



5-2022

Beyond Compliance: Critical Perspectives in Supporting Institutionally Underserved Survivors of Sexual Violence

William A. Martinez

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, wmarti27@vols.utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes



Part of the [Civil Rights and Discrimination Commons](#), [Education Law Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [Social Justice Commons](#), and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martinez, William A., "Beyond Compliance: Critical Perspectives in Supporting Institutionally Underserved Survivors of Sexual Violence. " Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 2022.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes/6439

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by William A. Martinez entitled "Beyond Compliance: Critical Perspectives in Supporting Institutionally Underserved Survivors of Sexual Violence." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in College Student Personnel.

Dorian L. McCoy, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Karen D. Boyd, Leia K. Cain, Ashley M. Blamey

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Beyond Compliance: Critical Perspectives in Supporting Institutionally Underserved Survivors
of Sexual Violence

A Thesis Presented for the
Master of Science
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

William Alexander Martinez

May 2022

Copyright © 2022 by William Alexander Martinez

All rights reserved.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to institutionally underserved survivors of sexual and interpersonal violence and those who work to support these survivors. To all survivors, I believe you and this is not your fault. You are loved, appreciated, and admired. Your voice, agency, resilience, and being continued to push me, even when I felt like I had nothing left to give.

I am forever indebted to those that support these survivors and who took the time to speak with me. Thank you for hard work and heart work. To Wanda Swan, the fiercest advocate, educator, and scholar-practitioner I know, thank you for taking the energy, the time, the emotional labor, and for giving yourself to your work. You've cultivated a fire within me that I carry dear to my heart.

To my cherished mentors, from Emory to UTK, your existence and resistance showed me that we belong here even when it doesn't feel like it. To Dorian, Karen, Leia, and Ashley, thank you for putting up with my antics and pushing me in ways I never knew I needed.

To my friends, family, and loved ones, both past and present, I am grateful for your unwavering support in this journey. To my Capybara Coffee family, thank you for fueling me and providing a space to vent and work while indulging in amazing coffee and treats. Club Capy, thank you for being my ladders when I needed help climbing lol. And last but not least, to the strongest women in my life: Amber, mom, Janie, and Shirley, Rose Lee, simply put: I am because of you. I am humbled to have had a village pour so much into me and hope this accomplishment can be seen as a tangible representation of your love and support.

Acknowledgements

Those who get to call Dr. Dorian L. McCoy their thesis/dissertation chair know that only he can manage to infuriate, care, push, and love in a way that Dorian can. We joke constantly, and I'll never own up to writing this (even though it's in print), but you're all right... borderline amazing on some days. I am always in awe of all that you do and the way you weave justice into your life. You almost make it look easy though I know it is far from that.

To Drs. Boyd, Cain, and Blamey, you are by far the best committee members I could have picked. A thank you doesn't even begin to cover it. Your grace, expertise, and guidance continue to remind me that though academia is hard, it is not devoid of compassion and support. I am grateful to have been able to work with the four of you. We did it!

Abstract

Interpersonal and sexual violence on college campuses is rampant. While federal legislation exists to support survivors of interpersonal violence in higher education via the Violence Against Women Act, Title IX, and Clery Act, support specifically for institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence (IUS) tends to be limited in nature. Because of this deficit, institutionally underserved students and survivors of interpersonal violence are often left unsupported by interpersonal violence prevention staff members (IVPSM). Through semi-structured interviews, this critical multisite case study collected information on the perceptions of IVPSM on IUS support and resources, identified gaps in education on how to respond and support IUS, and examined IVPSM's social identities and influence of their identities on their work. Data was analyzed through critical race theory and critical trauma theory lenses with a focus on intersectionality. This research can aid higher education professionals in understanding promising practices in supporting institutionally underserved survivors.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Sexual Violence in Higher Education	1
Sexual Violence Laws and Acts in Higher Education	2
Institutionally Underserved Survivor Resource Utilization and Support.....	5
Problem Statement	6
Methods.....	8
Research Questions	8
Summary	10
Organization of Study	10
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	11
Survey of Interpersonal Violence and Trauma Research.....	11
Theme One: Nonuniversal Terminology, Definitions, and Education Related to IPV	11
Theme Two: Impacts of Violence and Trauma and Barriers to Disclosure	21
Theme Three: Lack of IUS Representation and Future Research Directions	22
Theoretical Frameworks.....	23
Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies	23
Ethic of Care, Critical Care Theory, and Critical Trauma Studies.....	26
Summary	29
Chapter 3: Methodology	31
Introduction to Study.....	31
Critical Interpretive Framework	31
Methodology	33
Critical Methodology.....	33
Critical Case Study	33
Context	35
Participants	36
Data Collection.....	37
Semi-Structured Interviews	37
Data Analysis.....	38
Coding	39
Trustworthiness	40
Peer Review	40
Rich, Thick Descriptions	41
Member Checking	41
Critical Reflexivity	42
Positionality and Ethically Important Moments.....	43
Institutional Review Board.....	46
Summary	47
Chapter 4: Findings.....	48
Profile of Sample Group and Major Themes	48
Institutional Betrayal	48
Lack of Trust in Policies and Procedures	48

Lack of Support for Professionals	52
Summary.....	54
Expanding Current Conceptualization and Praxis	55
Challenging Stereotypes of IPV and Revamping Education.....	55
Summary.....	58
Embracing Prevention and Identity as Inextricable to IPV Work.....	58
Summary.....	62
Student Utilization and Office Limitations	62
Student Utilization.....	62
Office Limitations.....	66
Summary.....	67
Summary	68
Chapter 5: Discussion and Implications	69
Navigating the Politics and Contexts of Mistrust in Institutions	69
Lack of Education, Organizations, and Data Exchanges for IVPSMs.....	71
Implications of Identity and Power	73
Future Research.....	76
Conclusion.....	77
Appendices.....	103
Appendix A – Participation Recruitment Email	103
Appendix B – Participation Survey.....	104
Appendix C – Participation Interview Request.....	105
Appendix D - Consent for Research Participation	106
Appendix E – Trauma Resource Guide.....	110
Appendix F – Interview Protocol.....	111
Appendix G – Table 1: Participant Demographic and Resource Information	113
Appendix H – Table 2: Student Utilization and Resource Referral Comparison	114
Appendix I – IRB Approval.....	115
Vita.....	117

Chapter 1: Introduction

Sexual Violence in Higher Education

Across the United States, interpersonal violence, the “intentional use of physical force or power against other persons by an individual or small groups of individuals [which may be] physical, psychological/emotional, or sexual in nature” is pervasive (Mercy et al., 2017). On college campuses, interpersonal violence rates reflect this larger systemic issue (Cantor et al., 2020). Fedina (2018) found that scholars rarely account for the intersection of students’ race and gender when focusing on prevalence rates. While there is no one single agency that analyzes campus sexual violence statistics, several studies have contributed hypotheses and data to elucidate the prevalence of interpersonal violence on college campuses:

- Rates of interpersonal violence on college campuses in the United States have not declined since the 1980s (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018).
- One in five women and one in sixteen men are sexually assaulted while in college (Krebs et al., 2016).
- One in six college-age female survivors received assistance from a victim services agency (Cantor et al., 2015).
- Eleven percent of all students experience rape or sexual assault through physical force, violence, or incapacitation (among all graduate and undergraduate students) (Cantor et al., 2015).
- Among graduate and professional students, 9% of females and 2% of males experience rape or sexual assault through physical force, violence, or incapacitation (Cantor et al., 2015).

- Among undergraduate students, 23% of females and 5% of males experience rape or sexual assault through physical force, violence, or incapacitation (Cantor et al., 2015).
- Four percent of students have experienced stalking since entering college (Cantor et al., 2015).
- Twenty-one percent of TGQN (transgender, genderqueer, nonconforming) college students have been sexually assaulted, compared to 18% of non-TGQN females and 4% of non-TGQN males (Cantor et al., 2015).

To address interpersonal violence on campuses, several companies have developed training modules for universities to utilize for education on consent, active bystander, and healthy relationships.

Sexual Violence Laws and Acts in Higher Education

Title IX, passed as part of the Education Amendments of 1972, acts as a follow-up to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which did not legally protect individuals from sex-discrimination at educational institutions (Vojdik, 2017). Title IX, in its current form as the Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act of 2002, includes the verbiage, “no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.” In 2021, The U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, under the Biden administration, issued a Notice of Interpretation explaining that “discrimination on the basis of sex [includes]: (a) discrimination based on sexual orientation; and (b) discrimination based on gender identity. Additionally, Title IX requires that every university has a Title IX Coordinator to oversee correct reporting. *Alexander v. Yale* (1980) was the first case that brought sexual harassment charges under Title IX to an educational institution and allowed for sexual

harassment experienced by female students to be included under the purview of sex discrimination.

Another statute intended to protect students is the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (2016), a federal statute requiring institutions of higher education that receive federal funds to report certain crime statistics to students, faculty, and staff. After the murder of a white¹ Lehigh University first-year student, Jeanne Clery, by a student on campus, Clery's parents began a movement to ensure universities reported incidents of certain crimes and issue timely warnings if these crimes put the community at risk. After reviewing crime logs and reports around the time of Jeanne's murder, the Clerys discovered a trend of robbery and violent crime in the area which university police and administration did not originally share with the public (Karjane et al., 2002).

The United States Congress enacted the Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights as a part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. The Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights includes:

- Accuser and accused must have the same opportunity to have others present
- Both parties shall be informed of the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding
- Survivors shall be informed of their options to notify law enforcement
- Survivors shall be notified of counseling services
- Survivors shall be notified of options for changing academic and living situations.

¹ The author has chosen to not capitalize the term *white* and has chosen to capitalize historically institutionally underserved groups to recenter attention to these groups.

In 2016, Congress introduced the Survivors' Bill of Rights which became law that same year.

This legislation amended the federal criminal code to establish statutory rights for all sexual assault survivors, not just those in educational settings, including the right to:

1. Not be prevented from receiving a forensic medical examination and not be charged for an examination;
2. Have a sexual assault evidence collection kit (i.e., a rape kit) preserved for 20 years or the maximum applicable statute of limitations, whichever is shorter;
3. Receive written notification prior to destruction or disposal of a rape kit; and
4. Be informed of these rights and policies.

In another act of legislation, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (34 CFR § 668.46 [VAWA]) modified some of the requirements and language of the Clery Act (Murphy & Brunt, 2017). Guidelines under VAWA require institutions of higher education to specify definitions of consent, develop prevention programming for students and employees (which in many cases is done through active bystander intervention programming), and added additional reporting obligations for categories of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking that Clery did not have (Murphy & Brunt, 2017). VAWA attempted to address individuals from varying backgrounds by requiring that programming be:

comprehensive, intentional, and integrated programming, initiatives, strategies, and campaigns intended to end dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking that are culturally relevant, inclusive of diverse communities and identities, sustainable, responsive to community needs, and informed by research or assessed for value, effectiveness, or outcome. (668.46(a))

While more inclusive in some respects than previous legislation, VAWA still remained largely vague and left to institutional interpretation on how to best address the needs of its diverse population.

Institutionally Underserved Survivor Resource Utilization and Support

The mismanaging of Title IX cases has led to feelings of lack of trust and of support by several higher education institutions (Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018). In a report completed by The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018), researchers stated that “students who experienced sexual harassment by faculty/staff and endorsed a race or ethnicity other than white (non-Hispanic) perceived their campus as less safe than the other female STEM students” (p. 285).

In their capacity as Title IX officers, many in the field have more than one role on campus, such as working in diversity and inclusion offices or in human resources, and often times stay in their roles less than five years (Brown, 2019). With institutions often failing to require diversity and inclusion training or more specified trauma-informed care techniques in the hiring and onboarding process, often times Title IX officers feel unprepared for their roles, particularly when working with students from differing identities (Steele, 2018). The racial composition and lack of diverse IVPSM could also play a role in the feeling of discomfort some students have with interpersonal violence processes. In the few studies conducted on IVPSM identity, most Title IX Coordinators identified as white women (Cruz, 2021; Wiersma-Mosley, 2018). Lack of cultural competency and an ability to grasp *intersectionality*, a term coined by Crenshaw (1991) to describe the interwoven oppressions that those with many marginalized identities experience, dampers Title IX officers’ ability to address a diverse student population.

Inconsistencies in reporting structures for Title IX and Clery officers, those involved in Title IX/Clery cases (i.e., conduct, housing, administrators, etc.), and lack of streamlined information and communication can often dampen interpersonal violence support (Beavers & Halabi, 2017). In some cases, definitions of prohibited conduct versus what conduct violates Title IX policies can sometimes confuse individuals on proper reporting. The chronic stress put on Title IX officers to comply with the law, university constituents, and survivors has put many Title IX officers in positions of emotional fatigue (Klein, 2016). According to one Title IX coordinator:

When students report, they're putting their faith in the institution to do something. But Title IX officials are neutral fact finders, not advocates. They have to tell students who come forward, 'The person you accused has rights, too.' Many victims don't see fairness in that statement. They see someone who's not taking sexual misconduct seriously. Robinette Kelley, a former Title IX coordinator at Iowa State University, said there's not much she can do about that. 'We're supposed to be compliant, not compassionate.'" (Brown, 2019, para. 59)

While juggling federal compliance, many Title IX officers also serve as survivor advocates, a position that sometimes places the two roles in fundamental opposition to one another as Robinette Kelley mentioned. With a lack of institutional support and a lack of training, Title IX officers can feel as though they are overworked and failing their students, especially students with marginalized identities who already lack trust in institutions (Brown, 2019).

Problem Statement

While Title IX offices and survivor support services have traditionally been directed by and typically served female students from wealthy and white backgrounds, student populations

have become much more diverse (Davis & Fry, 2019). For populations with more privileged identities, the disruptions to learning that sexual violence can have on one's mental, physical, and emotional well-being can make attending classes, participating in co-curricular initiatives, and other daily activities seem impossible; by adding institutionally underserved identities to an already intense load, the intersections of identities and negative experiences can create extremely debilitating situations (Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network, 2020). In terms of sexual violence, federal mandates have required protocols and support for survivors on college campuses, but little is known about resource utilization and survivor support services for IUS. While most universities employ diversity offices for identities such as race, gender, sexuality, etc., few universities offer specific resources for survivors with historically underserved identities. As universities admit a more diverse student population, there has become a pervasive need to create specific resources for these institutionally underserved students that utilize critical perspectives, praxes, and methodologies.

While there has been an increase in representation of historically underserved populations on college campuses, there has not been a proportional increase of support services offered for these groups of students (Harris & Linder, 2017; Hirsch & Khan, 2020). The purpose of this study was to interrogate perceptions of IVPSM on IUS support and resources, identify gaps in education on how to respond and support IUS, and examine IVPSM's social identities and influence of their identities on their work. Additionally, this study will highlight best praxis in supporting IUS on the campuses researched in accordance with the literature surveyed. Lastly, this study will center the needs of Students of Color and those in the LGBTQ+ community who have historically not been centered in this work as they are often in the margins of society (Crenshaw, 1991; Harris & Linder, 2017; Hong & Marine, 2018).

Methods

The study used critical methodology and critical multisite case study methodology to examine four of the fourteen Southeastern Conference (SEC) institutions: University of Alabama, University of Arkansas, Auburn University, University of Florida, University of Georgia, University of Kentucky, Louisiana State University, University of Mississippi, Mississippi State University, University of Missouri, University of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, Texas A&M University, and Vanderbilt University. To uphold participant confidentiality, the specific institution names and participant names will not be reported. The purpose of this study was to interrogate perceptions of IVPSMs on IUS support and resources, identify gaps in education on how to respond and support IUS, and examine IVPSM's social identities and influence of their identities on their work. As methodologies that enable researchers to examine power structures and oppression, critical methodology and critical case study methodology are best suited for this study. To inform these methodologies, critical trauma and critical race-informed epistemologies were embedded. Utilizing data collected from semi-structured interviews with those who work with IUS, case studies of each institution were created. Promising practices for supporting IUS was also highlighted. These results and promising practices may contribute to the dearth of IUS-specific literature and may add depth to current campus sexual violence literature.

Research Questions

There are four research questions central to this study's purpose:

1. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence prevention staff members have of sexual violence resource utilization and support for institutionally underserved survivors at their university?

2. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence prevention staff members have of their own intersectional identities and the impacts identity may have on the work they do?
3. How do universities support institutionally underserved survivors?
4. What education do faculty, staff, and students receive in supporting institutionally underserved survivors?

Key Terms

Institutionally Underserved Survivors (IUS):

Echo-Hawk (2019) tweeted, “we are not a ‘historically’ underserved population. My history is one of ancestors survived so I could thrive. My history didn’t start with ‘western civilization.’ I am colonially underserved. I am institutionally underserved. And I am historically resilient #INDIGENOUS.” Pulling from this framework, institutionally underserved students are those who have been marginalized and oppressed. Recognizing that the Indigenous experience is unique to those who hold this identity, borrowing this term is meant to highlight communities who are also institutionally underserved. While the terms victim and survivor are sometimes used interchangeably, the term survivor typically pushes back on the deficit mindset that is associated with the term victim (Boyle & Rogers, 2020; Hockett & Saucier, 2015; Papendick & Bohner, 2017; RAINN, 2020).

Interpersonal violence prevention staff members (IVPSM):

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators [NASPA] (2021) utilizes the phrasing “Sexual and Relationship Violence Prevention, Education, and Response (SRVPER)” to describe the student affairs professionals “whose work involves working on dating/domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault on campus.” I have intentionally chosen to

use interpersonal violence to be as inclusive as possible of the wide range of situations these IVPSMs encounter. The usage of *prevention* does not attempt to undervalue the education, response, advocacy, and support that these IVPSMs provide but merely acts to shorten the abbreviation.

Summary

Interpersonal violence on college campuses is pervasive and rampant (Wooten & Mitchell, 2016). While federal legislation exists to support survivors of interpersonal violence in higher education via the Violence Against Women Act, Title IX, and Clery Act, support specifically for institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence (IUS) tends to be limited in nature (Harris & Linder, 2017). This study focused on the role of individual's providing support or response to reports. Discussed more in-depth in Chapter 2, prevention and response are two separate issues in the work of Title IX, Clery, and institutional health and wellness initiatives. IUS tend to experience discrimination and oppression due to their identities and oftentimes describe a double burden of being a survivor and having a historically underserved identity (Harris & Linder, 2017; Hong & Marine, 2018). This study provided insight into current support measures for IUS and elucidated best practices to support this community.

Organization of Study

This study is organized into five chapters. In Chapter One, the study's topic, its significance, and the research questions were introduced. In Chapter Two, I reviewed the relevant literature related to the topic, including Title IX and higher education, the current state of sexual violence legislation, and intersections of sexual violence and social identity. Chapter Three outlined the study's research methods. I present the study's findings in Chapter Four and the implications for practice and future research in Chapter Five

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Survey of Interpersonal Violence and Trauma Research

The scope of interpersonal violence (IPV) and trauma research is broad in nature and ranges from international IPV prevalence rates and intervention strategies to U.S. trauma-informed campus sexual violence advocacy. Literature published from 2015 to 2020 along with commonly cited, seminal texts were reviewed. In particular, A top-down approach was utilized, starting with general interpersonal violence and trauma definitions and concluding with research on interpersonal violence in U.S. institutions of higher education. The survey of literature yielded three themes. The first theme identified was nonuniversal terminology, definitions, and education related to interpersonal violence. The emotional, psychological, economic, and political effects of interpersonal violence and trauma and barriers to disclosure comprised the second theme. Lack of IUS Representation and Future Research Directions was the third theme. The fourth theme was a lack of focus and representation of institutionally underserved survivors and future directions for IPV and IUS work. Building on research aimed at intentionally including IUS in university policies and procedures, the theoretical frameworks (Critical Race Theory, Critical Whiteness Studies, and Critical Trauma Studies) used in this study to guide the critical methodology are discussed.

Theme One: Nonuniversal Terminology, Definitions, and Education Related to IPV

Violence

In the interpersonal violence literature surveyed, key terms included *interpersonal violence, family or partner violence, community violence, intimate partner violence/domestic violence, sexual violence, and sexual harassment*. While international entities and U.S. legislation defined some of these terms, the presence of overlapping and occasionally

contradicting definitions existed, especially from state-to-state in the U.S. (DeMatteo, 2015; Patsy Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act of 2002; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964). Key terms and definitions typically cited three sources: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; The U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women; and the Rape, Abuse, & Incest National Network. When referring specifically to college campuses, two additional sources – The Clery Center and U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights- were often cited.

Interpersonal violence is one of the most inclusive terms, often encompassing several forms of violence. According to Mercy et al. (2017), interpersonal violence involves:

The intentional use of physical force or power against other persons by an individual or small group of individuals. Interpersonal violence may be physical, sexual, or psychological (also called emotional violence), and it may involve deprivation and neglect. Acts of interpersonal violence can be further divided into family or partner violence and community violence:

Family or partner violence refers to violence within the family or between intimate partners. It includes child maltreatment, dating and intimate partner violence (IPV), and elder maltreatment.

Community violence occurs among individuals who are not related by family ties but who may know each other. It includes youth violence, bullying, assault, rape or sexual assault by acquaintances or strangers, and violence that occurs in institutional settings such as schools, workplaces, and prisons. (pp.71-72)

Intimate partner violence included “physical violence, sexual violence, stalking and psychological aggression (including coercive tactics) by a current or former intimate partner (i.e.,

spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend, dating partner, or ongoing sexual partner)” (Breiding, 2015, p. 11).

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence [NCADV] (n.d.) described *domestic violence* as “willful intimidation, physical assault, battery, sexual assault, and/or other abusive behavior as part of a systematic pattern of power and control perpetrated by one intimate partner against another. It includes physical violence, sexual violence, psychological violence, and emotional abuse” (para. 1). The Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women [OVW] (n.d.) stated:

The term “domestic violence” includes felony or misdemeanor crimes of violence committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or intimate partner, by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction receiving grant monies, or by any other person against an adult or youth victim who is protected from that person’s acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction. (OVW, n.d., para. 4)

A shift from utilizing domestic violence and instead using intimate partner violence existed in the literature; some organizations distinctly use domestic violence to refer to violence within a household; whereas intimate partner violence may occur between people not living together in the same household (Moorer, 2019; Wallace et al., 2018).

Sexual violence is “a non-legal term that refers to crimes such as sexual assault, rape, and sexual abuse” (The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network [RAINN], 2020, para. 1). The Office on Violence Against Women [OVW] (n.d.) states that “the term ‘sexual assault’ means any nonconsensual sexual act proscribed by Federal, tribal, or State law, including when the

victim lacks capacity to consent” (para. 4). Legal definitions and campus definitions of these terms and terms such as *consent*, *sexual assault*, and *sexual abuse* vary from state-to-state (RAINN, 2020).

One definition that remains consistent among universities and the literature surveyed is that of *sexual harassment*. Under the U.S. Department of Education Title IX Final Rule (2020), sexual harassment is defined as:

- A school employee conditioning an educational benefit or service upon a person’s participation in unwelcome sexual conduct (often called “quid pro quo” harassment);
- Unwelcome conduct determined by a reasonable person to be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive that it effectively denies a person equal access to the school’s education program or activity; or
- Sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, or stalking (as those offenses are defined in the Clery Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f), and the Violence Against Women Act, 34 U.S.C. § 12291(a) (p. 1)

These new regulations allow the U.S. Department of Education’s (2020) Title IX regulations to “recognize that sexual harassment, including sexual assault, is unlawful sex discrimination;” and gives a legally binding definition in place of previous definitions given solely through guidance documents (p. 1). While denoting and connoting similar meanings, variances in interpersonal violence definitions seem to contribute to a lack of comprehension of policies and regulations (Anderson, 2020). As the broadest and most all-encompassing term, *interpersonal violence* will be used throughout this study to refer to the forms of violence institutionally underserved survivors encounter.

Trauma

Like interpersonal violence, the definitions of *trauma* are varied and non-ubiquitous (Pai et al., 2017). According to the American Psychiatric Association's (2013) *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.; *DSM-5*), exposure to a traumatic event requires "actual or threatened death, serious injury, or sexual violence" (p. 271), but an explicit definition of trauma is not given. Briere and Scott (2015) describe the *DSM-5* definition of trauma as being broad on the surface but fairly restrictive underneath the surface as events do not need to explicitly occur for someone to think they are traumatic. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (2012), describes that trauma can occur:

From an event, series of events, or set of circumstances that is experienced by an individual as physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening and that has lasting adverse effects on the individual's functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or spiritual well-being. (p. 7)

Trauma can be described as a complicated term that is usually characterized by proximity to a traumatic event, the duration/thought of the event recurring, one's subjective response to the traumatic event, and the short-term and long-term effects the traumatic event may cause (American Psychological Association, 2020; SAMHSA, 2014). While there may be universal events that are considered traumatic- the loss of a loved one, a violent car accident, or mass genocide and violence- trauma is culturally bound and individually experienced meaning that trauma is informed by space, time, and context (May & Wisco, 2016; van der Kolk, 2014). In similar fashion to the definition of interpersonal violence, the definition of trauma offered by SAMHSA (2012) will be used throughout this study. As an umbrella term, many forms of

trauma exist which will be discussed in the following sections (Development Services, Inc., 2016).

Oppression Trauma and Racial Battle Fatigue. According to Nelson (2020):

Oppression based-trauma can be described as exposure to and lived experiences of personally mediated, institutional and structural forms of oppression (Jones, 2000) through symbolic, emotional, verbal, physical, sexual or economic manifestations, across one's lifespan.

Oppression-based trauma exposure includes but is not limited to linguicism, racism, sexism, classism, homophobia, transphobia, xenophobia, islamophobia, colonialism, political, historical and intergenerational trauma, and acts of oppression because of one's immigration- or refugee-, or former incarceration status. (p. 10)

Oppression-based trauma results from discrimination and oppression faced because of at least one marginalized identity. Those with multiple marginalized identities may feel oppression trauma differently as the effects of oppression on more than one identity may be experienced (Caldwell & Leighton, 2018; Harris & Linder, 2017; Menakem, 2017).

Collective and Historical Trauma. Collective trauma can be described as a "blow to the basic tissues of social life that damages the bonds attaching people together and impairs the prevailing sense of community" (Erikson, 1976). Collective trauma impacts a larger group of people at one given time given that a whole community experiences the trauma together. In the U.S., common collective trauma experiences revolve around 9/11; Pearl Harbor; and natural disasters that hit specific communities such as the Joplin, Missouri tornado, Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Andrew (Saul, 2013). The effects of this trauma exist in the psyche of people well after the event. Historical trauma is "cumulative emotional and psychological wounding over the lifespan and across generations, emanating from massive group trauma experiences" that exist

even in those who did not experience the trauma directly (Brave Heart, 2011, p. 7). Mass genocides and forced relocations of Indigenous folks, the enslavement of Black and African American people, and the atrocities of the Holocaust, from a historical trauma standpoint, continue to impact descendants of those who lived during these conditions.

Vicarious Trauma. Vicarious trauma typically manifests in caregivers responding to other's trauma (van der Merwe & Hunt, 2019) and can be described as the “cost of caring” (Figley, 1982). The American Counseling Association (2020) states, “vicarious trauma is the emotional residue of exposure that counselors have from working with people as they are hearing their trauma stories and become witnesses to the pain, fear, and terror that trauma survivors have endured” (p. 1). Specific to IPV in higher education, this form of trauma typically impacts those responding to disclosure of interpersonal violence such as resident assistants, Title IX coordinators, other professionals, and student leaders with counseling roles.

Compliance, Advocacy, Prevention, and Response

Within the literature, tensions among IVPSM as compliance officials or advocacy officials and the responsibility of prevention and response exist (Brubaker, 2019; Henkle et al., 2020). Henkle et al., (2020) describe that stereotypes of Title IX coordinators often include Title IX coordinators solely being compliance-driven, connected to the legal system, and not trauma-informed. In this role, Title IX officials' main role is in institutional compliance as opposed to survivor advocacy. Additionally, stereotypes of advocates include these individuals being more activist than administrative partners; who are anti-reporting, hyper-obsessed with victimization, and preoccupied with confidentiality. Survivor advocates support survivors by representing their goals and wishes, connecting them to campus and community resources, and occasionally act as proxies for survivors to represent their perspectives (Brubaker & Mancini, 2017). Due to their

reporting obligations set forth by the U.S. Department of Education, Title IX Coordinators often have a higher status within the institution than advocates and prevention educators (Brubaker, 2019; Brubaker & Keegan, 2019). Title IX coordinators are often charged with “going beyond compliance” to include a more advocate, trauma-informed focus as solely reporting IPV data does not support survivors (Brubaker & Keegan, 2019; Steiner, 2019).

When discussing interpersonal violence at the college and university-level, interpersonal wellness and violence prevention offices often utilized terms like *health promotion*, *wellness*, and *prevention*. According to the World Health Organization (2021), health promotion “is the process of enabling people to increase control over, and to improve, their health. It moves beyond a focus on individual behaviour towards a wide range of social and environmental interventions” (para. 1). Health promotion can include building healthy settings in social institutions like education systems, healthcare systems, and the legal system. The Rural Health Information Hub (2021) differentiated between wellness and prevention. Specifically, RHI Hub stated,

Disease prevention differs from health promotion because it focuses on specific efforts aimed at reducing the development and severity of chronic diseases and other morbidities.

Wellness is related to health promotion and disease prevention. Wellness is described as the attitudes and active decisions made by an individual that contribute to positive health behaviors and outcomes.

Health promotion and disease prevention programs often address social determinants of health, which influence modifiable risk behaviors. Social determinants of health are the

economic, social, cultural, and political conditions in which people are born, grow, and live that affect health status (para. 2).

Prevention programming was often described using the three-tiered Public Health Model (PHM) developed by the Institute of Medicine in 1994. Herkett and Kopp (2008) specified that prevention can be divided into three categories: primary prevention, secondary prevention, and tertiary prevention,

Primary prevention targets entire communities to reduce the incidence of a disorder or the occurrence of new cases. Secondary prevention aims to reduce the prevalence and recurrence of interpersonal violence by targeting individuals who have been exposed to violence or are at risk for exposure. The model's tertiary level of interpersonal violence prevention works to reduce the consequences and complications arising from the problem or disorder once it manifests. Prevention efforts can target entire general populations (universal prevention), subgroups that are vulnerable to violence exposure or perpetration (selected prevention), and individuals with early signs of exposure or perpetration (indicated prevention) (para. 4).

Most programs that address collegiate interpersonal violence utilize a primary prevention approach: educating college students on IPV, active bystander skills, healthy relationships, and consent. RAINN and NASPA's Culture of Respect offered a detailed programming matrix and outline describing common collegiate IPV programs including Green Dot College Prevention Strategy, Bringing in the Bystander®, and the DATE SAFE Project (NASPA Culture of Respect, 2021; RAINN, 2021). According to the Department of Education (2021), "if a school knows or reasonably should know about sexual harassment or sexual violence that creates a hostile environment, the school must take immediate action to eliminate the sexual harassment or sexual

violence, prevent its recurrence, and address its effects.” Under Title IX mandates, universities are not specifically guided on the type of response or prevention education students must receive; only on the specific procedures and policies universities must take when a complaint arises.

The concept of institutional response and the responsibility of the response is also a point of contention. Organizational tensions among IVPSMs could be characterized through an occupational orientation dimension or action orientation dimension (D’Enbeau, 2017). In the occupational orientation dimension, perceptions of response changed dependent on where IVPSMs were located (e.g., in human resources; health centers; Title IX or equity offices; survivor advocate offices). Within this study, tensions were often seen between compliance-centered officials (more often human resources, Title IX, and Clery coordinators) and student affairs-centered officials (more often survivor advocates, case managers, and health educators; D’Enbeau, 2017). In an action orientation dimension, tensions arose through how members focused either on proactive (prevention-based) interventions based in case management versus reactive (response-based) solutions based in mandates/compliance (D’Enbeau, 2017). In both dimensions, due to the ambiguity in law interpretation and the potential financial consequences of non-compliance for institutions, IVPSMs often centralized mandates in violence prevention conversations with responses ultimately being led by compliance officials (D’Enbeau, 2017, p. 244). The manner of response and support provided for survivors also depended on these dimensions. While responses from survivor-focused advocates and IVPSMs tended to be in the form of resource referral (e.g., directing survivors to mental health resources; accompanying survivors to hospitals), compliance-focused IVPSMs tended to respond with university and/or law enforcement reporting options. (Amar et al., 2014; Brubaker, 2019; Brubaker & Mancini, 2017; D’Enbeau, 2017).

Theme Two: Impacts of Violence and Trauma and Barriers to Disclosure

Violence and trauma can have several impacts on survivors in all aspects of their lives (RAINN, 2020). Psychological distress from interpersonal violence can manifest in depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), suicidality, sleep disorders, panic attacks, dissociation, eating disorders, and substance abuse to name a few (Basile et al., 2020; RAINN, 2020). As a result of psychological distress, academics, social life, work life, and many other facets of life can be impacted (Bennett et al., 2017; Carey et al., 2018). By adding microaggressions, discrimination, and other feelings of alienation with interpersonal violence, marginalized students tend to experience interpersonal violence in different ways (Hardy & Chakraborti, 2020; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018). Missing work/school, dependence on abusers, and inability to find safe childcare can all contribute to the economic impacts of interpersonal violence (Breiding et al., 2017; Stupakis, 2019; World Health Organization, 2014).

Barriers to disclosing interpersonal violence include the prevalence of rape myths/culture on campuses, concerns about stigmas, lack of knowledge of reporting structures, and wanting to forget about the experience (Muscari & Fleming, 2019; Mennicke, 2021; Smidt et al., 2019). Institutional betrayal/mistrust refers to “wrongdoings perpetrated by an institution upon individuals dependent on that institution, including failure to prevent or respond supportively to wrongdoings by individuals (e.g. sexual assault) committed within the context of the institution” (Smith & Freyd, 2013, p. 119). Fears of institutional mistrust and betrayal can be fueled by discriminatory policies/procedures. In addition, feelings of shame, judgement, and fear also tended to resonate with survivors who did not report (Spencer et al., 2017). Lastly, concerns about potential re-traumatization and encountering IVPSMs who are not culturally competent

were also present (Spencer et al., 2020). According to the Human Rights Campaign (n.d.), “for LGBTQ survivors of sexual assault, their identities – and the discrimination they face surrounding those identities – often make them hesitant to seek help from police, hospitals, shelters or rape crisis centers, the very resources that are supposed to help them” (para. 2). Similar distrust in social institutions exists within communities of color (Howard, 2018).

Theme Three: Lack of IUS Representation and Future Research Directions

The last theme revolved around recognizing who is and who is not discussed in the literature. Most current research, when discussing identity and campus interpersonal violence primarily focuses on women, specifically white women. Consequently, sparse data on gender and sexual minorities and on People of Color exists in the literature. According to the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018):

A challenge for any survey that is particularly important for sexual harassment surveys are their ability to gather information about non-majority members of a given workplace or campus. Often women of color and sexual- and gender minority women have been underrepresented among survey respondents, resulting in unreliable prevalence rates for these specific populations. (p. 33)

Because such a large gap exists in researching the effects that multiple marginalized identities have on the experiences of interpersonal violence, a large group of students on college campuses is often unaccounted for when consensus data is utilized.

While there has been an increase in the number of historically underserved students on college campuses, there has not been a proportional increase of support services offered for these groups of students (Duran, 2019; McCoy et al., 2017; Steinas, 2020). In terms of sexual violence, federal mandates have required protocols and support for survivors on college campuses, but

little is known about the intersections of identity, resource utilization, and survivor support for IUS. Moylan and Javorka (2020), suggested that future sexual violence research should investigate the availability of services for college students, what university processes and services feel like to survivors, and how these practices are improved or constrained by policy at different levels.

Theoretical Frameworks

Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies

According to Ladson-Billings (1998), Critical Race Theory emerged out of Critical Legal Studies inability to focus on the struggles of People of Color and has a focus on social justice, liberation, and economic empowerment. It is a movement comprising scholars committed to challenging and disrupting the status quo of racial hierarchy within social institutions. Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) asserted that race, gender, sexual orientation, and other social identities are significant factors affecting educational access, attainment, and justice in the United States; and therefore, continue to repeat the conditions of inequity in education for many students. While theorists from a variety of fields have contributed to the current landscape of Critical Race Theory, several tenets remain fairly persistent through most literature. McCoy and Rodricks (2015) stated that these tenets include the permanence of racism; experiential knowledge and counterstorytelling; interest convergence theory; intersectionality; whiteness as property; critique of liberalism; and commitment to social justice. In this study, I specifically use the following Critical Race tenants: intersectionality; whiteness as property; critique of liberalism; interest convergence; and commitment to social justice.

Intersectionality, defined by Crenshaw (1991) describes the multitude of social identities one has while navigating systems of oppression and privilege. Social identities such as

socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and ability often overlap and are interwoven to shape our experiences. Originally described by Harris (1993), *whiteness as property* refers to “assumptions, privileges, and benefits” (p. 1713) that come with being white. Since “white identity and whiteness were sources of privilege and protection; their absence meant being the object of property” (Harris, 1993, p. 1721). In higher education, whiteness as property can be seen in dominant narratives within classrooms such as white characters and white European/American literature alongside white, western epistemologies being centered in curriculum. According to Brown & Brown (2020), centering whiteness in curricula and in campus policies and legislation has currently shaped the ways in which institutions of higher education continually perpetuate the idea that college is for a certain group of individuals.

In a *critique of liberalism*, Critical Race theorists typically criticize notions of meritocracy, equal opportunity, incremental change, and policies that support a capitalist agenda. Soloranzo (1997) believed that these concepts “camouflage for the self-interest, power, and privilege of dominant groups in U.S. society” (p. 6). Liberalism also seems to sugar coat interpersonal violence to make the concept more digestible (Kalbaga & Spencer, 2019). Using language such as *nonconsensual sexual penetration* instead of rape, adding modifiers such as *acquaintance, date, or party* in front of rape, or even refusing to name institutional, systemic and structural violence as mitigating factors for violence forces the idea that interpersonal violence is a fluke of the system and occurs on an individual level (Kulbaga & Spencer, 2019). In a specific critique of liberalism, a phenomenon known as *interest convergence* emerged. According to Bell (1980), interest convergence explains that the interests of marginalized people are only invested in when they align with the interests of those in power. Bell (1980) uses the *Brown v. Board of Education* case to describe that desegregation was only passed because there was a vested

interest in being seen as a progressive nation among other reasons. Lastly, *a commitment to social justice* ensures what Adams et al., (2007)) defined as social justice:

full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs. Social justice includes a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure. (p. 21)

By centering social justice into the CRT framework, a focus on positive change, praxis, and action is emphasized (Soloranzo & Yosso, 2001).

Because most Title IX coordinators and IVPSMs identify as white women, interrogating whiteness is also important in this study (Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018). Frankenberg (1993) referred to whiteness as “a location of structural advantage, . . . a standpoint, . . . and a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed” (p. 1). To understand the complexities and intricacies of relationship between oppressors and the oppressed, Critical Whiteness Studies emerged (Applebaum, 2010). While tenants for Critical Whiteness Studies are not as clearly defined as CRT, three guiding principles are present in the literature: *white complicity*, *epistemologies of ignorance*, and *white normativity*. *White complicity* refers to how white people, even with the best of intentions, benefit from whiteness; because of this benefit, white people maintain and produce mechanisms of white supremacy to retain this power (Applebaum, 2010). Mills (1997) described *epistemologies of ignorance* as a mutual, unspoken agreement by white people to claim a collective white ignorance and amnesia to white peoples’ role in oppressive structures and the effects of white supremacy. Under this perspective, the conditions, traumas, and experiences of marginalized people are minimized and casted aside. Sullivan and Tuana (2007) emphasized that this phenomenon is “far from accidental... [and] deliberately cultivated by [white people], an act made easier by a vast array of institutional

systems supporting white peoples' obliviousness to the worlds of people of color" (p. 35). Yancy (2018) coined *white normativity* which refers to whiteness being the default, privileged race. Similar to *whiteness as property* in CRT, whiteness permeates all aspects of higher education including curriculum content, policy focus, and faculty/administrator demographic composition.

While critics of Critical Whiteness Studies claim this theory refocuses the attention on white people as opposed to those people they marginalize, many critical scholars believe CWS elucidates power relations (Cabrera et al., 2017; Chen, 2017; Matias et al., 2014). Cabrera et al. (2017) stated, "diversity and Critical Race Theory (CRT) scholars will find value in this... 'missing link' [Critical Whiteness Studies] in their analyses (i.e., one cannot understand the marginalization of Students of Color if there is no one doing the marginalizing)" (p. 7). For a more intentional understanding of how race and other social identities interact in support for IUS, both CRT and CWS are used.

Ethic of Care, Critical Care Theory, and Critical Trauma Studies

Tronto and Fisher (1990) defined caring as, "species activity that includes everything that we do to maintain, continue, and repair our 'world' so that we can live in it as well as possible" (p. 103). In essence, the support student affairs professionals and specifically IVPSM provide students functions as a form of caring. Though providing support for survivors of interpersonal violence is not explicitly stated in the Title IX regulations, Nodding's (1984) Ethic of Care framework explains student affairs professional's responsibility for supporting the students these professionals serve and why many institutions have support measures in place for students. According to the Ethic of Care framework, student affairs professionals should help students navigate their rights, freedoms, and responsibilities by establishing caring relationships. These caring relationships can be expressed by engaging in cultural competence, social justice, and risk

management (Pacquiao, 2008). According to the American College Health Association (2016), common support measures for students who have experienced interpersonal violence include connecting students to offices that can provide temporary academic relief, counseling and medical services, and housing accommodations.

Developed by Falk-Rafael (2005), Critical Care Theory is comprised of feminist theories, Watson's (1979) Theory of Human Caring which set forth ten tenets of care for nurses, and the work of Nightingale which focused on nurses as advocates utilizing a tree with branches and roots as a visual, these formative theorists/theories form the roots for Critical Care Theory (Falk-Rafael, 2005). Critical Caring Theory consists of seven "carative" health-promoting processes [CHPPs] (Falk-Rafael, 2005). Falk-Rafael (2005) demonstrated these carative CHPPs as tree branches and are bound together by *critical caring as a way of being, knowing, and choosing; preparing self; developing and maintaining helping-trusting relationships*. The branches represent: *using systemic reflexive approach; engaging in transpersonal teaching-learning; providing, creating, and/or maintaining supportive and sustainable environments; meeting needs and building capacity; and being open and attending to spiritual-mysterious and existential dimensions*. According to Dickson and Lobo (2017):

two [CHPP] processes define critical caring as a way of being (ontology), knowing (epistemology), and choosing (ethics). The other five processes define critical caring as praxis, an action/reflection practice (the tree branches in Figure 1). Falk-Rafael created all seven processes to provide a lens with which to view the core of public health nursing practice: caring for individuals, families, communities and populations, the environments in which they live, and the policies that affect them. (p. 3)

As a comprehensive theory, Critical Care Theory focuses social justice, power, and advocacy in relation to healthcare inequality. Within Critical Care Theory, the concept of critical reflexivity, an internal evaluation of one's power, privilege, and desire to help others must be interrogated before engaging with survivors (Josephsen, 2014).

Critical Trauma theorists recognize that individuals experience trauma differently based upon socialization. Outside of the individual, Critical Trauma theorists recognize the importance as seeing trauma as a cultural phenomenon that may affect a whole group of people (Casper & Wertheimer, 2016). Current studies in epigenetics, the study of changes in gene expression caused by external factors including trauma, may be present in generations that may not have experienced the trauma directly (i.e., current generations who are descendants of slaves; current generations who are descendants of Holocaust survivors) (Van der Kolk, 2015). Trauma-informed care, a component of critical trauma praxis, “understands and considers the pervasive nature of trauma and promotes environments of healing and recovery rather than practices and services that may inadvertently re-traumatize” (University at Buffalo, 2020). One key to preventing re-traumatization, a phenomenon where one becomes triggered and suffers an emotional response mimicking the traumatic experience, is to change the framing of the question: “What is wrong with you?” to “How can I best help you?” This shift refocuses the patient as a *resilient* human with lived experiences as opposed to a *broken* [sic] human that must be fixed (University at Buffalo, 2020). By assuming that everyone has experienced trauma, one can put themselves in the best position to avoid retraumatizing and creating a more inclusive environment for others. Both Critical Care theorists and Critical Trauma theorists emphasize the necessity of engaging with critical pedagogy that seeks to transform the way researchers discuss power, privilege, and oppression within social institutions

Summary

Three themes emerged from the literature review: non-universal terminology, definitions, and education; effects of interpersonal violence and barriers to disclosure; and lack of representation of IUS and future directions for interpersonal violence research. Because interpersonal violence and trauma are pervasive and rampant in U.S. society and higher education, understanding the nuances of terms and definitions is important to IPV care work (RAINN, 2020). Additionally, understanding prevention strategies and education programs that target specific audiences (i.e., college students, undergraduate college women) was cited as an important part of selecting campus IPV education programs. Effects of interpersonal violence affect the psychological, emotional, physical, economic, and political well-being of survivors (Breiding, 2017). Several barriers to disclosure of interpersonal violence by IUS include the prevalence of rape myths/culture on campuses, fears of institutional mistrust and betrayal via discriminatory policies/procedures, concerns regarding stigma, lack of knowledge of reporting structures, and wanting to forget about the experience (Fleming & Muscari, 2019; Smidt et al., 2019). The lack of representation of institutionally underserved survivors demonstrated a gap in literature and increasing research on IUS was often the topic of future directions in collegiate interpersonal violence research (Harris & Linder, 2017; Linder, 2019).

To be cognizant of the specific needs of interpersonal violence and trauma survivors, intersectional approaches have been developed (Nelson, 2020). Trauma-informed care is an approach where professionals realize that most people (including care workers) have experienced some form of trauma and understand trauma's negative effect on someone's well-being (University at Buffalo, 2020). Nelson (2020) proposes that Critical Trauma Theory is an anti-oppressive, socially just, and action-oriented framework that can be used to change institutional

policies and practices. Similarly, Critical Race Theory allows theorists to examine inequities and propose social-justice oriented solutions aimed at ameliorating the conditions of the oppressed (Amiot, 2020; Dixson, 2017; Lee, 2018; Patton, 2015).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction to Study

The proposed study used critical methodology to examine four institutions with similar student populations in the Southeastern Conference (SEC). The purpose of this study was to interrogate perceptions of IVPSMs on IUS support and resources, identify gaps in education on how to respond and support IUS, and examine IVPSM's social identities and influence of their identities on their work. Utilizing this data, case studies of each institution were created and promising practices for supporting IUS were highlighted. These results and promising practices added to the dearth of IUS-specific literature and depth to current campus sexual violence literature. There are four research questions central to this study's purpose:

1. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence prevention staff members have of sexual violence resource utilization and support for institutionally underserved survivors at their university?
2. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence prevention staff members have of their own intersectional identities and the impacts identity may have on the work they do?
3. How do universities support institutionally underserved survivors?
4. What education do faculty, staff, and students receive in supporting institutionally underserved survivors?

Critical Interpretive Framework

As a researcher, I consider myself a critical interpretivist (Cain et al., 2020; Mir & Mir, 2002; Sipe & Constable, 1996). I believe truth and Truth lies in analyzing both individuals and their experiences within a system and the power structures in place that make a system function.

To me, ethics, reflexivity, and accessibility should be continuously embedded in the research process. According to Doolin and McLeod (2005), critical interpretivist perspective analyze the power structures, status quo, and sociohistorical contexts of social institutions and participants involved. This study is informed by three theoretical frameworks: 1) Critical Race Theory; 2) Critical Whiteness Theory; and 3) Critical Trauma Theory (Charmaz, 2017; Clarke, 2005; Lather, 1991; Miller et al., 2017).

Both Critical Race Theory and Critical Trauma Theory centralize intersecting social identities (I.e., race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc.), center the experiences and needs of survivors, analyze power hierarchies that fuel systems of oppression (i.e., racism, classism, heterosexism, etc.), and explore the lived experiences and traumas of the oppressed with the intent of creating positive social change (López & Gadsden, 2017; Nelson et al., 2020; Roche et al., 2020; Shimmin et al., 2017). Critical Trauma theorists recognize that individuals experience trauma specific to the person based upon their biopsychology and interactions with social institutions such as their families, their schools, and the criminal justice system. Critical Trauma theorists recognize the importance as seeing trauma as a cultural phenomenon that may impact a group of people (Casper & Wertheimer, 2016). The impacts of trauma, via epigenetics, a chemical marker of trauma on a population, may be present in generations that may not have experienced the trauma directly (i.e., current generations who are descendants of slaves; current generations who are descendants of Holocaust survivors) (Van der Kolk, 2015). Considering this, institutionally underserved survivors of sexual violence may experience trauma intergenerationally from genetics, oppression, and sexual violence (Harris & Linder, 2017).

Methodology

Critical Methodology

Critical methodology critiques and analyzes power structures and inequality in social phenomena (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). A core basis of critical methodology is that “all thought is mediated by power relations that are historically and socially constructed” and “must be connected to an attempt to confront the injustice of a particular society” (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011, p. 164). As an eclectic methodology, critical methodology pulls from numerous frameworks including queer theory, feminist theory, critical race theory, intersectionality, queer theory, critical trauma studies, and critical ethnography (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In this particular study, critical methodology served as a framework for studying the inequalities in interpersonal violence support in higher education for IUS.

Critical multisite case study was used across four of these seven institutions:

Auburn University (30,440 students)

Louisiana State University (30,983 students)

University of Alabama (38,390 students)

University of Georgia (38,652 students)

University of Kentucky (29,182 students)

University of Missouri (29,843 students)

University of South Carolina (34,795 students)

Critical Case Study

According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), “if the unit of analysis is a bounded system — a case, such as a person, a program, or an event — one would label such a study a “qualitative case study” (p. 24). Yin (2013) described case studies as empirical analysis that investigates a

social phenomenon within its real-life context. Critical case studies utilize information-oriented sampling where specific cases are expected to have certain information content (Flyvbjerg, 2006; McCoy et al., 2015; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). A critical case study details and critiques a phenomenon in its specific sociopolitical context using multiple data sources and collection methods. This method allows for a researcher “to answer the ‘what’ research question but also to explore ‘why’ and ‘how’” (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2013). Smith (1978) describes the *what* of a case study as a *bounded system* which sets parameters for the study. This study was bounded by geographic location and institutional affiliation (the Southeastern Conference) and student enrollment population (enrollment of at least 29,000 but not exceeding 39,000 according to the 2019-2020 enrollment data from The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), U.S. Department of Education. Whereas, other forms of qualitative research revolve around the focus of the study, case study focuses on the unit of analysis, making it the most suitable for this study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Flyvbjerg (2006) identified common misunderstandings about case study research including the notion that practical/experiential knowledge being less valuable than theoretical knowledge and the potential for researchers bias verification. Stake (2010) underscored the constructivism perspective that case study methodology creates where learning is considered an active and subjective process based on one’s knowledge which is constructed from experiences. From Stake’s (2010) framework, the context of the phenomenon and the conditions in which the phenomenon occurred becomes central to understanding the why. This undermines the idea that context-dependent (practical) knowledge being less valuable than context-independent (theoretical) knowledge. Critically examining the context surrounding the researcher is equally important to understanding the context of the participants in the case study (Bettez, 2015).

Recognizing that researchers may bring bias to their research, case studies allow for researchers to revise their hypotheses to mitigate potential verification bias (Flyvbjerg, 2006). In this study, interviews allowed for both researcher and participants to engage in collaborative meaning-making and critical examinations of all contexts.

Context

This study examined sexual violence IVPSMs' perceptions of support for IUS. Specific to Title IX, regulations released by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights in May 2020 require universities to prominently "display important information about the school's Title IX policies and procedures on their website; contact information for the school's Title IX Coordinator(s); [and] the school's non-discrimination policy; and any training materials used to train the school's Title IX personnel" by August 14, 2020. Because of these new regulations, websites recently have been updated to reflect these new federal mandates and potential resources for IUS. With these updates, I was able to attain contact information for those working in interpersonal violence/wellness. While Title IX mandates influence all universities, specific focus will be given on schools in the Southeastern Conference (SEC).

The SEC is comprised of fourteen universities in the United States: University of Alabama, University of Arkansas, Auburn University, University of Florida, University of Georgia, University of Kentucky, Louisiana State University, University of Mississippi, Mississippi State University, University of Missouri, University of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, Texas A&M University, and Vanderbilt University (The SEC Network, 2018). Most institutions in the SEC are located in the southeastern region of the United States and are considered public, land-grant, flagship campuses for their state ranging in student populations from 13,500 to 69,000 students (The SEC Network, 2018).

Data was collected during a time of several concurring pandemics. The global COVID-19 pandemic changed the ways in which colleges and universities interacted with their students, especially in the virtual/in-person modality of classes and resources (June, 2020). Racial and social injustice has long plagued the United States and could be seen through the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on marginalized communities (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2021). Police brutality, mass shootings, and violence fueled by hate and bias also occurred during data collection. As microclimates of the national climate, colleges and universities are not impervious to outside influences and these contexts must be considered when employing a critical interpretivist epistemology to elucidate both the researcher's and participants' perspectives.

Participants

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described criterion-based sampling as a sampling method that requires participants fall into key parameters and attributes to be eligible for study. Criteria for participation in this study include:

- University employees working in either a Title IX Office or interpersonal wellness position that have direct contact with IUS.
- Regularly utilize their university's Title IX/interpersonal violence policy and resources for IUS.

Per federal Title IX regulations, a Title IX coordinator must be established at every university receiving federal funds (Patsy Mink Equal Opportunity Education Act, 2002). In most cases, universities will also employ Deputy Title IX coordinators and have IVPSMs dedicated to interpersonal wellness on campus. Recruitment tools such as the participation recruitment email (Appendix A), participation survey (Appendix B), participation interview request (Appendix C),

and the consent for research participation (Appendix D) can be found in Appendix section. I interviewed four participants for this critical multisite case study. To protect the identities of those involved in the study, pseudonyms were used for participants and their institution. Participants included Denise from Delta University, Beth from Beta University, Carrie from Alpha University, and Anna from Kappa University. Findings that could reveal their identity and institutional affiliation were reported as an aggregate as opposed to individual profiles. Demographic profiles of the four participants are summarized in Appendix G - Table 1: Participant Demographic Information.

Data Collection

Data was collected from an analysis of semi-structured interviews with IVPSM. Using Marshall and Rossman's (2006) seven analytic phases (described in detail later) data will be coded and analyzed for emergent themes to contribute to the formation of cases. The unit of analysis for this case study is the institution's interpersonal violence offices.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) suggested that interviewing is the best methodology for engaging individuals in extensive case studies. Semi-structured interviews will occur with those who work in interpersonal violence and alongside IUS. A semi-structured interview with some guiding questions formed before the interview "allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016, p. 110). Engaging with these new ideas and by analyzing data throughout the data collection process, modifications to the interview protocol will be made to aid in flow, probing, and content (Castillo-Montoya, 2016). By having the flexibility to both engage in a conversation and keep the conversation somewhat guided with a semi-structured interview

protocol allowed for a rich discussion where an environment of mutual learning was created (Manning & Kunkel, 2014). Interviews lasted approximately 60-75 minutes (See Appendix F for interview protocol). Participants were given a trauma resource guide after member checking was completed (see Appendix E).

Data Analysis

Marshall and Rossman (2006) recommended “preliminary research questions and the related literature...as guidelines for data analysis” (p. 156) and coding conceptualization. Coding allows a researcher to identify relevant data and themes that might be useful in addressing the research question (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The data analysis process was guided by Marshall and Rossman’s (2006) seven analytic phases:

- (a) organizing the data; (b) immersion in the data; (c) generating categories and themes;
- (d) coding the data; (e) offering interpretations through analytic memos; (f) searching for alternative understandings; and (g) writing the report...” (p. 156)

Intertwining the seven analytic phases via critical methodology informed by critical interpretivist epistemology (Charmaz, 2017; Clarke, 2005; Lather, 1991; Miller et al., 2017; Mirchandani, 2005) foregrounds the importance of understanding the relationships among lived experiences, traumas, intersectionality, positionality, and power structures (López & Gadsden, 2017; Nelson et al., 2020; Roche et al., 2020; Shimmin et al., 2017). As an IUS myself, I engaged with participants who did not share similar identities or experiences as me. In a dialogic method during interviews, meaning-making occurred via dialogue in a space where the researcher and the participants collaborated to learn from one another (Freire, 1968). The inductive and collaborative nature of meaning-making ensured that the experiences of both the researcher and participants were considered.

Coding

Coding, the annotation of data used by researchers to allow for the recalling of patterns and themes salient to the research, is an essential process in analyzing data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The coding process began with *open coding*, where initial themes and patterns are identified; *axial coding*, where open codes are grouped together based on similarity; and *analytical coding*, where overarching themes based on interpretation and meaning-making are gathered (Richards, 2015). I began the coding process by immersing myself in the data and recognizing that data is contextually bound by intersectional identities that inform experiences. By examining transcripts for common themes, experiences, thoughts, and suggestions for praxis, a clearer picture of the perceptions of IUS support from IVPSMs was created.

The final phase of this study employed a content analysis of the data from interviews with IVPSMs. Stories of experiences in higher education and schooling are contextual and bounded by social, historical, and political variables and viewpoints that give meaning to experiences (McDonald, 2017). To underscore critical methodology, the perspectives of those working directly with students, the identities these professionals have, and the power hierarchies that enable barriers in survivor support were examined. Data were analyzed concurrently with data collection to ensure emerging themes can be interrogated throughout interviews (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Covarrubias (2011) emphasized that we, as researchers, must commit to centering intersectionality throughout the entire research process which includes highlighting the experiences of Students of Color in non-deficit manners while simultaneously examining oppression and trauma to create spaces where equitable educational access and opportunities exist. While Students of Color were not interviewed in this study, perceptions of those who support IUS were critically examined to better understand how higher education professionals

can better serve IUS. As part of critical methodology, an examination of differential power structures, support, and policies from the perception of those who support IUS was conducted.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness or rigor of a study refers to the degree of confidence in data, interpretation, and methods used to ensure the quality of a study (Pilot & Beck, 2014; Amankwaa, 2016). Lichmen (2013) believed that trustworthy qualitative research makes explicit the researcher's role and relationship to those studied, makes a case that the topic of the study is important, elucidates how the study was done, and makes a convincing presentation. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that the value of a research study is strengthened by its trustworthiness and is established via: *credibility* - confidence in the 'truth' of the finding; *transferability* - showing that the findings have applicability in other contexts; *dependability* - showing that the findings are consistent and could be repeated; *confirmability* - a degree of neutrality or the extent to which the findings of a study are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias, motivation, or interest (p. 300) . I engaged in the following methods to ensure the trustworthiness of the study.

Peer Review

Biddix (2018) described *peer review* as a group of experts who have thoroughly examined the presented research in terms of content, applicability, and methodology. In this study, my thesis committee served as this group of experts to help critically analyze my work via a thesis proposal defense and final thesis defense. As content experts in the field of higher education with specific expertise relevant to this work, committee members provided an assessment and guidance on appropriate data collection, analysis, and contribution to the field.

Rich, Thick Descriptions

As a method of ensuring transferability, rich, thick descriptions extensively describe the setting of the study, findings, context, field notes, documents, and participant interview notes (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Lincoln and Guba (1985) emphasized that transferability can be achieved by creating a “thick description of the sending context so that someone in a potential receiving context may assess the similarity between them and . . . the study” (p. 125). I included thick, rich descriptions throughout the research and analysis process and provided the associated documents in the findings and appendices.

Member Checking

Member checking refers to eliciting feedback on content one has gathered during the interview process and preliminary interpretations of those findings to ensure one is representing participant’s thoughts well (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). According to Maxwell (2013), this is the single most important way of ruling out the possibility of misinterpreting the meaning of what participants say and do and the perspective they have on what is going on, as well as being an important way of identifying your own biases and misunderstanding of what you observed” (pp. 126-127). In tandem with critical reflexivity and remaining engaged with the mutual meaning-making process, member checking was completed at every step of the research process. Any adjustments that should be made to data collection methods were recorded in field notes, a collection of a researcher’s thoughts and observed experiences during the research process, and placed in the appendix (Allen, 2017).

Participant Follow Up with Resource Guide

The discussion of trauma, survivors, and the work interpersonal wellness staff does potentially can be a triggering topic. Participants were provided a guide listing resources for

support. Anonymity was of utmost importance to ensure that candid conversations were had while ensuring participants did not have to worry about negative repercussions for participating. Supporting those who offer support for IUS is also important as care workers sometimes forget to care for themselves.

Critical Reflexivity

Pillow (2010) conceptualized that reflexivity, “is focused upon ‘what I know’ and ‘how I know it’ and entails an ongoing conversation about experience while simultaneously living in the moment” (p. 273). In *critical reflexivity*, a researcher must strive to be aware of how power operates in the various aspects of conducting and writing research. According to Bettez (2015), “as part of being critically reflexive, researchers must be open and accountable to the varied aspects of ethical research practices: how the researcher conducts the research [and] how the researcher attends to participants’ concerns” (p. 940). As a core tenant of critical methodology, analysis of all power structures, including those between researcher and participants, colleagues, mentors along with the study’s focus of participants and IUS were examined. Additionally, critical reflexivity requires that researchers must interrogate how the work might “contribute to dismantling societal social structures that perpetuate oppression” (Subedi, 2006, p. 575). By recognizing and probing some of these barriers IUS experience, a foundation for more inclusive praxis to drive policies and procedures can be created. I engaged with critical reflexivity via a positionality statement situating myself in relation to the research; journaling my thoughts, emotions, and concerns throughout the whole process; and continuously collaborated with participants to ensure collected data and inferences correctly represented their ideas (Gemignani, 2017; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Pillow, 2016).

Positionality and Ethically Important Moments

Positioning oneself in relationship to the research requires critical reflections on one's experiences including trauma, feelings, affinities to certain philosophies, and potential biases (Cain et al., 2019; Dwyer & Buckell, 2009; Hoover & Morrow, 2015.) As a College Student Personnel graduate student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I most recently served as the Pride Center (LGBTQ+ Resource and Advocacy Center) Graduate Research Assistant from 2020-2021. Prior to that, I served as the Interpersonal Wellness Graduate Assistant in the Center for Health Education and Wellness from 2019-2020. From 2015-2019, I worked in residence life and housing in various roles, but as someone who responded to more than 50 cases of interpersonal violence, including stalking and non-consensual sexual penetration, I noticed trends of which student populations I was seeing and those I was not. In my experience, survivors from more privileged backgrounds (white cis-gender women) tend to seek support services more often than their institutionally underserved peers. Throughout my time as a student affairs professional, I have noticed a trend of Students of Color and/or queer students not wanting to disclose interpersonal violence. As a first-generation, low-income, gay Latino, who is also a survivor of interpersonal violence, I have found myself wanting to uncover potential barriers to disclosure to best serve marginalized students.

Dwyer and Bucknell (2009) stated, regardless of the researcher's insider or outside role, a researcher must assess their relationship to the research and participants at all steps of project design and study. Furthermore, they emphasized that researchers often occupy both an insider and an outsider status, what they call an *insider-outsider* role, challenging the dichotomy of *us* versus *them*, *researcher* versus *participant*, and underscoring the mutual meaning-making process. While there were dozens of ethically important moments, navigating my role as an

insider-outsider was by far the most paramount. Coming into this research as an insider, I knew I had assumptions about those involved with supporting IUSs. In my experience, those working as IVPSMs often have a close relationship to IPV, either as a survivor themselves or as someone who knows a survivor personally. While the purpose of this study was not necessarily to discuss their own experiences with IPV, I knew we would often have conversations about what brought IVPSMs to the field which could point to their experiences. As a survivor myself, I knew this could be potentially traumatizing. Extreme care was given in not interrupting participants, offering comfort breaks during the process, and giving a trauma guide post-interview. The safety and well-being of my participants was also forefront. As a student who navigated IPV support resources, I was an outsider as someone who was not an IVPSM. In my student role, I had experienced institutional betrayal and been exposed to constant negative press surrounding institutional noncompliance and Title IX mishandling. I knew that while mishandling occurred, there were often behind-the-scenes decisions and rationale that I was not privy to as someone who does not work as an IVPSM. Coming into this study, I also knew that most SEC institutions had some type of Title IX investigation that had occurred within the past 10 years (Department of Education, 2022). I often had to stop myself to sit in the fact that institutional betrayal was occurring, students were being negatively affected, and some IVPSMs were complacent in mishandlings. I gave all of my participants the benefit of the doubt in actively supporting IUSs despite institutional reputation.

While I am a firm believer in survivors, as a student affairs scholar practitioner, I am charged with serving all students and collaborating with fellow student affairs professionals to ensure students receive the support they deserve. As a critical race scholar focusing on trauma studies, I recognize that privilege and oppression are contextually bound by time, space, and

place and that more likely than not, people come to these situations having experienced some form of trauma. I recognized I can be critical of whiteness and heterosexism and consistently worked to ensure any experiences I have had with discrimination or trauma did not negatively affect how I engaged with participants or the data. During the data collection, analysis, and meaning making processes, I intentionally sought out opportunities to challenge myself and have others challenge me to ensure bias was identified and critically reflected on to uphold an ethical qualitative research study.

Guillemin and Gillam (2004) describe two dimensions of ethics in qualitative research: “(a) procedural ethics which usually involves seeking approval from a relevant ethics committee to undertake research involving humans; and (b) “ethics in practice” or the everyday ethical issues that arise in the doing of research” (p. 263). When discussing the ethics of practice, researchers engage in what Guillemin and Gillam (2004) call “ethical competence [or] the researcher’s willingness to acknowledge the ethical dimension of research practice, [their] ability to actually recognize this ethical dimension when it comes into play, and [their] ability to think through ethical issues and respond appropriately” (p. 269). The process of choosing a particular approach to research and the key decisions that are made are called *ethically important moments* (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004, p. 261). By engaging with reflexivity, I found myself engaging with these critically important moments often, by constantly analyzing how my identities, experiences, and stances affect the power relations and contexts between those involved in the research process.

I thoroughly believe that qualitative research and reflexivity are iterative, bolstering processes. Why I am interested in this research, how I show up in these research spaces, why I constructed the research process in the manner I did, what techniques and paradigms I am using

for analyzing, and how I am ensuring participants felt heard and safe are all ethically important moments that were in my mind before, while, and after I conducted this research. As a gay, biracial Latino who is white-passing, lives with migraines, anxiety, depression, and ADHD, and who has a first-generation, low-income background, I know that I navigate the world in a manner that is directly in response to my identities. As a survivor of interpersonal violence, I also know that I am tied to this work on a soul level which comes with pros and cons. I knew that I was at risk of retraumatizing myself, of potentially burning out, or of potentially giving away my experiences to participants (some people are so perceptive and know when someone has been through similar experiences). Lastly, I am a man doing work in a historically and understandably women-dominated arena. I recognized that more often than not, interpersonal violence takes the form of men abusing women. I knew there might be folks who were uncomfortable with talking to a man given the nature of gender-based violence, and I would have tried my best to be okay with that if it occurred. I constantly assessed myself, how I showed up, how I presented my work, and how I intentionally tried not to retraumatize or harm those with whom I work. Quoting former UT Knoxville Dean of Students Shea Kidd Brown, the work I do is “hard work and heart work;” and with that, I centered empathy and inclusion in this research and my identity as an insider-outsider scholar of IPV.

Institutional Review Board

This study adhered to ethical guidelines for research, including a formal review and approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) (University of Tennessee Institutional Review Board, 2012). IRB approval can be found in Appendix I. I used pseudonyms for the institutions and participant names to ensure ethical practice and a level of anonymity (Biddix, 2018). To protect the identities of participants and their affiliations, I removed distinguishing terms and/or

phrases from the transcripts. I stored video recordings of the interviews on a password-encrypted computer and external hard drive-in accordance with the IRB. Participants signed informed consent forms digitally, also stored with password protection.

Summary

This study used critical methodology to examine four institutions within the Southeastern Conference (SEC). Since critical interpretivist epistemology informed this work, critical methodology was the most appropriate methodology to employ to analyze the sociohistorical contexts leading to the conditions for IUS on these campuses. The purpose of this study was to interrogate perceptions of sexual violence IVPSMs on IUS support and resources, identify gaps in education on how to respond and support IUS, and examine IVPSM's social identities and influence of their identities on their work. Utilizing this data, case studies of each institution's interpersonal wellness offices were created and analyzed to compile promising practices for supporting IUS according to the literature surveyed. These findings and promising practices contributed to expanding the limited amount of IUS-specific research and provided a more intersectional perspective in current campus sexual violence literature. To emphasize trustworthiness, peer review; thick, rich descriptions; member checking; and critical reflexivity were employed. A positionality statement centering the experiences and identities I hold and their relationship to the research is provided.

Chapter 4: Findings

Profile of Sample Group and Major Themes

Four primary themes emerged from the analysis of the participant interviews: (a) institutional betrayal and mistrust, (b) expanding current conceptualizations and praxis of interpersonal violence, (c) identity as inextricable to IPV work, and (d) office operations and limitations. In this chapter, I present the four prominent themes and include participants' narratives to illuminate each theme.

Institutional Betrayal

Institutional betrayal (known also as *institutional mistrust* or *distrust*) refers to “wrongdoings perpetrated by an institution upon individuals dependent on that institution, including failure to prevent or respond supportively to wrongdoings by individuals (e.g., sexual assault) committed within the context of the institution” (Smith & Freyd, 2013, p. 119).

Participants focused on two social institutions: the legal system and their universities.

While not explicitly using the term, participants described institutional betrayal and mistrust as a lack of trust in and knowledge about policies and procedures to support IUSs at their universities.

A lack of support (e.g., financial, infrastructural, and educational) for IVPSMs from their educational institutions also contributed to feelings of institutional betrayal.

Lack of Trust in Policies and Procedures

When discussing a lack of trust in policies and procedures, participants often felt the need to situate their answers within the contexts of COVID-19, police brutality, and racial injustice.

Participants would relate institutional betrayal to the last time their institution mishandled a Title IX case, a racial incident, and/or student demands to discuss racism engrained in their universities. Participants mentioned institutional betrayal sometimes came through their

experiences working with students who did not trust university policies and procedures, such as bias incident reporting processes. All participants mentioned bias incident reporting options, but included students not knowing about specific reporting processes and students' hesitancy to use those services since the policies were new or did not yield the results students desired. Beth, from Beta University stated:

After protests and social movements [referring to police brutality and protests against racism] this past year, there has been a bias incident hotline created. Our students do not believe in it, though. They don't trust it, so it's not really being used. We do have policies in place to protect our Students of Color. They say we have a policy that protects our trans students. I don't see it being enacted very often, and I have a feeling it would take something [egregious] before [higher administration] would do something. We have our students who are experiencing things that for them [are] egregious, but administration doesn't see it at that level. So, I think there's a big difference between what's in policy and what's in practice.

Beth mentioned the difficulty in supporting institutional procedures and policies given so many students do not believe or trust in them. Anna, from Kappa University, had similar experiences given previous issues related to Title IX on her campus. She commented, "unfortunately, it took a horrible report and continued fallout for some action to happen here." Beth and Anna agreed, change only occurred when institutions garnered either enough negative press and/or constituent influence.

Policies to protect historically underserved identities varied across institutions. Denise acknowledged "other than what's in the Title IX policy... We do have a reporting process for discriminatory behavior, but I don't think there's any policies in place [specifically for IUSs]."

To Denise’s knowledge, the institution only protected IUSs from sex discrimination via Title IX. Carrie’s institution, Alpha University, has “an administrative regulation [that] says folks cannot be discriminated against on the basis of any protected class which covers race, socioeconomic class, gender, and ability” the institution’s equity and diversity office enforces. She elaborated, “you can't be discriminated against [those protected classes when we are] hiring and [this] applies to everyone on campus – students, faculty, or staff. There are things specifically within the student code of conduct that address [anti-discrimination], as well.” She pointed to protection from discrimination in hiring practices and through their code of conduct. Although IUSs are protected when they go through hiring processes, it remained unclear as to whether IUSs were specifically protected from discrimination within other aspects of the university (e.g., housing, classrooms, social locations, etc.). Anna, like her peers, identified a bias incident reporting system and explained:

There is a process for those types of complaints or grievances, but I’m not super familiar with it. I believe that there was recently some sort of [new] policy...that was improved or maybe just developed, [I am] not 100% sure on that, but I know that there's been a lot of policy talk and changing here. Speaking [of this] state, someone can still be fired for disclosing their gender or sexuality, so I wouldn’t be surprised if we just initiated a policy [on this campus]

Anna indicated hesitancy and lack of knowledge on the presence and/or modification of an existing discrimination policy. By contextualizing the state’s position on gender and sexuality in employment practices, Anna alluded to the climate on her campus as an SEC institution heavily influenced by state politics. While bias incident reporting options and non-discrimination policies were present for many of these institutions, participants mentioned that they and their

students were not comfortable or familiar with these policies and processes, which contributed to institutional mistrust.

Like Anna's discussion of state policies and legislation, Denise described the intricacies of students using her office and the potential for law enforcement to become involved:

...cultural mistrust from Students of Color makes total sense and they're certainly entitled to that. I'm trying to incorporate anti-racist practices into [the] work. [One time], I was working with a Survivor of Color and she wanted to report to the police. And I asked her, "would you prefer a detective of color?" and she's [replied], "that would be really great if it could be a Person of Color."

Understanding some of her IUS's mistrust with law enforcement, Denise attempted to mitigate feelings of institutional betrayal by providing care and support in a manner this IUS wanted. If IUSs felt as though they were not heard, Beth believed that students at her university would demand change in a public fashion through social media or in-person demonstrations if they felt unheard:

They know that they have a voice and they're going to make sure somebody's listening to it, and they just don't feel that it... I don't think it's that they don't feel Title IX is going to listen, they just don't feel the institution is going to listen and they know that Title IX has to be in line with what the institution is saying and so that is where they come to us [the IPV advocacy office]. We work more informally to make solutions. So, it's done under their radar than most anything else.

Beth discussing the way Title IX and the institution must align themselves seemed to create a divide between students and their institution/Title IX office. In this instance, Beth's office worked as the mediators, serving as a bridge to ameliorate the divide.

Participants demonstrated familiarity and varied levels of trust with anti-discrimination/bias policies and procedures on their campuses. Recognizing the hesitancy IUSs may have with their institutions due to previous racial and social injustice, reluctance to engage with the police, IVPSMs indicated that their positions acted as bridges with law enforcement, compliance offices, and other resources. Due to her campus being a state flagship institution, Anna underscored the added complexities state politics can have on institutions policies and procedures which could potentially apply to other SEC institutions.

Lack of Support for Professionals

Another facet of institutional betrayal was a lack of educational and financial support for professionals. Participants did not have institutional-required training provided by their university for working with institutionally underserved survivors. The participants often received their education and training working with IUSs through professional development opportunities outside of their office and sometimes outside of their institutions. Beth mentioned:

I will say from our institution, no. These were [opportunities] we had to go seek out, and [through] my role and my education as a social worker, I have access to quite a few different networks to find trauma-informed ways to have conversations. I am able to share those with my colleagues. Our institution, if it's going to happen, [my office is]going to be the one creating and giving [those trainings]...Attending conferences like NASPA strategies and connecting with those professionals to see what resources they've utilized has really expanded our ability to provide those resources.

In Beth's experience, education covering how to work with IUSs and with marginalized populations came from her office, meaning she was the content creator. Beth was the only person

to mention a specific professional opportunity outside of the university through the NASPA Strategies Conference. Similarly citing a lack of training, Anna revealed:

I think there needs to be more. Fortunately, I have gone through our Safe Space training, and I seek out opportunities to learn about underserved populations, but I don't think that there's that support to do that. I think any person, and I would hope any person in a position like this, would seek out educational opportunities, but it's not something that is set as a standard at Kappa. Both Beth and Anna sought training to support IUSs for their own professional development, not as requirements by their universities. In addition to lack of training, some participants discussed a lack of adequate financial, structural, and human resources. Beth elaborated on securing resources for international students whose primary language is not English.

We have low numbers of international students, but we do have some because we were able to get an interpreter and interpretation services which was a big help just because... our campus focuses on [these students having] to take the TOEFL [Test of English as a Foreign Language], and it's like the things we're saying and the conversations we're having are not conversational English that are assessed on TOEFL. We need the [interpretation] services and we need the budget for it because it's not cheap.

Another instance of inadequate resources is compensation. Anna felt that her compensation and the funding for her office are currently unsustainable. She works in an office within a health/medical service center and within a health promotion/wellness office:

I do have a small percentage of my job that is more general wellness duties, but I will say I'm anticipating in the next month, I will have to give up all of those duties because the need is dire. I needed to be fully 100% in this program, but we just didn't have the resources and funding.

For Anna, not having additional professional support has proved to be difficult. To compensate for this lack of staffing, Anna's office created a volunteer survivor advocate program with professionals across campus which has lessened her caseload:

I recognize we are a huge campus. The more recognition we get, the more students we get, and we cannot handle the demand, and then like I mentioned, there's two white females that coordinate this and are primarily meeting with our students, but by having these 110 advocates throughout campus, that broadens our ability to find someone they better identify with.

Beth, who works in a stand-alone advocacy center, also shared concerns about unit funding issues:

It's spaces inside institutions... that they've either been defunded in the past, or they are only ever provided with limited funding and have to find the funding elsewhere that is a constant stressor like that is hard to find professionals that can do great work and spend the time to feel comfortable developing those connections with students if they're constantly worried that they might not have a job at the end of the semester, at the end of the week.

For Beth, the lack of confidence and trust that professionals have in their institutions affects the confidence and trust that students have in their institutions since job security for those professionals seemed to be unpredictable.

Summary

While universities in this study often had anti-discrimination policies and bias response procedures in place, IVPSMs reported students either not knowing about or not trusting these policies and procedures. Situated in a time of rampant police brutality and campus protests over

racism, participants alluded to their universities having responded to these social movements inadequately since they have been employed. Participants connected their institution's inadequate response to inadequate infrastructure to properly support IUSs. Overall, a lack of trust with policies and procedures combined with a lack of appropriate education and resources seemed to fuel feelings of institutional betrayal for both students and professionals.

Expanding Current Conceptualization and Praxis

Expansion of the conceptualization and praxis within campus interpersonal violence prevention work also emerged as a theme. Participants discussed challenging stereotypes of interpersonal violence on their campuses and updating interpersonal violence prevention education. Citing a change in student demographics and demands from students, IVPSMs acknowledged the landscape of collegiate IPV was changing for the better.

Challenging Stereotypes of IPV and Revamping Education

Participants discussed plans to expand current understandings of IPV and the ways in which they educate campus communities. Anna stated that historically, there has been an assumption that IPV was infrequent and only included physical violence: "I would say [physical violence is] not that frequent [on this campus], but the emotional abuse and gaslighting, manipulation is much more prevalent." Similarly, Denise acknowledged that she "probably had seen more domestic violence situations and less sexual assault," specifically mentioning unhealthy relationships and manipulation. By identifying the trends and highlighting the overlooked non-physical aspects of interpersonal violence, campuses can more accurately address specific behaviors (e.g., promoting campaigns about emotional abuse alongside physical sexual assault prevention). While still focusing on sexual assault, both Anna and Denise discussed plans for emphasizing healthy relationships in future education.

In Carrie's office, interpersonal violence work was geared towards both undergraduate and graduate/professional students. Carrie detailed, "we've piloted a mini-series with our MBA program going through things like: 'What can workplace sexual harassment look like? How can you be an ally if you see someone experiencing it?'" Carrie articulated how the field of collegiate interpersonal violence work had historically been solely focused on undergraduate students. By centering programs for graduate students, her office was able to reach a larger student population.

Further expanding other conceptualizations of IPV work, Carrie's office restructured consent programming by moving beyond teaching "no means no" during sexual activity and moving towards a discussion of healthy relationships, boundaries, and consent more broadly in situations outside of sex (e.g., asking for consent and permission to borrow a book from someone). Carrie explained, "[we're reconceptualizing] what consent can mean and work in activities to help them figure out what are their own boundaries as opposed to just throwing this information at them about what consent means." She elaborated that reconceptualization encompasses identifying boundary setting and communication of those boundaries. Expanding the understanding of consent to more than just sexual activity allowed for Carrie's students to recognize they practice consent in everyday activities and underscored the importance of clear communication.

Anna also mentioned changing one of their programs focusing on active bystander intervention. She explained:

Our bystander intervention has branched out to be not so focused in sexual violence.

Because bystander intervention can be used in any situation, we found it an easier sell to have student orgs engaged if we said we're going to talk about sexual [consent] last, but

[first] we're going to talk about how you can be key in preventing discrimination or [how to intervene when] someone feels uncomfortable by another person's comments.

Through this change, Anna hoped to rebrand her office's active bystander training to include a broader anti-discrimination focus. Carrie discussed expanding the focus in her office to an anti-oppression framework given the rampant racial and social injustices in the United States.

Similarly, she stated, "interpersonal violence itself is not the issue. It's more a symptom of the issue. [We want to focus] more [on] systemic causes of oppression [such as] racism and sexism."

For Carrie, understanding the complexities of structural inequalities can better suit those working against interpersonal violence.

Beth's office also addressed root issues, though her office did so through presenting content in education classes:

We talk with science classes because those are the ones who were taught how to teach sex ed on our campus. We emphasize that as much as your school board will let you talk about consent, talk about respecting boundaries and creating those. We focus a lot on sexual communication whenever we talk about consent because we know consent can look different depending on the individuals in the conversation. Just being communicative – likes; dislikes; things maybe you're interested in trying, but you're not ready for that yet and talking through those things.

By discussing interpersonal violence content with future sex educators, Beth's office hoped to make future sex education discussions and classes more substantive while also addressing key terminology and behaviors early in a child's education. Recognizing the politics around sexual education in school districts, Beth emphasized that discussions of these topics should begin as early as possible since behavioral interventions should occur well before students reach college.

Summary

Both Anna and Denise challenged the narrative that dating and domestic violence are always physical in nature. In their experiences, many forms of dating and domestic violence were psychological and emotional, specifically mentioning gaslighting and manipulation. Carrie commented on interpersonal violence prevention work needing to have an anti-oppression framework to address systemic root causes of IPV. Anna, Beth, and Carrie mentioned changing the content of IPV work to be more marketable to a larger audience (e.g., graduate students, elementary and middle school sex educators).

Embracing Prevention and Identity as Inextricable to IPV Work

A third theme to emerge was embracing prevention and identity as inextricable to the work. Carrie thought that moving beyond advocacy and focusing on prevention is something “marginalized communities have been doing for centuries.” She continued, “our focus needs to be on advocacy/crisis counseling and intervention/prevention” indicating that finding the balance between advocacy and prevention is paramount to IPVSMs’ work. Another aspect that participants believe is inextricable to IPV work was recognizing the role of identity and cultural competency to IPV. Carrie suggested, “we need to have some level of cultural competency and [to] start figuring out different ways to adapt services to make them culturally relevant.” As an identity-based violence, sexual violence and the systemic conditions that allow IPV to occur must be identified, addressed, and combatted to reduce its prevalence. With the addition of a prevention perspective, intervening in proactive education can potentially decrease harmful behaviors. When working with students, Carrie believes that IPVSMs must have a culturally competent care approach because “you may be committing microaggressions against the folks who you are there to help, [so] you might be doing some harm. To build on cultural relevance

and create content that is more culturally competent, each participant mentioned critically assessing their own identities in relation to their work. Denise believed that you cannot talk about interpersonal violence without discussing identities because “that’s always going to be contributing to the power dynamic and power differential between the two or more people involved in interpersonal violence.” Similarly, Carrie elaborated:

If you are a direct service provider, your social identities are going to have a big effect on how you show up in the room and how you're viewed by your clients... If you are talking to a group of students who all share one identity and that's not an identity that you have, that doesn't mean you can't talk to that group of students. It may have an impact on how the students hear you, though, and how they respond to you. If I don't have an awareness of my own social identities and the identities of those who we're here to serve, then I can do a lot of harm. When discussing the interplay between identity and interpersonal violence work, Carrie held that “we are talking about a taboo topic [interpersonal violence] and then you're trying to add an intersection of more taboo topics [identity and discrimination] into this heavy topic.” For both Denise and Carrie, understanding the ways in which power, privilege, and anti-oppression interact with their own identities is integral to interpersonal violence advocacy work. Carrie emphasized that though interpersonal violence and identity discussions are at times taboo and uncomfortable, assessments of power dynamics must occur.

The three White women participants discussed how their identities, especially race, show up in the work they do. Denise stated that she is “a white woman and am acutely aware that when I am working with a Survivor of Color that there might be more cultural mistrust in seeking services in the first place.” While giving autonomy and agency to survivors was a common supportive measure deployed, Denise emphasized being “really intentional about it

when working with Survivors of Color” since there might be more cultural mistrust present. Beth recognized the limitations of her office in terms of diversity since both Beth and her office copartner are white women: “we know our office has its limitations. Unfortunately, people make assumptions, so that closes off some people if we don't spend that time for students to get to know us as humans [who] care and hold shared identities.” Similarly, Anna expressed, “we're really seeing a large percentage of our caseload [being] Black females accessing our program which I think is great [since they're] disproportionately impacted. I also think that's something really great considering I'm white, and [the] other person that primarily sees students is also white.” Though Anna and her office copartner are white women, Anna described a large Black female caseload. Anna continued, “that's something that I always take note when I'm meeting with students is ‘I'm just this white girl.’” Anna’s intentionally and critically navigated her white identity when working with marginalized communities.

Denise believed that being intentional with services was necessary to support students in the ways they needed to be supported. Beth reasoned that building relationships and trust with students was paramount for students to feel comfortable. One way Beth built relationships and trust was through a series of conversations with students so they could get to know other, less visible identities of IVPSMs in their offices. For example, Beth mentioned she presented as a white woman who is “married to a man.” Through conversations with students, Beth was able to share that she is a queer woman with biracial children. Similarly, Beth’s co-worker is “another visibly white woman and also has children, but no one ever sees her partner.” She elaborated:

unfortunately, people make assumptions, even with the best intent, and that closes off some people. [In this office], we try our best for students to get to know us as humans, that we care, and that we hold shared identities.

Beth contextualized the importance of relationship-building in pushing some of the assumptions people made about her and her co-worker's identity.

Carrie, the only Participant of Color, discussed the importance of cultural competence and explained "one of our advocates is [a]white woman, and she is very aware that there may be some Clients of Color who don't want to talk to her and she's okay with that." As a Person of Color who previously worked in a rape crisis center and is the director of her campus IPV office, Carrie believes that her experiences help to cultivate her understanding of cultural competency. In turn, she can take those skills, use her identities, and train her staff in cultural competency and trauma-informed care.

To build community, Beth explained that an advocate in her office "spends more time outside of her office than she does in to just visit [other] spaces and talk with the students." She clarified that the advocate does this "not in a crisis management way, just in a 'how are you? What is going on?'" way so they can get to know the students and build relationships with them outside of crisis situations. By getting to know students, Beth's office could also find out "what best ways we can support students and organizations and/or what changes they would like to see [because] we're not going to know if we don't hear from them and/or we might hear too late, and unfortunately something bad has happened." While recognizing the limitations of her office, Beth addressed actions her advocate is taking to build relationships and make her office and staff members known to IUSs.

Another identity to emerge was IVPSMs as advocates and their offices as resource/referral hubs. Common among all participants was a sentiment Anna shared, "the nature of the job is there is no typical day... a majority of my day is communicating with students and

between different faculty and staff on campus to advocate for [students].” Given this, participants worked closely with Title IX, housing, and ADA accommodation offices.

Summary

Embracing prevention allowed Carrie to recognize the role of anti-discrimination in IPV work. Additionally, this framework allowed Carrie’s office to pay homage to the Communities of Color who Carrie believed had done this prevention work for a long time. For all participants, their identities had an affect on their roles as IPVSMs. In particular, the participants named the identity and implications of “white women” IPVSMs. As white women, Beth, Anna, and Denise discussed their whiteness in relation to working with IUSs and measures they took to manage their privilege. By having candid conversations and physically being present in locations students felt comfortable and relationships with IUSs were being built. While addressing privilege, oppression, and cultural competence, participants grappled with ways in which their identities showed up and the roles those would have on IUSs.

Student Utilization and Office Limitations

The fourth theme to emerge was student utilization and office limitations. Two subthemes, (a) the students who use and do not use their offices; and (c) limitations within IPVSM’s offices, became apparent through the interviews. Participants discussed how they supported students and reached out to students who do not use their offices. Additionally, participants discussed limitations in their offices including the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic; concerns with staffing; and issues with attaining demographic data.

Student Utilization

A comparison of students who utilize and who do not utilize services according to IPVSMs in this study can be found in Appendix F - Table 2: Student Utilization and Resource

Referral Comparison. For ease of comparison, I present student utilization by participant and their institution. All participants explained that services within their office are most often utilized by white women, females, and typically underutilized by institutionally underserved survivors.

Beth – Beta University

Discussing groups that most often utilize services, Beth acknowledged, “unfortunately [there is a stereotype] that the student that feels most comfortable coming to our space is a white woman. I mean, we see that everywhere in this work.” Though her office mostly sees students who identify as white women, Beth indicated her office’s location near the LGBTQ+ resource center also allowed for her office “to see quite a few of their [the LGBTQ+ resource center] students [since] we just built up such a great relationship with them.” At Beta, Beth discussed the Latinx and Asian American student populations utilizing her office’s services but typically only in crisis intervention (a single meeting) situations and not in case management (two or more meetings) situations. She indicated that her office does “struggle to get Black students in... [and] we have low numbers of our international students, but we do have some [international students] because we were able to get an interpreter and interpretation services.” Beth elaborated that the inclusion of interpretation services allowed more students whose primary language is not English to use their services: “we were able to figure out, ‘oh, they're saying they've heard it from their friend’ and so that has helped be able to break into that community.” She felt as though the adding of interpretation services allowed for a more expansive reach into communities that had previously been unable to use her office due to language barriers.

Denise – Delta University

Positioning herself in her work, Denise found that her identity as a white female was “conducive to working with the demographic that [she] works with because a lot of them are also white females.” At Delta University, Denise described having survivors with “diversity in sexual orientation and racial identity” while giving the context of Delta being a “PWI [predominately white institution] ... [with] a really huge emphasis on the PW.” Despite being a PWI, Denise alluded to seeing an increase in “African American female survivors.” Similar to Beth’s experiences with international students, Denise figured out that one Black female survivor who met with us began telling her friends who she had known were also raped and then they came to us too.” Denise did not often work with international and/or Asian students particularly since there is an international office/program that works closely with these students and “would be a place where they would probably go first.” Similarly, Delta has a Black Student Union for undergraduates and graduate students and Denise thought that “they both get a lot of support out of those groups and maybe would just go there and not come to a university service.” While not seeing international, Asian, and Black students specifically use her office, Denise believed that students were receiving support via cultural spaces and offices where students felt more comfortable.

Carrie – Alpha University

In Carrie’s experience, white women/females were also the demographic who used her office the most. Her office had difficulty in reaching Students of Color and international students. She elaborated that often in these communities, it is “socially unacceptable” to seek help due to “stigmas attached to mental health.” Carrie continued, “it’s like, ‘that’s your business. You don’t air your dirty laundry...’ kinds of mentalities, so I do have concerns that

we're missing some of those folks.” Additionally, Carrie identified first-generation, LGBTQ+ students, and Students with Disabilities as groups who do not often utilize her office. With recent hires in her office, Carrie was hopeful that students from racially, gender, and sexually diverse backgrounds would “feel a little more comfortable having someone who they can identify with a little bit.”

Anna – Alpha University

Anna, like Denise, Beth, and Carrie, inferred that “certainly white females come to us a lot,” and further specified “especially [sorority member] students.” Anna’s office saw Black females as “a large percentage of [their] caseload.” Anna was the only participant to specifically mention males citing a “small uptick” from two males using the office in the last year (2019) to four males using the office in the past three weeks. Anna described working with one transgender student recently but did think the LGBTQ+ community was not utilizing her office frequently given “that they’re disproportionately impacted... [specifically] the extremely high rate of violence among the transgender community.”

COVID-19

Common among all participants were changes in office utilization due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Anna saw a decrease in the number of students who were coming to her office stating, “I do think that part of the reason we didn't see students accessing our program [during the stay at-home-order was] because they were with the person that was perpetrating the violence.” Being at home with abusers who were potentially isolating and restricting the activities of survivors led to a decrease in students reporting and using Anna’s office. Similar to Anna, Carrie’s office had “seen a decrease in our overall number of client services or individual clients that we've interacted with throughout this academic year, but anecdotally I feel like we've seen an increase

in the complexities of our clients.” Being at home with abusers often led to survivors needing more advocacy around protective orders and continued follow-up in Carrie’s experience. Unlike Anna and Carrie, Beth found some demographics using services more. Beth stated, “with the pandemic, we have noticed more men seeking services with us.” She could not pinpoint exactly why this occurred, but she did feel as though her office had broken through barriers that allowed students to feel more comfortable using their services.

All participants acknowledged that white women and females were the demographic most often utilizing services, participants and their offices varied in the populations that did not utilize their services. The participants were aware of outreach limitations in their office and the roles that identity could play in survivors feeling comfortable coming to an IVPSM office. Additionally, with the COVID-19 pandemic, service utilization tended to decrease; though the cases became more complex.

Office Limitations

The importance of collecting data on IPV and IUSs was emphasized by every participant. Denise mentioned that her “office is big on tracking work and collecting data on what we're doing... In a COVID world, I don't know how those numbers [IPV prevalence at Delta] are going to compare.” Contextualizing the collection of data within COVID-19, Denise believed that trends and statistics might have been affected given the pandemic. Limitations with collecting and tracking demographic data from students were mentioned by Carrie, Beth, and Anna. Carrie stated, “we do/will ask for other demographic data, but some of it is a little bit hard to track, because even though it's there, our files are still paper, so it's hard to run some of those numbers, but I do.” Though Carrie’s office utilized paper files, which made data analyses more laborious, she still analyzed the data. Carrie also described some data potentially being missing

from analyses stating “we know people with disabilities also experience very high rates of sexual violence, but I’ve not seen that data... I think that there could be a lot of students with disabilities who we might be missing.” Without campus data to support assumptions based on national data, Carrie felt as though there might be a population her office was not adequately serving.

Similarly, Anna could not recall having any tangible demographic data readily available during the interview and relied on her personal anecdotes. Discussing trends of specific IPV on her campus, Anna stated, “I also don't think that we have accurate data to show [specific trends], because we have not had success with our surveys and then of course COVID plays a role.” Beth attributed lack of data, particularly for IUSs to a history of marginalization, “due to trauma that researchers have historically caused in underserved and underrepresented communities, the data lacks. If we want to have this data, we're going to have to be the ones to work to get it, because we've already created the trust with students.” Due to the trauma that researchers have caused and fear of discrimination some students feel, Beth believed that data, specifically from LGBTQ+ communities, was missing. As a result, the voices and experiences of these students are often not represented in the current data Beth possesses.

Summary

A comparison of students who utilize and who do not utilize services and resource referrals according to IVPSM in this study can be found in Appendix F - Table 2: Student Utilization and Resource Referral Comparison. According to all participants, white females were the most seen demographic utilizing resources. Every participant mentioned at least one demographic group that did not utilize their office. All four participants mentioned having IPV rates on their campuses that are consistent with national averages, though not all have data that

specifically records or tracks IUS. According to all participants, building trust and relationships with students is an important first step in collecting IUS data and receiving feedback on how offices can serve these students better.

Summary

Through semi-structured interviews with these four participants, four themes emerged: (a) institutional betrayal; (b) expanding current conceptualization and praxis; (c) embracing prevention and identity as inextricable to IPV work; and (d) student utilization and office limitations. Participants expressed a lack of trust in their institutions policies and procedures to protect IUSs. In particular, IVPSMs pointed to a lack of institutional-level training on how to support IUSs. Whereas, previous conceptions of interpersonal violence mainly focused on sexual assault and rape, IVPSMs recognized that IPV case management is becoming more complicated as COVID-19 forced survivors to stay home with their abusers and created access barriers for students. New tactics in educating students on IPV were described through discussions of consent in everyday situations outside of sex and through active bystander skills being applicable as intervention skills in all forms of discrimination. The importance of prevention work as opposed to just response/case management work was highlighted. Lastly, white cis-gender heterosexual females and women were the demographics mostly commonly utilizing services at these institutions. IUSs, including LGBTQ+ students and Students of Color were often described as not using services.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Implications

The study's findings helped elucidate the relationship between IVPSM's perceptions of their own identities and IUS resource utilization by interrogating the roles that power, identity, and context play in interpersonal violence work. The centrality of identity for both IUSs and IVPSMs, navigating the politics and contexts of mistrust in institutions, and lack of education received from institutions for IVPSM, interplayed to create situations where gaps for IUS support could be present. Recognizing these potential gaps could allow for campuses to ensure that all survivors, particularly IUSs, feel comfortable asking for assistance and accessing campus resources. Chapter Five includes a discussion of the themes presented in Chapter Four and implications for practice that IPVSM deploy in supporting IUSs.

Navigating the Politics and Contexts of Mistrust in Institutions

Understanding the contexts of space and time can have a key role in IVPSMs supporting IUSs. Study participants often alluded to social movements and civil unrest regarding discrimination on a national and state level. Campuses, though often described as bubbles, are influenced by social forces external to the university. For example, in many states, legislatures pass legislation that modifies institutions of higher education budgets (Cornell Law School, 2021; Kaplin et al., 2020). Some participants alluded to strained relationships with the U.S. criminal justice system and police brutality which helped them contextualize IUSs hesitancy to utilize services, especially when those services were perceived to be attached to the law (e.g., Clery Act and Title IX). Clark and Pino (2016) elaborated on the tensions experienced by IUSs when reporting:

Some survivors, particularly survivors of color, undocumented survivors, and LGBT survivors, feel unsafe going to the police or to a hospital. Thus, while many of us find

safety, healing, and satisfaction in the pursuit of health and justice in our schools and communities, others experience a secondary trauma because of the way school or public officials respond to them. If the goal is to heal, the possibility of reinjuring oneself by undergoing the trauma of a hostile dean or an inept police report is a risk many survivors do not wish to take. (p. 334)

Mandatory reporting policies without adequate training and the mishandling of Title IX cases can instill and underscore feelings of institutional betrayal and mistrust by reporting to authorities deemed untrustworthy (Linder, 2017; Monteith et al., 2021; Clark & Pino, 2016; SAMHSA, 2014; Smidt et al., 2019). Universities' previous failures to appropriately address institutional racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination have established a tone of mistrust for many IUSs (Smith & Freyd, 2014). Stand-alone advocacy offices (e.g., those physically located outside of Title IX offices or health centers) that collaborated with multicultural student offices (e.g., LGBTQ+ centers, Black cultural centers) seemed to have higher numbers of IUSs utilizing their office. Though funding and staffing concerns were discussed, offices that were external to Title IX and their campus health centers often seemed to describe more success in building relationships with IUSs. Physically meeting students in spaces, they might feel comfortable (e.g., LGBTQ+ centers or Black cultural centers), seemed to create more authentic relationships with IUSs.

While the goal of advocacy is to support students, the requirements set forth by the U.S. Department of Education expect Title IX coordinators and Clery coordinators to focus on being compliant. Striking the balance between the two roles, especially with limited staff and resources, was often a source of stress for participants. According to SAMHSA (2014), trauma-informed perspectives must have six key components: safety, trustworthiness and transparency;

peer support; collaboration and mutuality; empowerment, voice, and choice and should be implemented at “multiple levels of an organization.” Using this framework, every staff and faculty member at an institution of higher education has the responsibility of being trauma informed.

As the foundation of creating a caring community, relationship building cannot occur when the work does not allow for adequate time for developing safe, trustworthy, and transparent relationships (SAMHSA, 2014). Participants in the study navigated this lack of finite resources in creative manners such as the faculty/staff advocate program and hosting office hours in spaces where IUSs frequent. Intentionally building these relationships with IUSs could also begin the important process of collecting data that is not solely anecdotal. For those in the study, national-level trends for IUSs were not reflected on their campuses, though they anecdotally knew interpersonal violence was occurring in IUS populations. Restoring and building trust with IUSs seems to be an imperative first step in attaining data so IVPSMs can make data-driven decisions that inform policies and practice to make tangible changes for IUSs. As a framework to build relationships, institutions of higher education can implement policies, trainings, and practices that reflect the six key components of trauma-informed praxis; Institutions as a whole and not just survivor advocacy offices must foster a trauma-informed environment for survivors to feel comfortable and empowered (NASPA Culture of Respect, 2021).

Lack of Education, Organizations, and Data Exchanges for IVPSMs

While all participants had at least one master’s degree, specific education related to working with IUSs was not explicitly covered in their formal education or job training. IVPSMs recognized their own identities and the limitations that might exist in working with IUSs since they did not share similar life experiences. As a method for bridging this gap in knowledge and

to cultivate more inclusive environments, some participants engaged with cultural competency and humility training (National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, 2021). To learn more about cultural competency and cultural humility while working with IUSs, IPVSMs often engaged their campus diversity, equity, and inclusion offices or attended conferences external to their universities. Some participants, like Denise, felt as though they wanted to express their intersectional, trauma-informed frameworks. Denise admitted, “I’m trying to incorporate anti-racist practices into our work. I think that has been a challenge for me personally; I would say I don’t really know how to send the message of being anti-racist through our services.” Feelings of being underprepared to support IUSs through explicit anti-racist and anti-oppressive stances are common; consequentially, without a proper signal or message stating their office’s commitment to anti-racism and other forms of oppressions, some IUSs may not feel comfortable utilizing those services (Linder, 2017,2018; Smidt et al., 2019)

While several functional areas within student affairs/higher education have specific professional organizations (e.g., NACA for Campus Activities; ACUI for College Unions), IPVSMs do not have professional organizations dedicated to interpersonal violence. Organizations such as NASPA, ACHA, and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) offer knowledge communities, subgroups, and mini-conferences specifically for interpersonal violence. Though IPVSMs wanted to support IUSs, participants discussed barriers to educational opportunities including the cost of conference attendance/travel, professional development, and professional association memberships.

The four participants shared their interest in reviewing data and best practices with colleagues at other institutions. Denise expressed, “I would love to see what you find out from your study because we know that these things are happening, but we just never communicate.”

Creating a national database and/or consortium of interpersonal violence researchers, statistics, reports, and best practices outside of Title IX and Clery could allow for advocates and other IVPSMs to collaborate and communicate with one another. By sharing what does and does not work at U. S. higher education institutions globally, programs and policies can be informed through precedence. Curricular changes to higher education and student affairs programs to incorporate more education surrounding case management and trauma-informed approaches could move the profession in a direction to better support survivors of violence. Additionally, a systematic approach to data collection with demographic-affirming questionnaires, particularly that allow for IUSs to be represented, could be considered when surveying students' health behaviors or experiences with interpersonal violence.

Implications of Identity and Power

This study collected the perceptions of interpersonal violence prevention staff members (IVPSMs) on the institutional support and resource utilization of institutionally underserved survivors of sexual violence (IUSs). By collecting the perspectives of these IVPSMs, the importance of identity and power in IPV work was highlighted. Recognizing the identities a person holds, the power those identities might have over others, and the geographical location and time contexts are important aspects in the first steps to supporting IUSs. For the three white participants in the study, the guiding principles of Critical Whiteness Studies: white complicity, epistemologies of ignorance, and white normativity were present (Applebaum, 2010; Cabrera et al., 2017; Chen, 2017; Matias et al., 2014). Each person in the study acknowledged their racial identity and mentioned the implications their identity might have on the students with whom they work. Though only two participants explicitly mentioned anti-oppressive and anti-racist frameworks, participants were aware of how whiteness can be complicit, ignorant, and normative

(Applebaum, 2010; Hunter & Van der Westhuizen, 2022). Focusing on the white participants, only one participant seemed hesitant to discuss her white identity and would often pause to ensure the right phrasing/language was used. While this participant could have just needed a little time to process, the hesitancy during the interview portion about identity could have been interpreted as this person never having to interrogate their whiteness in relation to their work (Cabrera et al., 2017). While interrogating their own racial identities, IVPSMs should recognize the identities of those they are working alongside. As the demographic composition of universities changes to include an array of identities, practices that worked for dominant groups by those in the dominant group (e.g., practices that white IVPSMs used with white survivors) might not be appropriate for IUS. Warning against a single narrative of sexual assault, Clark & Pino (2016) stated:

There is no single “assault narrative” and it is dangerous to assume there is one. When the media only reports on middle- and upper-class white women, they erase the experiences of so many and reinforce damaging narratives about what sexual assault looks like. These constricting narratives exclude women of color, whose likelihood of surviving (and not surviving) violence are very high; they exclude the experiences of boys and men whose experiences are silenced by a culture that promotes toxic masculinity; they exclude the daily realities of transgender women, who are the least likely to survive violence. (p. 337)

As a phenomenon that occurs because of gender or sexual-based identity discrimination plus violence, IVPSMs should be well-versed in their own identities and how those show up in spaces with IUSs. As student affairs and higher education professionals, many people join the profession to help students along their path to graduation. Doyle (2015) concluded that as

education professionals “we tend to understand ourselves as part of a ‘good thing...’ [but] our sense of the campus as a safe space, the principle of the thing, is routinely deployed against us” (p. 108). When this institutional betrayal occurs, commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion can be undermined (Gómez, 2021; Pyke, 2018). While study participants acknowledged university commitments to diversity, equity, and inclusion, institutional action to provide education and sessions on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) work and interpersonal violence seem to have been absent. This study also pinpointed an absence of education provided by institutions on how to specially support IUSs, particularly for IVPSMs employed at PWIs and who work with diverse students. To properly feel prepared to address their own identities and the multiple intersecting identities of the students they serve, IVPSMs must have adequate education on these topics outside of mandatory policy-focused trainings. As a vital part of the Ethic of Care framework, proper understandings of cultural competence and social justice are necessary to provide a minimum threshold of care for students (Hemberg, 2019; Saunders & Wilson, 2017). To maintain the “good thing” Doyle (2015) speaks of, higher education professionals must first know how to “do good” on our campuses for those who are historically underserved.

Each participant referenced the importance of a trauma-informed approach, but recognizing that trauma can manifest differently in IUS populations and how to respond specifically to IUSs was not explicitly mentioned. Failure to understand these concepts can lead to revictimization (ACHA, 2020). It is therefore the responsibility of institutions to fully commit to DEI work by including education on identity and power; anti-oppression praxis; and interpersonal violence prevention education (Linder & Harris, 2017). To quote the slogan of the 2014 Obama-era campus sexual assault campaign, “It’s On Us” to combat interpersonal

violence, but we can only do so if everyone is educated on interpersonal violence and prepared to have conversations on IUSs facing institutional and systemic inequity (Civic Nation, 2020).

Future Research

The number of participants (4) was small compared to the number of IVPSMs on each campus and the number of IVPSMs across the United States. Future research should include more IVPSMs. Additionally, gleaning perspectives of IUSs themselves could be beneficial in developing a more holistic understanding of IPV in collegiate environments. While ensuring participants felt safe and comfortable in interview settings, participants' responses might have differed under different conditions (e.g., via in-person interviews, interviewing in their offices versus at home). Research was conducted amidst the global COVID-19 pandemic, U.S. discrimination/systemic racism, and office/institutional incidents and restructures. These considerations therefore make the findings from these institutions only applicable within the bounds of this case study. The discussion of interpersonal violence, identities, and potential shortcomings of the individual or institution also could have created an environment where participants felt they could not express everything. The virtual nature of Zoom interviews may have stymied the behavioral and verbal cues usually present during in-person interviews (Irani, 2018).

Future research on interpersonal violence on college campuses and specifically with IUSs should include navigating the intricacies of IPV, alcohol/substance usage, and victim blaming. While higher education health professionals know alcohol and substance usage can impair motor functions and cognition, those professionals tasked with holding students accountable cannot allow inanimate objects to be the blame for interpersonal violence and lack of consent. Education for higher education professionals on the complexities of compliance, how to support survivors

of sexual violence, and on trauma-informed practices; and education for compliance professionals on advocacy, the student affairs perspective, and incorporating trauma-informed practices within their work would benefit both fields. Additionally, re-evaluating policies and procedures that might victim blame or incriminate students (e.g., medical amnesty policies) could also be beneficial. Lastly, exploring whether IUSs believe that formal reporting is a part of their own healing and justice journeys while navigating Title IX and Clery compliance could help to inform federal and campus policies.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to interrogate perceptions of interpersonal violence prevention staff members (IVPSMs) on institutionally underserved survivors of sexual violence (IUSs) support and resources, identify gaps in education on how to respond and support IUSs, and examined IVPSMs social identities and influence of their identities on their work. In this study, I interviewed four participants from four Southeastern Conference schools. Four themes emerged from the interviews: (a) institutional betrayal and mistrust; (b) expanding current conceptualizations and praxis of interpersonal violence; (c) identity as inextricable to IPV work; and (d) student service utilization and office limitations. These findings and practices contribute to expanding the limited amount of IUS-specific research and provides a more intersectional perspective to the campus sexual violence literature. Merely going beyond compliance will not solve the institutional and systemic issues that allow interpersonal violence to exist. As Clark & Pino (2016) succinctly stated, “many survivors of color and queer survivors will never be able to come forward, but we must always seek to support them” (p. #). Providing IUSs adequate resources, representation, and care can begin the long process of fostering relationships, building trust, and going beyond compliance.

References

- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice*. Routledge.
- Aleshire, S. (2014). *The spectrum of discourse: A case study utilizing Critical Race Theory and critical discourse analysis* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona]. UA Campus Repository.
- Alexander, J., Eyerman, R., Giesen, B., Smelser, N., & Sztompka, P. (2004). *Cultural trauma and collective identity*. University of California Press.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pp9nb>
- Alexander v. Yale University. 631 F.2d 178 (1980).
https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=12213197469613891965
- Allen, C. T., Ridgeway, R., & Swan, S. C. (2015). College students' beliefs regarding help seeking for male and female sexual assault survivors: Even less support for male survivors. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 24(1), 102-115.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2015.982237>
- Allen, J. J. & Anderson, C. A. (2017). Aggression and violence: Definitions and distinctions. In P. Sturmey (Ed.), *The Wiley handbook of violence and aggression* (pp. 1-14). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Allen, M. (2017). *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vols. 1-4). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411>
- Amankwaa, L. (2016). Creating protocols for trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, 23(3), 121–127.

- Amar, A. F., Strout, T. D., Simpson, S., Cardiello, M., & Beckford, S. (2014). *Administrators' perceptions of college campus protocols, response, and student prevention efforts for sexual assault*. *Violence and Victims, 29*(4), 579–593. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.vv-d-12-00154>
- American Counseling Association. (2020). *Fact sheet #9: Vicarious trauma*. American Counseling Association. <https://www.counseling.org/docs/trauma-disaster/fact-sheet-9---vicarious-trauma.pdf>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- Amiot, M. N., Mayer-Glenn, J., & Parker, L. (2020). Applied critical race theory: Educational leadership actions for student equity. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 23*(2), 200-220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2019.1599342>
- Applebaum, B. (2010). *Being white, being good: White complicity, white moral responsibility, and social justice pedagogy*. Lexington Books.
- Basile, K. C., Clayton, H. B., DeGue, S., Gilford, J. W., Vagi, K. J., Suarez, N. A., Zwald, M. L., & Lowry, R. (2020). Interpersonal Violence Victimization Among High School Students - Youth Risk Behavior Survey, United States, 2019. *MMWR supplements, 69*(1), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.su6901a4>
- Beavers, J., & Halabi, S. (2017). Stigma and the structure of Title IX compliance. *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 45*(4), 558-568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073110517750596>
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(4), 544-559. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573>

- Bell, D. (1980). *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518-533. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1340546>
- Bennett, S., Banyard, V. L., & Edwards, K. M.. (2017). The impact of the bystander's relationship with the victim and the perpetrator on intent to help in situations involving sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(5), 682–702.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515586373>
- Bettez, S. C. (2015). Navigating the complexity of qualitative research in postmodern contexts: Assemblage, critical reflexivity, and communion as guides. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 28(8), 932–954.
- Biddix, J. P. (2018). *Research methods and applications for student affairs*. Jossey Bass Inc.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and racial inequality in contemporary America*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boyle, K. M. & Rogers, K. B. (2020). Beyond the rape “victim”–“survivor” binary: How race, gender, and identity processes interact to shape distress. *Social Forum*, 35, 323-345.
- Breiding, M. J., Basile, K. C., Smith, S. G., Black, M. C., & Mahendra, R. (2015). Intimate partner violence surveillance uniform definitions and recommended data elements: Version 2.0. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/ipv/intimatepartnerviolence.pdf>
- Briere, J. N. & Scott, C. (2015). *Principles of trauma therapy: A guide to symptoms, evaluation and treatment (DSM-5 update; 2nd ed.)* SAGE Publishing.
- Brown, K. D., & Brown, A. L. (2020). Anti-Blackness and the school curriculum. In C. A. Grant, A. N. Woodson, & M. J. Dumas (Eds.), *The future is Black: Afropessimism, fugitivity, and radical hope in education* (pp. 72–78).Brown, S. (2019). *Life inside the*

- Title IX pressure cooker*. Chronicle of Higher Education. <https://www-chronicle-com.proxy.lib.utk.edu/article/life-inside-the-title-ix-pressure-cooker/>
- Brubaker, S. J. (2019). Campus-based sexual assault victim advocacy and Title IX: Revisiting tensions between grassroots activism and the criminal justice system. *Feminist Criminology*, 14(3), 307-329. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1557085118772087>
- Brubaker, S. J., & Keegan, B. (2019). “Suddenly everyone’s an expert in our field”: Campus victim advocates and the promise and perils of professionalization. *Violence Against Women*, 25(9), 1116–1137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801218807096>
- Brubaker, S. J., & Mancini, C. (2017). The impact of increased state regulation of campus sexual assault practices: Perspectives of campus personnel. *Journal of School Violence* 16(3), 286-301, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2017.1318577>
- Burstow, B. (2003). Toward a radical understanding of trauma and trauma work. *Violence Against Women*, 9, 1293–1317. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801203255555>
- Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2016). *Whiteness in higher education: The invisible missing link in diversity and racial analyses* (ASHE Higher Education Report, 42). Association for the Study of Higher Education. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.utk.edu/10.1002/aehe.20116>
- Cahill, C., Quijada Cerecer, D. A. & Bradley, M. (2010). “Dreaming of ... ”: Reflections on participatory action research as a feminist praxis of critical hope. *Affilia*, 25, pp. 406–416.
- Cain, L. K., A. L. MacDonald, J. M. Coker, J. C. Velasco, & G. D. West. (2020). “Ethics and Reflexivity in Mixed Methods Research: An Examination of Current Practices and a Call for Further Discussion.” *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 11(2), 144–55. <https://doi.org/10.29034/ijmra.v11n2a2>

- Caldwell, C., & Leighton, L. B. (2018). *Oppression and the body: Roots, resistance, and resolutions*. North Atlantic Books.
- Campus Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights, S.1289, 102nd Cong. (1992).
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnail, S., Harps, S., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., Lee, H., Kranz, V., Herbison, R., & Madden, K. (2020). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct*. The Association of American Universities (AAU). [https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/Key-Issues/Campus-Safety/Revised%20Aggregate%20report%20%20and%20appendices%201-7_\(01-16-2020_FINAL\).pdf](https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/Key-Issues/Campus-Safety/Revised%20Aggregate%20report%20%20and%20appendices%201-7_(01-16-2020_FINAL).pdf)
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnail, S., Townsend, S., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct*. The Association of American Universities (AAU). https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/AAU_Campus_Climate_Survey_12_14_15.pdf
- Carey, K. B., Norris, A. L., Durney, S. E., Shepardson, R. L., & Carey, M. P.. (2018). Mental health consequences of sexual assault among first-year college women. *Journal of American College Health*, 66(6), 480–486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2018.1431915>
- Casper, M. & Wertheimer, E. (2016). *Critical trauma studies: Understanding violence, conflict, and memory in Everyday Life*. New York University Press.
- Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework. *The Qualitative Report*, 21(5), 811-831. <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss5/2>

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2021). *Health equity considerations and racial and ethnic minority groups*. CDC. <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/community/health-equity/race-ethnicity.html>
- Charmaz, K. (2017). The power of constructivist Grounded Theory for critical inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800416657105>
- Chen, J. M. (2017). The Contentious Field of Whiteness Studies. *Journal for Social Thought*, 2(1). <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/jst/vol2/iss1/3>
- Civil Rights Act of 1964 § 7, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq (1964).
- Civic Nation. (2020). *It's on us: To stop sexual assault*. Its On Us. <https://www.itsonus.org/>
- Clark, A. E., & Pino, A. L. (2016). *We believe you: Survivors of campus sexual assault speak out*. Macmillan.
- Clarke, A. (2005). *Situational analysis: Grounded Theory after the Postmodern turn*. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412985833>
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Cruz, J.. (2021). The Constraints of Fear and Neutrality in Title IX Administrators' Responses to Sexual Violence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 92(3), 363–384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2020.1809268>
- Cornell Law School. (2021). *Higher education - state laws*. Legal Information Institute. https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/table_higher_education
- Davis, L. & Fry, R. (2019). *College faculty have become more racially and ethnically diverse, but remain far less so than students*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/31/us-college-faculty-student-diversity/>

D'Enbeau, S. (2017). Unpacking the dimensions of organizational tension: the case of sexual violence response and prevention among college students, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 45(3), 237-255,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2017.1320568>

DeMatteo, D., Galloway, M., Arnold, S., & Patel, U. (2015). Sexual assault on college campuses: A 50-state survey of criminal sexual assault statutes and their relevance to campus sexual assault. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 21(3), 227–238.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000055>

Department of Education- Office for Civil Rights. (2020, May 18). *Office for Civil Rights Blog - 20200518: SCHOOLS MUST POST IMPORTANT INFORMATION REGARDING TITLE IX ON SCHOOL WEBSITES UNDER THE NEW TITLE IX RULE.*
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/blog/20200518.html>

Department of Education- Office for Civil Rights. (2022, January 2). Pending cases currently under investigation at elementary-secondary and post-secondary schools as of January 2, 2022 7:30 am search. <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/investigations/open-investigations/tix.html>

Department of Justice- Office on Violence Against Women (OVW). (n.d.). Domestic Violence.
<https://www.justice.gov/ovw/domestic-violence#:~:text=The%20term%20%E2%80%9Cdomestic%20violence%E2%80%9D%20includes,spouse%20or%20intimate%20partner%2C%20by>

Development Services Group, Inc. (2016). *Behind the term: Trauma*. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration,

National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices.

https://calswec.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/4-3_behind_the_term_trauma.pdf

Dickson, E., & Lobo, M. L. (2017). Critical caring theory and public health nursing advocacy for comprehensive sexual health education. *Public Health Nursing, 35*(1), 78–84.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/phn.12369>

Dixson, A. D. & Anderson, C. R. (2017). Where are we? Critical race theory in education 20 years later.

Doolin, B. & McLeod, L. (2005). Towards critical interpretivism in IS research. In D. Howcroft & E. M. Trauth (Eds.), *Handbook of critical information systems research: Theory and application* (pp. 244-271). Edward Elgar.

Duran, A. (2019). Queer and of color: A systematic literature review on Queer Students of Color in higher education scholarship. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 12*(4), 390–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000084>

Dwyer, S. C. & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54-63.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F160940690900800105>

Echo-Hawk, A. [echohawkd3]. (2019, Sept. 7). *We are not a “historically” underserved population. My history is one of ancestors survived so I could thrive. My history didn't start with “western civilization.” I am colonially underserved. I am institutionally underserved. And I am historically resilient #INDIGENOUS* [Tweet]. Twitter.

<https://twitter.com/echohawkd3/status/1170371608894046208>

Enforcement of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 with Respect to Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Light of *Bostock v. Clayton County*:

- A Rule by the [Education Department](#) on [06/22/2021](#), 86 Fed. Reg. 32637 (June 22, 2021)
(to be codified at 34 CFR chapter undef.).
- Erickson, K. T. (1976). *Everything in its path: Destruction of community in the Buffalo Creek flood*. Simon & Schuster.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The study of language*. Pearson.
- Falk-Rafael, A. (2005). Advancing nursing theory through theory-guided practice: The emergence of a critical caring perspective. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 28(1), 38-49.
- Fedina, L., Holmes, J. L., & Backes, B. L. (2018). Campus Sexual Assault: A Systematic Review of Prevalence Research From 2000 to 2015. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 19(1), 76–93.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016631129>
- Figley, C. R. (Ed.). (1995). *Compassion fatigue: Coping with secondary traumatic stress disorder in those who treat the traumatized*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Fisher, B. & Tronto, J. (1990) ‘Toward a Feminist Theory of caring. In E. Abel & M. Nelson (Eds.) *Circles of Care*. SUNY Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219–245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>
- Foste, Z. & Irwin, L. (2020). Apply Critical Whiteness Studies in college student development theory and research. *Journal of College Student Development* 61(4), 439-455.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2020.0050>
- Gemignani, M. (2017). Toward a critical reflexivity in qualitative inquiry: Relational and posthumanist reflections on realism, researcher’s centrality, and representationalism in reflexivity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(2), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000070>

- Gómez, J. M. (2021). Gender, campus sexual violence, cultural betrayal, institutional betrayal, and institutional support in U.S. ethnic minority college students: A descriptive study. *Violence Against Women*, 107780122199875.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801221998757>
- Gray-Rosendale, L. A. (2020). *Me too, feminist theory, and surviving sexual violence in the academy*. Lexington Books.
- Harden, J., McAllister, P., Spencer, C. M., & Stith, S. M. (2020). The dark side of the rainbow: Queer Women's experiences of intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020933869>
- Hardy S. J., Chakraborti N. (2020). Invisible victims. In: Blood, Threats and Fears. Palgrave Hate Studies. Palgrave Pivot, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31997-7_9
- Harris, C. I. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*, 106, 1707–1791.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1341787>
- Harris, J. C. & Linder, C. (2018). A critical race analysis of Students of Colors' racialized experiences in higher education and student affairs graduate preparation programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 59(2), 141-158.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0014>
- Harris, J.C., & Linder, C. (2017). *Intersections of identity and sexual violence on campus: Centering minoritized students' experiences*. Stylus.
- Harris, K. (2019). *Beyond the Rapist: Title IX and Sexual Violence on US Campuses*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190876920.001.0001>

- Heart, M. Y., Chase, J., Elkins, J., & Altschul, D. B. (2011). Historical trauma among Indigenous Peoples of the Americas: Concepts, research, and clinical considerations. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 43(4), 282–290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2011.628913>
- Hemberg, J. (2019). Caring ethics as the foundation for cultural competence: views of health professionals working in student healthcare context. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/scs.12807>
- Henkle, J. E., Dunlap, J., & Tabachnick. (2020). *Expanding the frame: Institutional responses to students accused of sexual misconduct*. NASPA. <https://www.naspa.org/report/expanding-the-frame-institutional-responses-to-students-accused-of-sexual-misconduct>
- Herkett, M. K., & Kopp, A. L. (2008). An introduction to interpersonal violence prevention. Advocates' Forum. The University of Chicago. <https://crownschool.uchicago.edu/introduction-interpersonal-violence-prevention>
- Hiraldo, P. (2010). The role of critical race theory in higher education. *The Vermont Connection*, 31.(7), 53-59.
- Hirsch, J.S., & Khan, S. (2020). *Sexual citizens: A landmark study of sex, power, and assault on campus*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Hockett, J. M. & Saucier, D. A. (2015). A systematic literature review of “rape victims” versus “rape survivors”: Implications for theory, research, and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 25(A), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.07.003>
- Hong, L., & Marine, S.B. (2018). Sexual violence through a social justice paradigm: Framing and applications. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2018, 21-33.

- Hoover, S. M., & Morrow, S. L. (2015). Qualitative researcher reflexivity: A follow-up study with female sexual assault survivors. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1476-1489.
- Howard, J. L., Jr. (2018). *Building a model of Black women's confidence in campus sexual assault resources: A critical race feminist quantitative study*. [Doctoral dissertation, Clemson University]. Clemson University All Dissertations.
https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3256&context=all_dissertations
- Human Rights Campaign. (n.d.) *Sexual assault and the LGBTQ community*. HRC.
<https://www.hrc.org/resources/sexual-assault-and-the-lgbt-community>
- Hunter, & Van der Westhuizen, C. (2022). *Routledge handbook of critical studies in whiteness*. Routledge.
- Institute of Medicine. (1994). Reducing risks for mental disorders: Frontiers for preventive intervention research. In: Mrazek, P. J., & Haggerty, R. J., (Eds.) *Committee on Prevention of Mental Disorders, Division of Biobehavioral Sciences and Mental Disorders*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1994.
- Irani, E. (2019). The use of videoconferencing for qualitative interviewing: Opportunities, challenges, and considerations. *Clinical Nursing Research*, 28(1), 3–8.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1054773818803170>
- Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1092(f) (2016).
- Johnson, M. (2017). Being Black in a world where white lies matter. *The Undefeated*. Retrieved from <https://theundefeated.com/features/being-black-in-a-world-where-white-lies-matter/>

- Josephsen, J. (2014). Critically reflexive theory: A proposal for nursing education. *Advances in Nursing, 2014*, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/594360>
- June, A. (2020 August 26). 10 ways the coronavirus has shaped higher ed and its world: New lawsuits, more hunger, fewer jobs, and shaken local economies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/10-ways-the-coronavirus-has-shaped-higher-ed-and-its-world>
- Kaplin, W. A., Lee, B. A., Hutchens, N. H., & Rooksby, J. H. (2020). *The law of higher education: Student edition* (6th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2002). Campus sexual assault: How America's institutions of higher education respond (Final Report, NIJ Grant # 1999-WA-VX-0008). Education Development Center, Inc. <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196676.pdf>
- Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to bricolage. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.
- Klein, L. B. (2016). Fostering compassion satisfaction among college & university Title IX administrators. *Journal of Campus Title IX Compliance and Best Practices, 2*, 58-75. <https://doi.org/10.17732/campusix02>
- Konik, J., & Cortina, L. M. (2008). Policing gender at work: Intersections of harassment based on sex and sexuality. *Social Justice Research, 21*(3), 313-337. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-008-0074-z>
- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M. et al. (2016). Campus Climate Survey validation study final technical report (NCJ 249545). Washington, DC: Department of Justice.

- Kulbaga, T. & Spencer, L. (2019). *Campuses of consent: Sexual and social justice in higher education*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G.. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *11*(1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/095183998236863>
- Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. F. (1995). Towards a Critical Race Theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, *97*(1), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/016146819509700104>
- Landreman, L. M. & Williamsen, K. M. (2018), Addressing sexual violence as student affairs work. *Student Services*, *2018*(161): 35-45. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20251>
- Lather. (1991). Deconstructing/deconstructive inquiry: The politics of knowing and being known. *Educational Theory*, *41*(2), 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.1991.00153.x>
- Lee, J. (2018). Affirmation, support, and advocacy: Critical race theory and academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *38*(1), 77-87, <https://doi.org/10.12930/NACADA-17-028>
- Lichman, M. (2014). Ethical issues in qualitative research. In *Qualitative Research for the Social Sciences*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781544307756.n3>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- Linder, C. (2017). Institutional betrayal as a motivator for campus sexual assault activism. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, *11*(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19407882.2017.1385489>
- Linder, C. (2018). *Sexual violence on campus: Power-conscious approaches to awareness, prevention, and response*. Emerald Publishing.

- Linder, C. (2019). Moving beyond policy to address campus sexual violence. In P. M. Magolda, M. Baxter Magolda, & R. Carducci (Eds.) *Dialogues about equity, safety, and civility*. Stylus.
- Lisak, D., Gardinier, L., Nicksa, S. C., & Cote, A. M. (2010). False allegations of sexual assault: An analysis of ten years of reported cases. *Violence Against Women*, 16, 1318-1334.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210387747>
- López, N., & Gadsden, V. L. (2017). Health inequities, social determinants, and intersectionality, in Bogard, K., V. Murray, & C. Alexander, Eds., *Perspectives on Health Equity and Social Determinants of Health*. National Academies of Medicine.
- Manning, J., & Kunkel, A. (2014). Making meaning of meaning-making research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31(4), 433–441.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407514525890>
- Matias, C. E., K. M. Viesca, D. F. Garrison-Wade, M. Tandon, and R. Galindo. 2014. “What is critical whiteness doing in our nice field like critical race theory?” Applying CRT and CWS to understand the white imaginations of white teacher candidates.” *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(3), 289–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2014.933692>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- May, C. L., & Wisco, B. E. (2016). Defining trauma: How level of exposure and proximity affect risk for posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychological trauma: Theory, Research, Practice and Policy*, 8(2), 233–240. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000077>
- Menakem, R. (2017). *My grandmother’s hands: Racialized trauma and the pathway to mending our hearts and bodies*. Central Recovery Press, LLC.

- McCoy, D. & Rodricks, D. (2015). Special issue: Critical race theory in higher education: 20 years of theoretical and research innovations. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 41(3), 1-117. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.utk.edu/10.1002/aehe.20021>
- McCoy, D. L., Luedke, C. L., & Winkle-Wagner, R. (2017). Encouraged or Weeded Out: Perspectives of Students of Color in the STEM Disciplines on Faculty Interactions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 58(5), 657-673. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2017.0052>
- McCoy, D. L., Winkle-Wagner, R., & Luedke, C. L. (2015). Colorblind mentoring? Exploring white faculty mentoring of students of color. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(4), 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038676>
- McDonald, J. (2017). Critical methods. In J. Matthes, C.S. Davis, & R.F. Potter (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods* <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0053>
- Meghani, S., Brooks, J., Gipson-Jones, T., Waite, R., Whitfield-Harris, L. & Deatrick, J. (2009) . Patient–provider race-concordance: does it matter in improving minority patients’ health outcomes?, *Ethnicity & Health*, 14(1), 107-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557850802227031>
- Mennicke, A., Bowling, J., Gromer, J., & Ryan, C. (2021). Factors Associated With and Barriers to Disclosure of a Sexual Assault to Formal On-Campus Resources Among College Students. *Violence Against Women*, 27(2), 255–273. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801219889173>
- Mercy, J., Hillis, S., Butchart, A., Bellis, M., Ward, C., Fang, X., & Rosenberg, M. (2017). In C. N. Mock, R. Nugent,, O. Kobusingye, . K. R. Smith, K (Eds.), *Disease Control*

- Priorities: Vol. 7. Injury Prevention and Environmental Health* (3rd ed., pp. 71-96).
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK525218/pdf/Bookshelf_NBK525218.pdf
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey Bass.
- Miller, R. A., Wynn, R. D., & Webb, K. W. (2017). Queering Disability in higher education: Views from intersections. In E. Kim & K. C. Aquino (Eds.) *Disability as diversity in higher education: Policies and practices to enhance student success* (pp. 31-44).
Routledge.
- Mills, C. (1997). *The racial contract*. Cornell University Press.
- Mir, R. & Mir, A. (2002). The organizational imagination: From paradigm wars to praxis. *The Journal of Organizational Research Methods*, 5(1), 105-125.
- Mirchandani, R. (2005). Postmodernism and Sociology: From the Epistemological to the Empirical. *Sociological Theory*, 23(1), 86–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2005.00244.x>
- Monteith, L. L., Holliday, R., Schneider, A. L., Miller, C. N., Bahraini, N. H., & Forster, J. E. (2021). Institutional Betrayal and Help-Seeking Among Women Survivors of Military Sexual Trauma. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*.
Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/tra0001027>
- Moorer, O. (2021). *Intimate partner violence vs. domestic violence*. YWCA Spokane.
<https://ywcaspokane.org/what-is-intimate-partner-domestic-violence/>

- Moylan, C. A., & Javorika, M.. (2020). Widening the lens: An ecological review of campus sexual assault. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 21(1), 179–192.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018756121>
- Murphy, A. & Van Brunt, B. (2017). *Uprooting sexual violence in higher education: A guide for practitioners and faculty*. Routledge.
- Muscari, E. C., & Fleming, C. E. (2019). Help-seeking for mental health concerns: The role of partner influence. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice*, 8(4), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cfp0000125>
- Nadal, K. L. (2018). Microaggressions and traumatic stress: Theory, research, and clinical treatment. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0000073-000>
- NASPA. (2021). Prevention programming matrix. *Culture of Respect*.
<https://cultureofrespect.org/programs-and-tools/matrix/>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
<https://doi.org/10.17226/24994>.
- National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments [NCSSLE]. (2021). *Cultural and linguistic competence*. NCSSLE. <https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/topic-research/engagement/cultural-linguistic-competence>
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence [NCADV]. (n.d.). *What is domestic violence?* NCADV. <https://ncadv.org/learn-more>
- Nelson, A. (2020, September 15). Applying theory to the work: Bridging panel concepts to practice through decolonization and antiracism [Panel Presentation]. National Hispanic

and Latino Addiction Technology Transfer Center Network, National Latino Behavioral Health Association, and U.S. Health and Human Services Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, *The Intersection of Acculturation, Assimilation and Substance Use Disorders in the Latinx Community: A Virtual Learning Community*.

Nelson, A. N., Kew, K. L. & Castro, E. (2020, Apr 17 - 21). Applied Critical Trauma Theory to enhance resilience and success for college students with oppression-based trauma [Roundtable Session]. AERA Annual Meeting San Francisco, CA, United States.

<http://tinyurl.com/v4ce9gw>

Nelson, A., Kew, K., & Castro, E. (2020, November 9-12). Decolonizing pedagogical and leadership practices in higher education through Critical Trauma Theory [Asynchronous Webinar]. University Council for Educational Administration 2020 Annual Convention.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A Feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. University of California Press.

Pacquiao, D. F. (2008). Nursing care of vulnerable populations using a framework of cultural competence, social justice and human rights. *Contemporary Nurse*, 28(1-2), 189–197.

<https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.673.28.1-2.189>

Papendick, M. & Bohner, G. (2017). “Passive victim – strong survivor”? Perceived meaning of labels applied to women who were raped. *PLoS ONE*, 12(5), 1-21.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177550>

Patsy T. Mink Equal Opportunity in Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 *et seq.* (2002).

<https://www.justice.gov/crt/title-ix-education-amendments-1972>

- Patton, L. D. (2015). Disrupting postsecondary prose: Toward a critical race theory of higher education. *Urban Education, 51*(3), 315-324,
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0042085915602542>
- Pillow, W. S. (2010). Dangerous reflexivity: Rigour, responsibility and reflexivity in qualitative research. In P. Thompson & M. Walker (Eds.), *The Routledge doctoral student's companion* (pp. 270–282). Routledge.
- Pilot, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2014). *Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing practice* (8th ed.). Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Pitner, B. (2019, June 12). Viewpoint: What series on Central Park Five teaches us today. *BBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-48503826>
- Pyke, K. D.. (2018). Institutional betrayal: inequity, discrimination, bullying, and retaliation in academia. *Sociological Perspectives, 61*(1), 5–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121417743816>
- Quiros, L., Varghese, R., & Vanidestine, T. (2019). Disrupting the single story: Challenging dominant trauma narratives through a Critical Race lens. *Traumatology, 1*(999), 1-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000223>
- Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network [RAINN]. (2016). *The criminal justice system: Statistics*. RAINN. <https://www.rainn.org/statistics/criminal-justice-system>
- Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network [RAINN]. (2020). *Effects of Sexual Violence*. RAINN. <https://www.rainn.org/effects-sexual-violence>.
- Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network [RAINN]. (2021). *Prevention navigator: Find a program*. RAINN. <https://preventionnavigator.rainn.org/find-a-program/>

- Roche, P., Shimmin, C., Hickes, S., Khan, M., Sherzoi, O., Wicklund, E., Lavoie J., Hardie, S., Wittmeier, K., & Sibley, K. M. (2020). Valuing all voices: Refining a trauma-informed, intersectional and critical reflexive framework for patient engagement in health research using a qualitative descriptive approach. *Research Involvement and Engagement*, 6(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-00217-2>
- RTI (Research Triangle Institute International). (2018). Qualitative Study of Sexual Harassment in Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.
- Rural Health Information Hub. (2021). *Defining health promotion and disease prevention*. Rural Health Information Hub. <https://www.ruralhealthinfo.org/toolkits/health-promotion/1/definition>
- Saul, J. (2014). *Collective trauma, collective healing: Promoting community resilience in the aftermath of disaster*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Shimmin, C., Wittmeier, K., Lavoie, J., Wicklund, E., & Sibley, K. (2017). Moving towards a more inclusive patient and public involvement in health research paradigm: The incorporation of a trauma-informed intersectional analysis. *BMC health services research*, 17(1), 539. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-017-2463-1>
- Sipe, L. & Constable, S. (1996). A chart of four contemporary research paradigms: Metaphor for the modes of inquiry. *TABOO: The Journal of Culture and Education*, 1, 153-163.
- Smidt, A. M., Rosenthal, M. N., Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2019). Out and in harm's way: Sexual minority students' psychological and physical health after institutional betrayal and sexual assault. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2019.1581867>

- Smith, C. S. & Freyd, J. J. (2013). Dangerous safe havens: Institutional betrayal exacerbates sexual trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 26*, 119-124.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jts.21778>
- Smith, L. M. (1978). 8: An evolving logic of participant observation, educational ethnography, and other case studies. *Review of Research in Education, 6*(1), 316–377.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X006001316>
- Solorzano, D. G. (1997). Images and words that wound: Critical Race Theory, racial stereotyping, and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*(3), 5–19.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478088>
- Solorzano, D. & Yosso, T. (2001). Critical Race and LatCrit Theory and method: Counter-storytelling. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(4), 471-495,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09518390110063365>
- Spencer, C., Mallory, A., Toews, M., Stith, S., & Wood, L. (2017). Why sexual assault survivors do not report to universities: A feminist analysis. *Family Relations, 66*, 166-179.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12241>
- Spencer, C., Stith, S., Durtschi, J., & Toews, M. (2020). Factors related to college students' decisions to report sexual assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 35*, 4666-4685.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517717490>
- Stader, D. L. & Williams-Cunningham, J. L. (2017). Campus sexual assault, institutional betrayal, and Title IX. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues, and Ideas, 90*, 198-202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2017.1361287>
- [Stake, R. E. \(2010\). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. Guilford Press.](#)

- Steele, T. (2018). Toxicity in the work environment: Retaining IVPSMs of color at a predominantly white institution. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 36(1), 109-123.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/csaj.2018.0007>
- Steinas, J. E. (2020). *Preparing student affairs administrators to support college Students of Color with mental health needs* (Order No. 28031023) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.
- Steiner, L. (2019). Addressing sexual harassment in journalism education. *Journalism*, 20(1), 118–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918809272>
- Stupakis, S. E, What the future may hold for victims of domestic and sexual violence without the Violence Against Women Act, *Hastings Women's* 30(261).
<https://repository.uchastings.edu/hwlj/vol30/iss2/7>
- Subedi, B. (2006). Theorizing a ‘halfie’ researcher’s identity in transnational fieldwork. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19, 573–593.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2014). *SAMHSA’s Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach* (HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14-4884). U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
- Sullivan, S., & Tauna, N. (2007). *Race and epistemologies of ignorance*. SUNY Press.
- Survivors’ Bill of Rights Act of 2016., Pub. L. No. 114-236 (2016).
<https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ236/PLAW-114pub236.pdf>

- University at Buffalo. (2020). *What is trauma-informed care?* Buffalo Center for Social Research: The Institute on Trauma and Trauma-Informed Care (ITTIC).
<http://socialwork.buffalo.edu/social-research/institutes-centers/institute-on-trauma-and-trauma-informed-care/what-is-trauma-informed-care.html>
- The SEC Network. (2018, June 18). *About the Southeastern Conference*.
<https://www.secsports.com/article/11067695/about-southeastern-conference>.
- Van der Kolk, B. (2015). *The body keeps the score: brain, mind, and body in the healing of trauma*. New York, New York: Penguin Books.
- van der Merwe, A., & Hunt, X. (2019). Secondary trauma among trauma researchers: Lessons from the field. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 11(1), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000414>
- Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 34 CFR § 668.46 [VAWA] (2013).
- Vojdik, V. K. (2017). Introduction: Forging the path forward: Critical conversations from Title IX: history, legacy, and controversy. *Tennessee Journal of Race, Gender, & Social Justice* 6(1), 1-6.
- Wallace, S., Wallace, C., Kenkre, J. E., & Brayford, J. (2018). Men who experience domestic abuse: A service perspective. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 11(2), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JACPR-03-2018-0353>
- Wiersma-Mosley, J. D., & DiLoreto, J. (2018). The role of Title IX coordinators on college and university campuses. *Behavioral Sciences* (Basel, Switzerland), 8(38), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/bs8040038>

- Wilson, J. M., Fauci, J. E., & Goodman, L. A. (2015). Bringing trauma-informed practice to domestic violence programs: A qualitative analysis of current approaches. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 85(6), 586–599. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000098>
- Wood, L., Voth Schrag, R., Hairston, D., & Jones, C. (2021). Exploring advocacy practices for interpersonal violence survivors on college campuses: Approaches and key factors. *Journal of Psychology of Violence*, 11(1), 28-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/vio0000343>
- Wooten, S. C. & Mitchell, R. W. (2016). *The crisis of campus sexual violence: Critical perspectives on prevention and response*. Routledge.
- World Health Organization [WHO]. (2021). *Health promotion*. WHO.
https://www.who.int/health-topics/health-promotion#tab=tab_1
- Yancy, G. (2018). *Backlash: What happens when we talk honestly about racism in America*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation*, 19(3), 321–332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389013497081>

Appendices

Appendix A – Participation Recruitment Email

Hello [INSERT POTENTIAL PARTICIPANT NAME HERE],

My name is Will Martinez (he/him/his), and I am a second-year master's student at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in the College Student Personnel program. I am completing a thesis focusing on supporting institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence, such as students in the LGBTQ+ community and/or Students of Color).

The study has four research questions:

1. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence staff members have of sexual violence resource utilization and support for institutionally underserved survivors at their university?
2. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence staff members have of their own intersectional identities and the impacts identity may have on the work they do?
3. How do universities support institutionally underserved survivors?
4. What education do faculty, staff, and students receive in supporting institutionally underserved survivors?

We are recruiting folks for a 60-75 minute virtual interview who:

1) Work at one of the institutions this study focuses on:

- Auburn University
- Clemson University
- Iowa State University
- Louisiana State University
- Michigan State University
- North Carolina State University
- Purdue University
- University of Alabama
- University of Florida
- University of Georgia
- University of Kentucky
- University of Minnesota
- University of Missouri
- University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- University of South Carolina
- University of Wisconsin
- Virginia Tech

2) Potentially work with institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence.

Your participation will be confidential and your name and institution will not be included as pseudonyms (a fake name) will be used.

If you believe you fit this criteria and would like to participate, please fill out this brief survey. Additionally, please feel free to forward this opportunity to other folks you might think fit this criteria.

Any questions or concerns can be addressed to the Principal Investigator, Will Martinez (wmarti27@tennessee.edu). I appreciate your time!

All my best,

Will Martinez

Appendix B – Participation Survey

Survey Purpose: To ensure the eligibility of participants who fit the parameters of the study. The survey will help determine if participants work at institutions included in the study and work with interpersonal violence/wellness offices and institutionally underserved survivors of sexual violence.

Process for Identifying Potential Survey Participants: Interpersonal violence/wellness staff members will be identified using campus wellness and Title IX staff webpages and online directories.

Key terms that will be included on the QuestionPro survey:

Institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence (IUS) include students who identify within the LGBTQ+ community and/or as a Student of Color who have experienced sexual violence.

Sexual violence can refer to sexual assault, rape, stalking, incest, intimate partner violence, domestic violence, and any other forms of sexually-motivated violence.

By entering this screening survey, I indicate that I have read the information attached (a copy of the consent for research participation) provided and agree to participate. Participation in the screening survey will not automatically lead to participation in the interview portion. You will be contacted if we would like to interview you.

Survey Questions

1. Name (short response)
2. Email (short response)
3. What institution do you currently work at? (drop-down selection menu)
4. What department/office do you currently work for? (short response)
5. What is your current title? (short response)
6. How long have you worked in this role? (short response)
7. Do you currently work with *institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence (IUS)* (i.e. students who identify within the LGBTQ+ community and/or as a Student of Color who have experienced sexual violence)?

Do you wish to participate in the interview phase of this study? (Yes, No, I need more information before committing)

Appendix C – Participation Interview Request

Hello [INSERT NAME OF POTENTIAL PARTICIPANT],

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the survey sent to you. Based on your results, I would like to schedule an interview with you if you are willing and able. Please send me any dates or times that work best for you. I have attached the informed consent to this email so you may read it and ask any questions. Additionally, we will review this consent together, answer any questions, and address any concerns before we begin the interview.

I am appreciate your willingness to be involved in this study! Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

All my best,

Will Martinez

Appendix D - Consent for Research Participation

Consent for Research Participation

Research Study Title: “Beyond Compliance: Critical Perspectives in Supporting Institutionally Underserved Survivors of Sexual Violence”

Researcher(s):

Principal Investigator: William Martinez, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Faculty Advisor: Dorian McCoy, Ph.D., University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Why am I being asked to be in this research study?

We are asking you to be in this research study because you work closely with *institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence* (IUS).

Institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence include students who identify within the LGBTQ+ community and/or as a Student of Color who have experienced sexual violence.

For this study, *sexual violence* can refer to sexual assault, rape, stalking, incest, intimate partner violence, domestic violence, and any other forms of sexually-motivated violence.

What is this research study about?

The purpose of the research study is to understand your social identities (race, gender, sex, etc.), the work you do to support institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence, how your institution supports IUS, and any education faculty, staff, and students on your campus receive specific to IUS.

Your participation will remain confidential throughout and after the research study and data you provide will be kept confidential.

How long will I be in the research study?

If you agree to be in the study, your participation in the virtual interview will last for 60 to 75 minutes. Interviews will take place between February 2021 and March 2021. Follow up confirming that we accurately represented what you said will also occur during this time.

What will happen if I say “Yes, I want to be in this research study”?

If you agree to be in this study, we will ask you to:

- Disclose your social identities
- Discuss the work you do on your campus, especially for those who are survivors of interpersonal violence in the LGBTQ+ community and/or identify as Students of Color, what this research study refers to as “institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence” or IUS.
- Discuss the work your institution does to support survivors, especially for those who are survivors of interpersonal violence in the LGBTQ+ community and/or identify as Students of Color, what this research study refers to as “institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence” or IUS.

Discuss the education your campus provides for supporting survivors of interpersonal violence, especially for those who are in the LGBTQ+ community and/or identify as Students of

Color, what this research study refers to as “institutionally underserved survivors of interpersonal violence” or IUS.

What happens if I say “No, I do not want to be in this research study”?

Being in this study is up to you. You can say no now or leave the study later. Either way, your decision won’t affect your relationship with the researchers or the University of Tennessee.

What happens if I say “Yes” but change my mind later?

Even if you decide to be in the study now, you can change your mind and stop at any time. If you decide to stop before the study is completed, you may contact the PI, William Martinez (wmarti27@vols.utk.edu).

If data is collected from you, data will be destroyed and not used in the study. If at some point during the research participant data cannot be withdrawn, such as after data are de-identified and code key destroyed or after a confidential survey is submitted, we will inform participants of that information.

Are there any possible risks to me?

It is possible that someone could find out you were in this study or see your study information, but we believe this risk is small because of the procedures we use to protect your information. These procedures are described later in this form.

Possible risks include psychological and social discomfort due to the sensitive nature of discussing interpersonal violence and systemic discrimination. To minimize these risks, we will allow participants to break at any point during the interview and will provide participants with a trauma resource guide.

As with any research study, there is a possibility for risks that are currently unknown and unanticipated. If any risks arise, please contact us immediately. Your safety and wellbeing is of the utmost importance to the researchers.

Are there any benefits to being in this research study?

We do not expect you to benefit from being in this study. Your participation may help us to learn more about survivors of interpersonal violence and support for LGBTQ+ and/or Students of Color who are survivors of interpersonal violence. We hope the knowledge gained from this study will benefit others in the future.

Participants may have access to the completed thesis and study results upon request.

Who can see or use the information collected for this research study?

Access to information collected for this research study will only be available to the Principal Investigator and Faculty Advisor. Information that may make participants identifiable will not be utilized. Best practices at institutions will be identified in the most general terms to ensure that institutions are not explicitly or implicitly mentioned.

We will protect the confidentiality of your information by using pseudonyms or fake names for both participants and their institutions. Additionally, all recordings and transcriptions will only be available to the Principal Investigator. Data will be coded as to not allow for identification of specific participants.

If information from this study is published or presented at scientific meetings, your name and other personal information will not be used.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information or what information came from you. Although it is unlikely, there are times when others may need to see the information we collect about you. These include:

- People at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville who oversee research to make sure it is conducted properly.
- Government agencies (such as the Office for Human Research Protections in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services), and others responsible for watching over the safety, effectiveness, and conduct of the research.
- If a law or court requires us to share the information, we would have to follow that law or final court ruling.

What will happen to my information after this study is over?

We will not keep your information to use for future research or other purposes. Your name and other information that can directly identify you will be kept secure and stored separately from your research data collected as part of the study.

We will not share your research data with other researchers.

What else do I need to know?

About four people will take part in this study. Because of the small number of participants in this study, it is possible that someone could identify you based on the information we collected from you. Information about your social identities and your perspectives in your work are extremely important to this study.

If we learn about any new information that may change your mind about being in the study, we will tell you. If that happens, you may be asked to sign a new consent form.

Who can answer my questions about this research study?

If you have questions or concerns about this study, or have experienced a research related problem or injury, contact the researchers:

Principal Investigator

William Martinez

wmarti27@vols.utk.edu

Faculty Advisor

Dorian McCoy

dmccoy5@utk.edu

For questions or concerns about your rights or to speak with someone other than the research team about the study, please contact:

Institutional Review Board

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

1534 White Avenue

Blount Hall, Room 408

Knoxville, TN 37996-1529

Phone: 865-974-7697

Email: utkirb@utk.edu

STATEMENT OF CONSENT

I have read this form and the research study has been explained to me. I have been given the chance to ask questions and my questions have been answered. If I have more questions, I have been told who to contact. By signing this document, I am agreeing to be in this study. I will receive a copy of this document after I sign it.

Printed Name of Adult Participant

Signature of Adult Participant

Date

Researcher Signature (to be completed at time of informed consent)

I have explained the study to the participant and answered all of his/her questions. I believe that he/she understands the information described in this consent form and freely consents to be in the study.

Printed Name of Research Team Member

Signature of Research Team Member

Date

Appendix E – Trauma Resource Guide Compassion Fatigue and Trauma Resource Guide

Compassion fatigue refers to the profound emotional and physical erosion that takes place when helpers are unable to refuel and regenerate or the cost of caring (Mathieu, 2012), the term *vicarious trauma* was coined by Pearlman (2012) to describe the profound shift in world view that occurs in helping professionals when they work with clients who have experienced trauma. Below are resources to help understand, identify, and combat both compassion fatigue and vicarious trauma.

The National Sexual Violence Resource Center: NSVRC provides resources for advocates and educators who support survivors.

Office for Victims of Crimes Vicarious Trauma Toolkit:

The OVC Vicarious Trauma Toolkit can be used to:

- conduct an assessment of your agency's current capacity as a vicarious trauma-informed organization;
- review your existing capacity, identify gaps, and prioritize needs;
- locate resources and tools to help meet your identified needs; and
- develop a comprehensive plan to address exposure to single incidents of crime or violence and acts of mass violence and terrorism.

The toolkit contains a repository of nearly 500 resources tailored specifically to address the vicarious trauma needs of their staff and promote resiliency.

Additional Literature and Resources:

- Ivicic, R., & Motta, R. (2017). Variables associated with secondary traumatic stress among mental health professionals. *Traumatology*, 23(2), 196–204. <https://doi.org/10.1037/trm0000065>
- Kanno, H. & Giddings, M. M. (2017). Hidden trauma victims: Understanding and preventing traumatic stress in mental health professionals. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 13(3), 331-353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2016.1220442>
- Lipsky, L. V. N. (2009). *Trauma stewardship: An everyday guide to caring for self while caring for others*. Berrett-Koehler.
- Mathieu, F. (2012). Compassion fatigue. In C. R. Figley (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of trauma*. Sage Publications.
- Nikischer, A. (2019). Vicarious trauma inside the academe: understanding the impact of teaching, researching and writing violence. *Higher Education* 77, 905–916. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0308-4>
- Ortiz, I. (2016). *How can victim advocates find balance when caring for themselves and supporting victims of gender-based violence?* VAWnet. <https://vawnet.org/news/how-can-victim-advocates-find-balance-when-caring-themselves-and-supporting-victims-gender>
- Pearlman, L. A. (2012). Vicarious trauma. In C. R. Figley (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of trauma*. Sage Publications.

Appendix F – Interview Protocol

Interview Purpose: The purpose of this study was two-fold. The first objective was to explore the perceptions interpersonal violence prevention IVPSMs have of their own intersectional identities, the impacts identity may have on the work they do, and education community stakeholders receive in supporting IUS. The second objective was to glean information on sexual violence resource utilization and support for institutionally underserved survivors.

Research Questions:

1. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence prevention IVPSMs have of sexual violence resource utilization and support for institutionally underserved survivors at their university?
2. What are the perceptions interpersonal violence prevention IVPSMs have of their own intersectional identities and the impacts identity may have on the work they do?
3. How do universities support institutionally underserved survivors?
4. What education do faculty, staff, and students receive in supporting institutionally underserved survivors?

Introduction:

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I greatly appreciate the work you do for your campus in your role supporting survivors. This research study focuses on the perceptions of interpersonal violence prevention IVPSMs and the resource utilization and support for students from marginalized backgrounds, specifically Students of Color and/or students in the LGBTQ+ community. Throughout this study, we refer to these students as institutionally underserved students and survivors of interpersonal violence (IUS).

Questions

The first few questions are to get to know you better.

1. Tell me about yourself
 - a. Where home is for you
 - b. What your degree is in
 - c. Social identities
2. Tell me about how you stepped into Title IX work.
 - a. How long have you been working in Title IX?
 - b. Have you worked at any other institutions?
 - c. Have you worked in any other functional areas?

Now we will transition to discussing the students you serve. To respect the confidentiality you must uphold, these questions will only ask about non-identifying information.

3. How would you describe the prevalence of interpersonal violence on your campus?
4. How would you describe support for students who are survivors? What support does your university provide for students?
5. Can you describe the education students, faculty, and IVPSMs have on institutionally underserved survivors?
6. Have you seen a specific student demographic (gender, sex, sexual orientation, race, ability, etc.) come to your office more often than other groups?
7. Are there any specific group of students you do not see come to your office?

8. Are there policies in place for specific groups of students based on their social identities (race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.)?

9. Speaking of identities, what role do you believe social identities have in interpersonal violence work?

- a. How have your multiple, intersecting identities such as race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, religious, ability, etc. informed or influenced your experiences in your current role?

10. Is there anything I did not ask in the interview that you would like to share?

Thank you so much again for your participation in this interview. I greatly appreciate

Appendix G – Table 1: Participant Demographic and Resource Information

	Denise Delta University	Beth Beta University	Carrie Alpha University	Anna Kappa University
Home	Midwest	Midwest	Midwest	Midwest
Education	working toward PhD in Counseling Education	Master's in social work	Working on PhD in Human development with concentration in social work	Master's in Public Health (MPH)
Race	white	white	mixed Black	white
Gender	Cis-gender woman	Woman	Woman	Woman
Orientation	Heterosexual	Queer	Did not specify	Straight
Other identities disclosed	N/A	mother of biracial children	N/A	N/A
Role	Graduate Assistant	Coordinator	Director	Assistant Director

Appendix H – Table 2: Student Utilization and Resource Referral Comparison

	Denise	Beth	Carrie	Anna
Students Using Services Most Often	white females	white women LGBTQ+ students	white heterosexual women/females	white females (especially Greek students)
Students Not Using Services Often	Asian students International students	Black students International students	First generation students International students LGBTQ+ students Students of Color Students with Disabilities	LGBTQ+ students
Increase in Student Utilization	African American females	Men	N/A	Black females Males
Offices IVPSM Worked With		Title IX Identity-based/multicultural center Academic Departments (education; human development & family studies) Accessibility/Disability Center International Center Campus Police	Title IX Housing/Residence Life Identity-based/multicultural office International Center Academic Departments (Gender and Women’s Studies and Public Health)	Title IX Dean of Students Housing/Residence Life Accessibility/Disability Center Identity-based/multicultural office Campus Medical/Psychological Services
Education Programs and Initiatives Mentioned	Green Dot		Green Dot Active Bystander and Anti-Discrimination Consent Mini-series with MBA students	Bystander Intervention

Appendix I – IRB Approval

March 08, 2021

William Alexander Martinez

UTK- Dean of Students

Re: UTK IRB-21-06273-XP

Study Title: Beyond Compliance: Critical Perspectives in Supporting Institutionally Underserved Survivors of Sexual Violence

Dear William Alexander Martinez:

The UTK Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed your application for the above referenced project. It determined that your application is eligible for expedited review under 45 CFR 46.110(b)(1), category/ies (5) and (7). The use of children as subjects is approved under 45 CFR 46.404, in that it involves no more than minimal risk. The use of pregnant women and fetuses as subjects is approved under 45 CFR 46.204. The IRB has reviewed these materials and determined that they do comply with proper consideration for the rights and welfare of human subjects and the regulatory requirements for the protection of human subjects.

Therefore, this letter constitutes full approval by the IRB of your application (version 1.4). You are approved to enroll a maximum of 4 participants. Approval of this study will be valid from March 08, 2021 to 03/07/2022.

Approval Information:

Categories 6 and 7

4 participants

Written informed consent

Continuing Review Required – PI is a student

Approved Documents:

Application version 1.4

Consent for Beyond Compliance - Version 1.1

Martinez Interview Participation Request - Version 1.0

Trauma Resource Guide - Version 1.0

Martinez Recruitment Email - Version 1.0

QuestionPro Survey Outline and Interview Protocol - Version 1.0

Please note that restrictions are in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and all in-person contact with research participants is on hold until further notice.

- Newly-approved studies with in-person interactions may not begin enrollment until further notice from the IRB/HRPP. Please submit a UTK Request to Resume In-Person Research Activity During COVID-19 if you wish to receive an exception to institutional restrictions. See <https://irb.utk.edu/covid-19/> for complete forms and instructions.
- Newly-approved studies with no in-person participant interaction may begin after receiving IRB approval.

Please monitor the COVID-19 Updates at <https://www.utk.edu/coronavirus/faq/> for the latest information. Human Subjects Research updates are being filed under Information for Instructors/Research.

Any revisions in the approved application, consent forms, instruments, recruitment materials, etc., must be submitted to and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. In addition, you are responsible for reporting any unanticipated serious adverse events or other problems involving risks to subjects or others in the manner required by the local IRB policy.

Finally, re-approval of your project is required by the IRB in accord with the conditions specified above. You may not continue the research study beyond the time or other limits specified unless you obtain prior written approval of the IRB.

Sincerely,
Lora Beebe, Ph.D., PMHNP-BC, FAAN
Chair

Vita

William (Will) Alexander Martinez (he/him/his) was born in Knoxville, Tennessee and moved to Lawrenceville, Georgia at the age of ten. Will attended Emory University from 2014 to 2018 and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in anthropology and minor in sociology where he researched the impacts of police brutality on gender/sexual minorities. Will's passion for higher education and social justice began at Emory where he was involved in residence life, admissions, and student advocacy. In 2018, Will began his master's degree in sociology (critical race and ethnic studies concentration) before moving to the college student personnel program in 2019. While in his master's program, Will worked in University Housing, the Center for Health Education and Wellness, and the Pride Center. Throughout his research, Will examines anti-oppressive praxis to support historically underserved students. Will received his Master of Science in college student personnel and began a Ph.D. in public health sciences at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in summer 2021.