American College Health Association

CAMPUS VIOLENCE WHITE PAPER

Approved by the ACHA Board of Directors
February 5, 2005

American College Health Association
P.O. Box 28937
Baltimore, MD 21240-8937
Website: www.acha.org

CAMPUS VIOLENCE WHITE PAPER

Written by:
Joetta L. Carr, PhD
Western Michigan University
ACHA Campus Violence Committee Chair

With assistance from 2003-2004 Campus Violence Committee members:
Eric Buhi, MPH, CHES - Texas A&M University
JodiAnn Solito, MA, CHES - Slippery Rock University
Anne Devney, EdD, RN - College of Lake County

And in consultation with:
Rhonda Luckey, EdD, MSPH - Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Mary Alice Serafini, MA - University of Arkansas-Fayetteville

The American College Health Association and the 2003-2004 Campus Violence Committee also expresses thanks to Luoluo Hong, PhD, MPH - University of Wisconsin-Madison and Rhonda Luckey, EdD, MSPH - Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and previous Campus Violence Task Forces for their important contributions in drafts of this White Paper.

Suggested citation:
Carr, J. L. (2005, February). *American College Health Association campus violence white paper.* Baltimore, MD: American College Health Association.

Campus Violence White Paper

In 1999, the American College Health Association (ACHA) Executive Committee adopted a position statement for the Association that addresses acts of violence, bias, and other violations of human rights that have been occurring all too often within or adjacent to college communities:

> The American College Health Association is deeply saddened by the many acts of violence, hate crimes and loss of life over this past year. We, the members of the Association, believe that for a campus community to be truly healthy, it must be guided by the values of multicultural inclusion, respect, and equality. Intolerance has no place at an institution of higher learning. The Association supports all individuals regardless of sexual orientation, race, national origin, age, religion, or disability. We encourage all campus health professionals to be actively engaged in the struggle to end oppression, to prevent bias-related violence in our campus communities, and to take action to eradicate injustice. (ACHA, 1999)

Since this timely position statement was developed, acts of violence have continued to force U.S. colleges and universities to address the dangerous and alarming violent events that send shockwaves throughout many campuses and compromise students' and employees' health and safety. Campus shootings, murder-suicides, homicides, hate crimes based on gender, race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation, suicides, assaults, hazing, and arson require us to conduct fresh analyses and create new paradigms for preventing and decreasing all campus violence.

This paper will adopt the World Health Organization definition of violence as:

> The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation. (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, p. 4)

ACHA's *Healthy Campus 2010* establishes national health objectives and serves as a basis for developing plans to create college health programs and improve student health (ACHA, 2002). Healthy Campus identifies Injury and Violence Prevention as a key leading health indicator. The goal is to "reduce disabilities, injuries and deaths due to injury and violence" (p. 51). Specifically, ACHA seeks to reduce homicides, physical assaults, intimate partner violence, emotional abuse, sexual abuse, rape and attempted rape, physical fighting, and weapon carrying. In addition, a goal is to increase the annual rate of reporting of rape and attempted rape to the police *and* via surveys.

The purpose of this ACHA White Paper is to confront this serious college health issue through analyzing campus violence patterns, types of violence, methodological problems with collecting campus crime data, underlying issues related to campus violence, and promising practices to prevent and address campus violence.

Scope of the Problem

There are approximately 16 million students enrolled in 4,200 colleges and universities (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The Violence Against Women Act (1994) mandated the study of campus victimization. The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) gathers data on crimes reported and not reported to the police from a nationally representative sample of U.S. households. Beginning in 1995, the Bureau of Justice Statistics added new items to the survey regarding student victims of crime.

According to the Violent Victimization of College Students report (Baum & Klaus, 2005), between 1995 and 2002, college students ages 18-24 were victims of approximately 479,000 crimes of violence annually: rape/sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault. Overall, the violent crime rate declined 54%. These data include both part-time and full-time students attending private or public

institutions. During this seven-year period, students experienced crimes at a lower average rate than non-students ages 18-24, except for rape/sexual assault. A summary of the Baum & Klaus data follows. Additional data regarding the victimization of college students are integrated in the following list and are cited as appropriate.

- Approximately 15-20% of female college students have experienced forced intercourse (rape) (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987).
- Approximately 5-15% of college men have acknowledged forced intercourse (Koss et al., 1987; Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991).
- Approximately one out of every 14 U.S. men have been physically assaulted or raped by an intimate partner (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).
- Simple assault accounted for about two-thirds of college student violent crimes (63%), while rape/sexual assault accounted for around 6%.
- Approximately 5% of completed and attempted rapes committed against students were reported to police (Fisher et al., 2000).
- Rape/sexual assault was the only violent crime against students more likely to be committed by a person the victim knew. Non-strangers committed 79% of the rape/sexual assaults against students.
- Alcohol and other drugs were implicated in approximately 55-74% of sexual assaults on campuses (Lisak & Roth, 1990; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987).
- Non-Hispanic whites were more likely than other races to be victims of overall violence or simple assault. Black students were somewhat more likely than white students to suffer a simple assault.
- Male college students were twice as likely to be victims of overall violence than female students.
- White college students had somewhat higher rates of violent victimization than Blacks and higher rates than students of other races.
- Strangers committed 58% of all violent crimes of students.
- Approximately 93% of crimes against students occurred off-campus. Approximately 15% of students reside on campus.
- Only 35% of acts of violence against students were reported to the police in the 1995-2002 period.
- In 41% of all violent crime experienced by college students, the offender was perceived to be under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol.
- Firearms were present in 9% of all violent crimes, 8% of assaults, and 31% of robberies against college students. Weapons were present in 34% of all violent college student crimes.
- Nationwide, 8% of men and 1% of women have working firearms at college. (Miller, Hemenway, & Wechsler, 2002).
- More than one-third (36%) of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) undergraduate students have experienced harassment within the past year (Rankin, 2003).
- Twenty percent of faculty, staff, and students surveyed feared for their physical safety because of their sexual orientation or gender identity (Rankin, 2003).
- Within the last school year, 7% of students were in a physical fight and 4% were physically assaulted (ACHA, 2004).
- Nearly 19% of students who drank alcohol reported being physically injured (ACHA, 2004).
- An estimated 1,400 college students die each year from alcohol-related injuries (Hingson, Heeren, Zakocs, Kopstein, & Wechsler, 2002).
- Most (72%) of the off-campus violence against students was between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m.
- Most on-campus violence (56%) against students occurred during the day, 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.
- About one-quarter of students were injured as a result of the violence, but only 60% of those injured were treated for their injuries.
- Overall violent crime against students fell from 88 to 41 victimizations per 1,000 students, and a similar drop was observed in non-students of the same age.

Campus crime statistics have been found to be flawed due to a significant underreporting among victims (Sloan, Fisher, & Cullen, 1997). In an important study of 3,400 students randomly selected from 12 colleges and universities stratified by student enrollment and location, Sloan et al. found that only

25% of campus crimes were reported to *any* authority across all offenses. Only 22% of rapes and 18% of sexual assaults were reported, 0% of robberies, 50% of aggravated assaults, and 25% of burglaries.

The main reasons given by the students for not reporting these crimes were too minor (39%), private matter (16%), and not clear it was a crime (5%). When crimes were reported, 83% were reported to the campus police or security. When these 3,400 students were interviewed by phone about on-campus victimizations, personal crimes made up 45% of victimizations, with 8% acts of violence and 37% theft. Living quarters crimes consisted of burglary, larceny, and vandalism, and constituted up to 30% of all crimes experienced. Threats and harassments made up 25% of the crimes.

The individual student may be too ashamed to report interpersonal violence or to get help for her/his victimization. Students who are victimized can feel overwhelmed and need a great deal of support. If they do not sense that this support is there, they will be less likely to report and seek help.

Although the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (1998), originally known as the Student Right-To-Know and Campus Security Act, requires colleges to publish annual crime statistics for their campuses, doubts about the reliability and validity of these statistics are commonplace. In addition, the act excludes offenses such as larceny, theft, threats, harassment, and vandalism. Many college health professionals know that the victimization patterns that we see are not included in any official statistics, for various reasons, and it may be up to us to address this problem.

A fundamental contradiction built into campus life contrasts the *necessity* of recruiting students, winning over parents, attracting donors, etc., versus the *reality* of various forms of violence on campus. Parents or guardians may be less likely to send their children to a university that is known as a "party school," has high incidence of rape, or is not welcoming to minority students.

Underreporting by campus sexual assault victims stems from a combination of individual, institutional, and socio-cultural factors. Higher education institutions unintentionally condone victim-blaming when they circulate materials that focus primarily on the individual victim's responsibility to avoid sexual assault without balancing this risk management information with prevention education that stresses the perpetrator's responsibility for committing the crime. Any policy or procedure that compromises, or worse, eliminates the student's ability to make her/his own informed choices about proceeding through the reporting and adjudication process — such as mandatory reporting requirements that do not include an anonymous reporting option or require the victim to participate in the adjudication process if the report is filed — not only reduces reporting rates but may be counter-productive to the victim's healing process.

Direct and Indirect Consequences of Campus Violence

Campus violence impacts students, staff, and faculty in many ways. Victims may need to leave school either by dropping out or taking a leave of absence. They may move back home to recover, regroup, or transfer to a school closer to home. When victims remain in school, they may have problems concentrating, studying, and attending classes. They may fear running into the person(s) who perpetrated the violent act so they may avoid academic and social activities. College life may become so stressful that they develop clinical symptoms of trauma or anxiety that affect their mental and physical health.

Staff, faculty, and paraprofessional student staff may be harassed and intimidated by violence-prone students in or outside of the classroom, impinging on academic freedom, policy enforcement, and their own safety and welfare. Angry students may disrupt the classroom learning environment and threaten faculty if they do not like their grades, do not get accepted into a program, or get dismissed from a program.

A Conceptualization of Campus Violence Categories

Sexual Violence

Sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual conduct which is related to any condition of employment or evaluation of student performance. It includes unwarranted sex-related comments, sexually explicit comments or graphics, unwelcome touching, etc. This harassment can take the form of making derogatory jokes based on sex, speaking crude or offensive language, spreading rumors about a person's

sexuality, placing a compromising photo on the web, or ogling. These behaviors cause the recipient discomfort or humiliation, and continue after the recipient has made clear that they want them to stop (Sandler & Shoop, 1997).

Sexual assault on campus is far more extensive than reported in official statistics, and the large majority of rapists are never apprehended (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004). The ACHA-National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) found that the incidence of rape and attempted rape in female college students within the last academic year was 5.8%, with 11.9% reporting unwanted sexual touching (ACHA, 2004). Colleges with 10,000 college women could experience more than 350 rapes per academic year and the vast majority of rapes occur in living quarters (Fisher et al., 2000). Surveys have consistently reported that college men acknowledged forced intercourse at a rate of 5-15% and college sexual aggression at a rate of 15-25% (Koss et al., 1987; Malamuth et al., 1991).

Cross-cultural studies of rape and studies of rape-prone versus rape-free campus cultures identify sex role socialization, rape myths, lack of sanctions for woman abuse, male peer group support, pornography, and all-male membership groups such as fraternities and sports teams as contributors to sexual violence (Berkowitz, 1992; Carr & VanDeusen, 2004; Quackenbush, 1989; Sanday, 1996; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Warshaw & Parrot, 1991).

Stalking is defined as "the willful, repeated, and malicious following, harassing, or threatening of another person" (Melton, 2000, p. 248). Results from a national survey of women attending two- and four-year colleges in the U.S. (Fisher et al., 2000) revealed four out of every five college-aged female victims know their stalkers. Stalkers were most often a boyfriend or ex-boyfriend (42.5%), classmate (24.5%), acquaintance (10.3%), friend (5.6%), or co-worker (5.6%). Only a small percentage of stalkers are strangers to the victim (McGuire & Wraith, 2000). The most common stalking behaviors reported by Fisher et al. were being telephoned (77.7%), being waited for outside or inside places (47.9%), being watched from afar (44%), being followed (42%), being sent letters (30.7%), and being e-mailed (24.7%).

Research suggests that stalking victimization may be greater among female college students than in the general population. Fisher et al. (2000) found 13.1% of female college students in their sample had been stalked since the school year began (almost seven months prior to the survey). Mustaine and Tewsbury (1999) found a similar incidence in their study of women attending nine institutions of higher learning; 10% of the female students participating in this study reported being stalked in the previous six months. Other studies have revealed between 25 and 30% of college women and between 11 and 17% of college men have ever been stalked (Bjerregaard, 2000; Fremouw, Westrup, & Pennypacker, 1996).

Ravensberg and Miller (2003) identified two possible reasons why stalking victimization rates are higher among college-aged individuals than in the general population. First, stalkers may have "developmental deficits in social skills" (p. 458). That is, college-aged individuals are so young that they are still learning how to handle, and act in, complex social relationships and situations. These individuals may simply not recognize their behavior as stalking. Second, the nature of student life and structure of college campuses may contribute to higher stalking victimization rates among college-aged individuals. College students typically live in close proximity to each other (e.g., in residence halls, fraternities, and sororities), as well as have flexible schedules and a large amount of unstructured discretionary time. Additionally, students "are not accountable to an authority figure for their daily activities and they are working to establish themselves socially" (p. 459).

Stalking can result in emotional or psychological injury, physical harm, or sexual assault. Fisher et al. (2000) reported that, according to respondents, 10.3% of stalking incidents resulted in forced or attempted sexual contact. The most common impact of stalking on victims, however, was psychological — 30% of victims in their sample reported being injured emotionally or psychologically.

Very little research has been conducted to determine the effectiveness of methods to deal with stalkers. Fisher et al. (2000) stated that victims reported the stalking incident to the police in 17% of incidents. Most victims, however, reported avoiding the stalker (43.2%). Only 16.3% of victims confronted their stalker. Other responses to stalkers included ignoring messages or e-mails, moving residence, seeking a

restraining order, filing a grievance with university officials, getting caller ID, improving residential security, traveling with a companion, and buying a weapon.

For legal considerations regarding stalking and recommended campus anti-stalking policy, see Jordan, Quinn, Jordan, and Daileader (1999-2000) and Romeo (2001), respectively. Stalking laws vary from state to state.

Campus dating violence is the actual or threatened physical or sexual violence or psychological and emotional abuse directed toward a current or former dating partner. Intimate partners may be heterosexual, bisexual, or homosexual.

College is a major arena for dating violence and the college setting provides opportunities for primary and secondary prevention of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) (Carr & VanDeusen, 2002). A recent longitudinal study of dating violence among adolescent and college women found that women who were physically assaulted as adolescents by a romantic partner were at greater risk for being revictimized during their freshman year and subsequent years of college (Smith, White, & Holland, 2003).

In addition, women who were physically abused in any year were more likely to be sexually assaulted that same year. ACHA-NCHA data indicated that 15.0% of women and 9.2% of men report being in emotionally abusive relationships within the last school year. ACHA-NCHA data also revealed 2.4% of women and 1.3% of men have been in a physically abusive relationship during the last school year, and 1.7% of women and 1.0% of men have been in a sexually abusive relationship in that time frame (ACHA, 2004).

According to the National Violence Against Women Survey, one out of four U.S. women have been physically assaulted or raped by an intimate partner; one out of every 14 U.S. men reported such an experience (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Nearly two-thirds of women who reported being raped, physically assaulted, or stalked since age 18 were victimized by a current or former husband, cohabitating partner, boyfriend, or date (Tjaden & Thoennes). Among women who are physically assaulted or raped by an intimate partner, one in three is injured. Each year, more than 500,000 women injured as a result of IPV require medical treatment (Tjaden & Thoennes). Women ages 20 to 29 years are at greatest risk of being killed by an intimate partner (Paulozzi, Saltzman, Thompson, & Holmgreen, 2001).

Specific to the LGBT population, according to the National Center for Victims of Crime (2004) there were 5,046 reported incidents of IPV in 2001, an increase of 25% over LGBT cases reported in 2000.

Intimate Partner Violence is often repetitive. Two-thirds of both men and women physically assaulted by an intimate partner experienced multiple incidents, and half of all women raped by intimates reported victimization by the same partner 2-9 times. Relationship physical assault involves 10 or more incidents for 19.8% of women and 10.6% of men. Relationship rape involves 10 or more incidents for 15.2% of women (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

Perpetrators of IPV may lack some social skills, such as communication skills, particularly in the context of problematic situations with their intimate partners (Holtzworth-Monroe et al., 1997). A high proportion of IPV perpetrators report more depression, lower self-esteem, and more aggression than non-violent intimate partners. Evidence indicates that violent intimate partners may be more likely to have personality disorders, such as schizoidal/ borderline personality, antisocial or narcissistic behaviors, and dependency and attachment problems (Holtzworth-Monroe et al.).

Alcohol use is frequently associated with violence between intimate partners. It is estimated that in 45% of cases of IPV, men had been drinking, and in about 20% of cases, women had been drinking (Roizen, 1993). As the consumption of alcohol by either the victim or perpetrator increases, the rate of serious injuries associated with IPV also increases (Makepeace, 1988).

Racial, Ethnic, and Gender-based Violence and Homophobic Intimidation

The Federal Hate Crime Statistics Act (1990) defined **bias crime** as crime "motivated, in whole or in part, by hatred against a victim based on his or her race, religion, sexual orientation, ethnicity, national origin or disability" (Wessler & Moss, 2001, p. 17). The Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act (1995)

includes gender in its definition of bias crime. In addition, the Violence Against Women Act (1994) addresses crimes motivated by gender. "Gendered aggression" is aggression "in which the meanings, motives, and consequences are different for women and men" (Smith et al., 2003, p. 1108).

Hate crimes may include assault, threats, or property damage. Many hate or bias incidents that are not criminal conduct include bias-motivated degrading comments and harassment. A report from the Center for Prevention of Hate Violence (2001) argues that the problem of hate crimes on campus is more widespread than any statistics are likely to reveal, since victims of hate crimes are reluctant to come forward because they feel isolated and fear repercussions of a perpetrator. People are unsure of what to report, and some states do not have laws protecting gays and lesbians from discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Based on available statistics from the FBI in 1998, data indicate that 57% of hate crimes on campus were motivated by race, 18% by anti-Semitism and 16% were based on sexual orientation (Wessler & Moss, 2001). Incidents may include graffiti, verbal slurs, bombing threats and bombings, threatening notes, emails, photographs or phone calls, and physical attacks. These acts can have a very traumatic effect on students, faculty, and staff. They can create fear and intimidation of entire groups of people and can affect health, academic work, and threaten the basic safety of the community.

In a large portion of campus hate crime cases, illegal conduct seems to have escalated from lower levels of harassment, beginning with degrading language about women, gays and lesbians, racial minorities, and slurs based on religion (Wessler & Moss, 2001). If not challenged, the widespread use of this language may send the message that bias is accepted within a campus community.

Hazing

Hazing "refers to any activity expected of someone joining a group (or to maintain full status in a group) that humiliates, degrades, or risks emotional and/or physical harm, regardless of the person's willingness to participate" (StopHazing.org, n.d., 1). Hazing can take the form of verbal abuse that ridicules, embarrasses, or silences a student. It can also be forced alcohol consumption, ingestion of vile substances, sexual violation, and assault, such as paddling, beating, burning, and brandings. Other examples include sleep deprivation and restrictions on personal hygiene and personal servitude. Hazing occurs in college fraternities and sororities, athletic teams, and a variety of other campus organizations. It is a complex social problem that is shaped by power dynamics operating in a group or organization. Hazing is usually against the rules of the institution, team, or Greek group.

A multi-year, multi-site national research initiative on hazing in colleges and universities is ongoing, co-sponsored by the North American Interfraternal Foundation (NIF) and the National Association of School Personnel Administrators (NASPA). The purpose of this study is to provide foundational data from which to assess campus climates and to inform best practices for hazing prevention and intervention (Allan, n.d.).

Celebratory Violence

Celebratory violence includes riots after sporting events (e.g., tearing down goal posts and property destruction outside of the sport grounds), at parties, and at other school events (Coakley & Donnelly, 2004). A recent *New York Times* story (Newman, 2004) reflected an all-too-familiar occurrence of celebration-related violence among students and sports fans. According to the article, following the University of Connecticut men's basketball national championship victory, "Cars were overturned… Fires were set… Fans and revelers set off fireworks and overturned trash cans in the streets." In actuality, however, we know very little about the dynamics of celebratory violence, with the exception of a study on football (soccer) hooliganism in Britain (Coakley & Donnelly). The distinction between celebratory and other forms of violence is that celebratory violence is recreational and expressive. On the contrary, other violent behaviors, such as homicide and battery, are often instrumental; that is, these behaviors are goal-oriented, thereby trying to bring about or coerce changes from another individual.

Attempted Suicide and Suicide

The ACHA-NCHA (ACHA, 2004) sampled 47,202 students and reported that 11% of women and 9% of men had seriously considered suicide and 1.3% reported at least one attempt within the last school year. Kisch, Leino, and Silverman (in press) found the

following risk factors associated with seriously considering suicide: feeling hopeless or so depressed that it is difficult to function; being in an emotionally abusive relationship; and being LGBT. Of those students who report having attempted suicide during the past school year, only 21% were on medication and 19% were in therapy. Morton Silverman, a suicidologist, reports college student rates of completed suicide at 7 per 100,000 vs. 15 per 100,000 in a matched population (Maris, Berman & Silverman, 2000; Silverman, 2003).

In 2002, the National Mental Health Association and The Jed Foundation co-sponsored an expert panel to study college suicide (2002). The panel of experts recommended the following essential services for addressing suicidal behaviors on campus: screening programs, targeted educational programs for faculty, coaches, clergy and student resident advisors, broad-based campus-wide public education and programs for parents; on-site counseling center and medical services; off-campus referrals; medical leave policies; and student support networks. Post-intervention programs and 24-hour access to emergency services were also recommended. In addition, The Jed Foundation has begun developing a National College Suicide Registry (Suicide Prevention Resource Center, 2004).

Murder/Suicide

McEvoy (2000) has studied the phenomenon of murder/suicides and discussed common elements of murder/suicide.

> The student perpetrator is usually socially isolated with a limited network of friends, few positive attachments to parents or family, history of severe antisocial conduct in some cases, and endured intense and protracted pattern of perceived bullying, ostracism or public humiliation… the student has recurring fantasies of getting even or revenge and a coherent plan to settle scores and be the center of attention. (McEvoy, 2000, p. 2)

Murder/Non-negligent Manslaughter

According to the U.S. Department of Education (n.d.), there were 23 murders or non-negligent manslaughters on campus recorded for 2002, the latest year available.

Aggravated Assault

According to the U.S. Department of Education (n.d.), there were 2,953 reported assaults on campus for 2002. Aggravated assault is defined as a completed or attempted attack with a weapon and an attack without a weapon in which the victim is seriously injured.

Arson

According to the U.S. Department of Education (n.d.), there were 1,098 cases of campus arson reported in 2002.

Attacks on Faculty or Staff

Attacks on campus faculty and staff have received much publicity and is of great concern in the college health profession. Although statistics are not available on these attacks, this phenomenon is a serious threat to the health and safety of our faculty and staff. The Arizona State University nursing professor murders and the Case Western Reserve University shooting spree are examples of attacks that required the entire campuses to respond on multiple, coordinated levels to deal with the crimes and their aftermath.

Underlying Issues Related to Campus Violence

In his book on teaching college men about gender, Kilmartin (2001) discussed the importance of enlisting men in changing the destructive aspects of masculine culture and helping college students see how this culture is created and maintained. He views:

> ...rape and other partner violence as the worst symptom of a larger problem: a continuum of disrespect toward women. This continuum includes men's display of negative attitudes through misogynist jokes, demeaning pornography... and runs to the most extreme form of violence: gender-motivated murder. Such an analysis also emphasizes power imbalances between the sexes and the social forces that create and maintain these imbalances. (Kilmartin, 2001, p. 3)

Some campus violence is a reflection of society's sexism, racism, and homophobia. Students are acculturated in the dominant ideologies and cultural practices of the times before they come to college. The

media and popular culture play a decisive role in how students view gender, race, ethnicity, sexual identity, sexual orientation, alcohol and drug use, and interpersonal relationships.

Sports culture can promote competition, aggression, and male privilege. "The locker room is a breeding ground for male aggression and the denigration of women" (Barnett & DiSabato, 2000, p. 201). The recruiting trip experience can reinforce this culture, as athletes and coaches seek to impress the new recruit and demonstrate the benefits of team membership and camaraderie (Barnett & DiSabato). Competition, status, bonding, entitlements, hypermasculinity, power, and sexual conquest can be promoted in this culture. However, not all sports cultures exhibit such extremes.

Many ethnic minority students have complained of a hostile culture on campus, especially in schools that are predominantly white. Bias crimes based on a foundation of bigotry send a message of fear and terror and can have a unique psychological impact on the victim. Victims of hate crimes are attacked for being different, and trauma can be compounded because the attack is rooted in prejudice and hatred (National Center for Hate Crime Prevention, 2000).

Alcohol is a major factor in campus violence. Presley, Meilman, and Cashin (1997) reported that students were under the influence of alcohol or other drugs in 13% of incidents of ethnic harassment, 46% of incidents of theft involving force or threat of force, 51% of threats of physical assault, 64% of physical assaults, 71% of forced sexual touching, and 79% of unwanted sexual intercourse.

First-year students are particularly vulnerable to victimization, since they have new freedoms, lack parental control for the first time, may be inexperienced in self-protection and boundaries, and are thrust into residence halls where living density is high and social experimentation is common. In addition, more students are entering college with severe mental health disorders and conduct disorders with violent components. Treatment for these problems can be disrupted or cease when students enter college and are no longer supervised by parents or guardians (Kitzrow, 2003).

A Public Health Approach to Campus Violence Prevention

Luoluo Hong, associate vice president and dean of students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a college health educator, presented her vision of campus violence prevention at the 2002 ACHA Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., in the session "Understanding and Preventing Violence on Our Campuses." The Campus Violence Committee endorses this approach, which is summarized below.

- "The essence of the environmental management approach is for administrators, faculty, and staff, working in consort with the local community, to change those campus and community policies, practices, infrastructure, and culture which promote violence and tolerance for it."
- Address the entire continuum of violence.
- Incorporate collaboration by all campus constituents, not just student health services or police.
- Infuse into all aspects of curricular and co-curricular life on a continuous basis.
- Focus on patterns of and determinants of perpetration rather than of victimization.
- Recognize that violence is a learned and gendered behavior.

ACHA Campus Violence Committee Recommendations

- Offer students alcohol and smoke-free residence halls.
- Build a sense of community
  Keeling (2000) advocated that it is essential to reduce anonymity and strengthen relationships among students, faculty, staff, and the community so that differences are worked out peacefully.
- Enforce codes of conduct (Keeling, 2000).
- Implement tougher sanctions, including expulsion/suspension for serious misconduct.
- Create zero tolerance policies for campus violence.
- Review the handling of rape cases.
  See, for example, Kate Dieringer's case where she was raped at Georgetown University and

later claimed that she was silenced by campus officials by their not allowing her to discuss the outcome of a disciplinary action taken against her rapist. The U.S. Department of Education questioned this policy as violating the Federal Regulations in the Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights (1992), a portion of the Jeanne Clery Act (U.S. Department of Education, April 18, 2003).

- Disclose information about registered sex offenders on campus.
  The Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act of 2000 provides for the collection and disclosure of information about convicted, registered sex offenders either enrolled in or employed at institutions of higher education.
- Encourage bystander interventions (see Epstein, 2002).
  Bystanders must feel safe, respected, and encouraged when coming forward to report suspicious activities. Confidentiality of their identity and rights will be a critical element of any institution's policy and procedures.

The administration of any institution should feel confident enough to know when to use their campus safety personnel and when to use external law enforcement personnel. This point underscores the need for a campuswide coalition to design and develop a violence prevention strategy that will be used and includes:

- Warning students about criminal activity at orientation, through the campus newspaper, in residence halls, and through campus Internet communications devices.
- Screening out students who pose a real threat. See Nero v. Kansas State University (1993). The university permitted a known rapist to reside in the sole summer residence hall. When the rapist re-offended while living in the hall, the university faced a damaging case from the rape victim (Epstein, 2000).
- Creating classroom disruption policies addressing harassment and intimidation.
- Creating or strengthening a LGBT campus office.
- Creating a safe space for LGBT and non-LGBT dialogue and interaction.
- Actively recruiting and retaining heterosexual allies for LGBT students.
- Providing trainings for public safety officers on LGBT issues and concerns and anti-LGBT violence.
- Creating a campuswide response to hate crimes that includes:

  Disseminating a training curriculum for police officers, such as the Department of Justice National Hate Crime Training Initiative (Bureau of Justice Assistance).

  Designating a civil rights officer for each campus or municipal police department.

  Developing a brochure that defines what activities should be reported, when, and to whom. These should be distributed broadly to faculty, staff, and students, and campus departments and centers, such as housing, athletics, student life, student affairs, counseling center, multicultural center, etc.

  Delineating clear reporting guidelines for police, campus administrators, students, staff, and faculty. These should point to the necessity of reporting crimes in a timely manner, the importance of preserving evidence, and selecting weekend and holiday personnel for notification up the administrative ladder.

  Establishing a hate crime response team.

  Disseminating accurate information about incidences of hate crimes to the entire campus community, explaining what has occurred and restating the university's position and condemnation of the act.

  Developing peer diversity education programs and groups.

Legal Mandates and Policy Recommendations

The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (1998). This act requires colleges and universities to report campus crime statistics in a consistent manner on an annual basis. Schools must make timely warnings to the campus community about crimes that pose an ongoing threat to students and employees. It also requires campuses to describe their crime prevention programs and strategies designed to increase awareness about the issues and behavioral change, particularly among female students (Gregory & Janosik, 2002).

Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights (1992). This law requires that all colleges and universities, both public and private, that participate in federal student aid programs afford sexual assault survivors certain basic rights. The accuser and accused must have the same opportunity to have others present at judicial hearings. Both parties shall be informed of the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding. Survivors shall be informed of their options to notify law enforcement. Survivors shall be notified of counseling services and of options for changing academic and living situations.

Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act (2000). This act provides for the collection and disclosure of information about convicted, registered sex offenders either enrolled in or employed at institutions of higher education.

University duty to warn

Courts have held that policy and federal law permit notification of family or others (usually by the dean of students) but do not create a duty to notify (Jain v. State of Iowa, 2000). The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) permits notification as a health or safety issue. Psychologists and psychiatrists have a duty to warn if specific threats are made against specific people by their clients. Privacy obligations of administrators may provide greater flexibility than confidentiality obligations of professional counseling or medical staff. Courts have ruled that colleges have a duty to provide "reasonable supervision of students" and "take reasonable steps to protect students" (Jain v. State of Iowa).

Recommendations

These recommendations are based on the ACHA 2003 Annual Meeting Legal Symposium on High-Risk Students, an invited address by Nancy Tribbensee (2003) (see also Lake & Tribbensee, 2002).

- Make necessary a consultative approach across departments and administrative lines to manage high-risk student behavior.
- Educate faculty and graduate assistants, staff, and other students about the importance of early referral for distressed students.
- Address environmental issues such as drugs and alcohol.
- Develop an early warning system, such as a Student Assistance Coordinating Committee, where troubled students are discussed and prevention plans are developed.

The following recommendations are taken from Epstein (2002):

- Legal council should undertake a legal review of the campus violence prevention plan.
- Institute a policy to identify types of prohibited speech as disruptive to the educational environment.
- Establish a campus ban on firearms.
- Expand campus mental health services.
- Encourage students/staff to report verbal and written threats, weapons, and bizarre behaviors.
- Have protocols in place for conveying information regarding dangerous situations and threats.

Epstein (2002) recommends development of a protocol that addresses bystander reports for each college or university campus. While recognizing conflicting issues of unjust accusations vs. not reporting potential risks that become actual hazards, the policy should ensure due process, confidentiality of the bystander whenever possible, rights of the suspected student, and constitutional validity of the policy itself. College administration must be aware of the risks associated with bystander disclosure and protect that person's rights and safety.

It is extremely important to have protocols in place for conveying information regarding dangerous situations and threats and search and seizure, as well as checking the reliability of third-party tips. A strong emphasis must be placed on increasing staff and student awareness of policies and procedures so that untrained personnel minimize risk. With regard to concerns for violation of privacy issues, Epstein (2002) suggested that one way to involve students is to ask incoming students to sign a release that will allow administrators to take action if their behavior warrants concern and becomes erratic.

Resources: Innovative Programs and Suggested Readings

Promising and innovative sexual violence prevention programs have been developed that are intended for college males only, females only, mixed-gendered audiences, athletes, fraternity members, and

other targeted campus groups. Many programs utilize a variety of modalities, including general education regarding violence, theatre productions, poster contests, and involvement in community activities (Harner, 2003). However, according to Söchting, Fairbrother, and Koch (2004), sexual violence prevention programs on the American college campus maintain a limited focus. "Almost exclusively, rape prevention programs have, to date, been designed to change beliefs and attitudes assumed to increase the probability of men perpetrating a sexual crime and of women failing to take sufficient precaution" (Söchting et al., 2004, p. 74). Few studies evaluating these prevention programs have documented actual attitude changes among program participants, and fewer studies have even assessed changes in student behaviors (i.e., a reduction in sexual assault). For an in-depth review and discussion of promising or innovative sexual violence prevention programs, see Wolfe and Jaffe (2003), Söchting et al., Katz (1995), Kilmartin (2001), Foubert (2000), Banyard, Plante, and Moynihan (2004), Schewe (2002), and Lonsway (1996).

The social norms and social marketing approach has been implemented in various areas of college health to reduce binge drinking, increase healthy sexual behaviors, decrease racial prejudice and sexism, etc. Social marketing is the application of commercial marketing principles to the design and implementation of mass media campaigns to advance social causes. Although research has not clearly demonstrated the efficacy of this approach, many find it promising. Some promising programs have been published and presented at ACHA Annual Meetings (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenbach, & Stark, 2003; Konradi & DeBruin, 2003).

Conclusions

ACHA is committed to deconstructing campus violence by tapping into its membership's conceptual skills and vast experiences in addressing this pressing issue. Through the circulation of this White Paper, its presentation at the 2004 and 2005 ACHA Annual Meetings, and discussions on campuses throughout the country, it is anticipated that best practices will be flushed out and empirically tested whenever possible. We encourage readers of this paper to circulate it widely and generate feedback, ideas, and empirically evaluated programs for violence prevention and amelioration on our campuses.

Websites

The following list, verified as of December 2004, includes websites with statistics and information on campus violence prevention issues and innovative programs. It is provided as a starting point and is not intended to be an exhaustive listing. Please note that a listing here does not indicate endorsement by ACHA.

American Medical Association Violence Prevention www.ama-assn.org/go/violence

The Bacchus & Gamma Peer Education Network www.bacchusgamma.org

Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence www.colorado.edu/cspv

Center for the Prevention of Hate Violence www.cphv.usm.maine.edu

Dating Violence Resource Center www.ncvc.org/ncvc/main.aspx?dbID=DB_DatingViolenceResourceCenter101

"Face the Issue" Campaign www.facetheissue.com

Hazing www.stophazing.org

The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention www.higheredcenter.org

The Jed Foundation www.jedfoundation.org

Men Can Stop Rape. The Strength Campaign www.mencanstoprape.org

Mentors in Violence Prevention www.sportinsociety.org/mvp

National Adolescent Health Information Center http://nahic.ucsf.edu/

National Gay and Lesbian Task Force www.ngltf.org

National Youth Violence Prevention Resource Center www.safeyouth.org/home.htm

Security on Campus, Inc. www.securityoncampus.org

Social Norms Reports www.socialnormslink.com

Suicide Prevention Resource Center www.sprc.org

Violence Against Women on Campuses. Violence Against Women Grants Office (U.S. Department of Justice) www.ojp.usdoj.gov/vawo/

References

Allan, E. (n.d.). *Examining and transforming campus hazing cultures*. Retrieved April 27, 2004, from http://www.stophazing.org/hazingstudy.htm

American College Health Association. (2004). *National college health assessment: Reference group executive summary spring 2004.* Baltimore, MD: American College Health Association.

American College Health Association. (2002, September). *Healthy campus 2010: Making it happen.* Baltimore, MD: American College Health Association.

American College Health Association. (1999). *Anti-bias/anti-violence statement*. Retrieved April 29, 2004, from http://www.acha.org/about_acha/policy_statements.cfm

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*(1), 61-79.

Barnett, N. D., & DiSabato, M. (2000). Training camp: Lessons in masculinity. In J. Gold & S. Villari (Eds.), *Just sex: Students rewrite the rules on sex, violence, activism and equality* (pp. 197-210). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Baum, K., & Klaus, P. (2005, January). *Violent victimization of college students, 1995-2002.* (NCJ Publication No. 206836). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics).

Berkowitz, A. (1992). College men as perpetrators of acquaintance rape and sexual assault: A review of recent research. J*ournal of American College Health, 40*(4), 175-181.

Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims, 15*(4), 389-406.

Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights, Pub. L. No. 102-135, § 486(c), (1992).

Campus Sex Crimes Prevention Act, Pub. L. No. 106-386, § 1601, (2000).

Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(6), 630-646.

Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(5), 279-289.

Center for Prevention of Hate Violence. Retrieved November 12, 2004, from http://www.cphv.usm.maine.edu

Coakley, J., & Donnelly, P. (2004). *Sport in society: Issues and controversies.* Toronto, Canada: McGraw-Hill.

Epstein, J. (2000). *Hate crimes and other criminal acts on campus.* Retrieved January 21, 2004, from http://www.campussafety.org/information/artop/jepstein01.html

Epstein, J. (2002). Breaking the code of silence: Bystander to campus violence and the law of college and university safety. *Stetson Law Review, 42*(1), 91-124.

Fabiano, P. M., Perkins, H. W., Berkowitz, A., Linkenbach, J., & Stark, C. (2003). Engaging men as social justice allies in ending violence against women: Evidence for a social norms approach. *Journal of American College Health, 52*(3), 105-112.

Federal Hate Crime Statistics Act, 28 U.S.C. § 534, (1990).

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women* (NCJRS Publication No. 182369). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Foubert, J. D. (2000). The longitudinal effects of a rape-prevention program on fraternity men's attitudes, behavioral intent, and behavior. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(4), 158-163.

Fremouw, W. J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1996). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 42*(4), 666-669.

Gregory, D. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2002) The Clery Act: How effective is it? Perceptions from the field-The current state

of the research and recommendations for improvement of the Act and campus safety. *Stetson Law Review, 32*(1), 7-59.

Harner, H. (2003, May). *Sexual Violence and Adolescence.* Retrieved April 8, 2004, from http://www.vaw.umn.edu/documents/vawnet/adolescent/aradolescent.html

Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act, Pub. L. No. 103-322, § 280003, (1995).

Hingson, R.W., Hereen, T., Zakocs, R.C., Kopstein, A., & Wechsler, H. (2002, March). Magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among U.S. college students ages 18-24. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 63*(2), 136-144.

Holtzworth-Monroe, A., Bates, L., Smutzler, N., & Sandin, E. (1997). A brief review of the research on husband violence: Part 1: Maritally violent vs. nonviolent men. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 2*(1), 65-99.

Hong, L. (2002, May). *Understanding and preventing violence on our campuses: A comprehensive student affairs initiative.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American College Health Association, Washington, D.C.

Jain v. State of Iowa, 617 N.W.2d 293 (Iowa, 2000).

Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, Pub. L. No. 105-244, § 486(e), (1998).

Jordan, C. E., Quinn, K., Jordan, B., & Daileader, C. R. (1999-2000). Stalking: Cultural, clinical and legal considerations. *Brandeis Law Journal, 38*, 513-579.

Katz, J. (1995). Reconstructing masculinity in the locker room: The mentors in violence prevention project. *Harvard Educational Review, 65*(2), 163-174.

Keeling, R. (2000). NASPA Factsheet: Violence and the campus community. Washington, DC: NASPA.

Kilmartin, C. (2001). *Sexual assault in context: Teaching college men about gender.* Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.

Kisch, J., Leino, E.V., & Silverman, M.M.(in press). Aspects of suicidal behavior, depression, and treatment in college students: Results from the spring 2000 national college health assessment survey. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 35*(1).

Kitzrow, M.A. (2003). The mental health needs of today's college students: Challenges and recommendations. *NASPA Journal, 41*(1), 167-181.

Konradi, A., & DeBruin, P. L. (2003). Using a social marketing approach to advertise sexual assault nurse examination (SANE) services to college students. *Journal of American College Health, 52*(1), 33-40.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 64-170.

Krug, E.G., Dahlberg, L.L., Mercy, J.A., Zwi, A.B., & Lozano, R. (Eds.) (2002). *World report on violence and health.* Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Lake, P., & Tribbensee, N. (2002). The emerging crisis of college student suicide: Law and policy responses to serious forms of self-inflicted injury. *Stetson Law Review, 32*(1), 125-157.

Lisak, D., & Roth, S. (1990). Motives and psychodynamics of self-reported, unincarcerated rapists. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. *60*, 268-280.

Lonsway, K. A. (1996). Preventing acquaintance rape through education: What do we know? *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*, 229-265.

Makepeace, J. M. (1988). The severity of courtship violence and the effectiveness of individual precautions. In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *Family abuse and its consequences. New directions in research* (pp. 297-311). Sage Publishers, London.

Malamuth, N. M., Sockloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model

using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59,* 670-681.

Maris, R. W., Berman, A. L., Silverman, M. M. (2000). *Comprehensive textbook of suicidology.* Guilford Press: New York.

McEvoy, A. (2000). Murder-suicide by students. *School Intervention Report, 13*(2), 1-5.

McGuire, B., & Wraith, A. (2000). Legal and psychological aspects of stalking: A review. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry, 11*(2), 316-327.

Melton, H. C. (2000). Stalking: A review of the literature and direction for the future. *Criminal Justice Review, 25*(2), 246-252.

Miller, M., Hemenway, D., & Wechsler, H. (2002). Guns and gun threats at college. *Journal of American College Health, 51*(2), 57-66.

Muelenhard, C., & Linton, M. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 186-196.

Mustaine, E. E., & Tewsbury, R. (1999). A routine activity theory explanation of women's stalking victimizations. *Violence Against Women, 5*(1), 43-62.

National Center for Hate Crime Prevention (2000, June 15). Retrieved April 29, 2004, from http://www.edc.org/HHD/hatecrime/id1.htm

National Center for Victims of Crime. (2004). Retrieved April 1, 2004, from http://www.ncvc.org/ncvc

National Mental Health Association & The Jed Foundation. (2002). *Safeguarding your students against suicide: Expanding the safety net.* Proceedings from panel on vulnerability, depressive symptoms, and suicidal behavior on college campuses.

Nero v. Kansas State University, 861 Ka. P.2d 768 (1993).

Newman, M. (2004, April 6). Barely over last night's party, UConn hopes for another. *NYTimes.com.* Retrieved April 8, 2004, from http://www.nytimes.com/2004/04/06/sports/ncaabasketball/06CND-STOR.html

Paulozzi, L. J., Saltzman, L. A., Thompson, M. J., & Holmgreen, P. (2001). Surveillance for homicide among intimate partners—United States, 1981-1998. *CDC Surveillance Summaries, 50*(SS-3), 1-16.

Presley, C. A., Meilman, P. W., & Cashin, J. R. (1997). Weapon carrying and substance abuse among college students. *Journal of American College Health, 46*(1), 3-8.

Quackenbush, R. L. (1989). A comparison of androgynous, masculine sex-typed, and undifferentiated males on dimensions of attitudes toward rape. *Journal of Research in Personality, 23,* 318-342.

Rankin, S.R. (2003). *Campus Climate for Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender People: A National Perspective.* New York: The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute.

Ravensberg, V., & Miller, C. (2003). Stalking among young adults: A review of the preliminary research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 8,* 455-469.

Roizen, J. (1993). Issues in the epidemiology of alcohol and violence. In S. E. Martin (Ed.), *Alcohol and interpersonal violence: Fostering multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 3-36; NIAAA Research Monograph No. 24). Bethesda, MD: National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

Romeo, F. F. (2001). A recommendation for a campus anti-stalking policy and procedures handbook. *College Student Journal, 35*(4), 514-516.

Sanday, P. R. (1996). *A woman scorned: Acquaintance rape on trial.* New York: Doubleday.

Sandler, B. R., & Shoop, R. J. (Eds.) (1997). *Sexual harassment on campus: a guide for administrators, faculty and students.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Schewe, P. A. (2002). *Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the lifespan.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Silverman, M. (2003, May). *Treating the high risk student: Legal issues and innovative protocols.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American College Health Association, Miami Beach, FL.

Sloan, J. J., Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (1997). Assessing the student right-to-know and campus security act of 1990: An analysis of the victim reporting practices of college and university students. *Crime & Delinquency, 43*(2), 148-168.

Smith, P. H., White, J. W., & Holland, L. J. (2003). A longitudinal perspective on dating violence among adolescent and college-age women. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(7), 1104-1109.

Söchting, I., Fairbrother, N., & Koch, W. J. (2004). Sexual assault of women: Prevention efforts and risk factors. *Violence Against Women, 10*(1), 73-93.

StopHazing.org. (n.d.). *Hazing defined.* Retrieved April 29, 2004, from http://www.stophazing.org/definition.html

Suicide Prevention Resource Center (2004). *Promoting mental health and preventing suicide in college and university settings.* Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000, July). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* (NCJRS Publication No. 181867). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Tribbensee, N. (2003, May). *College student suicide: Managing risks and promoting effective communication*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American College Health Association, Miami Beach, FL.

U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS) enrollment survey, spring 2002.* National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved November 12, 2004, from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003168

U.S. Department of Education (2003, April 18) *Letter to Georgetown University president.* Retrieved January 3, 2005, from http://www.securityoncampus.org/reporters/releases/degioia04182003.html

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Summary campus crime and security statistics: Criminal offenses.* Retrieved April 29, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/safety/crime/criminaloffenses/index.html

Violence Against Women Act, 42 U.S.C. § 13981 (1994).

Warshaw, R., & Parrot, A. (1991). The contribution of sex-role socialization to acquaintance rape. In A. Parrot & L. Bechhofer (Eds.), *Acquaintance rape: The hidden crime* (pp. 73-82). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Wessler, S. & Moss. M. (2001, October). *Hate Crimes On Campus: The Problem and Efforts to Confront It.* (NCJ Publication No. 187249). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Wolfe, D. A., & Jaffe, P. G. (2003, January). *Prevention of domestic violence and sexual assault*. Retrieved April 8, 2004, from http://www.vaw.umn.edu/documents/vawnet/arprevent/arprevent.html

American College Health Association
P.O. Box 28937
Baltimore, MD 21240-8937
(410) 859-1500 / (410) 859-1510 fax
www.acha.org

2/05