CENTRE FOR RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND CHILDREN

CENTRE DE RECHERCHE SUR LA VIOLENCE FAITE AUX FEMMES ET AUX ENFANTS

A collaborative venture of Fanshawe College, The London Coordinating Committee to End Woman Abuse and The University of Western Ontario

Assessing "Chilly Climate" in Co-Ed University Residences

by
Christian de Keresztes, Ph.D., C.Psych.
Helene Berman, R.N., Ph.D.
Katreena Scott, M.A.

and

The Prevention Research
Committee*

1997

University College • Room 101 • London, Ontario • Canada • N6A 3K7
Telephone: (519) 661-4040 • Fax: (519) 661-3491

funded by Scotiabank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Purpose
This project was begun in February, 1995, by the Residence Life Unit of a large university in Canada, and the Prevention Committee of the Centre for Research on Violence against Women and Children in London, Ontario. Preliminary research conducted in 1995 had suggested that sexism and racism might be prevalent in residence life. The preliminary research included focus groups with undergraduate residents, and a survey of 627 male residents about intimate and peer relationships (Reitzel-Jaffe 1995). The survey suggested the presence of widespread gender, ethnocultural, and sexual orientation biases that may create a "chilly climate" of personal and social barriers for some residents.

Accordingly, the management of the university's student residence department requested that the Centre for Research on Violence against Women and Children conduct further research on the nature, extent, and development of sexism, racism, and homophobia in residence. The research was funded by a grant from the Violence Prevention Secretariat of the Government of Ontario's Ministry of Education and Training, and managed by the President's Committee on the Safety of Women on Campus at the university.

Chilly Climate
The culture/climate of an organization is a reflection of the patterns of norms, values, roles, and behaviours shared by most of its members (Dipboye, Howell, & Smith 1994; Duffy & Wong 1996). The members of an organization are shaped in the image of these characteristic patterns of shared expectations and typical behaviours which, once established, tend to be maintained. The construct of "chilly climate", first identified in surveys of the classroom experiences of female faculty in the U.S. (Wylie 1995), refers to gender bias that is institutionalized and cultural. The term refers to acts of sexism, racism, and homophobia that may be denied and trivialized by dominant groups in the organization. The experience of chilly climate is the result of attitudes and behaviours (Wylie 1995) that may be conscious or unconscious, although the latter prevail. Indeed, the experience of chilly climate is much more the result of informal and implicit policies and norms than of explicit, formally institutionalized ones (Wylie 1995, p. 37). Thus, the norms and behaviours that lead to the experience of chilly climate may not be harmful in intent, but nonetheless result in systematically disadvantaging some groups in relation to others within the organization.

The purpose of the present study was to assess chilly climate in a university residence setting by examining the frequency, experience, and meaning of sexist, racist, and homophobic behaviours there. The study sought to identify, describe, and track the development of students' experiences and perceptions of the extent and meaning of harassing and violent behaviours in university residences during the 1995/1996 academic year. The findings from the study were used to assess the need for, and types of, interventions aimed at improving gender and race relations in student residences.

Harassment and violence on campus; a review of the literature
Over the last two decades, there has been a significant shift in how the terms harassment and abuse are defined. In the past, abuse was defined by its most visible result, physical injury. This definition still prevails in our legal system. However, as people began to study the development of violence in relationships, it became clear that physical abuse was one end of a continuum of violence, that ranged from severely violent acts, such as punching, to less severe psychological acts such as name-calling and harassment. Although the outward severity of these acts seems quite different, the effect of seemingly less severe emotional and psychological abuse can be as damaging to the person as physical assault (Walker 1989). Research on campus harassment and violence reflects this broadened definition (Pezza 1995).

Campus violence may sound like a contradiction in terms (Pezza 1995), but a growing body of incidence and prevalence[1] surveys shows that it isn't. The Center for the Prevention of Campus Violence at Towson State University has conducted several incidence surveys of campus violence in the U.S. and in Canada (Cockey et al 1989; in Pezza 1995). The response rates from dean's offices and security departments tended to be low, but nonetheless pointed to the presence of considerable physical violence. A survey of campus housing officers by Palmer (1993; in Pezza 1995), again with a relatively low response rate, also reported a large number of physically and sexually violent acts in campus residence halls. Research conducted on violence related to gender, ethnocultural background, and sexual orientation will be reviewed in the following sections.

i) Sexual aggression and victimization
Two large-scale national incidence and prevalence surveys have been conducted on sexual aggression and victimization among post-secondary students, one in the United States by Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987), and one in Canada by DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993). Both surveys used a multi-stage probability sampling procedure to obtain a nationally representative sample.

In the Koss et al. (1987) survey, a sample of 3,187 women and 2,972 men completed a 330-item questionnaire which included the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), a 10-item measure of the experience of different degrees of sexual aggression and victimization. Koss et al. classified respondents according to the most severe act of sexual aggression or victimization that they reported. With regard to prevalence, 54% of women reported experiencing sexual victimization: sexual contact for 14%, sexual coercion for 12%, attempted rape for 12%, and rape for 15%. Further analyses revealed that fully 85% of rape victims in this sample were raped by acquaintances (Koss & Cox 1989). Among men, 75% said that they had not participated in any form of sexual aggression, while 25% admitted they had. Of these latter, 10% had engaged in unwanted sexual contact, 7% in sexual coercion, 3% had attempted rape, and 4% had committed rape. As Koss et al. (1987) present only

---

[1] Prevalence refers to the number of events in a given population *at a given point in time*. Prevalence is most commonly calculated as a ratio of the total number of individuals who have been subjected to the target event at a particular time divided by the population at risk of having the event at that time. By contrast, incidence is the number of *new* events occurring in a given population *during a given period of time*. Incidence is most commonly calculated as a rate obtained by dividing the number of new events occurring during a given period of time by the number of people exposed to those events (i.e., the relevant population) during that period of time (see Last, 1995).

2

raw incidence numbers for the sample, rather than calculating incidence rates for the population, incidence will not be discussed here. Both the victimization rate for women and the perpetration rate for men calculated for this sample were found to be much higher (by 10 times and by 2-3 times, respectively) than had been estimated from national crime statistics.

The Canadian survey by DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993) also used the SES, along with the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus & Gelles 1986) to assess sexual, physical, and psychological abuse on campus. The CTS is an 18-item scale that measures how much respondents use reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical violence to deal with conflict in intimate relationships. There were 1,805 women and 1,307 men in the Canadian sample.

Like Koss et al. (1987), DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993) combined behaviours with differing degrees of violence to obtain their prevalence estimates. The prevalence rates for sexual victimization are comparable to the U.S. survey, with 45.1% of women and 19.5% of men reporting at least one act of sexual victimization since leaving high school. As in the Koss et al. survey, there were large differences between reported perpetration by men and victimization by women in DeKeseredy and Kelly's sample. With regard to incidence, DeKeseredy and Kelly report a global one-year incidence rate of: 28% for female sexual victimization and 11% for male sexual perpetration; 22% for female physical victimization and 134% for male perpetration of physical abuse; and, 79% for female psychological victimization and 74% for male perpetration of psychological abuse.

ii) Racism
Although no national data on the incidence and prevalence of racist attitudes and behaviour on campus are available, local studies suggest that the experience of racism on campus is common for minority students. For instance, a recent survey at a university in the U.S. northeast found growing rates of discrimination against Black and Hispanic students (McCormack 1995) over a four-year period. In another study, both Asian-American and African-American students reported facing many incidents of racism and prejudice, mainly from other students (Tan 1994). Minority students may be subjected to a continuum of discriminatory practices, including aggression, exclusion, dismissal of subculture, and typecasting (Feagin 1992). A study of white students' attitudes at two points in time 10 years apart found that many expressed negative attitudes toward Blacks in educational-vocational and in personal-social situations (Balenger, Hoffman, & Sedlacek 1992).

iii) Homophobia
The prevalence of victimization of gay and lesbian students in schools and colleges is very high. Surveys of anti-gay violence at Yale, Rutgers, and Penn State found that 55-76% of respondents had been verbally harassed, while 16-26% had been threatened with physical violence (Berrill 1990, p. 284). Most often, the victimizers are other students (D'Augelli 1992). The available data come from nonrepresentative (i.e., not randomly selected) samples that are gay-identified, and do not include those who may conceal their sexual preference (Berrill 1990) due to denial and stigmatization of homosexuality (Herek 1990). A study of heterosexual students' attitudes at one university found that homophobia remained at the same level over a period of seven years (D'Augelli 1995). Compulsory heterosexuality (Eyre 1993) appears to be the norm on campus, paradoxically in the face of a liberal ethos of equality (Norris 1992). Indeed, students who hold more positive attitudes toward women, different cultures, and homosexuals, report feeling greater alienation from wider society (Wells &

Daly 1992); female undergraduates are more likely to hold such views than male undergraduates (Qualls, Cox, & Schehr 1992).

Analytical perspective

This brief review of the literature suggests that universities are not safe havens. Sexist, racist, and homophobic attitudes exist on campus, and are translated into sexist, racist, and homophobic behaviours that make universities an uncomfortable and unsafe place for a number of students.

The present research was conceived and designed from the perspective of feminist political gender analysis (Walker 1989). This perspective posits that the problem of violence is fundamentally one of inequalities in power and control between men and women. Accordingly, it is important to examine violent acts perpetrated and experienced by men and women against the backdrop of a society with a long history of ignoring and minimizing the problem of violence against women, racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities. Much of this inequality of the experience of violence is rooted in the different social power held by these groups. This difference in power creates barriers to equal access to employment, financial resources, legal resources, and the ability to make changes in social policies. These domains are still largely populated by white men, and are unduly difficult for ethnic minorities and women to penetrate. In order to preserve the status quo, there is a largely unconscious, systematic societal process that places women, ethnic minorities and those with homosexual or bisexual orientation in a "one-down" position. It was this process that we attempted to document and understand within a university residence setting, based on students' experiences.

Members of the Prevention Committee hypothesized that students living in university residences would mirror the attitudes and behaviours of people in society at large, attitudes that result in the downgrading of women, ethnic minorities, and gays and lesbians. Therefore, we expected that university students would express sexist, racist, and homophobic attitudes. We expected university students to have observed, experienced, and committed harassing, aggressive, and violent behaviours of a sexist, racist, or homophobic nature in residences. Given differences in social power, we expected that men would commit more sexually harassing or sexually violent behaviours against women, and that experiencing these acts would be more distressing to women than to men.

This research was a longitudinal case study consisting of two components. The first component entailed a survey of a cohort of 457 students living in residence at three points in time: near the beginning, middle, and end of the academic year. The purpose of the survey was to assess perceptions of sexist, racist, and homophobic behaviours in residence and emotional reactions to them. The second part of the study was a series of focus groups. The purpose of the focus groups was to examine the phenomenology of gender, race, and sexual orientation relations among residence students, drawn from the survey cohort, in their own words. The combination of statistical and experiential data was intended to provide a more complete picture of behaviour in context than either kind of data could provide on its own.

METHOD

Sample

A self-selected sample of 230 male and 227 female students was recruited to participate in the survey by means of posters placed in residences at the university. Respondents had to be full-time students living in residence, and be 18 years of age or older. There were no significant gender differences in demographic characteristics. The majority of respondents were 19-year-olds (56%), with 91% of the sample between 18 and 20 years of age. Fully 86% were residents of Ontario, and 78% were first-year students. Among survey respondents, 2.1% and 2.5 % of male and female students, respectively, were international students, 17.2% of female and 25.3% of male students indicated that they were a visible minority, and approximately 2% of the sample identified themselves as either of a gay, lesbian, or bisexual orientation.

Procedure

Following the study's approval by the university's research ethics committee, the respondents were recruited early in the Fall of 1995 to participate in the survey. Respondents received a letter of information and signed a consent form. At the first session in October, 1995, respondents were asked to complete (a) a demographic questionnaire, and (b) the University Social Climate Survey (see Appendix A). Subsequently, the respondents were asked to complete the survey in January, 1996, and in April, 1996. Respondents were paid $5 for each of the three surveys that they completed. The study used a single-setting, multiple-period case design.

Survey measures

The main measure used in the study was the University Social Climate Survey (Appendix A). This measure was an adaptation of one developed by Reitzel-Jaffe (1995) in an earlier study. This questionnaire included rating scales asking respondents about a wide range of attitudes, behaviours, and emotional reactions to behaviours. The survey also included demographic information about age, gender, year of study, year in residence, and place of permanent residence. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether or not they were immigrants, members of a visible minority, as well as their sexual orientation (Section 4, items 1, 2, and 3).

To assess attitudes about sexism, respondents were asked to rate four kinds of "sexually oriented" behaviours in terms of social intolerability and blatancy of sexual harassment (Section 1), as well as their agreement with statements about levels of sexual harassment and sexism in society (Section 6, items 1 and 4).

Both male and female respondents were asked to rate the observed frequency of occurrence of sexually aggressive acts directed by other: (a) men toward men, (b) men toward women, (c) women toward women, and (d) women toward men. Respondents were also asked to rate how common each of these behaviours was in residence compared to outside of residence, and their emotional reactions to such behaviours (Section 2). Next, respondents were asked to rate how frequently they had been physically or sexually victimized by same or opposite sex members, on behaviours ranging from being pressured to attend a strip club to rape (Section 3). If respondents indicated that they had experienced a particular behaviour, they were then asked to rate their typical emotional reaction to

it. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether or not they had committed any of these behaviours.

Respondents' attitudes about racism and homosexuality were assessed by rating their agreement with statements about these (Section 6, items 2 and 3). Respondents were asked to rate their perceptions of how well visible minority and gay/lesbian students were integrated in residence life (Section 4, items 4 to 7). Respondents were also asked to indicate how often they observed a range of racist and homophobic behaviours, their typical emotional reaction to observing these behaviours, and how often they had done these behaviours (Section 5).

Focus groups
In order to gain a more comprehensive picture of the climate in university residences than could be obtained from quantitative data, four sets of focus group discussions were conducted after the surveys were completed. Two groups were with female student residents and two were with male student residents. The focus group participants were drawn from the survey respondents. In the two focus groups for women, there were five and eight participants, respectively. There were seven and 10 participants, respectively, in the focus groups for men. Each focus group participant was paid $10. No other information was collected about the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Each focus group began with a brief introduction by the team of two facilitators (male facilitators were used for the men's groups, while female ones were used for the women's groups). Participants were told that the committee was interested in gaining additional insight into the meaning of the survey results. The voluntary nature of their participation was emphasized, and confidentiality was assured. Discussion then began with the facilitators sharing with the students one of the key findings from the survey and asking them to comment on them.

The students began by sharing several concerns with the format of the survey which they believed were relevant to the results. These concerns were: (a) the lack of a "neutral" option — answers had to be mildly pleasant or mildly unpleasant, and some didn't want to choose either; (b) one participant suggested that the high incidence of verbal abuse may reflect the fact that many did not take the survey seriously.

The sessions were audio-taped. (The tapes for the groups with the women were transcribed verbatim. However, because of recording problems, transcripts could not be prepared for the sessions with the men, and the moderators wrote a summary instead.) Content analysis of the data was carried out using techniques suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967) for the elucidation of patterns and themes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The major qualitative and quantitative findings from this survey are presented together, with the aim of explaining the meaning of survey data with reference to focus group participants' experiences. First is an examination of students' attitudes about sexism and sexist behaviour and an exploration of what students reported about their experiences as victims and/or perpetrators of violence. Next is an exploration of attitudes and behaviours regarding racism and homophobia. Finally, changes in attitudes, behaviour, and emotional responses over time are explored.

Sexism: Perhaps we have gotten the message (or at least we know the right answers)
To gauge students' awareness and acceptance of sexual harassment, respondents were asked to rate four harassing situations on their degree of intolerability and the extent to which they were blatant examples of sexual harassment on a five-point scale. For example, men and women were asked to rate the degree of intolerability (1 = "not at all" to 5 = "very much") of an expressed or clearly implied promise of reward or reprisal for complying or failing to comply with a sexually oriented request. Both men and women rated this situation and the other three in the survey as socially intolerable, though women rated them as slightly more intolerable than men.[2] A similar pattern of results was evident in students' ratings of the blatantness of these examples. A five-point scale was also used (1 = "not at all" to 5 = "very blatant") for these judgements. Both men and women indicated that all four situations were blatant examples of harassment. Once again, women rated situations as significantly more blatant than men did.[3]

This examination of the general attitudes of first year university students about issues of sexual harassment and sexism suggests that the messages these students have received have, at the very least, provided them with the "right answers". Both men and women expressed awareness and intolerance of sexually harassing behaviours.

There were gender differences in global attitudes about levels of sexism in society. Women, but not men, were more likely to agree that "There is too much sexism in our society", and that levels of sexual harassment are not greatly exaggerated. These substantive and statistically significant differences between men and women[4] suggest, among other things, that women who are fighting against sexist attitudes or behaviours in residence are likely not to be supported by their male counterparts, an interpretation that is supported by the focus group discussions.

i) Attitudes toward feminism
A brief discussion about the word 'feminist' in one of the women's focus groups may shed some light on these survey findings. The topic was raised by the facilitator, but the students' comments were interesting and illuminating. "They [feminists] are usually looked down on by guys...They just don't like having feminists around when they get into debates and stuff." Another student readily agreed and another added:

---

[2] The mean rating for the four situations was 3.69 for men and 3.95 for women; $F(1,310) = 4.97$, $p < .05$.
[3] The mean rating for men was 3.79, while the mean rating for women was 4.13; $F(1,307) = 16.28$, $p < .0001$.
[4] $F(1,308) = 54.11$, $p < .0001$ for ratings of sexism, and $F(1,309) = 21.3$, $p < .0001$ for ratings of harassment.

7

There are a bunch of girls...and they are real feminists and they write a column about whatever, you know who I'm talking about, right? I just read it and I thought it was pretty bad...They were like totally banging guys. It was just like, if that's feminism, I don't want a part of it because it was just totally, it was almost like racist like the way that they were saying that.

Another student concurred, stating that "There is no difference whatsoever between feminism and racist (sic)." Several other negative viewpoints were shared about feminists. There seemed to be little understanding about the essence of feminism. These comments suggest that the expression of feminist values about sexual harassment may be dismissed and stigmatized by both men and women.

Through the mirror: What did my neighbour do this year?
Both men and women were asked to report on their observations of male-perpetrated and female-perpetrated aggressive sexual behaviours. Both sexes agreed about the extent of observed violence committed by men and by women. There were no significant differences between male and female respondents in the overall frequency with which they reported observing men sexually harassing women and women sexually harassing men. Accordingly, ratings of observed behaviours by male and female respondents were analysed together rather than separately. Table 1 shows the frequency of sexually aggressive behaviours in residence reported by respondents[5] at the third administration of the survey. Ratings given at this time covered the entire school year. These data show the relative frequency of harassing and violent acts perpetrated by men and by women. This analysis shows that, with one exception, both male and female residents saw more men than women perpetrating these behaviours against women.[6] The higher observed frequency of aggressive sexual behaviour by males directed at females than vice versa was statistically significant for a) provoking by showing pornographic pictures, b) making unwanted sexually suggestive comments, c) showing off parts of body, d) making unwanted sexual advances and, e) psychological coercion to have sex. There were no differences in the frequency with which respondents observed men and women a) teasing sexually when in bathrobe or night clothes, b) in being verbally abusive, c) touching against will, and d) physical coercion to have sex. The exception to the pattern was the finding that both male and female respondents reported observing significantly more female residents physically abuse (slap, kick or hit) male residents than vice versa.

---

[5] For each of the behaviours shown in Table 1, respondents were asked to rate an item about males directing the behaviour toward females and an item about females directing the behaviour toward males. For analysis, the ratings for each of these items were assigned to one of two levels of a single variable, with each level representing the direction of the behaviour — male to female and female to male. Also, for simplicity in presentation, respondents' ratings on a five-point scale were dichotomized into two categories: whether or not the behaviour was observed.

[6] The difference between the frequencies of behaviour by males toward females and females toward males was tested by means of Cochran's Q statistic (Hays 1988). Cochran's Q assesses the null hypothesis that the frequency of a dichotomously coded behaviour is the same for matched groups, and is distributed approximately as Chi-square.

Table 1
Frequency of perpetrated violence observed by respondents*

Observed behaviour	Male toward female (n = 310)	Female toward male (n = 310)	Cochran's Q
Tease sexually when in bathrobe/night clothes	65.9%	68.4%	1.52
Provoke by showing pornographic pictures	42.9%	24.8%	52.66*
Make unwanted sexually suggestive comments	83.3%	71.9%	20.76*
Surprise by showing off parts of body	52.6%	35.6%	28.37*
Make unwanted sexual advances	75.9%	61.3%	33.88*
Verbally abuse	71.0%	68.4%	1.60
Touch against will	50.6%	41.0%	14.06
Physically abuse (slap, hit, kick)	33.1%	46.6%	23.83*
Psychologically coerce into having sex	30.6%	18.7%	22.44*
Psychologically coerce to have intercourse	16.7%	9.6%	14.23

Note: Male and female responses are aggregated.
*p<.01.

Respondents were asked to indicate their typical emotional reaction to observing these behaviours. Ratings were made on a six-point scale ranging from 1 = "very unpleasant" to 6 = "very pleasant". Table 2 shows the mean ratings of emotional reactions by male and by female respondents to aggressive sexual behaviours, again at the third administration of the survey. As there were no significant differences between male and female respondents in emotional reaction to any of the aggressive sexual behaviours, their responses were combined. Furthermore, there were no significant differences between respondents' emotional reaction to aggressive behaviours directed by men toward women and such behaviours directed by women toward men.[7] Mean ratings were at least mildly unpleasant or lower, depending on the severity of the behaviour. More aggressive behaviours were rated as more unpleasant.

---

[7] For each of the behaviours shown in Table 2, respondents were asked to rate their emotional reaction to the behaviour by males toward females, and to rate their emotional reaction to the same behaviour by females toward males. For analysis, the ratings for these two items were assigned to two levels of a single variable, with each level representing the directing of the behaviour — male to female and vice versa. A two-way repeated-measures analysis of variance was then performed on the recoded ratings, with gender and direction of behaviour as the independent variables. Gender was the between-subjects variable and direction of the behaviour was the within-subjects variable. Only the direction of behaviour effects are reported in Table 2. There were no gender differences and there were no interactions between gender and direction of behaviour in the emotional reaction ratings.

Table 2
Mean ratings of emotional reaction to observed aggressive sexual behaviours

Emotional reaction to behaviour	Male toward female (n = 310)	Female toward male (n = 310)	F
Tease sexually when in bathrobe/night clothes	2.72	2.93	10.18
Provoke by showing pornographic pictures	2.36	2.51	6.16
Make unwanted sexually suggestive comments	2.30	2.52	9.92
Surprise by showing off parts of body	2.46	2.82	9.52
Make unwanted sexual advances	2.12	2.34	13.85
Verbally abuse	1.94	2.06	9.77
Touch against will	1.71	1.91	16.17
Physically abuse (slap, hit, kick)	1.52	1.63	4.97
Psychologically coerce into having sex	1.59	1.71	3.27
Physically coerce to have intercourse	1.34	1.50	3.18

Note: Male and female responses are aggregated.

In contrast to the survey ratings, the focus groups highlighted a difference in emotional impact on men and women of sexually suggestive behaviours. The women insisted that when they engaged in unwanted sexually suggestive behaviour, it was solely in the context of "good fun".

> *I think guys take it more as a joke...if a girl does it, it is not like the girl is really going to attack the guy.*

There seemed to be a real difference in the way the women perceived their own unwanted advances and those of the men they encountered. When women made unwanted sexually suggestive remarks, these tended to be viewed as a joke, and were not taken seriously. The women indicated that they did not intend them to be taken seriously, nor did the "guys" view their behaviours in any serious manner. According to the female participants, the men did not perceive what the women did or said as threatening or as a precursor to more serious physical attack.

In contrast, male comments were taken more seriously. The women expressed more fear that men's unwanted comments or behaviours could escalate to something more threatening. This seemed to be a legitimate concern since men do sexually assault women more frequently.

> *But if it is the other way around, the girl would probably take it more seriously because you just never know.*

In summary, survey respondents observed a disturbingly high number of sexually harassing behaviours. Both men and women agreed that more of these behaviours were directed towards women than towards men. Also, both male and female respondents reported similarly negative emotional reactions to these behaviours. Nonetheless, the focus groups suggested that these behaviours may have different meanings for men and women.

Sexual harassment and abuse: It may happen, but nobody does it

Along with the frequency of observed events, respondents were asked to report both the frequency of their own victimization and of their own perpetration of abusive events. Table 3 shows the self-reported incidence of victimization (at least once) compared with the number of individuals who indicated that they had themselves committed these acts.

Table 3
Frequency of self-reported victimization and perpetration for male and female university students

Behaviour	Female Victim (n=144)	Male Perpetrator (n=163)	Male Victim (n=163)	Female Perpetrator (n=144)
Teased sexually while in your bathrobe/night clothes	56.6 %	23.5 %	53.7 %	33.3 %
Provoked by being shown pornographic pictures	22.2%	11.2%	29.1%	2.1%
Received unwanted sexually suggestive comments	63.4%	12.6%	47.6%	6.9%
Surprised by a member of the opposite sex who showed off parts of his/ her body	38.9%	17.9%	39.6%	4.9%
Received unwanted sexual advances	59.0%	11.8%	51.2%	2.8%
Verbally abused	43.7%	23.0%	46.9%	21.7%
Touched against your will	35.2%	6.3%	37.2%	3.4%
Physically abused (slapped, hit, kicked)	18.1%	8.7%	28.8%	13.9%
Psychologically coerced into having sex	13.4%	5.0%	13.5%	2.1%
Forced to have intercourse	7.7%	3.1%	8.5%	1.4%

The most alarming aspect of these findings is the high number of both men and women who reported having been victimized over the year. For every behaviour, the level of perpetration reported was lower than the level of victimization reported. More than one in three men and women reported that they had been touched against their will by a member of the opposite sex, and/or were surprised by

a member of the opposite sex showed off part(s) of his or her body. Almost one in five women and one in three men reported that they had been slapped, hit or kicked by a member of the opposite sex. Overall, there were no significant differences between men and women in their reports of the frequency of victimization or of perpetration.

Although the frequency of male and female victimization was equal, there were clear and significant differences between the emotional reactions of men and women to these events.[8] Table 4 shows mean ratings of emotional reactions to aggressive sexual behaviours directed at respondents. Women consistently rated their emotional reactions to behaviours that they directly experienced as significantly more negative than men. An examination of the means in question showed that women reported that these experiences were "very unpleasant", whereas men found them "unpleasant". When experienced personally, sexually aggressive behaviours were more distressing to female respondents than they were to male respondents. In contrast, when the same sexually aggressive behaviours were observed happening to others (see Table 2), male and female respondents reported similar levels of emotional reaction.

Table 4
Mean ratings of emotional reaction to experienced aggressive sexual behaviours

Behaviour by member of opposite sex	Mean female emotional reaction	Mean male emotional reaction	F
Teased sexually	3.00 (n=81)	3.66 (n=87)	15.37 *
Provoked by being shown pornographic pictures	2.61 (n=31)	3.46 (n=47)	9.02 *
Received unwanted sexually suggestive comments	2.32 (n=84)	2.94 (n=78)	16.96 *
Surprised by showing off parts of body	2.90 (n=53)	3.74 (n=66)	11.97 *
Received unwanted sexual advances	2.13 (n=80)	2.80 (n=85)	15.59 *
Verbally abused	1.95 (n=62)	2.56 (n=78)	12.59 *
Touched against will	1.63 (n=52)	2.83 (n=60)	37.83 *
Physically abused	1.85 (n=27)	2.69 (n=46)	9.23 *
Psychologically coerced	1.84 (n=19)	3.08 (n=23)	10.69 *
Forced physically to have intercourse	2.16 (n=12)	3.13 (n=15)	2.71

* $p < .01$

[8] $F_{(1,261)} = 33.82$, $p < .0001$.

A striking observation from Table 3 is how few respondents actually admitted to perpetrating these events. This finding is especially pronounced for items such as "touched against your will", where only 6.3% and 3.4% of men and women, respectively, admitted to perpetrating these behaviours — whereas over one in three men and women reported that they had been on the receiving end of such behaviour.

With these findings in mind, we can turn to an examination of the qualitative data from the current study. The idea that people were "just having fun" was repeated time and again by many of the participants in both of the women's focus groups. As another stated:

> *You walk down the hall and like one of your friends, like a guy will whistle at you and just be joking around with something like that. It is nothing like...being really arrogant or rude or anything, just like joking around. We would all do it, the same thing, if I see a guy walking around. Like one of my guy friends walking down the hall, it would be like whistling you know, like 'whoo, whoo' or something. It is nothing like really serious or being harmful or anything like that.*

Although the women seemed determined to convey an impression of mutual respect and fun, there were subtle indicators that they experienced at least some degree of fear and discomfort. For the most part, these were revealed during the latter part of each focus group session, when many began to acknowledge that some of the "light-hearted banter" was in fact offensive. As one resident said, "You pretty much know most of the people so you are not really in huge fear of them doing something". The question that arises from this comment is, are they living in some, if not "huge" fear? In the words of another participant:

> *I think it all starts out with people joking around and then it is the extent to which people...take it more seriously and girls, they just take it more seriously at a lower point than guys do.*

Thus, the dissociation between quantitative and qualitative data suggests that both men and women minimize the emotional impact of sexually aggressive behaviours, although women do so to a lesser extent.

Between friends

Along similar lines, the female focus group participants suggested that their responses to unwanted male comments and behaviours were influenced to a large degree by whether the men were known to them. When they did not know the men, they were more likely to be offended by sexually suggestive jokes, comments, posters, or the showing of pornographic videos.

The focus group participants also discussed in some depth their thoughts as to why women might engage in unwanted sexually suggestive behaviours. The incessant joking, banter and innuendo that seem to characterize so many of the reported incidents of sexually suggestive behaviour were viewed as light-hearted fun, which several suggested was a reflection of the comfort they feel with one another. They spent considerable time emphasizing the high level of familiarity and comfort they perceive. The overwhelming impression conveyed was that everyone lives as "one happy family".

13

Consistent with this idea, several indicated that they are more willing to "take it" from people with whom they feel close.

> *If you don't feel really comfortable with a person, you are going, 'Why are they doing that?' Some people you know are just joking but if you are not really close with the person, then you stop.*

According to one student, "You get too comfortable with each other". Another person stated, "He's just a friend. Like just the same as a girl. There is no gender difference. You just make the same comments". Collectively, these comments imply that the students were more inclined to tolerate behaviours and remarks from people they know, where there was no perceived threat, than they might tolerate from individuals who were not known to them. It would seem that the context in which unwanted comments were made became quite important. Sexually suggestive behaviours, by individuals whom women know and like, were not viewed as harassment. Similar remarks from strangers could be perceived as threatening in nature, and as harassment. Several spoke of the closeness they felt with the men on their floors, describing the relationship as one of neighbour to neighbour, or brother to sister, whereby the brother's role was to provide protection to the sister.

Questions are raised by the survey data, which highlight a large difference between many people reporting victimization and few admitting to perpetration. If these behaviours are taken at face value as expressions of friendship, then why is it that so few people admitted to engaging in them?

Pressuring our peers
In addition to asking about a range of cross-gender harassment behaviours, the survey also asked about observing and experiencing same-sex harassment. Men and women were asked to indicate the frequency with which they observed individuals of the same sex pressuring each other to attend a strip club or to read/watch pornography. In both instances, there were clear differences between the observed behaviours reported by both men and women. Not surprisingly, both men and women indicated that they had observed a significantly higher number of men pressuring men to read/watch pornography or to attend a strip club, than women pressuring women to engage in similar behaviours.[9] However, the sexes did not agree about how often they observed these events. Men reported observing more male-to-male pressure than did women,[10] and more female-to-female pressure,[11] than did women. The first finding is not surprising, as men are more likely to see other men pressuring each other. However, the second finding is quite striking. Men said they had observed more women putting pressure on each other to attend strip clubs, or to watch pornography (likely events done without the men present) than women. Women again tended to find observing these events more distressing than men.

Men and women were also asked to report on same-sex victimization and perpetration. As with observed behaviours, there were some clear differences in frequency of these behaviours for men

---

[9] $t(311) = 17.33$, $p < .0001$.
[10] $F(1,308) = 26.23$, $p < .0001$.
[11] $F(1,309) = 9.35$, $P < .05$.

and women: 68.3% of men indicated that they had been pressured on at least one occasion to attend a strip club, and 61.2% indicated that they had been pressured to read or watch pornography. In contrast, same-sex pressure was significantly lower for females,[12] with 20.7% indicating that they had been pressured to attend a strip club, and 20.3% to read/watch pornography. This difference was echoed in the perpetration data on these behaviours, with 34.5% and 30.5% of men and only 6.9% and 5.5% of women admitting to having pressured peers to attend a strip club or read/watch pornography, again a significant difference.[13]

An examination of the emotional impact of these experiences once again suggests that they have different meaning for men and women. For men, the mean emotional reaction was 3.7 on a six-point scale (1 = "very unpleasant" to 6 = "very pleasant"), indicating that they generally reacted in a neutral to mildly pleasant manner to pressure from their peers. In contrast, the mean emotional reaction for females was 1.22, indicating that women tended to find same-sex pressure unpleasant to very unpleasant, a significant difference.[14]

In summary, these data indicate that men experienced a lot of pressure from their peers to go to a strip club or to watch/read pornography, and that this pressure was not generally experienced in a negative way. Thus, among male residents, there existed a culture where consuming pornography was accepted and perhaps encouraged. In contrast, women were less likely to experience this type of peer pressure, and to find it more distressing.

Racism and homophobia: But it's not a problem
The survey also revealed racist and homophobic attitudes (note that almost all of the respondents identified themselves as white and heterosexual). There were disturbingly high levels of both observed and perpetrated racist and homophobic acts reported. Table 5 shows the frequency of respondents who reported that they had witnessed someone perpetrating these events at least once or twice, along with the number of individuals who reported engaging in these behaviours themselves.

---

[12] $F_{(1,308)} = 96.21, p < .0001$.
[13] $F_{(1,308)} = 38.98, p < .0001$ for pressuring to attend strip clubs, and $F_{(1,308)} = 34.81, p < .001$ for pressuring to view pornography.
[14] $F_{(1,213)} = 46.44, p < .0001$.

Table 5
Frequency of observed and perpetrated racist and homophobic acts

Behaviour	Male Respondents		Female Respondents	
	Observed	Perpetrated	Observed	Perpetrated
Tear down or deface a poster depicting gay/lesbian concerns	52.4%	18.6%	34.9%	0.7%
Tell an offensive joke about gays/lesbians	92%	60.1%	89.0%	25.5%
Make an insulting comment to a gay/lesbian person	33.1%	15.7%	26.9%	3.5%
Tell an offensive joke about a racial/ethnic group	85.9%	58.4%	86.3%	28.5%
Make an insulting racial/ethnic comment to another person	53.7%	23.4%	34.9%	3.5%

As with sexist behaviours, the number of individuals who admitted to perpetrating these behaviours fell far below the number of individuals who observed others perpetrating these events. Regardless of this difference, respondents reported a very high level of perpetrated racist and homophobic acts, with almost two in three men, and one in four women admitting to telling offensive jokes about gay or lesbian individuals, and over half of men and one quarter of women, respectively, admitting to telling an offensive joke about a racial or ethnic group. In addition to admitting to a high frequency of perpetration, survey respondents indicated that they observed a very high number of racist and homophobic behaviours, with over 80% of both men and women reporting that they had heard others tell offensive jokes about gays/lesbians and racial/ethnic groups.

These findings about the frequency of observed and perpetrated behaviour were particularly disturbing when considered in light of respondents' ratings of the general integration of students of different racial backgrounds and sexual orientations into residence. On average, men and women both agreed (1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree") with the statement that "visible minority residents are well integrated with other students in my residence" (mean rating for men, 3.79, mean rating for women, 3.76). In addition, both men and women indicated their disagreement with the statement that minority residents were excluded from parties or similar social gatherings (the mean rating for men was 1.77, and mean rating for women was 1.88).

There were differences between men and women in attitudes toward gay and lesbian students. Female students were more likely to agree that these students were well-integrated[15] and more likely to disagree with the statement that gay/lesbian students were excluded.[16] These findings were supported by the analysis of the focus group discussions.

---

[15] The mean rating for men was 1.77, while the mean rating for women was 3.30; $F(1,303) = 10.17$, $p < .01$.

[16] The mean rating for men 2.66, while the mean rating for women, 2.25; $F(1,303) = 9.07$, $p < .01$.

In the focus groups, residents expressed mixed views regarding the degree to which residents from different racial and ethnic groups were accepted within the residence. Consistent with earlier comments, there seemed to be a desire to convey an attitude of tolerance. For example, some spoke of decorating the halls at Christmas time with Chanukah symbols. The extent to which racism and multiculturalism are understood seemed to be at the most superficial level. Many students expressed their annoyance and resentment that certain cultural groups hold events for members of that group.

> *If you go to the UCC and there is a Chinese cultural dance happening, you don't see the Chinese person giving out flyers to the white people, the black people, other than Chinese people. They will stick to the Chinese people.*

Asked why this occurs, another student responded, "because they want to segregate. They want to have...the best of both worlds. They want to be part of the big university, yet have their own little cliché (sic) thing inside". According to another, "I don't really want to go, but just the fact that those groups exist..."

Another student suggested that racism "goes both ways, majority and minority are racist to each other". Consistent with this perspective, another student expressed her frustration that people from ethnic groups tend to stick together: "People of specific ethnicity only really making an effort to talk or to make friends with people of the same ethnicity, which is their choice but...I was always taught not to do that."

These remarks suggest that the students wanted everyone to be accepted equally, that there should be no differences. They seem frustrated that some groups preferred to "stick together", or have activities that only involved members of a particular racial, ethnic, or cultural group. Several students spoke with resentment about their sense of feeling excluded. They gave an example of one "girl" whom several had tried to befriend, but "because you are not the same race as her, she won't talk to you".

Missing from their concerns was an understanding of the history of racism and the role of power and privilege. Ethnic clubs were viewed as racist by their exclusionary nature, with no recognition of the way in which white, mainstream culture excludes minority groups. Rather than attempting to understand the underlying reasons why some groups may choose to stay together, and in the absence of any analysis of racism and its historical roots, the students in the focus group stated that they felt excluded, a sort of reverse racism. What is clear is that the students seemed unable to differentiate between expressions of cultural pride and expressions of racism.

When asked about attitudes toward differences in sexual orientation, the participants began by stating that there were no differences, that they didn't know anyone who was gay. Therefore, they couldn't project how they might deal with or respond to people who are "different".

Increasingly, students spoke about specific situations which had arisen. One student spoke of someone she knew who was bisexual, but "no one minded...everyone was very comfortable with the idea because it was not as if he would come on to somebody..." Thus, it's acceptable as long as he keeps it to himself. Similarly, the group indicated that if someone were gay, they'd want to know

17

about it, that there might be some initial discomfort but that this would fade once they got used to the idea.

> *I think if the person was open about it, then you would at least be able to get their point of view and understand it more.*

Consistent with the survey results, women indicated that there was more intolerance from men. For example, when asked if they heard many anti-gay jokes, one woman replied, "from the guys".

Overall, focus group participants seemed to feel that "It's okay" as long as someone who is gay is open about it. Like many people, these students have an assumption of heterosexuality, and any departure from that "norm" needs to be declared. The women offered several examples of male homophobia. As one said, "Girls get over it easier. Guys kind of stick on it because you know guys, a lot of guys are in that macho thing and don't want people to say that they are gay too." The choice of words, that "girls get over it" was interesting, implying that knowledge of someone's homosexuality was something to "get over".

A few students acknowledged that there may be more homosexuality than they were aware of, but that the climate didn't really encourage people to come forward with this knowledge. In the words of one group member, there seemed to be little control about who knew what about whom.

> *I think in residence, it would just go around so fast. The whole residence would know and if you really didn't want everybody to be talking about you...I don't think you would say anything while you are in residence because that would just fly.*

As another said, "You would tell one person, by the end of the day everybody would know about it". These comments seemed contradictory to previous comments. On the one hand, the students wanted people to be open about their sexual preferences. On the other, they recognized that once one person was told, chances were it would soon be public knowledge. In other words, the overall climate was one which was not respectful of individual differences, or desire for privacy. Knowledge of one's homosexuality became fodder for gossip among the larger resident body. Interestingly, none of the students mentioned lesbianism. All of the discussion around homosexuality seemed to refer to gay males. It is worth speculating whether these women would have been as tolerant toward lesbians as they seemed to be toward gay men.

In summary, there is a striking disparity between both observed and perpetrated racist and homophobic behaviours, and beliefs about the effects of these behaviours. The quantitative and qualitative data complement each other in reflecting a rejection of multiculturalism and homosexuality within residences.

Fit in or be left out
One theme which emerged in the focus group discussions was the pressure to conform with peer norms. This pressure adds an important context for understanding the results of the study. Facilitators noted that throughout the focus group discussions, there was an underlying tension between the desire to let everyone live as they choose — including a respect for differences in

18

lifestyles, values, and behaviours — and a stifling pressure for conformity, with very little tolerance of difference. These two seemingly polarized positions were evident in many comments:

> *Sometimes people do take it kind of far, but...you know everybody else is kind of giggling about it so you just sort of like don't really say anything, but people probably still do get offended by it.*

Some students spoke of jokes or pranks which they did not consider to be funny, but described the need to nevertheless go along with them for fear of being seen as "different", or being seen as someone who couldn't "take a joke".

The students in one of the women's focus groups described one scenario with a resident who did not date, and the difficulties that a number of residents had accepting her position: "Like why are you at university? University is all liberal and you are just going to have to be, like you had better date or you had better get in with the guys". Similarly, they described prevailing attitudes — not their own — toward someone who was openly gay.

The idea that everyone got along well with each other as long as no one dared to be different, was evident in the comments of one student: "Everyone learns to really respect everybody, so maybe it is a habit, maybe some people are homophobic or whatever, but everybody respects everyone else so much that if they do have specific [differences] they keep it to themselves." From this comment, clearly coming from someone not belonging to a marginalized minority group, it might be concluded that students cannot "be themselves" and feel respected if they are different in any way from the dominant group.

Patterns in attitudes, behaviour, and emotional responses over time

One of the aims of the survey was to track attitudes and behaviour over time during one academic year in order to assess the extent to which they changed. Toward this end, the survey was administered three times. For the analysis of the effects of time, the survey items were organized into a more compact set of 20 summed scales representing attitudes, behaviours, and emotional reactions to behaviours.

Responses were considered both individually and combined into 20 summed scales. Appendix B presents the 20 summed scales, and their internal consistency reliability assessed by means of Cronbach's alpha coefficient.[17]

Generally, the patterns of attitudes, behaviour, and emotional responses reported in the previous

---

[17] Reliability refers to the accuracy or precision of a measure. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha is an estimate of the reliability of a measure based on the average correlation between all possible pairs of items. Coefficient Alpha may range from 0 to 1.00. The higher the number, the higher the average correlation between the items in the measure, and therefore the greater the reliability of the measure.

section were stable across time.[18] Appendix C displays the analysis of gender and time differences for each of the 20 summed scales. The similarities and differences between men and women at the third administration of the survey, reported in the previous section, were also present during the first and second administrations. Independently of gender (i.e., men and women did not differ in their ratings), differences in mean scores due to time were found for only seven of the 20 scales, listed below. They were:

> Attitude toward sexual harassment,
> Frequency of male sexual behaviours directed toward males,
> Frequency of female sexual behaviours directed toward females,
> Frequency of female sexual behaviours directed toward males,
> Frequency of aggressive sexual behaviours to self - II,
> Perpetrated aggressive sexual behaviours - I, and
> Observed racist and homophobic behaviours.

As expected, both male and female respondents reported observing more aggressive sexual, racist, and homophobic behaviours over time. Also, both male and female respondents' attitudes toward sexual harassment became more negative over time. Specifically, the significant differences in means over time were always due to an increase between the first and the third administrations of the survey. The more time, the greater the number of observed aggressive behaviours. Attitudes about, and emotional reactions to aggressive behaviours did not change over time. It is likely that men and women bring sexism and racism to university with them, where these attitudes are reinforced by experience and behaviour.

Issues
The present study was designed to examine the existence and development of a chilly climate in the residences of a university, as reflected in sexist, racist, and homophobic attitudes and behaviours. The results suggest that such a chilly climate exists in these residences. This study, designed specifically for the setting involved, should be replicated in other university settings, using randomly selected samples, to assess external validity and generalizability.

i) Conflicting attitudes and behaviours
There were high levels of observed and enacted harassment and violence. Many students admitted to behaviours such as telling offensive jokes or defacing posters that highlight the concerns of minority groups. Students minimized the potentially harmful effects of these behaviours, and disregarded the legitimacy of the concerns of underprivileged groups. For example, when students spoke of racism in focus group discussions, there was very little analysis or apparent understanding about the historical sources of racism, about power differentials between those belonging to a

---

[18] A 2 X 3 repeated-measures multiple analysis of variance with gender as the between-subjects factor and 3 levels of time as the within-subjects factor was conducted on the 20 summated rating scales from the residence survey. The analysis was performed with the SAS GLM program. There were 363 males and 226 females in the sample. With the use of Wilk's Lambda criterion, the combined DVs were significantly affected by gender, $F_{(20, 309)}=15.09$, $p <.0001$) and time $F_{(40, 464)}=2.53$, $p < .0001$, but not by their interaction $F_{(40, 464)}=1.10$. These results show a moderate association between gender and the combined DVs, eta $=.24$. The association between time and the combined DVs was small, eta $=.11$.

majority group and to minority groups. Some students spoke extensively about their hostility toward various ethnic clubs and social groupings, which they perceived as another form of racism, as one said, "racism in reverse". They expressed their dislike about feeling excluded, and any expression of ethnic pride which was not open to everyone was viewed as an act of racism.

These behaviours occurred in the context of apparently accepting and tolerant attitudes of individual differences. Survey respondents indicated their disagreement with sexist, racist, and homophobic attitudes. Focus groups participants seemed genuinely interested in discussing issues, and eager to convey an attitude of tolerance and acceptance. The general impression was that residences are a place where everyone can fit in and be comfortable with their differences.

This dissociation between attitudes and behaviours may be understood by considering the contradiction between letting everyone live as they choose versus the considerable pressure to conform to group standards. Although students expressed tolerant attitudes, focus group discussions clearly indicated that this acceptance was based on strict rules about conforming to norms. For example, in discussions around issues of homophobia, students suggested homosexuals were not excluded or singled out, but that there were some clear "rules" as to how they ought to behave in order to "win" acceptance. These included being open about their homosexuality, not "springing" it on others by surprise, and not imposing "it" on others. The general sentiment was that "we accept them as long as they try to be like us, try to fit in, and don't do anything different."

ii)Female aggression
Additional themes were evident through these analyses that expand and challenge attempts to understand and change the climate the exists in university residences. One of the most challenging findings of the current study was that women reported committing sexually harassing and violent behaviours against men with considerable frequency, although seldom approaching the levels reported about men.

These findings are not unique. In two national surveys using self-report data, Straus and Gelles (1986) found that there were no significant differences in rates of husband-to-wife violence and wife-to-husband violence. This result held for indicators of minor violence, such as slapping or pushing, and for severe violence, including acts considered to have a relatively high probability of causing injury, such as kicking, punching, or using a weapon. Other researchers have confirmed this finding. In longitudinal predictive studies, O'Leary, Malone, & Tyree (1994), and Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary (1994) also reported high rates of mutual violence in spouses.

Yet the impact and meaning of these behaviours are different for men and women. When respondents experienced violence against them (see Table 3), women had more negative emotional reactions than men. This finding was consistent with focus group discussions about the emotional impact of observing and experiencing violence. Consistent with this finding, studies of abusive marriages show that in most violent couples, men "drive the system", with their violent acts causing more injury (Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary 1994; Cascardi, Langhrinrichsen, & Vivian 1992; Eagly & Steffen 1986; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn 1995), producing more fear, (Jacobson et al. 1994; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. 1995), and having a controlling function (Hyden 1995; Jacobson et al. 1994).

However, the extent and degree of mutual violence found in the present study should not be discounted because of differences in meaning; or because this finding is difficult to reconcile with a view that harassment and violence are used by the dominant group to keep the nondominant group in a one-down position. Instead, these findings suggest further investigation of the meaning and function of violence and harassment perpetrated by women against men. This question may best be approached through developmental analysis of gender relations. Throughout childhood and adolescence, boys tend to organize social groups in a hierarchical fashion (Beal 1992) and resolve conflicts through domination or disengagement (Laursen & Collins 1994). In contrast, girls tend to organize social groups around norms of cooperation and cohesion (Beal 1992), and place higher value on the use of negotiation and compromise to resolve conflicts (Laursen & Collins 1994). Given these differences, it is interesting to speculate on the potential interactional dynamics of the large groups of men and women that form in university residences. It may be that women are using harassment and violent tactics to "copy" men and fit into a male-dominated system.

Furthermore, it is important to examine the perpetration of violence by women in light of the risk associated with the use of violence by any member of a relationship. Research by O'Leary et al. (1994) on the development of violent marital relationships has shown that there is a relatively strong path from psychological aggression to physical aggression over time, and that for women, use of violence in other relationships is directly related to their subsequent participation in a violent relationship. Given this, it is particularly important to curtail the use of violence by both men and women.

iii) Function of harassing and violent behaviours

The meaning of the behaviours and attitudes studied here should be understood not only from a societal perspective, but also from that of the residences, with their social groups and interactions. It must be acknowledged that, in general, students do not see their participation in verbal and physical harassment as problematic. The focus group discussions indicated that a degree of harassment among groups of friends was expected and accepted. Given this group acceptance, it becomes necessary to examine the function of harassing and violent behaviours at this group and interaction level. A clue to this meaning may be provided in the discussion of the effect of friendship and group membership on the interpretation of harassing and violent behaviours. Students said that these behaviours were acceptable only if they came from another group member. The same behaviour by someone from a different social circle or someone with whom the recipient was not close, was perceived much more negatively. Similarly, someone who was in the group, but "could not take a joke" was eventually excluded. These findings open the possibility that within the group and interaction context, verbally and physically harassing behaviours are means to express and consolidate social bonds between friends and group members.

In summary, changing the climate in university residences will be a challenging undertaking. Students already endorse non-sexist, non-racist, and non-homophobic attitudes, but back those attitudes with behaviours that are sexist, racist, and homophobic. How then to engage a population to change when they do not see a problem with their behaviour?

RECOMMENDATIONS

The issues raised by this research are complex and difficult. The creation of a climate whereby all students can live in harmony, with mutual respect regardless of race, gender, or sexual orientation, is not something which is amenable to simple solutions or "quick fixes". The problems which manifest themselves in university residences do not occur in isolation. Rather, they have been passed down through the generations, perpetuated in almost every facet of our social, political, and cultural lives. In this sense, the patterns, behaviours, and attitudes which have been documented in this research are, in fact, a microcosm of the values embraced by the society in which we live.

From this research, it is clear that the behaviours suggestive of racism, sexism, or homophobia are so deeply entrenched, they often go unnoticed by those who engage in them. Thus, finding ways to overcome the "chilly climate" presents a substantial challenge to those seeking solutions and necessitates a fresh and creative look at strategies which are most likely to be effective. The recommendations presented below fall under the broad categories of education, service, research, and policy. They are not suggested as an exhaustive list, but more aptly reflect a "work in progress". Because each of these areas are so closely interrelated, they are discussed together.

Furthermore, the residents sampled in this study did not see a problem, which poses a major challenge to any intervention. In the absence of a felt need for change, there is little, if anything, to mobilize by means of traditional community development approaches. Should any action be taken? If action is taken, what should its goals be?

There are at least two compelling reasons for action. There is the high prevalence of sexually aggressive, racist, and homophobic behaviours reported by residents. And the people who experience these behaviours do not like them, even if they may accept them as normative. Based on these reasons, interventions should address changes in both attitudes and behaviour: first by increasing residents' awareness of the nature and scope of aggressive behaviour; and secondly, by promoting tolerant and accepting behaviours that are consistent with espoused attitudes. The challenge will be to find ways to support these changes that are neither stigmatizing nor subtly coercive in "political correctness".

One of the inherent challenges faced by those striving to design meaningful educational initiatives is the reality that increased knowledge and subsequent changes in attitudes do not necessarily translate into changes in behaviour. Thus, it is doubtful that simply "teaching" students in university residences about prejudice will result in meaningful change in behaviour. The likelihood that educational programs will achieve the desired outcomes is enhanced when several principles are incorporated into these programs.

The use of a synthesizing conceptual framework may assist in developing a rationally-based and coordinated plan of action for individual and institutional/social change. A conceptual framework can provide a problem-solving process to identify tactics of changing behaviour that are consistent with the norms of the setting and the values of participants. Bloom (1996) presents such a framework for selecting, planning, implementing, and evaluating prevention interventions. Bloom's framework

emphasizes increasing strengths and decreasing limitations at different levels — individual, group, and institution — and its use can also help to identify the process of preventive problem-solving by which preventive interventions should be conducted.

Planned action should also be informed by a theory of behaviour change, which provides a causal model of the relationship between specific interventions and outcomes. At the level of the individual, the transtheoretical model of behaviour change (Prochaska, DiClemente, & Norcross 1992) appears to be particularly appropriate, because it addresses the issues present when people do not recognize a a problem with their behaviour or a need to change. This model suggests that different intervention strategies are required for individuals at different stages of readiness to change behaviour. At the level of the residence and its culture/climate, there are several social models of behaviour change that may be useful. These models are directed at changing social norms and organizational dynamics, through changing the environment, infulencing leadership, and supporting existing strengths/social movements (Friedman, Des Jarlais, & Ward 1994).

Burkell and Ellis (1995) have identified principles of effective anti-violence prevention which may be used in efforts to reduce chilly climate. Some of these principles apply specifically to college/university populations: a potential strength to be tapped is that university students are "generally prepared for and focused on learning" (Burkell & Ellis 1995, p. 12). Students generally espouse attitudes of tolerance and equality. Recognizing discrepancies betwen attitudes and behaviours may lead to changes in behaviour. It may be possible to elicit significant and enduring behaviour change by confronting individuals with the contradiction/conflict between their values and their behaviour.

First, and perhaps most important, programs must have personal relevance to the students. It is not enough to simply talk abstractly about why prejudice is harmful to all of us. Instead, approaches are needed that bring the "chilly climate" to a very personal level. Strategies which may be useful in enhancing the perception of personal relevance include small group discussions about the students' own experiences of exclusion, involvement of peer leaders rather than "experts" to facilitate discussions, and a range of role-playing activities to convey the feelings of exclusion and to demonstrate the subtle and not-so-subtle ways in which power and privilege held by dominant groups serve to oppress those who lack power or privilege. The community should own the problem and be part of designing the solution.

Second, educational programs should incorporate multiple messages and multiple sources for conveying information. It has been documented that the most persuasive effects occur when individuals hear the same message again and again in a variety of ways. While programs should combine the use of "experts" with the use of peer leaders, decisions regarding when to use experts or peers should be made carefully. While peer leaders may be more useful for addressing topics involving personal beliefs, experts may be more effective in presenting factual information. Similarly, a variety of materials, including both anecdotal reports and statistical data, should be used.

Third, educational programs must challenge and confront taken-for-granted assumptions, thereby involving participants as active and critical thinkers and learners. As discussed previously, the participants in this research were eager to present themselves as tolerant and open to differences in

beliefs and behaviours. Yet, upon deeper probing, many inconsistencies between their attitudes and behaviours were quite evident. Further, there was very little analysis or understanding about the historical basis of racism, the relation between sexist behaviour and violence, or more generally about the ways in which power and privilege are incompatible with equal rights. Simply preaching or lecturing to students about these issues or about the discrepancies in their own behaviours and attitudes will not result in any meaningful change. Strategies are needed whereby individuals are gently confronted with the contradictions in their own attitudes and behaviours. Only then can they begin to make the connections which are prerequisites to any lasting and enduring changes in behaviour.

One of the limitations of the present research was that there was no deliberate attempt to include individuals who might be living "on the fringes". While the focus groups and the surveys included individuals from differing minority groups, data were not collected in the focus groups regarding demographics or sexual orientation of participants. Thus, the extent to which marginalized groups were included is not known. It is likely that very different results might have been obtained if sampling strategies incorporated a conscious effort to include students living in university residences who consider themselves outside the mainstream of residence life. The voices of marginalized groups and individuals need to be heard. An appropriate next step would be to conduct research which deliberately seeks to hear from these individuals and groups.

Linking education and research, the implementation of various educational interventions designed to modify attitudes and behaviours, is an important direction. As an example, the film on Chilly Climate[19] could be shown to residents, in conjunction with a series of small group sessions. The use of a pretest-posttest study design which taps into changes in attitudes and behaviours, including multiple evaluations to assess the extent to which changes endure, would be a logical approach. Another interesting, and potentially exciting avenue, would be the use of participatory approaches in the design, implementation, and evaluation of research. Involving student residents in a study about the chilly climate, not simply as respondents, but as researchers who help in the formulation of study questions, methods and relevance enhances the likelihood that research will be meaningful and useful to those whom it claims to be about. Findings could then be used for the development of further programming and policy. By involving residents in this manner, the sense of ownership of both the problems and the solutions is greatly enhanced.

As stated above, there are no "quick fixes" for the chilly climate. The tenacity of this problem requires the use of non-traditional strategies and creative approaches to a very difficult issue. These approaches must challenge students to delve into the contradictions and tensions which so often remain hidden, in order that they may begin to understand and change these.

---

[19] The Chilly Climate for Women in Colleges and Universities, University of Western Ontario Caucus on Women's Issues and Kem Murch Productions, 1991.

REFERENCES

Balenger, V., Hoffman, M., & Sedlacek, W. (1992). Racial attitudes among incoming White students: A study of 10-year trends. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 245-252.

Beal, C.R. (1992). Boys and girls: The development of gender roles. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.

Berrill, K. (1990). Anti-gay violence and victimization in the United States: An overview. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5, 274-294.

Bloom, M. (1996). Primary Prevention Practices (Issues in children's and families' lives; Vol. 5). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Burkell, J., & Ellis, K. (1995). Principles of effective anti-violence prevention: A review of prevention literature. London, ON: Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children.

Cantos, A.L., Neidig, P.H., & O'Leary, K.D. (1994). Injuries of women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. Journal of Family Violence, 9(2), 113-124.

Cascardi, M., Langhinrichsen, J., & Vivian, D. (1992). Marital aggression: Impact, injury, and health correlates for husbands and wives. Archives of International Medicine, 152, 1178-1184.

D'Augelli, A. (1992). Lesbian and gay male undergraduates' experiences of harassment and fear on campus. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, 383-395.

D'Augelli, A. (1995). A multiyear analysis of changes in AIDS concerns and homophobia on a university campus. Journal of American College Health, 44, 3-10.

DeKeseredy, W., & Kelly, K. (1993). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Canadian university and college dating relationships. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 18, 137-159.

Dipboye, R., Howell, W., & Smith, C. (1994). Understanding industrial and organizational psychology. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Dobash, R., Dobash, E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. Social Problems, 39, 71-91.

Duffy, K., & Wong, F. (1996). Community psychology. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Eagly, A., & Steffen, V. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A metanalytic review of the social psychological literature. Psychological Bulletin, 309-330.

Eyre, L. (1993). Compulsory heterosexuality in a university classroom. Canadian Journal of Education, 18, 273-284.

Feagin, J. (1992). The continuing significance of racism: Discrimination against Black students in White colleges. Journal of Black Studies, 22, 546-578.

Friedman, S., Des Jarlais, D., & Ward, T. (1994). Social models for changing health-relevant behavior. In R. DiClemete, J. Peterson (Eds.), Preventing AIDS:Theories and methods of behavioral interventions. NY: Plenum.

Gagne, M. & Lavoie, F. (1993). Young people's views of the causes of violence in adolescents' romantic relationships. Canada's Mental Health, 3, 11-15.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Hays, W.L. (1988). Statistics, 4th ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Herek, G. (1990). The context of anti-gay violence: Notes on cultural and psychological heterosexism. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5, 316-333.

Hyden, M. (1995). Verbal aggression as prehistory of woman battering. Journal of Family Violence, 10(1), 55-71.

Jacobson, N.S., Gottman, J.M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R., Babcock, J., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1994). Affect, verbal content, and psychophysiology in the arguments of couples with a violent husband. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62(5), 982-988.

Koss, P., & Cox, S. (1989). Stranger and acquaintance rape: Are there differences in the victim's experience? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 1-24.

Koss, M., Gidycz, C., & 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 Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P. & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: Gender differences in levels of current violence and past abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 10(2), 159-176.

Last, J. (1995). A dictionary of epidemiology, 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Laursen, B., & Collins, A. (1994). Interpersonal conflict during adolescence. Psychological Bulletin, 115, 197-209.

Makepeace, J. (1986). Gender differences in courtship victimization. Family Relations, 35, 383-388.

McCormack, A.S. (1995). The changing nature of racism on college campuses: Study of discrimination at a northeastern public university. College Student Journal, 29, 150-156.

Moffitt, T.E., Caspi, A., Krueger, R.F., & Magdol, L. (in press). Do partners agree about abuse in their relationship? A psychometric evaluation of interpartner agreement. Psychological Assessment.

Norris, W. (1992). Liberal attitudes and homophobic acts: The paradoxes of homosexual experiences in a liberal institution. Journal of Homosexuality, 81-120.

O'Leary, K.D., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Physical aggression in early marriage: Prerelationship and relationship effects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62(3), 594-602.

Pezza, P. (1995). College campus violence: The nature of the problem and its frequency. Educational Psychology Review, 7(1), 93-103.

Prochaska, J.O., DiClemente, C.C., & Norcross, J. (1992). In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors. American Psychologist, 47, 1102-1114.

Qualls, R.C., Cox, M., & Schehr, T. (1992). Racial attitudes on campus: Are there gender differences? Journal of College Student Development, 33, 524-530.

Reitzel-Jaffe, D. (1995). The chilly climate survey of male residents: Interim report. Unpublished report, University of Western Ontario.

Straus, M.A. & Gelles, R.J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 465-479.

Sugarman, D.B. & Hotaling, G.T. (1997). Intimate violence and social desirability: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12(2), 275-290.

Tan, D. (1994). Uniqueness of the Asian-American experience in higher education. College Student Journal, 28, 412-421.

University of Western Ontario Caucus on Women's Issues & Kem Murch Productions. (1991). The Chilly Climate for Women in Colleges and Universities. Video.

Walker, L.E. (1989). Psychology and violence against women. American Psychologist, 44, 695-702.

Wells, J., & Daly, A. (1992). University students' felt alienation and their attitudes toward African-Americans, women, and homosexuals. Psychological Reports, 623-626.

28

Wylie, A. (1995). The contexts of activism on "Climate" issues. In The Chilly Collective (Eds.), Breaking anonymity: The chilly climate for women faculty (pp. 29-60). Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

APPENDIX A
Social Climate Survey

SOCIAL CLIMATE SURVEY

This survey is intended to assess your views on important issues related to social living conditions in residence. Some questions are of a personal nature. You may omit any questions you do not wish to answer. However, complete surveys will facilitate our research. Results of the study, in summary form, will be provided to students via the residences when the study is complete. Your individual responses will not be publicly identified in any way, and we will only employ identifying information in order to match responses from one test administration to another. No-one, including residence administrators and employees, will see any identifying information in connection with individual responses. Completed surveys should be placed in available collection envelopes, which will then be sealed.

CORRECT MARK	INCORRECT MARKS	USE HB PENCIL	DO NOT FOLD SURVEY
●	⊗ ⊘ ⊖ ⊙ ○		

age	permanent place of residence	year of study	year in residence	gender
○ 17 or under	○ within province/state	○ 1st	○ 1st	○ male
○ 18	○ out of province/state	○ 2nd	○ 2nd	○ female
○ 19	○ out of country	○ 3rd	○ 3rd or higher	
○ 20		○ 4th		
○ 21-22		○ 5th or higher		
○ 23 or over				

section 1

Please indicate (1) the degree to which you believe that each of the following acts is socially intolerable and (2) how blatant an example of sexual harassment it is.

HOW SOCIALLY INTOLERABLE IS THE ACT? (NOT AT ALL → VERY MUCH)

IS IT A BLATANT EXAMPLE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT? (NOT AT ALL → VERY BLATANT)

1. unwanted attention of a sexually-oriented nature directed at an individual by a person who knows, or ought reasonably to know, that such attention is unwanted ○ ○ ○ ○ ○   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

2. an expressed or clearly implied promise of reward or reprisal for complying or failing to comply with a sexually-oriented request ○ ○ ○ ○ ○   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

3. a sexually-oriented remark which might reasonably be perceived to create a negative psychological work/study/living environment ○ ○ ○ ○ ○   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

4. a sexually-oriented behaviour which might reasonably be perceived to create a negative psychological work/study/living environment ○ ○ ○ ○ ○   ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

section 2

Please indicate: (1) how often, since the start of the school year, you have witnessed each of the behaviours listed below inside a UWO residence, (2) whether or not you believe that the behaviour is more common within the residence environment than outside of it, and (3) what your typical emotional reaction to such events was (or what it would be, if you were to witness the behaviour).

behaviour

	OBSERVED OCCURENCES IN RESIDENCE THIS YEAR (NEVER / ONCE OR TWICE / 3-5 TIMES / 6-10 TIMES / OVER 10 TIMES)	HOW COMMON INSIDE RESIDENCE (VS. OUTSIDE)? (FAR LESS / SOMEWHAT LESS / THE SAME / SOMEWHAT MORE / FAR MORE)	YOUR TYPICAL EMOTIONAL REACTION (VERY UNPLEASANT / UNPLEASANT / MILDLY UNPLEASANT / MILDLY PLEASANT / PLEASANT / VERY PLEASANT)
1. a male student pressure another male to attend a strip club	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
2. a female student pressure another female to attend a strip club	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
3. a male student pressure another male to watch/read pornography	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
4. a female student pressure another female to watch/read pornography	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
5. a male student tease a woman sexually who is in her bathrobe/night clothes	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
6. a female student tease a man sexually who is in his bathrobe/night clothes	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
7. a male student provoke a woman by showing pornographic pictures to her	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
8. a female student provoke a man by showing pornographic pictures to him	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
9. a male student make unwanted sexually suggestive comments to a woman	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
10. a female student make unwanted sexually suggestive comments to a man	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
11. a male student surprise a woman by showing off parts of his body	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
12. a female student surprise a man by showing off parts of her body	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
13. a male student make unwanted sexual advances toward a woman	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
14. a female student make unwanted sexual advances toward a man	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
15. a male student verbally abuse a woman	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
16. a female student verbally abuse a man	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
17. a male student touch a woman against her will	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
18. a female student touch a man against his will	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
19. a male student physically abuse a woman (slap, hit, kick)	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
20. a female student physically abuse a man (slap, hit, kick)	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
21. a woman confide that a male student psychologically coerced her into having sex	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
22. a man confide that a female student psychologically coerced him into having sex	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
23. a woman confide that a male student forced her physically to have intercourse	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○
24. a man confide that a female student forced him physically to have intercourse	○○○○○	○○○○○	○○○○○○

Please indicate: (1) *how often; since the start of the school year you have been the target* of each of the behaviours listed below while inside a UWO residence (2) what *your typical emotional reaction* to the behaviour was, if it has been directed toward you and (3) whether or not *you have done* any of these things to someone inside residence this year. (Please remember that all responses will be kept anonymous and confidential)

	HAS IT HAPPENED TO YOU IN RESIDENCE THIS YEAR?	IF SO, WHAT WAS YOUR TYPICAL EMOTIONAL REACTION?	HAVE YOU DONE IT TO ANYONE IN RESIDENCE THIS YEAR?

behaviour

1. pressured by a member of the same sex to attend a strip club
2. pressured by a member of the same sex to watch/read pornography
3. teased sexually by a member of the opposite sex while in your bathrobe/night clothes
4. provoked by a member of the opposite sex by being shown pornographic pictures
5. received unwanted sexually suggestive comments from a member of the opposite sex
6. surprised by a member of the opposite sex who showed off parts of his/her body
7. received unwanted sexual advances from a member of the opposite sex
8. verbally abused by a member of the opposite sex
9. touched by a member of the opposite sex against your will
10. physically abused (slapped, hit, kicked) by member of the opposite sex
11. psychologically coerced into having sex by a member of the opposite sex
12. forced physically to have intercourse by a member of the opposite sex
13. other (please specify) •
   •

1. Are you an international student or recent immigrant to Canada? ○ *yes* ○ *no*
2. Do you consider yourself to be a member of a visible minority? ○ *yes* ○ *no*
3. What is your sexual orientation? ○ *heterosexual* ○ *homosexual* ○ *bisexual*

Do you agree with the following statements?   STRONGLY DISAGREE ... STRONGLY AGREE

4. visible minority residents are well integrated with other students in my residence
5. visible minority residents are excluded from parties or similar social gatherings in my residence
6. gays/lesbians are well integrated with other students in my residence
7. gays/lesbians are excluded from parties or similar social gatherings in my residence

Please indicate: (1) how often, since the start of the school year, you have *witnessed* each of the behaviours listed below inside a UWO residence, (2) what *your typical emotional reaction* to such events was (or what it would be, if you were to witness the behaviour) and (3) whether or not *you have ever done* any of these things inside residence this year.

	OBSERVED OCCURENCES IN RESIDENCE THIS YEAR	YOUR TYPICAL EMOTIONAL REACTION	HAVE YOU DONE IT IN RESIDENCE THIS YEAR?

behaviour

1. someone tear down or deface a poster depicting gay/lesbian concerns
2. someone tell an offensive joke about gays/lesbians
3. someone make an insulting comment to a gay/lesbian person
4. someone tell an offensive joke about a racial/ethnic group
5. someone make an insulting racial/ethnic comment to another person
6. somone make an offensive sexist comment
7. someone criticize or make fun of an individual for pointing out sexism

Do you agree with the following general statements?   STRONGLY DISAGREE ... STRONGLY AGREE

1. levels of sexual harassment are greatly exaggerated in our society
2. homosexuality is just as moral and natural as heterosexuality
3. certain racial or ethnic groups are superior to others
4. there is too much sexism in our society

Thank you for participating!

APPENDIX B
Internal consistency reliability of subscales of Social Climate Survey

SUBSCALE	CRONBACH'S COEFFICIENT ALPHA
1. Attitude toward sexual harassment (four items)	0.87
2. Perceived blatancy of sexual harassment (four items)	0.73
3. Frequency of male sexual behaviours directed males (two items)	0.84
4. Frequency of female sexual behaviours directed at female (two items)	0.79
5. Frequency of male sexual behaviours directed at females (10 items)	0.85
6. Frequency of female sexual behaviours directed at males (10 items)	0.82
7. Emotional reaction to male sexual behaviours directed to males (two items)	0.81
8. Emotional reaction to female sexual behaviours directed to females (two items)	0.72
9. Emotional reaction to male sexual behaviour directed to females (10 items)	0.87
10. Emotional reaction to female sexual behaviour directed to males (10 items)	0.87
11. Frequency of aggressive sexual behaviours to self - I (two items: pressure to attend strip club and to view pornography)	0.73
12. Frequency of aggressive sexual behaviours to self - II (10 items)	0.82
13. Emotional response to aggressive sexual behaviours to self - I (two items)	0.87
14. Emotional response to aggressive sexual behaviours to self - II (10 items)	0.90
15. Perpetrated aggressive sexual behaviours - I (two items)	0.50
16. Perpetrated aggressive sexual behaviours - II (10 items)	0.68
17. Perceptions of racism and homophobia in residence (four items)	0.61
18. Observed racist and homophobic behaviours in residence (seven items)	0.79
19. Emotional reaction to racist and homophobic behaviours (seven items)	0.88
20. Global bigotry (four items)	0.33

31

APPENDIX C
Mean Sum Scores On Subscales of Social Climate Survey by Gender

SCALE	F df 1,328	p	Male $\bar{x}$	Female $\bar{x}$
Attitude toward sexual harassment	6.85	<.01	14.8	15.9
Perceived blatancy of sexual harassment	23.17	<.01	14.8	16.4
Frequency of male sexual behaviours directed to males	24.86	<.01	5.2	4.2
Frequency of female sexual behaviours directed to females	5.53	<.01	18.8	17.1
Emotional reaction to male sexual behaviours directed to males	100.62	<.01	7.0	5.0
Emotional reaction to female sexual behaviour directed to females	39.36	<.01	6.6	5.3
Emotional reaction to male sexual behaviour directed to females	29.41	<.01	21.6	17.6
Emotional reaction to female sexual behaviour directed to males	61.62	<.01	25.2	19.0
Frequency of experience of aggressive sexual behaviours - I	98.77	<.01	4.4	2.6
Frequency of experience of aggressive sexual behaviours - II	14.11	<.01	16.0	15.5
Emotional response to experience of aggressive sexual behaviours - I	73.34	<.01	6.8	4.8
Emotional response to experience of aggressive sexual behaviours - II	39.81	<.01	22.3	16.1
Perpetrated aggressive sexual behaviours - I	53.26	<.01	3.4	3.8
Perpetrated aggressive sexual behaviours - II	4.71	<.01	18.5	19.0
Observed racist and homophobic behaviours	21.87	<.01	17.7	14.7
Emotional reaction to racist and homophobic behaviours	62.36	<.01	20.0	14.5
Global bigotry	64.44	<.01	10.9	8.3