, paranoia, depression, nightmares, suicidal ideation, emotional detachment, reduced academic interest, and PTSD (CDC 2009, Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Female victims of sexual assault are more likely than other students to withdraw from

college (Karjane, Fischer, & Cullen, 2005), which is a negative effect for the college and can be a very long-term negative effect for the student. Sexual assault and similar negative and/or traumatic life events, particularly being in an abusive relationship, have been found to be major contributors to depression in college women (Leino & Kisch, 2005). In a much broader sense, dating violence, as with intimate partner violence in general has become a major public health issue (CDC 2009).

Amar and Alexy (2005) had several interesting findings relevant to psychological damage from dating violence, as discussed in the following. Emotional distress from dating violence has sometimes led to eating disorders such as bulimia, suicidal ideation, and anger becoming such a pervasive feeling that it seems to be an integral part of the victim. Some victims have reported a strong distrust of others following dating violence, particularly in areas of romantic or sexual relationships, while others have reported feeling that they personally are of little value. In some cases victims' daily lives suffer disruptions such as hesitancy to answer phone calls or fear of being alone at night. In most cases the victim seems to feel disempowered (Amar & Alexy, 2005). For a college student of typical college age (18-24 years) this is a very sad way to begin "adult" life.

Dating violence victims may resort to other negative health behaviors as a release: smoking, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, and eating disorders (CDC, 2009). In that sense, the results of violence are far-reaching and may cause life-long issues, affecting not only individuals, but the costs of health care. Bonomi, Anderson, Rivara and Thompson (2009) found that both mental and physical abuse resulted in more utilization of health care services, with physically abused women utilizing health care at a 42% higher rate than their non-abused counterparts, while non-physical abuse resulted in rates 24% higher than non-abused women. The financial impact to health care was \$19.3 million higher for every 100,000 abused women (Bonomi, et al., 2009). Healthy Kentuckians 2020, Healthy Campus 2020, and Healthy People 2020 all list as goals the reduction

of injury and violence, including intimate partner violence and thus dating violence. Health Promotion Goal number seven in Healthy Kentuckians 2020 is “to reduce among all Kentuckians the incidence and severity of injuries from unintentional causes, as well as death and disabilities due to violence.” Under this goal, the following objective is stated:

7.22 Family and intimate partner violence (IPV) and sexual assault: reduce physical abuse by current or former intimate partners to less than 23 per 10,000 (baseline data listed as not available), including:

- support programs that accumulate information about the incidence and causes of IPV; a need exists for Kentucky specific incidence data to describe the magnitude of the problem;
- evaluate existing interventions and the impact of those interventions;
- support programs that provide protection services to IPV victims;
- develop and support programs that are designed to prevent IPV.

Although objectives 7.23 and 7.24 are related, in that they reference reducing the rate of forced sexual intercourse and sexual assault other than rape, they are not specifically addressed here, but are considered under physical abuse. In Healthy Kentuckians 2020 it is noted that one of the areas in which there was lack of progress from the Healthy Kentuckians 2000 and Healthy Kentuckians 2010 goal is that women are still frequently assaulted by their partners. Other more general issues include the dearth of data resources and violence tracking systems (Healthy Kentuckians 2020).

Logically, these goals would also apply to intimate partner violence when it occurs in the form of dating violence on college campuses. In fact, Healthy Campus 2020, based upon Healthy People 2020, establishes as one goal the reduction of physical assaults, sexual abuse, rape, attempted rape, emotional abuse, and intimate partner violence on college campuses. In 2005 The American College Health Association, via a series of randomized mailings, web-based surveys,

and classroom surveys, determined that college women were relatively frequent victims of sexual assault ranging from verbal threats to forced sex. Possibly as many as one in four college women report experiencing some type of sexual assault while in college (Payne & Fogerty, 2007). The Centers for Disease Control (2009) estimate that one of every four or five sexual assault victims are women of 18-24 years, the age of traditional college students. Research suggests that dating violence incidence may run as high as 88% of college dating couples (Shook, Gerrity, Jurich, Segrist, 2000; White & Koss, 1991).

If dating violence were occurring on college campuses at these rates, then obviously it must be addressed by college administrators, whether directly or via student support services, residence life, student health service, or campus security/local police. In 1999 the American College Health Association formally requested campus health professionals to support the struggle against campus violence, and the American College Health Association, via the White Paper, requested that college administrators be proactive against campus violence of any sort (Carr, 2005). The Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act of 2000, which later became known as the Clery Act (for Jeanne Clery, a student raped and killed at Lehigh University in 1986) was designed to disseminate information about sex offenders enrolled or employed at colleges. The Clery Act specifies that colleges and universities must: 1) publish annual reports describing the extent of certain crimes committed at the school during a three year period, 2) publish a crime log available to the public, 3) provide crime data to the U.S. Department of Education, and 4) provide strategies to protect the rights of sexual assault victims (Payne, 2008). The Clery Act can only provide so much protection. For example, a college cannot identify a potential employee or student as a sex offender if that person has not been registered as a sex offender. In spite of the protections intended by the Clery Act to protect students, Yeardeley Love was killed by her boyfriend in 2010.

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated in this study was the differences in perceptions of administrators and female students regarding dating violence prevalence and type, and regarding knowledge of dating violence policies on small rural college campuses. As part of the problem, the same differences in perceptions were looked at both between resident and commuter students, and by school classification, under class and upper class women.

Because the bulk of previous studies concerning dating violence on college campuses has either been done at large urban colleges, or the size and setting of the subject college have not been specified, the problem investigated in this study was to examine the perceptions of administrators and female students regarding dating violence prevalence and type, and regarding dating violence policies, on small rural college campuses. This issue is important because on a college campus, in addition to the personal risk to the students, two levels of vulnerability exist in relation to dating violence among students. The first level of vulnerability is that retention and recruitment problems may increase if there is known dating violence on campus, such as the recently released list of colleges under investigation (Anderson, 2014). The second level of vulnerability is liability issues that have the potential to surface should a student become a victim of dating violence, particularly if college administrators cannot demonstrate actual or constructive knowledge of dating violence on their campuses, and cannot demonstrate satisfactorily that dating violence prevention programs and information have been successfully disseminated to all students.

Students on college campuses experience dating violence, including stalking, harassment, and assault, a fact well-established over the last two decades (Gruber, 1992; Fletcher & Bryden, 2007; Carr 2005). Well-documented is the fact that dating violence in its various forms can lead to depression, which in turn leads to lowered academic success (Leino & Kisch, 2005). Lowered academic success rates would certainly have a negative impact upon a small college, via

decreased student retention rates and lower graduation rates, and possibly affect regional accreditation status for the college. Colby College lost nearly one percent of its students to suspension or withdrawal as a result of one sexual incident in 2011 (Smith, 2012). Given that small colleges' financial solvency is related to tuition, losing students can easily have a devastating impact (Ryvard, 2013). An example of this is a small college in Kentucky (not one of the subject colleges), which is currently laying off faculty due to a loss of only 18 students from its 2013 projections (Lexington Herald-Leader, Sept 15, 2013). The FBI, in a report on campus attacks, noted that a contributing factor common in college settings, unlike most other settings, is that developmental stressors are increased by virtue of the fact that students may live and attend school in the same setting, and that along with academic pressures exist new pressures to create a path in life and to increase independence and self-discipline (Drysdale et al., 2010). An added complication is that smaller colleges generally do not have the resources to provide an on-campus sexual assault center, which exists at larger colleges (Carmody, et al., 2009; Ryvard, 2013) and may well be lacking in campus security resources.

There is a dearth of research on dating violence at small rural colleges; therefore, this study was specifically geared toward small (less than 1500 students), rural (as defined by the Carnegie College Ranking System), not-for-profit, liberal arts colleges located in Kentucky, and was intended to be a pilot study to determine if the methods utilized were appropriate to allow answers to the research questions and to suggest program improvements. Of the 4,314 degree granting institutions of higher education in the United States, 41% have enrollment of less than 1,000 (enrollment equal to four percent of the total in the U.S.) (Drysdale et al., 2010). These smaller colleges are of interest because they have both a level of vulnerability and visibility (at least community-wide) to which larger colleges are less susceptible. Should there be a dating violence incident on campus, a smaller college may have fewer resources available to recover from lawsuits or from decreased enrollment due to negative public relations. Shrinking rural

populations and declining enrollment, as the freshman base dwindles and fewer students are being graduated from high schools, hits hard at a college that is tuition-dependent and likely has smaller endowments than do large colleges. This combination of factors contributes to making student retention ever more critical (Ryvard, 2013).

In comparison to urban or larger institutions, small colleges in rural areas, with enrollment less than 3,000 students, and which are already facing difficult financial scenarios (Ryvard, 2013) would likely be more at risk of damage from negative publicity or lawsuits for three reasons:

- Loss of students due to negative publicity would have a bigger impact due to a lower student population, in turn resulting in less ability to absorb losses;
- There is generally much less availability of quick response from law enforcement or emergency medical personnel, according to a Kentucky State Police post captain interviewed for this study (see above), and
- There are fewer medical facilities of any sort, from student health to doctors' offices to urgent care to hospitals. As evidence of this lack of facilities is the situation of one of the subject colleges: located in a town in which there is no emergency medical facility of any sort, one of the college's health sciences buildings has been designated by Homeland Security as an emergency medical facility in times of extreme emergency, such as a terrorist attack, according to the college president. Resources in rural areas, whether medical or social, vary from sparse to non-existent. Furthermore, should a student not have personal transportation, it could be quite difficult to escape a violent or potentially violent situation because in a rural locale there is, to paraphrase Annan (2008) "very little in the way of places to go, if there were even a way to get there." Additionally, the smaller a campus, the fewer the number of security officers to be found on campus at night.

Purpose of the Study

Dating violence, as addressed in this study, included both emotional and physical violence such as bullying, berating, criticizing, stalking, harassing, hitting, shoving, forcing, abusing, assaulting, raping, and using date rape drugs to coerce a date into doing something he or she does not want to do. Because so little research has been done specific to small rural college campuses, results of this study would potentially be useful to administrators of these campuses, primarily in decreasing the amount of dating violence on campuses, increasing the awareness of the problem, and determining whether the college's existing policies and programs toward dating violence are sufficient to protect both the institution and the students. Given the importance of administration on any college campus, including administration in the current study was deemed essential. Administrators have more influence on campus policies, procedures, and culture than any other group. Higher level administration such as college presidents and vice-presidents, provide leadership to the college in many ways: financial, risk management, academic growth, academic quality, admissions, recruitment and retention, marketing, and public relations, among others.

Examining the difference between perceptions of female students and administrators was deemed important for two reasons: first, because for a policy or program to be effective it must be known and understood by the intended audience (in this case, female students who are at risk of being victimized by dating violence), and second, because if an administrator were to create a program or policy to help students, the administrator must first understand the nature and incidence of events or actions that have indicated a need for such policy or program.

Should the existing policies and programs of the subject colleges in this study be determined insufficient to protect the institution from liability and the students from dating violence, results of this study could conceivably be used to assist in developing new programs and policies that are more consistent with what is needed to protect the students from dating

violence and the institutions from repercussions of dating violence among students. Sufficiency of the subject colleges' policies regarding dating violence was not addressed in this study. That determination would be the prerogative of the individual college administrators, as would the decision to use or not to use the results provided by the study. The study does offer information that college administrators might use in their decision-making processes regarding campus policies related to dating violence.

The purpose of this study was to describe, in a quantitative manner, the perceptions of administrators and college students of dating violence on small rural college campuses, relative to dating violence beliefs and experience, and to describe the knowledge of dating violence policies on small rural college campuses, and to compare the perceptions and knowledge of the two groups. Additionally, perceptions of students by selected demographic were examined: resident versus commuter status, and class standing of under-class (freshmen/sophomores) and upper class (juniors/seniors). Recognizing the differences in perceptions and knowledge is critical because before any policies or programs can be put into place, administration needs to be aware of the current situation at the college. Specifically, administration needs to know how much and what type of dating violence is being experienced by students. No matter how thorough or creative a program might be, if the students are not aware of the programs and policies those programs and policies are not accomplishing their purpose and are of little use.

Support for the study can be found in the literature. In the 2008 Executive Summary of the NASPA-Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education the request is made for campus leaders to examine the current issues, which included dating violence (Carr, 2008). This directly supports the current study's stated purpose of determining if there is indeed a gap between the perceptions of college administrators and the reality reported by students, relative to dating violence on campus. The Healthy Campus 2020 goal of reducing the number of physical assaults, sexual abuse, rape, attempted rape, emotional abuse and intimate partner violence on college

campuses directly supports the purpose of the study (American College Health Association, 2010).

In order to accomplish this purpose of comparing the perceptions of dating violence type and incidence between female students and administrators, and to compare the knowledge of female students and college administrators of campus policies on dating violence, the following research questions were posed. Comparisons were also examined of the differences in knowledge of dating violence within demographic variables of students (resident versus commuter students and underclassmen versus upperclassmen). Survey design necessitated several hypothesis tests for each question, thus the associated hypotheses can be found in Appendix E.

Research Questions

1. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding dating violence on small rural college campuses based on selected demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by classification (freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?
2. What are the perceptions of college administrators and of female students regarding dating violence experiences of female students on small rural college campuses?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of the experience of dating violence between female students and college administrators on small rural college campuses?
4. What is the knowledge of dating violence policy of female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?
5. What are the differences in knowledge between female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?
6. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding knowledge of dating violence policy on small rural college campuses based on selected

demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by classification (freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?

Definition of Terms

The following are definitions of the terms used in this study:

- **Dating violence** is physical or psychological assault or abuse of a person known to but not married to the perpetrator, and is commonly used to refer to someone with whom the perpetrator has a social, sexual, or emotional relationship, but not a kinship relationship (Dating Violence Resource Center, 2002).
- **Violence** can be defined as succinctly as “Violence is anything you wouldn’t want someone to do to you” (Prothrow-Stith, 2007).
- **Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)** is an emotional illness that usually develops as a result of a terribly frightening, life-threatening, or otherwise highly unsafe experience. PTSD sufferers re-experience the traumatic event or events in some way, tend to avoid places, people, or other things that remind them of the event (avoidance), and are exquisitely sensitive to normal life experiences (Centers for Disease Control 2009).
- **Sexual assault** includes kissing, sexual touching, vaginal intercourse, oral/anal sex, or any unwanted sexual conduct or contact (National Center for Victims of Crime).
- **Small rural college:** college defined by Carnegie Commission on Higher Education as small (less than 3000 students), and by the United States Department of Agriculture as rural (an area, or county, having a population of less than 50,000 people) (Carnegie Commission on Higher education).

Summary

Approximately one quarter of college women today are victimized by dating violence while at college. Substantial research has been conducted regarding dating violence on college campuses (CDC, 2009; Carmody, et al, 2009; Fisher, et al, 2009; McMahan, 2008; Tjaden &

Thoennes, 2000; Karjane, et al, 2005), but little if any has been reported specific to small and/or rural college campuses. This study was designed to examine differences in perceptions of female college students and college administrators on small rural college campuses to determine if there exists a difference in their perceptions of the dating violence type and incidence that is experienced on the campus, and to determine if there is a difference in the knowledge of dating violence policy between college administrators and female students.

Additionally, the study sought to determine if the female student perceptions of type and incidence of dating violence, and knowledge of policy, were similar within the demographic variables of resident versus commuter status, and underclassmen versus upperclassmen.

Chapter Two: Review of Literature

Chapter Two addresses support found in the literature for the current study, beginning in Section One with a definition of dating violence and the related health impacts, followed by a discussion of the current status of dating violence as reported by students and as perceived by college administrators, and the relevance of dating violence to college administration programs and decision-making. Section One also includes a brief summary of what is currently being done to address dating violence on college campuses, and a discussion of why dating violence is or is not reported by victims.

Section Two describes the aspects of colleges that denote them as rural, and that identify what constitutes a college as small. Section Two also addresses the issue of the geographic setting of a rural college, and discusses why the subject colleges were chosen for the study. A definition of what constitutes a rural area is included in this section. Also found in Section Two is barriers faced by rural colleges, and supporting evidence that small and/or rural private colleges have unique financial issues.

Section Three addresses predictors of dating violence, including the use of alcohol and of drugs considered “date rape” drugs, and explains the classifications of date rape drugs and how those drugs are used appropriately (if they are), and indicates percentages of dating violence that involve use of date rape drugs. Section Three also contains an explanation of how a date rape drug acts in the human body, via a process known as pharmacodynamics.

Section Four supports the current study by recommendations for further research from previous related studies, in particular the need for stronger dating violence prevention strategies. Section Four also shows support for the use of the Health Belief Model in examining dating violence on college campuses. In Section Five prevention and deterrence of dating violence are addressed.

Section One: Dating Violence Defined

The Dating Violence Resource Center defines dating violence as "... controlling, abusive, and aggressive behavior in a romantic relationship. It occurs in both heterosexual and homosexual relationships and can include verbal, emotional, physical, or sexual abuse, or a combination of these (Dating Violence Resource Center, 2002).

According to the National Women's Health Information Center, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Women's Health, dating violence occurs "...when one person purposely causes physical or psychological harm to another person they [sic] are dating, including sexual assault, physical abuse, and psychological/emotional abuse. It is a serious crime that occurs in both casual and serious relationships, and in both heterosexual and same-sex relationships. Sometimes, a victim might unknowingly ingest alcohol or 'date rape' drugs such as Rohypnol. Date rape drugs are often slipped into a victim's drink while a person is in a social setting such as a club or party. These drugs, as well as alcohol, can make a person unable to resist assault, and can cause a type of amnesia such that the victim is uncertain about what happened. The victim is then left to deal not only with the trauma of the sexual assault, but also with the uncertainty surrounding the specifics of the crime. Unfortunately, most cases of dating violence are not reported to the police" (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services).

Even more disturbing is the phenomenon of "polyvictimization." Polyvictimization refers to a woman who has been victimized by violence once being more likely to become a victim of violence in the future, whether by the same perpetrator or other(s) (Sabina & Straus, 2008). A more concise, "user-friendly" definition of violence comes from Prothrow-Stith (2007), quoting an unnamed psychologist: "Violence is anything you wouldn't want someone to do to you."

Health impacts of dating violence experienced by victims. Psychological and physical problems abound among dating violence victims. Frequently, victims later suffer from depression

and post-traumatic stress disorder. Coker, Weston, Creson, Justice & Blakeney (2005) found a direct correlation between the amount and severity of physical violence and the severity and frequency of post-traumatic stress disorder. Other authors found the same type of correlation between psychological abuse and post-traumatic stress disorder (Coker, et al., 2005; Street and Arias, 2001). Further discussion of the impact of dating violence upon the victim is found in chapter one.

Current status of dating violence on college campuses. The issue of college dating violence is not a new phenomenon. In 2003, Smith, White, and Holland published the results of their longitudinal study of dating violence among college women, a study that was conducted over the subjects' four years of college, with a large sample size of 1,569. The authors were primarily interested in the dating violence recurrence or re-victimization of women. One notable finding from this study was that the women who had been victimized as adolescents were found to be more likely to be victimized during their freshman year of college, and to continue being victimized. This correlation was much stronger than that of students who had been victimized as children, rather than adolescents. Further, there was a significant finding that women who were victimized in any year during college were likely to be victimized again during the same year. Perhaps the most significant finding in this research was that many college women experiencing physical violence were from low-risk populations; one in eight of the women studied had never been victimized prior to college. As a result of this finding, White and Koss (1991) suggest a need to investigate social and other factors that contribute to risk of receiving or perpetrating violence.

In 2013, in an effort to assess and improve the health of America's (at that time) 16.6 million college students, the American College Health Association received completed surveys from 54,111 students from a total of 71 United States postsecondary institutions. Of the surveyed schools, 67 were four-year schools and 16 had fewer than 2,500 students, 33 were private

colleges, and 16 of the 71 were located in rural areas. Results are not broken down to specify responses as to rural versus urban, private versus public, or enrollment size, nor is it clear which, if any, schools were both small and rural. Therefore, it is not known if size or setting of the smaller and/or rural colleges corresponded to a noticeably different dating violence status than that of larger or more urban colleges. Researchers used a combination of web-based surveys, classroom surveys, and mailings, all randomized. Although the 300-question survey included many other areas of health, the predominant variables in the survey were: sexual behavior, alcohol and drug use, violence, safety and security, and mental/physical. Following alcohol use, 1.7 percent of women and 0.8% of men reported having been forced into sex, either directly or via threats. Fifteen percent of women and 17% of men reported having had unprotected sex. As to type of sex, both male and female reported vaginal sex (51% female, 58% male), followed by anal intercourse (23% female, 36% male) and oral intercourse (3% female, 4% male).

A 2009 survey of 290 single college women (Buelna, Ulloa, Ulibarri, 2009) found that 85% of college women reported being victims of some type of dating violence within the previous year. Perhaps as many as one out of four college women have experienced some type of sexual assault (Payne & Fogerty, 2007). According to these same authors, in 2003 the CDC suggested that over 4 million women are victims of violence each year, and women are ten times more likely to be victimized by someone acquainted with the victim. According to research by Roudsari, Leahy, and Walters, (2008) other authors estimate the incidence of dating violence on college campuses ranging from 5% to 30% (Knox, Custis & Zusman, 2000; Spencer & Bryant, 2000) to as high as 66% (Nicholson, et al., 1998; Roscoe & Callahan, 1985; Smith et al., 2003; Spencer & Bryant, 2000; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989; White & Koss, 1991). Roudsari et al. (2008), note that other authors suggest that psychological or verbal abuse occurs in an estimated 88% of college dating couples (Shook et al., 2000; White & Koss, 1991). With regard to sexual assault, women reported verbal threats for sex (4.4%), sexual touching against the victim's will

(11.7%), attempted penetration against will (4.1%), and penetration against will (2.0%). Men's responses indicated a percentage approximately half that of the women in each of the four scenarios. Abusive relationships were reported as: emotionally abusive (women 15%, men 9%), physically abusive (women 2.2%, men 1.6%), and sexually abusive (women 1.95%, men 1.2%) (Payne & Fogerty, 2007).

The U.S. Department of Justice oversees the Office of Violence against Women. Through that office, the Dating Violence Resource Center publishes the "Campus Dating Violence Fact Sheet." The Dating Violence Resource Center, in this fact sheet, reports an incidence of 32% of college students reporting dating violence by a previous partner, with 21% reporting dating violence by a current partner. Further, this report estimates that each year 5% of college women experience a rape or attempted rape. This report contains an additional note that 75% of men and 55% of women report they had been drinking alcohol or taking drugs prior to the incident (Dating Violence Resource Center, 2002). Hertzog and Yeilding (2009) found that class standing influenced whether sexual violence was perceived as a problem by female college students, with upper-classmen being more open to the possibility they could experience sexual violence than under-classmen.

Drysdale, et al. (2010), in compiling data on college campus violence as part of a joint report for the United State Department of Education, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the United States Secret Service, found that between 2005 and 2008 the Department of Education, via the Clery Act, received reports of 13,842 forcible sex offenses and 222 non-forcible sex offenses, representing 5.9 percent and 0.1 percent of all campus crimes, respectively. These authors further noted that incidents had been identified in 42 states and in Washington, DC, with the majority of incidents (57%) occurring in ten states. Further, it was noted that the incidence of violence had steadily escalated since the 1950s (13 incidents) up to 83 incidents by 2008. The authors suggest one reason for the increase may be the increase in media coverage since the middle of the

twentieth century. Additionally, they ponder the increased enrollment at colleges as a factor. In this work, it was noted that 33.9% of assaults were related to an intimate relationship. Ten point one percent were related to refusal of advances or obsession with target, and 9.7% were acquaintance or stranger based sexual violence (Drysdale, et al., 2010). Male and female undergraduate students surveyed about the use of drugs and alcohol in sexual assault reported an incidence of 6.6% of college women having been sexually victimized by men who gave them date rape drugs or alcohol, while 8% of the women in the survey of 280 college students (male and female) reported having thought that they had been given a drug without their knowledge (Girard & Senn, 2008).

When dating violence among community college students in southern Appalachia was examined, findings indicated that approximately one fourth of the 116 students surveyed had been violent towards an intimate partner in the last year (Wetzel, 2005). Wetzel (2005) reported that significant indicators of physical assault and injury among these students included dominance and communication problems. Wetzel found that past injury by an intimate partner resulted in depression-related problems in women; however, the same did not hold true for men. An aspect of this author's work that proved noteworthy was that the findings reported for these Southern Appalachian community college students were not significantly different than those reported by students of other areas, even though there is a perception of a culture of violence in the Southern Appalachians.

Guerette and Caron (2007) noted that 29.4% of reported rapes are of women between the ages of 18 and 24, the age of traditional college students. The Dating Violence Resource Center (2002) states that women and girls aged 16 to 24 are the most likely to be abused in a dating relationship. These statistics indicate that female college students, typically aged 18 to 21 years, have a high possibility of being on the receiving end of dating violence.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Secret Service, and United States

Department of Education published a joint report as an attempt to assist campus officials in identifying the risk of violence at colleges. The authors noted that with colleges there is an inherent difficulty associated with the complexity of a college campus. This complexity is due to the interplay of privacy laws (for example, FERPA, the Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act), academic freedom, civil rights laws, and the combination of a campus being a residence and school (Drysdale, et al., 2010).

What's being done about dating violence on campuses. In 2005 the U.S. Education Department fined Miami University \$27,500 for failing to notify sexual assault victims of the outcome of disciplinary actions related to their cases. Additionally, Miami violated the Clery Act, which requires disclosure of crimes on a college's campus (Hoover, 2005). According to the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Law (1998), all colleges are required to report campus crime statistics annually. In 1999, the American College Health Association released a position statement encouraging campus health professionals to support the struggle against violence on campuses. The Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act of 2000 was created to collect and distribute information regarding sex offenders enrolled at, or employed by, institutions of higher learning.

The 1992 Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights ensured that all victims of sexual assault on campuses are afforded certain rights by any post-secondary institution which receives federal money. As far back as 1994, the Violence Against Women Act mandated the study of campus victimization (Carr, 2005) yet surprisingly, little has been accomplished in that endeavor. In 2005 the Campus Violence White Paper was released by the American College Health Association (Carr, 2005). That organization, via the White Paper, requested that college administrators be proactive against campus violence of any sort. The American College Health Association's Healthy Campus 2020, based upon Healthy People 2020, established as one goal the reduction of physical assaults, sexual abuse, rape, attempted rape, emotional abuse and

intimate partner violence. This goal directly supports the current study's stated purpose of determining if there is indeed a gap between the perceptions of college administrators and the reality reported by students, relative to dating violence on campus. In 2004, the state of Kentucky, in which all subject colleges are located, enacted the Michael Minger Act, which required reporting to the state, the students, and the public any incidences of violence on a college campus (Kentucky Council on Post-Secondary Education, 2014).

One method used to increase awareness of college (and other) intimate partner violence is the Clothesline Project (CLP), which appears frequently on college campuses (Payne & Fogerty, 2007), who reported "The CLP is a program started in 1990 to address the issue of violence against women. It is a vehicle for women affected by violence to express their emotions by decorating a shirt. Many of the shirts detail the violence experienced and can be disturbing. Shirts are then displayed on a clothesline to be viewed by others as testimony to the problem of violence against women." The CLP is available to colleges nationwide as a traveling exhibition. A second program is the Green Dot program, a model that utilizes community members to provide social change. In this model, individuals of various community groups learn strategies to incorporate prevention in daily activities (Gale and Edwards, 2010).

Although not an academic research study, the popular media has become involved, as evidenced in a January 2012 article in *Cosmopolitan* magazine urging readers to submit their colleges' sexual assault policy as part of the magazine's campaign Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) and their Campus Accountability Project (Tuder, 2012).

All fifty states and the District of Columbia have laws against dating violence. In spite of that and the statistics reported in previous paragraphs, 43% of students reported they had not received information about sexual assault/relationship violence from their institutions. One of the most important aspects of preventing dating violence is consent, although who consents to what, and when, appears to be a relatively confusing issue (Borges, Banyard & Moynihan, 2008). This

directly relates to the current study in particular, as it is possible the information was conveyed to students at some of the institutions. In Kentucky, in addition to reporting crimes via the Clery Act, all post-secondary institutions are required to report all campus crimes to their employees, students, and the public on a timely basis via the Michael Minger Act, which took effect in 2004 (<http://www.mingerfoundation.org/legislative-work/minger-act/>, 2014).

In the February 4, 2011, edition of *CQ Researcher*, the publication of Congressional Quarterly Research, there is a suggestion that a confounding factor in campus violence is the section of the Clery Act that exempts college counselors from being required to report incidents of violence or assault reported to the counselors by students. The obvious result of this is that administration might legitimately be unaware of many of the crimes committed, leading to more likelihood of fines for violating the Clery Act. Senator Robert Casey, D-Pennsylvania, is in the process of introducing a proposal (the Sexual Violence Elimination Act) that would strengthen the Clery Act via clearer standards for college policies regarding sexual assault victimization and perpetration. A portion of this proposal would require that colleges state clearly what penalties would be imposed for sexual assault and what options the victim has (*CQ Researcher*, 2011).

Efforts to reduce college dating violence are underway at the federal level. In 2014, the Department of Justice awarded eleven colleges grants, under the auspices of the Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women. The grants were for the purpose of reducing dating violence and sexual assaults on campuses. In concert with this effort Department of Justice personnel have begun a program of meeting with students, administrators, and other stakeholders at the eleven colleges across the United States to research efforts underway at colleges (Inside Higher Ed, 2014)

Additionally, Senator Kirsten Gillibrand of New York has asked the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault to implement these policies: 1) colleges be required to conduct yearly surveys (anonymous) about sexual violence, 2) U.S. Department of

Education appoint an overseer for sexual misconduct on campuses, and 3) that the department's Office for Civil Rights issue updates and create a searchable database regarding dating violence (Inside Higher Ed, 2014).

Reporting rape. Compliance with the Clery Act is difficult when the college is unaware that a problem has occurred. Research by Cohn, Zinzow, Resnick and Kilpatrick (2013) illustrates eight possible reasons for not reporting rape and suggests that among 441 women who experienced rape, the primary three factors were not wanting others to know, non-acknowledgement of rape, and criminal justice concerns. Another study found that college students tended not to disclose rape that is perpetrated by an acquaintance or a date because of that relationship, and that the disclosure rate is further reduced when the victim is an adolescent who is fearful of admitting that alcohol was involved (Rickert, Wiemann and Vaughan, 2005). Of the 86 young women who reported rape, 58% stated they had reported the rape within the following year, but 29 (50%) of those who reported rape only reported it to one individual. In all except one case that individual was a friend or family member. The lone individual did report the rape to police and did seek help from mental health services. Not surprisingly, reporting was less prevalent among those who had willingly gone to a private location with the perpetrator, while those who had fewer previous dates with the perpetrator were more likely to report (Rickert, Wiemann and Vaughan, 2005). Gray (2014) noted that less than half of victims of dating violence report the violence.

In looking at needs of college sexual assault centers, Carmody, et al. (2009) found that the following are the primary needs of college sexual assault centers: strategies for serving international students, funding, increased education and awareness, and statewide coordination of sexual assault services. One such need can possibly be filled by use of the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) program, in which a nurse specialist in sexual assault is called to a hospital to treat and support sexual assault victims.

After a non-specified sexual incident at Colby College in 2011, 15 of the 1,825 students withdrew or were suspended, and the football coach of 23 years resigned, despite police indicating that the completed investigation did not result in any charges of wrongdoing. While the incident remains a mystery to those outside administration, on a positive note, other students rallied to form a club decrying sexual assault and providing a more positive image of the college and its students. Additionally, the college created a staff position to deal with gender and sexuality issues (Smith, 2012).

A recent article in the Washington Post (Anderson, 2014) revealed that 55 colleges (named in the article) were under investigation for inadequate handling of sexual assault claims. This list included small colleges, public universities, Ivy League colleges, and notable institutions of higher education. That this list was released by the Department of Education drives home the point that colleges need to do better at investigating and reporting claims of sexual assault and campus violence.

Section Two: Definition of a “Small Rural College”

The current study addressed small rural four-year colleges in Kentucky, ranked as “small” and “rural” by size (according to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education ranking system) and setting (according to the United States Department of Agriculture). The Carnegie Institute ranking is the standard by which researchers characterize and control for differences in higher education institutions, with category labels that are widely recognized in higher education. (McCormick & Zhao, 2005).

Per the Carnegie Classification (www.carnegiefoundation.org), as the ranking has come to be known, the four colleges addressed in this study meet the criteria for the following:

- Liberal arts
- Designated as ExU4-exclusively undergraduate four year (national average enrollment 1244)

- Designated as S4 or VS4-small or very small four year (small is enrollment of 1000-2999, very small is enrollment less than 1000); enrollment is considered by full-time equivalent (full time plus one-third of full time); selected colleges for study show enrollments of 611-1066 students
- Private
- Not-for-profit
- Geographical setting meets the U.S. Census Bureau definition of “rural”.

Although one fourth of the United States population resides in rural areas, there is a dearth of studies addressing intimate partner violence in rural localities, and none were found addressing intimate partner violence or dating violence at small rural colleges. The majority of studies focuses on larger institutions, or do not specify size/locale. Differences abound in rural and urban settings: when a victim is known to almost everyone in the area, as happens in rural areas, confidentiality can be completely lost. For example, a patient’s close relative (or that of the perpetrator) may be the only professional available in the position of treating the patient. There is a definite lack of the anonymity found in urban areas. Rural communities tend to be more close-knit, with victim and perpetrator having many family ties to the area and thus the victim, perpetrator and police officer possibly tied via familial connection, versus the ties found in an urban area (Annan, 2008). These issues may spill over into local colleges. Rural colleges may tend to attract students who live in the area, frequently those who wish to stay close to family and familiar territory because they need babysitters, are afraid to drive in a city, or are very involved with, and prefer to stay close to, family. Further, very small rural colleges do not tend to have any form of student health services, so students must use medical and health facilities available in the area, which leads back to the issues of confidentiality and lack of anonymity. For the purposes of the current study, the comparison colleges selected are in counties which meet

the definition of rural according to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the U.S. Census Bureau, and are listed by OMB as rural.

The U.S. Census Bureau defines rural/non-metro as an area (such as a county) having a population of less than 50,000 people (van Dis, Mahmoodiam, Goddik & Dimitrievich, 2002). Other authors (Bosch & Schumm, 2004) have suggested that counties not within easy commuting distance of an area offering at least 10,000 jobs are rural. Rural describes the living environment of approximately one-fourth of the U.S. population (Annan, 2008). Institutions, including colleges, located within a rural-defined area are considered rural. A characteristic of rural areas includes the existence of little or no public service coverage, illustrated by the fact that half the rural police departments in the U.S. have ten or fewer police officers, many of them working only part-time (Annan, 2008). Of the four subject colleges in the current study, none have dedicated campus police departments.

Shannon, Logan, Cole and Medley (2006) described rural areas as counties which were 78-100% rural. A frequently used identification system for U.S. counties is the “Rural Continuum Code” of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, specifying counties as “urban, large rural, or small rural” (Moore, Probst, Tompkins, Cuffe & Martin, 2007). Beattie and Shaughnessy (2000), in their work on interviews with Kentucky women who had been imprisoned (and later paroled) for killing their abusers, identified nearly 100% of their subjects from Kentucky as being from rural areas. Generally, rural communities are viewed as being more bucolic and peaceful than urban settings, but frequently the opposite is found as neighbors are found not to act on behalf of the common good (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2008).

One group of authors studied patterns of men in rural areas who abuse their partners, using a rural area of population 11,624 and a sample size of 100 (Peek-Asa, Zwerling, Young, Stromquist, Burmeister & Merchant, 2005). The current study includes small colleges (student body less than 3000) in rural counties (populations between 11,000 and 70,000), similar to the

geographic population examined by Peek-Asa, et al (2005).

Barriers faced by small rural colleges. Geographical isolation inherent in rural areas encompasses an array of issues for both colleges and community: few police officers spread over a larger area, bad and sometimes impassable roads, no public transportation, lower telephone subscription rates, and increased difficulty of receiving cell signals due to topography and fewer cell towers (Annan, 2008). For a student who lives on-campus in a rural college and has no personal transportation, the issue is intensified: dorms are small, there are few places and limited hours for meals, and it becomes difficult to avoid someone with whom you've had problems. Increased poverty and social isolation are much more of a problem in rural than in urban areas (Bhandari, et al., 2008). The National Centers for Excellence in Women's Health do not provide services in rural areas (Hillemeier, Weiseman, Baker & Primavera, 2005). Rural women use less or different types of health services than their urban cohorts, and tend more to utilize attorneys rather than the police and victim advocate used by urban women; urban women view the justice system as more helpful than do rural women (Shannon et al., 2006). Urban women tend to use Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous more frequently, and also tend to discuss the situation with friends more readily than do rural women (Shannon, et al., 2006). This is not surprising, in that rural women are likely more familiar with a culture of "aloneness."

One common characteristic of rural areas which complicates situations involving dating violence or domestic violence is the problem of lack of law enforcement, illustrated by the fact that half of the rural police departments in the U.S. have ten or fewer police officers, many of them working only part-time (Annan, 2008). As small rural colleges are likely to have only minimal security hired by the college, there is more of a dependence upon municipal/county law enforcement, such as state police, municipal police, and sheriff's departments. This lack of law enforcement presents a problem for victims of dating violence on rural campuses, particularly those campuses that have little or no security staff. Noticeably difficult is the logistical problem

of the officer(s) getting to a dating violence incident in time to prevent harm to the victim. For example, Kentucky State Police Post #15 covers two counties. According to the Post 15 Kentucky State Police lieutenant interviewed for this study, the state police have from one to four troopers on the clock at any given time covering two counties, including the county that is home to one of the subject colleges. The number of troopers on duty at one time is relevant to the day of the week and time of day. The state police reportedly try to have more officers out on weekends and from 4:00 p.m. until 4:00 a.m. as their data show that this is when the most manpower is needed. These officers are covering approximately 30,000 people in 650 square miles (U.S. Census, 2000). The total road mileage for the two counties, covered by state police and a combination of sheriff's office and municipal police, is 963 miles of road (508 total public road miles in one county and 455 total public road miles in the adjacent county). There also exist numerous small, private roads that, while not routinely patrolled, officers may need to access on a call. Complicating this is that a small, sparsely inhabited gravel road may be not only difficult to traverse, but actually unknown to the officer. In some cases it can be difficult to determine exactly where the public road ends and a private drive begins.

As regards any type of domestic violence calls, including dating violence, per a command post captain, the Kentucky State Police policy is that domestic violence is considered a priority and the closest two troopers will be sent. Sending two troopers on a domestic violence call is a safety precaution for the officers; additionally, the presence of two officers allows the physical separation of the parties involved and the capacity to interview each individual outside the presence of the other in order to determine what actually happened, if charges are needed, and if so, whom to charge with what. The Kentucky Revised Statutes do not provide leeway for an officer dealing with a domestic situation; the law reads that the KSP "shall" arrest if there is sign of violence, rather than "may" arrest, as in other statutes. In relation to geographic isolation in rural areas, if the trooper covering two counties under Post 15 is on duty is in the southern part of

one county, to reach the northern part of the other county is approximately 50 miles, and about half of that is curvy, hilly back roads such that it is impossible to drive at speeds much above 45 miles per hour. Although one subject college is located approximately at the middle of these two counties, response time can vary substantially due to manpower, geography, and serendipity (relative to the trooper's location when called, and what other call he may be already be responding to at the time). Thus, for a dating violence incident at this subject college, it seems likely that the college would be dependent upon, in addition to the lone college security officer on campus, a combination of city police officers and the county sheriff's office. However, note should be made that for that particular county the sheriff's office does not provide 24-hour law enforcement services, other than an "on call" basis. This subject college, which is probably the most geographically isolated, is less subject to the vagaries of mountain terrain than are the other three subject colleges.

When a police officer, whether state police, sheriff's office, city police or campus police does respond to a dating violence call, that officer must make a decision as to whether or not to arrest the perpetrator, try to calm and separate the participants, or suggest that the victim apply for a restraining order (Trujillo & Ross, 2008). A campus security officer who is not a law enforcement officer does not have arrest powers, so potentially will have to decide whether to call local law enforcement for assistance or try to defuse the situation without assistance. Factors that influence the officer's decision on how to handle the situation include first and foremost, the level of fear expressed by the victim, which seems to give legitimacy to the victim's complaint (Trujillo & Ross, 2008).

Other factors influencing the officer's decision include previous calls for the same couple, severity of the violence involved, and indications of previous violence history of the offender (Trujillo & Ross, 2008). Additionally, whether the perpetrator is armed would influence the officer's decision. When the incident occurs on a college campus, the officer's actions and

decision-making are likely to be complicated by the relationship of the college and the community, and the fact that either or both parties are likely to be tuition-paying students. Thus, it would seem that a strong policy might include requesting the presence of a college official when an incident occurs. And while most colleges have sexual assault crisis centers on campus (Carmody, et al., 2009), it is very likely not financially feasible for a college with less than 2000 students to have such a resource.

An additional difference between intimate partner violence in rural and urban areas is that in rural areas the victim and perpetrator are much more likely to have some level of “connectedness” to the courts, to law enforcement, and to health care workers, making it much more difficult and more sensitive to ask for help (Websdale, 1995 and 1998). For the same reason, patients are less likely to ask their physician for advice in a rural area (van Dis, et al., 2002). According to Websdale (1998) there is little outside influence in rural areas, and the society tends to be more patriarchal, both factors that contribute to the idea that urban solutions cannot logically always be applied to rural situations.

Small private colleges and rural colleges face financial pressures not completely like those in larger or more urban institutions. They are already under fire as a result of the economic recession beginning in 2008, with national declines in the number of traditional-age college students. By 2012 college enrollment (freshmen) declined up to ten percent in private colleges, from the 2010 level. Smaller colleges tend to have smaller endowments and be tuition-dependant, so student retention becomes a critical factor. Rural colleges have their own set of problems, as many are in areas with shrinking populations and facing the additional problem that the college student base is tending more toward minority students and those from urban areas (Ryvard, 2013).

Another group of researchers cited the vulnerability of campuses to violence, noting that date rape, stalking, abuse and harassment all occur on campuses today, and quote Gruber (1992)

as stating that harassment occurs more in male-dominated environs such as academic settings (Fletcher & Bryden, 2007) in their survey of college faculty and staff. Carmody et al. note the unique situation of a college environment, relative to sexual assault, in that a greater number of people are concentrated in a small area, and that college campuses are traditionally areas prone to both increased dating and increased alcohol use (Carmody et al., 2009).

Section Three: Dating Violence Predictors

There is little doubt that dating violence is one of the less pleasant social phenomena of recent decades, or that prevention strategies are becoming more important before dating violence segues into marital violence (Baker & Stith 2008). In examining risk factors for dating violence Baker and Stith (2008) found that for college men who exhibit violence toward their dating partner low anger management abilities and the partner's use of physical aggression were the most prevalent motivators for dating violence. Of the 118 undergraduate college men studied (86% Caucasian), 35 reported being physically violent (shoving, arm-twisting, throwing an object at, or grabbing their partner) within the past year. Suggestions for future dating violence prevention programming emerging from this study included primarily two components: teaching participants to respond to partner aggression in ways that do not include "retaliation," and promoting help-seeking when victimized. When Stephens and George (2009) surveyed 146 college men they found that past history of self-reported aggressive sexual behavior may be of use in predicting whether men are at high risk for future sexual aggression. These authors suggest that a good starting place for high-risk sexually aggressive men would be with attitudes toward rape, and with rape myth acceptance.

A second factor noted in the instances of dating violence was that of "relationship power." Buelna, Ulloa, and Ulibarri (2008), in their work correlating sexually transmitted infections with dating violence prevalence, determined that a lack of relationship power tended to be prevalent among female victims of dating violence. One factor possibly related to relationship

power is “consent.” Consent (or the lack of it), whether given or received, is one of the most critical aspects of dating violence, and all too frequently students are unsure of exactly what is meant by consent, when it must be given, and under what circumstances it is given (Borge, et al., 2008).

The third factor used to predict dating violence victimization for women is prior victimization, whether of self or friend. When victimized by violence as young adolescents, it was determined that older adolescents were at more than twice the risk of being victimized by sexual dating violence as were non-victimized adolescents. The most intense predictor was being hit by an adult, usually a parent (Foshee, Benefield, Ennett, Bauman & Suchindran, 2004). Although this research was designed to determine dating violence occurrence in 8th-9th graders, it seems likely that once the pattern of victimization is established it would persist into the early years in college, if not beyond. A similar result was found in a study documenting a willingness among college students to accept aggression as a predictor of dating violence (Merten & Williams, 2009). In a related study Merten (2008) found that length of a relationship tended to be a predictor of the acceptance of dating violence. Helweg-Larsen, Harding and Kleinman (2008) found that 66% of a sample of 1,545 college students had already been victimized in high school. Additionally, this group posited that perception of risk of future violence accurately predicts future violence. Smith, et al., (2003) suggest that dating violence in the past predicted similar abuse throughout the college experience. Childhood sibling violence proved to be a weak predictor of dating violence, with perpetration of dating violence following perpetration of sibling violence a slightly stronger predictor than victimization of sibling violence and dating violence. Additionally, father-to-child and mother-to-father violence were found to be predictors of dating violence (Noland, Liller, McDermott, Coulter & Seraphine, 2004).

A fourth factor all too common in dating violence is the use of alcohol and/or drugs, specifically the drugs known as “date rape” drugs, whether the victim knowingly ingests these

substances or not. According to the Dating Violence Resource Center (2002), 75% of men and 55% of women involved in acquaintance rape were using alcohol and/or drugs prior to the incident. In 41% of the college violence incidents reported, the perpetrator was reportedly under the influence of alcohol (Hart, 2003). “Date fighting” was found to be associated with other health-risk behaviors among college students, particularly the use of alcohol, amphetamines, pain pills, and hallucinogens. For women who reported being victims of date fighting a direct relationship was noted between rate of victimization and reported rate of other health-risk behaviors including alcohol, drugs, multiple sex partners and other types of violence (DuRant, et al., 2007). These authors suggest that the connection between date fighting and other health-risk behaviors is a two-way street in that date fighting can be a result of, or a contributing factor to, other health-risk behaviors. Date fighting in this study was determined as physical violence only, thus was not all-inclusive of the range of behaviors generally considered as constituting dating violence; rather, it constitutes being a part of dating violence. Further, DuRant, et al. (2007) noted that for their study the students reporting decided for themselves what behaviors included date fighting.

Results of a study on college women’s alcohol use related to detection of date-rape risk showed that besides decreasing inhibitions, alcohol negatively affects the ability to recognize when a situation with a date is becoming a high-risk situation for dating violence, and that when the risk is finally recognized, recognition takes longer to occur (Loiselle & Fuqua, 2007). Other notable findings from Loiselle and Fuqua (2007) included that 57% of women who reported experiencing sexual assault by a date cited alcohol influencing the partner who committed the violence, 57% of the victims were under alcohol influence, 57% of the assaults included use of physical force, and 14% of the victims were afraid of injury or death. Whether the three statistics of 57% were the same subjects for the three vignettes of alcohol influence of perpetrator, alcohol influence of victim, and use of physical force is not specified in this study.

Alcohol is not the only substance associated with dating violence. Other substances associated with possibly unintended sexual events, or at least loosened sexual inhibitions, on campuses, in addition to alcohol, include marijuana, cocaine, and occasionally lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD) and methamphetamine, although the last two tend to have been replaced by the club drugs (Smith, Larive & Romanelli, 2002).

In the last decade there has been a tsunami of the use of “date rape drugs,” also known as “club drugs.” The list of club drugs includes gamma-hydroxybutyrate (GHB), flunitrazepam (Rohypnol, or “roofies”), Ketamine, and 3,4-Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA, or ecstasy). According to Smith, Larive, and Romanelli (2002) club drugs are defined as “chemical substances used recreationally in an attempt to enhance social experiences.” Smith, Larive and Romanelli, in their 2002 study, address the intended uses and pharmacology of these drugs as noted in the following paragraphs. Although the users intend these drugs to result in a positive experience, the unfortunate side effect of the loosened inhibitions caused by these drugs can be date rape. MDMA (also known as hug drug, Adam, lover’s speed, X, roll, M, bean, clarity; but primarily as the more frequently heard “ecstasy”) has, among other effects, increased libido, increased energy, and a sense of increased intimacy. Flunitrazepam, a benzodiazepine (skeletal muscle relaxant) much like diazepam (Valium) is marketed as Rohypnol and its use has been documented in cases of date rape, particularly as it is associated with aggressive behavior. Ketamine, a local anesthetic frequently used in veterinary medicine, has side effects that compound the problems that make it harder to avoid date rape: it provides a dissociative effect (“floating above one’s body”) along with decreased coordination. Both effects make it harder to resist an aggressive date. GHB, a Schedule I controlled substance, is often used as a date rape drug because it can be quickly dissolved in a drink and the recipient of the drug suffers amnesia and lost consciousness, making resistance almost non-existent, and decreasing the likelihood of reporting the assault due to amnesia (Girard & Senn, 2008). GHB is also used as a sexual

stimulant (Smith, et al., 2002). Schedule I controlled substances, including GHB, cannot be obtained legally in the United States except with special permits for research purposes. Schedule I controlled substances (such as heroin and LSD) have no medical use in this country, and are classified as Schedule I because of the high potential for abuse. As with alcohol and other drugs, date rape drugs are referenced here for their contributions to and association with dating violence. Other than this association these substances were not specifically addressed in the current study.

Are there places and/or events which students commonly associate with fear of dating violence? Fear of violence or sexual aggression at fraternity parties versus non-fraternity parties was investigated in a study undertaken by Menning (2009). Students in this study reported that they perceived neither situation as a “fear spot,” in spite of parties, particularly fraternity parties, being perceived as events with more inherent danger of sexual violence, and women did not report feeling unsafe at any higher level than was reported by men.

In addition to the factors mentioned above, Drysdale, et al., (2010) noted that freshmen are dealing with their new “independence” as they are now becoming responsible for themselves, including such life decisions as academic, social, and health decisions. While some may be more comfortable talking with friends or making use of campus counselors, others may tend to withdraw or use more drugs and/or alcohol. Although help from parents may remain an option, it is up to the student to decide to use that option. This new-found independence potentially could impact a student’s vulnerability to dating violence.

Section Four: Justification for Study/Further Research Needed

In the joint study of the U.S. Secret Service, the Institute of Higher Education, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation safety for those on college campuses is specified as a “vital task” (Drysdale, et al., 2010). According to Prothrow-Stith (2007), violence should be considered a problem of health and of public health, and indeed is “...more of a problem on your campus than you think.” Prothrow-Stith further notes that zero-tolerance violence policies and mandatory

sentences have less effect on two people who know each other and act/react emotionally, than on strangers who are looking for prey. This is of particular importance on a small rural campus, where it is more likely that perpetrator and victim have unavoidable and possibly regular interaction in classes, dorms, organizations, libraries, student services, and food services.

The organization NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, in 2008 released an executive summary, “New Directions in Student Services,” intended as a guideline for college administrators to use in management of campus violence incidents. In support of the current study, the model stresses the importance of four key areas: prevention, preparedness, response and recovery; more specifically, the role of students, faculty, and staff. Examples of items suggested for inclusion consist of ways to train staff (such as faculty) to: 1) use the chosen prevention and preparedness model, 2) map violence incidents on campus; and 3) use information discovered about violence on the campus to inform decision-making, involve students in developing and presenting training opportunities, and consider having campus police/security accredited in dealing with campus violence, use a model to address violence issues, clarify administrative roles in the process, and designate a specific mode of communication to be used in dating (or other) violence . The authors conclude by emphasizing the increased responsibility of campus administration to provide safety for students on campus.

In their study on the correlation of dating violence with heavy alcohol use by college students, Roudsari et al., (2008) suggest a need for the study to be repeated with the inclusion of non-heavy alcohol-using students. The proposed study addresses all students, both heavy alcohol-using, non-heavy alcohol-using, and non-alcohol-using, without specification of which category fits the student. These authors repeatedly stress the importance of attention by student affairs specialists and faculty to prevention measures, which supports the current study’s intent to determine if student perceptions are the same as those of faculty and/or administration, relative to dating violence (Hertzog & Yeilding, 2009).

Research questions posed in the current study are supported in a study of dating violence among college students in an Appalachian college (Wetzel, 2005). Fletcher and Bryden (2007) also called for more campus awareness of violence of all types, and increased administrative policy development to deter violence. Specifically, these authors contend that colleges are prone to compromised safety as regards violence, and suggest a need for multi-site research into violence on college campuses, as is addressed in the current study. White and Koss (1991) suggest a need to investigate social and other factors that contribute to the risk of receiving or perpetrating violence.

Results of a study in which college students were asked to assign “blame” for date rape during alcohol and/or drug induced sexual assault suggested that sexual assault involving alcohol or drug use is a problem on college campuses, and that there exists a need for further research into the attitudes and incidence relating to drug-facilitated and/or alcohol-facilitated sexual assault among college students (Girard & Senn, 2008). Implications of this study included a need for further research based upon the unintended consequences (to the victim) of lessened “victim” status, in part due to an inability to report the assault when there is no memory of it.

Further need for the research in the current study is supported by a current lawsuit filed against Dominican College by the mother of a student who committed suicide after becoming despondent over the college’s lack of response to her report of being a victim of gang rape on campus. That the student followed proper channels in reporting the rape and going to a hospital afterward is not in dispute, nor is there dispute that hospital documentation supported her claim of being raped. In spite of this the college is requesting that charges be dropped in view of a videotape, made outside the room where the alleged rape occurred, in which a student holds up a note allegedly written by the rape victim and claiming “I want to have sex.” Complicating this case is the potential conflict of interest by the police detective investigating the rape, a part-time faculty member at the college. This particular small college (2000 students) has a history of being

fined for inaccurate statistics in its Clery reports (cqresearcher.com, 2011).

Payne and Fogerty (2007) note the importance of cognition of dating violence to college administrators, counselors, and faculty. This is relevant to the current study's stated purpose of describing dating violence on small rural campuses, and supports the importance of the study's goal of providing current dating violence information to college administration. When the Office of Justice Statistics researched violence statistics for college students, the Bureau of Justice Statistics determined that the average student enrollment for full and part time students from 1995 to 2002 was approximately 7.9 million (students aged 18-24 years). Although overall violence against college students was found to occur at a lower rate than violence against non-students, the report noted that 43 out of 1,000 college women were likely to be the victims of violence, with rape/sexual assault accounting for 3.8% (Baum & Klaus, 2005). Other authors have suggested that programs on sexual assault and/or rape be included as a routine topic in educational curriculae and that programs be directed toward an emphasis on prevention information relating to context (for example, parties) (Menning, 2009). In this regard the author suggests that this study be repeated on other campuses, and at a level to determine the finding that women do not tend to feel fear at parties, in spite of known danger signs found there (Menning, 2009). Certainly more research is needed into how to teach victims ways to respond to partner abuse and into how to convince victims to seek help when abused, according to Baker and Stith (2008), who also support more research into factors that predict abuse. Research on interventions for women who are at risk of re-victimization is an established need (Stein, et al., 2009).

Further support of the current study is found in the Chronicle of Higher Education, referencing the incident in mentioned in Chapter One, in which Miami University received a \$27,500 fine for violation of the Clery Act and failure to notify sexual assault victims of their case outcomes. Had Miami University administration been more aware of the extent and severity of dating violence on the campus, it seems reasonable that the university would have paid more

attention to the ramifications to the university of failing to address dating violence properly, whether in prevention, treatment, or reporting of dating violence (Hoover, 2005).

Lamis, et al. (2009) studied the relationship between alcohol use and suicide among college students. If future research is needed this group suggests that the relationship between alcohol use and suicide among college students be examined using subjects from different groupings of students (socioeconomic, religion, ethnic differences) to determine if their findings hold true across the majority of college students. Amar and Alexy (2005) note that more studies are needed to address suicide among college students in order that college administrators can improve their suicide interventions. Given the established link between alcohol and dating violence (Dating Violence Resource Center, 2002; Hart, 2003; Loiselle & Fuqua, 2007) and the suicidal ideation found among college dating violence victims (Amar & Alexy, 2005) there would be reasonable expectation that the findings of these researchers might apply to all college students, including those attending small rural colleges, in spite of the geographical isolation. Further, it is expected that results of such studies can indeed have a positive effect upon the policies and programs college administrators develop as dating violence interventions, particularly as most of these studies were done on larger, more urban campuses. Suicide, including that resulting from dating violence, has thus become a significant concern on college campuses, given the results of the above studies.

When police, whether local or campus or unarmed security staff, have a realistic picture of an intimate partner violence victim or incident, including who is and who is not likely to report violence, training and procedures are improved to the benefit of all involved parties (Akers & Kaukinen, 2008). Likewise, the more accurate and complete dating violence information that campus administrators receive from students, the more likely it is that the college dating violence prevention programs will be in line with the true experience at the college. Trujillo and Ross (2008) provided data suggesting that further study of police officers' perceived risk to self in

dating violence situations, via employment of the Health Belief Model, could provide intriguing follow-up research.

Carmody, et al. (2009) supported the findings of increased need for sexual assault prevention efforts and with campuses sharing “best practices” and resources being mutually supportive rather than competitive. This group further suggests that students do pay attention to sexual assault programs and support efforts to increase awareness. In follow-up discussion of their research on needs of sexual assault advocates in campus sexual assault centers Carmody, et al., (2009) suggest further research is needed into risk-reducing strategies and campus violence prevention, and in particular the availability of more strategies to reduce risk.

Use of the Health Belief Model. The Health Belief Model has been used to predict whether someone will participate in a dating violence prevention program (Cornelius, Sullivan, Wynargden & Milliken, 2009). In a study based on matching the components of the Health Belief Model to likelihood of attending a dating violence prevention program, the above authors determined a significant relationship between perceived susceptibility to dating violence and perceived benefits of attending a dating violence prevention program. Among the particularly important findings of this study was the emergence of evidence that the more convenient and easily attended a program is, the more likely it is that the target population will attend the dating violence prevention programs. This finding would seem to forge a logical progression to the concept that “convenience” and “easily attended” would be positively related to knowledge that such a program exists at one’s school. Cornelius, et al. (2009) suggest two things: 1) that recruitment methods for attendance at dating violence prevention programs should be based upon a theoretical model, and 2) that the relationship of perceptions and beliefs of susceptibility and barriers to dating violence should provide impetus in program planning.

Further support for use of the Health Belief Model in dating violence can be found in the literature: the decision-making process police employ to assess the police action needed in a

particular situation and the perceived risk to self of intervention. Trujillo and Ross (2008) found that police actions are influenced by the level of perceived risk of the victim. The Health Belief model would lend itself well to determining perceived risk based upon prior experience, according to results found by Foshee, et al. (2004).

Section Five: Prevention of Dating Violence

At one level or another sexual assault has been brought to the forefront since the Women's Movement in the 1970s (Carmody, et al., 2009). In one of the many related studies conducted since that time, Karjane, et al., (2005) found that most prevention of dating violence is designed to occur at the policy level, rather than at a more "up close and personal" level of training in resistance of personal assault. Support services were found to be offered at many campuses and in communities, but were more focused on risk assessment and survivors' services (Foubert & Marriott, 1997). Potter, Krider, and McMahon (2000) suggest that increased emphasis needs to be paid to promotion of healthy behaviors. Teaching healthy behaviors – what to do, rather than what not to do – is mentioned as a needed priority by Berkowitz (2001). As mentioned earlier, consent becomes an issue (Borge, et al., 2008), specifically in that it could be confusing as to what exactly defines consent (Lim & Roloff, 1999). This pro-active stance was exhibited by Currier (2009).

In teaching a university course on Women and Violence, in which a specific course goal was to encourage students to find ways to decrease violence, Currier determined that there was a change in students' attitudes toward women and violence. Her study of this single semester course revealed that specific courses aimed at violence against women could indeed improve attitudes about rape victims and about assigning blame to victims. Results of this study suggested that men and younger students were more apt to believe rape myths and in general be less sympathetic to rape victims (Currier & Carlson, 2009). In preventing sexual assault and rape, colleges tend to focus on stranger rape, self-defense, and programs involving escorting women to

their cars (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton & Banyard, 2009). The unfortunate reality is that these programs tend to ignore acquaintance rape, which is more prevalent, as Potter, et al., (2009) report on the findings of Fisher (2000) and Karjane, et al. (2005). Potter, et al. (2009) encourage the use of a media campaign to increase community involvement in sexual assault prevention. This group instituted a month-long poster campaign regarding campus sexual violence and found that those who reported seeing the posters exhibited a greater awareness of campus violence. Further, these authors noted that “provocative imagery” inspired contemplation of sexual violence, thus leading to increased awareness. Smith, et al. (2003) suggest as an implication for prevention that if dating violence can be prevented during adolescence, it is more likely to be avoided during subsequent years.

Drysdale, et al. (2010) examined pre-incident behaviors and found that in 29% of cases of direct assault the subjects had previously displayed threats toward the victim, ranging from threatening communication to stalking/harassing. It is not specified whether these assaults were related to dating violence or more “general” campus violence. However, they did observe that in 19% of incidents the behaviors occurred within either a current or former relationship or in non-romantic settings.

Borge, et al., (2008) suggest that improvement in dating violence prevention programs is a primary need on college campuses. In this group’s research on consent, they discovered a positive impact from a short program on sexual consent, and suggested that policies addressing consent be a fundamental part of dating violence programs. The problem in policies and programs is that “... policies are only as effective as peoples’ understanding and use of them.” Menning (2009) found that when college administration attempted to provide dating violence information, no effect on the level of concern was apparent among students, which supports Borge, et al.’s 2008 assertion regarding the effectiveness of policies.

One innovative leader in preventing sexual assaults on campus has been in the forefront

in recent months. University of Kentucky President Eli Capilouto has stated that preventing sexual assault is a priority at the University, and has been featured on national television for his efforts to prevent assaults. The University of Kentucky did a campus wide survey on sexual assault ten years ago, and at that time began involving the entire campus community in prevention. The University has since trained more than 5000 students in “how to recognize risky situations, intervene, and do it in a creative way” (Brammer, 2014).

Technology can have an impact upon campus dating violence. Baton Rouge Community College has installed more lighting in parking lots, surveillance cameras, printed emergency information on the back of parking tags and building swipe cards, all in addition to enhancements to phone, computer, security alert systems and text-messaging. At Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College a preparedness mentality has resulted in more stringent qualifications for campus security personnel, regular drills to determine security effectiveness, and a working relationship with the community which involves community emergency personnel periodically visiting the campus to maintain knowledge of buildings and parking lots (Halligan, 2009).

Chapter Three: Methods

Studies of dating violence in colleges exist in the literature, but not studies specific to small rural colleges with one exception: a study of intimate partner violence among Appalachian Community College students (Wetzel, 2005). The purpose of the current study was to remedy that information deficit by providing a quantitative description of dating violence on four small rural college campuses in Kentucky by identifying the differences in perceptions of dating violence beliefs and experiences of female students and college administrators on small rural campuses. The study also identified those differences in perceptions of resident versus commuter students, and of underclassmen versus upperclassmen. Research questions answered are found below. The nature of the survey required a large number of hypotheses, found in Appendix E.

1. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding dating violence on small rural college campuses based on selected demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by classification (freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?
2. What are the perceptions of college administrators and of female students regarding dating violence experiences of female students on small rural college campuses?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of the experience of dating violence between female students and college administrators on small rural college campuses?
4. What is the knowledge of dating violence policy of female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?
5. What are the differences in knowledge between female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?
6. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding knowledge of dating violence policy on small rural college campuses based on selected

demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by classification (freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?

Data collected were used to test the null hypotheses. Due to survey design, several sets of hypotheses were developed for each question. Hypotheses can be found in Appendix E.

A common method used in research studies of intimate partner violence is the use of the survey (Eastman, Bunch, Williams & Carawen, 2007). Researchers frequently use the Conflict Tactics Scale to determine the level of intimate partner violence in the home (Cohen, et al., 2005; Bailey & Daugherty, 2007). Another scale used is the Women Experiencing Battering (WEB) scale (Coker, et al., 2007). Relative to the current study, Hertzog and Yeilding (2009) surveyed 134 college women to determine their perceptions of acquaintance rape using a 75-question survey instrument, comprised in part by the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance (IRMA) survey. As in the current study, Hertzog and Yeilding (2009) used a combination of questions from previous surveys to compile their acquaintance rape survey. Lonsway and Kothari (2000) examined the success of mandatory acquaintance rape education programs among college freshmen using the short form of the IRMA scale, along with the Victim Evaluation Questionnaire. These researchers also used a combination of surveys administered to students in psychology classes and follow-up telephone surveys. Whatever scale is used, a survey research method seems to be effective in determining many issues related to intimate partner violence (Burke, O'Campo, Peak, 2006; Peek-Asa, et al., 2005; Arnette, Mascaro, Santana, Davis & Kaslow, 2007; Stein, Tran & Fisher, 2009).

In a study somewhat similar to the current study Merten (2009) surveyed 264 male and 390 female college students, although this study occurred at a large university rather than at a small rural college. Merten's 2009 research involved in-class questionnaires distributed to unmarried college students, questioning attitudes toward marital violence along with demographics similar to those for the current study. As in the current study, Merten's subjects

were college students aged 18 to 25 years, and with the following demographics: 20% freshmen, 21% sophomores, 21% juniors, and 38% seniors; with 91% of the participants being Caucasian, the rest a mix of African-American, Asian, and Hispanic. This demographic is very similar to that of the current study. Smith, et al. (2003), in their study correlating previous dating violence as a predictor of college dating violence, were among the few researchers who examined dating violence in a small (although not rural) college in Pennsylvania, surveying 192 female undergraduate students. Support for the current study's questions regarding methods of disseminating dating violence information is found in Hertzog and Yeilding (2009). College women who have experienced dating violence perceived a higher expected rate (55%) of dating violence among classmates than is perceived by college women who have not experienced dating violence (43%) (Stein, Tran & Fisher, 2009). This finding is supported by Helweg-Larsen, et al. (2008).

Subject Selection & Recruitment

College selection. Since all or most of the prior research on dating violence on college campuses focuses on urban and/or large colleges, or does not identify the geographic setting and/or size of the college, the current study focused on small and rural colleges. Determination of which of the colleges to be used in the proposed study was a convenience sample of four of Kentucky's eight colleges designated as EXU4, based upon the Carnegie Institute rankings of colleges by size and setting.

The eight colleges in Kentucky identified as both small (per Carnegie ranking) and rural (per Agriculture Rural Continuum Code) were invited to participate in the study. One of the colleges invited chose not to participate, one did not respond, and two were willing but scheduling did not permit their participation. Administrators at four of the eight colleges in Kentucky accepted the invitation and were chosen as a convenience sample representative of small rural colleges. For purposes of anonymity, in the study the subject colleges were designated

as College A, College B, College C, and College D. Three of the four subject colleges are in rural Appalachian counties and one is in a rural non-Appalachian county.

Inclusive selection criteria for subject colleges were the following: primarily undergraduate four year institutions which are private, not-for-profit liberal arts college designated as EXU4 by Carnegie ranking system (very small, with student body full-time equivalent less than 1,000) or small (student body less than 2,999) and rural (population less than 50,000 people). Although all four colleges do have graduate programs, the majority of the student population at all four colleges was undergraduate. All four colleges met the size criteria for small or very small, and all four were located in geographical settings meeting the U.S. Census Bureau definition of “rural.” Non-rural colleges were excluded, as were those with undergraduate student bodies of more than 3,000. A further explanation of the “small” and “rural” criteria is found below.

Small colleges were defined according to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, established in 1967 to make recommendations on issues facing U.S. higher education. One of the products of the Carnegie report was determining ways in which to differentiate various higher education institutions. This Carnegie report has now become the standard by which researchers characterize and control for differences in higher education institutions, with category labels that are widely recognized in higher education (McCormick & Zhao, 2005).

Subject colleges were selected as rural according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Continuum Code, and the U.S. Census Bureau definition of rural as having a population less than 50,000 people. According to the Rural Continuum Code, Kentucky counties have an average rural-urban rating of 5.65, on a rural continuum scale of 1-9. This rating would place Kentucky approximately in the middle of rural versus urban states, according to the continuum code. Therefore, Kentucky is considered a good example of a state with similar amounts of rural and urban population. Kentucky has a mix of Appalachian and non-Appalachian rural counties;

however, it should be noted that most Appalachian counties are also considered rural. A more precise explanation of what constitutes “rural” can be found in the following paragraphs.

“Rural” has been described variously by several authors. Bosch and Schumm (2004) suggest that counties not within easy commuting distance of an area offering at least 10,000 jobs are rural, while Shannon et al. (2006) described rural areas as 78-100% rural population. According to Annan (2008) approximately one-fourth of the U.S. population lives in rural areas. The Rural Continuum Code specifies counties as “urban, large rural, or small rural” (Moore et al., 2007). Using the above criteria, the colleges selected for the study were all geographically located in rural counties (populations less than 70,000).

Participant Selection

Administrators. Participants for this survey were a convenience sample of two groups: female college students aged 18 years or above and college administrators, including “other professionals” at the four selected small rural colleges. “Administrators” includes the following definition from the Integrated Post Secondary Education System (“IPEDS”) under the National Center for Education Statistics division of the U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences:

Executive, Administrative, and Managerial: A primary function or occupational activity category used to classify persons whose assignments require management of the institution, or a customarily recognized department or subdivision thereof. Assignments require the performance of work directly related to management policies or general business operations of the institution, department or subdivision. Assignments in this category customarily and regularly require the incumbent to exercise discretion and independent judgment. Included in this category are employees holding titles such as: top executives; chief executives; general and operations managers; advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales managers; operations specialties managers; administrative services managers; computer and information systems managers; financial managers; human resources managers; purchasing managers; postsecondary education administrators such as: presidents, vice presidents (including assistants and associates), deans (including assistants and associates) if their principal activity is administrative and not primarily instruction, research or public service, directors (including assistants and associates), department heads (including assistants and associates) if their principal activity is administrative and not primarily instruction, research or public service, assistant and associate managers (including first-line managers of service, production and sales workers who spend more than 80 percent of their time performing supervisory

activities); engineering managers; food service managers; lodging managers; and medical and health services managers.

Using the above definition of “administrators” including “other professionals,” total potential participants numbered 34, 48, 24 and 24 respectively at colleges A, B, C, D. The intent was to secure responses from all administrators at each college. However, despite efforts to solicit participation from all administrators requested to participate, the study population of administrators was by necessity a convenience sample.

Students. Student subject recruitment was via request to the college president at each subject college that the investigator be allowed to distribute surveys to students at the end of class, with faculty permission for the selected classes. In a report published by The Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges & Universities (AICKU), the collective “voice” for private, non-profit colleges in Kentucky, the female student populations at the four selected colleges were as follows:

- College A: 510 women out of 850 students (60% female)
- College B: 566 women out of 824 students (69% female)
- College C: 303 women out of 506 students (60% female)
- College D: 867 women out of 1746 students (50% female)

The goal for student subjects was a total representative sample of approximately $n=600$ female students. To achieve the goal of 600 desired responses of the total available students ($n=2246$), the respective anticipated distribution of students, and the proportions and student counts associated with the four institutions were the following:

- College A: 22.7% or $n=136$ students
- College B: 25.2% or $n=151$ students
- College C: 13.5% or $n=81$ students
- College D: 38.6% or $n=232$ students

According to an authority of the University of Kentucky Center for Survey Research, a total survey response count from students of 400 surveys would be sufficient for a margin of error of +/- 5%, 500 surveys would be sufficient for a margin of error of +/-4%, and 600 surveys would be required for a margin of +/-3%. The anticipated response counts (above) for the survey would generate approximately 600 responses, thus meeting the goal of 600 student responses total. For purposes of recruitment every effort was made to request full cooperation at each of the four subject colleges in an attempt to include all female undergraduate students at each college.

Methods

Measures. Questions concerning beliefs about rape issues and student experiences with dating violence were found in previously established surveys, although for the current study the wording in some instances had to be revised. Other questions on the proposed surveys, particularly those relating to the amount and type of campus security, and the perceptions of what happens to a student who abuses another student, were not found in the literature.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have published “Measuring Intimate Partner Violence Victimization and Perpetration: A Compendium of Assessment Tools” (Thompson, Basile, Hertz & Sitterle, 2007), the intent being to provide researchers with tools to measure victimization and interpersonal violence. Relative to the study, this compendium specifically addresses dating violence among college students. CDC authors suggest that each researcher adapt the language of the scale to that appropriate for the survey population, as was done with this study.

For this study’s surveys, the questions borrowed from the CDC’s compendium included questions from the following section: “Severity of Violence Against Women Scale” (Marshall, 1992). Validity for the CDC “Severity of Violence Against Women Scale” was found in the fact that each scale used in this publication had to meet the following criteria: published in a peer-reviewed journal or book, assessed for psychometric characteristics (with information on

reliability, validity or sensitivity available), created by the authors and not adapted from a preexisting scale, developed for research purposes, designed for direct participant response, and intended to assess actual violence rather than correlates, risk factors, or consequences of IPV (Centers for Disease Control, 2009).

Hertzog and Yeilding (2009) examined the awareness of 134 women at a metropolitan college, in relation to the risk reduction strategies and rape awareness of the women. Additionally, the survey used by these authors queried communication with peers regarding risk and protection, effect of alcohol and drugs on sexual assault, history of sexual assault, sex education received at the college, along with perceptions of vulnerability to sexual violence. Questions adapted from their scales included the survey questions regarding whether or how the college addresses dating violence history and attitudes, and reporting of dating violence. Validity for this study was indicated by its appearance in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal (Hertzog & Yeilding, 2009).

A third survey which contributed to the current survey was the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale Short Form (IRMA-SF) (Payne, Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1999), apparently considered somewhat of a “gold standard” among sexual assault measurement instruments. Study question 9, which examines attitudes and beliefs regarding rape, was derived from this scale. The authors make a strong case that this scale could provide additional support to those investigating, prosecuting, and/or defending those who accuse, or are accused, of rape.

Payne, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1999) conducted a series of six studies to examine rape myths, and in the process created the IRMA. Although the current study addressed all of dating violence, rather than addressing only rape, the IRMA-SF was used as it addresses more general areas of dating violence than the specific rape issues found in the IRMA. The six studies examined agreement with previous rape myths, development of and support for strong psychometric properties, and construct validity of the IRMA. The authors determined content

validity of the IRMA via the scale development process. Specific concerns taken with development of the IRMA were the psychometric questions in general and rape myth concerns. In the process the authors also constructed a shortened version of the IRMA, the IRMA-SF. The IRMA-SF has only 20 questions, as opposed to the IRMA, with its cumbersome total of 45 questions. The IRMA-SF addresses rape myth in general, but not the specific components, as does the IRMA. Both the IRMA and the IRMA-SF are divided into sub-categories of myths, addressing the following: SA: She asked for it; LI: She liked it; TE: Rape is a trivial event; MT: He didn't mean to; NR: It wasn't really rape; LI: She lied; and DE: Rape is a deviant event. There were also filler questions (FI), which are not considered in scoring the IRMA or the IRMA-SF. For purposes of the proposed study, questions were taken from the IRMA-SF, from the following categories: NR, LI, TE and SA. Because the proposed study did not address men's intent in dating violence, the category of MT "he didn't mean to" was omitted, as was DE (rape is a deviant event) because the proposed study did not address the 'why' of rape. Whether the woman liked it (LI) was also omitted. Categories utilized in the current study were whether it is a trivial event (TE), whether it was or was not really rape (NR) and whether or not she 'asked' for it (SA), were considered more relevant to the current research questions and hypotheses. The IRMA and IRMA-SF have been cited in numerous articles (100+) since their inception in 1999, as indicated by the number of articles which the literature demonstrates use of the scale.

In addition to a combination of questions adapted from the above-listed established surveys, several questions were devised by the investigator due to the unique nature of the proposed study. The questions devised by the investigator were tested for reliability using two pilot surveys, which were also used to determine potentially omitted or confusing items on the survey. Reliability is defined as "consistency of a measure" (Nolan & Heinzen, 2008), and the survey questions were answered consistently with study results by pilot survey participants. The first pilot survey was administered to a group of seven female students at College A, in a class

taught by Ms. Nora Hatton. After some adjustments to survey questions a second pilot was administered to twelve students of Dr. Mansim Okafor, also at College A. Administrator surveys were piloted by two administrators, one at a subject college and one at a non-subject college. The researcher invited the pilot survey participants to suggest, via comments written on the survey, any issues noticed during the survey, including suggestion of questions that might need to be added to or deleted from the original survey, and issues or clarifications needed on the informed consent. Feedback from these two groups of students indicated that the only question that was confusing or not clear was survey question 3 (“If you were with a date who became violent, whom is the most likely you would call for help FIRST”), which offered 6 different responses to be ranked by preference. The pilot survey students felt that the question would be much clearer if it were a simple “check one” question, rather than a ranking. This change was incorporated into both the student and administrator surveys. All other questions appeared to be easily understood and were answered in a consistent fashion by pilot participants. Additionally, feedback solicited as to the length of the survey showed no issues with survey length (21 questions). Completion time for surveys was determined to be approximately ten minutes.

There were no previous surveys designed to be used with college administrators; thus for the administrator surveys the student survey questions were adjusted to be used with college administrators. Table 1 (below) addresses which survey question was adapted from which established survey.

Table 1: Source of Survey Questions

Question	Source
1: What is your belief as to the percent of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence?	Original question by investigator
2: At night and on weekends, what type of security does this campus have?	Original question by investigator
3: If you were with a date who became violent, whom is most likely you would call first for help?	Original question by investigator
4: What percent of female students on this campus do you believe know how to reach security or locate police on weekends and at night?	Original question by investigator
5: On this campus is it appropriate to talk about or seek help with dating violence from faculty, staff, or administrators?	Original question by investigator
6: Who, if anyone, on this campus provides information on dating violence?	Adapted from Hertzog & Yeilding, 2009
7: How is the information on dating violence provided?	Hertzog & Yeilding, 2009
8: Here are some scenarios a female student might encounter on a date. How often do you experience these behaviors from someone you are dating?	CDC, Sections B6, C1, C3
Physical abuse	CDC, Section B6, items 1-12
Psychological abuse	CDC, Section C1, items 1-30
Sexual abuse	CDC, Section C3, items 1-33
9: What is your opinion on the statements below?	CDC
If a woman is drunk it is partly her responsibility if she is raped	IRMA, item 1
If a woman doesn't physically resist, you can't really say it was rape	IRMA, item 12
When women wear low-cut tops or short skirts they are asking for trouble	IRMA, item 15
Rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks	IRMA, item 17
If a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know it is her own fault if she is raped	IRMA, item 19
If the rapist doesn't have a weapon you can't really call it rape	IRMA, item 24
In reality women are almost never raped by their boyfriends	IRMA, item 28
Women tend to exaggerate how rape affects them	IRMA, item 29
10: What is your belief as to the percent of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence and who REPORT the violence?	Original question by investigator
11: If a student failed to report dating violence, what would be the primary reason?	Original question by investigator

Table 1 (cont.)

12: Does this college have a policy on dating violence?	Original question by investigator
13: If this college has a policy on dating violence where would you find it?	Original question by investigator
14: On this campus, what would happen to a student who victimizes another student through dating violence?	Original question by investigator
15: Are familiar with the requirements of the Clery Act?	Original question by investigator
16: STUDENTS: Indicate your level in college ADMINISTRATORS: Indicate your position at this college	Original question by investigator
17: STUDENTS: Are you a resident or commuter student? ADMINISTRATORS: How long have you been an administrator at this college?	Original question by investigator
18: How long are you in years?	Original question by investigator
19: What is your racial/ethnic background?	U.S. Census
20: What is your home background?	U.S. Census
21: Please add any comments.	Original question by investigator

Surveys to be administered were reviewed for face and content validity by experts familiar with theory constructs and validity. All questions were found to be adequate to determine the information sought and answer the research questions. Those experts who reviewed the survey questions for content and face validity were the following: Sr. Mary Angela Shaughnessy, Legal Counsel, Graduate School Dean, and former Education Department Chair at St. Catharine College; Dr. Joe Oldham, Chair of Computer Science, Centre College; Dr. Lisa Kay, professor of Statistics, Eastern Kentucky University; Nora Hatton, Institutional Research and Effectiveness Director at St. Catharine College, and Dr. Yong Wang, Chair, Statistics Department at Eastern Kentucky University. Statisticians Kay and Wang supported the content validity as indicated by previously stated published findings. Additionally, the investigator met with Dr. Adam Pritchard of the University of the Kentucky Center for Violence Against Women, who assisted in revising survey questions and determined questions to have content validity.

Surveys were designed to elicit the following information concerning the campus dating

violence type and incidence, and the campus dating policies and programs:

- What administrators perceive to be the campus dating violence type and incidence
- What students perceive actually happens on campus regarding the type and incidence of dating violence
- What differences exist regarding dating violence experience and type perception between resident and commuter students, and between underclassmen and upperclassmen.
- What administrators perceive that students know regarding campus dating violence policies and programs
- What students actually know regarding campus dating violence policies and programs
- What differences exist in dating violence policy and program knowledge between resident and commuter students, and between underclassmen and upperclassmen.

Surveys for each institution were differentiated via the method of printing each college's surveys on a different color of paper. To this end, white paper was used for College A, tan paper was used for College B, pink paper was used for College C, and lavender paper was used for College D.

Table 2 at the end of the procedures section lists which research question and hypothesis each of the survey questions addresses, along with the statistical test used and the domain. Survey questions were grouped into two domains: dating violence experience and beliefs, and dating violence policy knowledge. In most cases the questions were reworded somewhat from established surveys in order to conform to the intent of the proposed surveys. Demographic questions relating to race and ethnicity and home background include the same categories used in the 2010 U.S. Census.

Procedures. The principal investigator contacted college presidents at the eight small rural colleges in Kentucky to invite participation in the study. After receiving indication of interest in the survey from the four colleges electing to participate, the principal investigator

submitted to the administration of each subject college a letter of introduction and an explanation of the proposed study, a list of survey questions, and a formal request that the investigator be allowed to administer the survey on the campus (Appendix A). This request was followed with a telephone call to determine if requests were received and if permission were granted to administer the surveys.

Data for the study were collected via survey instruments provided to college administrators in a mail-in format, with an online option, and provided to female students in a face-to-face format. More specific details follow in the procedures section. Although every attempt was made to ask administrators and students identical questions, of necessity some questions are pertinent to one group but not the other; therefore, the difference between the two surveys is limited to demographic types of questions. Specifically, questions 16, 17, and 18 varied between the two participant groups as followed: for students, question 16 was "Indicate your level in college," with options of "freshman," "sophomore," "junior," or "senior." For administrators, question 16 was "What is your position at this college?" with options "President, vice-president, or other senior level administrator," "Dean, residence advisor, or other residential student services professional," "Department heads/chairs or those whose duties are not primarily the faculty role," and "Other professional not listed in above categories." Question 17, for students was "Are you a resident on campus or are you a commuter student?" with answer options "resident" or "commuter." For administrators, question 17 was "How many years have you been an administrator or professional at this college?" with fill-in-the-blank option. Question 18 for both groups of participants was "How old are you in years?" Student response options were "18-19," "20-21," "22-24," and "25 or above." Administrator response options were "44 or below," "45-54," "55-64," and "65 or above."

The decision to administer the surveys to students in a face-to-face approach was made following review of literature on survey response rates and issues. An evaluation of on-line

versus telephone versus face-to-face questionnaires suggests that while the response rates are similar in all three methods, and while an online survey might be substantially easier to administer, the telephone and on-line surveys inherently pose a greater security risk for subjects (Coughlan, Cronin & Ryan, 2009). Given the nature of the study, it was anticipated that some respondents might find the material sensitive or disturbing, and therefore would be less likely to complete the survey if there were any possibility of lack of anonymity such as might be obtainable via telephone number or email address. Face-to-face surveys can be administered with absolutely no gathering of identifying information (such as email address or telephone number), thereby ensuring confidentiality. When surveys were distributed, the cover sheet contained all the elements of the informed consent, and the investigator discussed all elements of informed consent with the student subjects. Additionally, subjects were required to sign an informed consent form, which was received unattached to/unassociated with the subject's survey response form.

The face-to-face format was not considered to be appropriate for the proposed study in collecting the data from college administrators. Given the small number of administrators at each college, it was anticipated there would be a reluctance to answer some questions face-to-face, based upon concerns the administrators might have regarding confidentiality. For this reason, the surveys for administrators were given in individual packets to a high-ranking member of administration at each institution (that member designated by the institution's president), with the request that they be distributed to administrators' mailboxes. Administrators also were given, in the packet, an on-line option for completing the surveys anonymously using Sakai on-line survey.

With adjustments per pilot surveys made, after obtaining University of Kentucky Institutional Review Board approval to conduct the study, and following an introductory letter to each subject campus, student surveys were administered in face-to-face format by the principal investigator during a pre-arranged scheduled visit to each campus. Hard copy surveys were administered to the recruited administrators via each institution's presidential designee and to

prospective student subjects either at the end of each class in which faculty agreed to allow the surveys (College A) or via group meetings requested by the specific college (Colleges B,C,D). Signed documentations of informed consent were collected by the investigator and placed in envelopes which were then labeled with the college name and sealed. Following the collection of signed consent to participate forms, the introductory page, containing instructions on how to complete the survey and counseling information, was distributed to student participants and reviewed aloud by the investigator, and participants were requested to read it and to retain it in order to have access to the number of the free counselor assigned to assist subjects with issues that might be raised by the survey questions.

Before subjects began the survey the investigator informed the subjects that their confidentiality was assured as no identifying information would be available to the investigator, since the informed consent form was turned in unattached to the related participant response. The investigator explained to participants that it was necessary that they take the introductory page with them to avoid a situation in which one student was identified as potentially ‘needing counseling’ because that was the only student who kept the page with the counselor phone number. Other pertinent portions of the introductory page reviewed by the investigator included possible risk to the subject (the revival of upsetting or disturbing memories of dating violence), possible benefits to the subject (knowledge of what constitutes dating violence), and the suggestion that the subject’s college might increase or improve dating violence prevention and reporting programs as a result of the study. Student subjects were made aware that they potentially were helping future students who find themselves in dating violence situations, and that their increased awareness of dating violence subsequent to completing the survey may lower their personal risk. Emphasis was placed upon the fact that since similar studies have not previously been done at small rural colleges, participation was likely to result in development of future policies or programs which will help other college women in dating violence situations.

Student subjects were informed that there would be no compensation for completing the survey. All participants were requested to complete the survey at that time and the investigator collected the surveys as they were completed. At that time the investigator answered questions regarding any aspect of survey administration or confidentiality. Administrators were not offered compensation other than that the study results for their particular school would be made available to the school (and to that school only), along with suggestions for improved or increased programs and prevention strategies.

All subjects, both student and administrator, were assured complete anonymity for themselves and confidentiality for the college as indicated by an explanation of how informed consent forms would be collected and stored separately from surveys, and that an individual's consent form and survey could not be connected. Administrators were assured that the subject colleges would not be referenced by any identifying information in the surveys or the final study, with the exception that the surveys would be coded in a way (known only to the investigator) that ensured each school would get a full report of their own college results but would have access to no other school's information, including the school names, while the aggregate data for the four schools was summarized in the study results.

In the case of administrators, survey completion was conducted via U.S. mail or online using Sakai. The introductory page (Appendix B) for both groups of participants included contact information for a psychological counselor, at no charge to the subject, in the event the survey content was disturbing or upsetting to the subject. This page also included all the elements of informed consent. Arrangements were made beforehand to obtain contact information and permission from the preferred counselor at each college. In the event that the college counselor was not available for an appointment at no charge, the investigator made prepayment arrangements with a local psychologist (unaffiliated with any of subject colleges), who would inform the investigator only that "a participant" requested an appointment and would then bill the

investigator for services.

A copy of the survey questions can be found in Appendix C for the administrator survey and Appendix D for the student survey. Per request of three of the subject colleges, only one visit was made to campus, and surveys were distributed in a group format at that time. Protection of human subjects was accomplished according to the rules of the University of Kentucky Institutional Review Board. The investigator is certified by the University of Kentucky Institutional Research Board (Appendix F); no other personnel were used in collecting the data. In summary, the step-by-step survey procedures were:

1. Obtain permission to administer the surveys from the University of Kentucky Institutional Review Board.
2. Invite the eight eligible small rural Kentucky colleges to participate via email to each college president.
3. Investigator contacted Administration at subject colleges via written letter and follow-up phone call to ask permission to collect data. Request included the purpose of the study, the nature of the surveys, how confidentiality for the college and anonymity of the subjects would be addressed (including elements of informed consent), and any risks/benefits to the subject college. At this time permission was requested to contact faculty for permission to administer the survey at the end of class, and to contact Human Resources Director to request surveys be distributed to “Administrative, Executive & Managerial” and “Other Professional.” While the surveys were identical for each student and for each administrator, each survey form was coded either “pink,” “lavender,” “white” or “tan” to identify the school whence it originated.
4. a) Investigator contacted faculty members to request permission to administer survey during class (College A) or contacted the college president’s designee (Colleges B, C, and D) to arrange a group meeting with students for purposes of completing surveys.

b) Investigator contacted an administration delegate at each college and asked that the survey packets be distributed to all “Administrative, Executive & Managerial” and “Other Professional” employee mailboxes at the college. Each survey packet contained the introductory letter (with instructions for on-line survey completion), the survey, a postage-paid envelope in which to return the informed consent, and a separate, larger, postage-paid envelope in which to return the survey. For those preferring to utilize the on-line option of survey completion, the instruction sheet provided instructions and a data link.

5. a) Investigator arrived at the designated location at each college to distribute surveys to students at the agreed-upon time and then distributed the informed consent, which was explained and after signing, collected and placed into a sealed envelope; the introductory letter, explaining the nature and importance of the survey and discussing risks and benefits to participants; discussed the components of informed consent, explained what to do if the survey evoked painful or disturbing memories, and explained how anonymity was to be maintained. Each participant was then given the informed consent form. When informed consent forms had been collected and the introductory letter distributed and explained, the surveys were distributed and then collected as completed.

b) For Administrators, investigator met with an administrative designee at each college to request that survey packets be distributed to “Administrative, Executive & Managerial,” and “Other Professional” personnel. Each survey packet contained the following: the instruction/introductory letter for the survey, a page detailing the procedure to follow if the survey questions revived disturbing or hurtful memories, informed consent form, and the survey.

Envelopes to return informed consent and the survey form separately were included.

Administrators mailed completed surveys and signed informed consent forms to the investigator,

who then entered the data.

Informed consent. Both administrator and student surveys were subject to the “expedited non-medical review” process under the University of Kentucky Institutional Review Board. Informed consent elements were included in the introductory letter attached to each survey; additionally, signed informed consent was obtained from each subject. While telephone and electronic surveys, by their very nature, result in the collection of at least minimal identifying information (respectively, telephone number and email address) face-to-face and mail surveys can be accomplished with no identifiers at all (Coughlan, Cronin & Ryan, 2009). In this case “no identifiers” occurs because the surveys and informed consents cannot be linked to each other due to being distributed and collected separately.

Analysis of Data

Prior to analysis, all variables were analyzed for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and normality of distribution. Based upon consultation with statisticians at Eastern Kentucky University, surveys containing responses to less than 30% of the questions were to be eliminated from data analysis, as were any questions with a response rate of less than 50% or with incorrectly applied responses (for example, if the instructions were “check one” and the participant checked more than one).

According to the University of Kentucky Center for Survey Research, a total survey response count from students of 400 surveys would be sufficient for a margin of error of +/- 5%, 500 surveys would be sufficient for a margin of error of +/- 4%, and 600 surveys would be required for a margin of +/- 3%. These anticipated response counts for the study (136 students + 151 students + 81 students + 232 students) would generate approximately 600 responses, thus meeting the goal of $n=600$ student responses total.

There were six categories of participants: students, administrators, campus resident, commuter students, and students by class standing (freshmen/sophomores and

juniors/seniors). Statistical analysis was completed in SAS 9.2 at Eastern Kentucky University. For each of the questions in the survey (except the demographic questions to which only descriptive statistics are applied), either Pearson's chi-square test or Fisher's exact test was applied to determine whether the difference in the proportions of participants choosing different answers is statistically significant between the two categories. Analyses for resident versus commuter students, and for underclassmen versus upperclassmen, were handled in the same manner as the analysis of students and administrators, using either Fisher's exact test or Pearson chi-square test.

Several of the survey questions had multi-part answers and were more appropriately analyzed by breaking the question into its various components and treating each separately, using an alpha level equal to the p-value divided by the number of responses analyzed. Given the variety of statistical tests used, please see the following for a list of survey questions, followed by the statistical test used for each.

Table 2: Statistical Tests and Research Questions

Survey Question	Statistical test	Research Question	Hypothesis
1: What is your belief as to the percent of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence?	Fisher's Exact test	1,2,3	1-3
2: At night and on weekends, what type of security does this campus have?	Fisher's Exact test	4,5,6	42-50
3: If you were with a date who became violent, whom is most likely you would call first for help?	Fisher's Exact test	4,5,6	51-53

Table 2 (cont.)

4: What percent of female students on this campus do you believe know how to reach security or locate police on weekends and at night?	Pearson Chi-square test	4,5,6	54-56
5: On this campus is it appropriate to talk about or seek help with dating violence from faculty, staff, or administrators?	Pearson Chi-square test	4,5,6	
6: Who, if anyone, on this campus provides information on dating violence?	Pearson Chi-square test	4,5,6	57-65
7: How is the information on dating violence provided?	Pearson Chi-square test	4,5,6	66-74
8: Here are some scenarios a female student might encounter on a date. How often do you experience these behaviors from someone you are dating?	Pearson Chi-square test	1,2,3	4-12
9: What is your opinion on the statements below?	Fisher's Exact test	1,2,3	13-35
10: What is your belief as to the percent of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence and who REPORT the violence?	Fisher's Exact test	1,2,3	36-38
11: If a student failed to report dating violence, what would be the primary reason?	Fisher's Exact test	1,2,3	39-41
12: Does this college have a policy on dating violence?	Fisher's Exact test	4,5,6	75-77
13: If this college has a policy on dating violence where would you find it?	Pearson Chi-square test	4,5,6	78-86
14: On this campus, what would happen to a student who victimizes another student through dating violence?	Pearson chi-square test	4,5,6	
15: Are familiar with the requirements of the Clery Act?	Pearson Chi-square test	4,5,6	87-89
The following questions addressed demographics:			
16: STUDENTS: Indicate your level in college ADMINISTRATORS: Indicate your position at this college			
17: STUDENTS: Are you a resident or commuter student? ADMINISTRATORS: How long have you been an administrator at this college?			
18: How old are you in years?			
19: What is your racial/ethnic background?			

Table 2 (cont.)

20: What is your home background?
21: Please add any comments.

Consultation with a professional statistician revealed a variety of programs that might be useful for analyzing study results. For the most effective and accurate analysis the statistician suggested using SAS 9.2 as the most appropriate program. If the prediction of the alternative hypotheses (that there is a difference in the perceptions of students and administrators regarding the incidence and type of dating violence on small rural college campuses, and that there is a difference in the perceptions of students and administrators regarding knowledge of dating violence programs on small rural campuses) were correct, the expectation was that the resulting P value would be small. The P value of 0.05% was used to determine significance.

Summary

Surveys regarding perceptions of dating violence experiences, type, and policy knowledge were distributed to n=306 students n=52 college administrators at four of Kentucky's eight small rural colleges. The purpose of the study was to determine if female students and college administrators had the same perceptions as to the experiences and type of dating violence, and the same knowledge of dating violence policy at each college. Within the student group, similarities and differences in perceptions and knowledge of dating violence were also examined between resident and commuter students, and between students by class standing. There were 6 research questions examined. The nature of the survey questions, combined with three groups of participants, necessitated a large number of hypotheses, which can be found in Appendix E.

Surveys were administered to students in a face-to-face format either during classes, or at a meeting time and place specified by the subject college. Administrator surveys were distributed via campus mail at each institution and returned to the investigator via U.S. Postal Service. The 21 questions on the surveys were grouped into two domains: dating violence beliefs and

experiences, and knowledge of dating violence policies. Additionally, demographic data were collected.

The University of Kentucky Institutional Research Board approved the study. Surveys were a combination of questions adapted from established public domain surveys and questions devised by the investigator as there were no previously established measurement instruments, relative to dating violence, for college administrators. Surveys were reviewed for validity and reliability by experts from the University of Kentucky, Centre College, Eastern Kentucky University and St. Catharine College. Data analysis was completed using SAS 9.2, with significance indicated by a P-value ≤ 0.05 .

Chapter Four: Results and Discussion

Results

This chapter presents the results of the study followed by a discussion of the results. The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of dating violence incidence and type (as indicated by beliefs and experience), and the knowledge of dating violence policy, of female students and college administrators, and students by selected demographic of residence (commuter versus resident students) and class standing (underclassmen versus upperclassmen) at four small rural colleges.

Research questions answered by this study included:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding dating violence on small rural college campuses based on selected demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by classification (freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?
2. What are the perceptions of college administrators and of female students regarding dating violence experiences of female students on small rural college campuses?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of the experience of dating violence between female students and college administrators on small rural college campuses?
4. What is the knowledge of dating violence policy of female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?
5. What are the differences in knowledge between female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?
6. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding knowledge of dating violence policy on small rural college campuses based on selected demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by classification

(freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?

Hypotheses for the study are addressed in the results section, and are listed specifically in Appendix E. The nature of the survey design suggested a need for more than one hypothesis for each survey question. Another factor in the creation of a large number of hypotheses was the use of three levels of participants (student/administrator status, commuter/resident student status, and class standing of underclassmen and upperclassmen).

In order to accomplish the purpose of the study, to answer research questions, and to reject or fail to reject the hypotheses, a survey instrument was developed and distributed to female college students and college administrators at four small rural colleges. Survey questions were categorized into two major domains:

1. Dating violence beliefs and experience, which addressed research questions 1, 2, and 3 (survey questions 1, 8, 9, 10, 11), to determine if administrators have an accurate understanding of what students believe is the incidence and type of dating violence experienced by students, and if students by demographic of residence and class standing have the same perceptions with their demographic; and
2. Knowledge of college dating violence policy, which addressed research questions 4, 5, and 6 (survey questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15), to determine if students have an accurate knowledge of what policies administrators perceive are in place, and if students by demographic of residence and class standing have the same perceptions.

The survey concluded with questions regarding major demographic characteristics of the subjects, followed by an open-ended “comments” question. The comments question was not analyzed for significance; rather, responses to this question were reviewed for discussion purposes.

After reviewing the preliminary results of the study, the researcher made the decision to eliminate two questions from the survey due to an apparent confusion on the part of the subjects,

as indicated by the manner in which participants responded to the questions, detailed below. Those questions were #5 (On this campus, is it appropriate to talk about dating violence with faculty, staff or administrators, or to seek help with dating violence from faculty, staff, and administrators?) and #14 (On this campus, what would happen to a student who victimizes another student through dating violence?) The intent of question 5 was that respondents answer either “yes” or “no” for each half of the question regarding whether it is appropriate on campus to (a) discuss, or to (b) seek help for, dating violence. The majority of respondents answered only one half of the question. On question 14, which addressed what would happen to a student who perpetrated violence against another student, eight possible answers were listed with the instruction to “check one.” Respondents either skipped the question altogether or indicated that it would not be realistic to check a response without knowing the specific situation. Since useful data could not be gleaned from either question the determination was made to eliminate both questions. Although this confusion was not observed in the pilot surveys administered, as more participants completed the survey the confusion became more evident. In the case of questions which did not receive a 100% response rate, the missing data is included in Tables 7-19, but was not analyzed.

Response Rates and Characteristics of the Sample

Four colleges participated in the study. The four colleges were represented as A, B, C, and D to ensure anonymity of colleges. The aggregate number of female student enrollment at all four colleges was $n=2246$. Based upon advice from the University of Kentucky Survey Research Center, the desired number of female student participants for this study was $n=600$, which would be 26% of the total available female students. Surveys were distributed to all administrators ($n=122$) who were eligible to participate in the survey and 41% of them ($n=52$) completed the survey. Although the intent was to distribute surveys to a total of $n=600$ female students, survey distribution was limited as follows, due to changes three of the colleges requested in the method

of achieving student participation. Colleges B, C, and D each requested that students be gathered in an assembly and surveys be completed during the assembly. College A did allow surveys to be distributed at the end of various classes. Response rates ranged from a high at College A of 77% ($n=26$) for administrators and 96% ($n=130$) for students, to a low of 11.8% ($n=36$) for students and 13.5% ($n=7$) for administrators at College B. College D had the second highest response rate for students, with College C showing the third highest response rate for students, but the second highest response rate for administrators. In order of response rate order for students the colleges were, in order, A, D, C, B and for administrators, A, C, D, B. Response rates from the four colleges (for students) are shown in Table 3. See Table 4 for survey response rates of administrators.

Table 3: Surveys Distributed and Response Rates for Students by College and Total

Students	Responses Desired $n=600$	Responses Received $n=306$	Response rates per college	Response as % of total 51%
College A	136	130	96%	42.5%
College B	81	36	44%	11.8%
College C	237	43	18%	14.1%
College D	143	97	68%	31.7%
TOTAL	597	306	51%	100.0%

Table 4: Surveys Distributed and Response Rates for Administrators by College and Total

Administrators	Responses desired $n=122$	Responses received $n=52$	Response rates per college	Response as % of total 43%
College A	34	26	77%	50.0%
College B	40	7	18%	13.5%
College C	24	11	46%	21.2%
College D	24	8	33%	15.3%
TOTAL	122	52	43%	100.0%

Demographics

Students. There was a slightly higher percentage of underclassmen (58%), and overall younger students (44% were 18-19 years of age), responding to the survey than upperclassmen and older students. Only 13% ($n=40$) non-traditional (aged 25 years and above) students responded. Likewise, more resident students (61%, $n=191$) responded than did commuters. Students primarily (39%, $n=119$) hailed from small towns (population less than 50,000) with the bulk of the remainder divided almost evenly among rural (farm or non-farm) and city backgrounds (population =50,000-250,000). A small percentage of student respondents (9%, $n=26$) were from suburban backgrounds or (4%, $n=11$) metropolitan areas (population greater than 250,000). As to racial/ethnic backgrounds, the vast majority of students were white with only $n=11$ (4%) being Black/African American and $n=5$ (2%) being Hispanic/Latin American or Asian. Ten students did not report their racial/ethnic background (3%).

Administrators. Top level administrators (president, vice president, senior level administrator) comprised 25% ($n=13$) of the 52 administrator respondents, with deans/residential student services professionals comprising just 8% ($n=4$) of the total administrator respondents. Remaining administrator respondents were those whose role was not primarily faculty or student services. Length of employment as an administrator or professional at the college indicated a mean of 11.53 years, with a standard deviation of 11.82. Age of the participating administrators was asked in intervals: 44 years and below, 45-54 years, 55-64 years, and 65 years and above. Respondents primarily ($n=26$) were aged 45-64 years. Racially, only one administrator was non-white. While the predominant geographical background for administrators was small town, all other home town backgrounds were represented. Although 52 administrators responded to the surveys, there were some missing responses for some demographic questions. Four of the respondents did not answer questions regarding racial/ethnic background or hometown background (two from College A, and one each from College B and College C). One respondent

from College A and one respondent from College C answered all dating violence and policy knowledge questions, but none of the demographic questions. Three other respondents from College A answered some, but not all of the demographic questions. College B respondents answered all questions. See Table 5 for student demographic information and Table 6 for administrator demographics.

Table 5: Demographics (Students)

Level in College	<i>n=306</i>	%	Racial/ethnic background	<i>n=306</i>	%
Freshman	99	32%	American Indian or Alaska native	0	0%
Sophomore	78	26%	Asian	0	0%
Junior	61	20%	Black or African American	11	4%
Senior	64	21%	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0%
Missing data	4	1%	White	280	92%
Campus resident	187	61%	Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin (any race)	5	2%
Commuter student	115	38%	Did not respond	10	3%
Missing data	4	1%			

Table 5 (cont.)

Age in years	<i>n=306</i>	%	Home background	<i>n=306</i>	%
18-19 years	136	44%	Rural farm	44	14%
20-21 years	99	32%	Rural non-farm	46	15%
22-24 years	29	10%	Suburban	26	9%
25 years or above	40	13%	Small town (<50,000 pop)	119	39%
Missing data	2	1%	City (50,000-250,000 pop)	57	19%
			Metropolitan (greater than 250,000 population)	11	4%
			Missing data	3	1%

Table 6: Demographics (Administrators)

Position at college	<i>n=52</i>	%	Racial/ethnic background	<i>n=52</i>	%
Senior administrator	13	25%	American Indian/Alaska native	1	2%
Residence professionals, Deans	4	8%	Asian	0	0%
Chairs	13	25%	Black or African American	0	0%
"Other professional"	22	42%	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0%
Missing data	0	0%	White	47	90%
Tenure as administrator at college			Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin (may be of any race)	0	0%
5years or less	21	40%	Missing data	4	8%
6-14 years	14	27%	Home background		
15-24 years	5	10%	Rural farm	6	13%
25 years or more	10	19%	Rural non-farm	8	17%
Missing data	2	4%	Suburban	5	10%

Table 6 (cont.)

Age in years:	<i>n</i> =52		Small town	20	42%
44 or below	8	15%	City	3	6%
45-54	17	32%	Metropolitan	6	13%
55-64	19	37%	Missing data	4	8%
65 or above	8	15%			
Missing data	0	0%			

Survey questions were grouped into two domains, dating violence experiences and beliefs, which addressed research questions 1, 2, and 3 and dating violence policy knowledge, which addressed research questions 4, 5, and 6. Each domain is addressed separately below. For several survey questions data were collapsed into categories of responses to facilitate a less cumbersome data analysis, particularly as a small number of responses resulted in a scattering of responses across options. These collapsed responses were as follows. Survey questions 1, 4, and 10 each offered 11 categories with answers in incremental ranges of 10%. The response options for these questions were reduced to three (0-30%, 40-60%, and 70-100%). Survey questions 2, 3, 6, 7, and 13 each offered 6-7 response options, which were collapsed into three by combining similar response options (for example, three response options for question 6 were “campus police/security,” “deans or residence advisors,” and “faculty or athletic coaches.” These three options were collapsed into one option covering faculty/staff/administration. Survey question 8 offered three frequency sections, each with categories ranging from “never” to “a few times.” For analysis, this question was collapsed into three responses (never, once, few times). For survey question 9 “strongly disagree” and “disagree” responses were combined to become “disagree,” while “strongly agree” and “agree” were combined to become “agree.”

Dating Violence Beliefs and Experience

The domain of dating violence beliefs and experiences was based upon administrators' perceptions of what students actually experienced (question 8) or what students perceived other students experienced or believed. Five questions on the survey (questions 1, 8, 9, 10, 11) addressed dating violence beliefs and experiences, and those questions related to research questions 1-3 below.

Research question #1. What are the differences in perceptions of female students regarding dating violence on small rural college campuses by selected demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and classification (underclassmen versus upperclassmen). Data for research question 1 can be found in Tables 7-11, p-values are found in Table 20.

Only two significant differences (at $p=0.05$) were found in responses of students by selected demographics of residency status or class standing. Students by class standing ($n=242$) showed a significant difference, at adjusted alpha level $\alpha=0.006$, to the belief that "if a woman doesn't physically resist, even if protesting verbally, you can't really call it rape." Freshmen/sophomores ($n=191$) tended more to agree with this belief ($n=30$, $p=0.0055$) than did juniors/seniors ($n=7$). Commuter and resident students ($n=306$) showed a significant difference in the belief that "if a woman is raped while drunk she is at least somewhat responsible," with almost half of commuter students ($n=73$) agreeing with the statement. Commuter and resident students, and students by class standing, all tended to show similar responses to dating violence behaviors experienced by dates, with less than half of students reporting experiencing any of the three behaviors.

Survey questions regarding estimates of how many students who experience dating violence report it and reasons for not reporting did not show significant differences in perceptions of students relative to demographics of residency status or class standing.

Research question #2. What are the perceptions of female students and of administrators regarding dating violence on small rural college campuses? Research question 2 was also answered by survey questions 1, 8, 9, 10, 11. Data for research question 2 can be found in Tables 7-11, p-values in Table 20. Results indicated that administrators ($n=52$) and students ($n=306$) had no significant differences as to estimates of how many students had experienced dating violence. Responses to whether specific dating violence behaviors were experienced indicated that administrators were more likely ($n=43-47$) than were students ($n=36-97$) to perceive the behaviors as common among students. Significant differences were found between administrators and students for all three behaviors (physical, psychological, and sexual abuse).

The question regarding agreement with beliefs about rape resulted in significant differences between students and administrators for three of the eight statements. Administrators ($n=52$) showed a propensity to disagree with all eight statements, while students did agree with the statements that if a woman is drunk she is somewhat responsible ($n=132$), that if she does not physically resist sex you really can't call it rape ($n=37$), and if a woman goes home with a man she does not know it is her fault if she is raped ($n=109$). For survey questions regarding reporting dating violence, and reasons for not reporting dating violence, students and administrators showed no significant differences.

Research question #3. What are the similarities and differences in perceptions of female college students and college administrations regarding dating violence experiences of female students on small rural college campuses? Data for question 3 is found in Tables 7-11. Overall, similar responses were found in administrator ($n=52$) and student ($n=306$) perceptions of dating violence beliefs and experiences, indicating more similarities than differences. The primary area of difference, as discussed above, was in whether students had experienced three specific dating violence behaviors, an area which showed strongly significant differences ($p<0.0001$), administrators perceiving a much higher rate of these behaviors than students reported

experiencing.

Specific data for dating violence beliefs and experience can be found in the following tables. Table 7 shows responses as to the percent of dating violence experienced by students. Table 8 shows responses of dating violence behaviors experienced by students. Table 9 shows responses to beliefs about rape, Table 10 responses to beliefs about the percentage of students reporting dating violence, Table 11 displays responses to reasons for not reporting.

Table 7: Percentage of Dating Violence Experienced by Students

% experi- encing violence	Adm <i>n</i> = 52	%	Std <i>n</i> = 306	%	Com <i>n</i> = 115	%	Res <i>n</i> = 191	%	fr/so <i>n</i> = 179	%	Jr/sr <i>n</i> = 127	%
0-30%	42	81%	196	64%	73	64%	123	64%	111	63%	85	67%
40-60%	9	17%	94	31%	35	30%	59	31%	57	30%	37	29%
70- 100%	1	2%	16	5%	7	6%	9	5%	11	6%	5	4%
Missing data	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table 8: Behaviors Experienced on Dates

Behavior	Adm <i>n</i> = 52	%	Std <i>n</i> = 306	%	Com <i>n</i> = 115	%	Res <i>n</i> = 191	%	fr/ so <i>n</i> = 179	%	Jr/sr <i>n</i> = 127	%
physical abuse	47	90%	78	26%	33	29%	45	24%	39	22%	39	31%
psycholo- -gical abuse	46	89%	97	32%	43	37%	54	28%	54	30%	43	34%
sexual abuse	43	83%	36	12%	15	5%	21	11%	19	11%	17	13%

Table 9: Agreement/disagreement with beliefs about rape

A. Belief: If a woman is drunk she is somewhat responsible for what happens.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	40	77%	156	51%	73	63%	83	44%	87	49%	69	54%
no opinion	1	2%	17	6%	6	5%	11	6%	12	7%	5	4%
agree	8	16%	132	43%	36	31%	96	51%	79	44%	63	42%
B. If a woman does not physically resist, you cannot really call it rape.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	49	100%	249	82%	101	88%	148	78%	135	76%	114	90%
no opinion	0	0%	19	6%	4	4%	15	8%	13	7%	6	5%
agree	0	0%	37	12%	10	9%	27	14%	30	17%	7	6%
C. Belief: If a woman wears low-cut tops or short skirts, she is asking for trouble.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	36	74%	170	56%	76	66%	94	50%	106	60%	67	53%
no opinion	3	6%	33	11%	12	10%	21	11%	20	11%	13	10%
agree	10	20%	101	33%	27	24%	74	39%	55	30%	46	36%
D. Belief: Rape probably did not happen if there are no bruises.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	36	74%	170	56%	76	66%	94	50%	106	60%	67	53%
no opinion	3	6%	33	11%	12	10%	21	11%	20	11%	13	10%
agree	10	20%	101	33%	27	24%	74	39%	55	30%	46	36%
E. Belief: If a woman goes home with a stranger, it is her fault if she is raped.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	45	92%	164	54%	68	59%	96	51%	93	52%	71	56%
no opinion	1	2%	32	11%	11	10%	21	11%	18	10%	14	11%
agree	3	6%	109	36%	36	31%	73	38%	67	37%	42	33%
F. Belief: If there is no weapon, you cannot call it rape.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	49	100%	290	95%	114	99%	176	93%	164	92%	126	99%
no opinion	0	0%	8	3%	0	0%	8	4%	8	5%	0	0%
agree	0	0%	5	2%	1	1%	4	2%	4	2%	1	1%

Table 9 (cont.)

G. Belief: In reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	48	98%	269	88%	290	89%	167	88%	154	86%	115	91%
no opinion	0	0%	22	7%	8	5%	16	8%	15	8%	7	6%
agree	1	2%	12	4%	5	4%	7	4%	9	5%	3	2%
H. Belief: Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.												
	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	Std.	<i>n</i>	Com	<i>n</i>	Res	<i>n</i>	Fr/So	<i>n</i>	Jr/Sr
disagree	43	88%	244	80%	269	83%	149	78%	140	78%	104	82%
no opinion	2	4%	38	13%	22	6%	31	16%	25	14%	13	10%
agree	2	2%	22	7%	12	10%	10	5%	12	7%	10	9%

Table 10: Percentage of students reporting dating violence, significance level $p < .05$

Percent	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	std	<i>n</i>	com	<i>n</i>	res	<i>n</i>	Fr/so	<i>n</i>	Jr/sr
0-30%	45	87%	254	83%	96	84%	158	83%	147	82%	107	84%
40-60%	5	10%	48	16%	18	16%	30	16%	29	16%	19	15%
70-100%	2	4%	4	1%	1	0.90%	3	2%	3	2%	1	1%

Table 11: Reasons given for students not reporting dating violence, significance level $p \leq 0.05$

Reason	<i>n</i>	Adm	<i>n</i>	std	<i>n</i>	com	<i>n</i>	res	<i>n</i>	fr/so	<i>n</i>	jr/sr
Nothing would be done	5	10%	54	18%	21	18%	33	17%	29	16%	25	20%
no proof	4	8%	40	13%	13	11%	27	14%	29	16%	11	9%
reaction from abuser	13	25%	80	26	29	25%	51	27%	45	25%	35	28%
not sure qualify as violence	2	4%	15	5%	27	6%	8	4%	4	6%	5	4%

Dating Violence Policy Knowledge

Dating violence policy knowledge was based upon whether students were aware of the policies in place to protect them from dating violence. Research questions 4-6, below, addressed differences in the extent of dating violence policy knowledge of female students and college administrators on small rural campuses. These research questions also addressed the differences in extent of dating violence policy knowledge of students by selected demographics of class standing (freshmen/sophomores versus juniors/seniors) and by residency status (commuters versus residents). Research questions 4-6 were addressed by survey questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, and 15. Survey questions 5 and 14, intended to be part of dating violence policy knowledge, were omitted from data analysis due to the large number of incomplete or missing responses. Tables 12-19 exhibit responses to survey questions in the domain of dating violence policy knowledge.

Research question #4. What is the knowledge of female students and of college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses? Students ($n=306$) demonstrated a lack of awareness in several areas, most significantly found in the questions regarding awareness of the Clery Act, and knowledge of whether or not the college had in place a policy on dating violence. Specific data for question 4 are found in Table 12, p-values in Table 21. Of the $n=306$ students surveyed, $n=225$ responded they “did not know” if the campus had a dating violence policy. Other areas where students appeared unsure of policy were survey questions 6 and 7, relating to who provides dating violence information, and in what format the information is provided. For these two questions, which asked respondents to “check all that apply” answer options included either “no one provides information” or “information is not provided.” Possible inconsistency of answers was checked by examining responses to ensure that any participant who selected “no one,” or “information is not provided” did not choose any additional options. No such occurrences were found. Responses to where a dating violence policy might be found indicated that students did seem to have an accurate idea of where such a policy, if it existed, would be found.

Administrator ($n=52$) responses for the majority of dating violence policy knowledge questions indicated that administrators were knowledgeable about dating violence policy on campus in several areas: type of security available on campus, who provides dating violence information, how it is disseminated, and where such policies could be found. Specific data are found in Tables 12-19, p-values in Table 21. However, administrators were not in agreement as to whether the college had a dating violence policy ($n=16$ responded that they did not know), and displayed a lack of familiarity with the Clery Act (43% responded they were not aware of the Clery Act). For one college more than half of administrators did not know if the college had a dating violence policy.

Research question #5. What are the differences in knowledge between female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses? Administrator and student responses for dating violence policy knowledge were rife with significant differences, with $n=9$ of the sixteen responses indicating significant differences. Analysis of survey questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13 and 15 showed a variety of agreement and differences, as indicated in Tables 12-19. No significant differences were found between administrators and students relative to the type of security available on campus. When asked whom a student would call first for help if her date became violent, administrators ($n=30$, $n=11$) were more likely to choose “friend or family” or “911,” while several students ($n=44$) chose “local/state police,” which was selected by no administrators. Students were much more likely ($n=31$) to select “campus police or security” than administrators, but overwhelmingly ($n=186$) opted for “friend or family”. When asked whether students know how to reach campus security or police after hours, both groups had similar responses with no significant differences.

Survey questions 6 and 7 showed differences between administrators and students for 5 of the 6 categories of response, with students being much more likely to respond “no one” provides dating violence information ($n=108$) and more divided as to how dating violence is provided. The exception was that students and administrators showed no significant difference as to beliefs that dating violence information is provided by security/deans/residence advisors/faculty/coaches. Students and administrators exhibited significant differences in views on whether or not the college had a dating violence policy, and familiarity with the Clery Act. Asked where a dating violence policy would be found, students and administrators showed significant differences in whether it would be found on campus website/library/online/in student handbook, but significant differences were not found in the options of “does not have a policy” or “found in administrative offices.”

Research question #6. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students, regarding knowledge of dating violence policy on small rural college campuses, by selected demographic variables of residency status (residents versus commuters, $n=306$) and class standing (freshmen/sophomores versus juniors/seniors, $n=242$). For this research question no areas of significant difference were found, all students exhibiting similar knowledge. Tables 12-19 below show responses to survey questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 15.

Table 12: Type of security available on campus

	Adm n= 52	%	Std n= 306	%	Com n= 115	%	Res n= 191	%	fr/so n= 179	%	jr/sr n= 127	%
sec/pol on foot/car	52	100%	290	95	105	91	185	97%	167	93	123	97%
state/loc police	5	10%	23	8%	11	10%	12	6%	16	9%	7	6%
call box	1	2%	19	6%	11	10	8	4%	14	8%	5	4%

Table 13: Who would student call for help if date were violent

	Adm n= 52	%	Std n= 306	%	Com n= 115	%	Res n= 191	%	fr/so n= 179	%	jr/sr n= 127	%
Campus police/ security	11	21%	31	10%	11	10%	20	11%	19	11%	12	10%
Local/ State Police	0	0%	44	14%	14	12%	30	16%	23	13%	21	17%
RA/Dean	4	8%	9	3%	3	3%	6	3%	4	2%	5	4%
Friend/ Family	30	58%	186	61%	77	67%	109	57%	114	64%	72	57%
911	7	14%	36	12%	10	9%	26	14%	19	11%	17	14%
Missing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table 14: percent of students who know how to reach security

	Adm n= 52	%	Std n= 306	%	Com n= 115	%	Res n= 191	%	fr/so n= 179	%	jr/sr n= 127	%
0-30%	15	29%	83	27%	37	32%	46	24%	48	27%	35	28%
40-60%	13	25%	69	23%	25	22%	44	23%	39	22%	30	24%
70-100%	24	46%	154	50%	53	46%	101	88%	92	52%	62	49%
	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Table 15: Who provides dating violence information on campus

	Adm n= 52	%	Std n= 306	%	Com n= 115	%	Res n= 191	%	fr/so n= 179	%	jr/sr n= 127	%
Not provided	8	15%	108	35%	41	36%	67	35%	48	27%	35	28%
Written/ Elect/ Printed/ Posted/ handbook	42	81%	180	59%	63	55%	117	61%	39	22%	30	24%
Meetings/ Class/ practice	17	33%	56	18%	26	23%	30	16%	92	51%	62	49%

Table 16: How is information provided

	Adm n= 52	%	Std n= 306	%	Com n= 115	%	Res n= 191	%	fr/so n= 179	%	jr/sr n= 127	%
Not provided	6	12%	90	29%	36	31%	54	28%	52	29%	38	30%
Written/ Elect/ Printed/ Posted/ handbook	40	77%	170	56%	60	52%	110	58%	96	54%	74	58%
Meetings/ Class/ practice	30	58%	122	40%	39	34%	83	44%	76	43%	46	36%

Table 17: Does this campus have a dating violence policy

	Adm n= 52	%	Std n= 306	%	Com n= 115	%	Res n= 191	%	fr/so n= 179	%	jr/sr n= 127	%
Yes	28	54%	58	19%	21	18%	37	19%	32	18%	26	21%
No	4	8%	19	6%	9	8%	10	5%	8	5%	11	9%
Don't know	16	31%	225	74%	84	73%	141	74%	136	76%	89	70%
missing	4	8%	4	1%	1	1%	6	3%	3	2%	1	1%

Table 18: Where would you find a campus dating violence policy

	Adm n= 52	%	Std n= 306	%	Com n= 115	%	Res n= 191	%	fr/so n= 179	%	Jr/sr n= 127	%
No Policy	5	10%	28	9%	9	8%	19	10%	11	6%	17	13%
Administrative offices	6	12%	80	26%	25	22%	55	29%	54	30%	26	20%
Website/Library/online/handbook	44	85%	204	67%	80	70%	124	65%	121	68%	83	65%

Table 19: Familiarity with the Clery Act

	n= 52	%	n= 306	%	n= 115	%	n= 191	%	n= 179	%	n= 127	%
Yes	24	46%	19	6%	6	5%	13	7%	15	8%	4	3%
No	25	48%	283	93%	108	94%	175	92%	162	91%	121	95%
missing	3	6%	4	1%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%	2	2%

Hypothesis Testing

As a result of the complex and varied nature of the survey questions a null and alternative hypothesis test was developed and tested separately for each question and for each group of participants (student and administrator, resident and commuter, and class standing of freshman/sophomore or junior/senior). The resulting large number of hypothesis tests can be found in Appendix E, appearing in order by survey question, within each domain. For purposes of rejecting or failing to reject the null hypothesis the decision was based upon the comparison between p-values and adjusted alpha (adjusted for each individual test). For each test, if the p-value were equal to or less than the adjusted alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected and the conclusion was made that there was enough evidence in the data to support the alternative hypothesis. This adjustment was necessary for survey questions 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 13. For survey questions 2, 6, 7, 8 and 13 the adjusted alpha=0.017 ($0.05/3$, 3 being the number of possible responses (questions)). For survey question 9 the adjusted alpha was 0.006 ($0.05/8$, 8 being the number of possible responses). For a given test, if the p-value were equal to or less than the adjusted alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected, and the conclusion reached that there was enough evidence in the data to support the alternative. Where the p-value was greater than the adjusted alpha, the null hypothesis was not rejected as there was insufficient evidence in the data to support the alternative hypothesis.

For the domain of dating violence beliefs and experiences, with a null and alternative hypothesis for each group of participants, there were 41 sets of hypotheses. Of these 41 hypothesis tests, there were 8 (19.5%) for which the null hypothesis was rejected. Those hypothesis sets were 4, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 24. Six of the eight rejected null hypothesis tests were from the group “administrator/student status.” Of the remaining two rejected null hypothesis tests, one was from the group “by class standing” and one from the group “by residency status.” These findings indicated that administrators and students do have similar perceptions of the

amount of dating violence, although not the specific type of dating violence behaviors experienced. Dating violence beliefs relative to rape were also similar. Conclusions were that administrators had a reasonably accurate view of what students perceive.

For dating violence policy knowledge differences were observed in more aspects of policy knowledge between students and administrators than between other groups. Of the 48 related hypotheses, 10 (21%) of the null hypotheses were rejected. The rejected null hypothesis tests were numbers 51, 57, 60, 62, 67, 70, 72, 75, 84 and 87. All of the eight questions concerning dating violence policy knowledge showed significant differences between administrators and students, except two (type of security available on campus and percent of students who know how to reach security). Students appeared to lack knowledge of dating violence policy.

Conclusions of hypothesis testing were that administrators were relatively aware of what amount of dating violence students actually experience, but not of the specific types of behavior experienced. Areas of significant differences were concentrated within the question addressing specific types of behaviors students have experienced and three of the rape beliefs. Students, however, are not fully aware of what policies and programs are in place to assist them. For dating violence policy knowledge the areas of significant difference were more scattered throughout the questions.

Tables 20 and 21, following, show the p-values for the domain of dating violence beliefs and experience (Table 20) and for dating violence policy knowledge (Table 21). Superscripts indicate the adjusted alpha, and bolding indicates a significant difference.

Table 20: Dating Violence statistical tests and p-values for Domain Dating Violence Experience and Beliefs: incidence of behaviors experienced, agreement with rape statements, reporting violence, reasons for not reporting violence, at significance level $\alpha=0.05$ for each survey question (adjusted for survey questions with different numbers of categories).

Table 20: Statistical test and p-values for beliefs and experiences, significance level $p=0.05$

Survey Question	Statistical Test	p-value student, administrator	p-value residents, commuters	p-value by class stdng
1. What is your belief as to the percent of female students who have experienced dating violence $p=0.05$	Fisher's Exact	0.0675	0.8720	0.5690
8. Dating violence behaviors Experienced $p=0.05$	Pearson Chi-sq.			
a) Date has been physically abusive $\alpha=0.017$		<0.0001*	0.3181	0.0777
b) Date has been threatening or psychologically abusive $\alpha=0.017$		<0.0001*	0.0968	0.4942
c) Date has been sexually abusive $\alpha=0.017$		<0.0001*	0.5901	0.4585
9. What is your opinion on the statements listed below? $p=0.05$	Fisher's Exact			
a) if a woman is raped while drunk she is at least somewhat responsible α level $a=0.006$		0.0001*	0.0030*	0.4384
b) if a woman doesn't physically resist sex, even if protesting verbally, it can't be considered rape α level $a=0.006$		0.0012*	0.0932	0.0055*
c) when women wear low-cut tops or short skirts, they're asking for trouble α level $a=0.006$		0.0730	0.0127	0.5927
d) rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks α level $a=0.006$		0.2942	0.5078	0.3714
e) if a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know it is her fault if she is raped α level $a=0.006$		<0.0001*	0.3408	0.7131
f) if the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't call it rape α level $a=0.006$		0.6630	0.0310	0.0176
g) in reality women are almost never raped by their boyfriends α level $a=0.006$		0.0904	0.5714	0.3483
h) women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them α level $a=0.006$		0.5995	0.0120	0.5803
10. What is your belief as to the percent of female students who are victims of dating violence who <i>report the violence</i> ? $p=0.05$	Fisher's Exact	0.1798	1.000	0.8271
11. If a student failed to report dating violence, what would be the primary reason? $p=0.05$	Fisher's Exact	0.4811	0.6770	0.4517

Table 21 shows statistical tests and p-values for dating violence policy knowledge. Significant differences are indicated by bolded p-values. Survey questions 2, 6, 7 and 13 have adjusted alpha=0.017.

Table 21: Statistical tests and p-values for dating violence policy knowledge, at significance level $p=0.05$ for each survey question, adjusted for survey questions with different number of categories

Survey question	statistical test	Administrators, students	commuters, residents	fresh/ soph & juniors/ seniors
2: What type of security is available on campus? <i>Check all that apply</i> $p=0.05$	Fisher's exact test			
security officer on foot or in car ^{*alpha a=0.017}		0.1426	0.0345	0.2004
state/local police ^{*alpha a=0.017}		0.6022	0.2915	0.2626
emergency call boxes ^{*alpha a=0.017}		0.3307	0.0591	0.2298
3: If you were with a date who became violent, whom would you call first for help? <i>Check one.</i> $P=0.05$	Fisher's exact test	<0.0000*	0.5175	0.6126
4: What percent of female students know how to reach campus security or state/local police at night/weekend? <i>Check one.</i> $p=0.05$	Pearson chi-square test	0.852	0.2947	0.894
0-30%				
40-60%				
70-100%				

Table 21 (cont.)

6: Who on campus provides dating violence information? Check all that apply. P=0.05	Pearson chi-square test			
No one ^{Alpha =0.017}		0.0046*	0.919	0.1337
Campus security/deans/RA/faculty ^{Alpha =0.017}		0.0026*	0.2651	0.3823
student organizations ^{Alpha =0.017}		0.0172	0.1305	0.1158
7: How is the information on dating violence provided? Check all that apply. p=0.05	Pearson chi-square test			
Not provided ^{a=0.017}		0.0071*	0.5729	0.8691
Written/electronic/posted/student handbook ^{a=0.017}		0.0038*	0.3556	0.4213
at meetings/during class/practice ^{a=0.017}		0.0162*	0.0987	0.2722
12: Does this college have a policy on dating violence? Check one. p=0.05	Fisher's exact test	<0.0001*	0.6625	0.2582
yes				
no				
don't know				
13: If this college does have a policy on dating violence, where would you find it? Check all that apply. p=0.05	Pearson chi-square test			
Does not have a policy ^{Alpha =0.017}		0.9146	0.533	0.0304
Administrative offices ^{Alpha =0.017}		0.0227	0.1736	0.0572
Campus website/library/online/student handbook ^{Alpha =0.017}		0.0095*	0.4039	0.6817
15: Are you familiar with the Clery Act? Check one. p=0.05	Pearson chi-square test	<0.0001*	0.5666	0.0904
yes				
no				

Application of Health Belief Model. The findings of this study appeared to align well with the Health Belief Model, if dating violence is viewed as a ‘disease’ that can affect students or institutions. Responses from surveys suggest that students (including by demographic) and administrators perceive a susceptibility, as indicated by how many students experience dating violence, and certainly by how many students and administrators appear not to know of a dating violence policy or the Clery Act, or how to find a policy. The Health Belief Model is addressed in more detail in discussion and in recommendations for further research.

Discussion

Demographics. Demographically, there were few differences between students and administrators. Racial/ethnic backgrounds were very similar. Home background for both groups primarily was small/town or rural, with few of either group hailing from metropolitan areas. Demographic similarities between students may be accounted for by geographic proximity of the students’ homes to the college, especially as many rural students have children or are unable to move away.

Dating violence beliefs and experiences. Administrators and students appeared to have similar perceptions that approximately 30% or less of students were experiencing dating violence. Likewise, there did not appear to be significant differences in perceptions between underclassmen and upperclassmen, or between resident and commuter students. The current study supports the findings by other authors in the literature regarding the amount of dating violence experienced on college campuses (30% or less). Authors with similar findings of 20-25% included Gray (2012), Langford (2004), Wetzell (2005) and Caitlin (2014). Students in the current study reported experiencing less dating violence incidence than did Buelna, et al. (2009) or Hertzog and Yeilding (2009).

Payne and Fogerty (2007) found that 85% of college women had been victimized by some type of dating violence, with as many as 25% being sexually assaulted. This 2007 study was

very similar in sample size to the current study (290 subjects versus 306), although the specific target population did not specify rural or urban. However, the current study found a much lower percentage of dating violence (a range of 10% experiencing sexual abuse to as high as 27% experiencing threatening or psychological abuse). Similarly, the current study found slightly lower rates than the 32% of college students experiencing dating violence reported by the Dating Violence Resource Center (2002). In the current study, administrators showed a reasonably accurate perception of the incidence of dating violence experienced on campus, according to student reports. The researcher was unable to locate any studies which specifically addressed the perceptions of administrators regarding campus dating violence.

When specific dating violence behaviors encountered were addressed, a complicating factor in the current study was that while administrators were asked their perceptions of how much dating violence behaviors were experienced by students, the students were asked how much they personally have experienced (not their perception of what others have experienced) these dating violence behaviors. Over the three types of behavior in the current study, $n=70$ reported experiencing some sort of dating violence, lower than the 25% of sexual assault reported by Payne and Fogerty (2007). Payne and Fogerty (2007) report a much higher incidence of dating violence (25%), while Roudsari, et al. (2008) report combined sexual abuse as 17.8% (this included touching and penetration against the will of the victim). Students in the current study reported that 32% have experienced threatening or stalking behavior (psychological abuse), whereas Roudsari, et al. (2008) notes that many researchers report psychological or verbal abuse in 88% of college dating couples. The possibility exists that students in the current study did not and those in Roudsari's study did not have the same idea of what constitutes abuse. Physical abuse (hitting, kicking, shoving, et cetera) was reported by 26% of the subjects in the current study. None of the studies referenced specified whether the students were at large or small rural or urban, private or public colleges with the exception of Wetzel (2005), reporting on dating

violence at a small Appalachian college.

As to questions regarding agreement or disagreement with rape belief statements, significant differences between administrator and student responses were found in some, but not all, of the belief statements. In each of these beliefs, students were found to express some degree of agreement with the statements, although the majority of students did disagree with the statements. The largest percentage of agreement was with the statement that a woman who is drunk bears some responsibility for events, with students almost equally split between agreeing and disagreeing with the belief. Within selected student demographics of commuter versus resident there tended to be fewer significant differences in responses; there also were fewer significant differences found in students by class standing. Resident students agreed with the statement that if a woman is drunk she is somewhat responsible for what happens, and under-classmen agreed with the statement that if a woman does not physically resist, you cannot really call it rape. Possible reasons for these differences include that freshmen and sophomores are generally the younger students, and have not matured into a full understanding that all issues are not black or white. For example, the younger students may believe a woman must fight back, but may be unaware that a woman can be so scared she cannot physically resist, that she may be unknowingly drugged, or she may feel that resistance will result in additional harm on top of rape. Resident students may be the same as the under-classmen, as it is likely that the older, more mature students have moved out of campus residences into apartments or marriages. Thus the same naivety may apply to residents as applies to under-classmen.

Administrators overwhelmingly disagreed with the statements of rape beliefs. One rape belief that exhibited differences between administrators and students was that if a woman is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible if she is raped. Other researchers have reported findings that, while not assigning blame or fault, tend to support the notion that alcohol is a contributing factor in dating violence, with Loiselle and Fuqua (2007) noting that 57% of women

reporting sexual assault by a date cited being under the influence of alcohol at the time. Gray (2014) noted that 43% of women sexually assaulted on a date had been drinking. The Dating Violence Resource Center (2002) supports that finding, noting that 55% of women involved in acquaintance rape were using alcohol or drugs prior to the incident. In the current study, a belief which showed significant differences between students by class standing was that if a woman doesn't physically resist you can't really call it rape. A lack of physical resistance to rape is a well-documented effect (and in fact is the intended effect) of 'date-rape' drugs such as Ketamine, GHB, Rohypnol, and ecstasy (Smith, et al., 2002 and Girard & Senn, 2008). No studies specifically addressed the risk involved with going home with a stranger. Administrators disagreed with all eight rape beliefs. One reason for this consistent disagreement is that administrators are likely more mature and experienced than students, and realized that these belief statements cannot be assumed to be completely true or completely false, that there are gray areas in which a student might have had alcohol added to her drink without her knowledge, might be afraid to resist rape, among other salient factors in agreeing/disagreeing with these beliefs.

Reporting rape is a primary tenet of the Clery Act, but the college cannot report an incident that is unknown. Reasons given for not reporting rape were similar among students and administrators at the subject colleges, with the same order of prevalence for both groups: too embarrassed to report, fear of negative reaction from the abuser, and a belief that nothing would be done. This response was similar to other findings (Cohn et al., 2013). For both groups the dominant reason was clearly embarrassment. Reasons given in other studies included not wanting others to know and criminal justice concerns, and some students preferring not to report rape because they did not want it known they were using alcohol (Rickert et al., 2005).

Rickert, et al. (2005) reported that 58% of young women whom they interviewed regarding rape had reported the incident to one or more persons; however, of the $n=29$ women who did report, 58% of those women reported it only to one person. Only one subject of the $n=50$

reported the incident to police, while 8 (9%) reported the incident to a mental health professional. Of their subjects experiencing verbally coerced sex, very few told anyone other than a parent or girlfriend. Caution should be exercised to note that these subjects were not identified as to college student status, but were within approximately the same age range or slightly younger (14-19 years of age). Gray (2014) reports that at least half of victimized college women do not report the incident. This supports the current study's finding that both students and administrators perceived that less than 30% of students would report dating violence. In this instance, administrators and students appeared to be in close agreement ($p=0.1798$).

Student perceptions in the current study supported the findings of Rickert, et al. (2005), who found that dating violence is rarely reported (see Table 10). Reasons given for not reporting violence were similar in other studies as in the current study (see Table 11). Rickert, et al. (2005), in a finding unlike those in the current study, found that reporting dating violence was reduced by a fear of admitting alcohol was involved, and found that subjects who'd had multiple partners were less likely to report. Although not a direct link, these reasons could be construed as "too embarrassed to report," similar to the current study. Rickert, et al. (2005) found that reporting dating violence among their subjects was less likely from subjects who had willingly gone to a private location with the abuser. Cohn, et al. (2013) identified the three primary factors for not reporting dating violence as not wanting others to know, non-acknowledgement of rape, and criminal justice concerns. Not wanting others to know could be considered "embarrassment," although a case could also be made that it was more an issue of privacy. See Table 8 for data.

Differences in groups of respondents. As to differences between administrator and student perceptions, where administrators and students did exhibit a significant difference was in their perception of the amount of given behaviors (physical, psychological, or sexual abuse) that students had experienced. Administrators appeared more likely to believe that students had experienced these behaviors than students reported ($p<0.0001$). Administrators in the current

study appeared to be overestimating the incidence of specific behaviors encountered by students, although not overestimating the amount of dating violence in general. A possible reason for this discrepancy between administrators' relatively accurate estimates of the amount of dating violence and significantly inaccurate estimates of the type of dating violence may be accounted for by one or both groups not having a clear perception of what actually constitutes dating violence. One possibility for this is that students might see hitting as violence, but not shoving as not violence.

As to rape beliefs and agreement/disagreement with those beliefs, where differences were found in this question between administrators and students: it is likely that administrators have developed, over their lifetime, a more pragmatic view of the gray areas between blaming and blameless, while students of college age may still see concepts as black or white. In other words, a younger student might not be aware of the "blame the victim" concept, or might feel that either someone is at fault or they are not, and lack understanding of the continuum between fault and faultless. Within student demographics, those students who agreed with the rape belief statements may be experiencing the "zeal of the newly converted," as they leave home and begin developing their own world view. These tended to be the younger students (freshmen/sophomores) and the resident students. Resident students and freshmen/sophomores may well be the same students overall, as it seems more likely that younger students are the ones who are residents, as the older students (21 and up) may be living off-campus in apartments or are married.

Caution is urged in use of these findings, primarily within the realm of causation. For example, if a woman does not resist rape it cannot be said that she is or is not complicit unless it is known why she did not resist. A woman could be afraid of what the attacker will do if she does resist, she could feel that her attacker is so much stronger resistance is futile, or she could be drugged without her knowledge. Most date rape drugs, due to their pharmacodynamics, render the victim unable to resist, or at best unable to recall, events (Smith, et al, 2002). Further, she could

be intoxicated (intentionally or not), and she could be so frightened that she is psychologically or physically incapable of resistance. These are just a few examples of why a woman might not fight back. Similarly, if a woman goes home with a stranger that could mean it was a blind date set up by someone she trusted, or it could be someone she just picked up in a bar. Additionally, it could mean she needed a place to go immediately, and what was offered appeared the lesser of two evils. Therefore, whether the respondents in this study agree or disagree with these statements should be analyzed judiciously.

Knowledge of college policy. Overall, students and administrators exhibited some differences regarding knowledge of college dating violence policy. There were no significant differences noted in knowledge of college policy regarding types of security on the campus, how to reach security, and where to find a policy if one existed. Logic suggests that given that all four campuses have a security officer, and that on a small campus students are likely to see that officer on a regular basis, students would be more likely to be aware of his/her existence and how to reach security. What significant differences were found did not appear to be as concentrated within a specific question, as occurred with dating violence beliefs and experiences. No significant differences were found between students by selected demographics.

One area of difference was found in whom a student would call for help in a violent dating situation. As to whom a person would call first for help, students in the current study were largely in favor of calling friends/family if experiencing dating violence, with local/state police a distant second (Table 17). Care should be taken with this finding in that, as discussed previously, state/local police may be less available in a rural, sparsely-populated area. While administrators agreed with this, many (21%) felt that campus police or 911 would be the first call. There is enough discrepancy there to be of concern. This finding is supported in the literature by Carmody et al. (2009), who found that a primary need for colleges was statewide coordination of sexual assault services. The finding is further supported by Beattie and Shaughnessy (2000) and

DeKeseredy and Schwartz (2008), who found that in rural communities there is less access to state and local police/911. Further support was found by investigator interviews with Kentucky State Police regarding police availability and accessibility in rural Kentucky counties. Annan (2008) further supports this finding in her study reporting that fewer police officers, bad roads, and poor cell reception contribute to those who experience dating violence preferring to contact family or friends, who are already established as interested in responding immediately and whose cell connectivity may already be known. Fletcher and Bryden (2007) reported that female college students and employees were more likely to use security than to depend on other means of safety on campus, which was not consistent with the current study's finding that friends and family were more likely to be called. The difference here is possibly a result of Fletcher and Bryden (2007) including employees in their study, while the current study did not include employees other than administrators. Hertzog and Yeilding (2009) found that college women tend to discuss risk factors of sexual violence with friends. This somewhat similar to the current study's finding that college women are more likely to call a friend or family member for help.

A disturbing finding from the current study was that 30% of students believe that no one on campus provides dating violence information, whereas the bulk of administrators perceive this information is provided by campus security, faculty, coaches, and residence hall staff. In a sense this issue was at the crux of the current study: if administrators provide information on dating violence, are the students aware it was provided? While a majority (65.9%) of students did believe dating violence information was provided by security, faculty, coaches and residence staff, the large number (30.1%) reporting that this information is not provided is of concern. Several studies exist which address the value of providing information about dating violence. Hertzog & Yeilding (2009) found that education about dating violence did not appear to reduce risk-taking behaviors among women, while Borge, et al. (2008) found that 43% of students reported not receiving dating violence information from their college. Menning (2009) similarly

found that when administration attempted to provide dating violence information, no effect on the level of concern about dating violence was apparent among students. Hertzog and Yeilding (2009) suggest that more strategies to reach students with dating violence information would be appropriate. An example of a strategy was reported by Halligan (2009), who reported that a few small community colleges have begun increasing the presence and training of their security personnel/systems.

One area of significant difference ($p < 0.0001$) between administrators and students was whether the campus has a policy on dating violence at all. Students largely did not know, although a surprising number of administrators also did not know. Given that students were largely unaware as to the existence or not of a dating violence policy on campus, it is not surprising that almost all students expressed that they were not familiar with the Clery Act (see Table 19). That administrators did not know of a dating violence policy, and some administrators were unaware of the Clery Act, posed a concern. Implications of this are discussed further in Chapter Five, under recommendations for colleges.

Differences in groups of respondents. The differences in whom a student experiencing dating violence would call first for help is quite possibly the result of four factors. The first is that, as Annan (2008) reported, students may already know how well the call will connect to “frequently called numbers,” who are likely friends and family. The second is that when scared, a student may have a natural tendency to call family, as a result of a lifelong habit of calling family for help, especially as students may not be long away from the family household. The third reason is that, similarly to students not reporting rape because they don’t want others to know, students may prefer to call a girlfriend rather than cause parents to “freak out,” or make a “big deal” of calling 911. A fourth difference might be that, as reported by Hertzog & Yeilding (2009) underclassmen and resident students may be younger, thus are more naïve and conservative. Administrators, on the other hand, are more mature and more experienced, thus more likely to see

the value of calling professionals for help.

That students did not know whether the campus had a dating violence policy was somewhat concerning, or should be to administrators. This is likely the result that students just are not retaining the information, if indeed it was ever absorbed at all. Administrators, for the most part, knew whether the college had a dating violence policy. Given that it is their job to know this, and indeed to create the policy, it is not surprising they were more likely than students to know of its existence.

The Clery Act, while designed to protect students by enacting legal requirements upon the college, is not something a student would likely be familiar with, even if she reported dating violence. The Clery Act would serve more as a follow-up to an incident, one that was completed by college administration. Not all administrators were familiar with the Clery Act. This is not surprising, given that “administrators” for the current study included not only presidents, deans, etc., but accountants and similar “other professionals.” While presidents, deans and legal counsel would be expected to be familiar with the Clery Act, other professionals such as accountants would not necessarily have any involvement with Clery. The expectation was that senior level administrators were aware of the Clery act, given that it’s most likely their jobs that could be on the line if Clery Act requirements are not met. This is borne out by *CQ Researcher* (2011), in which it was noted that a section of the Clery Act exempts college counselors from reporting dating violence incidents reported to them in confidence. However, it would be reasonable to expect counselors to report incidents of dating violence to administration, even if names of perpetrators and victims were omitted. As with students in general, commuter and resident students, and under- and upper-classmen, were not familiar with the Clery Act. That students are not aware of Clery is not as serious a concern as their lack of knowledge of dating violence policy. The Clery Act is a means for requiring federal reporting from college administration, thus it is not surprising or worrying that students are not familiar with it. Students being unaware of

dating violence policies is a concern, however, because those policies exist to support and protect students. One of the problems at the crux of the current study was the question of whether students are aware of the existing policies. If they are not aware of the policies which exist to help them, they likely will not get the needed information or support to help them avoid becoming a victim of dating violence, or to know what to do if they do become a victim.

The smaller and more rural a college, the less likelihood there is of a campus health service or a student psychological counseling service, as a result of financial and/or geographical issues related to developing such assets; and the less likelihood there is of sufficient (and sufficiently trained) security personnel on campus. Another problem for a small rural college is the importance of good relations with the associated community, which can impact funding, law enforcement response, and faculty and student housing, at a minimum. If a campus were known to have a high level of violence, it is unlikely a landlord would be willing to rent housing to students, or even to faculty and staff.

Law enforcement in particular can be a problem for a rural college: it seems likely that small or very small colleges, particularly those in rural areas, are less likely to have a large security or campus police force, thus they may well depend upon local and/or state police or sheriff's offices. To further complicate the situation, city police forces in small towns typically do not cover the entire county, and in some counties the sheriff's office is not adequately staffed to provide 24-hour coverage, leaving most of the police coverage to state police. An example of this issue is provided in a small county in which one subject college is located: according to the Kentucky State Police there are from 1 to 4 state police officers on duty at one time for the 33,000 people and 564 square miles encompassing the subject college county and the adjacent county, which are covered simultaneously by the same officer(s). The officers on duty patrol nearly 1,000 miles of roads in the two counties. The subject college is located near the geographic center of the two counties, yet it is quite possible that if the officer on duty were patrolling one of the more

distant sections of the county when an emergency call comes in, transportation time could still take 45-60 minutes, assuming good road conditions (no ice or heavy rain). Most of the roads in the two counties are two-lane “back roads,” narrow and curving. There are numerous stretches where, if an officer were to get behind a hay wagon traveling at 10 miles per hour, the officer would be unable to pass for several miles. That is a best case scenario, as bad weather or previous engagements could add to the response time. This lack of security suggests that an escalating dating violence situation might not be quickly resolved by any sort of law enforcement or security. In addition, small colleges are less likely to have a student health service, and may well have fewer, if any, responsible adult personnel on campus at night.

Application of Health Belief Model. The Health Belief Model was found to be a reasonable model to address dating violence on small rural campuses. The following shows the ways in which it could be applied, first for students, followed by potential application to institutions. The second application is referred to as the Institutional Health Belief Model.

Health Belief Model (students)

Perceived Susceptibility

Does the student believe she could be a victim of dating violence?

A: Has she experienced actual or perceived threat of dating violence, or have friends who have experienced dating violence?

B: Does she know how to prevent and/or get help with dating violence?

C: Does the college have dating violence policies/programs in place?

D: Does the college have a security person or campus police officer on duty during nights and weekends?

Perceived Severity

What might be the results for a student, physically or psychologically, of experiencing dating violence?

A: Could she be killed as a result of dating violence?

B: Could she be severely hurt, such as cuts and bruises or broken bones, as a result of dating violence?

C: Could she be raped?

D: Could she experience PTSD or other severe psychological trauma as a result of dating violence?

Perceived Benefits

Does the student understand the positive aspects of being familiar with college policies and practices to prevent or assist victims of dating violence?

A: Does the student understand the benefits to her of knowing how to contact someone for fast help if needed?

B: Does the student comprehend the importance to her and to other students of reporting incidents of dating violence?

C: Does the student understand the benefits to her of acquiring and retaining information on dating violence when the college presents or makes available a program or information?

Perceived Barriers

Why would the student not absorb and retain dating violence information provided by the college, or not report the incident?

A: Would the student be too embarrassed to report the incident?

B: Would the student be afraid of retaliation by the perpetrator and/or his friends?

C: Would the student be too distracted by other aspects of becoming a college student to devote attention to retaining dating violence information?

D: Would the student feel that dating violence is not likely to happen to her?

E: Would the student feel that it is not "cool" to worry about such things as dating violence?

F: Would the student feel it would not be worth the trouble to report the incident as nothing might be done about it?

Cues to Action

What would make a student revise her personal views, and begin to pay attention to dating violence programs and to report dating violence?

A: if she experiences dating violence for the first time, or is in a situation that causes her to worry about dating violence

B: she or another student severely injured or killed by dating violence

Self-Efficacy

Why would a student believe that by attention and adherence to campus dating violence programs she could more safely navigate dating and avoid serious injury from dating violence?

A: She would know exactly what to do in case of a real or perceived threat of dating violence

B: She would be able to explain to a potential perpetrator what the results might be if he acted violently against her

C: She would know that the college would follow through with investigating any incident and punishing the perpetrator

Institutional Health Belief Model

Perceived Susceptibility Does the college administration believe the college could incur the “disease,” (i.e., damages from dating violence), particularly if there are not adequate policies in place?

A: How much dating violence does the college experience?

B: Do the students know how to prevent and/or get help with dating violence?

C: Does the college have dating violence policies/programs in place?

Perceived Severity How much damage might occur to the college if appropriate programs/policies are not in place?

A: Might a major lawsuit or fine occur that would have a major negative financial impact on the college?

B: Would the bad publicity from a problem cause the college to lose students and therefore tuition and/or donation funds?

C: Would the Board of Trustees perceive that 'bad management' led to the problem, thereby causing administrative jobs to be in jeopardy?

D: Would liability insurance rates rise in the event of a serious incident such as death of a student?

E: Would the college incur other penalties?

Perceived Benefits Does the college understand the positive aspects of having adequate policies/programs in place?

A: Good public relations: admitting the potential exists for a problem and a plan to prevent the problem : 1) open records such that public and government perceive nothing is hidden, and 2) specific, known, enforced punishment for those who perpetrate dating violence

B: Avoidance of financial loss: 1) eliminate likelihood of fines by compliance with Clery Act, 2) avoid loss of tuition that might occur subsequent to incident

Does the college understand the positive aspects of having adequate policies/programs in place?

Perceived Barriers

Why would the college not institute adequate programs/policies?

A: Financial cost of adequate policies: 1) infrastructure changes needed, 2) assigning responsibility for records compliance, 3) additional personnel needed for security

B: Reluctance to be perceived as a site of dating violence

C: Belief the incident is overrated

D: Ostrich effect: belief that if it is ignored, dating violence incident did not happen or will go away, i.e. "best not spoken of"

E: Belief that the specific type of college is immune to dating violence: 1) single-sex college, 2) faith-based institution, 3) small local college

F: Difficulty of proving that college had protected the student to the fullest extent possible

Cues to Action

What would make a college re-evaluate its position on dating violence?

A: student severely injured or death

B: lawsuit from student/parents

C: fine for not reporting incidents via Clery Act

D: Increased liability insurance pursuant to an incident

E: Negative publicity from media

Self-Efficacy

How would a college be inclined to believe effective programs could be created?

A: Benchmark dating violence programs/policies for colleges with very low incidence of dating violence

B: Review past incidents to determine more suitable ways to handle incidents

C: Stakeholder involvement in determining most effective policies: students, security, legal counsel, residence advisors, counselors, parents

Summary

Results of this study indicated some areas of support for agreement between administrators and students regarding their respective perceptions of dating violence incidence and policy, while other areas appeared to show differences in those perceptions. There did not appear to be a clear-cut division between agreement and disagreement of perceptions. Overall, administrators and students appeared to have similar perceptions of the amount and type of dating violence experienced on their campus, and similar beliefs as to theories about rape. The most notable exception to this was that there did appear to be more differences in perceptions as to how many students had experienced specific types of dating violence behavior. Similarly, knowledge of college policy on dating violence indicated overall differences, with the strongest point of agreement being where a college dating violence policy would be found (administrative offices). Results would indicate that administrators need to do more to ensure that students are aware of policies and where help can be found, and need to become more familiar with exactly what female students are experiencing.

Chapter Five: Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Research

Summary

College dating violence is occurring at alarming rates, with estimates that 1 in 5 college women report being sexually assaulted while attending college. With 17 million college students in the United States, that 20% (3.4 million) is too large to ignore. College violence, including dating violence, has been addressed as a problem by the American College Health Association, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Centers for Disease Control, and the Obama Administration, among others. Reduction of intimate partner violence (including dating violence) is a goal of Healthy People 2020, Healthy Campus 2020, and Healthy Kentuckians 2020. Yet even with such thorough acknowledgement of the problem, the issue still abounds, and colleges may suffer the consequences. When a college acquires a reputation (or worse, national headlines) for violence losses are likely to be incurred. That can include lowered admission rates, decreased retention, decreased alumni donations, damaged community relations, and increased insurance liability, possibly lawsuits. Careers can be destroyed or jobs lost as a result of the detrimental effects dating violence has on the real victims, the students.

One partial solution to college dating violence has been the enactment, in 1990, of the Clery Act, which requires that colleges report crime statistics and specify what security measures are in place. Still, nearly half of the college students surveyed have reported that they have received no information about dating violence from their college. Reporting dating violence on campuses has been an additional issue. College students tend to be reluctant to report sexual assault, due to a combination of fear that nothing will be done, embarrassment, and lack of knowledge of what constitutes rape. Another complicating factor reported by a staff writer for *CQ Researcher* was that the Clery Act exempts college counselors from reporting requirements, thus administrators may legitimately be unaware of incidents. Logically, it is very difficult for a college's administration to address problems if administration is not aware the problems have

occurred.

Much research has been accomplished regarding college dating violence, but almost the entire body of research centers on either large and/or urban colleges, or does not specify the location and size of the subject college. The purpose of this study was to examine dating violence on small rural college campuses in order to determine if the perceptions of college administrators and female students were the same regarding the type and incidence of dating violence occurring on the campus, and to determine the extent of knowledge of college dating violence policy of the college administrators and female students. A further purpose was to determine if there are differences in the perceptions of dating violence on campus between resident and commuter students, and between underclassmen as opposed to upperclassmen. To that end, the following research questions were posed, along with the hypotheses found in Appendix E.

Research questions answered by this study included:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding dating violence on small rural college campuses based on selected demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by class standing (freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?
2. What are the perceptions of college administrators and of female students regarding dating violence experiences of female students on small rural college campuses?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of the experience of dating violence between female students and college administrators on small rural college campuses?
4. What is the knowledge of dating violence policy of female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?
5. What are the differences in knowledge between female students and college administrators relative to dating violence policies on small rural college campuses?

6. What are the similarities and differences in the perceptions of female students regarding knowledge of dating violence policy on small rural college campuses based on selected demographic variables of residence (resident versus commuter) and by class standing (freshman and sophomores versus juniors and seniors)?

This study consisted of surveys administered to 306 female college students and 52 college administrators at four subject colleges in Kentucky, all defined as small by the Carnegie College Ranking System and as rural according to the U.S. Census Bureau. For students, surveys were administered to a convenience sample at each college in a face-to-face format, and for administrators the surveys were delivered to each college's designated coordinator, who distributed them to all college administrators at their college. Each survey contained twenty questions. Administrator and student surveys were matched closely, the only questions that differed were that while administrators were asked what position they hold at the college and how long they've been an administrator at the college, students were asked their academic level of achievement and whether they were commuter or resident students. The remaining eighteen questions for each group were identical, and were grouped into two domains: a) dating violence beliefs and experience, which primarily addressed how accurate administrator perceptions were of what students are experiencing, and b) knowledge of dating violence policy, primarily addressing students' perceptions of the policies and procedures in place to protect them from, or prevent, dating violence. Questions were analyzed using the SAS 9.2 system, with either Fischer's Exact or Pearson Chi-Square tests.

Findings were that administrators are relatively cognizant regarding what female students are experiencing as regards dating violence, with administrator and female students reporting similar perceptions of the amount of dating violence experienced by female college students in small rural colleges. . The bulk of students and administrators were in agreement that 30% or less of students report dating violence, and indicated reasons of embarrassment, fear of negative

reaction from the abuser, and a belief that nothing would be done anyway. Few differences were found in responses between commuter and resident students, and between underclassmen and upperclassmen. What differences were found could potentially be attributed to underclassmen and resident students (these may be largely the same populations, underclassmen being more likely to live in dormitories) are more naïve and conservative.

Slight differences, however, were shown in perceptions of the specific type of dating violence behaviors experienced. Administrators tended to believe that the specific abuse behaviors occurred at a higher rate than students indicated, and seemed to have beliefs more in line with what other studies reported. When asked about dating violence beliefs, students tended toward agreement with three of the statements regarding rape, whereas administrators disagreed with all eight statements. Primarily, students tended to assign some blame to a woman for rape if she is drunk, and approximately one-third of students felt that a woman bore some responsibility for rape if she went home with a stranger, or if she wore certain types of clothing. When it came to knowledge of college policy, including safety and security, students did not exhibit a particularly strong knowledge of what was available. Not surprisingly, administrators tended to score somewhat more highly in this knowledge. While the questions regarding knowledge of campus security available, and how to reach security, did not show significant differences between administrators and students, the questions regarding dissemination of dating violence knowledge to students did indicate significant differences, although both groups were in agreement on where to find a dating violence policy if indeed one existed. There were certainly more differences exhibited in the domain of dating violence policy knowledge than in that of dating violence experience and beliefs. An interesting significant difference was found in whom a student would likely call first for help in a dating violence situation. Administrators felt the first call would be to 911, while students overwhelmingly reported they would call a friend or family member.

While administrator views toward dating violence were not addressed in the literature, issues related to intimate partner violence victims in rural areas securing emergency help have been addressed, and those findings indicate that this should be an area of concern in dating violence. One of the most significant findings of this study, relative to research question 4, was that 30% of students believed that no one on campus provides dating violence information, while most administrators reported that this information is provided by a combination of campus security, faculty, coaches, and residence hall staff. This is borne out in the literature by other studies in which students reported they had received no such information. Students were largely unfamiliar with the Clery Act, while most administrators were familiar with it. Differences were found at a significant level for most of the dating violence policy knowledge questions. Research question 3 was answered by the finding that administrators and female students at small rural colleges do, overall, have different levels of knowledge of campus dating violence policy. This concept that students are not aware of what exists to help them strikes at the heart of the current study.

McMahon (2008) calls for development of comprehensive sexual assault policies on campuses, relative to National Institute of Justice requirements. Other researchers suggest the importance of developing increased education for students (especially first year students) as to what their options are regarding dating violence, and increased education in general about issues surrounding dating violence: what constitutes rape, how to get support, how to report it, what to do if it happens (Guerette & Caron, 2007). The importance of student affairs professionals in implementing student dating violence education programs is emphasized by Hertzog and Yeilding (2009).

Conclusions

Findings of this study were not wildly divergent from those of studies done at large and/or urban and/or unspecified colleges, with the current study reporting, as did other studies, a

dating violence rate of 20-25% among college students. Given the geographic isolation of rural colleges, and the limited nature of ways to avoid an abuser, a higher rate of dating violence would not have been surprising. Conversely, there existed the possibility that the smallness and closeness of a small rural college could result in students who were less likely to become violent with dates. Results of the survey analyses indicated that administrators are relatively cognizant of the incidence of dating violence female students are experiencing. This finding, that administration is not out of touch with what is occurring on campus relative to dating violence, should be somewhat reassuring to college administrators at the subject colleges, particularly in light of the fact that administrators did not appear to be as aware of the specific type of dating violence found on the college campuses, relative to psychological, physical, or sexual types of dating violence. At the same time, administrators did not appear to know what type of violence students were experiencing. This seemed paradoxical. There were no indicators as to why administrators were aware of the incidence, but not the type, of dating violence found on their campuses. Conceivable reasons for this knowledge gap could include a hearsay or surface, rather than in-depth, knowledge of the status of dating violence on campus; failure of students to report dating violence in any detail, whether from lack of knowledge, embarrassment, or inattention to detail on the part of the reporting student; lack of knowledge on the part of administration or students as to what actually constitutes dating violence; and failure to pay attention to detail when incidents of dating violence are reported. Perhaps the reports do not ask the correct questions, but college administrators do need to address in some way that they are not comprehending what type of violence is occurring. The study results should be somewhat reassuring to college administrators that they do indeed have a handle on the amount of crimes on campus, at least those related to dating violence.

While study results may cause administration to breathe a sigh of relief that they are not out of touch with how much dating violence is occurring on campus, that sigh of relief needs to

be held until colleges have addressed the problem that students do not seem to be aware of dating violence information that has been provided to them. This lack of awareness suggests that students are less likely to be able to protect themselves from dating violence. That students were relatively unaware that information on dating violence policies and procedures is being disseminated should be of major concern to administrators. There is nothing positive to be gained when the college works hard to provide information to students, and the students do not recognize that the information has been provided, or do not retain the information.

One explanation for this failure to acknowledge programs presented, and policies in place could include inattention and distractions, particularly for students who are away from home for the first time and do not have parents handy to remind them to look for information. College students in a meeting may be easily distracted by cellular phones, proximity of friends or “attractive others,” or concern over an upcoming (or recently past) test or assignment. Other possible reasons include the “cramming” effect, of learning the information for the moment, then promptly relegating it to the mental “back forty”; failure to attend a required dating violence program which has no repercussions for failure to attend; and a belief that “it won’t happen to me.” In an interesting reversal of part of this knowledge gap, students did seem to know exactly where to look for dating violence policies and information, if that information existed.

One area of concern for administrators should be whom students would call for help if experiencing dating violence. Administrators believed that students would call 911 or campus security, while students overwhelmingly reported they would call a trusted friend or family member. Given that most family members may be miles, or hundreds of miles, from campus, this appears to be an area that administrators need to address in order to encourage students to utilize more local assistance. In an interesting paradox regarding this section, students appear to be familiar with the type of campus security available. This paradox of knowing what’s there, but not using it, may suggest a lack of confidence in the type of help immediately available to

students experiencing dating violence. Certainly this is an area that administrators must address.

The Health Belief Model was an appropriate model to use with this study, and can be viewed in two ways in relation to the study. The obvious use of the Health Belief model is shown in student responses. That students perceived they would be at least somewhat susceptible to dating violence was indicated in that the majority of students perceiving that up to 30% of students experience dating violence. The types of dating violence behaviors experienced suggest that students do have some understanding of their susceptibility. Reasons given by students for not reporting dating violence suggest a barrier to reporting dating violence, as does the tendency to call a trusted friend or family member, rather than 911, for assistance. Additionally, those reasons (fear that nothing would be done about it, or too embarrassed to report) suggest that students do not necessarily have the self-efficacy to surmount the hurdles of prevention, protection, and reporting.

An alternative application of the Health Belief model is to look at the college as the entity, or subject, of the Health Belief Model. From this perspective administration would be viewed as “being” the college, representing the official college viewpoint. In that sense, the college would likely self-perceive as very susceptible (and the resulting problem very severe) to dating violence, given the consequences (reduced enrollment, potential lawsuits, negatively impacted community relations) of failing to protect students from, or report incidents of, dating violence. An obvious barrier to successful prevention of dating violence can be found in the results reported by the current study, that even when a program is presented or a policy disseminated, students tend not to absorb and retain the information successfully.

Limitations of the Study

As analysis of this study progressed, note was made of several issues of concern:

- The small number of administrator and female student subjects: for a college to receive direct benefit from this study it would need to be repeated with a larger sample size of

both administrators and students. Although the current study focused on 50% of the small rural colleges in Kentucky, out of the four subject colleges a total of only 52 administrators completed the survey, and 24 of those (46%) were from the second smallest college. Although that particular college might have a relatively strong determination as to what administrators perceive, those colleges with only 7-10 administrators responding will be hard pressed to make sufficient use of the information provided. The number of female student subjects was substantially larger, but still was only half the number anticipated to provide substantive data for analysis.

- The small number of subject colleges: only four subject colleges participated in the survey. Including all eight small rural colleges in Kentucky would have provided more generalizable data, as would including small rural colleges from other states.
- Survey timing: part of the problem with participation, both with colleges and with subjects, was that data were collected over a major winter holiday, at the end of fall semester. Repeating this survey with all eight small rural Kentucky colleges, and at a time of year when the semester is in full swing, would optimally give much better data via higher participation rates.
- Survey question selection: while most of the questions posed in the surveys were logical and relevant questions, a few of the questions did not lend themselves well to analysis. The first such question was the question addressing the type of security on the campus. One option was “Emergency call boxes.” Several of the students expressed that they were not aware of this item, and it is logical that on a very small campus there would not be emergency call boxes. This question could be better adjusted to reflect the reality of the size of the campuses being studied. This also applies to the next question, in which “emergency call box” is an option for whom a student would call if in trouble. Question 5 addressed the appropriateness of talking about and/or seeking help with

dating violence on campus. This question appeared to be confusing to participants, as evidenced by the large number of participants not answering one or both sections of the question, although the intent was that both parts of the question be answered 'yes' or 'no'. Question 11 addressed why a student might not report being a victim of dating violence. Although the administrators appeared to be comfortable with picking one reason, 8 of the student subjects expressed that it was difficult to choose one specific reason; that more than one reason might apply. Question 14 was representative of the same issue: 31 students (10%) and 4 administrators (7.7%) either ignored this question altogether or responded that the punishment would be dependent upon the type of crime, and/or that more than one punishment would be equally employed.

- Survey design: The variety of response options in this survey created problems relative to hypothesis statements and data analysis. With the variables already somewhat confusing in that they were the perceptions of the participants, some questions were "check all options that apply," some were "check one," some were a Likert scale, while others were one or a series of "yes" or "no" responses. Redesigning the survey questions would have greatly facilitated analysis of results. Survey design needs to be valid and reliable, and based upon a theoretical framework. Items and subscales need to be accurate and consistent. Separate items might be needed for rural/small colleges compared to urban/large colleges. Basing the questions more specifically upon the Health Belief Model of Health Promotion would lend itself to a much more logical survey design. Specifically, basing questions upon the elements of the Health Belief Model, with response options aligned, would allow a more clear comparison of administrator and student responses, and more streamlined hypothesis design.

Recommendations

This study provides clear pathways to knowledge that health promoters could potentially use in assisting both the students and the colleges. Numerous suggestions for helping colleges to protect their students, and thus the college, are listed below.

- College administrators in this study are clearly not doing a sufficient job of ensuring that students are aware of college policies, and are aware of information that has been provided to them. It not only needs to be ensured that students receive the information, for the protection of the college it needs to be documented that each student did receive it. Suggestions for improving this include:
 1. Many colleges now require freshmen to take a college success course. Ideally, health education could be included in such a course, identifying provision of information on what constitutes dating violence, and addressing the prevalence and prevention of, and response to dating violence. The importance of reporting dating violence to the college could also be stressed, as applicable to policy and procedures.
 2. Creation of a mandatory class with this information (or inclusion in a course that many colleges currently require freshmen to take, involving success in college), such that the grade provides documentation of receiving the information. Specifically, a Health Education class might be utilized to include information on dating violence.
 3. Upon acceptance to the college, including a document signed by both college legal counsel and student or parent that specifies what the Clery Act is and what it provides, where results for this college can be found, and whom to contact with any questions. A further application of this would be a document outlining exactly how and when the college addresses dating violence to the student population.
 4. A mandatory ‘walk-through’ of campus by security (with very small groups of students), in which students are introduced to security personnel, use of emergency

call-boxes or texting systems or contact information is demonstrated (and practiced by students)

5. Required self-defense courses
 6. Increased visuals/graphics of dating violence information
 7. Inclusion of dating violence information whenever the opportunity presents itself: for instance, during Women's History Month the topic could be required to be addressed in each course or by each faculty member (and included on an exam), similarly to how Constitution Day is sometimes required to be addressed. Note should be made that to do this, faculty members would need to be trained in presenting dating violence information.
 8. Required periodic sessions with a campus counselor or nurse, in which the professional can introduce the topic. This is probably the most expensive of options, but the cost of a lawsuit could potentially be quite high.
 9. Colleges need to investigate what program already exist and are proven successful in preventing dating violence (for example, the Green Dot program).
- Colleges must re-evaluate the costs of failing to provide a Campus Health or a Health and Wellness Center. This is a logical place for students to come for help, and could include a small Dating/Relationship Center or counselor. Even if not open 24/7, such a center might conceivably have an "on call" staff to handle crises.
 - Publicizing and being very clear about penalties for abusing another student might be analyzed as a possible deterrent.
 - College administrators must be willing to have frank, open discussions with their Boards and with local communities, particularly law enforcement and mental health facilities and areas where student housing might be prevalent. One option here might be use of the ITGA, or International Town and Gown Association, to facilitate relations.

- Colleges might look to technology for assistance. Emergency call boxes perhaps should occupy a more prominent position in budgeting decisions. Further, a texting system might be possible in which students could text campus security via a 3-digit emergency number.
- Small rural colleges would do well to follow the example of the University of Kentucky.

This involves two primary concepts:

1. Setting up intervention programs that disperse the responsibility for campus safety to the entire campus (students, faculty, staff, police force, and others that partner with the community to make a difference). This concept of spreading the responsibility to the entire campus community is a good way of making all aware of potential problems.
 2. Training college students, for example those in leadership roles such as student government, residence advisors, or presidents of sororities/fraternities, to recognize potential problems and intervene. This is probably the most effective and least expensive option available. This concept, named the “Green Dot Program,” might be compared to using a designated driver when drinking. To enlarge upon the Green Dot plan, one way that this could be accomplished is by trained students knowing when to call for assistance, even if the assistance takes the form of a “buddy system” of a couple other students. A further variation on this idea is to form a campus “Dating Violence Prevention” club, students working with other students to educate and protect. Small and rural colleges should give strong consideration to asking these “Green Dot” program representatives from larger universities (such as the University of Kentucky) to come to the college and train others to intervene in dating violence situations, as they apparently are willing to do.
- In the case of a campus with no health service, prior arrangements might be made with regional emergency services. A problem with this could be that while an emergency room

may be necessary if a student has been harmed by a date, no emergency room personnel are required to report back to the college. Prior arrangements could have the ability to lessen the impact of this. Although HIPAA prevents emergency rooms from providing personal information, it might be that an arrangement can be worked out with nearby facilities whereby the information is relayed that an incident (unknown victim) occurred on a specific date. This would only work, however, if the victim specified they were a student at the specific college, although emergency personnel could be encouraged to ask the student if she would like someone from the college contacted. Additionally, there are several hospitals in Kentucky which provide a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner service, which could be used in the case of an assault upon a student.

- Whatever processes or policies are in place, students must be able to access. This suggests that logical places (including duplications), based upon student perceptions of where information would be found (provided in this study) include the campus website, the student handbook, and posted in classroom buildings, student centers and dormitories.
- College administration must have full knowledge of and compliance with Clery (and in Kentucky, Minger). Lack of this knowledge appears to be a factor in colleges getting into trouble with fines, lost jobs, and poor student retention in the past. Specific suggestions follow:
 1. College administrators must exercise extreme due diligence in prompt reporting of crimes for the Clery Act and (in Kentucky) the Michael Minger Act, and must be aware of all legal obligations relating to dating violence.
 2. Colleges absolutely must keep up with what (and whom) has been reported. When the student was killed at the University of Virginia, the information was available to administration that the couple had domestic dating violence issues in the past. It is imperative that college administration appoint a reliable officer to stay current on this

information, and to follow up after events to see if the parties are still involved with each other.

This study has implications for Health Promotion. While some students may seek out dating violence information, the assumption cannot be made that all will. In order to help students empower and protect themselves, colleges must stay actively involved in student life, and must demonstrate both that they have actively pursued awareness of the importance of providing dating violence information to students, and that they are in strict compliance (both letter and spirit of the law) with reporting requirements per Clery/Mingler. Knowledge from this study can be used to attain the goals of Healthy People 2020, Healthy Campus 2020, Healthy Kentuckians 2020, and the Centers for Disease Control. Incumbent upon health promoters is the charge to do everything possible to meet U.S. health goals. To do that, there needs to be a combination of planned learning experiences providing the opportunity to acquire knowledge, attitudes and skills to adopt healthy behavior. Colleges must stand as advocate for the health and well-being of the students, and empower the students to be advocates for themselves.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study is rife with suggestions for further research in this ever-growing field, from type or size of college to type of student population, geographical region differences, demographic differences, and the obvious question of the role played by drugs and alcohol.

- Given that three of the four subject colleges exhibit some strong religious ties (one is Catholic, two are Protestant) it would seem of interest to determine exactly how dating violence differs (if it does) in a religion-based, or ‘faith-based,’ college environment than in a secular environment. Some of the comments added to the questionnaires in this study suggest that religion, whether of the student or the express religious ties of the college, does play a part in how dating violence is viewed by both students and administrators. For example, there were comments relative to how religious certain “Christian” male

students actually are, and comments relative to how a female student is treated if she becomes pregnant out of wedlock (versus how her male partner is treated).

- Are profit-based and not-for-profit colleges experiencing (and reporting) the same results, relative to dating violence? The Clery Act was designed for colleges that receive federal funding, which would mean that not-for-profit colleges potentially might be exempt, yet the subject colleges all appeared to subscribe to the tenets of the Clery Act. There was, however, some frustration expressed verbally by students that dating violence is under-reported by the college(s).
- Different demographics could potentially change the results of this study. The four subject colleges were small and rural, almost entirely White student populations. Most colleges which have been part of dating violence studies are large and urban. A student might find a different world (as regards dating violence) in a small *urban* college, for instance in a place such as New York City, or a small located within a city. One interesting study would be small rural colleges in other states, such as northern or 'snow' states, in which students might be confined indoors for most of the winter. Additionally, inclusion of colleges in which racial/ethnic makeup is more diverse has the potential to provide widely varying results.
- Two salient factors in college dating violence are the behavior of students, and the effectiveness of programs and policies. One of the subject colleges offers a class in model family behavior. An obvious direction for further research is to institute such a program at a college and then redo the study after a year or so of the program/course, in order to determine whether the course (or whatever program is selected) has any effect upon the overall status of dating violence on the campus and/or upon the behavior of students. Similarly, other programs instituted might reflect different knowledge and/or behaviors after a period of adjustment.

- Subjects in this study, at least the student subjects, were primarily college freshmen and sophomores, and their average age was 19-20 years. Would older students, such as graduate students, report differently? At first glance it would seem that a graduate student, being both older and more experienced in campus conditions, would be less likely to be a victim of dating violence (although they could experience spousal violence). Whether that is true remains to be determined. Other demographic data that could have an impact is a comparison to determine whether dating violence in large urban universities and dating violence in small rural colleges parallel with the general domestic violence rates of the geographic area. Additionally, the demographics of athletes versus non-athletes, Greek life students versus non-Greek, could be examined.
- Are colleges that are considered more “elite” prone to the same rates and types of dating violence as those that cater primarily to students from the nearby geographic region? For example, one of the small rural colleges in Kentucky is considered more elite, is certainly pricier, and draws its student population from throughout the United States. The four subject colleges in general tend to serve a more local student population, likely serving many non-traditional students who have families and who prefer to attend a college that is geographically nearby. An interesting study would be to match two small rural colleges at opposite ends of the “elite” scale to determine what, if any, differences in dating violence issues exist.
- Increased application of health promotion theories/models, for example, by repeating the study for additional small rural colleges and basing the questionnaire more specifically upon the elements of the Health Belief Model. Use of the Institutional Health Belief Model was found to be a reasonable application; however, other models may work as well or better.

More suggestions for further research include the use of more detailed questions (for

example, if you were sexually assaulted on campus was it a stranger, or an acquaintance), the relationship of family background of violence to the dating violence experienced on campus, and the perception of faculty and staff and of male students. Development of a validated scale for campus violence, a scale that could be used on campuses irrespective of size or location, would be immensely valuable. Following up on self-defense courses to determine if students have needed/used what was taught, if they feel more empowered, and the effectiveness of the teachings would provide some good feedback to colleges.

However, the most likely area for further research may well be the inclusion of drug and alcohol factors, especially the use of “date rape” drugs. Although question 9 somewhat addresses factors of alcohol and drugs, a more complete investigation would probably prove valuable. Questions might include “do you leave your drink unattended, or accept drinks from someone you don’t know,” and “when you were assaulted were you or your date intoxicated” and others from the IRMA survey. Results from this study can be used as a starting point for a college to begin to get an idea of the college’s own situation, and of how best to address it. When colleges can do better at predicting dating violence incidence, and when colleges can be pro-active in prevention and deterrence, the college’s dating violence situation will likely improve, and liability may decrease.

Appendix A

Letter of request to administer survey on subject campus

Jean Oldham Aug 24th, 2011

33 Newby Lane

Harrodsburg, KY 40330

Dear President _____,

I am a doctoral candidate in the department of Kinesiology & Health Promotion, under the College of Education at the University of Kentucky. I am writing this letter as a request to administer a survey at _____ College in support of my doctoral dissertation study. The subject of the dissertation is “Dating Violence on Small rural College Campuses: Are Student and Administrator Perceptions Similar?” The twofold intent is to determine:

- a) whether college administrators accurately understand the incidence and type of dating violence experienced by female students on the campus, and
- b) whether female students and college administrators are thoroughly aware of what policies and programs exist to deter dating violence on the campus.

With your permission I would like to administer the survey in a hard copy format to two groups: the first group consisting of college administrators, including: president, vice-presidents, deans, student life and residence directors and “other professionals” as denoted by IPEDS; and the second group consisting of female undergraduate students aged 18 years or older. To collect the data from the students I am requesting permission to ask faculty to allow me to administer the surveys at the end of class (survey completion should take approximately 10 minutes) or in a group meeting at a time of your choice. To collect the data from administrators I am requesting permission to provide survey packets for each to the Human Resources Director or to

administration for distribution to administrators. Your college's participation and all data collected will be confidential.

Although there will be no identifying information gathered, thus ensuring anonymity of subjects, in the event that the survey questions revive disturbing or uncomfortable feelings it will be necessary for me to recommend a counselor the survey participant could visit at no charge. To that end I would also like to request permission to suggest the counselor at the college for this purpose.

This study is intended to be administered at several small rural colleges in Kentucky. Determination of which colleges qualify as "small" and "rural" is based upon the Carnegie Institute College Rankings system. There will be no information identifying the results from any college in any format that a non-administrator of that college will be able to access. For purposes only of providing the results to each college's administration, each survey will be coded such that the investigator will be able to identify the college. Once the information is collected and analyzed, each college's results will be given to the specific college president along with recommendations for practices that might narrow any gaps between what administrators and female students perceive as dating violence realities and dating violence policies/programs at your college. The proposed study will also be used as a pilot to determine if the methods for collecting this data are appropriate to the situation.

Please consider allowing me to administer this survey at your institution. Should you have further questions, my contact information is below. My academic advisor at the University of Kentucky is Dr. Richard Riggs, Director of Graduate Studies in Kinesiology & Health Promotion. Dr. Riggs can be reached at 859 257-3645, or via richard.riggs@email.uky.edu.

Thank you for considering this request. I will contact you by telephone within the next few days to discuss with the study.

Sincerely,

Jean A. Oldham

Health Promotion Department., College of Education, University of Kentucky

Jean Oldham 859 229-6280, or jaoldh1@email.uky.edu

Appendix B

Survey introductory page

To Administrators and Students of _____ College:

Please consider taking a few minutes to answer the following survey. This survey is designed to determine if college administrators and students on small rural college campuses have the same perceptions of the following: the incidence and type of dating violence affecting students on the campus, the campus policies on dating violence, the dissemination of dating violence information and security measures available on campus. You are receiving this survey because you are one of the following on a small rural college campus: female undergraduate student of at least age 18 years or a college administrator (including “other professional” as denoted by IPEDS). The name of the study is “Dating Violence on Small Rural College Campuses: are Student and Administrator Perceptions Similar.”

Although you will not receive personal benefit from taking part in this research study, your responses may help us understand more about the differences in dating violence perceptions of administrators and students, so that dating violence programs and policies on the campus may be adjusted to provide better assistance to students and to the college.

We hope to receive completed questionnaires from about 600 people, so your answers are important. Of course, you have a choice about whether or not to complete the survey/questionnaire, but if you do participate, you are free to skip any questions or discontinue at any time. The survey/questionnaire will take about ten minutes to complete.

There are no known physical risks to participating in this study. However, questions of a personal or sensitive nature are included in the survey. Although we have tried to minimize this, some

questions may make you upset or feel uncomfortable, and you may choose not to answer them. If some questions do upset you, you may contact the following person for free counseling: School Counselor _____ at _____, email _____.

Your response to the survey is anonymous, which means no names will appear or be used on research documents, or be used in presentations or publications. The research team will not know that any information you provided came from you, nor even whether you participated in the study.

Your college's participation in the study will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. When we write about the study your college will not be identified, and in reporting findings to each college your specific answers will be anonymous, so that no one will know whether you completed the survey or how you answered the questions.

If you have questions about the study, please feel free to ask; my contact information is given below. If you have complaints, suggestions, or questions about your rights as a research volunteer, contact the staff in the University of Kentucky Office of Research Integrity at 859-257-9428 or toll-free at 1-866-400-9428.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this important project.

Sincerely,

Jean Oldham

Department of Kinesiology & Health Promotion Department., College of Education, University of Kentucky

PHONE: 859-229-6280 E-MAIL: jaoldh1@email.uky.edu

Appendix C

Survey questions for administrators

For each question please check only the most appropriate box unless question specifies otherwise.

- 1. What is your belief as to the percent of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence? *Check one.***

	0%		20%		40%		60%		80%		100%
	10%		30%		50%		70%		90%		

- 2. At night and on weekends, what type of security does this campus have? (*Check all that apply*)**

	A security or police officer in a marked car
	A security or police officer on foot or in an un-marked car
	Dependent upon state or local police
	Emergency call boxes at various locations

- 3. If a female student on this campus were with a date who became violent, whom do you believe is the most likely she would call for help FIRST? *Check one.***

	campus police or campus security
	local or state police
	a residence advisor or dean
	a trusted friend or family member
	911 *Please specify whom 911 would reach:
	An 'emergency call box' would be used

4. What percent of female students do you believe (based on conversations, numbers posted around campus, information given out on campus) **KNOW HOW TO REACH** the campus security, campus police, or local/state police in an emergency on weekends or at night? *Check one.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	20%	<input type="checkbox"/>	40%	<input type="checkbox"/>	60%	<input type="checkbox"/>	80%	<input type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	10%	<input type="checkbox"/>	30%	<input type="checkbox"/>	50%	<input type="checkbox"/>	70%	<input type="checkbox"/>	90%		

5. On this campus, is it appropriate to talk about dating violence with faculty, staff, or administrators, or to seek help with dating violence from faculty, staff, or administrators? *Check one.*

Yes	No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Appropriate to talk about dating violence with administrators/faculty/staff
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	appropriate to seek help with dating violence from administrators/faculty/staff

6. Who, if anyone, on this campus provides information on dating violence? *Check all that apply.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	No one provides information
<input type="checkbox"/>	Campus police/security
<input type="checkbox"/>	Deans or Residence Advisors
<input type="checkbox"/>	Faculty or athletic coaches
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student organizations such as student government, phi theta kappa, etc

7. How is the information on dating violence provided? *Check all that apply.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	Information is not provided
<input type="checkbox"/>	Printed/posted (for example, handouts or signs)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Electronically (website or text or email)

	Required meetings
	Student handbook or at orientation
	During class/practice by faculty or coaches
	Voluntary meetings

8. Below are some scenarios a female student might encounter on a date. How often do female students at this college experience these behaviors from someone they are or have been dating or who has asked them for a date? Please check one response for each category.

Never	Once	A few times	Many times	
				Date has been physically abusive. <i>Includes throwing, smashing or breaking an object, destroying possessions, kicking/hitting a wall or piece of furniture, holding date down/ pinning her in place, shaking or rough handling, pulling hair, arm twisting, scratching, spanking, biting, choking, slapping; hitting with object, punching/kicking, stomping, choking or burning, using a weapon, or being beaten up.</i>
				Date has been threatening or psychologically abusive. <i>Includes driving dangerously with date in the car, shaking a finger/fist at date, making threatening faces/gestures, threatening to harm people/damage property date cares about; threatening to kill himself or date, threatening date with weapon, acting as if he wants to kill date.</i>
				Date has been sexually abusive. <i>Includes physically forced vaginal, anal, or oral sex, demanding sexual intercourse against date's will, using an object on date in a sexual way.</i>

9. What is your opinion on the statements listed below?

Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	No opinion	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	
					If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
					If a woman doesn't physically resist sex, even when protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.
					When women go around wearing low-cut tops or short skirts, they're just asking for trouble.
					A rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.
					If a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.
					If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it a rape.
					In reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.
					Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Please check one response for each statement.

10. What is your belief as to the percent of those female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who *report the incident of dating violence*? Check one.

0%	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%
10%	30%	50%	70%	90%	

11. If a student failed to report being the victim of dating violence, what do you believe would be the primary reason? *Check one.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	Might believe that nothing would be done about any dating violence that was reported.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Would be too embarrassed to report being the victim of dating violence.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Would feel no one believed her report of dating violence if she had no proof or witnesses
<input type="checkbox"/>	Would be afraid of a negative reaction from the abuser if an incident were reported.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Might not be sure that the incident that occurred would qualify as dating violence.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (specify)

12. Does this college have a policy on dating violence? *Check one*

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	Don't know

13. If this college does have a policy on dating violence where would you find it? *Check all that apply.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	This college does not have a policy on dating violence
<input type="checkbox"/>	Administrative offices
<input type="checkbox"/>	Campus website or online
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	Library

14. What would happen to a student on this campus who victimizes another student on this campus through dating violence? *Check one.*

	Nothing would happen
	The offending student would be warned
	The offending student would be placed on non-academic probation
	The offending student would be subject to educational sanction
	The offending student would be fined
	The offending student would be restricted as to their use of facilities
	The offending student would be temporarily restricted from campus or college events (for example, athletic participation)
	The offending student would be expelled from the college

15. Are you familiar with the requirements of the Clery Act regarding college dating violence? *Check one.*

	Yes
	No

16. What is your position at this college? *Check all that apply.*

	President, vice-president, or other senior level administrator
	Dean, residence advisor, or other residential student services professional
	Department heads/chairs are those whose duties are not primarily the faculty role
	“Other professional” not listed in above categories

17. How many years have you been an administrator or professional at this college_____

18. How old are you in years? *check one.*

	44 or below
	45-54
	55-64
	64 or above

19. What is your racial/ethnic background: *Check all that apply.*

	American Indian or Alaska Native
	Asian
	Black or African American
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
	White
	Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin (may be of any race)

20. Your home background is (check one)

	Rural farm
	Rural non-farm
	Suburban
	Small town (less than 50,000 population)
	City (50,000-250,000 population)
	Metropolitan (greater than 250,000 population)

21. Is there anything else you would like to say about dating violence on this campus? *If you need more room you may use the back of this page.*

Appendix D

Survey questions for students

For each question please check only the most appropriate box unless question specifies otherwise.

- 1. What is your belief as to the percent of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence? Check one.**

<input type="checkbox"/>	0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	20%	<input type="checkbox"/>	40%	<input type="checkbox"/>	60%	<input type="checkbox"/>	80%	<input type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	10%	<input type="checkbox"/>	30%	<input type="checkbox"/>	50%	<input type="checkbox"/>	70%	<input type="checkbox"/>	90%	<input type="checkbox"/>	

- 2. At night and on weekends, what type of security does this campus have? (Check all that apply)**

<input type="checkbox"/>	A security or police officer in a marked car
<input type="checkbox"/>	A security or police officer on foot or in an un-marked car
<input type="checkbox"/>	Dependent upon state or local police
<input type="checkbox"/>	Emergency call boxes at various locations

- 3. If you were with a date who became violent, whom would you most likely call for help first? Check one.**

<input type="checkbox"/>	campus police or campus security
<input type="checkbox"/>	local or state police
<input type="checkbox"/>	a residence advisor or dean
<input type="checkbox"/>	a trusted friend or family member
<input type="checkbox"/>	911 *Please specify whom 911 would reach:
<input type="checkbox"/>	An 'emergency call box' would be used

- 4. What percent of female students do you believe (based on conversations, numbers**

posted around campus, information given out on campus) **KNOW HOW TO REACH** the campus security, campus police, or local/state police in an emergency on weekends or at night? *Check one.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	0%	<input type="checkbox"/>	20%	<input type="checkbox"/>	40%	<input type="checkbox"/>	60%	<input type="checkbox"/>	80%	<input type="checkbox"/>	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	10%	<input type="checkbox"/>	30%	<input type="checkbox"/>	50%	<input type="checkbox"/>	70%	<input type="checkbox"/>	90%		

5. On this campus, is it appropriate to talk about dating violence with faculty, staff, or administrators, or to seek help with dating violence from faculty, staff, or administrators?

Check one.

Yes	No
appropriate to talk about dating violence with administrators/faculty/ staff	
appropriate to seek help with dating violence from administrators/faculty/staff	

6. Who, if anyone, on this campus provides information on dating violence? *Check all that apply.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	No one provides information
<input type="checkbox"/>	Campus police/security
<input type="checkbox"/>	Deans or Residence Advisors
<input type="checkbox"/>	Faculty or athletic coaches
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student organizations such as student government, phi theta kappa, etc

7. How is the information on dating violence provided? *Check all that apply.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	Information is not provided
<input type="checkbox"/>	Printed/posted (for example, handouts or signs)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Electronically (website or text or email)

	Required meetings
	Student handbook or at orientation
	During class/practice by faculty or coaches
	Voluntary meetings

8. Below are some scenarios a female student might encounter on a date. How often do you experience these behaviors from someone you are or have been dating or who has asked you for a date? *Please check one response for each category.*

Never	Once	A few times	Many times	
				Date has been physically abusive. <i>Includes throwing, smashing or breaking an object, destroying possessions, kicking/ hitting a wall or piece of furniture, holding date down/ pinning her in place, shaking or rough handling, pulling hair, arm twisting, scratching, spanking, biting, choking, slapping; hitting with object, punching/kicking, stomping, choking or burning, using a weapon, or being beaten up.</i>
				Date has been threatening or psychologically abusive. <i>Includes driving dangerously with date in the car, shaking a finger/ fist at date, making threatening faces/gestures, threatening to harm people/damage property date cares about; threatening to kill himself or date, threatening date with weapon, acting as if he wants to kill date.</i>
				Date has been sexually abusive. <i>Includes physically forced vaginal, anal, or oral sex, demanding sexual intercourse against date's will, using an object on date in a sexual way.</i>

9. What is your opinion on the statements listed below?

Please check one response for each statement.

Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	No opinion	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	
					If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
					If a woman doesn't physically resist sex, even when protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.
					When women go around wearing low-cut tops or short skirts, they're just asking for trouble.
					A rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.
					If a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.
					If the rapist doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it a rape.
					In reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.
					Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

10. What is your belief as to the percent of those female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who report the incident of dating violence? Check one.

0%		20%		40%		60%		80%		100%
10%		30%		50%		70%		90%		

11. If a student failed to report being the victim of dating violence, what do you believe would be the primary reason? Check one.

	Might believe that nothing would be done about any dating violence that was reported.
	Would be too embarrassed to report being the victim of dating violence.
	Would feel no one believed her report of dating violence if she had no proof or witnesses

	Would be afraid of a negative reaction from the abuser if an incident were reported.
	Might not be sure that the incident that occurred would qualify as dating violence.
	Other (specify)

12. Does this college have a policy on dating violence? *Check one.*

	Yes
	No
	Don't know

13. If this college does have a policy on dating violence where would you find it?

Check all that apply.

	This college does not have a policy on dating violence
	Administrative offices
	Campus website or online
	Student handbook
	Library

14. On this campus, what would happen to a student who victimizes another student through dating violence? *Check one.*

	Nothing would happen
	The offending student would be warned
	The offending student would be placed on non-academic probation
	The offending student would be subject to educational sanction
	The offending student would be fined

	The offending student would be restricted as to their use of facilities
	The offending student would be temporarily restricted from campus or college events (for example, athletic participation)
	The offending student would be expelled from the college

15. Are you familiar with the requirements of the Clery Act regarding college dating violence?

Check one.

	Yes
	No

16. Indicate your level in college. *Check one.*

	Freshman (29 credit hours or less)
	Sophomore (30-59 credit hours)
	Junior (60-89 credit hours)
	Senior (90 credit hours or more)

17. Are you a resident on campus or are you a commuter student? *Check one.*

	Resident
	commuter

18. How old are you in years? *check one.*

	18-19		20-21		22-24		25 or above
--	-------	--	-------	--	-------	--	-------------

19. What is your racial/ethnic background: *Check all that apply.*

	American Indian or Alaska Native
	Asian
	Black or African American
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
	White
	Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin (may be of any race)

20. Your home background is: *Check one.*

	Rural farm
	Rural non-farm
	Suburban
	Small town (less than 50,000 population)
	City (50,000-250,000 population)
	Metropolitan (greater than 250,000 population)

21. Is there anything else you would like to say about dating violence on this campus?

Appendix E

Hypotheses

The hypotheses for the domain of dating violence experiences and beliefs are as follows:

Hypotheses for survey question 1:

Hypothesis #1:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status in perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status in perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence.

Hypothesis #2:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status in perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have experienced physically abusive dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/ resident student status in perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence.

Hypothesis #3:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing and perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing and perception of the percentage of female students on this campus who have experienced dating violence.

Hypotheses for survey question 8:

Hypothesis #4:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status in perception of physically abusive dating violence behavior that female students on this campus have experienced.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status in perception of physically abusive dating violence behaviors that female students on this campus have experienced.

Hypothesis #5:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status in perception of physically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status in perception of physically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Hypothesis #6:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing in perception of physically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing in perception of physically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced on this campus.

Hypothesis #7:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status in perception of psychologically abusive dating violence behavior that female students on this campus have experienced.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status in perception of psychologically abusive dating violence behaviors that female students on this campus have experienced.

Hypothesis #8:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status in perception of psychologically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status in perception of psychologically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Hypothesis #9:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing in perception of psychologically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing in perception of psychologically abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Hypothesis #10:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status in perception of sexually abusive dating violence behavior that female students on this campus have experienced.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status in perception of sexually abusive dating violence behaviors that female students on this campus have experienced.

Hypothesis #11:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status in perception of sexually abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status in perception of sexually abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Hypothesis #12:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing in perception of sexually abusive dating violence behaviors experienced by female students on this campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing in perception of sexually abusive dating violence behaviors experienced on this campus.

Hypotheses for Survey question #9

Hypothesis #13:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator /student status of agreement with the statement that "If a woman is drunk, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the statement that "If a woman is drunk, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

Hypothesis #14:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the statement that "If a woman is drunk, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the statement that "If a woman is drunk, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

Hypothesis #15:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the statement that "If a woman is drunk, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the statement that "If a woman is drunk, she is somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control."

Hypothesis #16:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman doesn't physically resist, even if protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator /student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman doesn't physically resist, even if protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.

Hypothesis #16:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman doesn't physically resist, even if protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman doesn't physically resist, even if protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.

Hypothesis #17:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that if a woman doesn't physically resist, even if protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that if a woman doesn't physically resist, even if protesting verbally, it really can't be considered rape.

Hypothesis #18:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that when women wear low-cut tops or short skirts, they are just asking for trouble.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/ student status of agreement with the belief that when women wear low-cut tops or short skirts, they are just asking for trouble.

Hypothesis #19:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the belief that when women wear low-cut tops or short skirts, they are just asking for trouble.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the belief that when women wear low-cut tops or short skirts, they are just asking for trouble.

Hypothesis #20:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that when women wear low-cut tops or short skirts, they are just asking for trouble.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that when women wear low-cut tops or short skirts, they are just asking for trouble.

Hypothesis #21:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that a rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator /student status of agreement with the belief that a rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.

Hypothesis #22:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that a rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that a rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.

Hypothesis #23:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that a rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that a rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.

Hypothesis #24:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.

Hypothesis #25:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between resident/commuter student status of agreement with the belief that if a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped

Hypothesis #26:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that if a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that if a woman goes home with a man she doesn't know, it is her own fault if she is raped.

Hypothesis #27:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that if a rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that if a rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape.

Hypothesis #28:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that if a rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that if a rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape.

Hypothesis #29:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that if a rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that if a rapist doesn't have a weapon, you can't really call it rape.

Hypothesis #30:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that in reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that in reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.

Hypothesis #31:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that in reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that in reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.

Hypothesis #32:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that in reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.

Alternative hypothesis: there is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that in reality, women are almost never raped by their boyfriends.

Hypothesis #33:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student of agreement with the belief that women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of agreement with the belief that women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Hypothesis #34:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of agreement with the belief that women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Hypothesis #35:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of agreement with the belief that women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

Hypotheses for survey question #10:

Hypothesis #36

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who report the incident of dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who report the incident of dating violence.

Hypothesis #37

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who report the incident of dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who report the incident of dating violence.

Hypothesis #38:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who report the incident of dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception of the percentages of female students on this campus who have been victimized by dating violence who report the incident of dating violence.

Hypotheses for survey question #11:

Hypothesis #39:

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception of the reasons students fail to report being the victim of dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception of the reasons students fail to report being the victim of dating violence.

Hypothesis #40:

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of the reasons students fail to report being the victim of dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of the reasons students fail to report being the victim of dating violence.

Hypothesis #41:

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception of the reasons students fail to report being the victim of dating violence.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception of the reasons students fail to report being the victim of dating violence.

The hypotheses for the domain of dating violence knowledge of policy are as follows:

Hypotheses for survey question #2:

Hypothesis #42:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception of the presence of a police/security officer in a car or on foot on campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception of the presence of a police/security officer in a car or on foot on campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #43:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of the presence of a police/security officer in a car or on foot on campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of the presence of a police/security officer in a car or on foot on campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #44:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception of the presence of a police/security officer in a car or on foot on campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception of the presence of a police/security officer in a car or on foot on campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #45:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that state/local police are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that state/local police are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #46:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that state/local police are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that state/local police are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #47:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that state/local police are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that state/local police are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #48:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that emergency call boxes are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that emergency call boxes are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #49:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that emergency call boxes are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that emergency call boxes are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Hypothesis #50:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that emergency call boxes are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that emergency call boxes are the security used for the campus at night and on weekends.

Hypotheses for Survey question #3

Hypothesis #51:

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception of whom a student would most likely call for help if a date became violent.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception of whom a student would most likely call for help if a date became violent.

Hypothesis #52

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of whom a student would most likely call for help if a date became violent.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of whom a student would most likely call for help if a date became violent.

Hypothesis #53:

Null Hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception of whom a student would most likely call for help if a date became violent.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception of whom a student would most likely call for help if a date became violent.

Hypotheses for Survey Question #4

Hypothesis #54:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception of percentages of students who know how to reach security or state/local police at nights and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception of percentages of students who know how to reach security or state/local police at nights and on weekends.

Hypothesis #55:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of percentages of students who know how to reach security or state/local police at nights and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of the percentages of students who know how to reach security or state/local police at nights and on weekends.

Hypothesis #56:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception of percentages of students who know how to reach security or state/local police at nights and on weekends.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception of the percentage of students who know how to reach security or state/local police at nights and on weekends.

Hypotheses for Survey Question #6

Hypothesis #57:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that no one provides dating violence information on campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that no one provides dating violence information on campus.

Hypothesis #58:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that no one provides dating violence information on campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that no one provides dating violence information on campus.

Hypothesis #59:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that no one provides dating violence information on campus.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that no one provides dating violence information on campus.

Hypothesis #60:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by campus police/security/deans/coaches/residence advisors/faculty.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by campus police/security/deans/coaches/residence advisors/faculty.

Hypothesis #61:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by campus police/security/deans/coaches/residence advisors/faculty.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by campus police/security/deans/coaches/residence advisors/faculty.

Hypothesis #62:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by campus police/security/deans/coaches/residence advisors/faculty.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by campus police/security/deans/coaches/residence advisors/faculty.

Hypothesis #63:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by student organizations.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by student organizations.

Hypothesis #64:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by student organizations.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by student organizations.

Hypothesis #65:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by student organizations.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided by student organizations.

Hypotheses for Survey question #7

Hypothesis #66:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is not provided.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is not provided.

Hypothesis #67:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is not provided.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is not provided.

Hypothesis #68:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is not provided.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is not provided.

Hypothesis #69:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator /student status of perception that that dating violence information on campus is provided in written/electronic/printed/posted/student handbook.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator /student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided in written/electronic/printed/posted/student handbook.

Hypothesis #70:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided in written/electronic/printed/posted/student handbook.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided in written/electronic/printed/posted/student handbook.

Hypothesis #71:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided in written/electronic/printed/posted/student handbook.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided in written/electronic/printed/posted/student handbook.

Hypothesis #72:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided at meetings or during class or practice.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided at meetings or during class or practice.

Hypothesis #73:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided at meetings or during class or practice.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided at meetings or during class or practice.

Hypothesis #74:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided at meetings or during class or practice.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that dating violence information on campus is provided at meetings or during class or practice.

Hypotheses for Survey question #12

Hypothesis #75:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception of whether campus has a dating violence policy.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception of whether campus has a dating violence policy.

Hypothesis #76:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of whether campus has a dating violence policy.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception of whether campus has a dating violence policy.

Hypothesis #77:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception of whether campus has a dating violence policy.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception of whether campus has a dating violence policy.

Hypotheses for Survey question # 13

Hypothesis #78:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that campus does not have a dating violence policy.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that campus does not have a dating violence policy.

Hypothesis #79:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that campus does not have a dating violence policy.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that campus does not have a dating violence policy.

Hypothesis #80:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between class standing of perception that campus does not have a dating violence policy.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between class standing of perception that campus does not have a dating violence policy.

Hypothesis #81:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in administrative offices.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in administrative offices.

Hypothesis #82:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in administrative offices.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in administrative offices.

Hypothesis #83:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in administrative offices.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in administrative offices.

Hypothesis #84:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in campus website/library/online/student handbook.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in campus website/library/online/student handbook.

Hypothesis #85:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in campus website/library/online/student handbook.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident student status of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in campus website/library/online/student handbook.

Hypothesis #86:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in campus website/library/online/student handbook.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of perception that the campus dating violence policy can be found in campus website/library/online/student handbook.

Hypotheses for Survey question #15

Hypothesis #87:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between administrator/student status of familiarity with the Clery Act.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between administrator/student status of familiarity with the Clery Act.

Hypothesis #88:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between commuter/resident status of familiarity with the Clery Act.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between commuter/resident status of familiarity with the Clery Act.

Hypothesis #89:

Null hypothesis: There is no difference between students by class standing of familiarity with the Clery Act.

Alternative hypothesis: There is a difference between students by class standing of familiarity with the Clery Act.

Appendix F

IRB Letter of Approval



Office of Research Integrity
IRB, IACUC, RDRC
315 Kinkead Hall
Lexington, KY 40506-0057
859 257-9428
fax 859 257-8995
www.research.uky.edu/ori/

Initial Review

Approval Ends
October 10, 2012

IRB Number
11-0684-P4S

TO: Jean A Oldham
Kinesiology - Health Promotion

33 Newby Lane
Harrodsburg, KY 40330
PI phone #: (859) 229-6280

FROM: Chairperson/Vice Chairperson
Non-medical Institutional Review Board (IRB)

SUBJECT: Approval of Protocol Number 11-0684-P4S

DATE: October 13, 2011

On October 12, 2011, the Non-medical Institutional Review Board approved your protocol entitled:

Dating Violence on Small Rural College Campuses: Are Student and Administrator Perceptions the Same?

Approval is effective from October 12, 2011 until October 10, 2012 and extends to any consent/assent form, cover letter, and/or phone script. If applicable, attached is the IRB approved consent/assent document(s) to be used when enrolling subjects. **[Note, subjects can only be enrolled using consent/assent forms which have a valid "IRB Approval" stamp unless special waiver has been obtained from the IRB.]** Prior to the end of this period, you will be sent a Continuation Review Report Form which must be completed and returned to the Office of Research Integrity so that the protocol can be reviewed and approved for the next period.

In implementing the research activities, you are responsible for complying with IRB decisions, conditions and requirements. The research procedures should be implemented as approved in the IRB protocol. It is the principal investigators responsibility to ensure any changes planned for the research are submitted for review and approval by the IRB prior to implementation. Protocol changes made without prior IRB approval to eliminate apparent hazards to the subject(s) should be reported in writing immediately to the IRB. Furthermore, discontinuing a study or completion of a study is considered a change in the protocol's status and therefore the IRB should be promptly notified in writing.

For information describing investigator responsibilities after obtaining IRB approval, download and read the document "PI Guidance to Responsibilities, Qualifications, Records and Documentation of Human Subjects Research" from the Office of Research Integrity's Guidance and Policy Documents web page [<http://www.research.uky.edu/ori/human/guidance.htm#PIresp>]. Additional information regarding IRB review, federal regulations, and institutional policies may be found through ORI's web site [<http://www.research.uky.edu/ori>]. If you have questions, need additional information, or would like a paper copy of the above mentioned document, contact the Office of Research Integrity at (859) 257-9428.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "N. Van Tubergen Ph.D. / ah". Below the signature, the text "Chairperson/Vice Chairperson" is printed in a small, black, sans-serif font.
Chairperson/Vice Chairperson

REFERENCES

- Acierno, R. & Resnick, H. (1997). Health Impact of Interpersonal violence 1: Prevalence rates, case identification, and risk. *Behavioral Medicine*, 23(2), p. 53, summer 97.
- Akers, C. & Kaukinen, C. (2009). The police reporting behavior of intimate partner violence victims. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24, pp. 159-171.
- Amar, A.F. & Alexy, E.M. (2005). "Dissed" by dating violence, *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*. (41)4.
- American College Health Association (2005). American College Health Association National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA). *Reference Group Data Report, abridged*.
- Anderson, Nick (2014) 55 Colleges under investigation for handling of sex assault claims, *The Washington Post* (reprint in *Lexington Herald-Leader*), May 2nd, 2014.
- Annan, S. L. (2008). Intimate partner violence in rural environments. *Annual Review of Nursing Research*.
- Arnette, N.C.; Mascaro, N; Santana, M.C; Davis, S.; Kaslow, N. (2007). Enhancing spiritual well-being among suicidal African-American female survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 63(10), pp. 908-924.
- Bailey, B.A. & Daugherty, R.A. (2007). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy: incidence and associated health behaviors in a rural population. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 11, pp. 495-503.
- Baker, C.R. & Stith, S.M. (2008). Factors predicting dating violence perpetration among male and female college students. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma, Volume 17* #52.
- Baum, K. & Klaus, P. (2005) Violent victimization of college students, 1995-2002, *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*.

- Beattie, E. & Shaughnessy, M.A. (2000) *Sisters in Pain: Battered Women Fight Back*. University of Kentucky Press.
- Bhandari, S.; Levitch, A.H.; Ellis, K.K.; Ball, K.; Everett, K.; Geden, E.; & Bullock, L. (2008) Comparative analyses of stressors experienced by rural low-income pregnant women who are experiencing intimate partner violence and those who are not; *JOGGN*, 37, #4.
- Bonomi, A.E., Anderson, M.L., Rivara, F.P., & Thompson, R S. (2009) health care utilization costs associated with physical and nonphysical-only intimate partner violence, *Health Research and Educational Trust*.
- Borges, A.M., Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M. (2008) Clarifying consent: Primary prevention of sexual assault on a college campus. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*, 36(1/2), pp. 75-88.
- Bosch, K. & Schumm, W. (2004) Accessibility to resources: Helping rural women in abusive partner relationships become free from abuse, *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 30, pp. 357-370.
- Brammer, Jack (2014) UK leader describes preventing assaults, *Lexington Herald/Leader*, May 19, 2014.
- Brown, A.; Cosgrave, E.; Killackey, E.; Purcell, R.; Buckby, J.; & Yung, A. (2009) Longitudinal association of adolescent dating violence with psychiatric disorders and functioning, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24 (originally published online Dec 2008).
- Buelna, C.; Ulloa, E.; & Ulibarri, M. (2008) Sexual relationship power as a mediator between dating violence and sexually transmitted infections among college women, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(8).
- Burke, J.G.; O'Campo, P.; & Peak, G.L. (2006). Neighborhood influences and intimate partner violence: does geographical setting matter. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 83(2).

- Campbell, J.; Jones, A.S.; Dienemann, J.; Kub, J.; Schollenberger, J.; O'Campo, P.; Gielen, A.C.; and Wynne, C. (2002) Intimate partner violence and physical health consequences, *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 162, pp. 1157-1163.
- Canning, A.; Friedman, E.; & Netter, S. (2010) Warning signs in murder of Yeardeley Love: Nobody put it all together, *ABC News*, May 7, 2010.
- Carmody, D.; Ekhomu, J.; Payne, B.K. (2009) Needs of sexual assault advocates in campus-based sexual assault centers. *College Student Journal*, 43(2).
- Carr, J.L. (2005) Campus Violence White Paper, *American College Health Association*.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (2009). Division of violence prevention *Centers for Disease Control website*, <http://www.cdc.gov/family/college/>.
- Cohen, M.M.; Forte, T.; DuMont, J.; Hyman, I.; & Romans, S.: (2005). Intimate partner violence among Canadian women with activity limitations. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59, pp. 834-839.
- Cohn, A.M.; Zinzow, H.M.; Resnick, H.S. & Kilpatrick, D.G. (2013). Correlates of reasons for not reporting rape to police: Results from a national telephone household probability sample of women with forcible or drug-or-alcohol facilitated/incapacitated rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(3), pp. 455-473.
- Coker, A.; Flerx, V.C.; Smith, P.H.; Whitaker, D.J.; Fadden, M.K.; Williams, M. (2007). Intimate partner violence incidence and continuation in a primary care screening program. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 165(7).
- Cornelius, T.L.; Sullivan, K.T.; Wyngarden, N.; & Milliken, J.C. (2009). Participation in prevention programs for dating violence: Beliefs about relationship violence and intention to participate. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(6), pp. 1057-1078.
- Coughlan, M., Cronin, P. & Ryan, F. (2009) Survey research: Process and limitations. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 16(1). Currier, D.M., & Carlson, J.H.

- (2009) Creating attitudinal change through teaching: how a course on 'women and violence' changes students' attitudes about violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, p. 1735.
- CQ Researcher.com (2011). Retrieved from website, Feb 4th, 21(5), pp. 112-114.
- Daley, E.M. & Noland, V.J. (2001) Intimate partner violence in college students: A cross-cultural comparison. *International Electronic Journal of Health Education*, 4, pp. 35-40.
- Campus Dating Violence Fact Sheet (2002). *Dating Violence Resource Center*, author unlisted.
- DeKeseredy, W.S. & Schwartz, M.D. (2008) Separation/divorce/sexual assault in rural Ohio: Survivors' perceptions. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*. 36(1-2), pp. 105-119.
- DuRant, R.; Champion, H.; Wolfson, M.; Omli, M.; McCoy, T.; D'Agostino Jr, R.; Wagoner, K. & Mitra, A. (2007) Date fighting experiences among college students: Are they associated with other health-risk behaviors. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(5), pp. 291-295.
- Drysdale, D., Modzeleski, W., & Simons, A. (2010) Campus attacks: Targeted violence affecting institutions of higher education. *U.S. Secret Service, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.*
- Eastman, B.J. & Bunch, S.G. (2007) Providing services to survivors of domestic violence: A comparison of rural and urban service provider perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, p. 465.
- Eastman, B.J.; Bunch, S.G.; Williams, A.H. & Carawen, L.W. (2007) Exploring the perceptions of domestic violence service providers in rural localities, *Violence Against Women*, 13(7), pp. 700-716.
- Fisher, B. S.; Cullen, F.T.; Daigle, L.E. (2005) The discovery of acquaintance rape: The salience

- of methodological innovation and rigor. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(4), p. 493-500.
- Fletcher, P.C. & Bryden, P.J. (2007) Preliminary examination of safety issues on a university campus: Personal safety practices, beliefs, and attitudes of female faculty and staff. *College Student Journal*, Part B, 41(4).
- Foshee, V.A.; Benefield, T.S.; Ennet, S.T.; Bauman, K.E.; & Suchindran, C. (2004) Longitudinal predictors of serious physical & sexual dating violence victimization during adolescence. *Preventive Medicine*, 39, pp. 1007-1016.
- Fossey, R. (2010) Clery Act. *Higher Education Law*, 14-12-2010.
- Foubert, J.D., & Marriott, K.A. (2006) Effects of a sexual assault peer education program on men's beliefs in rape myths. *Sex Roles*, 36, pp. 259-268.
- Gidycz, C. (2006) preventing sexual assault and intimate partner violence on campuses. *Laboratory for the Study and Prevention of Sexual Assault*
<http://www.psych.ohiou.edu/labs/gidycz.html>.
- Girard, A.L.; Senn, C.Y. (2008) The role of the new date rape drugs in attributions about date rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(1), pp. 3-20.
- Gruber, J.E.: (1992) A typology of personal and environmental sexual harassment: Research and policy implications for the 1990s. *Sex Roles*, 26, pp. 447-464.
- Guerette, S.M. & Caron, S.L. (2007) Assessing the impact of acquaintance rape: Interviews with women who are survivors/victims of sexual assault while in college. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, 22(2), pp. 31-50.
- Halligan, T. (2009) Safety systems. *Community College Journal*.
- Hart, T. (2003) Violent victimization of college students. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report*, U.S. Department of Justice publication #196143.
- American College Health Association. (2012, June). *Healthy Campus 2020*. Retrieved 10/2010

<http://www.acha.org/HealthyCampus/index.cfm>.

Healthy Kentuckians 2020, Prevention Initiative (2013) Cabinet for Health Services, *Kentucky Department for Public Health*.

Health People 2020, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Nov 2010.

Helweg-Larsen, M.; Harding, H.G.; & Kleinman, K.E. (2008) Risk perceptions of dating violence among college women: The role of experience and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(6), pp. 600-620.

Hertzog, J. & Yielding, R. (2009) College women's rape awareness and use of commonly advocated risk reduction strategies. *College Student Journal*, Volume 43(1).

Hillemeier, M.M.; Weisman, C.S.; Baker, K.; & Primavera, K. (2005) Mental health services provided through the national center for excellence in women's health: Do they reach rural women. *Women's Health Issues*, 15, pp. 224-229.

Hoover, E. (2005) Education Department Fines Miami U. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52, #8.

Iconis, R. (2013) Dating violence among college students. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 6(1), pp. 111-114.

More Federal Concern on Sexual Violence on Campus, *Inside Higher Education*, April 22, 2014.

Jablonski, M. (2008) New directions for student services special supplement t executive summary of NASPA. *Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Karjane, H.M.; Fisher, B.S.; & Cullen, F.T. (2005) Sexual assault on campus: What colleges and universities are doing about it. *Research for Practice, National Institute of Justice*.

Kentucky Council on Post-Secondary Education, <http://www.mingerfoundation.org/legislative-work/minger-act/>, 2014.

Kilpatrick, D. & Acierno, R. (2003) Mental health needs of crime victims: Epidemiology and outcomes. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 16, p. 126.

Knox, D.; Custis, L.; & Zusman, M.E. (2000) Abuse in dating relationships among college

- students. *College Student Journal*, 34, pp. 505-509.
- Koss, M.P.; Gidycz, C.A.; & Wisniewski, N. (1987) The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 1987, 55(2), pp. 162-170.
- Kuffel, S.W. & Katz, J. (2002) Preventing physical, psychological, and sexual aggression in college dating relationships. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 22, pp. 361-374.
- Lamis, D.A.; Ellis, J.B.; Chumney, F.L.; & Dula, C.S. (2009) Reasons for living and alcohol use among college students. *Death Studies* 33, pp. 277-286.
- Langford, L. (2004) *Preventing violence and promoting safety in higher education settings: Overview of a comprehensive approach*, The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention Funded by the U.S. Department of Education.
- LaVergne, G. (2007) The legacy of the Texas tower sniper. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 00095982, 53(34).
- Leino, E.V. & Kisch, J. (2005) Correlates and predictors of depression in college students: results from the spring 2000 National College Health Assessment. *American Journal of Health education*, 36(2), pp. 66-74.
- Lexington Herald-Leader staff writer (2013) Midway College to lay off faculty. *Lexington Herald/Leader*, September 15, 2013.
- Lim, G.Y., & Roloff, M.E., (1999) Attributing sexual consent. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, pp. 1-23.
- Loiselle, M. & Fuqua, W.R. (2007) Alcohol's effects on women's risk detection in a date-rape vignette. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(5), pp. 261-266.

- Lonsway, K. A. & Kothari, C. (2000) First year campus acquaintance rape education: Evaluating the impact of a mandatory intervention. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, pp. 220-232.
- McMahon, P.P. (2008) Sexual violence on the college campus: A template for compliance with federal policy. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(3), pp. 361-365.
- McCormick, A. & Zhao, C.M. (2005) Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. *The Carnegie Foundation, Change*.
- Menning, C.L. (2009) Unsafe at any house?: Attendees' perceptions of microlevel environmental traits and personal safety at fraternity and nonfraternity parties. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, pp. 1714-1734.
- Merten, M. J. (2007) Acceptability of dating violence among late adolescents: The role of sports participation, competitive attitudes, and selected dynamics of relationship violence. *Adolescence*, 43(169), 31-56.
- Merten, M.J. & Williams, A.L. (2009) Acceptability of marital violence among college men and women: Does gender and current relationship status matter. *College Student Journal*, 01463934, 43(3).
- Moore, C.G., Probst, J.C., Tompkins, M., Cuffe, S., Martin, A.B., The Prevalence of Violent Disagreements in U.S. Families: the effects of Residence, Race/Ethnicity, and Parental Stress," *Pediatrics*, 2007, #119, pp. s68-276.
- Murray, C.E.; Kardatzke, K.N., "Dating violence among college students: Key issues for college counselors" *Journal of College Counseling*, 10(1), p. 79.
- NASPA, Student Affairs in Higher Education, "Executive Summary: New Directions for Student Services," special supplement, 2008.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2012), *Institute of Education Sciences*, <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>.

- Nevin, David, "Under the clock, a sniper with 31 minutes to live," *Life Magazine*, Aug 12, 1966, 61(7).
- Nicholson, M.E., Maney, D.W., Blair, K., Wamboldt, P.M., Mahoney, B.S., Yuan, J. (1998) "Trends in alcohol-related Campus Violence: Implications for Prevention," *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 43, pp. 34-52.
- Nolan, S. & Heinzen, T. (2008) "Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences," 2008.
- Noland, V.J., Liller, K.D.; McDermott, R.J.; Coulter, M.L.; Seraphine, AE (2004) Is adolescent sibling violence a precursor to college dating violence. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 2004, 28, Supplement 1, S13-S23.
- Payne, B. (2008) Challenges responding to sexual violence: differences between college campuses and communities. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36, pp. 224-230.
- Payne, B. & Fogerty, R. (2007) Narratives about violence: the words of college women. *Social Science Journal*, 44, pp. 367-373.
- Payne, D. L., Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33, 27-68.
- Peek-Asa, C.; Zwerling, C.; Young, T.; Stromquist, A.; Burmeister, L.; Merchant, J. (2005) A population based study of reporting patterns and characteristics among men who abuse their female partners. *Injury Prevention*, 11, pp. 180-185.
- Potter, R.H.; Krider, J.E.; McMahan, P.M. Examining elements of campus sexual violence policies. *Violence Against Women*, 6, pp. 1345-1362.
- Potter, S., Moynihan, M., Stapleton, J., & Banyard, V. (2009) Empowering bystanders to prevent campus violence against women. *Violence Against Women*, 15(1), pp. 106-121.
- Prothrow-Stith, D. (2007) Keynote address: Making campuses safer communities for students. *Journal of American College Health*, 55.

- Resnick, H.S. & Acierno, R. (1997) Health impact of interpersonal violence 2: Medical and mental health outcomes. *Behavioral Medicine*, 23(2), p. 65-79.
- Rickert, V.I., Wiemann, C.M., & Vaughan, R.D. (2005) Disclosure of date/acquaintance rape: Who reports and when. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 18 pp. 17-24.
- Roudsari, B.S., Leahy, M.M., Walters, S.T. (2009) Correlates of dating violence among male and female heavy-drinking college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(11).
- Roscoe, B. & Callahan, J.E. (1985) Adolescents' self-report of violence in family and dating relationships. *Adolescence*, 20, pp. 545-553.
- Ryvard, R., (2013) Private distress. *Inside Higher Ed*.
- Schwartz, J.P., Griffin, L.D., Russell, M., & Frontaura-Duck, S. (2006) Prevention of dating violence on college campuses: An innovative program. *Journal of College Counseling*, 9(1), p90.
- Shannon, L., Logan, T.K., Cole, J. & Medley, K. (2006) Help-seeking and coping strategies for intimate partner violence in rural and urban women. *Violence and Victims*, 21(2).
- Shook, N.J., Gerrity, D.A., Jurich, J., Segrist, A.F. (2000) Courtship violence among college students: A comparison of verbally and physically abusive couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, pp. 1-22.
- Smith, K.D., Larive, L.L. & Romanelli, F. (2002) Club drugs: methylenedioxymethamphetamine, flunitrazepam, ketamine hydrochloride, and γ -hydroxybutyrate. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacists*, 59.
- Smith, M. (2012) An incident and its aftermath. www.INSIDEHIGHERED.COM.
- Smith, P.H., White, J.W., Holland, L.J. (2003) A longitudinal perspective on dating violence among adolescent and college-age women. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(7), pp. 1104-1108.

- Spencer, G.A. & Bryant, S.A. (2000) University students' dating violence behaviors. *Journal of the New York State Nurses Association*, 31, pp. 15-20.
- Stein, A.L., Tran, G.Q., & Fisher, B.S. (2009) Intimate partner violence experience and expectations among college women in dating relationships: Implications for behavioral interventions. *Violence and Victims*, 24(2), pp. 153-162.
- Stephens, K.A. & George, W.H. (2009) Rape prevention with college men: Evaluating risk status. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, p. 996.
- Street, A.E. & Arias, I. (2001) Psychological abuse and post-traumatic stress disorder in battered women: Examining the roles of shame and guilt. *Violence and Victims*, 16(65).
- Sugarman, D., Hotaling, G. (1989) Dating violence: prevalence, context, risk markers. *Violence in Dating Relationships*, New York, Praeger Publishing.
- Thompson, M., Sitterle, D., Clay, G., & Kingree, J. (2007) Reasons for not reporting victimizations to the police: Do they vary for physical and sexual incidents? *Journal of American College Health*, 55(5), pp. 277-282.
- Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2000) *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence and Consequences of Violence Against Women*. National Institute of Justice.
- Trujillo, M. & Ross, S. (2008) Police response to domestic violence: Making decisions about risk and risk management. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(4), pp. 454-473.
- Tuder, S. (2012) Cosmo fights campus rape. *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, January.
- United States Department of Agriculture website: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data-products/rural-urban-continuum-codes.aspx>.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services website: <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/>.
- Van Dis, J., Mahmoodian, M., Goddik, S., Dimitrievich, E. (2002) A survey of the prevalence of domestic violence in rural and urban South Dakota. *South Dakota Journal of Medicine*, 55(4).

- Websdale, N. (1995) Rural women abuse: The voices of Kentucky women. 1(4).
- Websdale, N. (1998) *Rural woman battering and the justice system: An ethnography*. Sage Publications.
- West, A. & Wandrei, M.L. Intimate partner violence: A model for predicting interventions by informal helpers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, pp. 972-986.
- Wetzel, K. (2005) Intimate partner violence in Appalachia: A study of relationship violence among community college students in southern Appalachia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee.
- White, J.W. & Koss, M.P. (1991) Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students, *Violence and Victims*, 6(4), pp. 247-256.

VITA

Place of birth: Lexington, Kentucky.

University of Kentucky, 1995 Master of Science, (Recreation Therapy)
Thesis: "The Aerobic Training Effect & Physiological Benefits of Clog-Dance".

University of Kentucky, 1984 Bachelor of Science in Agriculture (Agricultural Economics,
concentration in Agribusiness Management).

Chair, Health and Sport Science, St. Catharine College, St. Catharine, Kentucky.

Program Director, Master of Arts in Leadership, Health Promotion track, St. Catharine College,
St. Catharine, Kentucky.

Advisor, Minor in Health Promotion, St. Catharine College, St. Catharine, Kentucky.

Awards: Research grant for dissertation, The Southern Association for College Student Affairs,
2011.

Jean Allen Oldham