

# AFP-OSU Workplace Climate Survey

## Preliminary Report 1

Prepared by:  
Megan LePere-Schloop, PhD  
Erynn Beaton, PhD

John Glenn College of Public Affairs, The Ohio State University

February 7, 2021

### Overview of Fundraising Workplace Climate Survey

This survey was conducted online by researchers from The Ohio State University in partnership with the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) between July 30 and August 30, 2020. The survey was sent to 17,041 AFP members aged 18+ working in the U.S. or Canada. A total of 1,783 (n=1,598 U.S., n=184 Canadian) respondents completed the survey for a response rate of 10.46%.

The survey sample frame was selected among those who are members of the Association of Fundraising Professionals that have agreed to participate in online surveys. People who identify as male responded at a lower rate to the 2018 Harris Survey of AFP members, and were therefore over-sampled for this survey. Weights were then calculated to adjust for the over-sampling of males and non-response bias across males and females working in the U.S. and Canada.

The survey instrument was modeled after a workplace climate survey developed and implemented by the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) of the U.S. Federal Government. Measures used in the MSPB survey are well-validated and reliable. After adapting the MSPB survey to the research objectives, OSU researchers conducted five cognitive interviews with fundraisers. Based on feedback from the cognitive interviews, the survey was adjusted to help ensure comprehension of the questions by respondents.

*Comparison to 2018 Survey:* The OSU researchers consider the present survey results to be more accurate than the results of the 2018 survey for several reasons. First, the 2018 survey was sent to all 25,000+ AFP members and yielded 1,040 (n=934 U.S., n=106 Canadian) responses. Therefore, the present survey returned a better response rate, decreasing the likelihood of response bias, and a larger overall sample, which increases the validity of the results. Second, the 2018 survey utilized several self-report and time-unbound measures of sexual harassment. The present survey adheres to standards for reliable research; for example, by asking respondents about experiences with specific behaviors rather than eliciting subjective assessments of experience with sexual harassment.

## Survey Respondents

We begin by evaluating the survey respondents to get a better sense of their representativeness and diversity.

### Comparison of AFP members, survey sample and survey respondents by gender and country

The following table presents a comparison of full AFP membership, the sample frame of members that received the survey and the respondents to the survey by the country in which they work and their gender. It shows that the proportion of male and female survey respondents from the US and Canada is roughly equivalent to the proportions of these groups in the full AFP membership. As intended, the number of male respondents, especially from the U.S., is larger than the proportion of male AFP members. We weight the survey results reported later in this report to account for over-sampling of males and non-response.

*Comparison of AFP Members, Survey Samples and Respondents*

	Member Count	Member Percent	Frame Count	Frame Percent	Respond Count	Respond Percent
U.S. Female	17596	66.79	9917	58.19	1137	63.80
U.S. Male	5491	20.84	5111	29.99	456	25.59
U.S. Self- Describe	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	0.28
CA Female	2531	9.61	1324	7.77	133	7.46
CA Male	726	2.76	689	4.04	48	2.69
CA Self- Describe	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	0.17
Total	26344	100.00	17041	100.00	1782	100.00

*Note on male/female and U.S./CA data used in table:* Because information on gender identity for the full roster of AFP members is unavailable, the researchers used the gender package in the computer language R to predict the gender of AFP members in order to over-sample males for the survey. The package uses U.S. census data to predict gender based on the proportion of census respondents with a given first name who identify as male or female. Given the strategy used to predict AFP member gender, there are no entries in the self-describe category in the first four columns of the table. AFP member records do include country of residence information, which was used to identify potential survey respondents in both countries. Information on respondents (the last two columns of the table) comes from responses to questions on the survey asking AFP members to describe their gender and identify the country where they spent most of the last two years working.

## Completion of survey by demographic characteristics

The following table presents a breakdown of survey respondents by additional demographic characteristics of the respondent. We find that the survey respondents represent diverse social identity groups. We also find that the number of Silent Generation and Millennial respondents is very small, which can lead to problems when survey results need to be weighted to account for over-sampling and non-response. We therefore do not include these generational groups in later tables of survey results.

*Survey Respondents by Demographic Characteristics*

	Count	Percentage
<i>SEXUALITY</i>		
Heterosexual*	1550	86.93
Not Heterosexual	233	13.07
<i>RACE</i>		
BIPOC	231	12.96
Caucasian	1552	87.04
<i>GENERATION</i>		
Silent Generation	16	0.9
Baby Boomers	1197	67.13
Gen X	549	30.79
Millenials	12	0.67

\*Interpretation Example: 86.93% of the survey’s respondents identified as heterosexual.

## Completion of survey by job type

The following table presents a breakdown of survey respondents by the type of fundraising job the respondent worked in for most of the last two years. Most survey respondents were employed as full-time employees with fundraising responsibilities over the past two years.

*Survey Respondents by Job Type*

	Count	Percentage
Consultant	149	8.36
FT Employee	1472	82.56
PT Employee	159	8.92
Total	1783	100.00

## Completion of survey by organization type

The following table presents a breakdown of survey respondents by the type of organization where the respondent worked for most of the last two years. Most survey respondents worked for nonprofit organizations over the past two years.

### *Survey Respondents by Organization Type*

	Count	Percentage
Nonprofit	1398	78.41
Charity (CA)	106	5.95
Public/Gov Org	140	7.85
Foundation of Public/Gov Org	42	2.36
Other	97	5.44
Total	1783	100.00

## Completion of survey by organization size

The following table presents a breakdown of survey respondents by the number of full-time staff at the organization where they worked for most of the last two years. Survey respondents were employed at a diverse range of organizations based on staff size over the past two years.

### *Survey Respondents by Organization Size*

	Count	Percentage
None	25	1.40
1-5	269	15.09
6-15	329	18.45
16-30	257	14.41
31-100	371	20.81
Over 100	528	29.61
Total	1783	100.00

## Experiences of Sexual Harassment

To follow up on the 2018 Harris survey, we consider experiences of AFP members with sexual harassment.

### AFP member experiences of sexual harassment behaviors over the course of their fundraising career

Research suggests that people have different understandings of what behavior constitutes sexual harassment. Asking survey respondents if they have experienced specific behaviors as opposed to simply asking, “Have you experienced sexual harassment?” therefore often provides clearer insight into people’s experiences. To better understand the experiences of AFP members with sexual harassment over their fundraising career, we asked:

*Over the course of your entire career working in the fundraising profession, have you ever experienced the following behaviors? (Check all that apply)*

- Unwelcome communications (e.g., emails, phone calls, notes, text messages, social media contacts) of a sexual nature
- Unwelcome invasion of personal space (e.g., touching, crowding, leaning over)
- Unwelcome sexually suggestive looks or gestures
- Pressure for sexual favors
- Pressure for dates
- Unwelcome sexual teasing, jokes, comments or questions
- The presence of sexually oriented material in any format (e.g., photos, videos)
- People having sexually oriented conversations in front of others
- Someone offering preferential treatment in the workplace in exchange for sexual favors
- Different treatment based on sex/gender (e.g., quality or nature of assignments)
- Use of derogatory or unprofessional terms related to a person’s sex/gender
- Stalking (e.g., unwanted intrusion (physically or electronically) into your personal life)
- Rape or sexual assault or attempted rape or sexual assault

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced any of the above sexual harassment behaviors during their fundraising career on at least one occasion by aggressor identity and the demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response. A review of the table below suggests high levels of fundraiser experience with sexual harassment behaviors across the board.

*Experiences of sexual harassment Behaviors over Career by Aggressor Identity Identity (coworker or external stakeholder) and Respondent Demographics*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Never
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	64.25	60.6	78.13	21.87
Male	56.13	39.45	63.9	36.1
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	61.5	56.66	74.93	25.07
Not Heterosexual	74.04	61.08	82.57	17.43
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	59.61	55.62	71.83	28.17
Caucasian	63.38	57.37	76.35	23.65
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	62.04	55.3	74.95	25.05
Gen X	65.9	61.97	78.73	21.27
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	62.9	57.15	75.78	24.22

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 78.13% of female AFP members have experienced sexual harassment behaviors by a coworker or external stakeholder ever in their career.

### Categories of sexual harassment behaviors

Research describes several different categories of sexual harassment behavior: gender hostility, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion. In this section, we define each category, list the associated behaviors from the survey, and describe its incidence among AFP members. Overall, initial analysis of survey data suggests that fundraisers may experience different categories and levels of sexual harassment behavior depending on the identity of the aggressor. This phenomenon should be examined more closely in future research.

## AFP members experiences with Gender Hostility over the course of their fundraising career

Gender Hostility - Unwelcome behaviors that disparage or objectify others based on their sex or gender.

- Unwelcome sexual teasing, jokes, comments or questions
- The presence of sexually oriented material in any format (e.g., photos, videos)
- People having sexually oriented conversations in front of others
- Different treatment based on sex/gender (e.g., quality or nature of assignments)
- Use of derogatory or unprofessional terms related to a person's sex/gender

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Gender Hostility behaviors over the course of their fundraising career by demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

### *Experiences of Gender Hostility by Aggressor Identity and Respondent Demographics*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Never
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	22.98	50.26	73.24	26.76
Male	24.46	34.51	58.97	41.03
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	23.2	46.73	69.93	30.07
Not Heterosexual	22.97	55.72	78.69	21.31
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	21.31	44.53	65.84	34.16
Caucasian	23.45	48.19	71.64	28.36
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	23.92	45.78	69.7	30.3
Gen X	22.03	53.08	75.11	24.89
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	23.18	47.72	70.9	29.1

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 73.24% of female AFP members have experienced gender hostility from a coworker or external stakeholder ever in their career.

## AFP members experiences with Unwanted Sexual Attention over the course of their fundraising career

Unwanted Sexual Attention - Unwelcome behaviors of a sexual nature that are directed toward a person.

- Unwelcome communications (e.g., emails, phone calls, notes, text messages, social media contacts) of a sexual nature
- Unwelcome invasion of personal space (e.g., touching, crowding, leaning over)
- Unwelcome sexually suggestive looks or gestures

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Unwanted Sexual Attention over the course of their fundraising career by demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

### *Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Attention by Aggressor Identity and Respondent Demographics*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Never
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	12.9	48.69	61.58	38.42
Male	17.07	23.61	40.68	59.32
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	13.05	44.25	57.29	42.71
Not Heterosexual	18.02	46.95	64.97	35.03
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	14.37	42.09	56.46	43.54
Caucasian	13.49	44.91	58.39	41.61
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	13.42	43.14	56.57	43.43
Gen X	14.06	48.5	62.57	37.43
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	13.6	44.55	58.15	41.85

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 61.58% of female AFP members have experienced unwanted sexual attention from a coworker or external stakeholder ever in their career.

## AFP members experiences with Sexual Coercion over the course of their fundraising career

Sexual Coercion - Pressure or force to engage in sexual behavior.

- Pressure for sexual favors
- Pressure for dates
- Someone offering preferential treatment in the workplace in exchange for sexual favors
- Stalking (e.g., unwanted intrusion (physically or electronically) into your personal life)
- Rape or sexual assault or attempted rape or sexual assault

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Sexual Coercion over the course of their fundraising career by demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

### *Experiences of Sexual Coercion by Aggressor Identity and Respondent Demographics*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Never
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	8.72	15.72	24.44	75.56
Male	6.72	9.42	16.14	83.86
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	8.03	14.29	22.31	77.69
Not Heterosexual	11.92	17.5	29.42	70.58
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	5.51	16.88	22.39	77.61
Caucasian	8.89	14.32	23.21	76.79
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	8.63	13.15	21.78	78.22
Gen X	8.01	18.02	26.03	73.97
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	8.46	14.64	23.1	76.9

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 24.44% of female AFP members have experienced sexual coercion from a coworker or external stakeholder ever in their career.

## AFP member experiences with sexual harassment behaviors over the past two years

To better understand the more recent experiences of AFP members, we asked:

*In the past two years while working as a fundraiser or fundraising consultant, did you experience any of the following behaviors?*

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced any of the above sexual harassment behaviors during the past two years by demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

*Experiences of sexual harassment Behaviors over Past 2 Years by Aggressor Identity and Demographic Characteristics of Respondent*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Not in 2 yrs
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	33.06	25.59	44.37	55.63
Male	24.7	14.54	30.32	69.68
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	29.96	22.87	40.98	59.02
Not Heterosexual	46.12	32.14	51.23	48.77
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	32.35	23.9	41.24	58.76
Caucasian	31.68	23.91	42.26	57.74
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	32.3	23.56	42.3	57.7
Gen X	31.29	25.05	42.58	57.42
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	31.77	23.91	42.13	57.87

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 44.37% of female AFP members have experienced sexual harassment behaviors by a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

Next, we again define each category of sexual harassment behavior, list the associated behaviors from the survey, and describe its estimated incidence among AFP members during the past two years.

## AFP members experiences with Gender Hostility over the past two years

Gender Hostility - Unwelcome behaviors that disparage or objectify others based on their sex or gender.

- Unwelcome sexual teasing, jokes, comments or questions
- The presence of sexually oriented material in any format (e.g., photos, videos)
- People having sexually oriented conversations in front of others
- Different treatment based on sex/gender (e.g., quality or nature of assignments)
- Use of derogatory or unprofessional terms related to a person's sex/gender

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Gender Hostility behaviors over the past two years by demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

### *Experiences of Gender Hostility over Past 2 Years by Aggressor Identity and Respondent Demographics*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Not in 2 yrs
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	19.51	18.25	37.76	62.24
Male	15.22	12.04	27.26	72.74
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	18.63	16.06	34.69	65.31
Not Heterosexual	19.62	27.72	47.34	52.66
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	18.94	17.52	36.46	63.54
Caucasian	18.71	17.34	36.05	63.95
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	19.53	16.29	35.82	64.18
Gen X	17.54	19.85	37.4	62.6
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	18.74	17.36	36.1	63.9

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 37.76% of female AFP members have experienced gender hostility from a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

## AFP members experiences with Unwanted Sexual Attention over the past two years

Unwanted Sexual Attention - Unwelcome behaviors of a sexual nature that are directed toward a person.

- Unwelcome communications (e.g., emails, phone calls, notes, text messages, social media contacts) of a sexual nature
- Unwelcome invasion of personal space (e.g., touching, crowding, leaning over)
- Unwelcome sexually suggestive looks or gestures

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Unwanted Sexual Attention over the past two years by demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

### *Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Attention over Past 2 Years by Aggressor Identity and Respondent Demographics*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Not in 2 yrs
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	8.98	17.62	26.59	73.41
Male	6.66	6.53	13.19	86.81
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	8.37	15.04	23.41	76.59
Not Heterosexual	11.15	21.72	32.87	67.13
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	10.84	17.43	28.27	71.73
Caucasian	8.37	15.55	23.92	76.08
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	9.58	15.61	25.19	74.81
Gen X	6.91	16.3	23.22	76.78
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	8.68	15.79	24.47	75.53

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 26.59% of female AFP members have experienced unwanted sexual attention from a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

## AFP members experiences with Sexual Coercion over the past two years

Sexual Coercion - Pressure or force to engage in sexual behavior.

- Pressure for sexual favors
- Pressure for dates
- Someone offering preferential treatment in the workplace in exchange for sexual favors
- Stalking (e.g., unwanted intrusion (physically or electronically) into your personal life)
- Rape or sexual assault or attempted rape or sexual assault

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced Sexual Coercion over the past two years by demographic characteristics of the respondent. Estimates are based on survey responses adjusted for over-sampling of males and non-response.

### *Experiences of Sexual Coercion over Past 2 Years by Aggressor Identity and Respondent Demographics*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Not in 2 yrs
<i>GENDER</i>				
Female*	3.37	3.97	7.33	92.67
Male	1.77	1.87	3.63	96.37
<i>SEXUALITY</i>				
Heterosexual	2.69	3.45	6.13	93.87
Not Heterosexual	6.35	5.58	11.93	88.07
<i>RACE</i>				
BIPOC	3.57	6.07	9.64	90.36
Caucasian	3.03	3.34	6.37	93.63
<i>GENERATION</i>				
Baby Boomers	3.13	3.51	6.63	93.37
Gen X	2.89	4.03	6.92	93.08
<i>ALL AFP MEMBERS</i>	3.09	3.68	6.78	93.22

\*Interpretation Example: We estimate 7.33% of female AFP members have experienced sexual coercion from a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

## Preventative Measures

Finally, we consider the preventative measures that survey respondents report their organizations are taking to protect employees and other stakeholders from sexual harassment.

### Sexual harassment experiences by sexual harassment policy

We first consider whether experiences with sexual harassment behavior in the past two years are associated with having an organizational policy on sexual harassment. To find out if the organization where respondents worked for most of the last two years had a sexual harassment policy, we asked:

*A policy prohibiting sexual harassment, which includes workplace violence and bullying based on sex.*

The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced sexual harassment behaviors in the past two years by organizational sexual harassment policy.

*Sexual Harassment in Past 2 Years and Sexual Harassment Policy*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Never
No*	31.78	32.71	54.67	45.33
Yes	31.75	23.70	41.65	58.35
Dont Know	32.36	22.95	42.82	57.18

\*Interpretation Example: Of the fundraisers working for an organization that does not have a sexual harassment policy, we estimate 54.67% have experienced sexual harassment behaviors by a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

## Sexual harassment experiences by anti-sexual harassment training

We next consider whether experiences with sexual harassment behavior in the past two years are associated with anti-sexual harassment training. To find out if the organization where respondents worked for most of the last two years offered anti-sexual harassment training, we asked:

*Which of the following types of anti-sexual harassment training was offered by the organization?*

- Online training
- In-person session

We then consolidated responses into a single measure of whether an organization offered any anti-sexual harassment training. The following table presents the percent of AFP members estimated to have experienced sexual harassment behaviors in the past two years by organizational anti-sexual harassment training.

*Sexual Harassment in Past 2 Years and Anti-Sexual Harassment Training*

	Coworker	Stakeholder	Either	Never
Not Offered*	35.27	29.16	47.88	52.12
Offered	31.35	22.29	40.91	59.09
Dont Know	23.65	17.39	31.87	68.13

\*Interpretation Example: Of the AFP members working for an organization that does not offer anti-sexual harassment training, we estimate 47.88% have experienced sexual harassment behaviors by a coworker or external stakeholder in the past two years.

## Sexual harassment policy by organization size

Research suggests that small organizations have fewer resources that can be used to design and implement policies and trainings, including those that can help prevent sexual harassment. The following table presents the estimated percentage of organizations employing AFP members with a sexual harassment policy by the number of full-time staff at the organization as an indicator of organizational size and capacity.

### *Sexual Harassment Policy by Organizational Size*

	No	Yes	Dont Know
None*	11.97	33.34	54.69
1-5	8.46	78.24	13.30
6-15	4.18	86.17	9.65
16-30	3.72	84.39	11.90
31-100	2.38	90.79	6.83
Over 100	0.22	95.61	4.17

\*Interpretation Example: Of the AFP members working for an organization that does not have any employees, we estimate 33.34% of those organizations do have a sexual harassment policy.

## Anti-Sexual harassment training by organization size

The following table presents the estimated percentage of organizations employing AFP members that offer anti-sexual harassment training by the number of full-time staff at the organization as an indicator of organizational size and capacity.

### *Anti-Sexual Harassment Training by Organizational Size*

	Not Offered	Offered	Dont Know
None*	36.42	29.62	33.96
1-5	44.55	42.76	12.69
6-15	46.50	40.68	12.82
16-30	39.92	48.47	11.61
31-100	26.81	62.47	10.71
Over 100	10.73	83.36	5.91

\*Interpretation Example: Of the AFP members working for an organization that does not have any employees, we estimate 29.62% of those organizations do offer anti-sexual harassment training.

## Sexual harassment policy by included stakeholder groups

It is also important to consider which stakeholder groups are included in organizational efforts to prevent sexual harassment. To find out which stakeholder groups were included in the policy prohibiting sexual harassment (of the organization where they spent most of the past two years working), we asked:

*Which of the following groups of people were included in the organizations sexual harassment policy?*

- All employees
- Outside consultants and contractors
- Trustees and/or board members
- Volunteers other than trustees and board members
- Other organizational stakeholders (donors, clients, etc.)

The following table presents the estimated percentage of organizations employing AFP members that include different stakeholder groups in their sexual harassment policy.

*Sexual Harassment Policy by Included Stakeholder Groups*

	Not Included	Included	Dont Know
All employees*	0.18	97.27	2.55
Consultantants/Contractors	46.42	44.01	9.49
BOD/Trustees	32.96	61.07	5.90
Other Volunteers	34.38	56.66	8.89
Other (donors, clients, etc)	46.45	34.02	19.46

\*Interpretation Example: Of the AFP members working for an organization that has a sexual harassment policy, we estimate 97.27% of those organizations include all employees in that policy.

## Anti-sexual harassment training by stakeholder group

To find out which stakeholder groups were included in the anti-sexual harassment training (of the organization where they spent most of the past two years working), we asked:

*Who was the anti-sexual harassment training offered to at the organization? (Check all that apply)*

- Executive level employees (i.e., CEO, Chief Development Officer, VP, Director of Development, etc.)
- Senior management employees (i.e., Deputy Director, Associate Director, Assistant or Associated VP, etc.)
- Mid-level employees (i.e., Directors, Managers, etc.)
- Junior level employees (i.e., fundraising and other staff)
- Outside consultants and contractors
- Trustees and/or board members
- Volunteers other than trustees and board members
- Other (please describe)

The following table presents the estimated percentage of organizations employing AFP members that offer anti-sexual harassment training to different stakeholder groups.

*Sexual Harassment Training by Included Stakeholder Groups*

	Not Offered	Offered	Dont Know
Executive*	0.79	95.11	4.11
Senior	1.01	95.98	3.01
Mid	0.92	96.85	2.23
Junior	1.68	94.56	3.76
Consultantants/Contractors	40.23	10.78	48.99
BOD/Trustees	23.57	30.75	45.67
Other Volunteers	28.82	28.40	42.78
Other (donors, clients, etc)	10.19	8.85	80.96

\*Interpretation Example: Of the AFP members working for an organization that offers anti-sexual harassment training, we estimate 95.11% of those organizations offer that training to executives.