

Report on the National Survey of Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence and Harassment in Irish HEIs

Authors | Pádraig MacNeela, Kate Dawson,
Theresa O'Rourke, Siobhán Healy-Cullen,
Lorraine Burke, William F. Flack

HEA | HIGHER EDUCATION AUTHORITY
AN tÚDARÁS um ARD-OIDEACHAS

Trigger Warning

The survey analysed in this report asked about personal experience with sexual misconduct, specifically sexual harassment and violence. Some of the language used in the report is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable. Information on how to get help, if you need it, can be found below or here: <https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2021/04/Links-to-supports.pdf>.

Service	Phone	Web
Text 50808	Free 24/7 Support in a Crisis - Text 'HELLO' to 50808	https://text50808.ie/
Samaritans	National Helpline - 116 123	https://www.samaritans.org/ireland/samaritans-ireland/
Dublin Rape Crisis Centre	Dublin Rape Crisis Centre's 24-hour helpline - 1800 77 8888	https://www.drcc.ie/Your local Rape Crisis Centre/Network https://www.rapecrisishelp.ie/find-a-service/
HSE		https://www2.hse.ie/services/sexual-assault-treatment-units/rape-sexual-assault-where-to-get-help.html
Sexual Assault Treatment Units		https://www2.hse.ie/sexual-assault-treatment-units/
Women's Aid	24-hour helpline - 1800 341 900	https://www.womensaid.ie/
Men's Aid	National Confidential Helpline - 01 554 3811	https://www.mensaid.ie/
Your local Gardaí		https://www.garda.ie/en/crime/sexual-crime/
HSE My Options	Freephone - 1800 828 010	https://www2.hse.ie/unplanned-pregnancy/
LGBT Ireland	National Helpline - 1890 929 539	https://lgbt.ie/

Contents

Section 1: Summary of the Survey Findings	5
1. Overview of the Survey	6
2. Demographic Questions	6
3. Campus Environment	7
4. Campus Safety	10
5. Consent Attitudes and Bystander Intervention	11
6. Staff Experiences of Sexual Harassment	15
7. Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence	23
8. Discussion of Findings	26
9. Recommendations	31
 Section 2: Analysis of Survey Responses	 35
10. Staff Survey Content and Methodology	36
10.1 Overview	36
10.2 Survey Content	37
11. Demographics of Respondents	40
12. Campus Environment	47
12.1 Beliefs about Institutional Policies and Practices	47
12.2 Awareness of Reporting Mechanisms and Supports for Staff	50
12.3 Negative Perceptions of Making Reports of Sexual Violence or Harassment	55
12.4 Perceptions of Organisational Culture and Support – Positive actions and culture	58
12.5 Perceptions of Organisational Culture and Support – Negative actions and culture	62
12.6 Willingness to Engage in Consent and SVH Initiatives	65
13. Campus Safety	70
13.1 Staff Perceptions of Safety and Responsibility	70
14. Consent and Bystander Attitudes	76
14.1 Consent Attitudes	77
14.2 Awareness of Discussion of Consent	80
14.3 Bystander Intervention	82
14.4 Responding to a Disclosure of Sexual Violence or Harassment	88
14.5 Perceptions of Female and Male Rape Myth Beliefs	90

15. Experiences of Sexual Harassment	106
15.1 'Not applicable' Responses	107
15.2 Sexualised Comments	110
15.3 Sexist Hostility	115
15.4 Sexual Hostility / Crude Gender Harassment	121
15.5 Unwanted Sexual Attention	126
15.6 Sexual Coercion	130
15.7 Sexual Harassment Via Electronic Communication or Visual/Written Materials	135
15.8 Follow Up Questions on Sexual Harassment	140
16. Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence	160
16.1 Background Information on the Questions about Sexual Violence	160
16.2 Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence	161
16.2 Follow Up Questions on Sexual Violence	167
Appendix: National Survey of Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence and Harassment in Irish HEIs	180
Bibliography	204

1 Summary of the Survey Findings

1. Overview of the Survey

In April 2021, at the request of the Minister for Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science, Simon Harris, T.D., the Higher Education Authority (HEA) conducted national surveys to monitor the experiences of students and staff in relation to sexual violence, harassment in order to create a robust evidence base for further policy and funding decisions in relation to tackling sexual violence and harassment in higher education institutions (HEIs). The HEA established an expert Advisory Group on Ending Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment in HEIs in January 2021 to support this work. In collaboration with this advisory group, the HEA Centre of Excellence for Equality Diversity and Inclusion developed and ran national surveys of staff and students to monitor their experiences in April 2021. 11, 417 responses were received (7,901 students and 3,516 staff). The results of the staff survey are now presented in this report. The report provides a picture of staff attitudes towards and experiences of sexual violence and sexual harassment, as well as their awareness and confidence in HEI policies, processes and initiatives in the area.

The survey of staff experiences was conducted online using Microsoft Forms between 12 April and 5 May 2021 by the HEA. The survey content was adapted from the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) content used in the Active* Consent / USI national survey of students in 2020 (Burke et al., 2020). This was in turn an adaptation of the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) Campus Climate Survey (Swartout et al., 2019). These sources were edited and adapted by the HEA Advisory Group. The Advisory Group also included additional statements and questions based on their analysis of what was required in a comprehensive survey tool relevant to the Irish higher education sector.

The survey was introduced by an extensive information section and warnings concerning the content of the survey, data protection and confidentiality. Each section of the survey included an introduction, and particularly sensitive sections of the survey asked staff members whether they wished to respond or skip the section concerned. Links to supports were provided at several points in the survey.

2. Demographic Questions

A total of 3,516 staff members completed the online survey. Nearly two thirds (64%) worked in a university, 22% at an Institute of Technology, 12% at a different HEI, and 1% preferred not to say. The survey respondents comprised 2,399 females (69%), 1,059 males (30%), 18 gender non-binary staff members (1%), and 40 staff who preferred not to say their gender (1%). The findings of the survey are presented in terms of the whole staff group and then organised in terms of four demographic characteristics: Gender, area of work, sexual orientation, and age.

For convenience in reporting, the sexual orientations were grouped into five categories in the report: (a) Asexual (1% of the sample), (b) Bisexual (4%), (c) Gay, lesbian, queer, and other orientations (5%), (d) Heterosexual (88%), and (e) Prefer not to say (3%).

Staff were also categorised by their area of work, as academics in AHSS-BL (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business and Law) (28%), academics in STEM-MH (STEM, Medicine and Health) (23%), Research (5%), Professional / technical (Professional, managerial, support services, and technical support) (38%), and Prefer not to say / Other (6%).

In terms of age, 14% of the survey respondents were aged 18-34 years, 28% were 35-44, 35% were 45-54, 22% were aged 55 years or more, and 1% preferred not to state their age category.

The following description provides an overview of the main demographic characteristics of the students who took part in the survey:

- > Four fifths (82%) of the staff who took part in the study identified their ethnicity as White Irish and another 13% identified as White Roma, White Irish Traveller or another White background. The other most common ethnic backgrounds were Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi (1%), and Other including mixed group/background (Mixed background / Other) (1%).
- > Six per cent of the staff indicated that they had a disability, including 7% of females, 5% of males, 39% of gender non-binary staff, and 8% of staff who preferred not to say their gender.

3. Campus Environment

This section of the survey covered staff beliefs, awareness, and knowledge of their institution's policies, practices, and supports in response to consent, sexual violence and harassment (SVH).

The statements in this section were presented in groups that relate to:

- > Beliefs about whether the institution would investigate reports of SVH in a proactive, appropriate manner.
- > Staff awareness of policies and procedures on SVH at their HEI.
- > Beliefs about SVH-related training and reporting mechanisms.
- > Willingness to engage in campus consent and sexual violence initiatives.

Beliefs about Institutional Policies and Practices

Approximately one third of the staff members agreed that their HEI is proactive in addressing issues of sexual violence and harassment, that policies and procedures at their HEI to tackle sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit, and that senior management are visible in addressing these issues. By comparison, a majority of staff agreed that they are aware of policies at their institution to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment, and one in five agreed that policies and procedures on this topic are effective.

A large percentage of staff members, typically a third or more, responded to these statements by selecting the 'Neutral' or 'Don't know' response.

Typically, male staff members were more likely to agree with the statements, as were Professional / technical staff, heterosexual and asexual staff members, and staff members in the 45-54 and 55 years+ categories.

Awareness of Reporting Mechanisms and Supports for Staff

This set of statements concerned staff members' awareness of specific reporting mechanisms for sexual violence and harassment at their HEI. The highest rate of agreement referred to awareness of how to make a report personally (44%) or if another person had experienced SVH (38%). Agreement levels on most of the statements concerning staff knowledge of reporting were between 20-30%, including the percentage of staff in agreement that they had knowledge of available supports, that there are clear lines of responsibility for dealing with reports, and in having awareness of informational messaging about reporting and responding to SVH.

One in five staff members or less agreed that their HEI has an easy-to-use system for reporting SVH, that training is available on how to report or respond to disclosures, or in knowing what supports would be available if the person themselves was accused of perpetrating SVH.

There was again a large degree of variation in response to these statements, with one quarter or more of survey participants choosing a 'Neutral' or 'Don't know' response.

Male staff were more likely to agree that they had relevant knowledge and awareness, along with staff working in a Professional / technical area, asexual and heterosexual respondents, and those aged 45-54 and 55 years or more.

Negative Perceptions of Making Reports of Sexual Violence or Harassment

Three statements in the survey referred to staff expectations for how reports of sexual violence or harassment are viewed in their HEI work culture. Approximately one fifth of staff were in agreement that there would be a negative response from the HEI to a person who reported SVH, or that there would be retaliation from the alleged offender or their friends. Depending on the statement, approximately one third of survey participants chose the 'Neutral' or 'Don't know' response.

Among different categories of staff members, females and individuals who preferred not to say their gender identity had the highest rates of agreement that there would be a negative response to someone who makes a report of SVH, along with bisexual staff and those who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another orientation.

Perceptions of Organisational Culture and Support – Positive actions and culture

Five statements in the survey asked staff members for their perspective on whether it was likely that their higher education institution would provide supports to a person who makes a report of sexual violence or harassment.

Half or more of the staff members said it was likely that the institution would provide supports or create a positive environment toward reporting SVH – through providing tangible supports such as counselling or meetings, by creating an environment where SVH was recognised as a problem, by accommodating the person's needs, and by creating an environment where SVH experiences were safe to discuss. Most of the remaining staff members chose the 'Neutral' response, with a smaller percentage disagreeing that the institution would react supportively.

There was a higher rate of agreement with these statements among males, non-binary staff members, Professional / technical staff, as well as asexual and heterosexual respondents.

Perceptions of Organisational Culture and Support – Negative actions and culture

The next set of statements on organisational culture comprised three negative expectations for reporting sexual violence or harassment. One third of the staff members said it was likely that their HEI would play an active role by suggesting the person's experiences might affect the reputation of the institution. One in five staff members rated it as likely that their HEI would create an environment where the reporting person did not feel valued or where it was difficult to continue working there.

Approximately one in three respondents chose the 'Neutral' response to these statements. Bisexual staff members were more likely than other sexual orientations to say it was likely that the HEI would react negatively.

Willingness to Engage in Consent and SVH Initiatives

A set of statements were presented in the survey about awareness of messaging on sexual violence and harassment and willingness to engage in training on topics such as disclosure, consent, and bystander intervention. Three quarters or more of the staff members agreed that they would be willing to complete training on disclosures, bystander intervention awareness, and consent awareness, if such training was made available by their HEI.

A majority of staff members agreed that they would become involved at a more active level in supporting or facilitating initiatives, but support for these roles was somewhat lower than for engaging in training. Thus, six in ten of the staff members agreed that they would be open to actively supporting culture change themselves, by facilitating student / staff initiatives or having a role in supporting these actions.

Depending on the statement involved, approximately 10-20% of staff disagreed that they would get involved with an initiative or did not know whether they would get involved.

Female and non-binary staff members typically had higher agreement levels on these statements, along with Research and Professional / technical staff, bisexual survey respondents, and 18-34 year olds.

4. Campus Safety

Staff Perceptions of Safety and Responsibility

This section of the survey presented three statements referring to staff feeling safe from sexual violence and harassment at their HEI, one statement about perceptions of staff responsibility for engaging with the topic of SVH, and two statements to gauge perceptions of whether SVH is a problem for students and staff.

The highest level of agreement was that 81% of staff agreed that they felt safe from sexual violence within their HEI. This compared with 72% of staff who agreed they felt safe from sexual harassment. Half of the staff members (52%) felt safe voicing concerns related to SVH.

Male staff members were more likely to feel safe from sexual violence or harassment and to agree that they felt safe voicing concerns, along with heterosexual and asexual staff members, and those aged 45-54 and 55 years+.

Turning to the next set of three statements presented in this section of the survey, 69% of staff members agreed that they felt a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of sexual violence and harassment. A far smaller percentage of staff members agreed that SVH among staff was a problem at their HEI (14%) or that SVH among students is a problem (27%) at their HEI.

There were particularly high percentage of staff who chose the ‘Neutral’ response to these three statements. One quarter were neutral on whether they had a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of SVH, while one third of staff were neutral as to whether SVH among staff was a problem at their HEI, and half were neutral as to whether SVH among students was a problem at their HEI.

Staff members with a non-binary gender identity were particularly likely to agree that SVH among students is a problem and were more likely than other gender groups to agree that they felt responsible to engage with the issue. Academic AHSS-BL staff members were more likely to see SVH as a problem and to have a sense of responsibility to act in response to this. Staff who were bisexual and those who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation were more likely to agree that SVH was a problem for staff and for students.

5. Consent Attitudes and Bystander Intervention

This section of the survey presented statements referring to staff attitudes to sexual consent attitudes and to bystander interventions. The statements in this section asked staff to indicate:

- > Their agreement with statements concerning personal attitudes to consent and attitudes attributed to students.
- > Awareness of consent being discussed by students and staff over the past four years.
- > Perceptions of feeling responsible to make an intervention in an incident where they are not directly involved.
- > Whether they had made a bystander intervention in the past four years concerning students or staff.
- > How well informed they were to make a bystander intervention or receive a disclosure of sexual violence or harassment.

Consent Attitudes

A total of 33% (n = 1,173) of the staff survey respondents chose to skip the statements on consent attitudes, with 66% (n = 2,343) of the respondents indicating that they wished to respond to this section.

In this part of the survey, staff members responded to two attitude statements about whether students feel awkward or confident in seeking sexual consent, and six statements about their personal attitudes to consent. The statements on personal attitudes referred to whether verbal consent is always needed and whether consent should always be actively sought regardless of the type of intimacy involved.

Staff member responses to statements on personal attitudes to consent indicate a very strong level of agreement with the principles of having consent for sexual intimacy. More than ninety per cent of the staff members agreed that sexual consent should always be obtained in all relationships regardless of whether they have had sex before, and that one should assume 'no' until there is clear indication to proceed with sexual activity.

A large majority of the survey participants agreed that someone should always assume that they do not have sexual consent when initiating sexual activity. Four out of five of the staff who responded agreed that verbally asking for sexual consent should occur before proceeding with any sexual activity. Almost two thirds agreed that consent should be asked before any kind of sexual behaviour, including kissing or touching.

A majority of staff members agreed that students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward. A small minority of staff members agreed that students typically feel confident seeking consent from a sexual partner.

Females, gender non-binary staff members, and those aged 18-34 years had relatively high agreement ratings with the statements on consent attitudes.

Awareness of Discussion of Consent

The next set of consent statements referred to awareness and discussion concerning consent. All of the staff members responded to these statements. Just over one third of staff agreed that they had heard students discuss sexual consent issues on campus over the past four years. A similar percentage of staff had heard other staff members discussing issues of consent on campus.

Non-binary staff members, Professional / technical staff, bisexual staff, staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation, and staff members aged 18-34 were more likely to say that they had heard consent issues being discussed by students.

Bystander Intervention

Three items in the staff survey asked about bystander intervention. These statements asked if staff felt a responsibility to intervene in the case of sexual violence or harassment taking place, whether the staff members had made a bystander intervention in the past four years, and how well informed the staff felt in making an effective bystander intervention.

Just over half of staff who responded felt a responsibility to make an intervention in the context of SVH where they were not directly involved, while over a third of the respondents said they did not know if they felt responsible for this.

Males, non-binary staff, those who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation, and staff aged 55+ were most likely to feel responsible to intervene.

One in eight of the survey respondents reported intervening in an incident of SVH involving staff and / or students on at least one occasion over the past four years. Where staff had intervened, on most occasions this had taken place once. Professional / technical staff were particularly likely to say they had intervened over this time.

Over six in ten of the staff members felt not informed or only slightly informed about how to make an effective bystander intervention. One third felt somewhat or fairly informed, and a small percentage felt completely informed about how to do this.

Female staff, heterosexual and asexual staff members, and staff aged 35-44 were most likely to report that they did not feel informed or only slightly informed about how to make an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of SVH.

Responding to a Disclosure of Sexual Violence or Harassment

One item in the section on sexual consent and bystander intervention asked about how well informed staff members felt in responding effectively to a disclosure of sexual violence or harassment. Six in ten of the staff members said that they either felt ‘Not informed at all’ or ‘Slightly informed’ about responding effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual harassment and / or violence. One in five said that they were either ‘Fairly informed’ or ‘Completely informed’ about how to respond effectively.

Rape Myth Acceptance

The statements in this section refer to both female and male rape myth beliefs. In both cases, these are inaccurate gender-related beliefs about people who are sexually assaulted or raped. These statements are grouped into two sub-scales:

- > ‘He didn’t mean to’ – which refers to explanations of rape that excuse or rationalise the behaviour of a man who engages in rape.
- > ‘She asked for it’ – this sub-scale describes behaviours or actions by women that attempt to make them responsible for rape having taken place
- > In addition, a set of 10 male rape myth statements were included after the statements on female rape myths.

The staff members were given the option to skip this section. A total of 2,832 staff members (81% of the full sample) chose to respond to these statements and 684 chose not to do so (20%).

One of the female rape myth sub-scales that was included is called “He didn’t mean to”. This sub-scale comprises six statements that refer to justifications or why a man would rape or sexually assault someone. Three of them describe ways in which disinhibition from alcohol would make this more likely to occur and the other three reference lack of control over sex drive as a rationale. The highest rate of agreement was with the statement that ‘If a man is drunk, he might rape or sexually assault someone unintentionally’, which 8% of staff members agreed with. Seven per cent of staff who completed this part of the survey agreed with the statement that ‘When guys rape or sexually assault, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex’ and with the statement that ‘Men don’t usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away’. Up to 13% of participants chose the ‘Neutral’ response option to one of the statements. Females, non-binary staff, academic AHSS-BL staff, and staff aged 18-34 years had the highest rate of disagreement with these statements.

The other female rape myth sub-scale included in the survey is titled “She asked for it”. This sub-scale comprised six statements that describe false beliefs regarding women having some responsibility for being sexually assaulted or raped. These state that women may engage in behaviour that leads to them getting assaulted, such as dressing a particular way, being alone with someone, consuming alcohol, and so on. Two of the statements had a 5% or more rate of agreement from the staff who responded to this part of the survey. Seven per cent agreed that if a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex. Five per cent agreed with the statement that ‘If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble’. Up to 9% of staff chose the ‘Neutral’ response to one of the statements. Females, bisexual staff and those who identified as gay, lesbian, queer, or with another orientation had the highest rates of disagreement with ‘She asked for it’ rape myth sub-scale items.

The ‘Male rape myths’ scale comprises ten statements that describe ways in which a sexual assault or rape of a man may be minimised. Nine of the statements are phrased negatively and describe men as being partly responsible for being assaulted or that they make insufficient attempts to resist. One statement is positively phrased in that it acknowledges that men are upset by being assaulted. Almost nine out of ten staff agreed that most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident. There was a high level of rejection of male rape myths by the staff group as a whole. The highest rate of agreement (4%) was for the statement that the extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted.

6. Staff Experiences of Sexual Harassment

The section on sexual harassment was introduced with a statement describing the topic for participants. This statement identified that sexual violence and sexual harassment refer to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent.

The participants also read that sexual violence or harassment refers to conduct that derogates, demeans, or humiliates a person based on that person’s sex or gender. Examples were given including sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, and sexual violence.

The participants were provided with a ‘trigger warning’ regarding the content of the items about harassment. This notified them that the questions asked about personal experiences of sexual harassment and used explicit language that some people may find uncomfortable. A link was provided at this point to information on supports.

The participants were told that they could choose not to answer the questions in this section. Of the 3,516 staff members who participated in the online survey, 83% (n = 2,900) indicated that they wanted to complete these items and 18% (n = 616) indicated that they did not want to do so.

The statements on sexual harassment were behaviourally-specific descriptions of harassment (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). The statements were preceded by introductory text that read: “In the last four years, have you been in a situation in which someone related to your HEI. Please choose the appropriate response for each item”. The sexual harassment statements then followed. The statements can be categorised into the following six categories:

- > Sexualised comments – Referring to race / ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religion, or trans / non-binary identity
- > Sexist hostility – Remarks and treatment that is derogatory and has a sexist basis.
- > Sexual hostility / crude gender harassment – Derogatory remarks and treatment that has a sexual basis.
- > Unwanted sexual attention – Persistent efforts by an individual to have a sexual or romantic relationship that is unwanted.
- > Sexual coercion – Bribery or special treatment that is provided contingent on sexual behaviour.
- > Sexual harassment via electronic communication or visual / written materials – The use of the Internet or communication platforms as a basis for harassment, including pornography and sexual images that are not on the Internet.

The response options for each sexual harassment statement indicated how frequently the person had that experience, from a choice of ‘Never’, ‘Once or twice’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Often’, ‘Many times’, or that the experience was ‘Not applicable’.

Sexualised Comments

The first category of statements in the sexual harassment section of the survey related to survey respondents having experienced sexualised comments in reference to gender, sexuality, race or ethnicity, religion, or trans / non-binary identity.

For the staff group as a whole, the most common form of harassment in this set of statements was exposure to sexualised comments related to male or female identity, which was described by 24% of the staff members.

The next most common experience (references to sexuality) was described by 13% of the staff members. The rate of experiencing the other forms of sexualised comments (by race or ethnicity, religion, or trans and / or non-binary identity) ranged from 3-8%.

- > Sexualised comments in reference to female or male identity were experienced 'Once or twice' by 13% of the participants, 11% had this experience more often (i.e., 'Sometimes', 'Often', or 'Many times'), and 3% selected the 'Not applicable' response.
- > Non-binary staff members were the most likely group to have experienced sexualised comments. In addition, more females (27%) than males (18%) described having experienced sexualised comments related to their gender identity.
- > Academic AHSS-BL staff and staff working in a Research environment were more likely to describe sexualised comments related to their gender or sexuality, along with those staff who preferred not to state their work area.
- > There was a considerably higher rate among bisexual staff of experiencing sexualised comments referencing sexuality ('Once or twice': 13%; more often: 10%) and among staff who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation ('Once or twice': 23%, more often: 21%).

Sexist Hostility

The next category of items on harassment comprised three statements concerning sexist hostility. This refers to being treated differently, personalised verbal mistreatment, or offensive sexist remarks being made because of the person's gender.

Approximately half of the respondents described being treated differently (52%) or being put down or condescended to (47%) because of gender. Approximately one third of the respondents (35%) said they had experienced sexist remarks.

Examining the full responses to the three sexist hostility statements, 18% of the respondents said they were treated differently 'Once or twice' because of their gender and 33% said they had been treated differently more often. There was a similar pattern in the breakdown of responses to the statement on being put down or condescended to – 21% of respondents said this happened to them 'Once or twice' and a greater percentage (26%) said it happened more often.

- > Depending on the statement, females described having these experiences almost twice or more than twice as often as males. Sexist hostility was described most frequently by non-binary staff and those who preferred not to state their gender.
- > There was a trend toward staff in AHSS-BL and Research work areas describing sexist hostility more commonly than staff in the other work areas, along with staff who preferred not to state their work area.

- > Examining sexist hostility by sexual orientation, the staff who identified as bisexual had the highest incidence on each of the three statements. Staff who preferred not to state their sexual orientation and those who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation described relatively high rates of sexist hostility as well.
- > There was an age-related trend in experiences of sexist hostility. Across all three statements in this section, the highest level of this harassment was described by the youngest age cohort (18-34 years). By comparison, the incidence was slightly lower among 35-44 and 45-54 year olds, and lower again among the 55+ age group.

Sexual Hostility / Crude Gender Harassment

This set of four statements refers to actions that have sexual connotations, including stories or jokes, offensive remarks, inappropriate sexual conversations, and non-verbal gestures or body language.

Depending on the statement, sexual hostility or crude gender harassment was described by between 14% and 21% of the survey respondents.

The most common experience was to be repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes (21%), followed by remarks about the person's appearance, body, or sexual activities (17%), unwelcome attempts to discuss sexual matters (14%), and embarrassing or offensive gestures or body language (14%).

Thirteen per cent of staff members said they had been repeatedly told offensive sexual stories or jokes 'Once or twice', while 8% had this experience more often. A total of 9% of staff had offensive remarks made 'Once or twice' about their appearance, body or sexual activities, and 8% had this experience more often.

- > The percentage of staff members who described sexual hostility varied by gender. People who preferred not to state their gender were the most likely to indicate they had experienced sexual hostility. Females were more likely than males to describe each of the forms of harassment in this set of statements. For instance, female staff (25%) were almost twice as likely as male staff (13%) to say they had been repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes. Non-binary staff described a relatively high rate of being told offensive sexual stories or jokes (27%).
- > The rate of experiencing sexual hostility typically did not vary more than 5% between the AHSS-BL, STEM-MH, Research, and Professional / technical work areas. Staff members who preferred not to state their work area described slightly higher rates of sexual hostility than other staff.

- > There were distinctive patterns in sexual hostility across sexual orientation categories. Those who preferred not to state their sexual orientation, along with bisexual staff members and staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation were more likely to describe sexual hostility. Depending on the statement, the incidence of sexual hostility was 5-13% higher among bisexual staff members than among heterosexual staff members.
- > There was a consistent trend in experiences of sexual hostility by age category. For each of the statements on sexual hostility, the 18-34 year old group described the highest rate of incidence, ranging from 16-26%. There was typically a small gap between the 18-34 age group and the 35-44 and 45-54 year old categories. There was a larger difference with the 55+ years age category, who described a percentage incidence rate of 8-17% across the statements. The staff members who preferred not to state their age were most likely to describe sexual hostility, ranging from 45-60% across the statements.

Unwanted Sexual Attention

The next set of items on the sexual harassment measure concern unwanted sexual attention. These statements refer to someone making persistent efforts to have a relationship which are unwanted or after the person had already said 'no'.

Overall, 6% of survey respondents said someone had continued to ask them for a romantic date even though they had said 'no' and 10% had the experience of someone making unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with them.

- > Female staff members were more likely than male staff to say they had had unwanted attempts to establish a sexual relationship (11% compared with 7%) and that someone had continued to ask them for romantic dates (7% compared with 3%).
- > Survey respondents who worked in AHSS-BL, STEM-MH, Research, and those who preferred not to say their work area described slightly higher rates of unwanted sexual attention.
- > There was a broadly consistent rate of unwanted sexual attention described by respondents across sexual orientation categories. Bisexual staff members described the highest levels of these experiences.
- > There was an age-related trend in descriptions of unwanted sexual attention. The 18-35 years age group had the highest incidence rate. There was a similar rate experienced among 35-44 and 45-54 year old groups. The 55+ age group described the lowest incidence level. Survey respondents who preferred not to state their age had the highest level of unwanted sexual attention overall.

Sexual Coercion

The next set of four items refers to coercive strategies for obtaining sexual intimacy, such as bribing someone with rewards, creating a threatening atmosphere, suggesting better treatment could be available, or retaliation after a relationship ended.

The incidence of these forms of coercive harassment ranged from 1% (retaliation after a relationship ended), to 2% (implying better treatment) and 3% (feeling threatened, feeling bribed with a reward). There is limited scope to make comparisons between sub-groups of staff members given the total percentage of the respondents who described experiencing sexual coercion.

Sexual Harassment Via Electronic Communication or Visual/Written Materials

This section comprised two statements that described being exposed to visual or written materials with sexist or suggestive content or the electronic sending or posting of unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or pictures.

More than one in six (15%) of the survey respondents described being exposed to sexist or suggestive materials such as pictures, stories or pornography that they found offensive. Overall, 8% of the participants said they had been exposed to sexist or suggestive materials 'Once or twice' and 6% said it had happened more often.

One in ten of the respondents described unwelcome sexual comments having been sent or posted online, including text, email, or other electronic formats on an online platform such as WhatsApp, Snapchat, or Facebook.

- > More females (17%) than males (9%) described being exposed to sexist or suggestive materials. There was a smaller difference between females (10%) and males (8%) on the statement concerning unwelcome sexual comments online. A relatively high percentage of the other gender groups were exposed to sexist or suggestive materials, including 21% of non-binary survey respondents and 30% of those respondents who preferred not to state their gender.
- > There was a consistent rate of respondents across areas of work who described exposure to sexist or suggestive materials, ranging from 13-16%. Academic staff in AHSS-BL were the most likely to have this experience. There was also broad consistency across work areas in unwelcome online experiences. The incidence of this form of harassment ranged from 7-12%. Staff working in a Research environment were the most likely to indicate that they had had this experience.

- > In terms of sexual orientation, bisexual staff members (24%) reported the highest incidence of someone having displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials via electronic communication or visual / written materials. Staff members who preferred not to say their sexual orientation (14%) reported the highest incidence of someone posting or sending unwelcome material electronically.
- > Compared with other age groups, staff who chose not to state their age described the highest level of unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or the display, use, or distribution of sexist or suggestive materials. Aside from this group, the trends among age groups were relatively similar, with 18-34 year olds slightly more likely to experience the display, use or distribution of sexist or suggestive materials (18%), and 45-54 year olds slightly more likely to experience unwelcome sexual comments being sent or posted (11%).

Follow Up Questions on Sexual Harassment

A set of follow up questions on sexual harassment experiences asked staff members to describe the circumstances of a particular incident that they had experienced. A total of 771 survey respondents indicated that they wished to answer the follow up questions. This represents 27% of the staff members who had completed the sexual harassment section. Not all of the individuals who said they wanted to answer them responded to each of the follow up questions.

The staff members who responded to these items identified the type of incident that they were referring to in the follow up questions as the situation that had the greatest effect on them. They could indicate more than one type of experience. The most common issue identified was sexist or sexually offensive language gestures or pictures, which was indicated by 56% of the 771 staff members who said they wanted to answer follow up questions.

The next follow up questions asked respondents about the identity of the person who was responsible for the harassment incident that had the greatest impact on them. Some staff members who indicated they wished to respond to follow up questions on sexual harassment did not say the identity of the person who was responsible. A large majority of staff who did answer this section of the survey indicated that a man had been responsible for the incident (80%). There was also a gender-related pattern, whereby males were more likely to indicate that the other person was a woman (55%) and 91% of females indicated that it was a man.

The next follow up question addressed whether the person who was responsible was a staff member or student at a higher education institution. A total of 716 of the survey participants responded to this question. Of these, 86% said that the person responsible was a staff member at a higher education institution, 12% said the person was not a staff member, and 2% did not know.

There were 708 staff members who responded to the question about whether the person responsible was a student. Sixteen per cent of these respondents said the person was a student, 83% said the person was not a student, and 2% did not know.

There were 715 staff members who responded to the question about whether the incident happened on campus. A large majority (86%) said that it did happen on campus. Compared with females (85%), a slightly lower percentage of male staff members (78%) said that the incident happened on campus.

The next follow up question asked the staff members how they reacted to the situation that they wanted to describe. This question illustrates the degree to which the individual reacted with passive or active strategies in response to being harassed, with percentages calculated against the 771 staff members who indicated they wished to respond to follow up questions.

The most frequent reaction that staff members described to the harassment situation was to have ignored the person and done nothing following the incident (45%). The next most frequent reaction was to have avoided the person / treated it like a joke (28%). More assertive responses were cited by fewer than 20% staff members who responded to this question – to tell the person to stop (19%), ask for advice and / or support (19%), and to report the person (10%).

There were relatively consistent responses given by females and males, but females were slightly more likely to avoid the person / treat it like a joke, to ask for advice and / or support, and to report the person.

The next part of the follow up section on harassment asked the staff members to say whether they had told anyone about the incident before completing the online survey. The response options were 'Yes' or 'No'. Of the 771 staff members who said they wanted to answer the follow up questions, 717 responded to this question. More than half (55%) of the staff members who responded said they had told someone about the incident prior to completing the survey. Compared with males (41%, n = 143), more females (59%) who responded to this question (n = 557) had told someone about the incident prior to completing the survey.

The final section of the follow up questions on sexual harassment split the respondents into those who had told someone prior to completing the survey and those who had not. Staff members who had told someone were provided with a set of choices as to who they had told. Staff who had not told anyone were invited to respond to a list of reasons for not disclosing the incident.

A total of 712 staff members responded to this section of the survey. This comprised 395 respondents who provided information on who they had told about the incident and 317 respondents who gave reasons why they had not told someone.

A majority of the staff members who had told someone else said that they had told a friend (57%) or another staff member (54%). Apart from this, the most frequent choices were to tell a line manager (27%), a romantic partner (35%), or a family member (24%). None of the other choices were selected by more than 6% of the respondents.

The staff members who had not told someone else prior to completing the survey about the incident they described were asked to indicate the reasons for non-disclosure.

The most common reasons for deciding not to disclose the incident to another person were that the staff member believed that it 'was not serious enough, not a crime' (49%), that they handled it themselves (38%), and that they wanted to put it behind them (34%).

7. Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence

The section on sexual violence began with a statement about whether the respondents wished to answer these questions. A total of 71% (n = 2,455) of staff members chose to answer the section in the online survey on sexual violence and 29% (n = 1,013) did not.

Respondents were first provided with information on what is meant by sexual violence and harassment:

For the purposes of this survey, sexual violence and sexual harassment collectively refer to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. It also refers to conduct that derogates, demeans, or humiliates a person based on that person's sex or gender. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, and sexual violence.

The survey respondents were told that they had the option to skip this section. If they chose to respond to this section of the survey, they read an orientating statement that read: "In the last four years, have you been in a situation in which someone related to your HEI. Please choose the appropriate response to each item". A set of six behaviourally-specific statements about sexual assault and violence then followed. These referred to:

- > Being touched inappropriately.
- > Being made to touch someone inappropriately.
- > Unwanted attempts at being stroked or kissed.
- > Having someone touch, rub or kiss private parts of their body without consent.
- > Having oral, anal, or vaginal sex without consent.
- > Someone trying to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex without consent.

For the staff group who responded to this part of the survey, the most common form of unwanted sexual contact was being touched in a way that made them feel uncomfortable (12%). Of these staff members, 7% said that it had happened to them once, 2% that it had happened twice, and 2% said that it had happened three times or more.

The next most common experience was someone making unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss the person. This was described by 4% of staff, with 2% indicating this had happened once, 1% that it happened twice, and 1% that it had happened three times or more.

Two per cent of the staff group said that someone had touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of their body or removed some of their clothes without their consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration).

One per cent or less of the staff members who responded to this part of the survey said that they had the experience of someone making them touch, stroke, or kiss them when they did not want to, that someone had tried to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with them without their consent, or that someone had oral, anal or vaginal sex with them without their consent.

- > Females (13%) were more likely than males (7%) to describe being touched in a way that made they felt uncomfortable. Gender non-binary staff (17%) and staff members who preferred not to state their gender (24%) were the most likely to have this experience.
- > The most common form of sexual misconduct experienced among the staff grouped by sexual orientation was for bisexual staff (15%) and staff who preferred not to say their orientation (26%) being touched in a way that made them feel uncomfortable.
- > There was a high level of consistency in the experience of sexual misconduct and violence among staff members across different work areas.
- > The two younger age groups described the highest rate of someone touching them in a way that made them feel uncomfortable (18-35 years: 13%; 35-44 years: 14%). The 55+ years group (7%) were least likely to say this had happened to them.

Follow Up Questions on Sexual Violence

After the section of the survey that asked about the experience of sexual violence over the past four years in connection with their higher education institution, the staff members were invited to answer follow up questions about the incident that had the greatest impact on them.

Of the 2,455 staff members who indicated that they wished to answer questions on sexual violence, 12% (n = 289) said that they wanted to answer follow up questions about the incident that had the greatest effect on them. Not all of the staff who said they wanted to complete the follow up section chose to respond to these questions.

Nearly all of the female staff members (98%) who identified the person responsible for the incident by gender said it was a man, while 37% of males said it was a man and 63% of them said it was a woman who was responsible.

Nearly three quarters (73%) of the staff who replied to this question said that the incident took place on campus. Female staff members were slightly more likely to say the incident took place on campus than males.

A large majority (84%) of the staff members who responded said that the person responsible was a staff member at a HEI. A similar percentage of females and males said the person was a staff member.

Fifteen per cent of the staff members who responded to this section said that the person responsible for the incident was a student. A greater percentage of male staff members (20%) who responded to this question said that the person responsible was a student, compared with females (12%).

The staff members who responded to the follow up questions were asked how they felt at the time of the incident. They responded to three statements, which were rated on a 5-point scale from 'Not at all' to 'Extremely'. In the following percentages, 'Very' and 'Extremely' responses are compiled into one figure.

Overall, 16% of the staff members who responded to these statements said that they had felt very or extremely scared, followed by 8% who felt that the person would hurt them if they did not go along with it, and 3% who felt their lives were in danger. Nearly one fifth of female staff reported feeling very scared, 9% felt that the other person would hurt them, and 4% that their life was in danger.

In the final section of follow up questions the participants were asked whether they had told someone about the incident before taking part in the survey. Depending on their response, the staff members who responded to this section of the survey were asked to indicate who they had told or were asked to indicate the reasons why they had not told someone. In both cases, a standard list was provided and the staff members could choose multiple options.

Overall, 237 staff members responded to the question about whether they had told someone previously about the incident. A total of 63% (n = 150) of the staff members who responded said that they had told someone about the incident prior to taking part in the survey and 37% (n = 87) had not.

Those staff members who did tell another person were asked who they had told (more than one choice was possible). The most frequent choices for the staff who had told someone about the incident were a friend (61%), another staff member (51%), a romantic partner (33%), family member (17%), or line manager (13%). None of the other choices were selected by more than 6% of the participants. Females (55%) were more likely than males (39%) to have told another staff member.

Among those participants who had not told anyone about the incident, eight of the reasons for not disclosing were selected by 10% or more staff members. The most frequently cited reasons were wanting to put it behind them (23%), handling it themselves (22%), being worried that it might affect their career (22%), feelings of shame or embarrassment (20%), not wanting anyone to know about it (18%), being scared of the offender (16%), thinking that the incident would be viewed as their fault (15%), and believing that the higher education institution or Gardaí could do nothing in response (12%).

There was a difference of approximately 10% between females and males on some of the reasons for not telling anyone. Female staff members were more likely than males to say that they wanted to put it behind them, that they were worried it might affect their career, and that they did not want anyone to know about the incident.

8. Discussion of Findings

This is the first large scale survey of staff members in Irish higher education on the topics of consent, sexual violence and harassment. As such, it provides an important insight on the attitudes and knowledge base that staff possess on these issues. These are critical points in relation to implementing a culture change framework that seeks to mobilise staff as agents of change and to engage them in awareness raising, education, and training initiatives in the

future. In addition, the survey findings provide information for the first time on staff members' experiences of sexual violence and harassment. This helps the sector to identify and assess staff support needs and priorities for action that will address the incidence of such experiences and responses made to them in the future.

The staff survey also took place in the context of a student survey methodology that employed many of the same topic areas. Taken together, both sets of findings provide a useful base to assess the experience of professionals working in higher education alongside that of students. Common issues can be identified across these groups, as well as serving to highlight particular priorities for each group.

Moreover, the staff survey findings provide a descriptive analysis of the experiences of staff sub-groups in terms of gender identity, area of work, age categories, and sexual orientation. This approach helps to identify at risk groups and target priorities for particular sub-groups among the higher education community.

Nevertheless, it should be acknowledged that while steps were taken to be inclusive in presenting the findings, there are further levels of analysis not reported here that would further enrich our understanding of staff attitudes and experiences. Staff disability status and ethnicity are two examples of diversity that were not a feature of the analysis. Given the demographic background of the participants in this survey, further work is required to explore the full range of community members in the Irish HE sector.

A minority of the staff who responded to the survey viewed the HEI as proactive and taking a leading role in developing and disseminating information on policies and procedures related to SVH. Nevertheless, a third or more of the respondents responded to these statements using the 'Neutral' or 'Don't know' response, indicating that levels of awareness of HEI activity in this area were mixed.

Similarly, there was a relatively low agreement rate in relation to staff having awareness of specific SVH reporting mechanisms. Less than half said that they were aware of how to make a report personally. A minority of staff agreed that they had knowledge of supports, lines of responsibility and information. Again, there was a relatively high percentage of staff who responded to these statements by saying they were 'Neutral' or 'Don't know'.

A minority of staff indicated that they believed their HEI or peers would respond negatively to a person who makes a report of sexual violence or harassment. This suggests that the staff members did not perceive a widespread culture of reporting being suppressed. At the same time, there was also a relatively high rate of 'Neutral' and 'Don't know' responses, continuing the

trend of a significant segment of staff members potentially lacking information or views on these issues.

Another set of statements that asked about the likelihood of the HEI taking negative actions found a similar pattern, but did identify up to a third of staff members who indicated that the HEI may suggest that reporting could affect the reputation of the institution.

A majority of the respondents to the survey indicated that the institution would provide supports or create a positive environment toward reporting sexual violence or harassment, through tangible supports such as counselling, setting up meetings, and so on. The trend toward 'Neutral' and 'Don't know' responses was again evident in response to these statements.

Taken together, the staff members' responses to the statements on campus culture and expectations for institutional responses suggest a range of views existing across the HE community. Across the responses to all of the statements, some staff viewed their HEI as unsupportive or paying insufficient attention to developing an infrastructure to support people affected by sexual violence and harassment. Other staff members tended not to have a view on these topics. Finally, a further category of staff members saw their institution as proactive and appropriately supportive.

Probing these divergent attitudes and understandings, there was a trend toward groups that are associated with higher risk of sexual violence and harassment to view the institution less positively. For instance, females, gender non-binary staff members, bisexual staff and those who are gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation were more likely to see the HEI as unsupportive or lacking in activity on SVH.

These findings on awareness of supports, policies and procedures are put in context by staff views on safety from SVH in the work environment. A total of 81% of staff said they felt safe from sexual violence and 72% agreed that they felt safe from sexual harassment. While these figures represent a clear majority, they may not meet an acceptable criterion. In addition, perceptions of safety were lower for groups that are at higher risk of SVH.

A related finding was that approximately half of the staff members felt safe in voicing concerns related to sexual violence and harassment. This figure indicates there may be some reticence in coming forward as an advocate or voice for change. Just over a third of staff members said that they had heard students or staff members discuss consent issues on campus over the past four years, which highlights the potential to increase the visibility of the topic in the future.

Perceptions of the degree to which SVH presents an issue for staff and students may contribute to a sense that this topic is not a priority. Just over a quarter of staff members agreed that SVH among students is a problem at their HEI and 16% agreed that it is a problem among staff. Perceptions of whether SVH was a problem are additionally put in context by a high rate of 'Neutral' responses to these statements, indicating that some staff members may not have sufficient information on these issues.

One very positive trend noted in the findings was for staff members to indicate a willingness to engage in a range of awareness raising, educational, and training initiatives. A large majority of staff members indicated that they would take part in training on disclosures, bystander intervention and consent awareness, if these were made available by their HEI.

A lower percentage, but still a majority, agreed that they would become involved in supportive or facilitating initiatives. On a comparable basis, almost 70% of staff members said they felt a responsibility to engage with the issue of sexual violence and harassment.

There was support for these statements across the staff group, and in particular from demographic groups such as females, Research and Technical staff, bisexual staff members, and staff aged 18-34.

There were also positive findings in respect of staff responses to statements on consent attitudes and bystander intervention. Staff member responses to statements on personal attitudes to consent indicate a strong agreement with the key principles for achieving consent to sexual intimacy. The imperative of having consent was strongly supported, although there was less clear cut support for having verbal consent for all forms of intimacy.

In addition, there was very limited agreement for female or male rape myth beliefs. The vast majority of staff members who responded to rape myth statements rejected the view that women may be responsible for being sexually assaulted or that men may not be able to control their sex drive. The highest degree of support or 'Neutral' ratings for such beliefs was in relation to female rape myths about men not meaning to engage in rape but doing so because of the influence of alcohol or a strong desire for sex.

Just over half of the staff said that they felt a sense of responsibility to intervene as a bystander in the event of sexual violence or harassment taking place. This suggests a strong base to build on. Over a third of staff members indicated that they did not know if they felt responsible for this, which may indicate limited awareness of what such action would involve. In line with this reasoning, a majority of staff said that they were not well informed about how to respond

effectively. On a similar note, a majority of staff members said that they were not well informed in receiving a disclosure of SVH from someone else.

83% of staff members who completed the survey chose to engage with the section on sexual harassment. A large proportion of staff members indicated that they had been harassed over the past four year period. For instance, 24% said that they had experienced sexualised comments related to male or female identity, 52% indicated that they had been put down due to their gender, 21% had been exposed to sexual stories or jokes, and 15% described being exposed to sexist or suggestive materials.

When reviewed by demographic characteristics, the likelihood of being sexually harassed increased substantially. Females, staff working in academic AHSS-BL or Research settings, bisexual staff members and those who are gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation, and younger staff members aged 18-34 all featured as having higher levels of sexual harassment experiences.

A minority of staff members who had responded to the questions on sexual harassment went on to complete the follow up section. The vast majority of the people who responded to follow up questions on harassment indicated that the person responsible was a member of staff at their HEI and that the incident happened on campus. A relatively small percentage of staff who responded said that they had reported the incident, and relatively passive strategies such as ignoring what had happened were relatively common. Just over half of the staff members said that they had told someone about the incident, with males less likely to have told someone about the incident prior to completing the survey.

Of those staff who had told someone what had happened, most chose to tell a friend or another staff member. A quarter had told a line manager. Among the staff members who had not told anyone about the incident of sexual harassment that most affected them, the most frequently cited reasons for not doing so were the belief that it was not serious enough and not a crime, that they handled it themselves, and that they wanted to put it behind them.

A total of 71% of the staff members who took part in the survey chose to complete the section comprising questions about the experience of sexual violence and assault that they had in connection with their HEI. The most common experience described by staff was to have been touched in a way that made them feel uncomfortable. This was the only statement that more than 10% of staff indicated had happened to them in the past four years. The next most common forms of assault were to have had someone make unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss them, or that someone had touched, kissed or rubbed against the private areas of their body.

The demographic groups at greatest risk of having these experiences were the same groups noted in other parts of the survey as experiencing higher levels of sexual harassment and less positive perceptions of their HEI's efforts to engage with the issue of SVH.

A relatively small number of staff members responded to the invitation to complete follow up questions on the incident of sexual violence that had the greatest impact on them. Of the 289 staff members who responded to this section, most said that the incident had taken place on campus and that the person responsible was a staff member. Two thirds had told someone about the incident prior to the survey, with friends and other staff members most likely to have been told. Thirteen per cent who had told someone had informed a line manager about it. A range of reasons were cited by those staff members who had not told anyone about what had happened, including shame, not wanting anyone to know, being scared of the perpetrator, as well as wanting to put it behind them and handling it themselves.

9. Recommendations

The national survey of staff has provided a timely insight on personal experiences of sexual harassment and violence in the context of the wider experience that staff have of their institution's efforts to engage with the subject of consent, sexual violence and harassment.

The key recommendations made from the findings of the survey link to the domains of:

- > Awareness, education, and training
- > Supporting people affected by sexual violence and harassment
- > Integration of staff development and support within Action Plans and national strategies
- > Ongoing research to explore context and to be inclusive of all community members

Awareness, education, and training

To increase information, awareness, knowledge and capacity of staff members throughout HEI institutions in Ireland with regard to policies and procedures relevant to consent, sexual violence and harassment. This includes policies concerning making a report of SVH to the institution as well as accessing personal supports.

The strategy to address information and knowledge gaps should take into account a likely range of needs experienced by staff in this area. Some staff do not see their HEI as supportive, while others may lack awareness of what supports are currently available. Other staff may already see the HEI as being active and supportive in relation to consent, sexual violence and harassment, but can be supported to become better informed and more able to support others.

In addition, there is a clear interest among staff members in receiving training in areas such as receiving a disclosure, intervening as an active bystander where appropriate, and supportive preventative sexual consent programmes. These skill sets can be offered on a tiered basis. As a result, the strategy for building capacity and mobilising the staff community should be planned for different levels of engagement. Those levels may range from having an initial level of awareness across all staff, to targeted briefings and education for staff in key positions in the institution, and on to more intensive training and ongoing support for staff members interested in playing an active role in supporting colleagues and students.

The focus of staff development should take into account the role that staff members may have in supporting students through orientation programmes, integration into academic programmes, and so on. In addition, the findings of the survey suggest a need for staff development to support their peers and colleagues as well as students.

Where possible, staff awareness, education, and training programmes should be integrated with the institutional Action Plans. They should engage with other aspects of the HEI as appropriate to ensure that staff development is sustainable and part of an ongoing strategy, such as by being aligned with relevant institutional units and monitored for take up and impact.

Supporting people affected by sexual violence and harassment

The findings of the survey indicate that a large percentage of the staff who took part had experienced sexual harassment at some point over the past four years. To a lesser extent, the staff members described the experience of sexual assault and violence. To date, this phenomenon has not been acknowledged appropriately in resourcing and support initiatives organised by HEIs. In identifying these issues for the first time in a detailed way, the survey points to the need to develop a response that can guide the sector and provide a feasible, sustainable model for individual institutions to follow.

The system of support for staff members who are affected by SVH would be likely to involve key areas involved in making reports and seeking supports. It should range across topic areas such as a review of the reporting and investigation processes undertaken by HEIs, identifying pathways for informal support and formal reporting that includes local HEI units and line managers, and ensuring accessibility of personal counselling supports. The need for enhanced supports should be underpinned by a trauma-informed approach which involves local stakeholders such as rape crisis centres and specialists.

Integration of staff development and support within Action Plans and national strategies

The topic of consent, sexual violence and harassment has recently gained prominence as a feature of the student experience. The 'Consent Framework' published by the Department of Education & Skills in 2019 highlighted staff as having a critical role in supporting culture change, for instance through enhanced awareness and capacity building. Primarily, this theme in the 'Consent Framework' was directed toward staff support for students. This is addressed in the earlier recommendation on awareness, education, and training.

In addition, there is a need to accommodate staff needs and priorities within institutional Action Plans and the national strategies that underpin and guide these local plans. Integrating supports for staff affected by SVH within plans and national strategy is an important step in acknowledging the experiences of staff members, and to ensure that efforts to address issues such as sexual harassment are sustainable.

Incorporating staff members within national strategies designed to promote positive behaviour and end sexual violence and harassment will require an approach that identifies the needs of particular staff groups. The survey findings point to the relevance of prioritising particular groups and fitting initiatives in an inclusive manner to the needs of females, sexual orientation minorities, younger staff members, and staff in particular work areas.

Besides incorporating staff needs within strategies explicitly linked to consent, sexual violence and harassment, there is much to gain by supporting collaboration with other strategic priorities in the HE sector. These include equality, diversity and inclusion, research governance, and healthy campuses.

Ongoing research to explore context and to be inclusive of all community members

As the first national survey of staff members in the Irish higher education sector, the survey findings have highlighted key trends and priorities. The report also acknowledges that, to be inclusive, it will be necessary to conduct further research with groups such as staff members with a disability, international staff, and staff from non-traditional backgrounds.

The findings also point to the need to explore the context in which staff members have experienced sexual violence and harassment. The survey findings point to important trends that require further exploration to understand how harassment in particular takes place and is responded to within the HEI sector. A better understanding of the decision making and experiences linked to disclosure and support seeking will help to inform efforts to enhance the responses that HEIs make to assist their staff. In addition, the most effective ways to provide awareness raising and education should be studied across a broad profile of staff as a way to understand how to build capacity and empowerment among the wider HEI community.

The national survey methodology should be reviewed in order to identify how ongoing monitoring and survey work can be carried out as effectively as possible. Continued development of the survey methodology through reviewing the content, response rates, and inclusiveness of the survey process will help to strengthen this approach. Several of the survey sections could prove useful for ongoing yearly monitoring of the impacts of projects to enhance awareness and knowledge. A sustained commitment to large scale surveys of staff and students will be a key support for a strategy of campus climate change, toward the goal of supporting positive behaviours and successfully addressing the issue of sexual violence and harassment.

2 Analysis of Survey Responses

10. Staff Survey Content and Methodology

10.1 Overview

This survey of staff members working at Irish Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) was carried out in 2021 to identify key trends in staff members' attitudes, knowledge, and experiences related to consent, sexual violence and harassment. Separate national surveys of staff and of students were carried out in April 2021 led by the Higher Education Authority HEA Centre for Excellence for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. Both surveys were requested by the Minister for Further & Higher Education, Research, Innovation & Skills in 2020. The survey tool for staff adapted the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey for use in an Irish context.

The ARC3 survey is a flexible, modular resource designed to meet the need for survey methodologies that are appropriate for assessing the experiences of staff members in higher education (Swartout, Flack, & Holland, 2021). It builds on the ARC3 survey tool for students, which is in itself reflective of a trend in the past decade in the U.S. for researcher-designed survey tools that assess consent, sexual violence and harassment in the wider ecology of the higher education organisation.

As yet, there has been little development of campus climate survey methods for staff in Europe. This methodology is distinctive in that it aims to develop a socio-ecological analysis of consent, sexual violence and harassment. Such an analysis has the advantage of identifying the incidence of negative experiences such as sexual assault and harassment, while also exploring information, knowledge and capacity to engage with institutional processes.

These processes include reporting and complaints procedures, institutional policies and frameworks, access to supports and services, and the individual's knowledge of initiatives related to prevention, disclosure support, education and training. These are distinct issues, presented as separate survey modules, and can be adapted to the specific purposes of a survey-based research study.

The 2021 national surveys were designed by the Higher Education Authority (HEA) Advisory Group on Ending Sexual Violence and Harassment in Irish Higher Education Institutions, which is led by the HEA Centre for Excellence for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. The ARC3 Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey was adapted to the culture and requirements of the Irish higher education system, particularly in light of the 2019 'Consent Framework' published by the Department of Education & Skills. The Framework has led to the adoption of Action Plans by each HEI across the country.

Initially, the agenda for the Framework and associated Actions focused on student needs, however the critical importance of staff members has gained increased prominence and acknowledgement:

- > Firstly, staff themselves may be subject to sexual violence and harassment (SVH), and we lack a systematic perspective on the incidence and patterns that these experiences may take.
- > Secondly, staff are a powerful force for culture change and development in a socio-ecological, systems-based perspective on addressing consent, sexual violence and harassment in higher education.

It is therefore imperative to assess staff members' personal experiences that may give rise to distress and trauma, while also gauging how staff capacity building can be supported as a positive force for change while institutional Action Plans are implemented. Many staff have engaged with this work as activists and in their job roles for some time. Yet it is important to identify how these efforts may be made sustainable, supported by education and training programmes.

Furthermore, the Consent Framework also identifies prerequisites for institutions and the higher education sector, such as ensuring that all staff have a minimal level of awareness of the issues involved in consent, sexual violence and harassment. The move toward designing and implementing trauma-informed policies and opportunities for reporting on sexual violence and harassment, such as the newly launched Speak Out tool, necessitate that the sector has a good level of knowledge of staff experiences and attitudes.

The national survey of Irish HEIs began with the adaptation of the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey. Questions were adapted in consultation with the HEA Advisory Group on Ending Sexual Violence and Harassment in Irish Higher Education Institutions.

Additional topics and questions were also included and are discussed in more detail below. Given the sensitivity of the survey topics, the survey had an extensive introduction section, links to supports that could be accessed by staff, and content warnings ahead of particular sections. Staff had the opportunity at several points to opt out of sections dealing with topics such as sexual violence.

10.2 Survey Content

The main body of the survey contained questions and statements regarding staff perceptions of campus climate regarding sexual misconduct, campus safety, consent attitudes and practices, bystander attitudes and practices. The survey contained sections on personal experiences of

sexual harassment experiences and sexual violence victimisation that took place in the past four years and which had a link to the survey participants' HEI.

The modules that comprised the survey included:

Demographic questions. The first module, Demographics, included age, gender identity, sex assigned at birth, disability status, ethnicity, sexual orientation, the person's current HEI, area of work, and employment details.

Campus Environment. Campus environment pertains to staff exposure to available consent and sexual violence-related resources, educational messages about sexual assault, and their opinions of the institution's response to sexual violence. The items in this section were adapted from a module of the ARC3 Campus Climate Survey that used the Rutgers Campus Climate Survey (Rutgers University, 2014), White House Task Force to protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014), Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, and additional campus climate projects (McMahon, 2014; McMahon, Stapleton, & Cusano, 2014; Rankin & Associates Consulting, 2008).

Several statements were developed to assess staff awareness and perceived effectiveness and accessibility of the sexual violence-related policies and procedures at their HEI and perceptions about their institution's efforts to reduce sexual misconduct. Staff were asked to rate their agreement in response to several statements, for example, 'My HEI proactively addresses issues of sexual violence and harassment', responding on a 5-point scale ranging from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'. Staff could also select 'Don't know' in response to each statement.

Eight items were developed to assess awareness of, and willingness to engage in sexual consent and sexual violence related training for staff, for example, 'I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institutions'. Staff responded to each statement using a 5-point rating scale ranging from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'.

Eight statements were developed for the purpose of this survey to assess staff perceptions regarding their HEI's response to a staff member reporting an incident of sexual harassment and/or violence, for example, 'My institutions would play an active role by actively supporting the person with either formal or informal resources'. Responses were rated on a 5-point scale from 'Very unlikely' to 'Very likely'.

Campus safety. Three statements assessed staff feelings of safety from sexual harassment and violence at their HEI, for example, 'I feel safe from sexual violence at my HEI'. Responses were recorded on a 5-point scale ranging from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'. These items were based on adapted items from the Safety Subscale of The General Campus Climate Survey (Cortina et al., 1998) used in the ARC3 Campus Climate Survey.

Three statements assessed staff perceptions regarding sexual violence and harassment at their HEI, for example, staff were asked to rate their level of agreement to statements like 'Sexual violence or harassment among faculty and staff is a problem at my HEI'. These items were derived from the Rutgers Campus Climate Survey (Banyard et al., 2014).

Consent attitudes. Staff consent attitudes regarding consent negotiation were assessed using The Sexual Consent Scale-Revised (SCS-R; Humphreys & Brousseau, 2010). Items were redrafted to ask about perceptions of students' attitudes to consent as well as staff members' personal attitudes. Responses were recorded using a 5-point scale from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'. Exposure to staff and students discussing consent issues over the past four years were assessed using a 'Yes' / 'No' measure.

Bystander intervention. Four statements assessed staff feelings towards and experience of engaging in bystander intervention, for example, "in the last four years I have made an intervention as a bystander to incident(s) of sexual harassment and/or violence involving students and/or staff".

Two items assessed staff preparedness regarding acting as a bystander and responding to a disclosure of sexual harassment and/or violence. Staff reported how informed they were regarding these topics on a five point scale ranging from 'Not informed at all' to 'Completely informed'. These items were derived from a modified version of the Bystander Attitudes Scale (Banyard et al., 2002), used in the ARC3 Campus Climate Survey.

Rape myth acceptance. The Updated Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (McMahon, 2010), which aims to understand attitudes and beliefs around sexual assault, was used to assess general rape myth acceptance. Two sub-scales were used to assess whether endorsement of false gendered beliefs about rape would decrease following the programme.

Sexual harassment victimisation. The frequency and type of sexual harassment experienced by staff over the past four years was measured using a modified version of nine items from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995) used in the ARC3 Campus Climate survey version. Additional items regarding sexual and sexist hostility related to one's gender, trans or non-binary identity, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and religious affiliation were included. Three items were also included measuring media-based harassment from the AAUW Knowledge Networks Survey (Nukukji, 2011). Additional follow up questions provided more detailed information about the sexual harassment incident that had the greatest effect on them.

Sexual violence victimisation. Staff experience of sexual misconduct measures over the past four years were derived from the Sexual Experiences Survey Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV) (Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Koss & Oros, 1982).

11. Demographics of Respondents

Of the 3,516 responses to the online staff survey, 64% worked in a university, 22% at an Institute of Technology, 12% at a different HEI, and 1% preferred not to say. The key demographic factors recorded in the survey, included age, gender identity, disability status, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. The main body of the report describes the findings for the whole sample and for particular demographic groups based on gender, age, sexual orientation, and area of work. Some of these demographic characteristics are grouped when reported in the main findings, for convenience of reporting and as there were low number in some demographic categories.

Reviewing the breakdown of survey responses by gender, 69% were female, 30% were male, 1% were gender non-binary gender, and 1% of staff respondents preferred not to say their gender.

Table 11.1: Gender composition of the staff online survey respondents.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Number	2,399	1,059	18	40	3,516
Percentage	68.8	30.1	0.5	1.1	100.0

Staff members were most likely to fall within the 45-54 age category, followed by 35-44 years, then 55-64 years, and 25-34. Smaller percentages were aged over 65, 18-24, or preferred not to say their age. For the purposes of reporting on the findings, the age categories were grouped into 18-34 (14%), 35-44 (28%), 45-54 (35%), 55+ years (22%), and those who preferred not to say their age.

Table 11.2: Breakdown of age profile of the staff survey respondents, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
18-24	1.0	0.7	5.6	2.5	1.0
25-34	13.3	11.0	38.9	10.0	12.7
35-44	29.8	25.2	16.7	15.0	28.2
45-54	36.2	33.5	27.8	37.5	35.4
55-64	18.0	25.8	11.1	15.0	20.3
65+	1.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	1.6
Prefer not to say	0.7	0.8	0.0	20.0	0.9

One per cent of the staff members indicated that their gender identity was not the same as that assigned at birth. Over half of staff (56%) with a non-binary gender identity said their gender was different to that assigned at birth.

Table 11.3: Percentage of staff members who responded to the demographic item on whether the person's gender identity was the same as that assigned at birth, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Yes	99.6	99.7	22.2	17.5	98.3
No	0.3	0.2	55.6	0.0	0.5
Prefer not to say	0.2	0.1	22.2	82.5	1.2

Six per cent of the staff respondents said that they had a disability. Gender non-binary staff were particularly likely to say that they had a disability (39%).

Table 11.4: Percentage of staff members who responded to say they had a disability, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Yes	6.5	5.3	38.9	7.5	6.3
No	91.1	93.1	55.6	52.5	91.1
Prefer not to say	2.4	1.6	5.6	40.0	2.6

The percentage of staff who identified with specific disability categories included in the online survey are indicated below. The most frequent form of disability within this group was having a mental health difficulty (35%). Males with a disability (28%) were less likely to say they had a mental health difficulty than females (37%) or non-binary staff (43%). The next most common type of disability among staff was an ongoing physical illness (25%).

Table 11.5: Percentage of staff members with specific disabilities, within those who identified as having a disability, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Specific learning difficulty e.g., dyslexia	8.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	8.9
Physical or mobility related	14.0	13.0	14.3	0.0	13.6
Blind or visually impaired	2.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	2.3
Deaf or hard of hearing	4.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.3
Mental health difficulty	37.3	27.8	42.9	33.3	35.0
ASD or Asperger's, ADD, ADHD	4.0	14.8	0.0	0.0	6.5
Ongoing physical illness	26.0	20.4	14.3	66.7	24.8
Prefer not to say	4.7	5.6	28.6	0.0	5.6

83% of the staff who took part in the study identified their ethnicity as White Irish and another 13% identified as having another White background. Between one and two per cent of the respondents identified with other ethnic backgrounds such as Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi (1%), mixed background (1%). One per cent of the staff members preferred not to say their ethnicity or racial background.

Table 11.6: Percentage of staff members who identified with a particular ethnic or racial background, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Asian or Asian Irish: Chinese	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3
Asian or Asian Irish: Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi	0.4	0.9	0.0	5.0	0.6
Black or Black Irish: African	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.2
Black or Black Irish: Any other Black background	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Other including mixed group/background: Arabic	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3
Other including mixed group/background: Mixed Background	0.7	0.6	5.6	0.0	0.7
Other including mixed group/background: Other	0.8	0.4	0.0	5.0	0.7
White: Irish	84.2	79.9	55.6	42.5	82.3
White: Irish Traveller	0.0	0.1	5.6	0.0	0.1
White: Roma	0.2	0.1	5.6	0.0	0.2
Any other White background	12.0	15.5	22.2	5.0	13.0
Prefer not to say	0.6	1.6	5.6	42.5	1.4

The percentage of staff who identified with each of the sexual orientation categories included in the online survey is indicated below. The largest percentage of staff (88%) were heterosexual. For convenience in reporting, the sexual orientations are grouped into five categories in the main body of the findings: (a) Asexual (1% of the sample), (b) Bisexual (4%), (c) Gay, lesbian, queer, and other orientations (5%), (d) Heterosexual (88%), and (e) Prefer not to say (3%).

Table 11.7: Percentage of staff who identified with each type of sexual orientation, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Gender Non- binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Asexual	1.4	1.1	11.1	2.5	1.4
Bisexual	3.8	2.5	33.3	2.5	3.6
Gay	0.5	7.4	0.0	2.5	2.6
Heterosexual/Straight	90.0	85.6	16.7	32.5	87.7
Lesbian	1.3	0.1	5.6	0.0	0.9
Queer	0.4	0.9	27.8	0.0	0.7
Prefer not to say	2.2	2.0	5.6	57.5	2.8
Orientation not listed here	0.4	0.3	0.0	2.5	0.4

The staff members cited a number of types of work contract, the most common of which were ‘full-time permanent / indefinite duration’ (69%), ‘full-time fixed-term contract’ (17%), and ‘part-time permanent / indefinite duration’ (5%). One third (34%) had been working at the Higher Education Institution for 1-5 years, 16% for 6-10 years, 15% for 11-15 years, 16% for 16-20 years, 11% for 21-25 years, and the remaining 8% had worked at their HEI for more than 26 years. A total of 1% of the students preferred not to say how long they had been working there.

Academic staff members worked as academics in Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences (20% of the total number of respondents), Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (16%), Medicine and Health (8%), or Business and Law (7%). Five per cent indicated that they worked in a research environment, in a Research Centre or Institute (4%) or as a Research Fellow (2%). One third (35%) worked in Professional, managerial and support services (35%), in Technical support (3%), or in another work area (4%), and 2% preferred not to say their area of work or discipline. More males than females worked as academics in STEM-MH, while more females than males worked in Professional, managerial and support services.

For convenience of reporting, the areas of work and disciplinary areas were categorised as academics in AHSS-BL (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business and Law) (28%), academics in STEM-MH (STEM, Medicine and Health (23%), Research (5%), Professional / technical (Professional, managerial, support services, and technical support) (38%), and Prefer not to say / Other (6.2%).

Table 11.8: Breakdown of area of work or disciplinary area, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Academic: Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences	19.8	19.9	44.4	22.5	20.7
Academic: Business and Law	7.0	8.3	0.0	10.0	7.4
Academic: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics	10.9	26.8	5.6	30.0	15.9
Academic: Medicine and Health	8.0	6.8	0.0	0.0	7.5
Research Centre / Institute	3.7	3.2	5.6	5.0	3.6
Research Fellow	1.6	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.7
Professional, Managerial and Support services	40.8	22.9	22.2	2.5	34.8
Technical Support	2.0	5.1	5.6	0.0	2.9
Other	4.4	3.0	11.1	2.5	4.0
Preferred not to say	1.9	1.9	5.6	27.5	2.2

Several of the demographic characteristics of the staff members are focused on in the findings of the report. The report portrays descriptive findings by gender identity, area of work, sexual orientation, and age. The intention is to provide perspectives on the findings that are relevant in terms of known risk factors for sexual violence and harassment, and to provide insights relevant to inclusion, organisational factors, and staff development. It is acknowledged that to be fully inclusive the report could also examine factors such as ethnicity and disability. The report format that was adopted was intended to address the need for an inclusive, comprehensive approach to describing findings on a range of different factors. The main demographic factors referred to are:

Gender:

- > Female
- > Male
- > Gender non-binary
- > Prefer not to say

Area or discipline of work:

- > AHSS-BL (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business and Law)
- > STEM-MH-HS (STEM-MH and Health Sciences)
- > Research
- > Professional, managerial, support and technical services (Professional / technical)
- > Prefer not to say / Other

Sexual orientation:

- > Asexual
- > Bisexual
- > Gay, lesbian, queer, or another orientation
- > Heterosexual
- > Prefer not to say

Age categories:

- > 18-34 years
- > 35-44 years
- > 45-54 years
- > 55+
- > Prefer not to say

12. Campus Environment

This section of the survey covered staff beliefs, awareness, and knowledge of their institution's policies, practices, and supports in response to consent, sexual violence and harassment (SVH). The statements in this section were presented in groups that relate to:

- > Beliefs about whether the institution would investigate reports of SVH in a proactive, appropriate manner.
- > Staff awareness of policies and procedures on SVH at their HEI.
- > Beliefs about SVH-related training and reporting mechanisms.
- > Willingness to engage in campus consent and sexual violence initiatives.

The tables below describe staff responses to the items grouped by gender identity.

12.1 Beliefs about Institutional Policies and Practices

Staff members responded to a set of statements about policies and procedures related to SVH at their HEI. They responded to a 5-point agreement scale from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree' with the addition of a 'Don't know' option. The 'Strongly agree' and 'Agree' are combined in the tables below, as are the 'Strong disagree' and 'Disagree' options are combined.

Approximately one third of the staff members agreed that their HEI is proactive in addressing issues of sexual violence and harassment (37%), that policies and procedures at their HEI to tackle sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit (37%), and that senior management are visible in addressing these issues (31%). By comparison, a higher percentage of staff (55%) agreed that they are aware of policies at their institution to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment, and a smaller percentage of staff (21%) agreed that policies and procedures on this topic are effective.

Table 12.1: Percentage of staff who chose the ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly agree’ response options to statements on institutional policies and practices, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
I am aware of policies at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment	51.2	62.6	38.9	57.5	54.6
My HEI proactively addresses issues of sexual violence and harassment	32.6	47.7	33.3	40.0	37.3
Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit	32.6	47.7	33.3	40.0	37.2
Senior management at my HEI are visible in addressing issues around sexual violence and harassment	26.6	41.0	27.8	37.5	31.1
Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are effective	17.0	30.9	22.2	32.5	21.4

Agreement levels with statements concerning institutional policies and procedures were widely distributed across the response options. Taking the staff group as a whole:

- > Rates of disagreement ranged from 22% (that policies and procedures are effective) to 32% (senior management are visible in addressing issues around SVH).
- > The percentage of staff who selected the ‘neutral’ option ranged from 13% (awareness of policies) to 27% (that policies and procedures are effective).
- > Agreement levels ranged from 21% (that policies and procedures are effective) to 55% (awareness of policies).
- > The percentage of staff who chose the ‘Don’t know’ option varied from 7% (awareness of policies) to 30% (that policies and procedures are effective).

The range in response options selected is illustrated below with a statement on the clarity and explicitness of policies and procedures. Over one quarter of staff respondents disagreed with this statement, one fifth were neutral, and 37% agreed with it.

Table 12.2: Distribution of responses on beliefs about institutional policies and practices on SVH being clear and explicit, for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit	26.3	20.3	37.2	16.2

There were consistent gender differences in agreement levels on this set of items. Agreement levels tended to differ by 10-15% by gender. Typically, male staff members were more likely to agree with the statements, although the percentage of males who agreed with any statement exceeded 60% only in relation to being aware of SVH policies.

Table 12.3: Distribution of responses on the statement 'Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit', by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
Female	29.8	20.2	32.5	17.4
Male	17.9	20.5	47.7	13.9
Non-binary	44.4	11.1	33.4	11.1
Prefer not to say	27.5	22.5	30.0	10.0

When agreement levels were reviewed by staff members' area of work, Professional / technical staff tended to have the highest agreement levels with statements in this section, followed by academics working in STEM-MH. Academic AHSS-BL and Research staff tended to have lower rates of agreement. Differences of this nature tended to be in the range of 5-10%. This pattern is illustrated below.

Table 12.4: Distribution of responses on the statement 'Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit', by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
AHSS-BL	33.7	18.7	31.4	16.2
STEM-MH	23.5	19.6	38.9	18.0
Research	25.9	19.5	31.9	22.7
Professional / technical	23.0	21.8	41.4	13.8

Reviewed by staff member sexual orientation, bisexual staff and staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or had another sexual orientation tended to have slightly lower agreement rates than heterosexual or asexual staff members. Differences of this kind tended to be in the range of approximately 5% or so, as illustrated below.

Table 12.5: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
Asexual	12.5	29.2	41.7	16.7
Bisexual	38.1	13.5	35.7	12.7
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	36.4	17.9	30.9	14.8
Heterosexual	25.3	20.5	37.6	16.5
Prefer not to say	30.6	20.4	35.7	13.3

There was a clear trend for staff members in the 18-34 and 34-44 age categories to be less likely to agree with the statements about policies and procedures. Differences between these groups and the 45-54 years category tended to be 5-10%, while differences between the younger age groups and the 55+ years category tended to be up to 20%. This trend is illustrated below.

Table 12.6: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
18-34	33.6	16.7	31.5	18.2
35-44	29.1	20.7	30.9	19.3
45-54	25.6	22.1	37.3	15.0
55+	18.9	18.9	49.0	13.3
Prefer not to say	33.3	24.2	27.3	15.2

12.2 Awareness of reporting mechanisms and supports for staff

This set of statements concerned staff members’ awareness of specific reporting mechanisms for sexual violence and harassment at their HEI. They responded to a 5-point agreement scale from ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’ with the addition of a ‘Don’t know’ option. The ‘Strongly agree’ and ‘Agree’ are combined in the tables below, as are the ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘Disagree’ options are combined.

The highest rate of agreement referred to awareness of how to make a report personally (44%) or if another person had experienced SVH (38%). Agreement levels on most of the statements concerning staff knowledge of reporting were between 20-30%. These included 31% of staff in agreement that they had knowledge of available supports, 28% that there are clear lines of responsibility for dealing with reports, and 27% indicating awareness of informational messaging about reporting and responding to SVH.

Lower levels of agreement were evident in response to statements that their HEI has an easy-to-use system for reporting SVH (21%) and that training is available on how to report or respond to disclosures (21%). The lowest level of agreement concerned knowing what supports would be available if the person themselves was accused of perpetrating SVH (16%).

Table 12.7: Percentage of staff by agreed or strongly agreed with statements on awareness of reporting mechanisms and supports for staff, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
If I was subjected to sexual violence and/or harassment I would know how to report this to my HEI	39.8	51.9	33.3	42.5	43.5
If someone I knew was subjected to sexual violence and/or harassment I would know how to report this to my HEI	33.9	47.8	27.8	40.0	38.1
If I reported a case of sexual violence and/or harassment I would know what supports were available to me at my HEI	27.7	37.8	38.9	25.0	30.8
There are clear lines of responsibility for dealing with reporting of sexual violence and harassment at my HEI	23.9	37.7	27.8	30.0	28.2
I am aware of ongoing messaging at my HEI that disseminates information around reporting and responding to incidents of sexual violence and harassment	21.6	37.0	38.9	40.0	26.5

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
My HEI has an easy-to-use system for staff to report incidents of sexual violence and harassment	18.1	28.2	22.2	25.0	21.3
Training on how to report and respond to disclosures of personal experiences of sexual violence and harassment involving staff and/or students is available to me at my HEI	17.4	28.4	33.3	32.5	21.0
If I were accused of perpetrating sexual violence and/or harassment I would know what supports were available to me at my HEI	14.4	20.3	22.2	10.0	16.2

There was considerable variation among staff members in the response options chosen to statements in this part of the survey:

- > Rates of disagreement with the statements tended to be higher than rates of agreement. Disagreement ranged from 27% (there is an easy-to-use system for reporting) to 58% (knowing what supports are available if accused of perpetrating SVH).
- > The percentage of staff who selected the neutral option was relatively consistent, ranging from 10% (knowing how to report SVH to the HEI) to 17% (there is an easy-to-use system for reporting).
- > Agreement levels ranged from 16% (knowing what supports are available if accused of perpetrating SVH) to 44% (knowing how to report SVH to the HEI).
- > Between 6% (knowing how to report SVH to the HEI) and 34% (there is an easy-to-use system for reporting) of staff chose the 'Don't know' option.

The distribution of agreement levels on statements in this section of the survey is illustrated below. In this example, nearly half (47%) of staff members disagreed that they were aware of ongoing messaging about reporting and responding to SVH. Approximately one quarter (27%) of the staff chose the 'Neutral' or 'Don't know' option, and a similar percentage (27%) agreed that they were aware of messaging of this kind.

Table 12.8: Distribution of responses on awareness of ongoing messaging about reporting and responding to SVH, for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
I am aware of ongoing messaging at my HEI that disseminates information around reporting and responding to incidents of sexual violence and harassment	46.5	15.9	26.5	11.1

There tended to be a gender difference of 10-15% between male and female staff in agreement levels. Male staff were more likely to agree that they had relevant knowledge and awareness.

Table 12.9: Distribution of responses on the statement 'Training on how to report and respond to disclosures of personal experiences of sexual violence and harassment involving staff and/or students is available to me at my HEI', by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
Female	35.5	13.3	17.3	33.8
Male	25.5	20.5	28.4	25.6
Non-binary	22.2	5.6	33.4	38.9
Prefer not to say	30.0	15.0	32.5	22.5

Analysed by staff members' area of work, Professional / technical staff tended to have the highest agreement levels that they knew how to make a report of SVH, followed by academic staff working in STEM-MH. Academics in AHSS-BL and Research staff had a lower rate of agreement. Typically, the rate of agreement among the staff groups differed by 5-10% in response to these statements. There were examples of larger differences, for example 30% of Research staff agreed they knew how to report SVH compared with 48% of Professional / technical staff. A typical example of differences between staff in different work areas is illustrated below.

Table 12.10: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘Training on how to report and respond to disclosures of personal experiences of sexual violence and harassment involving staff and/or students is available to me at my HEI’, by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
AHSS-BL	35.9	14.6	19.1	30.5
STEM-MH	28.3	16.2	22.0	33.5
Research	25.9	15.7	22.2	36.2
Professional / technical	33.5	15.8	21.2	29.4
Prefer not to say / Other	30.1	14.6	22.4	32.9

Bisexual staff members and staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or had another sexual orientation tended to have lower agreement rates on statements about reporting procedures than heterosexual or asexual staff members. Differences in agreement levels tended to range from 5-10% by sexual orientation.

The largest contrast was in the percentage of staff members who agreed that they knew how to report sexual violence or harassment in their HEI. This percentage ranged from 54% of asexual staff members to 44% of heterosexual staff, 40% of staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation, 39% of staff who preferred not to say their sexual orientation, and 30% of bisexual staff members. Differences in agreement levels by sexual orientation are illustrated below.

Table 12.11: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘Training on how to report and respond to disclosures of personal experiences of sexual violence and harassment involving staff and/or students is available to me at my HEI’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
Asexual	22.9	33.3	14.6	29.2
Bisexual	36.5	9.5	23.0	31.0
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	34.0	13.6	21.6	30.9
Heterosexual	32.1	15.5	20.7	31.6
Prefer not to say	35.7	16.3	27.6	20.4

There was a wide distribution of responses to statements about reporting mechanisms by age group. Younger age groups were less likely to agree with the statements presented. There were differences in the range of 5-20%+ in the percentage of the 18-34 years and the 55+ years age groups who agreed with these statements. The largest difference was in knowing how to report a personal experience of SVH to the HEI, which ranged from 31% agreement (18-34 year olds), to 37% (35-44 years), 46% (45-54), and 56% (55 years+). This trend is illustrated below.

Table 12.12: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘Training on how to report and respond to disclosures of personal experiences of sexual violence and harassment involving staff and/or students is available to me at my HEI’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
18-34	33.4	12.3	20.9	13.4
35-44	34.0	14.0	17.1	14.9
45-54	33.5	16.2	19.5	30.9
55+	27.3	18.1	28.3	26.3
Prefer not to say	42.4	18.2	21.2	18.2

12.3 Negative perceptions of making reports of sexual violence or harassment

Three statements in the survey referred to staff expectations for how reports of sexual violence or harassment are viewed in their HEI work culture. Two statements concerned the response made by the HEI and one referred to the person alleged to have been responsible. Responses were made on a 5-point scale from ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’, with the additional inclusion of a ‘Don’t know’ option.

Agreement with these statements indicated a belief that people who reported SVH would be viewed negatively. More staff disagreed than agreed with these items. Approximately one fifth (18-20%) of staff were in agreement that there would be a negative response to a person who reported SVH.

Table 12.13: Percentage of staff who agreed that there would be negative responses to someone making a report of SVH, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, other staff would see the person making the report as a troublemaker	22.4	13.2	5.6	37.5	19.7
If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, it would be hard for other staff to support the person who made the report	20.2	12.0	11.1	32.5	17.8

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, the person making the report would be subjected to retaliation, retribution or negative responses from the alleged offender(s) or their friends	19.5	12.7	16.7	30.0	17.6

There was wide range of responses made to the three statements:

- > Between 43% (the person would be subject to retaliation, retribution or negative responses) and 51% (it would be hard for other staff to support the person making the report) of staff disagreed with these statements.
- > A consistent percentage of staff (between 16-18%) chose the 'Neutral' option across these statements.
- > A similar percentage (18-20%) of staff members agreed with the three statements.
- > The 'Don't know' option was selected by between 14% (other staff see the person as a troublemaker) and 22% (the person would be subject to retaliation, retribution or negative responses) of staff.

The distribution of agreement levels on statements in this section of the survey is illustrated below. Half of the staff who responded disagreed that someone who makes a report of SVH would be seen by colleagues as a troublemaker, while nearly one third (30%) chose either the 'Neutral' or 'Don't know' response, and 20% agreed that they would be seen as a troublemaker.

Table 12.14: Distribution of responses to an illustrative statement about responses to making a report of SVH, for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, other staff would see the person making the report as a troublemaker	50.1	16.2	19.7	14.0

There was a consistent gender difference in ratings of these items. Females and staff who preferred not to say their gender identity had the highest rates of agreement that there would be a negative response to someone who makes a report of SVH, with a difference of 8-9% between females and males.

Table 12.15: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, other staff would see the person making the report as a troublemaker’, by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
Female	44.4	17.1	22.4	16.0
Male	63.3	14.3	13.2	9.2
Non-binary	55.6	16.7	5.6	22.2
Prefer not to say	40.0	7.5	37.5	15.0

Responses to the statements about responses to reporting SVH did not differ extensively by area of work. Rates of agreement typically varied by approximately 5% between these areas. The rate of agreement was slightly higher among AHSS-BL academic staff, as illustrated below.

Table 12.16: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, other staff would see the person making the report as a troublemaker’, by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
AHSS-BL	46.3	18.3	23.0	12.5
STEM-MH	56.0	12.7	18.9	12.5
Research	43.2	17.8	18.9	20.0
Professional / technical	51.4	16.3	17.4	14.8
Prefer not to say / Other	43.4	17.4	23.3	16.0

Agreement ratings tended to differ by 10-15% across sexual orientation categories. Compared with heterosexual and asexual staff, those who identified as bisexual or as gay, lesbian, queer, or another orientation were more likely to agree that making a report would meet disapproval in the HEI. Staff members who preferred not to state their sexual orientation also had relatively high levels of agreement.

Table 12.17: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, other staff would see the person making the report as a troublemaker’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
Asexual	45.8	22.9	18.8	12.5
Bisexual	40.5	12.7	27.8	19.0
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	46.3	16.0	24.7	13.0
Heterosexual	51.1	16.2	18.9	13.8
Prefer not to say	39.8	16.3	28.6	15.3

Agreement levels differed by approximately 5% across staff age categories. Staff members aged 55+ tended to have lower rates of agreement with these statements. Staff who preferred not to state their age had a relatively high rate of agreement with these statements.

Table 12.18: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, other staff would see the person making the report as a troublemaker’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
18-34	50.5	14.0	20.3	15.2
35-44	45.1	17.4	21.6	15.9
45-54	50.3	16.7	20.0	13.0
55+	57.1	14.8	16.0	12.1
Prefer not to say	30.3	18.2	30.3	21.2

12.4 Perceptions of Organisational Culture and Support – Positive actions and culture

Eight statements in the survey asked staff members for their perspective on whether it was likely that their higher education institution would provide supports to a person who makes a report of sexual violence or harassment. Five of these statements described positive cultural attributes and practices and three of them referred to negative features of organisational culture. The response scale for these items was a 5-point measure from ‘Very unlikely’ to ‘Very likely’. The ‘Very likely’ and ‘Likely’ responses are combined in the tables below, as are the ‘Very unlikely’ and ‘Unlikely’ responses.

The five positive statements are described first, followed by the three statements that reflected negatively on organisational culture. Two of the positive statements referred to ‘creating an environment’ in general terms and three of them described specific practices.

Half or more of the staff members said it was likely that the institution would provide supports or create a positive environment toward reporting SVH – through providing tangible supports such as counselling or meetings (62%), by creating an environment where SVH was recognised as a problem (54%), by accommodating the person’s needs (52%), and by creating an environment where SVH experiences were safe to discuss (49%). One of the positively worded statements received support by less than half of the staff members – nearly four in ten (39%) of the staff members said it was likely that the HEI would allow the person to play an active role in how their report of SVH was handled.

Table 12.19: Percentage of staff by who chose the ‘Likely’ or ‘Very likely’ response options to statements on HEI support for SVH, by gender.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
My institution would play a role by actively supporting the person with either formal or informal resources (e.g., counselling, meetings, or phone calls)	59.6	67.0	61.1	47.5	61.7
My institution would play an active role by creating an environment where this type of experience was recognised as a problem	49.8	64.0	66.7	50.0	54.2
My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs	48.5	59.7	61.1	42.5	51.9
My institution would play an active role by creating an environment where this type of experience was safe to discuss	46.0	57.4	50.0	32.5	49.3
My institution would play a role by allowing the person to play an active role in how their report was handled	35.5	46.8	50.0	22.5	38.8

There was considerable variation in responses to the statements on positive supports and organisational culture:

- > Between 17% (‘My institution would play a role by actively supporting the person with either formal or informal resources’) and 26% (‘My institution would play a role by allowing the person to play an active role in how their report was handled’) of staff members selected the ‘Very unlikely’ or ‘Unlikely’ response option.
- > The range of staff selecting the ‘Neutral’ response option was from 26% (‘My institution would play an active role by creating an environment where this type of experience was recognised as a problem’) to 35% (‘My institution would play a role by allowing the person to play an active role in how their report was handled’).
- > A range from 39% (‘My institution would play a role by allowing the person to play an active role in how their report was handled’) to 62% (‘My institution would play a role by actively supporting the person with either formal or informal resources’) of staff chose the ‘Likely’ or ‘Very likely’ response option.

In the breakdown of responses to an illustrative example below, 52% of the staff said it was likely that the institution would support the person and accommodate their needs. By comparison, 20% of staff said it was unlikely that this would occur, and 28% of staff chose the 'Neutral' response.

Table 12.20: Distribution of responses to the statement 'My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs', for all staff.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs	19.9	28.2	51.9

Compared with females or staff who preferred not to say their gender, a greater percentage of male and non-binary staff said it was likely that the institution would create a positive environment for reporting SVH and support a person who makes a complaint. The percentage of females who agreed with these statements was between 10-15% lower than it was for males.

Table 12.21: Distribution of responses on the statement 'My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs', by gender.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
Female	22.1	29.4	48.5
Male	14.4	25.9	59.7
Non-binary	16.7	22.2	61.1
Prefer not to say	37.5	20.0	42.5
Prefer not to say	49.3	14.5	36.2

There were differences by area of work in the perceived likelihood that HEIs would be supportive of staff who made a complaint of SVH. Differences of between 5%-15% were noted among work areas. For example, a lower rate of academic AHSS-BL staff and Research staff (55%) said it was likely that the HEI would provide informal or formal supports to the person, such as counselling, meetings, or phone calls, compared with 59% of staff who preferred not to state their work area, 62% of academic STEM-MH staff, and 68% of professional/technical staff.

In the example below, there is a difference of 14% in the percentage of academic AHSS-BL staff and Professional / technical staff who said it was unlikely that the HEI would support the person and accommodate their needs.

Table 12.22: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs’, by area of work.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
AHSS-BL	25.3	30.4	43.3
STEM-MH	19.7	27.5	52.8
Research	17.3	33.0	49.7
Professional / technical	15.6	26.7	57.7
Prefer not to say / Other	21.0	26.5	52.5

Differences in responses to these statements were also noted by sexual orientation. Asexual staff were most likely to say that the HEI would be supportive of people who report SVH and establish a positive culture for reporting. They were followed by heterosexual staff members, then staff who were gay, lesbian, queer and other sexual orientations, bisexual staff, and staff who preferred not to state their orientation.

There were examples of relatively large differences between sexual orientation groups – for example, 79% of asexual staff said it was likely that the HEI would formally or informally support the person, compared with 63% of heterosexuals, 56% of gay, lesbian, queer, and other sexual orientations, 48% of bisexual staff, and 47% of staff who preferred not to state their orientation.

In the example below, more heterosexual staff members (53%) said it was likely that their institution would support the person and accommodate their needs, compared with bisexual staff (41%) and those who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation (43%).

Table 12.23: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs’, by sexual orientation.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
Asexual	14.6	20.8	64.6
Bisexual	31.0	28.6	40.5
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	26.5	30.2	43.2
Heterosexual	18.7	28.4	53.0
Prefer not to say	36.7	22.4	40.8

The percentage of staff members who chose a ‘Likely’ or ‘Very likely’ response option following these statements was relatively consistent across age categories. Differences between age groups were less than 10%, with the exception of the difference between staff who preferred not to state their age and staff aged 55+. In the example below, older staff were most likely to say that their institution would support the person making a complaint, while staff who preferred not to state their age were least likely to say this.

Table 12.24: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs’, by age group.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
18-34	19.6	28.6	51.8
35-44	22.1	29.8	48.1
45-54	20.5	28.3	51.2
55+	15.5	25.9	58.6
Prefer not to say	39.4	24.2	36.4

12.5 Perceptions of Organisational Culture and Support – Negative actions and culture

The next set of statements on organisational culture comprised three negative expectations for reporting sexual violence or harassment – that the HEI would have a concern about reputational damage, that it would not value the person, or that it would create an environment where it would be difficult to stay at the institution. These negative statements regarding perceptions of culture were presented in the same set with the five positive statements about organisational culture and practices. The staff members assessed the likelihood of these statements on a 5-point scale from ‘Very unlikely’ to ‘Very likely’. The tables below compile ‘Very unlikely’ / ‘Unlikely’ responses and ‘Very likely’ / ‘Likely’ responses.

One third (35%) of the staff members said it was likely that their HEI would play an active role by suggesting the person’s experiences might affect the reputation of the institution. One in five staff members rated it as likely that their HEI would create an environment where the reporting person did not feel valued (19%) or where it was difficult to continue working there (19%).

Table 12.25: Percentage of staff by who chose the ‘Likely’ or ‘Very likely’ response options to statements on an unsupportive HEI culture toward reporting SVH, by gender identity.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
My institution would play an active role by suggesting the person’s experience/s might affect the reputation of the institution	35.7	32.5	38.9	52.5	35.0
My institution would play an active role by creating an environment where the person no longer felt like a valued member of the institution	19.5	17.0	27.8	35.0	18.9
My institution would play an active role creating an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult for the person	19.2	16.5	27.8	32.5	18.6

There was a wide range of responses given to these statements across the staff group, as indicated here:

- > The percentage of staff who chose one of the two ‘unlikely’ response options to these statements ranged from 32% (suggesting the person’s experience/s might affect the reputation of the institution) to 51% (creating an environment where the person no longer felt like a valued member of the HEI).
- > The ‘Neutral’ option was chosen by between 31% (creating an environment where the person no longer felt like a valued member of the HEI, or where staying at the HEI was difficult) and 33% (the HEI would suggest the person’s experience/s might affect the reputation of the institution).
- > One of the two ‘likely’ options was chosen by between 19% (creating an environment where the person no longer felt like a valued member of the HEI, or where staying at the HEI was difficult) and 35% (suggesting the person’s experience/s might affect the reputation of the institution) of the staff.

The distribution of ratings of likelihood of the HEI being unsupportive is illustrated below. Half of the staff members said it was ‘Very unlikely’ or ‘Unlikely’ that the HEI would create an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult. One third (31%) chose the ‘Neutral’ response, and 19% said it was likely that this would occur.

Table 12.26: Distribution of responses to an illustrative statement on an unsupportive HEI culture toward reporting SVH, for all staff.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
My institution would play an active role creating an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult for the person	49.9	31.4	18.6

Female and male staff members gave comparable responses to the three statements. Staff who had a gender non-binary identity and those who preferred not to state their gender were more likely to say that the institution would create a negative environment that did not support reporting of SVH.

Table 12.27: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘My institution would play an active role creating an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult for the person’, by gender.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
Female	47.2	33.6	19.2
Male	56.8	26.6	16.5
Non-binary	44.4	27.8	27.8
Prefer not to say	37.5	30.0	32.5
Prefer not to say	49.3	14.5	36.2

Across areas of work, there was variation of 5-10% in the percentage of staff who said it was likely that the HEI would establish a negative culture toward reporting SVH. Research staff and staff working in Professional / technical areas tended to be least likely to agree that the HEI would establish a negative reporting culture.

Table 12.28: Distribution of responses on the statement ‘My institution would play an active role creating an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult for the person’, by area of work.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
AHSS-BL	45.5	33.0	21.5
STEM-MH	52.8	29.1	18.2
Research	49.7	38.4	11.9
Professional / technical	52.6	30.3	17.1
Prefer not to say / Other	42.9	34.7	22.4

Bisexual staff members and those who preferred not to say their sexual orientation had the highest rate of agreement with this set of statements. For instance, 48% of bisexual staff said it was likely that the HEI would suggest the person's experience might affect the reputation of the institution, compared with 34% of heterosexual staff. In the illustrative example below, there was a smaller difference of 6% between bisexual staff members and heterosexuals.

Table 12.29: Distribution of responses on the statement 'My institution would play an active role creating an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult for the person', by sexual orientation.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
Asexual	50.0	35.4	14.6
Bisexual	42.1	34.1	23.8
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	42.6	37.0	20.4
Heterosexual	51.0	31.0	18.0
Prefer not to say	39.8	30.6	29.6

There were limited differences of approximately 5% by age group in perceptions of an unsupportive HEI culture toward reporting SVH. The staff members who preferred not to say their age were most likely to say that the HEI was unsupportive.

Table 12.30: Distribution of responses on the statement 'My institution would play an active role creating an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult for the person', by area of work, by age group.

	Unlikely	Neutral	Likely
18-34	48.4	31.3	20.2
35-44	46.8	34.6	18.6
45-54	50.1	29.7	20.2
55+	55.8	29.6	14.6
Prefer not to say	27.3	45.5	27.3

12.6 Willingness to Engage in Consent and SVH Initiatives

A set of statements were presented in the survey about awareness of messaging on sexual violence and harassment and willingness to engage in training on topics such as disclosure, consent, and bystander intervention. The statements were scored on a 5-point scale, from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree', with the additional inclusion of a 'Don't know' response option. 'Strongly disagree' / 'Disagree' and 'Strongly agree' / 'Agree' options are combined in the tables below.

A majority of staff members agreed that they were willing to be involved in training and roles supportive of consent, sexual violence and harassment. The lowest level of agreement was reflected in 40% of staff having awareness of ongoing messaging at their HEI to promote cultural change and awareness of sexual violence and harassment.

Three quarters or more of the staff members agreed that they would be willing to complete training on disclosures (83%), bystander intervention awareness (81%), and consent awareness (76%), if such training was made available by their HEI. A majority of staff members agreed that they would become involved at a more active level in supporting or facilitating initiatives, but support for these roles was somewhat lower than for engaging in training. Two thirds of the staff members agreed that they would be open to actively supporting culture change themselves, by facilitating student / staff initiatives (66%) or having a role in supporting these actions (62%).

Table 12.31: Percentage of staff by chose ‘Strongly agree’ or ‘Agree’ responses to statements on willingness to engage in training, by gender identity.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
I would be willing to complete training on disclosures of incidents of sexual violence and harassment if it was made available by my institution	86.0	75.9	83.3	55.0	82.6
I would be willing to complete bystander intervention awareness training if it was made available by my institution	85.6	71.7	77.8	55.0	81.0
I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institution	81.0	65.9	72.2	42.5	75.9
I would be willing to facilitate student/staff initiatives in relation to consent/bystander intervention/disclosure initiatives	68.3	60.5	55.6	40.0	65.6
I would be willing to be involved in roles in relation to consent/bystander intervention/disclosure initiatives	65.7	54.4	61.1	40.0	62.0
I am aware of ongoing messaging at my HEI that promotes cultural change and awareness of sexual violence and harassment	34.8	50.7	50.0	55.0	39.9

Excluding the statement on awareness of ongoing messaging on culture change, there was a moderate level of variation in the responses given to this set of statements:

- > The percentage of staff who disagreed that they would be willing to be involved in SVH-related initiatives ranged from 5% (training on disclosures, bystander intervention awareness) to 15% (willingness to be involved in roles that support initiatives).
- > Between 8% (training on disclosures) and 16% (willingness to be involved in roles that support initiatives) of staff chose the 'Neutral' option.
- > A majority of staff members expressed agreement that they would be willing to be involved in initiatives, ranging from 62% (willing to be involved in roles that support initiatives) to 83% (training on disclosures).

The distribution of agreement levels on statements in this section of the survey is illustrated below. Less than one in ten of the staff members (8%) disagreed that they would be willing to complete consent awareness training, while 76% agreed that they would be willing. The remaining 16% of staff did not know (5%) or were neutral (11%) as to whether they would be willing to do so.

Table 12.32: Distribution of responses to the statement 'I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institution', for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institution	8.1	10.8	75.9

Female and non-binary staff members typically had higher agreement levels than male staff members on the statements concerning willingness to engage in awareness training, with differences generally between 10-15% between females and males. However, more male staff members (51%) than female staff members (35%) agreed that they were aware of ongoing messaging on culture change and awareness at their HEI.

Table 12.33: Distribution of responses to the statement 'I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institution', by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
Female	5.2	8.4	81.0	5.5
Male	14.0	16.0	65.9	4.2
Non-binary	16.7	5.6	72.2	5.6
Prefer not to say	25.0	22.5	42.5	10.0

Differences of 5-10% in agreement levels with these statements were noted between staff across different work areas. Research and Professional / technical staff were the most likely to agree that they would be willing to engage with training initiatives. Agreement levels were lowest on the statement about awareness of ongoing messaging that promotes cultural change, with AHSS-BL academic staff (35%) least likely to say they were aware of this messaging and STEM-MH / Research staff most likely to be aware of it (43%). Differences in willingness to take part in training are illustrated below.

Table 12.34: Distribution of responses to the statement ‘I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institution’, by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
AHSS-BL	9.4	12.0	72.8	5.9
STEM-MH	11.3	14.8	70.1	3.8
Research	5.4	11.4	80.0	3.2
Professional / technical	5.2	7.4	82.1	5.3
Prefer not to say / Other	10.5	11.4	71.2	6.8

Variability in agreement levels were somewhat higher across sexual orientations, reflected in differences in agreement levels that ranged from 5%-20%+. For example, the percentage of staff willing to facilitate consent, bystander intervention, or disclosure initiatives ranged from 60% among asexual staff members to 72% of bisexual staff members.

There was considerable variation on the statement about being involved in roles related to initiatives –ranging from 52% (staff who preferred not to state their orientation), to 54% (asexual staff members), 62% (heterosexual staff), 64% (gay, lesbian, queer, or another orientation), to 76% (bisexual staff). Variation in willingness to engage in training is illustrated below.

Table 12.35: Distribution of responses to the statement ‘I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institution’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don’t know
Asexual	22.9	12.5	60.4	4.2
Bisexual	11.1	6.3	72.2	10.3
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	14.2	10.5	64.2	11.1
Heterosexual	12.1	15.9	65.5	6.5
Prefer not to say	9.2	15.3	63.3	12.2

Differences in agreement levels on these statements by staff age categories typically ranged from 5-10%. Agreement levels were higher among younger staff and lower among staff aged 55+. Those staff who preferred not to state their age had the lowest agreement levels. For example, the percentage of staff who agreed that they would be willing to be involved in roles related to initiatives on consent, sexual violence and harassment varied from 69% for 18-34 year olds to 59% for staff aged 55+ and 46% for staff who preferred not to state their age. The range of agreement in completing training is illustrated below.

Table 12.36: Distribution of responses to the statement ‘I would be willing to complete consent awareness training if it was made available by my institution’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Don't know
18-34	5.4	6.7	82.0	5.8
35-44	8.0	8.7	78.5	4.8
45-54	8.0	11.7	74.4	5.9
55+	9.6	14.2	72.7	3.5
Prefer not to say	21.2	24.2	42.4	12.1

13. Campus Safety

13.1 Staff Perceptions of Safety and Responsibility

This section of the survey presented three statements referring to staff feeling safe from sexual violence and harassment at their HEI, one statement about perceptions of staff responsibility for engaging with the topic of SVH, and two statements to gauge perceptions of whether SVH is a problem for students and staff. The statements were rated on a 5-point scale from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'. The 'Strongly disagree' / 'Disagree' and 'Strongly agree' / 'Agree' responses are aggregated in the tables.

Responses to the first set of statements are summarised below, referring to feeling safe from sexual violence and harassment, and feeling safe speaking up or voicing concerns about SVH. The highest level of agreement was that 81% of staff agreed that they felt safe from sexual violence within their HEI. This compared with 72% of staff who agreed they felt safe from sexual harassment. Half of the staff members (52%) felt safe voicing concerns related to SVH.

Table 13.1: Percentage of staff by who chose the 'Strongly agree' or 'Agree' response options to statements about safety from SVH, by gender identity and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
I feel safe from sexual violence within my HEI	77.9	89.9	77.8	62.5	81.3
I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI	66.9	85.0	61.1	45.0	72.1
I feel safe speaking up or voicing concerns in relation to sexual violence and/or harassment	47.6	65.1	61.1	40.0	52.8

The distribution of ratings across the response categories varied as follows:

- > The rate of disagreement with these three statements ranged from 6.1% (safety from sexual violence), to 13% (safety from sexual harassment), and 23% (safety speaking up or expressing concerns).
- > The percentage of staff who chose the neutral option on these statements varied between 13% (safety from sexual violence), 15% (safety from sexual harassment), and 25% (safety speaking up or expressing concerns).
- > Agreement levels varied from 53% (safety speaking up or expressing concerns), to 72% (safety from sexual harassment), and 81% (safety from sexual violence).

The distribution of agreement levels on statements in this section of the survey is illustrated below. Nearly three quarters (72%) of staff agreed that they felt safe from sexual harassment, while 15% gave a 'Neutral' response, and 13% disagreed that they felt safe.

Table 13.2: Distribution of responses to the statement 'I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI', for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI	12.9	15.0	72.1

Male staff members were more likely than females to feel safe from sexual violence or harassment and to agree that they felt safe voicing concerns. The difference among males and females was almost 20% for two of the statements (safety from harassment, safety in speaking up). Two thirds of females (67%) agreed that they felt safe from sexual harassment compared with 85% of males. Half of the females (48%) agreed that they felt safe in speaking up or voicing concerns about SVH, compared with 65% of males.

There was a larger difference between males and staff with a non-binary gender identity or those who preferred not to state their gender identity. For instance, 85% of males agreed they felt safe from sexual harassment compared with 67% of females, 61% of staff with a non-binary gender identity, and 45% of staff who preferred not to specify their gender identity.

Table 13.3: Distribution of responses to the statement 'I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI', by gender identity.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Female	16.3	16.8	66.9
Male	4.5	10.5	85.0
Non-binary	16.7	22.2	61.1
Prefer not to say	27.5	27.5	45.0

The rate of agreement with these statements did not vary considerably by staff area of work, with differences typically around 5-10% between groups. Agreement levels among AHSS-BL academic staff and staff who preferred not to state their work area were consistently lower than staff working in STEM-MH, Research or Professional / technical areas. This trend is illustrated below in perceptions of safety from sexual harassment.

Table 13.4: Distribution of responses to the statement ‘I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI’, by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
AHSS-BL	15.7	18.4	65.9
STEM-MH	13.0	13.0	74.0
Research	15.7	11.4	73.0
Professional / technical	10.0	13.9	76.1
Prefer not to say / Other	15.5	17.4	67.1

There was considerable variation in ratings of these statements by staff sexual orientation. Differences in agreement rates ranged up to 20%+ between sexual orientation groups. Bisexual, gay, lesbian, queer, and other sexual orientations had lower agreement levels than heterosexual and asexual staff members. Staff who preferred not to state their sexual orientation had particularly low levels of agreement, usually 10% below other groups. Differences by sexual orientation are illustrated below.

Table 13.5: Distribution of responses to the statement ‘I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Asexual	10.4	20.8	68.8
Bisexual	19.8	21.4	58.7
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	18.5	18.5	63.0
Heterosexual	11.8	14.4	73.7
Prefer not to say	29.6	16.3	54.1

Agreement levels on these statements varied consistently by age group, with the younger staff age categories reporting lower agreement with statements than staff aged 45-54 or 55+. Staff who preferred not to state their age described the lowest agreement levels. While 63% of staff aged 55+ agreed that they felt safe voicing concerns in relation to sexual violence and harassment, the comparable figure for 18-34 year olds was 47% and was 39% among staff who did not disclose their age. The further example below demonstrates an incremental difference by age group.

Table 13.6 Distribution of responses to the statement ‘I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
18-34	18.4	14.4	67.2
35-44	13.6	16.6	69.6
45-54	13.5	14.2	72.2
55+	6.8	14.2	79.1
Prefer not to say	33.3	24.2	42.4

Turning to the next set of three statements presented in this section of the survey, 69% of staff members agreed that they felt a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of sexual violence and harassment. A far smaller percentage of staff members agreed that SVH among staff was a problem at their HEI (14%) or that SVH among students is a problem (27%) at their HEI.

Table 13.7: Percentage of staff by who chose ‘Strongly agree’ or ‘Agree’ response options to statements about personal responsibility and perceptions of SVH, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
I feel a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of sexual violence and harassment at my HEI	69.0	70.6	77.8	57.5	69.4
Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI	29.7	20.1	44.4	27.5	26.8
Sexual violence or harassment among faculty and staff is a problem at my HEI	15.2	10.4	16.7	25.0	13.9

There were large differences in the responses given by the survey participants across these statements:

- > Disagreement rates varied considerably. Very few (7%) of staff disagreed that they had a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of SVH, while 23% disagreed that SVH among students is a problem at their HEI and 69% disagreed that SVH among staff is a problem at their HEI.

- > One quarter (24%) were neutral on whether they had a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of SVH. This rose to 35% of staff who were neutral as to whether SVH among staff was a problem at their HEI, and to 50% of staff who were neutral as to whether SVH among students was a problem at their HEI.
- > A majority of staff agreed that they felt a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of SVH at their HEI, while 14% agreed that SVH among faculty and staff is a problem at their HEI, and 27% agreed that SVH among students is a problem.

The distribution of agreement levels on statements in this section of the survey is illustrated below. Half of the staff members chose the 'Neutral' option, suggesting a lack of knowledge or information about the topic of SVH among students at their HEI, while a comparable percentage of staff disagreed (23%) or agreed (27%) that this was a problem.

Table 13.8: Distribution of responses to the statement 'Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI', for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI	23.2	49.9	26.8

Male members of staff were less likely to agree that sexual violence or harassment were problems for staff and students. Staff members with a non-binary gender identity were particularly likely to agree that SVH among students is a problem and were more likely than other gender groups to agree that they felt responsible to engage with the issue.

Table 13.9: Distribution of responses to the statement 'Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI', by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Female	20.0	50.3	29.7
Male	30.2	49.7	20.1
Non-binary	22.2	33.3	44.4
Prefer not to say	30.0	42.5	27.5

Differences in ratings of these items by work area were generally small. The staff groups across work areas usually within 5% of each other, although the ratings given by AHSS-BL academic staff members tended to be up to 10% different from the other work areas. Staff in this area were more likely to see SVH as a problem and to have a sense of responsibility to act in response to this. This trend is illustrated in the table below.

Table 13.10: Distribution of responses to the statement ‘Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI’, by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
AHSS-BL	22.0	44.6	33.3
STEM-MH	25.1	49.3	25.7
Research	21.6	54.6	23.8
Professional / technical	23.3	52.1	24.5
Prefer not to say / Other	21.9	58.9	19.2

Agreement levels on these items were usually within 10% across the different sexual orientation groups. Staff who were bisexual and those who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation were more likely to agree that SVH was a problem for staff and for students. An example of this trend is illustrated in the table below.

Table 13.11 Distribution of responses to the statement ‘Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Asexual	33.3	41.7	25.0
Bisexual	14.3	46.0	39.7
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	20.4	40.1	39.5
Heterosexual	23.6	50.9	25.5
Prefer not to say	21.4	44.9	33.7

Ratings of these statements were broadly comparable across different age groups, with little evidence of differences between age categories. Staff members who preferred not to state their age were more likely to agree that SVH among staff was a problem at their HEI (30% agreed with this, compared with 10-15% among the other age categories). This group was also more likely to agree that SVH was a problem for students (33% agreed with this, compared with 26-28% among the other groups).

Table 13.12: Distribution of responses to the statement ‘Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
18-34	25.7	46.3	28.0
35-44	20.8	51.3	28.0
45-54	23.8	50.0	26.2
55+	23.7	50.8	25.5
Prefer not to say	27.3	39.4	33.3

14. Consent and Bystander Attitudes

This section of the survey presented statements referring to staff attitudes to sexual consent attitudes and to bystander interventions. The statements in this section asked staff to indicate:

- > Their agreement with statements concerning personal attitudes to consent and attitudes attributed to students.
- > Awareness of consent being discussed by students and staff over the past four years.
- > Perceptions of feeling responsible to make an intervention in an incident where they are not directly involved.
- > Whether they had made a bystander intervention in the past four years concerning students or staff.
- > How well informed they were to make a bystander intervention or receive a disclosure of sexual violence or harassment.

The survey respondents had the option of not responding to the statements on consent attitudes. The introduction to that sub-section read:

The next set of questions are interested in perceptions of sexual consent. We are asking these questions in the context of increased student awareness of consent, related education initiatives, and the potential for disclosures to staff. If you are not comfortable answering these questions you have the option to skip to the next question.

A total of 33.3% (n = 1,173) of the staff survey respondents chose to skip the statements on consent attitudes, with 66.6% (n = 2,343) of the respondents indicating that they wished to respond to it. The statistics in relation to consent attitudes refer only to the two thirds of staff who completed the statements. A similar percentage of males (66.5%) and females (66.8%) chose to respond to this section of the survey, with more of the gender non-binary staff members (77.8%) and fewer of the staff who preferred not to say their gender (55.0%) choosing to take part.

A greater percentage of bisexual staff (79.4%, n = 100) and staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation (80.9%, n = 131) chose to respond to the statements on consent attitudes, compared with 52.1% of asexual staff (n = 25), 52.0% of staff who preferred not to say their gender (n = 51), and 66.1% of heterosexuals (n = 2,036).

There was consistency in the percentage of staff across work areas who chose to respond to statements on consent attitudes, including 67.4% of academic AHSS-BL staff (n = 648), 66.7% of academic STEM-MH staff (n = 548), 69.7% of Research staff (n = 129), and 66.9% of Professional / technical staff members (n = 888). The exception were those staff who preferred not to say their work area / other, 59.4% of whom (n = 130) chose to respond.

In terms of age group, more staff aged 18-34 chose to respond to the statements on consent attitudes (72.7%, n = 348), along with 66.7% of staff aged 35-44 (n = 662), 66.3% of staff aged 45-54 (n = 824), 64.0% of staff aged 55+ (n = 492), and 51.5% of staff who preferred not to say their age (n = 17).

14.1 Consent Attitudes

In this part of the survey, staff members responded to two attitude statements about whether students feel awkward or confident in seeking sexual consent, and six statements about their personal attitudes to consent. The statements on personal attitudes referred to whether verbal consent is always needed and whether consent should always be actively sought regardless of the type of intimacy involved. Staff members responded on a 5-point scale of agreement from 'Strongly disagree' to 'Strongly agree'. Responses were compiled for 'Strongly disagree' / 'Disagree' and 'Strongly agree' / 'Agree' for the tables below.

In summary, staff member responses to statements on personal attitudes to consent indicate a very strong level of agreement with the principles of having consent for sexual intimacy. There was a very high level of agreement among the staff members that sexual consent should always be obtained in all relationships regardless of whether they have had sex before (94%), and that one should assume 'no' until there is clear indication to proceed with sexual activity (93%). A large majority of the survey participants agreed that someone should always assume that they do not have sexual consent when initiating sexual activity (83%).

In addition, a large majority of staff were in support of having verbal consent for intimacy. Four out of five (79%) of the staff who responded agreed that verbally asking for sexual consent should occur before proceeding with any sexual activity. Almost two thirds (65%) of the staff members agreed that consent should be asked before any kind of sexual behaviour, including kissing or touching.

There was one negatively worded statement regarding personal attitudes, that the need for asking for sexual consent decreases as the length of an intimate relationship increases. For this latter statement, the percentage of staff who disagreed is the relevant indicator of support for verbal consent. A total of 55% of staff members disagreed with this statement.

In response to the two statements concerning student attitudes to consent, a majority of staff members agreed that students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward (62%), and a small minority of staff members agreed that students typically feel confident seeking consent from a sexual partner (16%). These figures contrast with student perceptions recorded in the national survey of students; a lower percentage of students who completed that survey agreed that asking for consent is awkward and a higher percentage said they felt confident in seeking consent from a sexual partner.

Table 14.1: Percentage of staff by who chose ‘Strongly agree’ or ‘Agree’ responses to consent attitude statements, by gender identity and for all staff.

	Women	Men	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
It is equally important to obtain sexual consent in all relationships regardless of whether or not they have had sex before	94.7	90.5	92.9	81.8	93.9
Before making sexual advances, one should assume “no” until there is clear indication to proceed	93.7	90.9	92.9	81.8	92.7
When initiating sexual activity, one should always assume that one does not have sexual consent	84.1	79.7	85.7	68.2	82.6
Verbally asking for sexual consent should occur before proceeding with any sexual activity	82.8	69.5	85.7	77.3	78.8
Consent should be asked before any kind of sexual behaviour, including kissing or touching	67.0	59.1	64.3	54.5	64.5
Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward	65.5	52.7	78.6	54.5	61.6

Excluding the negatively worded statement about the need for consent decreasing over time, staff responses still varied considerably across this set of statements:

- > The rate of disagreement with these three statements ranged from 2% (‘It is equally important to obtain sexual consent in all relationships regardless of whether or not they have had sex before’) to 39% (‘Students typically feel confident seeking consent from a sexual partner’).
- > The percentage of staff who chose the neutral option on these statements varied between 5% (‘It is equally important to obtain sexual consent in all relationships regardless of whether or not they have had sex before’) and 45% (‘Students typically feel confident seeking consent from a sexual partner’).
- > Agreement levels varied from 16% (‘Students typically feel confident seeking consent from a sexual partner’) to 94% (‘It is equally important to obtain sexual consent in all relationships regardless of whether or not they have had sex before’).

Overall, most staff (62%) agreed that students feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward. Most of the staff members who did not agree with this statement chose the 'Neutral' option, as illustrated in the table below.

Table 14.2: Illustrative example of distribution of responses to consent statements, 'Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward', for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward	6.4	32.0	61.6

Across a number of the consent attitude statements, females and non-binary staff members displayed higher levels of agreement than males or staff members who preferred not to say their gender. This trend is illustrated below in relation to the statement about whether students feel awkward about seeking verbal consent. Males and those who preferred not to say their gender were more likely to select the 'Neutral' response than females or non-binary staff members.

Table 14.3: Illustrative example of responses to consent statements, 'Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward', by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Female	5.8	28.7	65.5
Male	7.8	39.5	52.7
Non-binary	0.0	21.4	78.6
Prefer not to say	9.1	36.4	54.5

The rate of agreement with these statements did not vary considerably by staff area of work. There were differences of 5-10% in rates of agreement by area of work. This is illustrated below, with academic staff working in STEM-MH and those who preferred not to say their work area less likely to agree that students feel that verbal consent is awkward than those working in the Research environment.

Table 14.4: Illustrative example of responses to consent statements, 'Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward', by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
AHSS-BL	6.2	31.2	62.7
STEM-MH	8.2	34.5	57.3
Research	4.7	27.9	67.4
Professional / technical	5.4	31.5	63.1
Prefer not to say / Other	8.5	32.3	59.2

While differences in agreement levels were typically within 10% by sexual orientation, the example below shows that bisexual staff and those who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation were most likely to agree that students find verbal consent to be awkward.

Table 14.5: Illustrative example of responses to consent statements, ‘Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Asexual	0.0	48.0	52.0
Bisexual	8.0	20.0	72.0
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	8.4	21.4	70.2
Heterosexual	6.3	32.7	61.0
Prefer not to say	3.9	45.1	51.0

Agreement levels on consent attitude statements varied consistently by age group, with the younger staff age categories reporting higher agreement with statements than older staff. Staff who preferred not to state their age had the lowest agreement levels. While 71% of staff aged 18-34 years old agreed that students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward, the comparable figure for 55+ years was 52% and dropped to 44% among staff who did not state their age.

Table 14.6: Illustrative example of responses to consent statements, ‘Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
18-34	6.6	20.4	73.0
35-44	6.6	30.1	63.3
45-54	5.5	33.5	61.1
55+	7.7	39.4	52.8
Prefer not to say	0.0	52.9	47.1

14.2 Awareness of Discussion of Consent

The next set of consent statements referred to awareness and discussion concerning consent. All of the staff members responded to these statements. Two statements were included in the survey that referred to having heard students or other staff members discuss consent issues on campus, with ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ response options. Just over one third (35%) of staff agreed that they had heard students discuss sexual consent issues on campus over the past four years. Similarly, 36% of staff had heard other staff members discussing issues of consent on campus. Non-binary staff members were most likely to say that they had heard consent being discussed.

Table 14.7: Percentage of staff who indicated that they had heard sexual consent being discussed on campus in the past four years, by gender identity and total number of staff

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STUDENTS on campus	36.9	31.2	55.6	50.0	35.4
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STAFF on campus	36.8	34.2	38.9	37.5	36.0

Academic STEM-MH staff (27%) were least likely to say that they had heard students discuss consent on campus. Professional / technical staff (41%) were most likely to indicate that they had heard consent being discussed by staff on campus, followed by academic AHSS-BL staff (37%).

Table 14.8: Percentage of staff who agreed that they had heard sexual consent being discussed on campus, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/technical	Prefer not to say / Other
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STUDENTS on campus	38.9	26.9	36.2	38.9	30.1
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STAFF on campus	37.3	29.9	28.6	41.3	27.4

Bisexual staff (52%) and staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation (46%) were considerably more likely to say that they had heard consent issues being discussed by students. There was less variation among staff members in whether consent issues had been heard discussed among staff.

Table 14.9: Percentage of staff who agreed that they had heard sexual consent being discussed on campus, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STUDENTS on campus	29.2	51.6	45.7	34.3	36.7
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STAFF on campus	35.4	42.1	38.3	35.6	39.8

Staff members aged 18-34 (41%) were most likely to say that they had heard consent issues being discussed by students on campus. There was relatively little variation by age group in whether staff had been heard discussing consent issues on campus.

Table 14.10: Percentage of staff who agreed that they had heard sexual consent being discussed on campus, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STUDENTS on campus	40.7	35.8	35.2	31.9	39.4
In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by STAFF on campus	33.8	36.7	36.8	35.5	30.3

14.3 Bystander Intervention

Three items in the staff survey asked about bystander intervention. These statements asked if staff felt a responsibility to intervene in the case of sexual violence or harassment taking place, whether the staff members had made a bystander intervention in the past four years, and how well informed the staff felt in making an effective bystander intervention.

A majority (55%) of staff who responded to this section of the survey felt a responsibility to make an intervention in the context of SVH where they were not directly involved. Eight per cent said they did not feel responsible and 37% did not know if they felt responsible for this. In terms of gender, males (60%) and non-binary staff members (61%) were most likely to say that they felt responsible to intervene.

Table 14.11: Responses to the item ‘In the context of sexual harassment and/or violence, I feel a responsibility to make an intervention where I am not directly involved’, by gender and total number of staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Yes	53.4	60.2	61.1	45.0	55.4
No	8.3	7.6	5.6	12.5	8.1
Don’t know	38.2	32.3	33.3	42.5	36.5

A total of 12% of staff reported intervening in an incident of SVH involving staff and / or students on at least one occasion over the past four years. Staff members who preferred not to say their gender (17%) were most likely to have intervened. Where staff had intervened, on most occasions this had taken place once.

Table 14.12: Responses to the item, ‘In the last four years I have made an intervention as a bystander to incident(s) of sexual harassment and/or violence involving students and / or staff’, by gender and total number of staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
0 times	87.6	88.9	88.9	82.5	87.9
1 time	7.7	7.6	5.6	7.5	7.7
2 times	2.8	2.5	0.0	7.5	2.8
3+ times	1.9	1.0	5.6	2.5	1.6

Over one third of staff felt ‘Not informed at all’ (37%) and 27% felt ‘Slightly informed’ about making an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of sexual violence or harassment. A small percentage (3%) felt ‘Completely informed’ about how to respond effectively.

Female staff were most likely to report that they did not feel informed or only slightly informed about how to make an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of SVH.

Table 14.13: Self-appraisal of being informed to make an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of sexual violence or harassment, by gender and total number of staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Not informed at all	40.6	28.1	11.1	45.0	36.8
Slightly informed	25.8	28.8	27.8	5.0	26.5
Somewhat informed	18.7	22.9	27.8	22.5	20.1
Fairly informed	12.4	16.6	27.8	17.5	13.8

There was a limited range of responses across work areas as to whether staff members felt responsible to intervene in the context of sexual harassment and / or violence. Academic AHSS-BL staff were the most likely to say that they felt responsible (59%), and staff members who preferred not to say their work area / worked in another area (43%) were least likely to do so.

Table 14.14: Responses to the item ‘In the context of sexual harassment and/or violence, I feel a responsibility to make an intervention where I am not directly involved’, by work category

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ Technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Yes	59.4	56.0	53.5	54.4	43.4
No	6.5	6.5	9.2	9.2	9.6
Don’t know	34.1	34.1	37.3	36.4	47.0

Across work areas, between 82-92% of staff had not made a bystander intervention in the past four years. Academic AHSS-BL staff (18%) were the group most likely to have intervened while Professional / technical staff (8%) were the least likely to have done so.

Table 14.15: Responses to the item, ‘In the last four years I have made an intervention as a bystander to incident(s) of sexual harassment and/or violence involving students and/or staff’, by work category.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ Technical	Prefer not to say / Other
0 times	82.4	88.2	86.5	92.0	87.7
1 time	10.1	8.9	8.6	5.0	7.8
2 times	5.0	1.9	4.3	1.5	2.3
3+ times	2.5	1.0	0.5	1.5	2.3

Perceptions of feeling informed about how to make an effective intervention were broadly comparable across work areas. Staff working in Professional / technical settings (40%) were most likely to say that they were ‘Not informed at all’ about making an intervention.

Table 14.16: Self-appraisal of being informed to make an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of sexual violence or harassment, by work category.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ Technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Not informed at all	32.6	36.0	35.7	39.7	41.1
Slightly informed	27.9	27.5	24.3	25.9	21.9
Somewhat informed	22.6	18.5	24.9	18.5	20.1
Fairly informed	12.9	15.7	13.5	13.3	14.2
Completely informed	4.1	2.3	1.6	2.6	2.7

Among the sexual orientation categories, staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation (65%) were most likely to report feeling responsible to make an intervention in the context of sexual harassment and / or violence. Heterosexual staff (55%) and those who preferred not to say their orientation (53%) were least likely to say that they felt responsible.

Table 14.17: Responses to the item ‘In the context of sexual harassment and/or violence, I feel a responsibility to make an intervention where I am not directly involved’, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Yes	60.4	57.1	65.4	54.8	53.1
No	8.3	6.3	6.2	8.3	9.2
Don’t know	31.3	36.5	28.4	36.9	37.8

Across sexual orientations, there was a broadly consistent percentage of staff who reported intervening in an incident of SVH on at least one occasion during the past four years. Bisexual staff were the group who were most likely to have intervened (19%) while heterosexual staff were the least likely to have done so (11%). These trends are illustrated in the table below.

Table 14.18: Responses to the item, ‘In the last four years I have made an intervention as a bystander to incident(s) of sexual harassment and / or violence involving students and/or staff’, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
0 times	83.3	81.0	82.1	88.7	84.7
1 time	14.6	10.3	8.0	7.4	9.2
2 times	2.1	4.8	6.8	2.4	4.1
3+ times	0.0	4.0	3.1	1.5	2.0

Staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation were least likely to say that they were not well informed about how to make an effective bystander intervention. Heterosexual and asexual staff members were the most likely groups to say that they were not well informed.

Table 14.19: Self-appraisal of being informed to make an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of sexual violence or harassment, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Not informed at all	50.0	25.4	25.3	37.7	35.7
Slightly informed	14.6	34.1	28.4	26.4	22.4
Somewhat informed	18.8	19.0	24.1	19.8	22.4
Fairly informed	14.6	19.8	14.2	13.6	13.3
Completely informed	2.1	1.6	8.0	6.1	6.1

There was an age-related trend toward feeling responsible to make an intervention regarding sexual harassment and / or violence. Younger staff aged 18-34 (49%) were least likely to feel responsible while staff aged 55+ (60%) were most likely to feel responsible.

Table 14.20: Responses to the item ‘In the context of sexual harassment and/or violence, I feel a responsibility to make an intervention where I am not directly involved’, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
Yes	49.1	54.1	56.1	60.2	45.5
No	9.6	8.4	7.9	7.4	6.1
Don't know	41.3	37.5	36.0	32.4	48.5

There were limited differences between age groups as to having made an intervention as a bystander to an incident of sexual violence and / or harassment in the past four years. Staff who preferred not to say their age (21%) had the highest rate of having made an intervention.

Table 14.21: Responses to the item, ‘In the last four years I have made an intervention as a bystander to incident(s) of sexual harassment and / or violence involving students and/or staff’, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
0 times	87.5	89.1	87.0	88.6	78.8
1 time	6.5	7.7	8.0	7.8	9.1
2 times	3.5	1.8	3.1	2.6	12.1
3+ times	2.5	1.4	1.9	1.0	0.0

Staff aged 35-44 (67%) comprised the age group most likely to say that they were ‘Not informed at all’ or ‘Slightly informed’ about how to make an effective bystander intervention.

Table 14.22: Self-appraisal of being informed to make an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of sexual violence or harassment, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
Not informed at all	35.3	40.1	36.6	33.6	39.4
Slightly informed	26.3	27.0	27.2	25.5	9.1
Somewhat informed	21.5	20.0	19.1	20.5	24.2
Fairly informed	14.2	10.3	14.0	17.4	24.2
Completely informed	2.7	2.6	3.1	3.0	3.0

14.4: Responding to a Disclosure of Sexual Violence or Harassment

One item in the section on sexual consent and bystander intervention asked about how well informed staff members felt in responding effectively to a disclosure of sexual violence or harassment. Six in ten (61%) of the staff members said that they either felt 'Not informed at all' or 'Slightly informed' about responding effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual harassment and / or violence. One in five (22%) said that they were either 'Fairly informed' or 'Completely informed' about how to respond effectively.

Across the gender categories, female staff were the least likely group to report that they felt well informed about how to effectively to a disclosure of an incident of SVH.

Table 14.23: Self-appraisal of being informed to 'Respond effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual harassment and/or violence', by gender and total number of staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Not informed at all	41.0	26.6	22.2	42.5	36.6
Slightly informed	23.4	26.6	27.8	10.0	24.3
Somewhat informed	17.2	22.3	11.1	12.5	18.6
Fairly informed	14.3	19.5	33.3	22.5	16.0
Completely informed	4.1	4.9	5.6	12.5	4.5

There was a similar profile across staff areas as to how well informed staff felt in responding effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual violence and / or harassment.

Table 14.24: Self-appraisal of being informed to 'Respond effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual harassment and/or violence', by work area.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Not informed at all	33.7	36.0	36.8	37.8	44.3
Slightly informed	25.8	23.5	25.4	24.2	20.1
Somewhat informed	19.2	20.2	21.6	17.3	15.5
Fairly informed	16.4	16.9	13.5	15.8	14.6
Completely informed	4.9	3.4	2.7	4.9	5.5

There were some differences by sexual orientation in how well informed staff felt in responding effectively to a disclosure of sexual violence or harassment. Fewer bisexual staff (56%) and staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation (51%) said that they felt 'Not informed at all' or 'Slightly informed', however both of these groups had a relatively high rate of being 'Somewhat informed'. As a result, the percentage of staff who felt 'Fairly informed' or 'Well informed' remained relatively consistent across sexual orientation groups.

Table 14.25: Self-appraisal of being informed to 'Respond effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual harassment and/or violence', by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Not informed at all	50.0	34.9	26.5	36.8	42.9
Slightly informed	22.9	21.4	24.7	24.6	18.4
Somewhat informed	8.3	22.2	25.3	18.5	13.3
Fairly informed	16.7	19.8	15.4	15.8	20.4
Completely informed	2.1	1.6	8.0	4.4	5.1

Among the staff age groups, survey respondents aged 55+ were least likely to indicate that they were not informed at all or only slightly informed about how to respond effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual violence and / or harassment. Over one quarter (28%) of this age group said they were either 'Fairly informed' or 'Completely informed' about how to respond to a disclosure. This percentage was approximately 10% higher than for other age groups. Those staff who preferred not to say their age were the most likely overall to say that they were fairly or completely informed.

Table 14.26: Self-appraisal of being informed to 'Respond effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual harassment and/or violence', by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
Not informed at all	38.4	39.0	39.3	28.0	39.4
Slightly informed	23.4	25.9	23.5	24.3	15.2
Somewhat informed	18.8	19.9	17.1	19.6	12.1
Fairly informed	15.2	12.1	14.9	23.0	27.3
Completely informed	4.2	3.1	5.2	5.1	6.1

14.5 Perceptions of Female and Male Rape Myth Beliefs

The statements in this section reflect misperceptions and inaccurate beliefs about sexual violence and harassment, also known as ‘Rape myths’. These include provocative statements and language that reflect negative views and unjust explanations of sexual violence.

The statements in this section refer to both female and male rape myth beliefs. In both cases, these are inaccurate gender-related beliefs about people who are sexually assaulted or raped. The female rape myth statements included in the survey for staff were taken from the Updated Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance (IRMA) Scale (McMahon & Farmer, 2011). These statements are grouped into two sub-scales:

- > ‘He didn’t mean to’ – which refers to explanations of rape that excuse or rationalise the behaviour of a man who engages in rape.
- > ‘She asked for it’ – this sub-scale describes behaviours or actions by women that attempt to make them responsible for rape having taken place.

A set of 10 items were taken from the longer ‘Belief in male rape myths scale’ (Melanson, 1999). These statements reflect beliefs in male rape myths as a parallel to coverage of female rape myths. All of the statements were linked to a 5-point response scale from ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’. The ‘Strongly agree’ and ‘Agree’ responses are aggregated in the tables below, as are the ‘Strongly disagree’ and ‘Disagree’ responses.

This section of the survey was introduced with the following text:

The following questions ask about general attitudes to sexual violence and harassment. Some of the language used in these questions is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean.

The staff members were given the option to skip this section. A total of 2,832 staff members (80.5% of the full sample) chose to respond to these statements and 684 chose not to do so (19.5%).

The participants who chose to respond to the rape myth statements included 1,964 females (81.9% of the total number of females who took part in the survey), 830 males (78.4% of the total), 15 gender non-binary staff (83.6%), and 23 who preferred not to say their gender (57.5%).

A total of 25 asexual staff members (52.1% of the total number of asexual staff in the sample) chose to respond to this section, as did 105 bisexual staff (83.3%), 143 staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation (88.3%), 2,495 heterosexuals (81.0%), and 64 staff who preferred not to say their sexual orientation (65.3%).

In terms of response rates by work area, 770 academic AHSS-BL staff responded (80.0% of the total number of this group of staff in the survey), along with 645 academic STEM-MH staff members (78.5%), 155 Research staff (83.8%), 1,103 Professional / technical staff (83.1%), and 159 staff members who preferred not to say or worked in an 'other' area (72.6%).

By age, 385 of 18-34 year olds responded to the section on rape myth statements (80.4% of the total number of 18-34 year olds in the sample), along with 822 35-44 year olds (82.9%), 1,006 45-54 year olds (80.9%), 603 staff members aged 55+ (78.4%), and 16 who preferred not to say (48.5%).

One of the female rape myth sub-scales that was included is called "He didn't mean to". This sub-scale comprises six statements that refer to justifications for why a man would rape or sexually assault someone. Three of them describe ways in which disinhibition from alcohol would make this more likely to occur and the other three reference lack of control over sex drive as a rationale.

The highest rate of agreement was with the statement that 'If a man is drunk, he might rape or sexually assault someone unintentionally', which 8% of staff members agreed with. Seven per cent of staff who completed this part of the survey agreed with the statement that 'When guys rape or sexually assault, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex' and with the statement that 'Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away'.

Table 14.27: Percentage of staff who selected the ‘Strongly agree’ or ‘Agree’ options in response to the ‘He didn’t mean to’ rape myth sub-scale, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
When guys rape or sexually assault, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex	5.7	10.6	13.3	4.3	7.1
If a man is drunk, he might rape or sexually assault someone unintentionally	6.1	11.1	0.0	4.3	7.5
Men don’t usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away	5.5	9.0	0.0	4.3	6.5
Rape or sexual assault happens when a man’s sex drive gets out of control	4.1	7.1	6.7	0.0	4.9
If both people are drunk, it can’t be rape or sexual assault	0.8	1.6	0.0	4.3	1.0
It shouldn’t be considered rape or sexual assault if a man is drunk and didn’t realise what he was doing	0.4	0.8	6.7	4.3	0.6

The table below shows the range of responses to the ‘He didn’t mean to’ sub-scale. When agreement responses were collated with ‘Neutral’ responses, 16-20% of staff members chose either a ‘Neutral’ or agree response to the three most endorsed statements.

Table 14.28: Breakdown of responses to the ‘He didn’t mean to’ rape myth sub-scale, for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
If a man is drunk, he might rape or sexually assault someone unintentionally	83.9	8.7	7.5
When guys rape or sexually assault, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex	80.2	12.7	7.1
Men don’t usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away	80.9	12.6	6.5

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Rape or sexual assault happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control	86.6	8.4	4.9
If both people are drunk, it can't be rape or sexual assault	93.0	6.0	1.0
It shouldn't be considered rape or sexual assault if a man is drunk and didn't realise what he was doing	98.1	1.3	0.6

The range of responses to the items illustrates the strong tendency to disagree with this set of rape myth beliefs:

- > Disagreement: Between 80% ('When guys rape or sexually assault, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex') and 98% ('It shouldn't be considered rape or sexual assault if a man is drunk and didn't realise what he was doing') of staff selected the 'Disagree or 'Strongly Disagree' response options.
- > Neutral responses: Between 1% ('It shouldn't be considered rape or sexual assault if a man is drunk and didn't realise what he was doing') and 13% ('When guys rape or sexually assault, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex') of staff chose the neutral option.
- > Agreement: From 1% ('It shouldn't be considered rape or sexual assault if a man is drunk and didn't realise what he was doing') to 8% ('If a man is drunk, he might rape or sexually assault someone unintentionally') of staff selected the 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' option.

There was a consistent gender difference in ratings of these items. Typically, more male staff agreed with 'He didn't mean to' rape myth sub-scale statements compared with the other gender groups, with a difference of up to 5% in agreement levels between males and females. In the example below, 90% of females disagreed with the statement that 'Rape or sexual assault happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control', compared with 80% of males.

Table 14.29: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the 'He didn't mean to' rape myth sub-scale, 'Rape or sexual assault happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control', by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Female	89.7	6.2	4.1
Male	79.5	13.4	7.1
Non-binary	86.7	6.7	6.7
Prefer not to say	78.3	21.7	0.0

Rates of agreement with statements on this sub-scale varied by area of work by between 1-10%. The rate of agreement with the statements was slightly lower among academic AHSS-BL staff. STEM-MH and research staff tended to have slightly higher rates of agreement. In the example below, 82% of Research staff disagreed that rape or sexual assault happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control, compared with 89% of academic AHSS-BL staff members.

Table 14.30: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the 'He didn't mean to' rape myth sub-scale, 'Rape or sexual assault happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control', by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
AHSS-BL	89.0	7.7	3.4
STEM-MH	85.0	9.1	5.9
Research	81.9	12.9	5.2
Professional / technical	86.8	7.8	5.4
Prefer not to say / Other	85.5	9.4	5.0

Rates of agreement on this sub-scale typically varied by approximately 1-6% between age groups. Younger age groups tended to have slightly lower rates of agreement with these statements while staff aged 55+ years tended to have a slightly higher rate of agreement with them.

Table 14.31: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the 'He didn't mean to' rape myth sub-scale, 'Rape or sexual assault happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control', by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
18-34	91.2	6.2	2.6
35-44	89.9	7.7	2.4
45-54	85.7	8.3	6.0
55+	80.9	10.8	8.3
Prefer not to say	81.3	18.8	0.0

Agreement ratings tended to differ by 1-5% across sexual orientation categories. Those who identified as gay, lesbian, queer or with another orientation were less likely to agree with 'He didn't mean to' rape myth sub-scale statements.

Table 14.32: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘He didn’t mean to’ rape myth sub-scale, ‘Rape or sexual assault happens when a man’s sex drive gets out of control’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Asexual	76.0	20.0	4.0
Bisexual	87.6	7.6	4.8
Gay, lesbian, queer, other sexual orientation	88.8	7.0	4.2
Heterosexual	86.6	8.3	5.1
Prefer not to say	84.4	14.1	1.6

The other female rape myth sub-scale included in the survey is titled “She asked for it”. This sub-scale comprised six statements that describe false beliefs regarding women having some responsibility for being sexually assaulted or raped. These state that women may engage in behaviour that leads to them getting assaulted, such as dressing a particular way, being alone with someone, consuming alcohol, and so on.

Two of the statements had a 5% or more rate of agreement from the staff who responded to this part of the survey. Seven per cent agreed that if a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex. Five per cent agreed with the statement that ‘If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble’.

Table 14.33: Percentage of staff who selected the ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly agree’ options in response to statements from the ‘She asked for it’ rape myth sub-scale, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex	5.5	11.7	6.7	13.0	7.4
If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble	3.8	7.6	0.0	8.7	4.9
If a girl is raped or sexually assaulted while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control	1.6	1.6	0.0	4.3	1.6

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
When girls are raped or sexually assaulted, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
When girls go to parties wearing revealing clothing, they are asking for trouble	1.1	1.9	0.0	4.3	1.3
If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped or sexually assaulted	0.2	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.3

A breakdown of the responses to the statements is provided below. Combined with 'Neutral' responses, 16% of staff members were either 'Neutral' or agreed that 'If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex', while 13% were 'Neutral' or agreed with the statement that 'If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble'.

Table 14.34: Percentage of staff who selected the 'Strongly Disagree' or 'Disagree' response options, the 'Neutral' option or the 'Agree' or 'Strongly agree' options in response to statements from the 'She asked for it' rape myth sub-scale, for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex	84.3	8.4	7.4
If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble	86.5	8.5	4.9
If a girl is raped or sexually assaulted while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control	95.6	2.8	1.6
When girls are raped or sexually assaulted, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear	95.2	3.5	1.3
When girls go to parties wearing revealing clothing, they are asking for trouble	95.6	3.0	1.3
If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped or sexually assaulted	98.2	1.4	0.3

The range of responses to the items illustrates a high rate of disagreement with statements in this sub-scale of rape myth beliefs:

- > Disagree: From 84% ('If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex') to 98% ('If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped or sexually assaulted') of staff selected the 'Disagree' or 'Strongly disagree' response options.
- > Neutral: Between 1% ('If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped or sexually assaulted') and 9% ('If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble') of staff chose the 'Neutral' response option.
- > Agree: From 0.3% ('If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped or sexually assaulted') to 7% ('If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex') of staff selected the 'Agree' or 'Strongly agree' option.

There was a consistent gender difference in ratings of the most endorsed statements from the 'She asked for it' sub-scale. Typically, male staff members and those who preferred not to say their gender had a higher rate of agreement or 'Neutral' responses on these two statements. There was less difference by gender on the remaining statements.

Table 14.35: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the 'She asked for it' rape myth sub-scale, 'If a girl is raped or sexually assaulted while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control', by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Female	96.2	2.2	1.6
Male	94.5	4.0	1.6
Non-binary	93.3	6.7	0.0
Prefer not to say	87.0	8.7	4.3

Responses to the statements on the 'She asked for it' rape myth sub-scale did not differ by area of work. Rates of agreement typically varied by approximately 1-3% between areas of work.

Table 14.36: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘She asked for it’ rape myth sub-scale, ‘If a girl is raped or sexually assaulted while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control’, by work area.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
AHSS-BL	96.1	2.1	1.8
STEM-MH	94.7	3.7	1.6
Research	96.1	2.5	1.4
Professional / technical	96.1	2.5	1.4
Prefer not to say / Other	93.1	4.4	2.5

Agreement ratings tended to differ by 1-7% across sexual orientation categories. Compared with heterosexual and asexual staff, those who identified as bisexual or as gay, lesbian, queer, or with another orientation were less likely to agree with ‘She asked for it’ rape myth sub-scale items.

Table 14.37: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘She asked for it’ rape myth sub-scale, ‘If a girl is raped or sexually assaulted while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Asexual	84.0	12.0	4.0
Bisexual	97.1	1.9	1.0
Gay, lesbian, queer, other sexual orientation	96.5	2.1	1.4
Heterosexual	95.6	2.8	1.6
Prefer not to say	98.4	0.0	1.6

There were small differences in responses to the statements included in the ‘She asked for it’ rape myth sub-scale by age group. Rates of agreement typically varied by approximately 1-5% between these groups, with the rate of agreement or ‘Neutral’ ratings slightly higher among staff aged 55+.

Table 14.38: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘She asked for it’ rape myth sub-scale, ‘If a girl is raped or sexually assaulted while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control’, by age.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
18-34	97.7	1.0	1.3
35-44	97.4	1.3	1.2
45-54	95.3	3.2	1.5
55+	92.4	5.1	2.5
Prefer not to say	93.8	6.3	0.0

The ‘Male rape myths’ scale comprises ten statements that describe ways in which a sexual assault or rape of a man may be minimised. Nine of the statements are phrased negatively and describe men as being partly responsible for being assaulted or that they make insufficient attempts to resist. One statement is positively phrased in that it acknowledges that men are upset by being assaulted. The statements are rated on a 5-point scale from ‘Strongly disagree’ to ‘Strongly agree’. The ‘Strongly disagree’ and ‘Disagree’ responses are aggregated in the tables below as are the ‘Strongly agree’ and ‘Agree’ responses.

Nearly nine out of ten staff (89%) agreed that most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident. Agreement rates on the remaining statements indicate endorsement of male rape myth beliefs.

There was a high level of rejection of male rape myths by the staff group as a whole. The highest rate of agreement (4%) was for the statement that the extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted.

Two of the statements were supported by 2% of the staff members, that a man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced on him, and that many men claim rape or sexual assault if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards.

Table 14.39: Percentage of staff who selected 'Agree' or 'Strongly agree' options in response to the male rape myth items, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
The extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted	2.5	5.7	6.7	4.3	3.5
A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced on him	2.3	4.0	6.7	0.0	2.8
Many men claim rape or sexual assault if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards	2.3	3.9	0.0	0.0	2.8
Women who sexually assault men are sexually frustrated individuals	1.8	3.1	0.0	8.7	2.2
Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the attacker	1.0	1.8	0.0	13.0	1.3
Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not being more careful	0.8	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.0
Men who wear tight or skimpy clothes are asking for trouble	0.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.9
If a man engages in kissing and petting and he lets things get out of hand, it is his fault if the other person forces sex on him	0.7	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.8
Most men who have been raped or sexually assaulted have a history of promiscuity	0.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.6

There was a consistently high rate of agreement of 87-89% across males, females, and non-binary staff members that men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset. Staff who preferred not to say their gender (78%) were less likely to agree with this statement.

Table 14.40: Percentage of staff who selected ‘Strongly agree’ or ‘Agree’ options in response to positively phrased male rape myth statement, ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident	88.7	88.3	86.7	78.3	88.5

There was a consistently high level of rejection of male rape myths, indicated by a disagreement rate of 86-97% for most statements. One statement had a lower disagreement rate of 74%. The statement said that many men claim rape or sexual assault if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards, and 23% of the staff chose the ‘Neutral’ response in reaction to it.

Table 14.41: Breakdown of responses to ‘Male rape myths’ statements, for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted	89.8	6.7	3.5
A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced on him	88.9	8.3	2.8
Many men claim rape or sexual assault if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards	74.0	23.2	2.8
Women who sexually assault men are sexually frustrated individuals	86.7	11.1	2.2
Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the attacker	97.0	1.7	1.3
Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not being more careful	97.2	1.9	1.0
Men who wear tight or skimpy clothes are asking for trouble	96.8	2.3	0.9
If a man engages in kissing and petting and he lets things get out of hand, it is his fault if the other person forces sex on him	97.1	2.1	0.8
Most men who have been raped or sexually assaulted have a history of promiscuity	92.9	6.6	0.6

Table 14.42: Breakdown of responses to the positively phrased ‘Male rape myths’ statement, for all staff.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident	6.7	4.8	88.

The range of responses to the statements was restricted, reflecting the high level of rejection of male rape myths by staff:

- > Disagree: From 74% (‘Many men claim rape or sexual assault if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards’) to 97% (‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not being more careful’) of staff selected the ‘Disagree or ‘Strongly disagree’ response options.
- > Neutral: Between 2% (‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not being more careful’) and 23% (‘Many men claim rape or sexual assault if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards’) of staff members chose the ‘Neutral’ option.
- > Agree: From 1% (‘Most men who have been raped or sexually assaulted have a history of promiscuity’) to 4% (‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’) of staff selected the ‘Agree’ or ‘Strongly agree’ option.

The responses to two illustrative statements are broken down in the table below by gender. There was a similarity across gender groups to the response in statement that ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’. The rate of neutral responses was highest among staff who preferred not to say their gender (17%).

Table 14.43: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’, by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Female	7.1	4.2	88.7
Male	5.8	5.9	88.3
Non-binary	6.7	6.7	86.7
Prefer not to say	4.3	17.4	78.3

The next illustrative statement had a similar response from female and male staff members. The agreement rate was the lowest among non-binary staff (87%) and those who preferred not to say their gender (78%).

Table 14.44: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’, by gender.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Female	91.0	6.5	2.5
Male	87.3	7.0	5.7
Non-binary	86.7	6.7	6.7
Prefer not to say	78.3	17.4	4.3

Responses to the statement ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’ did not differ by area of work. Rates of agreement typically varied by approximately 1-3%.

Table 14.45: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’, by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
AHSS-BL	6.6	4.5	88.8
STEM-MH	6.0	5.0	89.0
Research	6.5	7.7	85.8
Professional / technical	7.0	4.6	88.4
Prefer not to say / Other	6.7	4.8	88.5

There was also a high level of consistency across areas of work in responding to the next illustrative statement. Between ‘Neutral’ and agreement responses, 12% of STEM-MH respondents did not disagree with the statement that ‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’.

Table 14.46: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’, by area of work.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
AHSS-BL	92.1	5.3	2.6
STEM-MH	88.4	7.6	4.0
Research	90.3	7.7	1.9
Professional / technical	89.6	6.5	3.9
Prefer not to say	85.5	10.7	3.8

The rate of agreement on the illustrative statement ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’ was high across all sexual orientations. It was lowest for asexual staff members (80%) and bisexual staff (84%).

Table 14.47: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Asexual	16.0	4.0	80.0
Bisexual	6.7	9.5	83.8
Gay, lesbian, queer, other sexual orientation	5.6	3.5	90.9
Heterosexual	6.7	4.6	88.6
Prefer not to say	3.1	6.3	90.6

Responses to the next illustrative statement did not differ substantially by sexual orientation category, although bisexual staff members (97%) and those who preferred not to say their orientation (95%) had the highest rate of disagreement that ‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’.

Table 14.48: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’, by sexual orientation.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
Asexual	88.0	12.0	0.0
Bisexual	97.1	1.9	1.0
Gay, lesbian, queer, other sexual orientation	90.9	4.2	4.9
Heterosexual	89.3	7.2	3.5
Prefer not to say	95.3	1.6	3.1

There was little difference by age group on the illustrative statement below that ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’. Staff in the 18-34 years age group had the highest level of disagreement and ‘Neutral’ ratings combined (14%).

Table 14.49: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident’, by age group.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
18-34	6.0	8.3	85.7
35-44	7.3	4.5	88.2
45-54	6.6	3.8	89.7
55+	6.6	4.5	88.9
Prefer not to say	0.0	12.5	87.5

There were only small differences across age categories on the next illustrative statement, that ‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’. The 55 years+ age group had the highest combined ‘Neutral’ and agreement ratings on this statement (13%).

Table 14.50: Illustrative example of the range of responses to a statement from the ‘Male rape myths’ scale, ‘The extent of a man’s resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted’, by age.

	Disagree	Neutral	Agree
18-34	90.6	6.8	2.6
35-44	92.1	5.1	2.8
45-54	89.4	7.0	3.7
55+	87.2	8.3	4.5
Prefer not to say	75.0	18.8	6.3

15. Experiences of Sexual Harassment

The section on sexual harassment was introduced with a statement describing the topic for participants. This statement identified that sexual violence and sexual harassment refer to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent.

The participants also read that sexual violence or harassment refers to conduct that derogates, demeans, or humiliates a person based on that person's sex or gender. Examples were given including sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, and sexual violence.

The participants were provided with a 'trigger warning' regarding the content of the items about harassment. This notified them that the questions in this section asked about personal experiences of sexual harassment and used explicit language that some people may find uncomfortable. A link was provided at this point to information on supports.

The participants were told that they could choose not to answer the questions in this section. Of the 3,516 staff members who participated in the online survey, 82.5% (n = 2,900) indicated that they wanted to complete these items and 17.5% (n = 616) indicated that they did not want to do so.

A comparable percentage of staff members by gender said they wanted to complete the section on sexual harassment, including 83.0% of females (n = 1,992), 81.7% of males (n = 865), 83.3% of gender non-binary staff members (n = 15), and 70% of staff who preferred not to state their gender (n = 28).

There was some variability by sexual orientation in the percentage of staff who decided to complete this section. A total of 64.6% of asexual staff members (n = 31) took part, along with 86.5% of bisexual staff (n = 109), 90.1% of the staff who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation (n = 146), 82.5% of heterosexuals (n = 2,543), and 72.4% of staff who preferred not to state their sexual orientation (n = 71).

A comparable percentage of staff members across areas of work indicated they wanted to complete the section on sexual harassment. This included 82.6% of academic AHSS-BL staff (n = 795), 81.8% of academic STEM-MH staff (n = 672), 88.1% of Research staff (n = 163), 83.4% of Professional / technical staff (n = 1,108), and 74.0% of staff who preferred not to say their area of work / other area of work (n = 162).

There was similarity in the rate of staff by age group who participated in this section of survey. A total of 82.3% of 18-34 year olds wanted to complete this section (n = 394), along with 85.3% of 35-44 year olds (n = 846), 82.7% of 45-54 year olds (n = 1,028), 79.6% of those aged 55+ (n = 612), and 60.6% of staff who preferred not to state their age (n = 20).

The statements on sexual harassment were behaviourally-specific descriptions of harassment (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). The statements were preceded by introductory text that read: “In the last four years, have you been in a situation in which someone related to your HEI. Please choose the appropriate response for each item”. The sexual harassment statements then followed. The statements can be categorised into the following six categories:

- > Sexualised comments – Referring to race / ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religion, or trans / non-binary identity
- > Sexist hostility – Remarks and treatment that is derogatory and has a sexist basis.
- > Sexual hostility / crude gender harassment – Derogatory remarks and treatment that has a sexual basis.
- > Unwanted sexual attention – Persistent efforts by an individual to have a sexual or romantic relationship that is unwanted.
- > Sexual coercion – Bribery or special treatment that is provided contingent on sexual behaviour.
- > Sexual harassment via electronic communication or visual / written materials – The use of the Internet or communication platforms as a basis for harassment, including pornography and sexual images that are not on the Internet.

15.1 ‘Not applicable’ Responses

The response options for each sexual harassment statement indicated how frequently the person had that experience, from a choice of ‘Never’, ‘Once or twice’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Often’, ‘Many times’, or that the experience was ‘Not applicable’. The percentages of staff reported in the main tables refer to those staff to whom the behaviour was applicable, once the staff who had said the item was ‘Not applicable’ were filtered from the analysis.

The follow up analysis of illustrative sexual harassment statements provides a full breakdown of responses that includes the ‘Not applicable’ percentage. For reference, the table below indicates what percentage of staff said that each statement in this section was not applicable to them. The not applicable responses fell into three categories. Some statements recorded low numbers of ‘Not applicable’ responses (e.g., 1.7% of participants selected the ‘Not applicable’ response following the statement about being treated differently because of gender).

For other statements, the percentage of total responses that were ‘Not applicable’ was higher, typically around 6-7%. For instance, 7% said it was not applicable to them to respond to an item about someone making sexualised comments about religion.

One statement was responded to as ‘not applicable’ at a higher rate. This item referred to trans / non-binary identity (26.6% not applicable).

The table below identifies the percentage of students who chose the ‘Not applicable’ option for each of the sexual harassment items.

Table 15.1: Number and percentage of students who chose the ‘Not applicable’ option to each of the forms of sexual harassment presented in the survey, among those staff members who chose to respond to the questions on sexual harassment.

	‘Not applicable’
Sexualised Comments	
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your race or ethnicity	n = 177 (6.1% of the total sample)
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your trans and/or non-binary identity	n = 771 (26.6%)
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male	n = 93 (3.2%)
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your sexuality	n = 113 (3.9%)
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your religion	n = 192 (6.6%)
Sexist Hostility	
Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)	n = 49 (1.7%)
Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)	n = 36 (1.2%)
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	n = 33 (1.1%)
Sexual hostility	
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	n = 41 (1.4%)

	'Not applicable'
Sexualised Comments	
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)	n = 40 (1.4%)
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	n = 35 (1.2%)
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	n = 42 (1.4%)
Unwanted Sexual Attention	
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you	n = 43 (1.5%)
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"	n = 75 (2.6%)
Sexual Coercion	
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review, threatening your reputation, etc.)	n = 57 (2.0%)
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour	n = 57 (2.0%)
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	n = 61 (2.1%)
Retaliated after you ended a sexual relationship with them	n = 202 (7.0%)
Sexual Harassment via Electronic Communication or Visual/Written Materials	
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)	n = 44 (1.5%)
Sent or posted unwelcome sexualised messages electronically, by text message, email, social media, or other electronic means (for example via WhatsApp, Snapchat, Facebook, etc.)	n = 52 (1.8%)

15.2 Sexualised Comments

The first category of statements in the sexual harassment section of the survey related to survey respondents having experienced sexualised comments in reference to gender, sexuality, race or ethnicity, religion, or trans / non-binary identity. For the staff group as a whole, the most common form of harassment in this set of statements was exposure to sexualised comments related to male or female identity, which was described by 24% of the staff members. The next most common experience (references to sexuality) was described by 13% of the staff members. The rate of experiencing the other forms of sexualised comments (by race or ethnicity, religion, or trans and / or non-binary identity) ranged from 3-8%.

While staff who preferred not to state their demographic background represented a small number of the respondents overall, they stand out as having experienced the highest levels of sexualised comments overall. The rate of these groups of staff reporting sexualised comments was typically higher or nearly as high as any of the identified demographic groups, across gender, area of work, sexual orientation, or age category.

Table 15.2: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexualised comments, by gender and total number of staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male	27.3	17.5	42.9	46.2	24.6
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your sexuality	13.2	11.7	26.7	20.0	12.9
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your race or ethnicity	7.2	7.7	13.3	16.0	7.5
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your religion	4.4	5.9	14.3	19.2	5.0
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your trans and/or non-binary identity	1.8	3.1	33.3	10.5	2.5

A breakdown of responses is presented below to the two most commonly described forms of harassment in this category. Sexualised comments in reference to female or male identity were experienced 'Once or twice' by 13% of the participants, 11% had this experience more often (i.e., 'Sometimes', 'Often', or 'Many times'), and 3% selected the 'Not applicable' response. Of the 13% of participants who indicated that they experienced sexualised comments in reference to their sexuality, 7% said this had happened once or twice and 6% said it happened more frequently.

Table 15.3: Breakdown of Illustrative examples of sexualised harassment comments, for all staff.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male	73.0	13.2	5.6	2.3	2.7	3.2
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your sexuality	83.7	6.7	2.8	1.2	1.7	3.9

Focusing first on gender, non-binary staff members were the most likely group to have experienced sexualised comments. In addition, more females (27%) than males (18%) described having experienced sexualised comments related to their gender identity. Fourteen per cent of females experienced sexualised comments related to their gender 'Once or twice', compared with 11% of males. One in eight females (12%) experienced these comments 'Sometimes', 'Often', or 'Many times', compared with 7% of males.

Table 15.4: Illustrative example of responses to sexualised comments items, 'Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male', by gender.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Female	69.9	14.0	6.4	2.6	3.3	3.8
Male	81.2	11.1	3.5	1.4	1.3	1.6
Non-binary	53.3	26.7	13.3	0.0	0.0	6.7
Prefer not to say	50.0	10.7	10.7	10.7	10.7	7.1

There was less variation in the experience of sexualised comments across work areas. However academic AHSS-BL staff and staff working in a Research environment were more likely to describe sexualised comments related to their gender or sexuality, along with those staff who preferred not to state their work area.

Table 15.5: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexualised comments, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male	29.4	23.1	29.7	20.9	28.3
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your sexuality	14.5	11.6	13.2	11.7	18.5
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your race or ethnicity	8.5	7.4	12.8	6.2	6.1
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your religion	5.6	6.0	3.3	4.0	6.7

The following breakdown of responses shows that sexualised comments referring to female or male gender were more commonly experienced by academic staff working in AHSS-BL (15% 'Once or twice', 14% more often), Research (15% 'Once or twice', 14% more often), and those who preferred not to state their work area (14% 'Once or twice', 12% more often).

Table 15.6: Illustrative example of responses to sexualised comments items, ‘Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male’, by area of work.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
AHSS-BL	68.4	15.0	7.5	2.6	3.3	3.1
STEM-MH	74.7	12.9	4.0	2.2	3.3	2.8
Research	68.1	15.3	4.9	4.3	4.3	3.1
Professional / technical	76.7	11.6	5.5	1.9	1.3	3.1
Prefer not to say / Other	67.3	14.2	4.3	1.9	6.2	6.2

There was considerable variation by sexual orientation in the experience of sexualised comments that referenced gender identity or sexuality. Bisexual respondents and those with gay, lesbian, queer or other sexual orientations were considerably more likely to describe these experiences. Staff who preferred to not state their sexual orientation also described higher levels of identity-based sexualised comments. There was a considerably higher rate among bisexual staff of experiencing sexualised comments referencing sexuality (‘Once or twice’: 13%; more often: 10%) and among staff who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation (‘Once or twice’: 23%, more often: 21%).

Table 15.7: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexualised comments, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male	16.7	35.6	33.3	23.5	31.9
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your sexuality	9.7	24.0	44.8	10.3	23.4
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your race or ethnicity	3.3	8.2	5.6	7.4	14.8
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your religion	0.0	5.2	4.6	4.9	12.7
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your trans and/or non-binary identity	4.5	9.2	7.3	1.9	4.3

The full breakdown of responses to the illustrative statement on sexualised comments referencing gender identity shows that 13% of heterosexual respondents described having this experience ‘Once or twice’ and 10% said it happened to them more frequently. The rate was considerably higher among bisexual respondents (‘Once or twice’: 17%, more often: 17%) and those who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation (‘Once or twice’: 19%, more often: 14%).

Table 15.8: Illustrative example of responses to sexualised comments items, ‘Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male’, by sexual orientation.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Asexual	80.6	9.7	3.2	3.2	0.0	3.2
Bisexual	61.5	17.4	11.0	2.8	2.8	4.6
Gay, Lesbian, Queer, Other	65.8	19.2	7.5	2.1	4.1	1.4
Heterosexual	74.0	12.6	5.3	2.3	2.6	3.3
Prefer not to say	66.2	15.5	5.6	2.8	7.0	2.8

Reviewing the responses by age category, a relatively high percentage of the 18-34 years age group indicated that they experienced sexualised comments in response to four of the five items in this section. The 35-44 and 45-54 years age groups had similar response patterns to one another. The 55+ years age group described the lowest levels of sexualised comments.

Table 15.9: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexualised comments, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say	Total
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male	33.1	26.0	24.3	16.7	55.0	24.6
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your sexuality	17.3	14.0	12.6	8.3	38.9	12.9
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your race or ethnicity	9.7	8.4	7.2	4.5	35.3	7.5

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say	Total
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your religion	1.7	3.8	6.0	5.9	44.4	5.0
Made sexualised comments that included reference to your trans and/or non-binary identity	3.2	3.0	1.9	2.1	18.2	2.5

The pattern of findings for this section and staff age categories is illustrated below. The rate of 18-34 year olds experiencing sexualised comments referencing gender identity was nearly twice that of the 55+ age group – 17% of 18-34 year olds experienced this ‘Once or twice’ and 15% experienced it more often, while 10% of the 55+ years group experienced it ‘Once or twice’ and 7% experienced it more often.

Table 15.10: Illustrative example of responses to sexualised comments items, ‘Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male’, by age group.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
18-34	64.7	17.0	7.6	4.3	3.0	3.3
35-44	71.3	13.8	5.4	2.4	3.4	3.7
45-54	73.5	13.2	6.1	1.7	2.6	2.8
55+	80.6	9.6	3.3	1.8	1.5	3.3
Prefer not to say	45.0	15.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	0.0

15.3 Sexist Hostility

The next category of items on harassment comprised three statements concerning sexist hostility. This refers to being treated differently, personalised verbal mistreatment, or offensive sexist remarks being made because of the person’s gender. Approximately half of the respondents described being treated differently (52%) or being put down or condescended to (47%) because of gender. Approximately one third of the respondents (35%) said they had experienced sexist remarks.

Table 15.11: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexist hostility, by gender and for the total number of staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)	62.1	26.5	73.3	76.9	51.7
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	57.5	20.3	66.7	63.0	46.5
Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)	40.7	22.6	46.7	40.7	35.4

Examining the full responses to the three sexist hostility statements, 18% of the respondents said they were treated differently ‘Once or twice’ because of their gender and 33% said they had been treated differently more often. There was a similar pattern in the breakdown of responses to the statement on being put down or condescended to – 21% of respondents said this happened to them ‘Once or twice’ and a greater percentage (26%) said it happened more often. In relation to experiencing offensive sexist remarks, 18% of the staff members said that it had happened ‘Once or twice’ and 17% said that it had happened more frequently.

Table 15.12: Responses to sexist hostility statements, for all staff.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)	47.5	17.6	16.8	6.3	10.1	1.7
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	52.9	20.5	12.5	4.6	8.4	1.1
Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)	63.8	17.8	9.2	3.3	4.6	1.2

There were considerable differences in the incidence of sexist hostility by gender identity. Depending on the statement, females described having these experiences almost twice or more than twice as often as males. Sexist hostility was described most frequently by non-binary staff and those who preferred not to state their gender.

Examining the full breakdown of responses to the most commonly cited form of sexist hostility, it was far more likely for females than for males to say that they were treated differently relatively often – 20% of females said it happened ‘Once or twice’ but 42% said it was more frequent than this (including 14% who said it happened ‘Many times’). By comparison, 13% of males said they were treated differently because of their gender ‘Once or twice’ and 13% of men said it happened more often than that.

Table 15.13: Illustrative example of responses to sexist hostility items, ‘Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)’, by gender.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Female	37.3	19.8	20.0	7.9	13.5	1.6
Male	72.1	12.8	8.8	2.4	2.0	1.8
Non-binary	26.7	13.3	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Prefer not to say	21.4	14.3	14.3	14.3	28.6	7.1

There was a trend toward staff in AHSS-BL and Research work areas describing sexist hostility more commonly than staff in the other work areas, along with staff who preferred not to state their work area. Academic staff in STEM-MH reported a lower incidence than other areas of work across all three statements in this section of the survey.

Table 15.14: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexist hostility, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)	58.7	45.3	51.3	50.5	51.6
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	51.5	39.8	50.6	46.7	45.3
Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)	39.0	32.3	42.2	33.6	35.0

The table below illustrates the breakdown of sexist harassment across work areas. AHSS-BL academic staff (20%) had the highest rate of being treated differently ‘Once or twice’ because of gender. The same group had the highest rate of being treated differently more often (39%), a figure that includes 15% of academic AHSS-BL staff who said this happened ‘Many times’.

Table 15.15: Illustrative example of responses to sexist hostility items, ‘Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)’, by area of work.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times
AHSS-BL	40.8	19.5	17.1	6.5	14.8
STEM-MH	53.7	13.8	14.3	7.1	9.2
Research	47.9	16.6	17.8	8.6	7.4
Professional / technical	48.6	18.5	18.5	5.4	7.2
Prefer not to say / Other	46.9	19.1	13.0	4.9	13.0

Examining sexist hostility by sexual orientation, the staff who identified as bisexual had the highest incidence on each of the three statements. Staff who preferred not to state their sexual orientation and those who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation described relatively high rates of sexist hostility as well.

Table 15.16: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexist hostility, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)	27.6	74.1	57.1	50.3	64.7
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	25.8	63.9	43.4	45.9	59.4
Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)	16.1	57.4	42.0	33.9	49.3

These trends by sexual orientation are illustrated in being treated differently because of gender. Of the 74% of bisexual survey respondents who described being treated differently because of their gender, 25% said this happened ‘Once or twice’, while nearly 49% said it happened more often (including 15% who described it happening ‘Many times’). Among the staff members who preferred not to say their sexual orientation, 21% said they were treated differently because of gender ‘Many times’.

Table 15.17: Illustrative example of responses to sexist hostility items, ‘Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)’, by sexual orientation.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Asexual	67.7	16.1	6.5	3.2	0.0	6.5
Bisexual	25.7	24.8	24.8	9.2	14.7	0.9
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other	41.1	19.9	21.2	4.8	8.9	4.1
Heterosexual	49.0	17.3	16.1	6.3	9.8	1.5
Prefer not to say	33.8	12.7	23.9	4.2	21.1	4.2

There was an age-related trend in experiences of sexist harassment. Across all three statements in this section, the highest level of harassment was described by the youngest age cohort (18-34 years). By comparison, incidence was slightly lower among 35-44 and 45-54 year olds, and lower again among the 55+ age group. Those who preferred not to state their age described a high incidence of sexist harassment.

Table 15.18: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexist hostility, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say	Total
Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)	60.9	56.3	51.8	38.3	75.0	51.7
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	53.1	51.3	46.7	34.8	70.0	46.5
Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)	46.4	39.3	35.5	22.0	55.0	35.4

The breakdown of frequency of sexist harassment by age is illustrated below. A similar pattern can be seen across the different age categories. In each case, the percentage of people who were treated differently because of gender ‘Once or twice’ was smaller than the percentage who were treated differently more often. For instance, 21% of 18-34 year olds said they had this experience ‘Once or twice’ while 39% said it had happened more often.

Table 15.19: Illustrative example of responses to sexist hostility items, ‘Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)’, by age group.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times
18-34	38.6	21.1	18.3	9.4	11.4
35-44	43.0	18.3	19.6	5.8	11.6
45-54	47.3	16.9	16.8	6.0	11.1
55+	60.6	15.2	12.3	5.2	4.9
Prefer not to say	25.0	30.0	5.0	10.0	30.0

15.4 Sexual Hostility / Crude Gender Harassment

This set of four statements refers to actions that have sexual connotations, including stories or jokes, offensive remarks, inappropriate sexual conversations, and non-verbal gestures or body language. Depending on the statement, sexual hostility or crude gender harassment was described by between 14% and 21% of the respondents who engaged with this section of the survey.

The most common experience was to be repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes (21%), followed by remarks about the person's appearance, body, or sexual activities (17%), unwelcome attempts to discuss sexual matters (14%), and embarrassing or offensive gestures or body language (14%).

Table 15.20: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual hostility, by gender and for the staff group as a whole.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	24.5	13.0	26.7	37.0	21.2
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	19.5	11.4	13.3	44.4	17.3
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)	15.3	10.5	6.7	26.9	13.9
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	15.8	8.2	13.3	19.2	13.5

Responses to the two most commonly described forms of sexual hostility are described in detail below. Thus, 13% of staff members said they had been repeatedly told offensive sexual stories or jokes 'Once or twice', while 8% had this experience more often. A total of 9% of staff had offensive remarks made 'Once or twice' about their appearance, body or sexual activities, and 8% had this experience more often.

Table 15.21: Illustrative example of responses to sexual hostility / crude gender harassment items, for all staff.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	77.7	12.7	4.2	1.7	2.3	1.4
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	81.7	9.2	4.1	1.5	2.3	1.2

The percentage of staff members who described sexual hostility varied by gender. People who preferred not to state their gender were the most likely to indicate they had experienced sexual hostility. Non-binary staff described a relatively high rate of being told offensive sexual stories or jokes (27%). Females were more likely than males to describe each of the forms of harassment in this set of statements.

For instance, female staff (25%) were almost twice as likely as male staff (13%) to say they had been repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes. The example below shows that, of the female staff members who responded to the statement about being repeatedly told offensive sexual stories or jokes, 15% were exposed to this experience ‘Once or twice’ and it happened more often to 10% of the females. This was approximately twice the rate experienced by males.

Table 15.22: Illustrative example of responses to sexual hostility / crude gender harassment items, ‘Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you’, by gender.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Female	74.2	14.6	4.5	2.0	3.0	1.6
Male	86.2	7.9	3.4	0.9	0.7	0.9
Non-binary	73.3	26.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Prefer not to say	60.7	17.9	10.7	3.6	3.6	3.6

The rate of experiencing sexual hostility typically did not vary more than 5% between the AHSS-BL, STEM-MH, Research, and Professional / technical work areas. Staff members who preferred not to state their work area described slightly higher rates of sexual hostility than other staff.

Table 15.23: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual hostility, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	22.4	21.9	19.3	20.0	22.4
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	20.6	15.6	16.7	15.2	23.3
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)	15.4	13.9	16.1	12.2	16.4
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	15.7	11.1	16.3	12.5	17.2

This broad consistency in patterns of sexual hostility across work areas is illustrated below. Across the different areas of work, between 10-13% of staff members said they were repeatedly told offensive sexual stories or jokes ‘Once or twice’, while between 7-10% said it had happened more often to them.

Table 15.24: Illustrative example of responses to sexual hostility / crude gender harassment items, ‘Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you’, by area of work.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
AHSS-BL	76.9	12.8	5.3	1.6	2.4	1.0
STEM-MH	77.4	13.1	3.1	2.4	3.1	0.9
Research	79.8	10.4	3.1	1.2	4.3	1.2
Professional / technical	78.6	12.8	4.0	1.5	1.4	1.7
Prefer not to say / Other	74.7	11.7	6.2	0.6	3.1	3.7

There were distinctive patterns in sexual hostility across sexual orientation categories. Those who preferred not to state their sexual orientation, along with bisexual staff members and staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation were more likely to describe sexual hostility. Depending on the statement, the incidence of sexual hostility was 5-13% higher among bisexual staff members than among heterosexual staff members.

Table 15.25: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual hostility, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	19.4	32.4	29.0	20.1	29.4
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	6.5	26.9	25.7	16.1	33.8
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)	19.4	22.2	24.1	12.7	20.9
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	9.7	16.7	17.9	13.0	19.7

Looking at the most common form of sexual hostility, 19% of bisexual staff members described being repeatedly told offensive sexual stories or jokes ‘Once or twice’ and 13% said this happened to them more often. The equivalent figures for heterosexual staff members were that 12% of this group had this experience ‘Once or twice’ and it had happened more often to 8% of this group.

Table 15.26: Illustrative example of responses to sexual hostility / crude gender harassment items, ‘Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you’, by sexual orientation.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Asexual	80.6	16.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bisexual	67.0	19.3	7.3	2.8	2.8	0.9
Gay, lesbian, queer, or other sexual orientation	70.5	14.4	6.8	3.4	4.1	0.7
Heterosexual	78.8	12.1	4.0	1.6	2.1	1.4
Prefer not to say	67.6	19.7	1.4	0.0	7.0	4.2

There was a consistent trend in experiences of sexual hostility by age category. For each of the statements on sexual hostility, the 18-34 year old group described the highest rate of incidence ranging from 16-26%. There was typically a small gap between the 18-34 age group and the 35-44 and 45-54 year old categories. Depending on the statement, the incidence rate for the latter two age groups ranged from 13-22%. There was a larger difference with the 55+ years age category, who described a percentage incidence rate of 8-17% across the statements. The staff members who preferred not to state their age were most likely to describe sexual hostility, ranging from 45-60% across the statements.

Table 15.27: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual hostility, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say	Total
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	25.6	21.9	20.9	17.1	45.0	51.7
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	21.9	20.5	17.1	8.9	60.0	46.5
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)	22.6	14.8	12.9	7.8	47.4	35.4

Reviewing the most commonly described item in this section, 12% of 18-34 year olds said they had repeatedly been told offensive sexual stories or jokes ‘Once or twice’ and 13% said this had happened more often. This compares with 13% of 45-54 year olds who had this experience ‘Once or twice’ and 8% who experienced this more often. Of staff aged 55+, 12% were repeatedly told offensive sexual stories or jokes ‘Once or twice’ and 5% experienced it more often.

Table 15.28: Illustrative example of responses to sexual hostility / crude gender harassment items, ‘Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you’, by age group.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
18-34	73.9	12.2	6.1	1.8	5.3	0.8
35-44	76.7	13.1	4.5	2.0	1.9	1.8
45-54	78.0	12.7	3.7	1.8	2.3	1.4
55+	81.7	12.1	3.3	0.8	0.7	1.5
Prefer not to say	55.0	20.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	0.0

15.5 Unwanted Sexual Attention

The next set of items on the sexual harassment measure concern unwanted sexual attention. These statements refer to someone making persistent efforts to have a relationship which are unwanted or after the person had already said ‘no’. Overall, 6% of survey respondents said someone had continued to ask them for a romantic date even though they had said ‘no’ and 10% had the experience of someone making unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with them.

Table 15.29: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced unwanted sexual attention, by gender and for the staff group as a whole.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you	11.3	7.2	33.3	11.1	10.2
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”	6.9	3.3	13.3	7.7	5.8

In terms of gender identity, a greater percentage of non-binary staff members said they had experienced unwanted sexual attention. Female staff members were more likely than male staff to say they had had unwanted attempts to establish a sexual relationship (11% compared with 7%) and that someone had continued to ask them for romantic dates (7% compared with 3%).

Examining the breakdown of responses to the most frequently cited item, 7% of females said they had the experience of someone making unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship ‘once or twice’ and 4% said they had this experience more often.

Table 15.30: Illustrative example of responses to unwanted sexual attention items, ‘Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you’, by gender.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Female	87.2	6.9	2.2	1.2	0.8	1.7
Male	91.8	5.2	1.0	0.3	0.6	1.0
Non-binary	66.7	26.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Prefer not to say	85.7	10.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6

The rate of unwanted sexual attention ranged from 8-17% across work areas. Survey respondents who worked in AHSS-BL, STEM-MH, Research, and those who preferred not to say their work area described slightly higher rates of unwanted sexual attention.

Table 15.31: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced unwanted sexual attention, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ Technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you	12.0	9.8	13.7	7.6	17.0
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”	7.0	6.2	10.1	3.7	8.9

This pattern can be seen in the breakdown of responses to the statement on unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship. For instance, 7% of staff working in the Research area experienced this ‘Once or twice’ and 7% said it had happened to them more often.

Table 15.32: Illustrative example of responses to unwanted sexual attention items, ‘Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you’, by area of work.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
AHSS-BL	87.0	8.4	2.3	0.5	0.6	1.1
STEM-MH	88.8	5.4	2.2	1.2	0.9	1.5
Research	85.3	6.7	3.7	1.8	1.2	1.2
Professional / technical	90.8	5.3	0.9	0.9	0.4	1.7
Prefer not to say / Other	81.5	10.5	3.1	1.2	1.9	1.9

There was a broadly consistent rate of unwanted sexual attention described by respondents across sexual orientation categories. Across these categories, there was a range of 7-13% of staff members who experienced unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with them. There was a range from 5-10% in being asked for dates despite having said ‘no’.

Table 15.33: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced unwanted sexual attention, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you	6.5	13.0	11.0	10.1	10.1
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”	6.7	4.7	7.8	5.6	10.3

Looking at the frequency with which unwanted sexual attention was experienced, bisexual respondents reported the highest rate of experiencing unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with them ‘Once or twice’ (8%) and more often (5%).

Table 15.34: Illustrative example of responses to unwanted sexual attention items, ‘Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you’, by sexual orientation.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Asexual	93.5	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bisexual	86.2	8.3	2.8	1.8	0.0	0.9
Gay, lesbian, queer, other	88.4	6.2	1.4	2.1	1.4	0.7
Heterosexual	88.6	6.6	1.9	0.8	0.6	1.5
Prefer not to say	87.3	2.8	1.4	1.4	4.2	2.8

There was an age-related trend in descriptions of unwanted sexual attention. The 18-35 years age group had the highest incidence rate. There was a similar rate experienced by 35-44 and 45-54 year old groups. The 55+ age group described the lowest incidence level. Survey respondents who preferred not to state their age had the highest level of unwanted sexual attention overall.

Table 15.35: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced unwanted sexual attention, by age groups.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say	Total
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you	15.3	11.7	9.5	5.3	31.6	51.7
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”	10.1	5.9	5.4	2.9	31.6	46.5

One in ten of the 18-34 year olds described experiencing unwanted attempts to establish a sexual relationship ‘Once or twice’. Five per cent of this age group said it had happened more often. By comparison, the equivalent figures for the 55+ age category were 3% (‘Once or twice’) and 2% (more often).

Table 15.36: Illustrative example of responses to unwanted sexual attention items, ‘Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you’, by age group.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
18-34	84.0	10.2	2.0	1.8	1.3	0.8
35-44	86.9	7.7	2.1	1.1	0.6	1.7
45-54	89.3	5.7	2.2	0.8	0.6	1.4
55+	93.0	3.4	0.8	0.5	0.5	1.8
Prefer not to say	65.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	5.0

15.6 Sexual Coercion

The next set of four items refers to coercive strategies for obtaining sexual intimacy, such as bribing someone with rewards, creating a threatening atmosphere, suggesting better treatment could be available, or retaliation after a relationship ended. The incidence of these forms of coercive harassment ranged from 1% (retaliation after a relationship ended), to 2% (implying better treatment) and 3% (feeling threatened, feeling bribed with a reward).

Table 15.37: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual coercion, by gender.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour	3.4	2.0	6.7	3.7	3.0
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review, threatening your reputation, etc.)	3.0	2.5	0.0	3.7	2.8
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	2.6	1.5	0.0	3.7	2.3
Retaliated after you ended a sexual relationship with them	1.0	1.8	6.7	0.0	1.3

Reviewing the breakdown of responses to the two most frequently cited items in this section, 2% of the respondents said they felt as though they were being bribed with a reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour ‘Once or twice’ and 1% described this happening more often. One per cent said they had felt threatened with retaliation for not being sexually cooperative ‘Once or twice’, and 1% said that this had happened to them more often.

Table 15.38: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, all staff members.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour	95.1	1.7	0.6	0.3	0.4	2.0
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review, threatening your reputation, etc.)	95.3	1.3	0.6	0.4	0.4	2.0
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	95.7	1.2	0.4	0.2	0.3	2.1
Retaliated after you ended a sexual relationship with them	91.8	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.1	7.0

There is limited scope to make comparisons between gender categories given the total percentage of the respondents who described experiencing sexual coercion. Female respondents described a higher incidence rate than males for three of the four items. In the illustrative example below, 2% of females said that ‘Once or twice’ they had felt like they were being bribed to engage in sexual behaviour and a similar percentage said this had happened to them more often.

Table 15.39: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, ‘Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour’, by gender.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Female	94.5	1.8	0.7	0.4	0.4	2.2
Male	96.6	1.3	0.1	0.1	0.5	1.4
Non-binary	93.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Prefer not to say	92.9	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6

Given the incidence rate of sexual coercion among the participants, there were minor differences by area of work. Staff working in a Research environment, academic AHSS-BL staff, and staff who preferred not to say their area of work described the highest level of sexual coercion. Six per cent of Research staff had felt bribed to engage in sexual behaviour and 5% of this group indicated they had felt threatened with retaliation for not being sexually cooperative.

Table 15.40: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual coercion, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour	4.1	3.3	6.3	1.4	3.8
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review, threatening your reputation, etc.)	3.7	2.7	5.0	1.7	4.4
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	3.2	2.1	3.1	1.2	4.5
Retaliated after you ended a sexual relationship with them	1.7	1.1	1.9	0.9	2.7

Among the Research staff, 4% indicated that they felt they were being bribed with a reward or special treatment 'Once or twice' and 2% that it happened to them more often. By comparison, 2% of academic AHSS-BL staff said they had felt bribed to engage in sexual behaviour 'Once or twice' and 2% said it had happened more often.

Table 15.41: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, 'Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour', by area of work.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
AHSS-BL	94.0	2.3	0.9	0.4	0.5	2.0
STEM-MH	95.1	2.1	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.6
Research	92.0	3.7	1.2	0.6	0.6	1.8
Professional / technical	96.7	0.6	0.5	0.0	0.2	2.0
Prefer not to say / Other	93.2	1.9	0.0	1.2	0.6	3.1

Examining responses by sexual orientation, respondents who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation described higher rates of sexual coercion than heterosexual or asexual staff members.

Table 15.42: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual coercion, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour	0.0	0.9	3.5	3.0	5.9
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review, threatening your reputation, etc.)	0.0	4.7	3.5	2.6	7.4
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	0.0	1.9	2.8	2.2	5.9
Retaliated after you ended a sexual relationship with them	0.0	1.0	2.9	1.1	4.5

Respondents who preferred not to say their sexual orientation had the highest rate of sexual coercion. They represented a relatively small number of participants, but 1% said they felt bribed with reward or special treatment ‘Once or twice’ and 4% said it happened to them more often.

Table 15.43: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, ‘Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour’, by sexual orientation.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Asexual	96.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Bisexual	97.2	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8
Gay, lesbian, queer, other	94.5	2.1	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.1
Heterosexual	95.2	1.7	0.6	0.2	0.4	1.9
Prefer not to say	90.1	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	4.2

The 18-34 and 45-54 years age groups described higher levels of sexual coercion than the two other age groups. The highest incidence was for 5% of 18-34 year olds and 4% of 45-54 year olds who had felt bribed with a reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour. Those who preferred not to state their age described higher levels of sexual coercion but the number of staff members in this group is quite low.

Table 15.44: Percentage of staff members who indicated they had experienced sexual coercion, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour	4.7	2.4	3.8	0.8	21.1
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review, threatening your reputation, etc.)	3.1	2.5	3.4	1.5	20.0
Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	2.6	1.6	3.3	0.8	15.8
Retaliated after you ended a sexual relationship with them	1.1	1.3	1.5	0.9	11.1

The table below shows the full breakdown of responses to one of the illustrative items by age group. Among 18-34 year olds, 3% experienced being bribed to engage in sexual behaviour 'Once or twice' and 2% said this happened to them more often.

Table 15.45: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, 'Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour', by age group.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
18-34	93.7	3.0	0.3	0.8	0.5	1.8
35-44	95.3	1.8	0.4	0.0	0.2	2.4
45-54	94.7	1.8	1.0	0.4	0.6	1.6
55+	97.1	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.3	2.1
Prefer not to say	75.0	15.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0

15.7 Sexual Harassment Via Electronic Communication or Visual/Written Materials

This section comprised two statements that described being exposed to visual or written materials with sexist or suggestive content or the electronic sending or posting of unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or pictures. More than one in six (15%) of the survey respondents described being exposed to sexist or suggestive materials such as pictures, stories or pornography that they found offensive. One in ten of the respondents described unwelcome sexual comments having been sent or posted online, including text, email, or other electronic formats on an online platform such as WhatsApp, Snapchat, or Facebook.

Table 15.46: Percentage of students who experienced sexual harassment via electronic communication or visual / written materials, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)	16.8	9.1	21.4	29.6	14.6
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures by text, email, or other electronic means (for example via WhatsApp, Snapchat, Facebook, etc.)	10.1	8.4	0.0	12.0	9.6

Overall, 8% of the participants said they had been exposed to sexist or suggestive materials ‘Once or twice’ and 6% said it had happened more often. By comparison, 6% indicated that someone had sent or posted unwelcome sexual content online ‘Once or twice’ and 4% that it had happened more often.

Table 15.47: Breakdown of responses to items on sexual harassment via electronic communication or visual / written materials, all staff.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)	84.1	8.1	3.7	1.1	1.5	1.5
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures by text, email, or other electronic means (for example via WhatsApp, Snapchat, Facebook, etc.)	88.8	5.8	2.3	0.6	0.7	1.8

More females (17%) than males (9%) described being exposed to sexist or suggestive materials. There was a smaller difference between females (10%) and males (8%) on the statement concerning unwelcome sexual comments online. A relatively high percentage of the other gender groups were exposed to sexist or suggestive materials, including 21% of non-binary survey respondents and 30% of those respondents who preferred not to state their gender.

Nine per cent of females said someone had displayed, used, or distributed offensive sexist or suggestive materials ‘Once or twice’, and 7% said it happened more often than that. By comparison, 5% of males indicated that they had had this experience ‘Once or twice’ and 4% that it had happened more often to them.

Table 15.48: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, ‘Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)’, by gender.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Female	81.9	9.2	4.0	1.4	1.9	1.6
Male	89.8	5.4	2.9	0.2	0.5	1.2
Non-binary	73.3	13.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7
Prefer not to say	67.9	10.7	7.1	3.6	7.1	3.6

There was a consistent rate of respondents across areas of work who described exposure to sexist or suggestive materials, ranging from 13-16%. Academic staff in AHSS-BL were the most likely to have this experience. There was also broad consistency across work areas in unwelcome online experiences. The incidence of this form of harassment ranged from 7-12%. Staff working in a Research environment were the most likely to indicate that they had had this experience.

Table 15.49: Percentage of students who experienced sexual harassment via electronic communication or visual / written materials, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)	16.2	14.7	14.5	13.4	15.3
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures by text, email, or other electronic means (for example via WhatsApp, Snapchat, Facebook, etc.)	10.5	11.4	12.4	7.3	10.3

The breakdown of responses to the item on exposure to offensive sexist or suggestive materials shows that 9% of academic AHSS-BL staff had this experience ‘Once or twice’ and 7% described it happening more often. A similar percentage of academic STEM-MH staff (7%) also said that this had happened to them more than once or twice, while 10% of staff who preferred not to say their work area or described it as ‘other’ said they had been exposed to offensive sexist or suggestive materials more than once or twice.

Table 15.50: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, ‘Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)’, by area of work.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
AHSS-BL	83.0	9.2	3.6	1.5	1.8	0.9
STEM-MH	84.1	7.3	4.2	1.0	1.9	1.5
Research	83.4	8.6	1.8	0.6	3.1	2.5
Professional / technical	85.2	8.2	3.3	0.9	0.7	1.6
Prefer not to say / Other	82.1	5.6	6.2	0.6	2.5	3.1

Bisexual staff members (24%) reported the highest incidence of someone having displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials via electronic communication or visual / written materials. Staff members who preferred not to say their sexual orientation (14%) reported the highest incidence of someone posting or sending unwelcome material electronically.

Table 15.51: Percentage of students who experienced sexual harassment via electronic communication or visual / written materials, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)	9.7	24.1	19.6	13.8	22.4
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures by text, email, or other electronic means (for example via WhatsApp, Snapchat, Facebook, etc.)	6.5	8.3	11.3	9.5	13.8

These differences by sexual orientation are illustrated below in the full breakdown of responses to an illustrative statement. Among the bisexual staff members, 16% said someone had displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials by electronic means ‘Once or twice’, while 8% of them had this experience more often.

Table 15.52: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, ‘Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)’, by sexual orientation.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
Asexual	90.3	3.2	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bisexual	75.2	15.6	5.5	1.8	0.9	0.9
Gay, lesbian, queer, other	78.8	9.6	5.5	1.4	2.7	2.1
Heterosexual	85.0	7.7	3.5	1.0	1.4	1.4
Prefer not to say	73.2	12.7	1.4	1.4	5.6	5.6

Compared with other age groups, staff who chose not to state their age described the highest level of unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or the display, use, or distribution of sexist or suggestive materials. Aside from this group, the trends among age groups were relatively similar, with 18-34 year olds slightly more likely to experience the display, use or distribution of sexist or suggestive materials (18%), and 45-54 year olds slightly more likely to experience unwelcome sexual comments being sent or posted (11%).

Table 15.53: Percentage of students who experienced sexual harassment via electronic communication or visual / written materials, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures by text, email, or other electronic means (for example via WhatsApp, Snapchat, Facebook, etc.)	9.0	9.3	11.2	7.3	22.2
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)	17.7	15.3	15.8	9.1	35.0

Differences by age group are illustrated below in the full breakdown of responses to an illustrative statement. Nine per cent of 18-34 year olds said someone had displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials by electronic means ‘Once or twice’ and 9% said it had happened more often than that.

Table 15.54: Illustrative breakdown of responses to sexual coercion items, ‘Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)’, by age group.

	Never	Once or twice	Sometimes	Often	Many times	Not applicable
18-34	81.2	8.6	4.1	1.8	3.0	1.3
35-44	82.7	8.3	3.5	1.4	1.7	2.4
45-54	83.3	8.9	4.9	0.7	1.3	1.1
55+	89.7	6.2	1.6	0.7	0.5	1.3
Prefer not to say	65.0	15.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0

15.8 Follow Up Questions on Sexual Harassment

A set of follow up questions on sexual harassment experiences asked staff members to describe the circumstances of a particular incident that they had experienced. This section of the survey began with staff members choosing whether to complete the follow up questions or skip them after reading the following introduction:

If you experienced one of the situations described in the last question, we would like to ask some follow up questions about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you. If this is not applicable to you or you are not comfortable answering questions about specific instances of sexual harassment you should skip to the next section.

A total of 771 survey respondents indicated that they wished to answer the follow up questions. This represents 26.6% of the staff members who had completed the sexual harassment section. Not all of the individuals who said they wanted to answer them responded to each of the follow up questions.

There were 593 females who said that they wanted to respond to the follow up questions on sexual harassment (29.8% of those who completed the sexual harassment section), 161 males (18.7%), five gender non-binary students (33.3%), and 12 staff members who preferred not to say their gender (42.9%). Given the low number of non-binary staff and those who preferred not to say their gender, these groups are included in the total figures for all staff but not represented in the follow up analysis. Including these individuals in the detailed follow up analysis could make it more likely that they are identifiable.

A total of 239 academic staff working in AHSS-BL indicated they wanted to answer the follow up questions (30.1% of academic AHSS-BL staff who completed the sexual harassment section), along with 167 academic STEM-MH members (24.9%), 52 Research staff (31.9%), 270 Professional / technical staff (24.4%), and 43 staff who preferred not to say their work area or who worked in an 'other' area (26.6%).

The sexual orientation of the staff who indicated they wanted to answer the follow up questions comprised five asexual staff members (16.1% of asexual staff who completed the sexual harassment section), 47 bisexual staff (43.1%), 52 staff members who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation (35.6%), 646 heterosexual staff members (25.4%), and 21 staff who preferred not to say their orientation (29.6%). Given the low number of asexual staff members who completed the follow up analysis, this group is not included in the detailed description below.

The age groups of staff members who chose to follow up questions comprised 159 staff aged 18-34 (40.4% of those who completed the sexual harassment section of the survey), 236 aged 35-44 (27.9%), 255 who were 45-54 (24.8%), and 109 aged 55+ (17.8%). Twelve staff members who preferred not to say their age said they wished to complete the follow up questions (60% of those who had completed the sexual harassment section). Given the low number of individuals, staff who preferred not to say their age are not included in the detailed follow up analysis.

The staff members who responded to these items identified the type of incident that they were referring to in the follow up questions as the situation that had the greatest effect on them. They could indicate more than one type of experience, as illustrated in the table below. The most common issue identified was sexist or sexually offensive language gestures or pictures, which was indicated by 56% of the 771 staff members who said they wanted to answer follow up questions. This trend was similar across female (56%) and male respondents (54%).

Table 15.55: Percentage of staff members who identified the focus of the incident that they described in the follow up items, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Total
Sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures	55.8	54.0	55.5
Unwanted sexual attention	23.9	18.6	22.8
Unwanted touching	14.0	14.3	14.0
Subtle or explicit bribes or threats	10.1	8.7	9.9

The forms of harassment associated with the follow up incident were broadly consistent by area of work. A total of 29% of the Research staff who indicated they wished to respond to follow up questions said that the incident involved unwanted sexual attention and 22% of them said that it involved unwanted touching. Staff who preferred not to say their area of work were the most likely to cite three of the four types of behaviour.

Table 15.56: Percentage of staff members who identified the focus of the incident that they described in the follow up items, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures	54.0	58.7	53.8	54.1	62.8
Unwanted sexual attention	24.7	22.2	28.8	21.5	16.3
Unwanted touching	12.6	15.0	19.2	11.9	25.6
Subtle or explicit bribes or threats	11.3	9.6	7.7	7.8	18.6

Bisexual and heterosexual staff were slightly less likely than gay, lesbian, queer or other staff to indicate that the incident related to (i) sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures, or (ii) unwanted sexual attention. Heterosexual staff were most likely to indicate that the focus of the incident had been unwanted touching. Those staff who preferred not to say their sexual orientation described a high level of offensive language, gestures, or pictures, as well as bribes or threats.

Table 15.57: Percentage of staff members who identified the focus of the incident that they described in the follow up items, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures	59.6	69.2	53.1	81.0
Unwanted sexual attention	14.9	30.8	22.9	23.8
Unwanted touching	10.6	13.5	14.6	9.5
Subtle or explicit bribes or threats	4.3	7.7	9.9	28.6

Similar forms of harassment were identified across age groups in relation to the follow up incident. One deviation from this was that a greater percentage of 18-34 year olds (62%) said they had experienced sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures. This age group were least likely to indicate that the incident involved subtle or explicit bribes or threats (6%).

Table 15.58: Percentage of staff members who identified the focus of the incident that they described in the follow up items, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
Sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures	62.3	53.0	56.1	49.5	21.1
Unwanted sexual attention	27.7	26.7	23.5	7.3	20.0
Unwanted touching	14.5	14.8	14.5	10.1	15.8
Subtle or explicit bribes or threats	6.3	8.1	12.5	11.9	11.1

The next follow up questions asked respondents about the identity of the person who was responsible for the harassment incident that had the greatest impact on them. Some staff members who indicated they wished to respond to follow up questions on sexual harassment did not say the identity of the person who was responsible. A large majority of staff who did answer this section of the survey indicated that a man had been responsible for the incident (80%). There was also a gender-related pattern, whereby males were more likely to indicate that the other person was a woman (55%).

Table 15.59: Gender identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Total
The other person was a man	90.8	38.4	79.2
The other person was a woman	5.9	54.6	16.6
The other person was of another gender	0.4	1.2	0.7

There was broad consistency among staff across work areas in whether the person responsible was a man. Depending on their area of work, between 77-81% of the staff who said they wanted to answer the follow up questions indicated that the person responsible was a man, with the exception of staff who preferred not to say their work area / worked in an 'other' area (70%). Across all work areas, between 15-18% of staff said that the person responsible was a woman.

Table 15.60: Gender identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional/ technical	Prefer not to say / Other
The other person was a man	77.8	81.4	76.9	81.1	69.8
The other person was a woman	15.9	15.0	17.3	18.1	16.3
The other person was of another gender	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	4.7

Bisexual staff members were more likely to report that the person responsible was a man (87%) than staff who identified with other sexual orientations. Notably, staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation (31%) were twice as likely as heterosexual staff members (16%) to report that the other person was a woman.

Table 15.61: Gender identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
The other person was a man	87.2	76.9	78.6	81.0
The other person was a woman	12.8	30.7	15.7	23.8
The other person was of another gender	0.0	1.9	0.7	0.0

Broken down by age category, the percentage of staff who identified a woman as responsible was highest among the 55+ age category (22%). The percentage of staff who identified that a man was responsible was highest among 18-34 year olds (83%).

Table 15.62: Gender identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, by age group.

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+
The other person was a man	83.0	78.4	81.2	72.5
The other person was a woman	16.3	17.8	13.4	22.0
The other person was of another gender	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.8

The next follow up question addressed whether the person who was responsible was a staff member or student at a higher education institution. A total of 716 of the survey participants responded to this question. Of these, 86% said that the person responsible was a staff member at a higher education institution and 2% did not know.

Table 15.63: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a staff member at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by gender and for all staff.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Female (n = 557)	88.5	9.9	1.6
Male (n = 143)	78.3	19.6	2.1
Total (n = 716)	85.9	12.2	2.0

There were 708 staff members who responded to the question about whether the person responsible was a student. Sixteen per cent of these respondents said the person was a student and 2% did not know. There was a difference by gender, with 13% of female respondents to this question indicating that the person responsible was a student compared with 26% of males.

Table 15.64: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a student at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by gender and for all staff.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Female (n = 554)	12.6	85.7	1.6
Male (n = 138)	25.4	73.2	1.4
Total (n = 708)	15.7	82.6	1.7

There were 715 staff members who responded to the question about whether the incident happened on campus. A large majority (86%) said that it did happen on campus. Compared with females (85%), a slightly lower percentage of male staff members (78%) said that the incident happened on campus.

Table 15.65: Location of the harassment incident, ‘Did this happen on campus?’, by gender and for all staff.

	Yes	No
Female (n = 556)	85.4	14.6
Male (n = 143)	78.3	21.7
Total (n = 715)	85.9	12.2

There was a comparable percentage of academic AHSS-BL and STEM-MH staff, as well as staff members working in a Research setting, who indicated that the person responsible for the incident was a staff member. Professional / technical staff and those who preferred not to say their area of work were slightly more likely to say that the person was a staff member.

Table 15.66: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a staff member at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by area of work.

	Yes	No	Don’t know
AHSS-BL (n = 219)	83.6	14.6	1.8
STEM-MH (n = 155)	83.2	15.5	1.3
Research (n = 49)	83.7	16.3	0.0
Professional / technical (n = 254)	89.8	7.9	2.4
Prefer not to say / Other (n = 39)	87.2	7.7	5.1

Professional / technical staff (8%) and those who preferred not to say their area of work (8%) were least likely to say that the person responsible for the incident was a student. Staff working in the other three work areas (20-22%) were more likely to say that the person was a student.

Table 15.67: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a student at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by area of work.

	Yes	No	Don’t know
AHSS-BL (n = 212)	20.3	78.8	0.9
STEM-MH (n = 154)	22.1	76.6	1.3
Research (n = 49)	20.4	79.6	0.0
Professional / technical (n = 254)	8.3	89.4	2.4
Prefer not to say / Other (n = 39)	7.7	87.2	5.1

Research staff (65%) were least likely to say that the incident happened on campus, followed by staff members who preferred not to say (77%). Staff working in the other three work areas were more likely to say that the incident happened on campus.

Table 15.68: Location of the harassment incident, ‘Did this happen on campus?’, by area of work.

	Yes	No
AHSS-BL (n = 218)	85.8	14.2
STEM-MH (n = 155)	85.2	14.8
Research (n = 49)	65.3	34.7
Professional / technical (n = 254)	86.2	13.8
Prefer not to say / Other (n = 39)	76.9	23.1

A similar percentage of bisexual staff members (87%), heterosexuals (87%), and those who preferred not to say their sexual orientation (86%) indicated that a staff member was responsible for the incident they described. By comparison, students who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation (72%) were less likely to say that the person was a staff member.

Table 15.69: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a staff member at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by sexual orientation.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Bisexual (n = 45)	86.7	11.1	2.2
Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 50)	72.0	24.0	4.0
Heterosexual (n = 595)	87.1	11.3	1.7
Prefer not to say (n = 21)	85.7	9.5	4.8

A higher percentage of staff who were gay, lesbian, queer, or another sexual orientation said that the person responsible was a student (29%), followed by staff members who did not say their sexual orientation (24%). Fewer heterosexual staff members (14%) said the person was a student.

Table 15.70: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a student at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by sexual orientation.

	Yes	No	Don't know
Bisexual (n = 45)	17.8	77.8	4.4
Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 49)	28.6	71.4	0.0
Heterosexual (n = 588)	14.1	84.2	1.7
Prefer not to say (n = 21)	23.8	76.2	0.0

Heterosexual staff members (85%), bisexual staff (82%) and those who preferred not to state their sexual orientation (91%) were more likely to say the incident happened on campus than staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation (66%).

Table 15.71: Location of the harassment incident, ‘Did this happen on campus?’, by sexual orientation.

	Yes	No
Bisexual (n = 45)	82.2	17.8
Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 50)	66.0	34.0
Heterosexual (n = 594)	85.2	14.8
Prefer not to say (n = 21)	90.5	9.5

The 18-34 years age group (78%) were the least likely to say that the person responsible for the incident was a staff member, followed by those aged 55+ (84%). The 35-44 and 45-54 years age cohort had a similar likelihood of the person responsible being a staff member (89-90%).

Table 15.72: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a staff member at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by age group.

	Yes	No	Don’t know
18-34 (n = 153)	78.4	18.3	3.3
35-44 (n = 216)	88.9	10.6	0.5
45-54 (n = 237)	89.5	8.4	2.1
55+ (n = 99)	83.8	14.1	2.0
Prefer not to say / Other (n = 39)	7.7	87.2	5.1

The 18-35 years age cohort (26%) were the most likely to say that the person responsible was a student, while the other age cohorts described a comparable percentage ranging from 12-13%.

Table 15.73: Identity of the person responsible for the incident of harassment, ‘Was the other person a student at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?’, by age group.

	Yes	No	Don’t know
18-34 (n = 153)	25.5	72.5	2.0
35-44 (n = 218)	13.3	85.3	1.4
45-54 (n = 234)	12.4	85.9	1.7
55+ (n = 92)	13.0	85.9	1.1

The incident that staff members described was most likely to have happened on campus among those aged 45-54 (89%) and 55+ (88%). Three quarters of those aged 18-35 said it happened on campus.

Table 15.74: Location of the harassment incident, ‘Did this happen on campus?’, by age group.

	Yes	No
18-34 (n = 152)	75.0	25.0
35-44 (n = 217)	82.9	17.1
45-54 (n = 236)	89.0	11.0
55+ (n = 99)	87.9	12.1

The next follow up question asked the staff members how they reacted to the situation that they wanted to describe. This question illustrates the degree to which the individual reacted with passive or active strategies in response to being harassed, with percentages calculated against the 771 staff members who indicated they wished to respond to follow up questions.

The most frequent reaction that staff members described to the harassment situation was to have ignored the person and done nothing following the incident (45%). The next most frequent reaction was to have avoided the person / treated it like a joke (28%). More assertive responses were cited by fewer than 20% staff members who responded to this question – to tell the person to stop (19%), ask for advice and / or support (19%), and to report the person (10%).

There were relatively consistent responses given by females and males, but females were slightly more likely to avoid the person / treat it like a joke, to ask for advice and / or support, and to report the person.

Table 15.75: Percentage of staff who described reactions to the harassment incident, by gender and for all staff (more than one response was possible).

	Female	Male	Total
I ignored the person and did nothing	45.2	42.9	44.7
I avoided the person as much as possible. I treated it like a joke	29.0	22.4	27.6
I told the person to stop	18.2	23.0	18.9
I asked someone for advice and/or support	19.7	12.4	18.8
I reported the person	10.6	6.2	9.7

There were similar trends across work areas in how staff reacted to the incident. However, Research staff were somewhat less likely to have ignored the person and more likely to tell the person to stop, and staff from the Professional / technical work area were slightly more likely to have ignored the person and to avoid them / treat it like a joke.

Table 15.76: Percentage of staff who described reactions to the harassment incident, by area of work (more than one response was possible).

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional / technical	Prefer not to say / other
I ignored the person and did nothing	43.1	44.9	36.5	48.9	37.2
I avoided the person as much as possible. I treated it like a joke	26.4	26.3	26.9	30.0	25.6
I told the person to stop	17.6	21.6	26.9	17.4	16.3
I reported the person	10.5	12.6	11.5	7.4	7.0
I asked someone for advice and/or support	20.1	17.4	19.2	17.0	27.9

Among the sexual orientation groups, bisexual staff members were the most likely to have ignored the person and done nothing, at a rate 10% higher than for other groups. Heterosexual staff members were the least likely to have avoided the person / treat it like a joke. Notably, bisexual people were the least likely to have reported the incident (2%), while staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation were the most likely (12%) to report it.

Table 15.77: Percentage of staff who described reactions to the harassment incident, by sexual orientation (more than one response was possible).

	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
I ignored the person and did nothing	53.2	42.3	44.6	42.9
I avoided the person as much as possible. I treated it like a joke	31.9	36.5	26.5	33.3
I told the person to stop	14.9	17.3	19.3	19.0
I reported the person	2.1	11.5	10.1	9.5
I asked someone for advice and/or support	21.3	11.5	18.0	52.4

There were differences by age group in how the staff members responded to the incident of harassment. Younger staff members were most likely to ignore the person (50%) and to avoid the person / treat it like a joke (39%). Staff aged 55+ (24%) were more likely to tell the person to stop and were least likely to say that they had asked someone for advice and / or support (10%).

Table 15.78: Percentage of staff who described reactions to the harassment incident, by age group (more than one response was possible).

	18-34	35-44	45-54	55+
I ignored the person and did nothing	49.7	43.6	44.3	44.0
I avoided the person as much as possible. I treated it like a joke	39.0	31.8	21.6	18.3
I told the person to stop	17.0	16.1	20.4	23.9
I reported the person	11.9	6.8	11.0	10.1
I asked someone for advice and/or support	21.4	20.8	18.4	10.1

The next part of the follow up section on harassment asked the staff members to say whether they had told anyone about the incident before completing the online survey. The response options were 'Yes' or 'No'. Of the 771 staff members who said they wanted to answer the follow up questions, 717 responded to this question. 55% of the staff members who responded said they had told someone about the incident prior to completing the survey.

Compared with males (41%, n = 143), more females (59%) who responded to this question (n = 557) had told someone about the incident prior to completing the survey.

Table 15.79: Percentage of staff who told someone about the incident before taking part in the online survey, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 557)	Male (n = 143)	Total (n = 717)
Yes	58.7	41.3	55.2
No	41.3	58.7	44.8

Staff working in the academic AHSS-BL work area (64%) were the most likely to have told someone about the situation they described prior to completing the survey. Professional / technical staff were the least likely to have done so (48%).

Table 15.80: Percentage of staff who told someone about the incident before taking part in the online survey, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL (n = 218)	STEM-MH (n = 155)	Research (n = 50)	Professional / technical (n = 255)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 39)
Yes	64.2	53.5	56.0	47.5	61.5
No	35.8	46.5	44.0	52.5	38.5

Heterosexual staff members (54%) were the least likely of the sexual orientation categories to have told someone about the incident, while those who preferred not to say their sexual orientation were the most likely (76%).

Table 15.81: Percentage of staff who told someone about the incident before taking part in the online survey, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 45)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 49)	Heterosexual (n = 597)	Prefer not to say (n = 21)
Yes	60.0	57.1	53.8	76.2
No	40.0	42.9	46.2	23.8

Across most of the age groups, a consistent percentage of staff had told someone about the incident (54-60%), with the exception of staff aged 55+ (43%).

Table 15.82: Percentage of staff who told someone about the incident before taking part in the online survey, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 151)	35-44 (n = 219)	45-54 (n = 237)	55+ (n = 99)
Yes	59.6	58.9	54.4	42.4
No	40.4	41.1	45.6	57.6

The next part of the follow up section on sexual harassment split the respondents into those who had told someone prior to completing the survey and those who had not. Staff members who had told someone were provided with a set of choices as to who they had told. Staff who had not told anyone were invited to respond to a list of reasons for not disclosing the incident.

A total of 712 staff members responded to this section of the survey. This comprised 395 respondents who provided information on who they had told about the incident and 317 respondents who gave reasons why they had not told someone. The tables below provide information on the total number of staff who responded to these questions, and specify the number of staff in each of the sub-groups included in the analysis. The smaller sub-groups (i.e., approximately 10 or less) are not included in the breakdown of responses but are included in the figures for total number of staff.

A majority of the staff members who had told someone else said that they had told a friend (57%) or another staff member (54%). Apart from this, the most frequent choices were to tell a line manager (27%), a romantic partner (35%), or a family member (24%). None of the other choices were selected by more than 6% of the respondents.

Female staff members were more likely than males to have told another staff member about the incident (56%, compared with 41% of males) or line manager (28%, compared with 21% of males). Male staff (41%) were more likely than females (34%) to tell a romantic partner about the incident.

Table 15.83 Percentage of staff members who told another person about the sexual harassment incident that impacted them most, gender and for the total staff group.

	Female(n = 326)	Male(n = 59)	Total(n = 395)
Friend	57.8	54.2	57.3
Another staff member	56.6	40.7	54.5
Romantic partner	33.9	40.7	35.1
Line manager	27.8	20.8	26.8
Family member	23.9	22.0	23.5
Off-campus counsellor	6.1	1.7	5.6
Garda Síochána	2.1	5.1	2.5
Campus security	1.8	1.7	1.8
HEI health services	0.9	3.4	1.3
On-campus counsellor	1.2	0.0	1.0
Religious (e.g., Priest, Nun, Rabbi, Imam, Pastor, Monk, Guru etc.)	0.0	1.7	0.3
Off-campus rape crisis staff	0.3	0.0	0.3
Doctor / nurse	0.0	0.0	0.0

The most frequently cited options are presented in the table below by work area. Research staff were the most likely group to have told a friend (79%) or a line manager (32%), but least likely to have told another staff member (43%). Academic AHSS-BL (42%) and STEM-MH staff (41%) were most likely to have told a romantic partner.

Table 15.84: Percentage of staff members who told another person about the sexual harassment incident that impacted them most, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL (n = 139)	STEM-MH (n = 83)	Research (n = 28)	Professional / technical (n = 121)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 24)
Friend	54.3	62.7	78.6	53.7	50.0
Another staff member	53.6	51.8	42.9	58.7	62.5
Romantic partner	42.1	41.0	28.6	25.6	29.2
Line manager	28.6	22.9	32.1	28.1	16.7
Family member	23.6	26.5	25.0	18.2	37.5

Among staff groups by sexual orientation, heterosexual staff members were least likely to have told a friend (56%) or romantic partner (32%) about the incident. Bisexual staff were least likely to have told a family member (11%) or line manager (19%).

Table 15.85: Percentage of staff members who told another person about the sexual harassment incident that impacted them most, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 27)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 28)	Heterosexual (n = 320)	Prefer not to say (n = 16)
Friend	66.7	67.9	55.5	56.3
Romantic partner	51.9	53.6	32.1	43.8
Family member	11.1	28.6	24.0	31.3
Line manager	18.5	28.6	27.1	25.0
Another staff member	51.9	50.0	55.5	56.3

The two younger age groups were more likely to have told a friend about the incident. The highest percentage was among 18-34 year olds (74%) and 35-44 year olds (63%), compared with 46% of 45-54 year olds and 41% of staff aged 55 years or older who had told a friend. There was a similar pattern of disclosure to a romantic partner, ranging from 42% of 18-34 year olds to 26% of staff aged 55+. The staff members aged 55+ were most likely to have told a line manager (36%) but least likely to have told another staff member (45%).

Table 15.86: Percentage of staff members who told another person about the sexual harassment incident that impacted them most, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 90)	35-44 (n = 129)	45-54 (n = 129)	55+ (n = 41)
Friend	74.4	62.8	45.7	40.5
Romantic partner	42.2	37.2	31.0	26.2
Family member	27.8	15.5	27.1	26.2
Line manager	26.7	27.1	23.3	35.7
Another staff member	57.8	51.9	58.9	45.2

The staff members who had not told someone else prior to completing the survey about the incident they described were asked to indicate the reasons for non-disclosure.

The most common reasons for deciding not to disclose the incident to another person were that the staff member believed that it ‘was not serious enough, not a crime’ (49%), that they handled it themselves (38%), and that they wanted to put it behind them (34%). There was a trend toward female staff being more likely to say they felt shame or embarrassment, that they were worried that it might affect their career, or had wanted to put it behind them.

Table 15.87: Reasons given for not telling another person about the incident, by gender and for the total number of staff.

	Female (n = 230)	Male (n = 84)	Total (n = 317)
I thought that it was not serious enough, not a crime	50.9	46.4	48.6
I handled it myself	36.5	42.9	38.0
I wanted to put it behind me	37.0	28.6	34.3
I was worried that it might affect my career	30.0	13.1	25.9
I didn’t think the higher education institution / Gardaí could do anything	16.1	17.9	16.8
I felt shame or embarrassment	19.6	9.5	16.8
I thought that I wouldn’t be believed	14.3	13.1	14.3
I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault	15.2	10.7	14.0
I didn’t want anyone to know	14.3	7.1	12.5

	Female (n = 230)	Male (n = 84)	Total(n = 317)
I didn't want involvement with the higher education institution authorities / Gardaí or courts	11.3	9.5	10.6
I was worried that it might affect the perpetrator's career	7.8	9.5	8.1
I was scared of offender	7.0	3.6	6.2
I didn't want the person arrested, jailed, deported, stressed out	3.9	9.5	5.3

Research staff (32%) were more likely than academic staff in AHSS-BL (23%) or STEM-MH work areas (17%) to say that they had not told anyone about the incident because they were worried about how it might affect their career. Research staff also had a relatively high likelihood of being worried that telling someone about the incident would affect the perpetrator's career (18%).

STEM-MH academic staff (43%) and Professional / technical staff (43%) were most likely to say that they handled the incident themselves. Among those staff members who had not told someone about the incident before the survey, which comprised a small sub-group (n = 15), those who preferred not to say their area of work / had another work area had a different profile of reasons to other staff members.

Table 15.88: Reasons given for not telling another person about the incident, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL (n = 76)	STEM-MH (n = 71)	Research (n = 22)	Professional / technical (n = 133)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 15)
I thought that it was not serious enough, not a crime	42.3	50.0	50.0	54.5	20.0
I handled it myself	34.6	43.1	18.2	42.5	20.0
I wanted to put it behind me	29.5	31.9	22.7	40.3	33.3
I was worried that it might affect my career	23.1	16.7	31.8	28.4	53.4
I didn't think the higher education institution /Gardaí could do anything	17.9	12.5	22.7	15.7	33.3

	AHSS-BL (n = 76)	STEM-MH (n = 71)	Research (n = 22)	Professional / technical (n = 133)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 15)
I thought that I wouldn't be believed	16.7	15.3	13.6	11.9	20.0
I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault	16.7	12.5	18.2	10.4	33.3
I didn't want anyone to know	14.1	15.3	4.5	11.2	13.3
I didn't want involvement with the higher education institution authorities / Gardaí or courts	10.3	6.9	9.1	11.9	20.0
I was worried that it might affect the perpetrator's career	3.8	5.6	18.2	9.0	20.0
I was scared of offender	11.5	4.2	0.0	3.7	20.0
I didn't want the person arrested, jailed, deported, stressed out	7.7	4.2	9.1	4.5	0.0

Among the three sexual orientation categories included in this analysis, the bisexual group (n = 21) and the gay, lesbian, queer, or other sexual orientation group (n = 21) were both relatively small compared with the heterosexual group (n = 272).

There were considerable differences across these groups in the reasons given for not telling anyone about the incident of harassment. Heterosexual staff members (28%) were particularly likely to say that they thought it might affect their career. Bisexual staff (56%) and heterosexuals (49%) were more likely to say it was not serious enough. Bisexuals (39%) and heterosexuals (39%) were also more likely to say that they had handled it themselves.

Staff members who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation were more likely to indicate that they wanted to put the incident behind them (57%), that they did not want involvement with the higher education institution authorities / Gardaí or courts (24%), and that they did not want the person arrested, jailed, deported, or stressed out (14%).

Table 15.89: Reasons given for not telling another person about the incident, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 18)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 21)	Heterosexual (n = 272)
I thought that it was not serious enough, not a crime	55.6	38.1	48.9
I handled it myself	38.9	28.6	38.4
I wanted to put it behind me	22.2	57.1	33.3
I was worried that it might affect my career	16.7	9.5	27.5
I didn't think the higher education institution /Gardaí could do anything	16.7	23.8	16.3
I felt shame or embarrassment	16.7	14.3	17.4
I thought that I wouldn't be believed	11.1	19.0	14.1
I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault	5.6	14.3	14.5
I didn't want anyone to know	5.6	14.3	12.7
I didn't want involvement with the higher education institution authorities / Gardaí or courts	5.6	23.8	9.4
I was worried that it might affect the perpetrator's career	0.0	9.5	8.7
I was scared of offender	5.6	4.8	6.2
I didn't want the person arrested, jailed, deported, stressed out	0.0	14.3	5.1

There were also differences across staff age groups in their reasons for not telling anyone about the incident. Compared with the other age groups, a higher percentage of staff aged 18-34 thought it was not serious enough (61%) and that they wanted to put the incident behind them (41%).

The 55 years+ age group were least likely to say that the incident was not serious enough (35%), that they felt shame or embarrassment (11%), that they were worried it would affect their career (16%), that the HEI or Gardaí could not do anything (7%), or that the incident would be viewed as their fault (4%). This age group were also most likely to say that they handled it themselves (56%).

Table 15.90: Reasons given for not telling another person about the incident, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 60)	35-44 (n = 89)	45-54 (n = 107)	55+ (n = 56)
I thought that it was not serious enough, not a crime	60.7	50.0	48.1	35.1
I handled it myself	31.1	30.0	38.9	56.1
I wanted to put it behind me	41.0	32.2	30.6	36.8
I was worried that it might affect my career	31.1	30.0	25.0	15.8
I didn't think the higher education institution /Gardaí could do anything	23.0	18.9	15.7	7.0
I felt shame or embarrassment	21.3	17.8	17.6	10.5
I thought that I wouldn't be believed	16.4	14.4	15.7	10.5
I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault	14.8	15.6	17.6	3.5
I didn't want anyone to know	6.6	13.3	13.9	15.8
I didn't want involvement with the higher education institution authorities/Gardaí or courts	14.8	10.0	8.3	10.5
I was worried that it might affect the perpetrators career	11.5	11.1	6.5	3.5
I was scared of offender	1.6	7.8	6.5	7.0
I didn't want the person arrested, jailed, deported, stressed out	9.8	4.4	5.6	1.8

16. Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence

The section on sexual violence began with a statement about whether the respondents wished to answer these questions. A total of 71% (n = 2,455) of staff members chose to answer the section in the online survey on sexual violence and 29% (n = 1,013) did not.

16.1 Background Information on the Questions about Sexual Violence

The first question in this section asked about the incidence of unwanted sexual contact in the past four years. Respondents were first provided with information on what is meant by sexual violence and harassment:

For the purposes of this survey, sexual violence and sexual harassment collectively refer to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. It also refers to conduct that derogates, demeans, or humiliates a person based on that person's sex or gender. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, and sexual violence.

Then the staff members were informed that:

The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we did not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly.

Following this, the survey respondents were told that they had the option to skip this section. If they chose to respond to this section of the survey, they read an orientating statement that read: "In the last four years, have you been in a situation in which someone related to your HEI. Please choose the appropriate response to each item". A set of six behaviourally-specific statements about sexual assault and violence then followed. These referred to:

- > Being touched inappropriately.
- > Being made to touch someone inappropriately.
- > Unwanted attempts at being stroked or kissed.
- > Having someone touch, rub or kiss private parts of their body without consent.
- > Having oral, anal, or vaginal sex without consent.
- > Someone trying to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex without consent.

A set of follow up questions were presented following the section on experiences of sexual violence. Again, the staff members were asked to indicate whether they wished to respond to this section or to skip it. The follow up section asked for additional information on an incident that had affected the staff members: "If you experienced one of the situations described in the last question, we would like to ask some follow up questions about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you".

If they chose to respond to the follow up section, the respondents were asked for information on the gender of the person responsible for the incident, their student / staff status, whether the incident had happened on campus, and their immediate reactions. The final parts of the follow up section asked who the person had disclosed the incident to prior to taking part in the survey, and if they had not told anyone, to respond to a set of potential reasons for not doing so.

There were slight variations in the number of people who responded to each of the statements on the different forms of sexual violence, for females (n = 1,683-1,688, 70.5% of the females who took part in the survey), males (n = 724-725, 68.4%), gender non-binary staff (n = 12, 67%), and staff who preferred not to state their gender (n = 24-25, 60%).

The sexual orientation breakdown of respondents who chose to answer the questions on forms of sexual violence were: Asexual staff (n = 23, 47.9% of the asexuals who took part in the survey), bisexual staff (n = 93, 73.8%), staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation (n = 121-122, 74.7%), heterosexuals (n = 2,160-2,165, 70.1%), and those staff members who preferred not to state their orientation (n = 46-47, 46.9%).

The survey respondents who responded to the statements on different forms of sexual violence by area of work comprised academic AHSS-BL (n = 660-662, 68.6%), academic STEM-MH (n = 567-569, 69.0%), Research (n = 135-136, 73.0%), Professional / technical (n = 946-949, 71.2%), and those who preferred not to say / other (n = 134-135, 61.2%).

By age group, the staff members who responded to statements on sexual violence comprised: 18-34 years (n = 345-346, 72.0% of 18-34 year olds who took part in the survey), 35-44 years (n = 732-735, 73.8%), 45-54 years (n = 850-853, 68.4%), 55+ years (n = 500-502, 65.0%), and those who preferred not to state their age (n = 15, 45.5%).

16.2 Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence

For the staff group who responded to this part of the survey, the most common form of unwanted sexual contact was being touched in a way that made them feel uncomfortable (12%). Of these staff members, 7% said that it had happened to them once, 2% that it had happened twice, and 2% said that it had happened three times or more.

The next most common experience was someone making unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss the person. This was described by 4% of staff, with 2% indicating this had happened once, 1% that it happened twice, and 1% that it had happened three times or more.

Two per cent of the staff group said that someone had touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of their body or removed some of their clothes without their consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration).

Table 16.1: Percentage of staff who experienced unwanted sexual contact in the past four years by someone related to their HEI, by gender and for all staff.

	Female	Male	Non-binary	Prefer not to say	Total
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	13.1	7.4	16.7	24.0	11.5
Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you	5.0	2.9	8.3	8.3	4.4
Touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast / chest, crotch or bottom) or removed some of your clothes without your consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)	2.4	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.1
Made you touch, stroke, or kiss them when you did not want to	1.7	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.3
TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.4

Females (13%) were more likely than males (7%) to describe being touched in a way that made them feel uncomfortable. Gender non-binary staff (17%) and staff members who preferred not to state their gender (24%) were the most likely to have this experience. The illustrative example below shows that the incidence of unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss the person were experienced by 5% of female staff members who responded to this part of the survey – with 3% having this experience once and 2% having it more than once.

Table 16.2: Frequency of responses to the illustrative statement, ‘Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you’, by gender and for all staff.

	0 times	1 time	2 times	3 times+
Female	95.0	2.8	1.1	1.1
Male	97.1	1.4	0.8	0.7
Non-binary	91.7	0.0	8.3	0.0
Prefer not to say	91.7	4.2	0.0	4.2
Total	95.6	2.4	1.0	1.0

The most common form of sexual misconduct by sexual orientation was for bisexual staff (15%) and staff who preferred not to say their orientation (26%) who were touched in a way that made them feel uncomfortable.

Table 16.3: Percentage of staff who experienced unwanted sexual contact in the past four years by someone related to their HEI, by sexual orientation.

	Asexual	Bisexual	Gay, lesbian, queer, other	Heterosexual	Prefer not to say
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	4.3	15.1	13.1	11.1	25.5
Made you touch, stroke, or kiss them when you did not want to	0.0	2.2	2.5	1.9	4.3
Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you	4.3	4.3	8.2	4.1	8.7
Touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast / chest, crotch or bottom) or removed some of your clothes without your consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)	0.0	1.1	3.3	2.1	4.3
Had oral, anal or vaginal sex with you without your consent	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	2.2
TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.4	2.2

In the illustrative example below, the staff members who were gay, lesbian, queer or another sexual orientation were more likely to say that someone had made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss them. This happened either once (4%) or more than once (6%). Staff who preferred not to say their sexual orientation described this experience more often as well, with 2% indicating it had happened once and 7% that it happened more often than that.

Table 16.4: Frequency of responses to the illustrative statement, ‘Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you’, by sexual orientation.

	0 times	1 time	2 times	3 times+
Asexual	95.7	4.3	0.0	0.0
Bisexual	95.7	3.2	1.1	0.0
Gay, lesbian, queer, other	91.8	2.5	4.1	1.6
Heterosexual	95.9	2.3	0.9	0.9
Prefer not to say	91.3	2.2	0.0	6.5

There was a high level of consistency in the experience of sexual misconduct and violence among staff members across different work areas. A higher percentage of staff working in the Research environment indicated they had experienced being made to touch, stroke or kiss someone when they did not want to or that someone had made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss them. A relatively high percentage of staff who preferred not to say their work area or cited their work area as ‘other’ (16%) said that they had been touched in a way that made them uncomfortable.

Table 16.5: Percentage of staff who experienced unwanted sexual contact in the past four years by someone related to their HEI, by work area.

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional / technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	13.1	9.5	9.6	11.3	16.3
Made you touch, stroke, or kiss them when you did not want to	1.8	0.5	4.4	1.0	1.5
Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you	5.6	4.2	6.7	3.0	7.5

	AHSS-BL	STEM-MH	Research	Professional / technical	Prefer not to say / Other
Touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast / chest, crotch or bottom) or removed some of your clothes without your consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)	1.7	1.6	4.4	2.1	4.5
Had oral, anal or vaginal sex with you without your consent	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.7
TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.1	1.5

There was a consistent incidence of about 5% across work areas in the experience of unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss the person. Research staff and those who preferred not to say their work area / other were more likely to experience this form of assault, with 4% of Research staff indicating that it happened once and 3% that it had happened more often than that.

Table 16.6: Frequency of responses to the illustrative statement, ‘Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you’, by work area.

	0 times	1 time	2 times	3 times+
AHSS-BL	94.4	3.8	1.1	0.8
STEM-MH	95.8	1.6	1.6	1.1
Research	93.3	4.4	1.5	0.7
Professional / technical	97.0	1.6	0.4	0.9
Prefer not to say / Other	92.5	2.2	2.2	3.0

The two youngest age groups described the highest rate of someone touching them in a way that made them feel uncomfortable (18-35 years: 13%; 35-44 years: 14%). The 55+ years group (7%) were least likely to say this had happened to them. While the staff members described limited incidence of the other forms of sexual assault described in the survey, there was a trend toward the incidence being age-related – higher among the youngest group and lowest among the oldest age cohort.

Table 16.7: Percentage of staff who experienced unwanted sexual contact in the past four years by someone related to their HEI, by age group.

	18-35	35-44	45-54	55+	Prefer not to say
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	13.0	14.0	11.1	7.2	26.7
Made you touch, stroke, or kiss them when you did not want to	2.3	1.2	1.5	0.4	0.0
Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you	6.1	4.4	5.4	1.6	6.7
Touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast / chest, crotch or bottom) or removed some of your clothes without your consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)	3.5	2.2	2.6	0.4	0.0
Had oral, anal or vaginal sex with you without your consent	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0
TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent	0.6	0.1	0.8	0.0	0.0

The 18-34 age group and those who preferred not to say their age had the highest incidence of someone making unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss them. Four per cent of the 18-34 year old staff members described this happening once, while 3% said it happened more than once. The 55+ age group were least likely to say they had this experience, with 1% indicating that it had taken place once while 1% said it happened more than once.

Table 16.8: Frequency of responses to the illustrative statement, ‘Made unwanted attempts to stroke or kiss you’, by age group.

	0 times	1 time	2 times	3 times+
18-34	93.9	3.5	2.3	0.3
35-44	95.6	2.5	0.7	1.2
45-54	94.6	2.7	1.3	1.4
55+	98.4	1.0	0.2	0.4
Prefer not to say	93.3	0.0	0.0	6.7

16.2 Follow Up Questions on Sexual Violence

After the section of the survey that asked about the experience of sexual violence over the past four years in connection with their higher education institution, the staff members were informed:

If you experienced one of the situations described in the last question, we would like to ask some follow up questions about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you. If this is not applicable to you or you are not comfortable answering questions about specific instances of sexual violence you should skip to the next section.

Of the 2,455 staff members who indicated that they wished to answer questions on sexual violence, 12% (n = 289) said that they wanted to answer follow up questions about the incident that had the greatest effect on them. Not all of the staff who said they wanted to complete the follow up section chose to respond to these questions.

Of those who chose to respond to this section, 217 were female (12.8% of females who said they wanted to answer the section on sexual violence), 64 were male (8.8% of males who said they wanted to answer the section on sexual violence), two identified as being gender non-binary (16.7%), and six preferred not to say their gender (25%). The number of staff who were gender non-binary and those who preferred not to say their gender was small. These sub-groups are not reported on separately in the tables below.

Of the participants who chose to answer follow up questions, 92 worked as academic AHSS-BL staff members (13.9% of the AHSS-BL staff who wanted to answer the sexual violence questions), 54 were academic STEM-MH members (9.5%), 15 worked in the Research environment (11%), 105 were Professional / technical staff (11.0%), and 23 preferred not to say their area of work / other (17.0%).

None of the staff members who said they wanted to answer the follow up questions were asexual, 16 were bisexual (17.2% of those who said they wanted to answer the section on sexual violence), 21 were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation (17.2%), 242 were heterosexual (11.2%), and 10 preferred not to state their orientation (21.3%).

In terms of age, 49 staff members who said they wanted to answer the follow up questions were aged 18-34 years (14.2% of this age group who said they wanted to answer the questions on sexual violence), 107 were staff aged 35-44 (14.5%), 95 were aged 45-54 (11.1%), 33 were aged 55 years or older (6.6%), and five preferred not to state their age (33.3%). Staff who preferred not to state their age are not included in the sub-group analysis below.

A total of 237 staff members responded to the questions about the gender of the person responsible for the incident addressed in the follow up questions. There were 197 staff members who identified the person responsible for the incident as a man (83% of those who identified the person's gender), while 39 identified the person as a woman (16% of those who identified the person's gender), and one staff member said the person had a different gender identity.

Nearly all of the female staff members (98%) who identified the person responsible for the incident by gender said it was a man, while 37% of males said it was a man and 63% of males said it was a woman who was responsible.

Table 16.9: Gender of the other person responsible for the incident, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 178)	Male (n = 51)	Total (n = 237)
Man	97.8	37.3	83.1
Woman	1.7	62.8	16.5
Other	0.6	0.0	0.4

Nearly three quarters (73%) of the staff who replied to this question said that the incident took place on campus. Female staff members were slightly more likely to say the incident took place on campus than males.

Table 16.10: Percentage of staff members who indicated that the incident took place on campus, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 176)	Male (n = 51)	Total (n = 235)
Yes	73.9	66.7	73.2
No	26.1	33.3	26.8

A large majority (84%) of the staff members who responded said that the person responsible was a staff member at a HEI. A similar percentage of females and males said the person was a staff member.

Table 16.11: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a staff member at their Higher Education Institution or another Higher Education Institution, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 177)	Male (n = 51)	Total (n = 236)
Yes	85.3	82.4	83.5
No	13.0	15.7	14.0
I don't know	1.7	2.0	2.5

A greater percentage of male staff members (20%) who responded to this question said that the person responsible was a student, compared with females (12%).

Table 16.12: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a student at your Higher Education Institution, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 173)	Male (n = 49)	Total (n = 229)
Yes	12.1	20.4	15.3
No	87.9	79.6	84.7
I don't know	0.0	0.0	0.0

There was a similar percentage of staff members across work areas who identified the person responsible for the incident of sexual violence as a man, ranging from 80-86%.

Table 16.13: Gender of the other person responsible for the incident, by work area.

	AHSS-BL (n = 74)	STEM-MH (n = 44)	Research (n = 12)	Professional / technical (n = 87)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 20)
Man	81.1	86.4	83.3	83.9	80.0
Woman	18.9	13.6	16.7	16.1	15.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0

There were some differences by area of work in whether the incident took place on campus. For instance, it was more likely for Professional / technical staff to say the incident took place on campus (81%) and that it was a staff member who was responsible for the incident (91%), compared with staff who worked in other areas. Professional / technical were the least likely (7%) to say that the person responsible was a student.

Table 16.14: Percentage of staff members who indicated that the incident took place on campus, by work area.

	AHSS-BL (n = 73)	STEM-MH (n = 44)	Research (n = 12)	Professional / technical (n = 86)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 20)
Yes	72.6	65.9	66.7	81.4	60.0
No	27.4	34.1	33.3	18.6	40.0

Table 16.15: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a staff member at their Higher Education Institution or another Higher Education Institution, by work area.

	AHSS-BL (n = 73)	STEM-MH (n = 44)	Research (n = 12)	Professional / technical (n = 87)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 20)
Yes	78.1	79.5	83.3	90.8	80.0
No	19.2	20.5	16.7	6.9	10.0
I don't know	2.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	10.0

Table 16.16: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a student at your Higher Education Institution, by work area.

	AHSS-BL (n = 72)	STEM-MH (n = 43)	Research (n = 12)	Professional / technical (n = 83)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 19)
Yes	20.8	27.9	16.7	7.2	0.0
No	79.2	72.1	83.3	92.8	100.0
I don't know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

There was variation across the sexual orientation groups as to whether the person responsible for the incident was a man – ranging from 56% among staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation, to 85% of heterosexual staff members and 92% of bisexuals.

Table 16.17: Gender of the other person responsible for the incident, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 13)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 18)	Heterosexual (n = 198)	Prefer not to say (n = 10)
Man	92.3	55.6	85.4	60.0
Woman	7.7	44.4	14.7	40.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0

While there was consistency across the sexual orientation groups as to whether the incident took place on campus, heterosexual staff members were most likely to say that it had happened on campus (74%). They were also most likely to say that the person responsible was a staff member (86%) and least likely to say that the person was a student (13%).

Table 16.18: Percentage of staff members who indicated that the incident took place on campus, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 13)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 18)	Heterosexual (n = 194)	Prefer not to say (n = 10)
Yes	69.2	66.7	73.7	80.0
No	30.8	33.3	26.3	20.0

Table 16.19: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a staff member at their Higher Education Institution or another Higher Education Institution, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 12)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 18)	Heterosexual (n = 196)	Prefer not to say (n = 10)
Yes	83.3	72.2	85.7	60.0
No	16.7	16.7	12.2	40.0
I don't know	0.0	11.1	2.0	0.0

Table 16.20: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a student at your Higher Education Institution, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 13)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 17)	Heterosexual (n = 189)	Prefer not to say (n = 10)
Yes	23.1	29.4	12.7	30.0
No	76.9	70.6	87.3	70.0
I don't know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The 55 years+ age group (70%) were the least likely to say that the person responsible for the incident was a man, while the 18-34 years group (90%) were most likely to say a man was responsible.

Table 16.21: Gender of the other person responsible for the incident, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 39)	35-44 (n = 87)	45-54 (n = 80)	55+ (n = 27)
Man	89.7	83.9	83.8	70.4
Woman	10.3	16.1	15.0	29.6
Other	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0

The category of staff aged 18-34 were least likely to indicate that the incident had taken place on campus (68%), and least likely to say that the person responsible was a member of staff (72%). Conversely, the same age group were most likely to say that the person responsible was a student (29%).

Table 16.22: Percentage of staff members who indicated that the incident took place on campus, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 38)	35-44 (n = 87)	45-54 (n = 79)	55+ (n = 27)
Yes	68.4	74.7	70.9	81.5
No	31.6	25.3	29.1	18.5

Table 16.23: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a staff member at their Higher Education Institution or another Higher Education Institution, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 39)	35-44 (n = 86)	45-54 (n = 80)	55+ (n = 27)
Yes	71.8	81.4	91.3	85.2
No	23.1	16.3	7.5	11.1
I don't know	5.1	2.3	1.3	3.7

Table 16.24: Percentage of staff members who said the person responsible for the incident was a student at your Higher Education Institution, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 38)	35-44 (n = 86)	45-54 (n = 75)	55+ (n = 27)
Yes	28.9	18.6	6.7	11.1
No	71.1	81.4	93.3	88.9
I don't know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

The staff members who responded to the follow up questions were asked how they felt at the time of the incident. Three statements were included, which were rated on a 5-point scale from 'Not at all' to 'Extremely'. In the following tables, 'Very' and 'Extremely' responses are compiled into one percentage. There were small variations in the numbers of staff members who responded to each of the statements, 224 staff members responded to all the statements.

Overall, 16% of the staff members who responded to these statements said that they had felt very or extremely scared, followed by 8% who felt that the person would hurt them if they did not go along with it, and 3% who felt their lives were in danger. Nearly one fifth of female staff reported feeling very scared, 9% felt that the other person would hurt them, and 4% that their life was in danger.

Table 16.25: Percentage of staff respondents who felt 'Very' or 'Extremely' scared, in danger, or that the other person would hurt them, by gender and total number of staff.

	Female (n = 169)	Male (n = 49)	Total (n = 224)
Scared	18.9	4.0	15.8
Like your life was in danger	4.2	0.0	3.1
Like the other person would hurt you if you didn't go along	8.9	4.1	7.5

Among staff by work areas, Research staff (42%) were most likely to say that they felt very or extremely scared during the incident and 9% of this group felt that their lives were in danger. Academic STEM-MH staff were most likely to feel that the other person would hurt them if they did not go along with the sexual violence that took place (12%).

Table 16.26: Percentage of staff who felt ‘Very’ or ‘Extremely’ scared, in danger, or that the other person would hurt them, by work area.

	AHSS-BL (n = 71)	STEM-MH (n = 41)	Research (n = 11)	Professional / technical (n = 81)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 20)
Scared	12.3	18.6	41.6	11.6	25.0
Like your life was in danger	1.4	4.8	9.1	3.7	0.0
Like the other person would hurt you if you didn’t go along	7.0	11.9	9.1	6.2	5.0

Heterosexual staff (17%) and those who preferred not to say their gender (30%) reported feeling very or extremely scared at the time of the incident. Nine per cent of heterosexual staff members felt that the other person would hurt them if they did not comply. Staff who were gay, lesbian, queer or another orientation were less likely to report feeling scared or that their lives were in danger.

Table 16.27: Percentage of staff who felt ‘Very’ or ‘Extremely’ scared, in danger, or that the other person would hurt them, by sexual orientation.

	Bisexual (n = 12)	Gay, lesbian, queer, other (n = 18)	Heterosexual (n = 184)	Prefer not to say (n = 10)
Scared	7.7	0.0	17.1	30.0
Like your life was in danger	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0
Like the other person would hurt you if you didn’t go along	0.0	5.6	8.6	0.0

Table 16.28: Percentage of staff who felt ‘Very’ or ‘Extremely’ scared, in danger, or that the other person would hurt them, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 37)	35-44 (n = 86)	45-54 (n = 72)	55+ (n = 24)
Scared	25.6	11.6	18.0	11.1
Like your life was in danger	5.4	4.5	2.8	0.0
Like the other person would hurt you if you didn’t go along	5.4	5.7	10.8	8.3

In the final section of follow up questions the participants were asked whether they had told someone about the incident before taking part in the survey. Depending on their response, the staff members who responded to this section of the survey were asked to indicate who they had told or were asked to indicate the reasons why they had not told someone. In both cases, a standard list was provided and the staff members could choose multiple options.

Overall, 237 staff members responded to the question about whether they had told someone previously about the incident. A total of 63% (n = 150) of the staff members who responded said that they had told someone about the incident prior to taking part in the survey and 37% (n = 87) had not. The sub-groups involved became smaller at this point of the analysis, however the indicative figures are provided below to represent the experiences of groups that had 10 or more participants.

Table 16.29: Percentage of staff members who had told someone about the incident before taking part in the survey, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 178)	Male (n = 51)	Total (n = 237)
Yes	63.5	64.7	63.3
No	36.5	35.3	36.7

Those staff members who did tell another person were asked who they had told (more than one choice was possible). The table below shows that a friend (61%), another staff member (51%), a romantic partner (33%), family member (17%), or line manager (13%) were the most frequent choices for the staff who had told someone about the incident. None of the other choices were selected by more than 6% of the participants. Females (55%) were more likely than males (39%) to have told another staff member.

Table 16.30: Percentage of staff members who told different groups about the incident, among those staff who had told someone before the survey, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 113)	Male (n = 33)	Total (n = 150)
Friend	62.8	57.6	61.3
Another staff member	54.9	39.4	51.3
Romantic partner	30.1	39.4	32.7
Family member	17.7	18.2	17.3
Line manager	15.0	9.1	13.3
Off-campus counsellor	8.0	0.0	6.0
Doctor / nurse	1.8	3.0	2.0
Campus security	1.8	0.0	1.3
Off-campus rape crisis centre staff	0.9	0.0	0.7
On-campus counsellor	0.9	0.0	0.7
Garda Síochána	0.9	0.0	0.7
Religious (e.g., Priest, Nun, Rabbi, Imam, Pastor, Monk, Guru, etc.)	0.0	0.0	0.0
Higher Education Institution health services	0.0	0.0	0.0

Among those participants who had not told anyone about the incident, eight of the reasons for not disclosing were selected by 10% or more staff members. The most frequently cited reasons were wanting to put it behind them (23%), handling it themselves (22%), being worried that it might affect their career (22%), feelings of shame or embarrassment (20%), not wanting anyone to know about it (18%), being scared of the offender (16%), thinking that the incident would be viewed as their fault (15%), and believing that the higher education institution or Gardaí could do nothing in response (12%).

There was a difference of approximately 10% between females and males on some of the reasons for not telling anyone. Female staff members were more likely than males to say that they wanted to put it behind them, that they were worried it might affect their career, and that they did not want anyone to know about the incident.

Table 16.31: Percentage of staff who identified reasons for not telling someone about the incident, among staff who had not disclosed it before the survey, by gender and for all staff.

	Female (n = 64)	Male (n = 18)	Total (n = 86)
I wanted to put it behind me	26.2	16.7	23.0
I handled it myself	20.0	27.8	21.8
I was worried that it might affect my career	23.1	11.1	21.8
I felt shame or embarrassment	20.0	16.7	19.5
I didn't want anyone to know	21.5	11.1	18.4
I was scared of offender	15.4	22.2	16.1
I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault	13.8	16.7	14.9
I don't think the higher education institution / Gardaí could do anything	10.8	11.1	11.5
I was worried that it might affect the perpetrator's career	6.2	5.6	5.7
I didn't want involvement with the higher education institution authorities / Gardaí or courts	6.2	0.0	4.6
I thought that I would not be believed	1.5	0.0	2.3
I didn't want the person arrested, jailed, deported, stressed out	1.5	5.6	2.3
I thought that it was not serious enough, not a crime	0.0	0.0	0.0

The tables below shows the breakdown of responses by area of work. Those areas of work that had 10 or more respondents are represented, where 10% or more of the participants had cited a type of person who had been disclosed to. Academic staff in AHSS-BL (69%) and STEM-MH (74%) were more likely to disclose to a friend.

Table 16.32: Percentage of staff members who told different groups about the incident, among those staff who had told someone before the survey, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL (n = 49)	STEM-MH (n = 31)	Professional / technical (n = 53)	Prefer not to say / Other (n = 12)
Friend	69.4	74.2	47.2	50.0
Romantic partner	40.8	35.5	26.4	40.0
Family member	20.0	12.9	15.1	30.0
Another staff member	51.0	48.4	54.7	50.0
Line manager	12.2	9.7	11.3	30.0

The three work areas that had more than 10 participants are included below in a table of reasons why staff members did not tell anyone about the incident they had experienced. The reasons included were cited by more than 10% of staff members who responded to this part of the survey. Staff working in a Professional / technical area (24%) were most likely to say they handled it themselves, while academic STEM-MH staff were most likely to say they experienced shame or embarrassment.

Table 16.33: Percentage of staff who identified reasons for not telling someone about the incident, among staff who had not disclosed it before the survey, by area of work.

	AHSS-BL (n = 25)	STEM-MH (n = 13)	Professional / technical (n = 34)
I wanted to put it behind me	20.0	30.8	23.5
I handled it myself	16.0	15.4	23.5
I was worried that it might affect my career	20.0	15.4	14.7
I felt shame or embarrassment	12.0	30.8	17.6
I didn't want anyone to know	16.0	15.4	20.6
I was scared of offender	20.0	15.4	11.8
I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault	16.0	7.7	11.8
I don't think the higher education institution / Gardaí could do anything	12.0	7.7	8.8

Applying the same inclusion criteria to the age categories, younger staff members were more likely to disclose what had happened to them to a friend – 81% of 18-34 year olds cited telling a friend compared with 27% of staff members aged 55+.

Table 16.34: Percentage of staff members who told different groups about the incident, among those staff who had told someone before the survey, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 26)	35-44 (n = 57)	45-54 (n = 48)	55+ (n = 15)
Friend	80.8	61.4	62.5	26.7
Romantic partner	26.9	31.6	31.3	40.0
Family member	15.4	7.0	27.1	20.0
Another staff member	50.0	56.1	47.9	46.7
Line manager	15.4	14.0	10.4	20.0

In terms of reasons for not telling anyone about the incident, the 55 years+ age group members were least likely to state that they were worried that it affected their career, that they felt shame or embarrassment, or that the incident would be viewed as their fault.

Table 16.35: Percentage of staff who identified reasons for not telling someone about the incident, among staff who had not disclosed it before the survey, by age group.

	18-34 (n = 13)	35-44 (n = 30)	45-54 (n = 32)	55+ (n = 12)
I wanted to put it behind me	23.1	23.3	18.8	33.3
I handled it myself	23.1	16.7	25.0	25.0
I was worried that it might affect my career	46.2	16.7	21.9	8.3
I felt shame or embarrassment	23.1	16.7	25.0	8.3
I didn't want anyone to know	23.1	13.3	21.9	16.7
I was scared of offender	7.7	10.0	25.0	16.7
I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault	15.4	13.3	18.8	8.3
I don't think the higher education institution / Gardaí could do anything	15.4	3.3	15.6	16.7

Appendix: National Survey of Staff Experiences of Sexual Violence and Harassment in Irish HEIs

Background

The Higher Education Authority (HEA) is committed to ensuring a national institutional campus culture which is safe, respectful and supportive and to supporting higher education institutions to foster a campus culture that is clear in the condemnation of unwanted and unacceptable behaviours.

The HEA has a statutory responsibility to promote the attainment of equality of opportunity in higher education (HE). Every employee in Irish higher education has a right to a workplace free from discrimination, and the HEA is committed to ensuring that all staff in Irish HEIs have the opportunity to work in a positive and productive environment. Sexual violence, and harassment can interfere with one's job performance and emotional and physical well-being. Preventing and remedying all forms of sexual harassment and sexual violence in Irish HE is essential to ensuring a safe environment for all faculty, staff, and students.

At the request of the Minister for Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science, Simon Harris, T.D., the HEA is conducting a national survey to monitor the experiences of staff in relation to sexual violence, harassment with a view to informing national equality, diversity and inclusion planning processes. We would welcome your participation in this survey to gain insight into your view on/experience of sexual violence and harassment in Irish higher education. The survey normally takes approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Sexual Misconduct, Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence

Sexual Misconduct is defined as any form of unwelcome behaviour of a sexual nature that may be subject to disciplinary proceedings. This includes crimes of sexual violence, sexual cyberbullying of any kind including non-consensual taking and/or sharing of intimate images, creating, accessing, viewing, or distributing child pornography material online or offline, stalking behaviours whether online or offline in a sexual context, and any verbal or physical harassment in a sexual context.

Sexual misconduct can be committed by a person of any gender and it can occur between people of the same or different genders. It is often gender targeted and perpetrated to demean, diminish, and intimidate. Sexual misconduct may occur between strangers or acquaintances, including people involved in an intimate or sexual relationship.

For the purposes of this survey, sexual violence and sexual harassment collectively refer to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. It also refers to conduct that derogates, demeans, or humiliates a person based on that person's sex or gender. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, and sexual violence.

The following survey is adapted from the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) Campus Climate Survey. Questions have been adapted and developed in consultation with the HEA Advisory Group on Ending Sexual Violence and Harassment in Irish Higher Education Institutions.

More information can found here:

<https://campusclimate.gsu.edu>

<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2021/04/Advisory-Group.pdf>

Who should take part and why should you take part?

All staff working in HEIs in the Republic of Ireland, regardless of their personal experience of sexual violence and/or harassment. We aim to assess awareness among all staff of policies and supports to address sexual violence and harassment in Irish HE and to survey staff for their views on/experiences of sexual violence and harassment in Irish HE.

By taking part in this survey you are helping us to identify areas for improvement, and ways to make those improvements. The survey results will be collated to provide an overall picture of staff views on/experiences of sexual violence and harassment across the Irish higher education sector.

PLEASE NOTE: PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY IS VOLUNTARY AND NO IDENTIFYING INFORMATION IS REQUESTED.

Personal demographic details

We do not ask you for your name or contact details in this survey, nor do we collect IP addresses of participants, meaning that no-one will be able to connect these with your survey answers. The results will be presented in summary form so no individual can be identified. To understand your answers in more context, we would be grateful if you could provide us with some personal demographic information as part of this survey. The amount of information you provide us with is entirely up to you; please only disclose information with which you are comfortable, but the more you provide, the more useful it will be for us when analysing your survey response. Where you do not wish to disclose information, please choose the 'prefer not to say' option. All of the information you provide will be held confidentially in full compliance with data protection legislation as outlined below.

Please take care not to identify yourself or any other people when filling in any open text boxes, as this is an anonymous survey.

Trigger Warning

This survey asks about your personal experience with sexual misconduct, specifically sexual harassment and violence. Some of the language used in this survey is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean. Trigger warnings are included at the start of sections on sensitive topics, and you will be given the option to skip questions if you do not feel comfortable answering them. Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears below, at relevant points in the survey and at the end of the survey.

<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2021/04/Links-to-supports.pdf>

Data protection and confidentiality

The survey will not ask you to provide any identifying information and your responses are confidential and anonymous. In the event of any publication or presentation of the survey results, no personally identifiable information will be shared. Survey responses will be reported at a national level rather than as individual cases or at the level of HEI.

Survey responses are anonymous. Please only answer questions with which you are comfortable. All data collected through this survey will be held securely and confidentially in accordance with our security policies. The data will not be used for any purpose other than the following: to provide an overall picture of staff experiences of and views on sexual violence and harassment across the Irish higher education sector; to inform HEI planning process in relation to sexual violence and harassment. Access to the national data set will be confined to a small group within the HEA Executive, who will be responsible for its subsequent analysis. HEI specific

data will be shared with individual institutions for planning purposes only. The HEA will only process data in line with the General Data Protection Regulation 2018 and the Data Protection Act 2018. If we appoint a data processor, this will be subject to a data processing agreement and they will only process data under our instructions. At no point will the information you provide be shared in a way that would allow you to be personally identified. Any published material will be anonymised.

The HEA regrets that it is not in a position to personally meet with any individuals who provide a submission or to address personal grievances. Respondents are requested not to submit any details of grievances which are the subject of legal proceedings.

If you have any questions about this survey that have not been answered by this information page, please contact SVHsurveys@hea.ie.

For more information on how the HEA as data controller processes personal data, please see the link to our Data Privacy Notice below.

https://hea.ie/about-us/data_protection/

Demographics

To understand your answers in more context we would be grateful if you could provide us with some personal demographic information as part of this survey. The amount of information you provide us with is entirely up to you; please only disclose information with which you are comfortable, but the more you provide, the more useful it will be for us when analysing your survey response. Where you do not wish to disclose information, please choose the 'prefer not to say' option. All of the information you provide will be held confidentially in full compliance with data protection legislation as outlined below.

1. What is your age?

- = Under 18
- = 18-24
- = 25-34
- = 35-44
- = 45-54
- = 55-64
- = 65 and over
- = Prefer not to say

2. What is your gender identity?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Female
- = Male
- = Gender Non-binary
- = Prefer not to say

3. Is your gender identity the same as the gender you were assigned at birth?

Please choose one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = Prefer not to say

4. What sex were you assigned at birth?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Female
- = Male
- = Prefer not to say

5. Do you have a disability including a mental or physical illness?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = Prefer not to say

6. What is your disability?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Specific learning difficulty e.g. dyslexia
- = Physical or mobility related disability
- = Blind or visually impaired
- = Deaf or hard of hearing
- = Mental health difficulty
- = ASD or Aspergers ADHD or ADD
- = Significant ongoing physical illness
- = Other, please specify:
- = Prefer not to say

7. With which ethnic group do you most identify?

The categories below are those to be used by the Central Statistics Office for Census 2022. While the HEA acknowledges their limitations, we use them here per the recommendation of the National Athena SWAN Ireland Intersectionality Working Group in their May 2020 statement on the use of ethnicity categories in Irish higher education:

<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2020/07/Intersectionality-WG-Statement-on-Ethnicity-Categories-in-Irish-HE.pdf>

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Asian or Asian Irish
 - = Chinese
 - = Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi
 - = Any other Asian background
- = Black or Black Irish
 - = African
 - = Any other Black background
- = Other including mixed group/background
 - = Arabic

- = Mixed Background
- = Other
- = White
 - = Irish
 - = Irish Traveller
 - = Roma
 - = Any other White background
- = Prefer not to say

8. What is your sexual orientation?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Asexual
- = Bisexual
- = Gay
- = Heterosexual/straight
- = Lesbian
- = Queer
- = A sexual orientation not listed here
- = Prefer not to say

9. What higher education institution do you currently work in?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Athlone Institute of Technology
- = Dublin City University
- = Dun Laoghaire Institute of Art and Design
- = Dundalk Institute of Technology
- = Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology
- = Griffith College
- = Institute of Technology Carlow
- = Institute of Technology Sligo
- = Letterkenny Institute of Technology
- = Limerick Institute of Technology
- = Maynooth University
- = Munster Technological University
- = National College of Ireland

- = National University of Ireland, Galway
- = Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland
- = St Angela's College / National College of Art & Design / Mary Immaculate College
- = Technological University Dublin
- = Trinity College Dublin
- = University College Cork
- = University College Dublin
- = University of Limerick
- = Waterford Institute of Technology
- = HECA HEI: CCT/DBS/Dorset College/GBS/Hibernia College/ICHAS/IICP/OTC/Setanta
- = College/SQT/SNMCI
- = Dropdown list of HEIs
- = A HEI not listed here
- = Prefer not to say

10. What is your area of work/disciplinary area?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Academic: Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences
- = Academic: Business and Law
- = Academic: Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics
- = Academic: Medicine and Health
- = Research Centre/Institute
- = Research Fellow
- = Professional, Managerial and Support Services
- = Technical Support
- = Other
- = Prefer not to say

11. What is your current role/grade by pay grade?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = >€130,000
- = €115,000-€129,999
- = €100,000-€114,999
- = €75,000-€99,999
- = €60,000-€74,999
- = €45,000-€59,999

- = €30,000-€44,999
- = €15,000-€29,999
- = <14,999
- = Prefer not to say

12. On what contractual basis are you currently employed?

Please choose all that apply.

- = Full-time permanent / indefinite duration
- = Part-time permanent / indefinite duration
- = Full-time fixed-term contract
- = Part-time fixed-term contract
- = Hourly paid
- = Other (please specify)
- = Prefer not to say

13. How long have you been employed at your HEI?

- = 1-5 years
- = 6-10 years
- = 11-15 years
- = 16-20 years
- = 21-25 years
- = 26-30 years
- = 31-35 years
- = 36-40 years
- = More than 40 years
- = Prefer not to say

Campus Environment

14. Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = My HEI proactively addresses issues of sexual violence and harassment.
- = Senior management at my HEI are visible in addressing issues around sexual violence and harassment.
- = I am aware of policies at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment.

- = Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are clear and explicit.
- = Policies and procedures at my HEI which seek to tackle and eliminate sexual violence and harassment are effective.

15. Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = My HEI has an easy-to-use system for staff to report incidents of sexual violence and harassment.
- = There are clear lines of responsibility for dealing with reporting of sexual violence and harassment at my HEI.
- = If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, other staff would see the person making the report as a troublemaker.
- = If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, it would be hard for other staff to support the person who made the report.
- = If someone were to report a case of sexual harassment or sexual violence at my HEI, the person making the report would be subjected to retaliation, retribution or negative responses from the alleged offender(s) or their friends.
- = If I was subjected to sexual violence and/or harassment I would know how to report this to my HEI.
- = If someone I knew was subjected sexual violence and/or harassment I would know how to report this to my HEI.
- = If I reported a case sexual violence and/or harassment I would know what supports were available to me at my HEI.
- = If I were accused of perpetrating sexual violence and/or harassment I would know what supports were available to me at my HEI.

16. Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = Training on how to report and respond to disclosures of personal experiences of sexual violence and harassment involving staff and/or students is available to me at my HEI.
- = I am aware of ongoing messaging at my HEI that disseminates information around reporting and responding to incidents of sexual violence and harassment.

- = I am aware of ongoing messaging at my HEI that promotes cultural change and awareness of sexual violence and harassment.
- = I would be willing to complete Bystander Intervention awareness training if it was made available by my institution.
- = I would be willing to complete Consent Awareness training if it was made available by my institution.
- = I would be willing to complete training on disclosures of incident of sexual violence and harassment if it was made available by my institution.
- = I would be willing to be involved in roles in relation to consent/bystander intervention/disclosure initiatives.
- = I would be willing to facilitate student/staff initiatives in relation to consent/bystander intervention/disclosure initiatives.

17. The following statements describe how your HEI might handle it if a staff member experienced an incident of sexual harassment and/or sexual violence. Using the scale provided, please indicate the likelihood of each statement.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Very Unlikely – Unlikely – Neutral – Likely – Very Likely

- = My institution would play a role by actively supporting the person with either formal or informal resources (e.g., counselling, meetings, or phone calls).
- = My institution would play a role by allowing the person to play an active role in how their report was handled.
- = My institution would actively support the person and accommodate their needs.
- = My institution would play an active role by creating an environment where this type of experience was safe to discuss.
- = My institution would play an active role by creating an environment where this type of experience was recognised as a problem.
- = My institution would play an active role by suggesting the person's experience/s might affect the reputation of the institution.
- = My institution would play an active role by creating an environment where the person no longer felt like a valued member of the institution.
- = My institution would play an active role creating an environment where staying at the HEI was difficult for the person.

Campus Safety

18. The following statements refer to both physical and online environments. Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = I feel safe from sexual harassment within my HEI.
- = I feel safe from sexual violence within my HEI.
- = I feel safe speaking up or voicing concerns in relation to sexual violence and/or harassment.

19. Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = I feel a sense of responsibility to engage with the issue of sexual violence and harassment at my HEI.
- = Sexual violence or harassment among faculty and staff is a problem at my HEI.
- = Sexual violence or harassment among students is a problem at my HEI.

Consent and Bystander attitudes

20. This scale is interested in perceptions of sexual consent. We are asking these questions in the context of increased student awareness of consent, related education initiatives, and the potential for disclosures to staff. If you are not comfortable answering these questions you have the option to skip to the next question.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = I would like to answer these questions.
- = I would like to skip these questions.

If answer = I would like to answer these questions.

21. For each of the following statements indicate how strongly you agree or disagree.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = Students typically feel confident seeking consent from a sexual partner.
- = Students typically feel that verbally asking for sexual consent is awkward.
- = When initiating sexual activity, one should always assume that one does not have sexual consent.

- = Before making sexual advances, one should assume “no” until there is clear indication to proceed.
- = It is equally important to obtain sexual consent in all relationships regardless of whether or not they have had sex before.
- = Verbally asking for sexual consent should occur before proceeding with any sexual activity.
- = The need for asking for sexual consent decreases as the length of an intimate relationship increases.
- = Consent should be asked before any kind of sexual behaviour, including kissing or touching.

If answer = I would like to skip these questions.

22. In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by students on campus.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No

23. In the last four years, I have heard sexual consent issues being discussed by staff on campus.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No

24. In the context of sexual harassment and/or violence, I feel a responsibility to make an intervention where I am not directly involved.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = I don't know

25. In the last four years I have made an intervention as a bystander to incident(s) of sexual harassment and/or violence involving students and/or staff.

- = 0 times
- = 1 time
- = 2 times
- = 3+ times

26. Using the scale provided, please rate how informed you feel you are to:

Scale = Not informed at all – slightly informed – somewhat informed – fairly informed – completely informed

- = Make an effective intervention as a bystander to an act of sexual harassment and/or violence.
- = Respond effectively to a disclosure of an incident of sexual harassment and/or violence.

Experiences of Sexual Harassment

For the purposes of this survey, **sexual violence and sexual harassment** collectively refer to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. It also refers to conduct that derogates, demeans, or humiliates a person based on that person's sex or gender. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, and sexual violence.

Trigger Warning

The following questions ask about your personal experience with sexual harassment. Some of the language used in these questions is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean. Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears below, at relevant points in the survey and at the end of the survey.

<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2021/04/Links-to-supports.pdf>

27. If you are not comfortable answering these questions you have the option to skip to the next section.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = I would like to answer these questions.
- = I would like to skip these questions.

28. In the last four years, have you been in a situation in which someone related to your HEI:

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Never - Once or twice – Sometimes – Often - Many times – Not Applicable

- = Treated you “differently” because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)?
- = Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (for example, pictures, stories, or pornography which you found offensive)?
- = Sent or posted unwelcome sexualised messages electronically, by text message, email, social media, or other electronic means (for example via WhatsApp, Snapchat, Facebook, etc.)?

- = Made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)?
- = Made sexualised comments that included reference to your race or ethnicity?
- = Made sexualised comments that included reference to your trans and/or non-binary identity?
- = Made sexualised comments that included reference to your identity as female or male?
- = Made sexualised comments that included reference to your sexuality?
- = Made sexualised comments that included reference to your religion?
- = Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender?
- = Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?
- = Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters (for example, attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)?
- = Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?
- = Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?
- = Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you?
- = Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”?
- = Made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behaviour?
- = Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (for example, by mentioning an upcoming review, threatening your reputation, etc.)?
- = Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?
- = Retaliated after you ended a sexual relationship with them?

29. If you experienced one of the situations described in the last question, we would like to ask some follow up questions about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you.

If this is not applicable to you or you are not comfortable answering questions about specific instances of sexual harassment you should skip to the next section.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = I would like to answer these questions.
- = I would like to skip these questions.

30. The situation involved:

Please choose all that apply:

- = Sexist or sexually offensive language, gestures or pictures
- = Unwanted sexual attention
- = Unwanted touching
- = Subtle or explicit bribes or threats

31. The other person was a:

Please choose all that apply:

- = Man
- = Woman
- = Other

32. Was the other person a staff member at your higher education institution?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = I don't know

33. Was the other person a student at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = I don't know

34. Did this happen on campus?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No

35. Please tell us how you reacted to the situation:

Please choose all that apply:

- = I ignored the person and did nothing.
- = I avoided the person as much as possible. I treated it like a joke.
- = I told the person to stop.

- = I reported the person.
- = asked someone for advice and/or support.

36. Did you tell anyone about the incident before this questionnaire?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No

Answer = Yes

37. Who did you tell?

Please choose all that apply:

- = Friend
- = Romantic partner
- = Family member
- = Doctor/nurse
- = Religious (e.g., Priest, Nun, Rabbi, Imam, Pastor, Monk, Guru etc.)
- = Off-campus rape crisis centre staff
- = Off-campus counsellor
- = On-campus counsellor
- = Higher education institution health services
- = Campus security
- = Garda Síochána
- = Another staff member
- = Line manager
- = Other. Please Specify _____

Answer = No

Why did you not tell anyone?

Please choose all that apply:

- = I thought that I wouldn't be believed
- = I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault
- = I didn't think the higher education institution /Gardaí could do anything
- = I was scared of offender
- = I thought that it was not serious enough, not a crime
- = I felt shame or embarrassment
- = I didn't want anyone to know

- = I didn't want involvement with the higher education institution authorities/Gardaí or courts
- = I was worried that it might affect my career
- = I was worried that it might affect the perpetrator's career
- = I didn't want the person arrested, jailed, deported, stressed out
- = I handled it myself
- = I wanted to put it behind me

39. Have you ever acted in a sexually inappropriate manner in the workplace such that another person was slighted/disadvantaged/made to feel uncomfortable?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = I don't know

Experiences of Sexual Violence

For the purposes of this survey, sexual violence and sexual harassment collectively refer to physical contact or non-physical conduct of a sexual nature in the absence of clear, knowing and voluntary consent. It also refers to conduct that derogates, demeans, or humiliates a person based on that person's sex or gender. Examples include sexual or gender-based harassment, stalking, and sexual violence.

The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we did not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly.

Trigger Warning

The following questions ask about your personal experience with sexual violence. Some of the language used in these questions is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean. Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears below, at relevant points in the survey and at the end of the survey.

<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2021/04/Links-to-supports.pdf>

40. If you are not comfortable answering these questions you have the option to skip to the next section.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = I would like to answer these questions.
- = I would like to skip these questions.

41. In the last four years, have you been in a situation in which someone related to your HEI:*

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = 0 times - 1 time - 2 times - 3+ times

- = Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?
- = Made you touch, stroke, or kiss them when you did not want to?
- = Made unwanted attempts to stroke, or kiss you?
- = Touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or bottom) or removed some of your clothes without your consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration).
- = Had oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent?
- = TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent?

42. If you experienced one of the situations described in the last question, we would like to ask some follow up questions about the ONE SITUATION that had the greatest effect on you.

If this is not applicable to you or you are not comfortable answering questions about specific instances of sexual violence you should skip to the next section.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = I would like to answer these questions.
- = I would like to skip these questions.

43. The other person was a (select all that apply if more than one other person):

Please choose all that apply:

- = Man
- = Woman
- = Other

44. Did this happen on campus?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No

45. Was the other person a staff member at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = I don't know

46. Was the other person a student at your higher education institution or another higher education institution?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No
- = I don't know

47. During the incident, to what extent did you feel:

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Not at all – Slightly – Somewhat – Very - Extremely

- = Scared
- = Like your life was in danger
- = Like the other person would hurt you if you didn't go along

48. Did you tell anyone about the incident before this questionnaire?

Please choose only one of the following:

- = Yes
- = No

Answer = Yes

49. Who did you tell?

Please choose all that apply:

- = Friend
- = Romantic partner
- = Family member
- = Doctor/nurse
- = Religious (e.g., Priest, Nun, Rabbi, Imam, Pastor, Monk, Guru etc.)
- = Off-campus rape crisis centre staff
- = Off-campus counsellor

- = On-campus counsellor
- = Higher education institution health services
- = Campus security
- = Garda Síochána
- = Another staff member
- = Line manager
- = Other. Please Specify _____

Answer = No

50. Why did you not tell anyone?

Please choose all that apply:

- = I thought that I wouldn't be believed
- = I thought that the incident would be viewed as my fault
- = I didn't think the higher education institution /Gardaí could do anything
- = I was scared of offender
- = I thought that it was not serious enough, not a crime
- = I felt shame or embarrassment
- = I didn't want anyone to know
- = I didn't want involvement with the higher education institution authorities/Gardaí or courts
- = I was worried that it might affect my career
- = I was worried that it might affect the perpetrator's career
- = I didn't want the person arrested, jailed, deported, stressed out
- = I handled it myself
- = I wanted to put it behind me
- = I didn't want relationship to end

General attitudes to and perceptions of sexual violence and harassment

We'd like to ask you some final questions relating to your attitudes to and perceptions of consent, sexual violence and harassment. We are asking these questions develop a picture of staff attitudes to and perceptions of these issues to inform future training/education initiatives that may be necessary and to measure changes to attitudes/perceptions over time.

Trigger Warning

The following questions ask about general attitudes to sexual violence and harassment. Some of the language used in these questions is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean.

Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears below, at relevant points in the survey and at the end of the survey.

<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2021/04/Links-to-supports.pdf>

51. If you are not comfortable answering these questions you have the option to skip to the next section.

Please choose only one of the following:

- = I would like to answer these questions.
- = I would like to skip these questions.

52. For this part of the survey we would like you read each of the following statements and indicate how true each is to you, from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = If a woman is raped or sexually assaulted while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of control.
- = When women go to parties wearing revealing clothing, they are asking for trouble.
- = If a woman goes to a room alone with a man at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped or sexually assaulted.
- = If a woman acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble.
- = When women are raped or sexually assaulted, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear.
- = If a woman initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex.
- = When men rape or sexually assault, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex.
- = Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.
- = Rape or sexual assault happens when a man's sex drive gets out of control.
- = If a man is drunk, he might rape or sexually assaulted someone unintentionally.
- = It shouldn't be considered rape or sexual assault if a man is drunk and didn't realise what he was doing.
- = If both people are drunk, it can't be rape or sexual assault.

53. For this part of the survey we would like you read each of the following statements and indicate how true each is to you, from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

Scale = Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree

- = The extent of a man's resistance should be a major factor in determining if he was raped or sexually assaulted
- = A man can enjoy sex even if it is being forced on him
- = Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are very upset by the incident
- = Many men claim rape or sexual assault if they have consented to homosexual relations but have changed their minds afterwards
- = Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the woman
- = If a man engages in kissing and petting and he lets things get out of hand, it is his fault if the other person forces sex on him
- = Most men who are raped or sexually assaulted are somewhat to blame for not being more careful
- = Most men who have been raped or sexually assaulted have a history of promiscuity
- = Women who rape or sexually assault men are sexually frustrated individuals
- = Men who wear tight or skimpy clothes are asking for trouble

Further Comments

54. If there is anything else you would like to add about sexual violence and/or harassment in your HEI, please use the box below. You may also use this space to indicate any actions that you would like to see to address sexual violence and/or harassment in Irish HE. You should also feel free to make a comment on the survey itself. Like the rest of your responses to this survey, any information you provide is anonymous and will only be reported grouped with all other comments. Please avoid including identifying information in this text box.

Thank you for completing the survey.

If you are affected by any of the issues raised in this survey, a list of organisations that may be able to provide help and advice, if you need it, can be found here:

<https://hea.ie/assets/uploads/2021/04/Links-to-supports.pdf>

Bibliography

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2002). Unpublished measures. Cited in ARC3 Campus Climate Survey: Technical documentation. Available from: <https://campusclimate.gsu.edu/arc3-campus-climate-survey/request-arc3-survey-technical-documents/>

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2005). Rape prevention through bystander education: Final report to NIJ for grant 2002WGBX0009. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208701.pdf>

Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M., Cares, A.C., & Warner, R. (2014). How do we know it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campus. *Psychology of Violence*, 4, 101-115.

Cortina, L. M., Swan, S., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Waldo, C. (1998). Sexual harassment and assault: Chilling the climate for women in academia. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22(3), 419-441.

Department of Education & Skills (2019). *Framework for consent in higher education institutions: Safe, respectful, supportive and positive – Ending sexual violence and harassment in Irish higher education institutions*. <https://www.gov.ie/en/publication/678fee-framework-for-consent-in-higher-education-institutions-safe-respectf/>

Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 425-445.

Fitzgerald, L.F., Shullman, S.L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, A.J., & Weitzman, L.M. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.

Humphreys, T. P., & Brousseau, M. M. (2010). The Sexual Consent Scale – Revised: Development, reliability, and preliminary validity. *Journal of Sex Research*, 47, 420-428.

Koss, M., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve the assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 357-370.

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). The Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 53, 442-423.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization among a national sample of students in higher education. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 55, 162-170.

Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). The Sexual Experiences Survey: An empirical instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 50, 455–457.

McMahon, S., Allen, C. T., Postmus, J. L., McMahon, S. M., Peterson, N. A., & Lowe Hoffman, M. (2014). Measuring bystander attitudes and behavior to prevent sexual violence. *Journal of American College Health*, 62(1), 58-66.

McMahon, S., & Farmer, G. L. (2011). An updated measure for assessing subtle rape myths. *Social Work Research*, 35(2), 71-81.

Nukulij, P. (2011). AAUW Knowledge Networks: Harassment at School Survey. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/files/2013/02/crossing-the-line-harassment-atschool-survey-methodology.pdf>

Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2008). *Carleton College Climate Assessment Project: Carleton Final Report*. Retrieved from: https://apps.carleton.edu/governance/diversity/campus_climate_survey/results/

Rutgers University (2014). #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey. Retrieved from: http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/Libraries/VAWC/new_doc_to_upload_for_ispeak.sflb.ashx

Swartout, K. M., Flack, W. F., Cook, S. L., Olson, L. N., Smith, P. H., & White, J. W. (2019). Measuring campus sexual misconduct and its context: The Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Consortium (ARC3) survey. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 11, 495–504.

Swartout, Flack, & Holland, 2021 *ARC3 approaches to evaluation: Pilot results from the ARC3 Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Survey*. Action Collaborative on Preventing Sexual Harassment in Higher Education: 2021 Public Summit, The National Academies of Science Engineering & Medicine. <https://www.nationalacademies.org/event/10-21-2021/action-collaborative-on-preventing-sexual-harassment-in-higher-education-2021-public-summit>

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2014). Climate surveys: Useful tools to help colleges and universities in their efforts to reduce and prevent sexual assault. Retrieved from: <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/ovw-climate-survey.pdf>

