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SURVEY INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The University of Hawai‘i (UH), under the leadership of President David Lassner, is actively engaged in continuous improvement of UH’s campus climate so that students can achieve academic success and personal growth in a safe and supportive environment.

Recognizing that sexual harassment and gender-based violence are prevalent among college students nationwide, campus leaders have taken proactive steps to address these issues. UH instituted a systemwide focus on sexual harassment and gender-based violence to enhance consistency of policies and procedures across all 10 campuses, forming in 2015 a new Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) under the Vice President for Administration. Jennifer Solidum Rose, J.D. was appointed to lead OIE as its founding director.

Since its formation, OIE has actively developed the policies and programs to prevent sexual harassment and gender-based violence and engaged with internal and external stakeholders on all campuses. Key initiatives included the following: Act 222 Affirmative Consent Task Force; the University’s Executive Policy 1.204 Sex Discrimination and Gender-Based Violence; launch of accessible, online and live Title IX training for University employees and students; development of online Title IX case management and intake system; and the development of partnerships with direct service providers in the community.

As a result of extensive community and University stakeholder dialogue, OIE received legislative support to carry out President Lassner’s commitment to scientifically assess incidence and prevalence of sexual harassment and gender-based violence and measure student awareness and perception of resources and rights systemwide. The stated purpose of the survey was: “to guide and inform UH’s policy, training and programmatic initiatives with respect to fulfilling the University’s obligations under Title IX and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and its mission of providing a safe and discrimination-free learning and working environment.” UH specified that the survey include the following areas of inquiry:

- Student perceptions of their campus environment as related to sexual harassment and gender-based violence, including how well the UH community is perceived in responding to student concerns
- Student awareness of UH policies, resources, and the reporting options available for those experiencing sexual harassment or gender-based violence
- Prevalence and incidence of sexual harassment and gender-based violence, including nonconsensual sexual contact, dating and domestic violence, stalking, and sexual harassment
- A description of those who experienced gender violence
The University of Hawai‘i Student Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Violence (hereafter referred to as the UH Survey) was first conducted in 2017, and this 2019 report updates the benchmark findings. The UH Survey is one of the first studies of an entire university system, encompassing four-year universities, community colleges and graduate and professional schools. It assessed sexual harassment and gender-based violence on the most diverse university system in the nation. Although the University of Hawai‘i has conducted smaller-scaled assessments in the past, this was the first comprehensive census of adult UH students with respect to sexual harassment and gender-based violence across all of the system’s 10 campuses. Further, it was the largest known online internet survey to date in Hawai‘i.

The 2017 UH Campus Climate Report on Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Violence was submitted to both the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice. The report was accepted as meeting their requirements.

The University of Hawai‘i Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) coordinated this survey as part of its larger mission. Research planning and development in 2019 utilized survey input from both students and end users, including UH Title IX Campus Coordinators, from UH adult student focus groups statewide which recruited from all campuses, from a comprehensive review of comments, inputs and questions in follow-up to the 2017 report, and from learnings of other surveys on gender violence.

UH contracted with Omnitрак Group, Inc. to undertake the survey in collaboration with OIE, Title IX Coordinators and other stakeholders as well as with student focus group input. Omnitрак, an independent Hawai‘i-based market research company, is led by a former United Nations social development planner with 35+ years of expertise researching sensitive subjects in the State. It utilized a national-local team to administer this survey. For this survey, Omnitрак teamed with two well-known national subject-matter experts: Professor Sandra L. Martin, Ph.D., Associate Dean of Research at the Gillings School of Global Public Health at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; and Professor Bonnie S. Fisher, Ph.D., of the School of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati and author of Unsafe in the Ivory Tower: The Sexual Victimization of College Women. Both Drs. Martin and Fisher consulted on the benchmark Association of American Universities (AAU) 2015 Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct. They joined Omnitрак’s team in 2017 and continued in 2019 with involvement in the pre-planning stage, remaining actively involved through analysis, writing and presentation of results.
CAMPUS CLIMATE APPROACH

Different definitions of campus climate are used by universities across the country in relation to sexual harassment and gender-based violence. For its 2015 study, the Association of American Universities (AAU) in its *Campus Climate on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct Survey* (2015) focused on prevalence, student knowledge, attitudes and behavior around sexual assault and gender-based violence. The 2015 AAU survey, conducted among 27 institutions of higher education, reported in detail on four types of gender-based violence students experienced; perceptions of safety and personal risk of gender-based violence; knowledge of and attitudes toward universities’ policy definitions; students’ rights; processes and programs to support students experiencing gender violence; actions, if any, taken by victims; and their perceptions of the interaction. AAU repeated this study in 2019.

For its 2017 benchmark survey of sexual harassment and gender-based violence, UH adopted the AAU approach. The AAU questionnaire, which is in the public domain, was utilized because it had previously undergone testing among students at 27 universities. Further, a methodological report was available, analyzing the instrument and recommendations for change.

Because the UH study was one of the first surveys encompassing multiple academic degree programs and one of the most diverse student populations in the nation, Omnitrac built upon AAU learnings with a rigorous program to gather local input and respond to Hawai‘i-based needs. Thus the 2019 UH Campus Climate Survey on Gender Violence additionally undertook a series of steps to ensure that the design of the survey instrument took into consideration the following: 1) learnings from other gender violence studies in the U.S., 2) issues and areas of concern at the University of Hawai‘i, and 3) alignment with UH’s diverse campus system. These additional design actions included the following:

- Direct student input through focus groups of undergraduate, graduate and professional school students conducted on all islands. Focus group implementation took place from August 28, 2018 through September 12, 2018 and gathered design input from different student constituencies.
- A survey planning dialogue with representatives from each campus, most of whom were Title IX coordinators; and
- A design meeting with the UH survey planning team and its local and national consultants to review the 2015 survey and discuss potential enhancements.

Local focus groups among UH students representing all campuses and covering all islands supplemented nationally derived input during the questionnaire development phase. The scope of UH inquiry into the campus climate included the percentage of students experiencing four types of gender-based violence; perceptions of safety on- and off-campus; to whom students reported gender-based violence incidence; whether students experiencing gender violence felt they had been treated with respect and with consideration for their privacy and safety; and sufficiency of student knowledge and attitudes of UH policies, programs and processes of sexual harassment and misconduct to be able to take action.
METHODOLOGY

To provide an empirical assessment of students experiencing sexual harassment and gender-based violence across UH’s entire statewide higher education system, the survey methodology was uniformly administered across all 10 campuses at the same time. Analysis of survey findings produced statistically reliable estimates for the UH System on four types of sexual harassment and gender-based violence behaviors and on tactics used systemwide as well as for each university campus, the aggregated community colleges, and undergraduates and students in graduate and professional schools. Separate estimates were calculated for relevant student sub-groups.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument included 143 questions organized into 11 sections. The questions were designed to identify conduct which UH is interested in preventing, and for student accessibility. The scope of inquiry included:

- Incidence and prevalence of sexual harassment and gender-based violence (including sexual harassment, stalking, dating and domestic violence [also referenced as intimate partner violence], and nonconsensual sexual contact)
- The section with questions about nonconsensual sexual contact (including both sexual penetration and sexual touching/non-penetration) also asked about the following four types of tactics used by offenders. Differentiation by these tactics was important because the first two may rise to the level of criminal conduct in addition to being potential policy violations.
  - Physical force or threat of physical force;
  - Incapacitation due to drugs, alcohol or being unconscious, asleep or passed out;
  - Coercive threats of non-physical harm or promised rewards;
  - Absence of active, ongoing, voluntary agreement
- The UH Survey asked about sexual harassment and gender-based violence and student impacts during two time periods:
  - **At any time while enrolled at UH** – This time period captured all incidents over the tenure of the student’s years of enrollment, allowing computation of a cumulative incidence of events since first enrolling in UH up until the time of the survey; and
  - **Since the beginning of the Fall 2018 term** – This “current academic year” question captured only those events that occurred during one full semester (Fall 2018) and the first month or two of the second semester (Spring 2019).
The survey instrument included the following sections:

- Section A: Background
- Section B: Perceptions of Risk
- Section C: Resources
- Section D: Sexual Harassment
- Section E: Stalking
- Section F: Dating and Domestic Violence (only asked of students who have ever been in a partnered relationship while enrolled at UH)
- Section G: Nonconsensual Sexual Contact Screener
- Section G(A): Detailed Incident Forms for Sexual Penetration
- Section G(B): Detailed Incident Forms for Sexual Touching
- Section H: Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Violence Prevention Training
- Section I: Perceptions of Responses to Reporting
- Section J: Bystander Behavior
- Section K: Debriefing Item

If students reported an incident of Sexual Harassment, Stalking, and Dating and Domestic Violence, they were asked follow-up questions that generally included incidence, relationship with offender, offender’s association with UH, whether a power relationship exists between perpetrator and survivor, the consequences the survivor suffered as a result of the gender violence incident, and whether or not they contacted UH resources about the incident.

If students reported an incident of nonconsensual sexual contact, they were asked further questions about the timing of the offense (at any time while enrolled at UH, or during the current academic year), offender tactics involved (e.g., physical force; incapacitation; coercion, or absence of affirmative consent as detailed above), and asked to complete a detailed form on their most recent incident. If the most recent incident involved nonconsensual sexual penetration, students were asked approximately 18 questions, such as location of the incident, involvement of alcohol and drug usage, contact with UH resources, and post-incident consequences, etc. Students who most recently experienced non-penetrative nonconsensual sexual contact were asked to complete a shorter form. The incident form was shortened after the instrument’s pre-test and cognitive testing because students found the questions lengthy and the incident form presented a risk of termination bias. These results were consistent with the AAU methodology report, which found higher termination rates while completing the incident forms.
Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which questions, rating scales or measurements accurately reflect the concepts that the study intends to measure. The UH Survey underwent a process of validation during development of the survey instrument. Much of the survey utilized questions that had been constructed and tested for the AAU survey, which was developed with input from multiple subject matter experts from 27 AAU-member institutions of higher education nationwide. Their input helped to establish the content validity of the constructs that were measured in the AAU survey. In addition, the chairperson of the AAU Design Committee (Dr. Martin) and the Co-Principal Investigator of the AAU project (Dr. Fisher) consulted on the UH Survey design from its inception. The AAU survey questions were tested by using two rounds of cognitive interviewing. Moreover, students and university liaisons from a participating university provided comments and feedback on the survey, which were used in survey revision. Over 150,000 (n=150,072 in undergraduate and graduate/professional programs) students across the country completed the AAU survey during the Spring of 2015. AAU released a methodological report, and its analyses and recommendations were considered in the UH Survey development.

Although the UH Survey was based on the AAU survey, it was refined in light of input from a variety of sources. Both Drs. Fisher and Martin, national subject matter experts, offered guidance throughout the survey development process. In addition, the UH Survey was reviewed in detail by the UH Campus Climate Survey Advisory Group subject matter experts. Omnitark also conducted 10 focus groups among UH students from across the System’s 10 campuses. Focus group members provided information on the clarity of the survey questions, including the definitions used for the types of gender violence. Working in collaboration with Drs. Fisher and Martin, Omnitark staff, OIE and the Advisory Group reviewed the AAU Survey Methodological Report, focus group results, and recommendations made by the two national consultants and Omnitark before approving the questionnaire for testing. Omnitark then conducted cognitive testing among 50 students including those who experienced gender violence, probing for whether they understood the question and what it was asking. OIE gave final approval to the UH Survey as a result of these processes and after cognitive test results.

Sampling Procedure

The survey sampling frame included 40,861 undergraduate, graduate and professional school students across all 10 University of Hawai‘i statewide campuses (UH Mānoa, UH Hilo, UH West O‘ahu, Hawai‘i Community College, Honolulu Community College, Kapi‘olani Community College, Kaua‘i Community College, Leeward Community College, UH Maui College, and Windward Community College) who met the following criteria:

- Were enrolled either full-time or part-time in the UH Spring 2019 semester; and
- Were age 18 years or older.

UH provided a database of student email addresses for students who met the survey screening criteria.
Data Collection

Data were collected via a self-administered, online web survey. Students also had the option of requesting a paper copy of the survey, which would be mailed to them along with a business reply envelope addressed to Omnitrak Group in which to return the survey.

The data collection process was multi-phased:

- A pre-survey implementation program promoted the survey across all 10 campuses in heavily trafficked areas.
- UH President David Lassner sent a letter to all Spring 2019 semester enrolled students 18 years or older inviting participation in the survey through an Omnitrak account. Each email included a unique link for the student to access the online survey. Students were requested to click on the link to complete the survey. The link enabled students to save answers and to return to the survey at a later date. When done, students submitted their surveys anonymously, and their identity and the completed survey were de-linked. Data were stored securely in Omnitrak’s encrypted server accessible only to staff with security certification.
- The University of Hawai‘i Office of Institutional Equity (OIE) encouraged campus specific initiatives to motivate survey participation. Before and during the survey execution phase, Title IX coordinators organized Campus Roll Out teams to plan and execute campus-specific promotional programs.
- Omnitrak administered a reminder program, thanking students for their responses and requesting students who had not yet responded to complete the survey. Others within the university system also had the option of sending reminders to students. In some classes, professors verbally encouraged survey participation.

To encourage participation in the survey, students were offered the opportunity to receive incentives of $10 and $5 for early responses. Students were not required to complete the survey to receive the incentive.

Survey data collection began on January 22, 2019 and was completed on February 25, 2019. The UH Survey field period was longer than the AAU average by about one week and was recommended given Omnitrak’s experience with the length of data collection time in Hawai‘i for internet surveys.
Data Analysis

**Definition of Completed Surveys to Estimate Survey Response Rates.**

For a survey to be classified as “completed,” it had to meet both of the following criteria:

- The survey participant spent at least five minutes completing the questionnaire before submitting the completed survey. This criterion was used to eliminate students who spent so little time online that they could not have read and answered the questions in the survey.
- For partial surveys where the submit button was not pressed, at least one question was answered in each of the gender violence sections (the last of which was near the end of the survey), except for section F which required screening for partnered relationship. This criterion was used for the definition of “complete” because a core goal of the survey was to measure the prevalence of various types of gender violence.

UH students systemwide who submitted a completed survey were analyzed as a percent of the total adult student enrollment for the Spring 2019 semester to derive an overall response rate. Additionally, students’ self-reported data from completed surveys were used to categorize survey participants and the number of completed surveys was analyzed as a percent of UH’s sub-group enrollment numbers to compute sub-group response rates.

**Non-Response Bias Analysis**

In addition to response rates, non-response bias analyses (NBA) was conducted for the UH System and for its campuses. Although all adult students enrolled in the Spring 2019 semester were invited to participate in the survey, students self-selected or made an individual decision whether or not to do so. This self-selection process made it possible that certain behavioral or attitudinal characteristics were correlated with survey participation.

Past sexual harassment and gender-based violence surveys acknowledged the possibility that those who have experienced the types of violence surveyed or had strong attitudes toward the subject were more likely to complete the survey. It was also acknowledged that those who have experienced gender violence might find recall painful and choose not to participate in the survey. While the former would result in potentially higher estimates of sexual harassment and gender-based violence, the latter would result in lower estimates.

To probe the issue of non-response bias, Omnitrak analyzed the percentage of survey participants who reported experiencing the four types of gender violence, comparing the “early” participants to the “late” participants (note that participants who completed surveys in the first half of the data collection period were defined as “early” participants and those who completed surveys in the last half of the data collection period were defined as “late” participants). Results showed that both the early and late survey participants experienced each of the types of gender violence. For three of the four gender-based violence areas (stalking, dating and non-consensual sexual contact), prevalence rates showed no statistical difference between early and late survey participants. For sexual harassment, the prevalence rates were significantly
higher statistically for early participants compared to late participants. Given the greater percentages of early participants who experienced sexual harassment compared to late participants, it is plausible that UH students were somewhat more likely to participate in the survey if they had experienced this form of gender violence. The AAU Survey Methodological Report (2015) found similar results between early and late survey participants. For almost all compared outcomes but coercion and bystander intervention, the differences were statistically significant and in the direction of a positive bias. In other words, late participants were less likely to report gender violence than early participants in the AAU survey.

### Table 1: Percent of Survey Participants Experiencing Different Types of Gender Violence At Any Time While Enrolled by Date of Survey Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Gender Violence</th>
<th>All UH CAMPUSES (n=6314)</th>
<th>EARLY SURVEY PARTICIPANTS (n=3902)</th>
<th>LATE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS (n = 2412)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>14.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating and domestic violence¹</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconsensual sexual contact</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shows a statistically significant difference between early and late participants

¹ The estimate of Dating/Domestic Violence was based on student participants who had ever been in a partnered relationship while enrolled at UH (69.7% of all participants). The total number of early participants included for dating and domestic violence estimate is 2,716, and the total number of late participants is 1,665.

### Data Weighting

Students who submitted completed surveys were then compared with UH-provided demographic and academic characteristics of its Spring 2019 adult student population. These included demographic characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, etc. as well as academic characteristics such as campus, enrollment level or type of student, year of study, etc. For surveys where demographic variables were missing, values were imputed through random allocation proportionate to answers provided by students with similar characteristics for final reporting.

Results of the composition comparison were used to weight survey results using the following variables: gender, campus, age, ethnicity and year in school. The composition comparison and subsequent weighting was limited based on the data available within the UH census. For example, there were eight gender identity categories in the survey and the official UH data only identified two gender categories. To be consistent with AAU weighting procedures, a Transgender Woman was grouped into Woman, and a Transgender Man was grouped into Man for weighting purpose, and cases with other identities or those with missing information were assigned to be either Female or Male based on neighboring cases with similar characteristics. This was for weighting purpose only, and gender tabulation in final report specifies Female, Male, Transgender/ Genderqueer/Questioning or Non-conforming (TGQN), and Decline.
In terms of campus, the variables used were each of the 10 campuses, with community colleges aggregated to one variable for analytical purposes in this report. Because of a wider range of ages at UH community colleges, six categories by year were used – 18 to 19, 20 to 21, 22 to 24, 25 to 29, 30 to 34, and 35 and older. Ethnicity variables included Caucasian, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian, Japanese, Mixed, and Other (which for purpose of weighting included Pacific Islander and Hispanic). Year in school weights were specific to the three universities with variables including freshman, sophomore, junior and senior classifications.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Survey results were analyzed to calculate frequency of responses systemwide for each of the questions by number and percentage of survey participants. The survey team also analyzed and estimated UH Survey findings of the percentage of students experiencing each of the four types of sexual harassment and gender-based violence (i.e., sexual harassment, stalking, dating/domestic violence, and nonconsensual sexual contact).

Descriptive statistics were also used to examine differences in the experiences of students by prevalence of gender violence, attitudes, and other results. Past studies in gender violence among university students provided insight on analytical variables that might be correlated with the prevalence of gender violence, and these became starting points for exploring factors associated with gender violence risk. These studies include but were not limited to Cantor et al., 2015; Fisher et al., 2000; White et al., 2004; Krebs et al., 2009; Gross et al., 2004; Koss et al., 1987. (See References at end of report.)

Building on these past surveys and using insights provided by the UH Advisory Group and UH focus groups, gender violence prevalence was analyzed by students’ demographic and academic characteristics including the following:

- **Demographic Characteristics** – Including gender identity, sexual orientation, (e.g., heterosexual/straight, gay or lesbian, bisexual, asexual, not listed, questioning, and declined to state), ethnicity, residence status, and disability status.
- **Academic Characteristics** – Including campus, type of student (university undergraduate, graduate/professional student, and community college student), year in school, and club participation.

**Statistical Significance Testing**

To determine if results within a sub-group were statistically different from each other, significance tests were computed, including the Z-test to determine differences, if any, in percentages for two or more student groups and T-test to determine differences, if any, in the means for two or more student groups. The data file contained within the appendix of this report shows overall frequencies as in percentages, frequencies by sub-groups, and the result of significance testing computations within the sub-group category.
Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to measure one type of reliability, namely, internal consistency (how closely related a set of survey items are as a group) of responses between multi-item statements. Internal consistency analyses were conducted on each of three banks of questions that used Likert scales: 1) perception of campus climate (survey items B1 – B3); 2) knowledge of UH policies and procedures of sexual assault and sexual harassment (survey items C2a – C2e); and 3) perception of reporting on sexual assault and sexual harassment (survey items I1 – I9). Results found that the Cronbach's Alpha for perception of campus climate was 0.738, knowledge of UH policies and procedures of sexual assault and sexual harassment was 0.908, and perception of reporting on sexual assault and sexual harassment was 0.928. (See Appendix V for the survey items analyzed and detailed results of these analyses.) These results indicated moderate to high levels of internal consistency for the three series of questions since all of the Cronbach Alpha results were above the value of 0.7, which is considered an acceptable level of internal consistency (UCLA Institute for Digital Research and Education, 2017).
DEFINITIONS

1. **Ethnicity** – All ethnic variables were self-reported with multiple responses permitted. This question asks for a student’s ethnic background as self-identified, not genetic ancestry. The Native Hawaiian variable specifies “Native Hawaiian or Part Hawaiian.”

2. **Four (4) types of behaviors** – This term references the four (4) types of gender violence behaviors researched in the UH Survey: Sexual harassment, stalking, dating and domestic violence (also referred to as intimate partner violence), and nonconsensual sexual contact. At the outset of sections on each type of gender violence, survey questions and their question numbers are shown. The survey instrument is contained in Appendix IV.C.

3. **n =** – This references the base of students who answered a specific question. It is the denominator used in calculating the percent if used in a table or graph.

4. **Nonconsensual sexual touching** – This term covers one of two categories of nonconsensual sexual contact. It is used interchangeably with non-penetrative nonconsensual sexual contact. The other behavioral contact category is nonconsensual sexual penetration.

5. **Offender** – Refers to alleged offender of one or more types of gender violence researched in the UH Survey. Neither the term victim nor perpetrator was used because of criminal implications.

6. **Prevalence & Incidence** – The UH Survey collected information to allow estimation of the extent of four forms of gender violence (sexual harassment, stalking, dating/domestic violence and nonconsensual sexual contact) during two time periods (during the current academic year, and during any time while enrolled at UH).

Prevalence, a measure of the percent of persons who experienced the event of interest during a particular time period, can be estimated by dividing the number of survey participants experiencing one or more such events during the time period of interest by the total number of survey participants (Truman & Langton, 2015). Since multiple events (incidents) of a particular type of gender violence can be experienced by an individual within a particular time period (e.g., an individual is sexually harassed three times during a one year period), survey questions also asked about the number of times each of the forms of gender violence occurred during the current academic year and during any time while enrolled at UH. Summing the numbers of events experienced by all survey participants during a particular time period results in a measure of incidence (the number of events that occurred during a time period of interest) (National Institute of Justice, 2008).
7. **Survey Participants** – This references the base of students who answered a specific question. It is the denominator used in calculating the percent if used in a table or graph. Survey participants are referenced as “n =.”

8. **Tactics** – This refers to the techniques used by offenders to commit gender violence against a student. For nonconsensual sexual contact, for example, tactics include physical force (completed or attempted); incapacitation due to drugs, alcohol or being unconscious, asleep or passed out; coercion or threats of non-physical harm or promised rewards; and absence of active, ongoing, voluntary agreement.

9. **UH System** – Refers to all UH students enrolled across all 10 UH campuses.
OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
Survey Response Rates
In 2019, response rates for the UH Campus Climate Study on Sexual Harassment and Gender Violence exceeded that in 2017 – which was higher than public universities participating in the Association of American Universities (AAU) Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct. Completed survey response rates rose to 15.5 percent for 2019 from 14.1 percent for 2017. Details follow.

All students enrolled throughout the entire 10-campus UH System in the Spring 2019 semester received an email invitation from UH President David Lassner to participate in the survey. This student census totaled 40,861 students. Of this, 7,491 or 18.3 percent initiated the survey, either submitting or leaving their responses in their survey account without pressing the submit button. A total of 6,314 of the surveys started met the criteria established for “completed surveys” which was consistently applied in both 2017 and 2019. This resulted in a completed survey response rate of 15.5 percent.

Although the completed survey response rates differed somewhat by campus, variances were less than in 2017. Across all 10 campuses, response rates ranged from 23.3 percent to 10.3 percent. While four-year campuses’ response rates stood both higher and lower than 2017, all community college campuses showed increases over response rates two years ago, ranging from 10.3 to 16.5 percent, up from 6.7 to 11.3 percent in 2017. By gender, female student response rates of 18.3 percent significantly exceeded those of male students. This pattern held in comparisons of gender and academic level: Female undergraduates’ response rate of 18.1 percent compared with male undergraduates of 10.7. Female students in graduate and professional schools response rate of 17.2 percent exceeded the 11.6 percent response rate of male graduate and professional survey respondents. In contrast to 2017 when graduate and professional school response rates differed from undergraduates by +9 points, 2019 response rates by academic level were comparable at 15.4 percent for undergraduates and 15.5 percent for graduate/professional schools.

Description of the Sample
To ensure that the sample for this study was representative of the UH student population during the Spring 2019 semester, Omnítrak conducted a non-response bias analysis to determine demographic sample bias. The process was identical to 2017: The UH Administration compiled a profile of Spring 2019 students by analyzing the composition of all enrolled students. Upon receipt from the University’s Office of Institutional Equity, Omnítrak used the UH Profile as the basis for comparing survey participants to UH’s actual student body for weighting the sample.

Overall, the composition comparison showed that the sample of students who completed the survey and the UH systemwide census profile were fairly well aligned. Generally, the sample was quite representative of UH students in the profile provided in terms of age, ethnicity, education level and geographic location of campus. However, the comparison indicated over-representation by female students and students from some campuses. Weighting was therefore conducted on gender at the campus level. Further campus-by-campus analyses of the survey participant profiles with UH campus profiles showed that while age, school year and ethnicity were generally aligned overall, some biases existed. A secondary weighting scheme
balancing age, school year and ethnicity by campus was hence applied to enhance representativeness of survey respondents with UH profiles at the campus level.

The weighted sample was representative of the UH System’s student population and of the campus populations. At a 95 percent confidence level, the total UH System sample size carries a sampling error of +/- 1.1 percent.

| Table A-1: Comparison of All UH Students and Students with Completed Surveys, and Completed Survey Response Rates, by Student Characteristics - 2019 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| UH Adult Student Population System-wide (Est. N =) | UH Adult Student Population System-wide (%) | Survey Participants Unweighted (n) | Survey Participants Unweighted (%) | Survey Participants Weighted (n) | Survey Participants Weighted (%) | Survey Response Rate (%) |
| TOTAL | 40,861 | 100% | 6,314 | 100% | 6,314 | 100% | 15.5% |
| GENDER | | | | | | | |
| Male | 16,316 | 39.9% | 1,852 | 29.3% | 2,555 | 40.5% | 11.4% |
| Female | 23,370 | 57.2% | 4,279 | 67.8% | 3,572 | 56.6% | 18.3% |
| TGQN/Decline/Unknown (Not Comparable) | 1175 | 2.9% | 183 | 2.9% | 186 | 3.0% | 15.6% |
| AGE | | | | | | | |
| 18 to 19 years | 9,154 | 22.4% | 1,532 | 24.3% | 1,363 | 21.6% | 16.7% |
| 20 to 21 years | 8,900 | 21.8% | 1,356 | 21.5% | 1,374 | 21.8% | 15.2% |
| 22 to 24 years | 7,587 | 18.6% | 1,056 | 16.7% | 1,188 | 18.8% | 13.9% |
| 25 to 29 years | 6,329 | 15.5% | 914 | 14.5% | 995 | 15.8% | 14.4% |
| 30 to 34 years | 3,382 | 8.3% | 531 | 8.4% | 531 | 8.4% | 15.7% |
| 35 and older | 5,508 | 13.5% | 925 | 14.6% | 864 | 13.7% | 16.8% |
| ETHNICITY | | | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 7,210 | 17.6% | 1,039 | 16.5% | 1,082 | 17.1% | 14.4% |
| Chinese | 1,777 | 4.3% | 283 | 4.5% | 288 | 4.6% | 15.9% |
| Filipino | 5,907 | 14.5% | 865 | 13.7% | 923 | 14.6% | 14.6% |
| Hawaiian/Part Hawaiian | 9,436 | 23.1% | 1,479 | 23.4% | 1,451 | 23.0% | 15.7% |
| Hispanic | 724 | 1.8% | 202 | 3.2% | 188 | 3.0% | 27.9% |
| Japanese | 2,740 | 6.7% | 376 | 6.0% | 445 | 7.1% | 13.7% |
| Pacific Islander | 907 | 2.2% | 118 | 1.9% | 113 | 1.8% | 13.0% |
| Mixed | 9,446 | 23.1% | 1,603 | 25.4% | 1,463 | 23.2% | 17.0% |
| All Other | 2,715 | 6.6% | 349 | 5.5% | 360 | 5.7% | 12.9% |
| ENROLLMENT LEVEL | | | | | | | |
| Undergraduate | 35,834 | 87.7% | 5,533 | 87.6% | 5,537 | 87.7% | 15.4% |
| Graduate/Professional School | 5,027 | 12.3% | 781 | 12.4% | 777 | 12.3% | 15.5% |
| GENDER & ENROLLMENT LEVEL | | | | | | | |
| Male Undergraduate | 15,072 | 36.9% | 1,617 | 25.6% | 2,250 | 35.6% | 10.7% |
| Male Graduate/Professional | 2,025 | 5.0% | 235 | 3.7% | 306 | 4.8% | 11.6% |
| Female Undergraduates | 20,762 | 50.8% | 3,762 | 59.6% | 3,127 | 49.5% | 18.1% |
| Female Graduates/Professionals | 3,002 | 7.3% | 517 | 8.2% | 445 | 7.0% | 17.2% |
| TGQN/Decline Undergraduate (not comparable) | -- | -- | 154 | 2.4% | 160 | 2.5% | -- |
| TGQN/Decline/Graduates & Professionals (not comparable) | -- | -- | 29 | 0.5% | 27 | 0.4% | -- |
| CAMPUS | | | | | | | |
| UH Mānoa | 16,168 | 39.6% | 2,523 | 40.0% | 2,498 | 39.6% | 15.6% |
| UH Hilo | 3,111 | 7.6% | 724 | 11.5% | 481 | 7.6% | 23.3% |
| UH West O‘ahu | 2,719 | 6.7% | 450 | 7.1% | 420 | 6.7% | 16.8% |
| Community Colleges | | | | | | | |
| Kapi‘olani | 2,015 | 4.9% | 279 | 4.4% | 311 | 4.9% | 13.8% |
| Leeward | 2,413 | 5.9% | 337 | 5.3% | 373 | 5.9% | 14.0% |
| Honolulu | 4,790 | 11.7% | 575 | 9.1% | 740 | 11.7% | 12.0% |
| Windward | 1,130 | 2.8% | 138 | 2.2% | 175 | 2.8% | 12.2% |
| Hawai‘i Island | 4,778 | 11.7% | 787 | 12.5% | 738 | 11.7% | 16.5% |
| Maui College | 2,221 | 5.4% | 345 | 5.5% | 343 | 5.4% | 15.5% |
| Kaua‘i | 1,516 | 3.7% | 156 | 2.5% | 234 | 3.7% | 10.3% |
Summary of Sexual Harassment and Gender Violence Prevalence

The University of Hawai‘i Study on Sexual Harassment and Gender Violence was designed to estimate the prevalence of four types of behaviors:

- Sexual Harassment
- Stalking
- Dating and Domestic Violence (also referred to as Intimate Partner Violence)
- Nonconsensual Sexual Contact, which included two sub-categories:
  1) Nonconsensual penetrative contact including penetration of the vagina or anus with a penis, finger or object; oral sex when someone’s mouth/tongue makes contact with someone else’s vagina, penis or anus;
  2) Nonconsensual sexual touching including kissing, touching of breasts, chest, crotch, genitals, groin/buttocks; and grabbing, groping or rubbing in a sexual way, even if the touching was over clothes

Detailed descriptions and the questions used in the survey instrument to measure prevalence precede subsequent sections that analyze in more detail each of the four specific types.

At Any Time While Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A-2: Percent of UH Student Participants System-Wide Experiencing the Four Types of Gender Violence at Any Time While Enrolled</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>12.7%*</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating and Domestic Violence</td>
<td>21.3%*</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconsensual Sexual Contact</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2019, UH survey participants reported experiencing all four types of sexual harassment and gender violence at any time while enrolled. The highest percentage experienced dating and domestic violence (DDV), which increased from 19.1 percent in 2017 to 21.4 percent in 2019. The 2-point change was statistically significant.

Sexual harassment experienced by survey participants also showed a significant increase. In 2017, just under 1 in 10 (9.3%) indicated incidents of sexual harassment. Two years later, it had risen to 12.7 percent, a 3.4-point increase.

Longitudinally, the prevalence of stalking and non-consensual sexual contact since enrolled remained statistically constant. About 1 in 10 survey participants experienced stalking in 2019 (10.6%), as in 2017 (9.7%).

Among survey participants, 1 in 14 (7.2%) indicated nonconsensual sexual contact, virtually the same as in 2017. While nonconsensual sexual penetration showed no change at 2.7 percent in 2019 and 2.4 percent in 2017, nonconsensual sexual touching increased directionally from 5.4 percent in 2017 to 6.3 percent in 2019.
Because the tenure of students’ enrollment at UH differs in duration with potential sample overlaps from one tracking study to another, prevalence during the current academic year provides a better time period for comparison. Across the four behaviors, dating and domestic violence and sexual harassment showed significant increases from 2017 to 2019, while stalking and nonconsensual sexual contact showed no statistical change.

Dating and domestic violence against survey participants grew. In 2019, 1 in 8 (12.1%) of survey participants indicated gender violence in a partnered relationship, compared with 1 in 10 (10.6%) in 2017. This increase of 1.5 percentage points was statistically significant.

Significantly more student participants likewise indicated that they experienced incidents of sexual harassment or domestic violence in the current academic year. With a change of 2.3 percentage points, the prevalence of sexual harassment rose from 5.7 percent in 2017 to 8.0 percent in 2019.

Incidence of stalking remained flat among survey participants. Approximately 1 in 15 survey participants experienced stalking in 2017 (6.0%) and in 2019 (6.1%).

Sections on each of the four individual behaviors that follow provide more details of prevalence for each of the 10 UH campuses as well as by demographic and academic characteristics.

### Offenders’ Association or Not with UH

| Table A-4: Percent of UH Student Participants System-wide Experiencing Consequences from Incidents of Four Types of Gender Violence at Any Time While Enrolled - 2019 |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| **Not Associated with UH** (Includes “person not associated with UH” and “non student hanging out around dormitories, on campus or accompanying other students”) | **Sexual Harassment** | **Stalking** | **Dating and Domestic Violence** | **Nonconsensual Sexual Contact** |
|                                            | 16.5% | 21.1% | 52.7% | 31.5% |
| **Associated with UH** (Net with two top associations shown below): | **Student** | **Faculty/Staff (Net)** |
|                                            | 93.8% | 77.9% | 48.7% | 68.1% |
|                                            | 84.1% | 70.9% | 43.9% | 61.9% |
|                                            | 29.9% | 14.2% | 9.1%  | 11.1% |
In 2019, the study asked survey participants experiencing each of the four gender violence behaviors if the offender was associated with UH and how. (Comparable data for all four categories was not available in 2017.) Further, 2019 survey participants chose from a wider range of UH associations due to expansion of response categories resulting from design input from students in focus groups.

As shown in the table, association with UH was evident among the majority of survey participants for 3 of 4 types of gender violence, though the percentage varied by behavior. UH association was highest among offenders of sexual harassment. Five in 6 survey participants identified offenders as students (84.1%), and almost 1 in 3 as faculty or staff (29.9%). Among survey participants who were stalked, 7 in 10 said the stalker was another student (70.9%) and 1 in 7 faculty/staff (14.2%). A majority of survey participants who indicated having nonconsensual sexual contact said the assailant was another UH student (55.4%). One in 8 identified faculty/staff (12.4%) as the perpetrator.

The pattern differed for dating and domestic violence where half (50.6%) of survey participants in a partnered relationship said the offender was not associated with UH. However, 2 in 5 (43.9%) indicated that DDV was perpetrated by a UH student. Almost 1 in 10 (9.1%) identified the DDV offender as faculty/staff.

While this is a summary of main responses, data analyzed in behavioral sections show all of the categories of association with UH and those students who did not know if there was an association.

**Consequences Reported by Survey Participants Experiencing Sexual Harassment or Gender Violence**

In the 2019 study, the survey instrument expanded types of consequences and asked the question for each of the four behaviors covered. The table below shows the five most frequently cited categories of consequences, with detail in subsequent sections. A majority of survey participants suffered serious consequences, ranging from 100 percent to 59.2 percent who experienced a sexual harassment or gender violence incident.

Survey participants most frequently indicated that emotional and behavioral health impacts followed the incident. Among all survey participants who experienced gender violence behaviors, 58.4 percent reported this consequence with 57.3 percent following sexual harassment, 46.6 percent after being stalked, 64.8 percent subsequent to DDV, and 45.3 percent after nonconsensual sexual contact. Between 26.4 percent to 44.2 percent reported that their social conditions were negatively impacted.
Among all survey participants who experienced gender violence behaviors, almost 2 in 4 (38.6%) suffered academic and professional consequences from the incidents. Academic and professional consequences were highest among DDV survivors (44.4%), followed by sexual harassment (35.6%) and stalking (34.3%). Examination of consequences also showed that survey participants experiencing DDV had the highest rate of consequences across most categories of impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had Consequences (NET)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
<th>Dating and Domestic Violence</th>
<th>Nonconsensual Sexual Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES
APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPMENT

For consistency and comparison, the publicly available and previously tested survey questions developed by the Association of American Universities in its 2015 study for 27 Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) formed the base of the survey design, particularly the questions asking about incidence and prevalence of sexual harassment and gender-based violence.

The 2019 UH Campus Climate Survey on Gender Violence additionally undertook a series of steps to ensure that the design of the survey instrument took into consideration the following: 1) learnings from other gender violence studies in the U.S.; 2) issues and areas of concern at the University of Hawai‘i, and 3) alignment with UH’s diverse campus system. These additional design actions included the following:

- Direct student input through focus groups of undergraduate, graduate and professional school students conducted on all islands. Focus groups implementation took place from August 28, 2018 through September 12, 2018 and gathered design input from different student constituencies.
- A survey planning dialogue with representatives from each campus, most of whom were Title IX coordinators;
- A design meeting with the UH survey planning team, its local and national consultants to review the past survey, stakeholder input, and recommend a 2019 survey instrument.

I.A. OIE UH Campus Climate Design

As a result of the UH meetings, stakeholders agreed that design changes would be evaluated using the following guidelines:

- Prevalence questions would be maintained to ensure ability to track results from 2017 to 2019
- Changes should be evaluated vis a vis potential for added burden as well as potential bias e.g., added length would add burden to survey participants and risk increase in termination rates and hence termination bias
- Where appropriate, questions would be enhanced to be more actionable
- Updates due to external variables

Omnitrak presented focus group results to the OIE Team and to Title IX Coordinators. Coordinators contributed subject matter expertise and a Hawai‘i campus perspective to the design decision-making process, and also identified areas where they wished to have additional information.

Using both national and local input, Omnitrak and, its national consultants, in consultation with the UH OIE team finalized an instrument for the UH Survey. Omnitrak conducted cognitive testing of the UH Survey draft instrument among students in January 2019, utilizing this testing and the focus group input in recommending a final questionnaire.
Main changes to the survey design involved the following:

- **Perpetrator** – Questions covering the perpetrator association with the UH, if any, and the relationship to the survivor were added.

- **Consequences/ Impact of Gender-Based Violence** – This follow up question was added to each behavioral area, e.g., Sexual Harassment, Stalking, Intimate Partner Violence, and Non-Consensual Sexual Contact.

- **Changes made to increase actionability of results**
  - Reporting Follow up – If students did not feel an incident was “serious enough to report,” they were asked to follow up questions to probe the reasons behind this sentiment. Title IX coordinators requested this addition to enhance actionability of results.
  - Instead of asking student knowledge of UH policies and procedures, the 2019 survey measured sufficiency of information to take action such as getting help, reporting an incident, knowing their rights, etc. This change was to enhance usefulness.

- **To align with new federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) definition of Intimate Partnered Relationships**, a slight change was made to the question on partnered relationships, which is a screening question for students to answer the section on Dating and Domestic Violence. The 2019 UH survey no longer included hook-ups as a partnered relationship qualifying for the DDV section.

UH OIE approved the final questionnaire instrument. It was then submitted to the UH Institutional Review Board (UHIRB) since the research involved human subjects. UHIRB approved the survey on December 5, 2018. Prior to launch of data collection, Omnitrak additionally applied for and secured the National Institute of Health’s Certificate of Confidentiality to provide students further levels of protection on confidentiality and non-disclosure. This approval was received on December 18, 2018.

Although English is the language of UH, portions of the final UHIRB-approved survey were translated into four (4) languages to facilitate ease of administration with UH’s diverse student body. The languages of translation were Tagalog, Chinese, Japanese and Korean.

**I.B. Comparison of the UH Survey and the AAU Survey**

Findings from the UH Survey can be compared to findings from the *Association of American Universities (AAU) Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct (2019)* (see Cantor, et al., 2019). However, it is important to understand the differences in the survey populations and methodologies when making this comparison.

First, the UH Survey focused on the public system’s/universities and community colleges, while the AAU 2019 survey focused on 33 universities, some of them private and some of them public. The report documenting the AAU survey findings combined information from all 33 universities (reporting average findings aggregated over all 33 universities) but did not offer all the findings from only the public universities.
Second, although the UH Survey incorporated many of the same behaviors (e.g., nonconsensual sexual contact, sexual harassment, stalking and dating and domestic violence) and scope of inquiry as used in the AAU survey, the survey instrument design and how questions were asked oftentimes changed for the UH Survey. UH changes were made in response to important feedback from focus groups of UH students statewide, key informant discussions conducted with UH students and staff, as well as the unique circumstances of the UH System which includes both 4-year universities and 2-year community colleges. Some examples are noted below.

The concepts/definitions of nonconsensual sexual contact were the same for the AAU and UH Surveys, with both surveys asking about specific types of nonconsensual sexual contact behaviors, as well as the tactics used by offenders to achieve (or attempt) this contact. However, somewhat different approaches were used in the AAU and UH Survey to pose questions about these issues. The AAU survey simultaneously asked about the specific behaviors (such as sexual penetration) and tactics (such as physical force) in one question (e.g., “…used physical force or threat of physical force to do the following with you…”). In contrast, the UH Survey first asked questions concerning specific behaviors (“…has any of the following types of sexual penetration happened to you without your consent…”), and if any of those behaviors were endorsed by student participants, then they were asked other questions about the tactics used by the offender to achieve the behavior (e.g., “Did you experience any of the following circumstances during this/the most recent incident?”) with the response options including physical force or threats of physical force, etc.

When asking students about sexual harassment, AAU’s survey question incorporated both examples of sexual harassing behaviors and a description of their negative impact in the wording of the question. However, the AAU Methodological Report recommended that the negative impact be posed as a separate question. UH adopted the AAU’s recommendation and asked specifically as a separate question if sexual harassment behaviors had a negative impact on the student in any of five possible ways. These included: (1) interfering with academic or professional performance; (2) interfering with academic participation; (3) interfering with academic attendance; (4) interfering with interaction with faculty, peers or others for academic purposes; or (5) creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment. Only survey participants who indicated that sexual harassment resulted in negative academic impacts were included in the calculation of the percent of UH students experiencing sexual harassment.

In the questions regarding stalking, UH kept AAU’s wording that stalking behaviors made students “afraid for (their) personal safety” but added “or caused emotional distress.” The latter was used in the 2016 redesign of the National Crime Victimization Survey’s Supplemental Victimization Survey (SVS) on stalking.

Regarding dating and domestic violence questions, UH’s design adopted national recommendations in the AAU Methodological Report, as well as suggestions from UH focus group participants, to expand examples to include psychological violence.
Comparison of findings from the 2019 UH Survey and the 2019 AAU survey are shown in Figure A1. The percentage of UH students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact was less than half that of the students in the AAU study (7.2% vs. 16.5%). The percentage of UH students reporting sexual harassment was approximately one third of the percentage of AAU students reporting this (12.7% vs. 41.8%). On the other hand, almost twice as many UH students reported experiencing stalking or dating/domestic violence compared with those in the AAU survey (10.6% vs. 5.8%, and 21.3% vs. 10.0%, respectively).

How might the differences in the questions of the UH Survey and AAU survey findings lead to different results? It is plausible that for sexual harassment, the lower UH prevalence may be due to the UH’s separate question on negative consequences, which made the latter more explicit and which defined sexual harassment only when both behavior and negative responses were positive. Regarding nonconsensual sexual contact, it is plausible that a similar construct affected prevalence estimates. However, it is also plausible that other system characteristics discussed in the next section (e.g., residential status and/or a limited fraternity/sorority presence) may be influencers. In addition, it is plausible that the higher percentage of stalking discovered by the UH Survey relative to the AAU survey is because the UH Survey not only documented stalking that made students afraid for their safety, but also documented stalking that caused students emotional distress. Further, a possible explanation for the greater percentage of UH students than AAU students reporting dating/domestic violence experiences may be because the UH Survey had a greater number of questions regarding dating/domestic violence compared to the AAU survey, including questions concerning psychological aggression, which is a common form of dating/domestic violence.
I.C. Student Focus Group Input Into Questionnaire Development

As part of the questionnaire development process, Omnitrac conducted eight focus groups with students from across all 10 University of Hawai‘i campuses. The purpose of the groups was primarily to obtain UH student input on specific areas of questionnaire design, including perpetrator identity and how to motivate increased reporting of gender violence incidents. Secondarily, focus groups explored how to publicize and motivate student participation in the survey. The focus groups were conducted prior to a questionnaire cognitive test among 51 students.

The UH Office of Institutional Equity and Omnitrac collaborated on the composition of the groups based on input from campuses after the 2015 survey, current input from Title IX coordinators, and a national literature search identifying potentially vulnerable populations. Participants were recruited using a snowballing sample frame as well as through on-campus central location random recruitment intercepts. Focus groups were conducted on each major island (O‘ahu, Hawai‘i, Maui and Kaua‘i) with participants recruited from each of the 10 campuses. Participants overall represented a mix of four-year and two-year campuses, undergraduates, graduate/professional schools, and different years in school. Both students who had experienced sexual harassment or gender violence and those who had not joined the groups. All groups were conducted on UH campuses.

Because of the sensitivity of the subject, the UH Office of Institutional Equity and Omnitrac, working with on-campus resources and with victim advocate resources in the community including the Domestic Violence Action Center (DVAC), developed protocols for focus group participants in distress or requiring emotional support. OIE and Omnitrac retained Victim Service Counselors at each focus group. Counselors were either just outside or within a five-minute walking distance from the focus group venue.

Briefings and trainings were conducted in advance of focus groups for both advocates and moderators. Focus group participants were informed both at recruitment and before each group of availability of support resources and how to request assistance. The process was developed to respond to student concerns that the request for assistance be discreet so as not to embarrass participants needing support. In addition, support resources were available at each site after the focus groups were completed. Omnitrac informed each participant of this resource and how to make contact during the focus group sign-out process.

More detailed information regarding focus groups is included in following sections of this appendix.