LONDON
metropolitan
university

The Centre for
**FAMILY LAW
AND PRACTICE**
Patron: Baroness Hale of Richmond

College and university responses to forced marriage

Funded by the Forced Marriage Unit

Prof. Marilyn Freeman and
Prof. Renate Klein

30 August 2013

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge with gratitude the assistance and support of the individuals who agreed to be interviewed for this study, and of Jacqueline Mburu, the research assistant who undertook the interviews and supported the project in many other ways. Our great appreciation is also expressed to the Forced Marriage Unit[1], the various university managements who supported this research, and everybody who helped us with advice and suggestions.

---

[1] The Forced Marriage Unit is a joint initiative of the United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth and Home Offices.

Contents

1. Summary

The goal of this study was to widen the evidence base on how colleges and universities respond to students affected by forced marriage (FM) and other forms of sexual or domestic abuse. Women are particularly likely to experience such abuses when they are between 16 and 25 years of age (Smith, Coleman, Eder & Hall, 2011). This also is the traditional age bracket for post-secondary education (PSE), which makes PSE institutions important contexts for intervention, prevention and support[1].

In pilot research with two British universities we had gathered preliminary evidence on institutional responses to FM and violence against women (VAW) students (Freeman and Klein, 2012). Building on this work, the Forced Marriage Unit (FMU) commissioned a larger study, the results of which are detailed in this report. The focus of this research is on institutional practices and resources, not on individuals' experiences of abuse. Our goal was to identify emerging and promising practices as well as gaps in recognition, provision and areas for improvement. With this research the FMU aims to support PSE institutions in developing their capacity to appropriately support students affected by FM/VAW.

Participants were contacted through professional associations and networks, and by word-of-mouth. Information about institutional practices comes primarily from 19 in-depth interviews with university staff, religious leaders, specialist service providers and police officers. In addition, we undertook an indicative scan of the sector, mostly through keyword searches on 56 higher education (HE) and further education (FE) websites to find out to what extent colleges and universities make their awareness of and response to FM/VAW visible on the public pages of their websites. Finally, we integrated feedback from Germany and Turkey in order to provide a wider, comparative framework.

With regard to institutional practices the findings of this study reaffirm what we observed in the pilot research. Violence against women—and FM in particular—remain largely invisible to university staff members. A few students do disclose abuse to student services and teaching staff but, considering base rates and disclosure dynamics, these students are likely to be the tip of the iceberg. The capacity of institutions to respond with proper support appears to vary considerably and seems mostly a matter of individual staff motivation and expertise, rather than systematic institutional policy. None of our interviewees were aware of written policies and procedures at their respective universities.

In conjunction with findings from the indicative scan this lack of awareness can be put into further context. Indeed, the scan did not find any policies including the keywords "violence against women" or "gender-based violence", and in only one case did it find policies including the keywords "forced marriage" or "domestic violence". However, a few websites held policies referencing sexual assault, rape, or stalking; many held policies referencing sexual harassment and nearly all held policies referencing bullying. Thus, the lack of awareness of specialised policies quite accurately reflects their near-absence. In comparison, broad policies that subsume different abusive behaviours under one heading are much more common, and in most cases this heading is gender neutral or makes no reference to gender (or sexuality) at all. Furthermore, it is debatable how useful such broad policies are in practice as, for instance, they do not encourage specialised staff training or recording gender of victim and perpetrator in case statistics.

In cases where there were established working relationships between university staff and specialist service providers in the community, these, too, seemed to depend mostly on individual staff initiative; the institutions were not part of multi-agency councils (which typically include specialist service providers and police). Finally, the comparison with Germany further suggested that, even within similar sectors such as academia and PSE, cross-cultural and international comparisons must go beyond comparing findings at the level of categories of abuse, such as sexual assault, and also examine the specific cultural and organisational practices in which the abuses occur. These local practices reflect particular configurations of power structures, norms, and other factors that must be engaged to develop effective intervention, prevention and support.

Strengths: PSE institutions are well positioned to contribute to intervention, prevention and support. They already work with a population at high risk for abuse. They already have support systems in place

---

[1] In its policy for ending violence against women and girls in the UK (26 March 2013), the UK government noted that following public consultation it is widening its definition of domestic violence to, among other aspects, include abuse against 16 and 17 year olds, https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/ending-violence-against-women-and-girls-in-the-uk [accessed 1 August 2013].

such as student counselling, financial advice, pastoral care, and personal tutors. They have a skilled workforce, and many university staff members are highly motivated to do their best by students and support them in any way they can. For some victims of abuse, time at university may be a safe place and one of few opportunities to access support. This has been suggested in particular for FM.

Weaknesses: PSE institutions are not only contexts for intervention, prevention and support but also contexts in which abuse occurs, in particular sexual harassment of female students. Aspects of student life at university such as "lad culture", fresher's week, or the power vested in male thesis advisors over female advisees may contribute to perpetration of abuse by creating circumstances in which power inequalities may be exploited or by creating social dynamics in which the line between fun and harassment is easily crossed and in which it may be difficult, particularly for young women, to object to harassment (for instance, for fear of being seen as uncool). Intervention in and prevention of gendered abuse, and support for victims of gendered abuse have traditionally not been seen as institutional priorities, even though student support for other problems such as depression or suicidality is often very well developed. As a result, systematic institutional strategies on FM/VAW are underdeveloped and the full potential of PSE institutions to contribute to early intervention, prevention and support has not yet been realised.

Moving forward: We recommend that PSE institutions make it one of their core institutional responsibilities to proactively address FM/VAW by pursuing the following steps: (1) improve access to specialist services in the community, for instance by publicising contact information or inviting representatives from specialist agencies to speak on campus; (2) invest in systematic specialist staff training and policy development; (3) participate in multi-agency groups that include community-based specialist service providers and statutory agencies; and (4) articulate FM/VAW in information campaigns which show that the institution not only is aware of these issues in theory but also knows how to address them in practice.

2. Background

The empirical findings we will report in the result section concern primarily British universities. However, we decided to put these findings into a wider internationally comparative perspective, in which we will reference research from North America, Australia and continental Europe, and report from our own observations in Germany. There are several reasons for adopting such a broader comparative framework. One is that the evidence base is increasingly a multi-country evidence base, in particular with the recent publication of a European Commission funded study that included five European countries (Feltes, Balloni, Czapska, Bodelon, & Stenning, 2012). Such evidence ought to be discussed in a comparative framework that acknowledges similarities and differences and informs overarching theory as well as locally specific practice.

Furthermore, forced marriage is an international issue, both for universities and more generally. Many students come to the UK from other countries subject to financial support from their parents and for some students this support depends on the understanding that they will marry someone of their parents' choice at the end of their course. This then falls squarely within the university's ambit while the students are in the UK, perhaps failing in their studies, and not wanting to "make good on the contract" (in 2012, the FMU handled cases involving 60 different countries from nearly all continents). Similarly, a national of the UK may be forced to marry someone from another country, sometimes to secure an entrance visa for that person. FM is, therefore, not a domestic issue. It is an international issue, and therefore we must have an understanding of what is happening elsewhere, and work collaboratively in order to produce the best outcomes for these students.

The PSE sector is highly diverse within and across countries. Institutions vary in size, age, academic emphasis, and composition of the student population. Internationally, there is variation in expectations and legal obligations in terms of how much responsibility educational institutions have towards ensuring student safety and well-being and thus how extensive and how specialised any institutional support services may need to be (such as university health or counselling centres for students). Furthermore, aspects of academic life such as "lad culture" in Britain and elsewhere, fraternity parties and college athletics in the United States, or the sense that male full professors are "untouchable" (often mentioned in Germany) create specific contexts for the exploitation of vulnerabilities and the perpetration of abuse. These contexts require specific responses tailored to different institutions and locations and the cultural and legal frameworks in which they operate.

Finally, over the past decades students' international mobility has been facilitated with schemes such as the European ERASMUS programme and through the Bologna Process toward a joint European Area of Higher Education[2]. In the context of the increasing marketisation of the PSE sector universities and colleges also are increasingly trying to attract international students, and many institutions pride themselves on having an internationally and culturally diverse student body. Such diversity is often seen as an asset that enhances students' educational experience (argued, for instance, by the University of Texas at Austin in a 2013 U.S. Supreme Court case[3]). However, this also means that institutions need to be able to address perpetration of FM/VAW and victimisation when gender, race, cultural background, institutional power, and economic rationales come together in complex and challenging circumstances.

The term post-secondary education (PSE) is used to refer to higher education universities and colleges, and further education colleges. In the UK, higher education institutions (HEIs) typically draw students 18 years and older and prepare them for professional or research-oriented jobs, whereas further education (FE) colleges typically draw students 16 to 18 years old and prepare them for vocational and technical jobs. In the U.S. literature the terms university, college and campus tend to be used interchangeably, whereas in the emerging research in continental Europe the primary term is university. We use the different terms in order to acknowledge the variety of legal, social and cultural contexts post-secondary education institutions constitute.

---

[2] http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/bologna_en.htm, accessed 5 August 2013.

[3] FISHER v. UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN ET AL. No. 11–345. Argued October 10, 2012 – Decided June 24, 2013, http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/12pdf/11-345_l5gm.pdf, accessed 12 July 2013.

2.1 Abuse and violence against female students (not including forced marriage)

There is mounting evidence from several countries that female students experience significant amounts of abuse while at university, in particular sexual harassment, but also rape, physical violence, and stalking. In the past, the issue of violence against women within academic environments in the UK has been in the news occasionally following particularly egregious instances such as the murders in 1991 of Rachel McLean at Oxford University and in 1999 of Elizabeth Stacey at Westminster University[4]. Only recently, however, have systematic prevalence surveys shed more light on the extent and nature of the problem, including prevalence and incidence estimates, victim impacts, who the perpetrators are, where perpetration occurs, and how little of it is ever reported to campus authorities or police. These studies have not specifically asked about forced marriage (see section 2.2). This seems to be indicative of a still widespread lack of awareness of forced marriage as an issue within the broader field of VAW and violence against students.

2.1.1 Prevalence

In the United Kingdom, studies at individual universities have found varying rates of victimisation. Using data from one university, and a sample of female and male students, Fisher and Wilkes (2003) estimated that over a 9-month period 6% of students had experienced rape or sexual assault. In a study of four English universities Stenning, Mitra-Kahn & Dunby (2012) found that between 11% and 34% of mostly female students had experienced at least one incident of sexual violence during their time at university, between 30% and 58% had experienced at least one incident of stalking, and between 50% and 69% had experienced at least one incident of sexual harassment. The only national study to date, a survey by the National Union of Students (NUS), estimated that 14% of female students in the UK have experienced a serious physical or sexual assault while a student at university; 12% have been stalked; 16% experienced unwanted kissing, touching or molesting; and over 10% were a victim of serious physical violence. 68% of women students reported one or more kinds of sexual harassment on campus during their time as a student abuse (NUS, 2010).

The abuse may have occurred on university premises, outside the university but still related to university activities (such as fieldtrips) or it may have had nothing to do with the university at all but occurred while the victim was a student. An important point about this is that the issue of abuse against students is not merely a matter of university-related abusive instances but of the fact that gendered abuse affects a considerable proportion of students during their time at university. All of this abuse has implications for the institutions, but in different ways. Abuse that occurs on university premises, or in the context of university-related activities, challenges the institutions most directly and calls for a review of institutional policies and procedures. In addition, even abuse that may have had nothing to do with the university may affect the institution because it impacts students' health and well-being and their ability to excel academically, pursue their education, and prepare for the workplace.

In Australia, a survey modelled on the NUS survey, also with university students, found that 86% of respondents reported being harassed with sexual comments, 35% reported unwanted touching, and 25% unwanted "physical contact of a sexual nature" while they were students at university (Sloane & Fitzpatrick, 2011; p. 11). Seventeen percent of respondents experienced "stalker-like or obsessive behavior" (p. 11), 9% had experienced physical violence, 12% had experienced rape, and 67% reported unwanted sexual experiences of any kind.

In the United States, a nationally representative telephone survey of 4,446 women attending 2- or 4-year PSE institutions found that over a shorter reference period (past seven months), 13.1% of female students experienced stalking and 2.8% had experienced an attempted or completed rape (Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2000). Because some women were sexually assaulted more than once, the rate of sexual assaults within a single academic year was 35 per 1,000 female students.

---

[4] http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/slaughter-that-cast-a-shadow-over-the-groves-of-academe/195994.article

The study by Stenning et al. (2012) was part of the multi-country European study, which also undertook research in Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain (Feltes et al., 2012). The study included an online survey of about 22,000 female students about their experiences of sexual harassment, stalking and sexual violence, fear of crime, disclosure of incidents and need for services. In addition, there were focus groups and interviews with students and interviews with student services staff and members of the criminal justice system. The number of institutions willing to participate in the study varied considerably across the five countries and so did the number of survey respondents: UK—3 institutions and 707 students; Spain—4/323; Italy—4/3,064; Poland—7/4,759; Germany—16/12,663 (among the reasons why universities did not participate were concern about extra unpaid work and concern about damaging the reputation of the university). Table 1 summarises findings from the online survey of female students. The table includes percentages and the absolute numbers they refer to. These figures show the prevalence (experienced at least one incident while at university) of sexual harassment, stalking, and sexual violence (unwanted sexual acts) as reported by the students who replied to the question.

Table 1: Prevalence of sexual harassment, stalking and sexual violence against female students in five European countries

	Sexual harassment	*Stalking*	*Sexual violence*
UK	68.6% *n=407*	58.2% *n=173*	33.6% *n=43*
Spain	54.2% *n=122*	52.9% *n=54*	36.7% *n=11*
Poland	65.8% *n=2,592*	48.7% *n=841*	47.3% *n=158*
Italy	47% *n=965*	41.8% *n=340*	30.2% *n=52*
Germany	68% *n=6,930*	50.8% *n=2,627*	29.9% *n=363*

Source: Feltes et al. (2012)

Prevalence rates were high in all participating countries. Between one third and two thirds of students had experienced sexual harassment, stalking or sexual violence while at university.

2.1.2 Impact

Feltes et al. (2012) also report in detail on the impact on female students of these victimisation experiences. Not all of this detail can be described here but several points must be noted as they seem directly relevant to how universities think about student services. The majority of students experienced negative impacts, in particular of sexual violence. A sizeable minority of students felt that the sexual harassment and stalking they experienced did not affect them negatively. However, among those who had felt threatened by the incidents of sexual harassment, stalking or sexual violence that they experienced, large majorities felt significant negative impacts and these were particularly significant for those who had felt threatened by stalking and sexual violence. For the present discussion the impacts are sorted into three broad categories:

- Mental health: feeling depressed; preoccupied with the incidents; ashamed, humiliated; low self-esteem; a few respondents said they developed an eating disorder, used alcohol or drugs to cope, or had suicidal thoughts.

- Academic performance: for many respondents this meant poor academic performance; avoiding certain courses; delay of academic progress. For a few respondents it meant having to change their academic field or interrupting their studies.

- Freedom of movement: scared of leaving the house; loss of confidence; difficulty trusting other people, forming relationships; avoiding certain places.

As we will report below, many of the student services staff in our research said that due to their professional training they were better able to recognise mental health issues (in particular depression and suicidality) than issues of FM/VAW. This may be a false dichotomy. Considering the impacts reported in the multi-country study it is likely that many students who present with mental health issues are dealing with sexual harassment, stalking or sexual violence. Humphreys and Thiara (2003), among others, have emphasised that for many women who struggle with intimate victimisation mental health problems are in fact "symptoms of abuse", and that effective support needs to include addressing the abuse, not merely treating the symptoms.

Universities need to be aware that a significant proportion of their female students will struggle academically because of sexual harassment, stalking and sexual violence. Even when perpetration and perpetrators are "outside the university" the impact of abuse on academic performance still matters to institutions that pride themselves in helping students reach their academic potential and prepare them for exciting careers. The impacts on "freedom of movement" are fundamental in the sense that distrust of others, lack of confidence, and avoidance behaviour are apt to undermine both academic performance while at university and professional success in the future.

2.1.3 Contexts of perpetration

With the exception of the UK, students experienced most incidents of sexual harassment "outside the university" (for instance, in a park, bar, or café). In the UK, slightly more than half of students reported being harassed "within university sites" including student residences, outdoor areas on campus, and student union rooms. There was considerable variation between countries with regard to the "university sites" where female students experienced sexual harassment. For instance, many Polish and German students reported being sexually harassed in lecture theatres and seminar rooms. And while many female students from all countries experienced sexual harassment in outdoor university areas, these seemed to be particularly problematic contexts for students in Italy and Spain (Feltes et al., 2012).

Most stalking occurred in physical locations outside the university, which was also more common than stalking over phone or Internet (Feltes et al., 2012). Nonetheless, between about 10% and 30% of female students said they had been stalked within university sites. Proportionally, stalking within university sites was much more common for UK students than for the other students, and most of this within-university stalking in the UK occurred in campus student residences.

Most sexual violence was experienced outside the university. Yet, between about 6% and 36% of female students reported sexual victimisation within university sites, and here, too, the highest proportion was in the UK students (mostly in campus student residences, Feltes et al., 2012). While a large majority of UK students felt nonetheless safe on campus (84%), this was eight percentage points lower than the majority of UK students who felt safe off-campus (92.8%).

Another interesting finding from the multi-country study is the difference between sites of fear and sites of danger. For example, when respondents were asked to identify areas on campus where they feel uncomfortable or afraid to walk, parking garages were near the top of the list. However, only few assaults actually occurred in parking garages. Many more assaults occur in private residences such as dorm rooms and flats. Nonetheless, institutional measures are often directed at sites of fear by improving lighting and installing emergency phones.

Such measures may be well-meant but need to be regarded critically in terms of what institutions choose to do within their realm of influence. The security of private residences that are off campus and unconnected to a university may well be beyond its reach. However, the conduct of its staff members and students is, to some extent, within an institution's realm of influence. For instance, as evidenced in staff policies HR departments routinely attempt to regulate staff behaviour on matters ranging from what to do during fire alarms to how to deal with harassment by other staff members. Similarly, many institutions adopt student codes of conduct that aim to regulate how students treat other students and staff members. Such policies usually have preambles or introductory paragraphs in which an institution expresses its commitment to creating a fair and equitable working environment for everyone. However, in practice, the policies tend to come into play, if at all, only when problems have escalated to the point of personal crisis and when formal allegations have been made. In

addition, as the experience with student policies in the U.S. has shown, their implementation is far from straightforward and the process of investigating and adjudicating claims of sexual harassment or sexual assault can further traumatise victims (Kelly, Lovett & Regan, 2005). Thus, while such policies are needed they are limited in their effectiveness as instruments of broader cultural change, and institutions need to become more proactive and creative about establishing and maintaining fair and equitable environments.

2.1.4 Perpetrators

Sexual harassment was almost exclusively perpetrated by men (96.1% or respondents were sexually harassed by a man). In Spain, Poland, Italy and Germany the perpetrator most often was somebody outside the university (and when it was an outsider, in all countries, it most frequently was a stranger). In the UK, for two-third of female students sexual harassment was perpetrated by a male fellow student (in Germany, for one-third of female students it was a male fellow student). Sexual harassment by male university staff (academic or other), infrequent overall, was relatively most common in Spain (followed by Poland; Feltes et al., 2012).

Similar to the findings on sexual harassment, men also perpetrated most of the stalking (91.1% of respondents were stalked by a man). And, again, in Spain, Poland, Italy and Germany the perpetrator most often was somebody outside the university. In the UK, it was evenly split, with half of respondents saying they had been stalked by an outsider, and half saying they had been stalked by a fellow student (Feltes et al., 2012). However, with regard to the relationship between perpetrator and victim the findings for stalking reveal striking differences. Amongst the respondents who reported stalking by somebody outside the university, the majority reported being stalked by an ex-partner rather than by a stranger. Only 17.6% of female students reported being stalked by an unknown perpetrator. In all other cases the perpetrator was known to the victim (friend, family member, co-worker, acquaintance).

Finally, men also perpetrated most of the sexual violence (96.6% of respondents reported being subjected to unwanted sexual acts from a man). In the UK, two-thirds of female students reported sexual violence from a fellow male student; in the other countries the majority of respondents experienced sexual violence from a man outside the university, although still about one-quarter of students experience sexual violence from a male fellow student (Feltes et al., 2012).

Compared to victimisation by men who are not associated with the university or by male fellow students, victimisation by university staff was rare. However, victimisation (sexual harassment, stalking, and sexual violence) perpetrated by university staff against female students did occur, and was particularly common in Germany and Poland. Table 2 lists the number of female students who reported being sexually harassed, stalked, or subjected to unwanted sexual acts by university staff. These are absolute figures (not percentages), referring to the number of respondents who reported that they had been abused by university staff (non-academic or academic staff).

Table 2. Number of female students in five European countries reporting sexual harassment, stalking and sexual violence from a university staff member

	Sexual harassment	Stalking	Sexual violence
UK	6 / 3	3 / 1	1 / 0
Spain	9 / 7	0 / 3	0 / 1
Poland	22 / 174	2 / 24	2 / 8
Italy	22 / 34	4 / 5	0 / 1
Germany	205 / 239	42 / 32	6 / 6

Source: Feltes et al. (2012). Entries refer to number of non-academic / academic staff.

For instance, looking only at violations perpetrated by academic staff, in the UK three students reported being sexually harassed by academic staff, compared to 174 in Poland and 239 in Germany. In the UK, one student reported being stalked by academic staff, compared to 24 in Poland and 32 in Germany. And while in the UK no student reported sexual violence from academic staff, in Poland 8 students experienced this and in Germany 6 students.

These findings show not only that violence against female students is very common but that perpetration patterns and forms of violence vary within and across countries. Intervention, prevention and support needs to attend to these variations and the local cultural, organisational and legal factors that may account for them.

2.1.5 Disclosure and reporting

Most incidents of abuse against female students are neither reported to campus authorities nor to police. However, many more incidents may be disclosed to friends and other informal third parties (Klein, 2012).

The NUS study found that only 4% of women who were seriously sexually assaulted reported the assault to their university and only 10% of women reported to the police. Of the 90% of women who did not report serious sexual assault to police about half did not report because they felt ashamed or embarrassed, and slightly less than half did not report because they feared they would be blamed.

Similarly, the multi-country study found that most students in each of the five participating countries told somebody about what happened to them (in particular incidents of sexual harassment and stalking), and these confidantes were most often fellow students or family members and friends outside the university. Fewer of the female students who had felt threatened by the sexual violence they experienced disclosed this to others but many still did (Feltes et al., 2012). Disclosure to university staff was rare. Comparisons across countries are not really possible here because the participating universities were so different with regard to designated student services. Most of the reporting to university staff happened in the UK, with 15.4% of UK students reporting sexual harassment, 22.4% reporting stalking, and 15% reporting sexual violence. This may speak to the trust in student services UK students have, but even so, universities need to recognise that between 78% and 85% of students did not report their victimisation experiences to university staff.

2.2 Forced marriage

A forced marriage is usually defined as one in which one or both spouses did not have the ability to give free, full, and informed consent (Gill & Anitha, 2011; Forced Marriage Unit 2010; Simmons & Burn, 2013). Such consent may be compromised by several factors including psychological pressure, emotional blackmail, filial duty or family loyalty, fear of deportation, mental disability, fear of harm, covert and overt threats, and actual physical force. Some victims are too young to give free, full and informed consent (in the 2012 statistics reported by the FMU the youngest victim was 2 years old).

Thus, forced marriage is different from arranged marriage in which family members suggest potential marriage partners but these have the ability to refuse with impunity. While the distinction between forced and arranged marriage is clear on paper, the terms are often used interchangeably. Moreover, family dynamics may be such that what in effect is a forced marriage is considered arranged. For example, young people who were pressured into marriages they would not have freely chosen, may call them "arranged" and think of them as "arranged", because they did not openly refuse, usually because open refusal would have been unthinkable (Mogensen, 2013). In other instances, the family interactions through which a forced marriage takes place may be incomprehensible to the victim. In a recent case before the Irish High Court the victim had approached her teachers with concerns about being married against her will – at that point the marriage ceremony had already taken place (High Court, 2011, No. 2031P, 18 June 2013) but this was not understood by the victim.

In 2011, the FMU gave advice or support on 1468 cases related to forced marriage[5]. The majority of victims (63%) were between 16 and 25 years old. Seventy-eight percent of victims were female; 22% were male. In 2012, the FMU gave advice or support on 1485 cases (82% female; 18% male). While the youngest victim was 2 years old and the oldest 71 years, in nearly three quarters of cases (71%) the victims fell into the traditional age bracket for PSE (16 to 25 years old). The FMU also noted an increase in the number of cases over holiday periods suggesting that while classes are in session students are somewhat protected. If that was the case, then time at university would be an important opportunity to seek help and PSE institutions should be all the more prepared.

Surveying local and national organisations that support victims of forced marriage the National Centre for Social Research (NCSR) estimated that in 2008 there were between 5,000 and 8,000 cases of FM in the UK (96% female victims; 4% male victims). Of these, 26% concerned victims 16 to 17 years old, 40% concerned victims 18 to 23 years old, and 20% concerned victims 24 and older, which means that over 60% were in the age bracket of HE and FE students (Kazimirski, Keogh & Kumari et al., 2009). (The FMU and NCSR data are based on reported cases and possibly underestimate the actual prevalence of FM in the UK as many are likely to be unreported.)

Thus, although FM prevalence data specifically for students is lacking (the NUS survey did not address FM), the data from the FMU and the NCSR suggest that a significant number of FM cases involve victims who are in the age bracket for FE and HE students.

Furthermore, most of these victims are likely to be young women, and they are likely to come from specific ethnic backgrounds. In the 2011 FMU statistics 70% of the cases involved families from South Asian communities and 30% of the cases were from other backgrounds. Thus, FM is likely to affect in particular a subgroup of young people at the typical age where they would enter into or be in post-secondary education. This has implications for the equality duty of public education institutions as they ought to avoid indirect discrimination based on, among several categories, gender and ethnic background.

The FMU statistics quoted above show that in 2011 around 925 of the cases the FMU was aware of involved 16-25 year olds. These are young people in the FE and HE age bracket. FM-related issues may have prevented them from entering post-secondary education in the first place, but if they did enter, they probably would have struggled with these issues while at university. However, in our pilot research as well as in this study we found that cases of FM rarely come to the attention of PSE staff members. FM remains nearly invisible in the PSE context. Students struggling with FM may miss a critical chance at finding support, in particular if colleges and universities were one of the social contexts they were still allowed to enter.

2.3   UK policy context

2.3.1 Public sector equality duty

HEIs fall within the public sector equality duty (set out in section 149 Equality Act, 2010) toward protected groups based on religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation that came into force in England, Scotland, and Wales on 5 April 2011 (with specific duty regulations for England 10 September 2011), and which concerns the elimination of unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation, and the enhancement of equality of opportunity. The Act requires universities to publish gender equality schemes that show how the institution is eliminating discrimination and harassment and how it is promoting equality of opportunity.

2.3.2 Strategies for ending violence against women and girls

The current study, as did the pilot study, addresses forced marriage within the broader problem of violence against women, following current research (Gill & Anitha, 2011) and recommendations by the End Violence against Women Coalition (Coy, Lovett & Kelly, 2008), and the UK government's

---

[5] Each year the FMU publishes its most recent statistics on its website at https://www.gov.uk/forced-marriage.

strategy for ending violence against women and girls[6]. The UK Department of Education also adopted this perspective[7]. At the writing of this report the London Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime had launched a public consultation for the Second Mayoral Strategy on Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG)[8]. The strategy discusses the need to mainstream VAWG into other policies and strategies and includes forced marriage specifically in the forms and definitions of violence against women. It also references the educational risk which VAWG poses to girls and the need for schools and other educational institutions to ensure that the school environment is a safe and supportive space for both boys and girls in order to comply with duties under the Equality Act.

The UK government's 2011 action plan on violence against women and girls noted that colleges "can play a vital role" in prevention (see fn 7). While the plan seems to view this role primarily in terms of teaching young people about healthy relationships, we suggest that HEIs have a broader responsibility to students. We know from this study, the pilot study, as well as research in the UK and elsewhere that victims and survivors disclose VAW/FM to HE staff (mostly to frontline student services but also to teaching staff; Branch, Hayes-Smith & Richards, 2011). Furthermore, as we detailed in sections 2.1 and 2.2 above, VAW disproportionately affects female students, and FM disproportionately affects students from backgrounds where FM may be prevalent. Both VAW and FM can severely challenge or even end students' ability to pursue education (Horsmann, 2006). In addition, support with these issues may require specialised knowledge and skills because of the complex interpersonal and social dynamics of these abuses and because the likely presence of perpetrators within students' family or social networks creates particular risks to students' safety and well-being[9].

2.3.3 Civil legal and criminal justice measures against forced marriage

Under the Forced Marriage (Civil Protection) Act 2007 a person can get a forced marriage protection order (FMPO). An FMPO can be applied for by the victim, a relevant third party, or with the leave of the court, any other person. Any other person could include someone from student services, which implies that reporting of FM at HEIs is an important issue. In addition, local authorities are relevant third parties who do not need the prior leave of the court to make an application for a FMPO, which means that HEIs working in partnership with local authorities is also important in this context. After further public consultation the UK government announced in June 2012 that FM will become a criminal offence in England and Wales[10]. This is supposed to be completed during the 2013/2014 legislative period. The advantages and disadvantages of criminalising forced marriage continue to be debated; in addition, the practical challenges to effectively implementing such law are likely to be formidable[11].

2.4 Policy context in other countries

In the United States, research and legislation on the sexual assault of students has a relatively long history (Koss, Gidyz & Wisniewski, 1987). Since the early 1970s Title IX legislation requires educational institutions that receive federal assistance to prevent sexual harassment, defined as including rape and sexual assault, by investigating reports and taking reasonable steps to end the abuse[12]. This includes public universities as well as private institutions that receive student financial aid or other federal assistance. The Clery Act (1990 and subsequent amendments) requires PSE institutions to publish crime statistics, including homicide, sex offences, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, motor vehicle theft and arson. The Clery Act is connected to the student financial aid programme and thus also applies to almost all PSE institutions in the United States. Its underlying rationale that publication (and presumably thus awareness) of crime statistics increases safety has been debated (Sloan, Fisher

---

6   http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/crime/call-end-violence-women-girls/vawg-action-plan?view=Binary

7   http://www.education.gov.uk/childrenandyoungpeople/healthandwellbeing/safeguardingchildren/a0072231/forced-marriage
[retrieved 23 March 2012].

8   http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/VAWGconsultationdocument5June2013.pdf, accessed 6 August 2013.

9   The UK's Forced Marriage Unit gives specific guidance at http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travel-and-living-abroad/when-things-go-wrong/forced-marriage/info-for-professionals; see also Ely, G.E. & Faherty, C. (2009). Intimate partner violence. In J.T. Andrade (Ed.), Handbook of violence risk assessment and treatment: New approaches for mental health professionals (pp. 157-177). New York, NY: Springer.

10 https://www.gov.uk/government/news/forced-marriage-to-be-made-a-criminal-offence, accessed 6 August 2013.

11 http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmpublic/antisocialbehaviour/memo/asb38.htm, accessed 6 August 2013.

12 http://www.dol.gov/oasam/regs/statutes/titleix.htm (Accessed 8.21.2012).

& Cullen, 1997). The Violence against Women Act (VAWA 1994 and subsequent reauthorisations) has taken a different approach by offering the PSE sector federal funds to improve victim support services, policy development, outreach, and multi-agency working[13]. In doing so VAWA has emphasised support and awareness-raising, and broader structural changes through working collaboratively on campus and with community agencies. On the whole, the PSE response in the U.S. to sexual and domestic violence has been complex and somewhat contradictory. While a lot of effort has gone into awareness-raising and there is recognition that abuse prevention also needs to include structural reforms[14], many structural problems such as the way in which athletics departments (and some fraternities) are sometimes shielded from scrutiny have remained. Furthermore, much of the work has focused on the student population, with little or no integration with the work directed at staff, reinforcing an artificial split between abuse against employees and abuse against students. This split is unrealistic in so far as many employees are also students, and many students also work on campus. It also contributes to the fragmentation of efforts to turn PSE institutions into environments free of abuse.

According to Feltes et al. (2012), at the time of the European multi-country study there was only one binding EU regulation referring to a form of violence against women. This was Directive 2002/73/EC which addresses equal treatment of women and men in employment and sees sexual harassment as discriminatory. The directive primarily focuses on education and vocational training, access to employment and working conditions. For the most part, violent crimes against women are dealt with under a country's criminal codes or equality law. Some countries also have civil legal instruments to address forms of violence against women such as stalking (Feltes et al., 2012). All countries in the study have a crime of rape on the books, formulated in "a resolutely gender-neutral way" (Feltes et al., 2012, p. 28). Finally, with the exception of the British Equality Duty no country in the study had legislation setting out PSE responsibilities at management level to address issues of violence against women. Both of these latter issues, the matter of "resolute" gender neutrality in language and the impact of the Equality Duty were reflected in the British PSE policy landscape as it appeared in our indicative scan.

3.   Research Questions

- How do issues related to FM and VAW present to university staff?

- How do the institutions respond?

- How could these responses be strengthened?

- Do PSE institutions make their response to FM/VAW visible on their institutional websites and if so, in which ways?

- How can international comparisons contribute to a better understanding of how PSE institutions can strengthen their responses to FM/VAW within the legal and cultural contexts in which they operate?

4.   Methodology

The proposed methodology was reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Review Panel in the faculty of Law, Governance and International Relations, London Metropolitan University.

---

[13] http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/legislation.htm (Accessed 8/21/2012)

[14] http://www.preventioninstitute.org/index.php?option=com_jlibrary&view=article&id=105&Itemid=127 (Accessed 8/21/2012)

4.1 Interviews

4.1.1 Recruiting interviewees

To recruit participants for interviews we used a variety of professional networks, associations and policy bodies as well as contacts with individual academics and practitioners.

Within the United Kingdom, a description of the project and invitation to participate were distributed to the Equality Challenge Unit, the National Union of Students, AMOSSHE, the FMU's partnership board, the Association of Colleges and the Safe Studies Network (see below). Their support is greatly appreciated. In addition, direct requests for participation were made through colleagues at universities. NGOs were contacted through the partnership board of the Forced Marriage Unit and directly. Police officers were contacted through professional contacts of the researchers.

- The Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) works to further and support equality and diversity for staff and students in higher education across the UK and further education in Scotland. The ECU publishes a newsletter, EqualityLink, which goesout to 1000 HE contacts (http://www.ecu.ac.uk/, accessed 16 July 2013).

- AMOSSHE is the UK Student Services Organisation. According to its website the organisation informs and supports the leaders of Student Services, and represents, advocates for, and promotes the student experience. Members of AMOSSHE include 148 British and international higher education institutions (http://www.amosshe.org.uk/, accessed 16 July 2013).

- The National Union of Students (NUS) is a confederation of 600 students' unions, amounting to more than 95% of all higher and further education unions in the UK. Through the students' unions NUS represents the interests of more than seven million students (http://www.nus.org.uk/, accessed 16 July 2013).

- The Association of College (AoC) represents general and tertiary further education colleges, sixth form colleges and specialist colleges in England. The organisation also works with and represents colleges in Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland (http://www.aoc.co.uk/, accessed 16 July 2013).

- The Safe Studies Network includes academics, policy makers, journalists, and activists working on and researching issues of gender, campus culture, and sexual violence in British higher education institutions (https://safestudiesnetwork.wordpress.com, accessed 16 July 16, 2013).

- The partnership board of the Forced Marriage Unit is a group of NGOs, law enforcement entities, researchers and policy makers who are actively involved in issues relating to forced marriage, and which includes the lead researchers and the organisation undertaking this research. The FMU convenes regular meetings of the partnership board.

Internationally, information about the study was distributed through the European Network on Gender and Violence. This yielded expressions of interest in particular from colleagues in Germany and the recommendation to recruit through the network of women's affairs officers at German universities. In addition, we used academic contexts in Turkey to elicit feedback on how Turkish institutions are addressing FM/VAW. The issue of forced marriage in the Turkish community in the UK had surfaced during the pilot project, and colleagues in Turkey had expressed interested in the topic as they were keen on addressing the issue of forced marriage against students in Turkey.

4.1.2 Designing the questions

Four sets of semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were prepared, including questions for frontline university staff such as counsellors, clergy, personal tutors, and lecturers, managerial university staff such as director of counselling centre, specialist services providers, and police officers. Interviews with front-line and teaching staff focused on how issues of VAW/FM present and how staff responses can be enhanced, including internal procedures and referrals to specialist services. Interviews with management focused on institutional structures and commitments (see Table 3). Interviews with staff at specialist service providers focused on working relationships between service providers and

HEIs, referral practices, gaps in services, and ways to integrate universities into multi-agency systems. In the introduction to the interviews it was made clear that their scope included FM and VAW, that FM and VAW disproportionally affect women and therefore the focus would be largely on female students, and that we were also interested in incidents where male students had been victims.

Table 3: Interviewees' professional roles and focus of interview questions

Role of staff	Focus of interview
Student services, Pastoral care, teaching	What issues have you seen relating to VAW/FM, relationship issues? What services are in place? How prepared do you feel to deal with these issues? What sort of training have you had to address these issues? What is the relationship between university and community services? How supported do you feel by university (including opportunities for professional development in this area)?
Management	Have issues related to VAW come up in your daily work? How has the university responded? What has your role been in responding to these issues? How does university support front-line staff? Are there policies in place for dealing with these issues? How have they been developed and implemented? Is there opportunity for professional development in these areas?
Community-based service providers	Have you had cases involving students? Are there particular barriers or facilitating factors when supporting students? Do you have any working relationship with universities or colleges? Is there a referral system in place? How easy or difficult is it to find and access the right contact points and people at university?
Police	Have you had cases involving students? What has been your experience working with universities on such cases? What would strengthen your work on VAW cases involving students?

4.1.3 Undertaking, documenting and analysing the interviews

Interviewees were contacted by email, over the phone or in person, and the research assistant set up interview dates. Most of the interviews were held in person, some over the phone, and in a few cases, two university staff members were interviewed together. The research assistant took detailed notes of the interviews, which were reviewed and discussed with her by Prof. Freeman and Prof. Klein. The findings from the interviews were interpreted within the broader empirical context as outlined by the UK research discussed above and the pertinent international literature.

4.2 Indicative scan

The indicative scan served as an additional strategy, besides the interviews, to gauge the current PSE sector response in the UK to FM/VAW. The primary emphasis of the scan was to examine how institutions address issues of FM/VAW on the public pages of their institutional websites. 16 HE institutions and 42 FE institutions were selected (for criteria for selection, see 4.2.1 below). Although websites are not the only way in which an institution can reach the public, they are an important and obvious access point for students, staff members and the general public and a medium of self-representation for the institution that reflects what an institution wishes to let the public know about itself.

4.2.1 Identifying the institutions

For HE institutions we decided to search the website of institutions whose names we encountered in the process of recruiting interviewees. This way, we would look at the websites of institutions for which we had an indication that they were interested in the issues in some way and could see how these institutions presented themselves on their websites. For instance, would an institution, which interviewees described as having a fairly proactive response to FM/VAW, appear proactive on these issues on its website? This group included nine universities (seven from the current study and two from the pilot study). In addition, we looked at the websites of universities where staff members had expressed interest in the project but the interviews fell through for various reasons (3), universities that had been suggested as participants and which we contacted but received no reply (3), and universities that came up in conversations about the project but that we did not contact due to limited project resources (1).

For FE institutions we chose a different strategy. We had interview information only about one FE institution (from a representative of a community-based agency), and no FE institution responded to our request for interviews. This made it less meaningful to choose websites based on interviews, and also few other indications that would have suggested specific institutions. Instead, we opted for a sample stratified by the regional distribution of the FMU case load as published in FMU 2012 statistics (see Table 4). Thus, the FE sample includes more colleges from areas where the FMU had more cases (as far as the region was known in the 2012 statistics) and fewer colleges from areas where the FMU had fewer cases. We are aware that a different sampling method could have been used but believe that this approach is useful for gathering college information in areas in which the FMU's caseload was particularly high. It may also be useful for further developing FMU outreach to colleges.

Table 4: Sample of 40 colleges stratified by regional distribution of FMU 2012 case load

Region	% of FMU case load 2012[2]	Number of colleges in region[1]	Number of colleges for sample[3]	Method of choosing from list of colleges
NOT KNOWN	27%			
REGION KNOWN	73%			
London	21%	53	10	*Every 5th listing*
West Midlands	16%	44	9	*Every 5th listing*
Southeast	11%	60	6	*Every 10th listing*
Northwest	8%	58	4	*Every 15th listing*
Yorkshire & Humberside	7%	36	4	*Every 9th listing*
East Midlands	3%	26	1	*In large urban area*
East Anglia/Eastern	2%	31	1	*Mentioned in interview*
South West	2%	31	1	*In large urban area*
Northeast/Northern	1%	23	1	*In large urban area*
Scotland	1%	32	1	*Contacted, no reply*
Wales	1%	1	1	*Only one listed*
Northern Ireland	<1%	6	1	*In large urban area*
TOTAL REGION KNOWN	73%			
REGION NOT KNOWN	27%			

[1] Data sources for number of colleges:
England and Wales: Association of Colleges, http://www.aoc.co.uk/ (accessed 17 July 2013)
Scotland: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_further_education_colleges_in_Scotland (accessed 17 July 17, 2013)
Northern Ireland: Colleges Northern Ireland, http://www.anic.ac.uk/index.aspx (accessed 17 July, 2013)

[2] Data source FMU statistics 2012: https://www.gov.uk/forced-marriage

[3] Oversampled by one or two colleges for first five regions in order to have 40 colleges in sample.
Thus, London 8+2, West Midlands 7+2, Southeast 5+1, Northwest 3+1, Yorkshire & Humberside 3+1.

4.2.2 Searching the websites

Searches were conducted by keyword. Keywords included 'forced marriage', 'arranged marriage', 'violence against women', 'gender-based violence', 'sexual assault', 'rape', 'domestic violence', 'stalking', 'sexual harassment', and 'bullying'. The keywords were typed into the search function on institutional homepages and the resulting hits, if any, were recorded and analysed.

The keywords were selected in order to determine whether institutions use any of the major terms currently in use in the field to name the issues and are in this way proactive in addressing terminology and issues. It should be noted that on some university websites terms such as 'personal problems' appear in relation to support services available at the institution. While issues of FM/VAW may come up when discussing personal problems, we did not search for such oblique keywords. Rather, we followed the feminist argument that abusive acts need to be named as such and not cloaked in euphemisms or referred to by oblique references. Public debate about domestic and sexual violence reflects this shift towards clearer and more specific naming to some extent. In addition, staff interviewed in the pilot study had made the comment that, when trust had been established and students were asked about sexual or domestic violence directly, they often responded openly and did not shy away from the topic (Freeman & Klein, 2012). In contrast, there may be more confusion still about the distinction between forced and arranged marriage. We found (see section 5.2) that several

university staff members would describe marriages against students' will as arranged, rather than forced. Therefore, we included both 'forced marriage' and 'arranged marriage' in our keywords, mindful that arranged marriages, if they truly are arranged and proceeding with the consent of both partners, are not problematic in the way forced marriages are.

The keyword searches were analysed in two steps. First, the keywords were used to search a couple of websites to get a better sense of the number and type of hits returned, and how to analyse these results. The keyword searches returned highly diverse content. Several links were followed back to get a better sense of what the content was about. In order to structure this diversity into a few larger categories that would be useful for the purpose of this study four categories were created:

1. Support. This was understood as content in which the institution offers advice and support concerning FM/VAW, including descriptions of these abuses and information about where to get help on campus or off campus (typically these are links to student services and welfare)

2. Policies. This was understood as content informing about institutional policy documents (such as harassment policy), in particular those that are linked to procedures for reporting a violation or filing a grievance

3. Corporate intent. This was understood as content informing about an institution's intent to address FM/VAW such as in equality and diversity reports and schemes or in corporate responsibility statements. This type of content was considered in its own category, rather than lumped in with policies because corporate intent documents reflect that the institution acts to move towards more equality, whereas for policies to take effect individual staff or students need to act by filing complaints (although the process of authoring and adopting a policy is more a matter of institutional action, as are an institution's responses to claims filed or reports made by staff or students).

4. Awareness. This was a very broad category understood as content reflecting and raising awareness of FM/VAW on the part of students, staff, or institution but not content in which the institution references its policies or support services. Awareness content included:

    • Conferences, seminars, and workshops

    • Guest speakers, including academics and activists and professionals from the community

    • Newsletters and online magazines (by the institution, the students' union, or the trade unions)

    • Academic course information

    • Research papers and reports

    • Staff research on staff profile pages

    • Documents from presentations such as powerpoints

    • Campaign-type events (such as the forced marriage awareness exhibit at a few Scottish universities)

    • Pamphlets, flyers, and posters about events

    • Meeting minutes (including from entities such as safety committee, which may have bearing on policies or corporate intent but is included under awareness)

Second, with these considerations in mind and using the four categories, all other websites were then searched. The keywords were typed into the search function on institutional homepages and the resulting hits, if any, were recorded and analysed.

4.3   Feedback from Germany

Information about the study was circulated by email announcement through the European Network on Gender and Violence, an association of over 160 researchers, practitioners and policy-makers from different countries, mostly in Europe. While academics from several countries responded to the announcement, sustained interest came in particular from Germany and leads there were pursued further. The information about the study was circulated through the German Association

of Women's Affairs and equal opportunity officers at universities (Bundeskonferenz der Frauen- und Gleichstellungsbeauftragten an Hochschulen, BUKOF, http://www.bukof.de/index.php/vorstand_kontakt.html). The women's affairs officers who were available for feedback were asked how German universities respond to FM/VAW, whether these issues are seen within the remit of a university's concerns, whether cases of FM/VAW come to the attention of staff members, and how the institutions tend to respond.

The second author, a native German speaker, spoke with three women's affairs officers from two different universities, both of which are among the 'new' universities that had emerged from former polytechnics, and were located in large metropolitan areas. In addition, information from the BUKOF website was perused as well as documents provided by the interviewees. The conversations were face-to-face and summarised in notes. Additional information was provided by individual researchers over the phone. Obviously, only very few women's affairs officers were interviewed. Whether the small number is due to lack of interest in the topic or other reasons is unclear. The findings from these conversations should not be seen as representative of the German higher education sector but rather as indicative of how issues of FM/VAW have been addressed at some universities in Germany.

Note also that the feedback from Germany was meant to help put the findings from the United Kingdom into an internationally comparative framework, not to replicate in detail the methodology used in the UK. Thus, the feedback from Germany is much less comprehensive and detailed than the evidence gathered in the UK. Nonetheless the feedback helps to illuminate how issues of FM/VAW are seen in different national PSE sectors. Similarly, we have only very limited information from Turkey about how Turkish universities are addressing FM/VAW but we do know that at some universities the issues are acknowledged and staff are taking proactive steps to address them (see section 5.7 below).

5. Findings

We first report on findings from the interviews, then on findings from the indicative scan, and conclude with a brief international comparison.

5.1 "Tip of the iceberg": Most of FM/VAW remains invisible

Consistent with what we found in the pilot study, not nearly as many cases of FM and VAW seem to come to the attention of university staff as one might expect if all incidents were reported, given the base rate estimates from the prevalence surveys mentioned above. Some interviewees had seen no cases at all; others had seen only a few over the course of years. Other interviewees remarked that it was likely that there might be more cases, given that incidents of VAW are relatively common in society at large, but that such incidents were not disclosed. As in the pilot study we conclude that those cases that are reported to campus staff are most likely only the metaphorical tip of the iceberg, and that it is highly unlikely that no cases exist where none are reported. This may mean different things to the students who are affected by these issues. It may mean that they never reported problems because they dealt with them sufficiently on their own or with the help of others. However, it may also mean that students who would have liked help from the university were facing obstacles that made it impossible for them to reach out to university staff. These cases may constitute important lost opportunities for provision of support. For instance, with regard to forced marriage, addressing practitioners working within statutory agencies, the FMU explicitly endorsed a "one chance" recommendation, meaning that potential helpers may have only one opportunity to help a student affected by FM, and that it is important not to miss this opportunity (Forced Marriage Unit, 2009). While this recommendation was not directed specifically at PSE staff, the university support situation may be analogous to the practitioner situation. Thus, for the PSE sector, too, the "one chance" rule may be good guidance, rather than assuming that support for students affected by FM/VAW may be provided elsewhere or at a later point. This, however, also requires PSE staff to be more knowledgeable about FM/VAW and very mindful of what they are able to provide and what should not be done.

5.2   Problematic assumptions about forced marriage and disclosure of FM

This section notes that a few of the interviewees were very knowledgeable about FM but that many others were not and appeared to hold problematic assumptions about forced marriage and about how students would bring up concerns about FM. Several interviewees appeared to be unclear about the distinction between forced marriage and arranged marriage and used the term arranged marriage to describe cases in which students did not want to get married. Furthermore, some interviewees voiced unrealistic expectations about how students would disclose FM and seemed to assume that if a student were concerned about FM, she or he would say so outright. In contrast, feedback from specialist services providers, as well as the literature cited above, suggests that students would be unlikely to be so straightforward. It is more likely that students would present with academic problems or depressive symptoms, which at first glance may seem to have nothing to do with FM. There may be different reasons for such indirect disclosure. Considering how sensitive the issue of FM is, students are likely to be extremely cautious and to try to establish whether they can trust the staff member. Other students may themselves be confused about what exactly is going on in their families, or may themselves think of a forced marriage as arranged if they did not openly protest against it, because open protest may have been unthinkable.

Instead, presenting issues often are academic: missing classes, failing papers and exams, sudden changes in attendance including attendance at times when the student is not required to be present (as happened in a case of FM that came before the Irish High Court). For some students, the opportunity to spend time in classrooms, labs or at the library may be a sort of safe haven, and they both perceive to be, and in fact may be, less likely to be taken away from university while in the midst of their studies. Other interviewees mentioned financial issues as presenting problems, or issues such as depression.

Finally, many interviewees did not seem to think it was strange that, even in student union related roles, they have never heard of a FM situation in the university, even though they think it probably exists.

This invisibility of the issues and the lack of disclosure appear in starker relief when compared with contexts in which disclosure is invited. One interviewee mentioned a theatre company that goes into schools and colleges with an interactive play about FM, which had caused students to disclose that this was what was happening in their own homes. This may mean that given the opportunity for disclosure in a context that helps naming and talking about the issue, students are willing to disclose. This was echoed by another interviewee who said that she addresses issues of FM/VAW in the context of an academic course she teaches and that students were often disclosing intimate concerns in the classroom. Thus, university staff members need to consider that lack of disclosure may reflect lack of opportunity to disclose as much, or more, than lack of problems to disclose. More specifically, for PSE institutions to provide opportunity to disclose they need to do more than point to the counselling services. They need to make the first step in addressing the issue, signalling their awareness, and thus open a difficult conversation, rather than wait for students to do it.

5.3   Generalist versus specialist staff expertise

Few interviewees had specialist training or expertise on FM/VAW. Many had generic counselling skills. It seems that there is very little training on FM issues within universities, except where those interviewed have a personal commitment to the area of FM/VAW, and have received training, or are otherwise involved in working in this area. It is very noticeable that in those cases staff members are very knowledgeable about the issues and an entirely different perspective is evident. In those cases, there is a realisation that family ties are extremely important, even in cases of FM, so that those at risk do not want to involve the police because they do not want their families criminalised, even though they are being forced into marriage. The danger with this is that there may be a good, individual response in these circumstances but usually without the supporting network required to ensure its institutional continuity without that individual in post. Otherwise, there is a distinct lack of insight into the issues. Several interviewees commented that there are arranged marriages taking place against the students' wishes, without considering these potential or actual cases of forced marriage.

Some interviewees expressed the conviction, which we also found in the pilot research (Freeman & Klein, 2012), that they would be able to deal with a FM situation if it arose because of their generic mentoring or counselling skills. For instance, some interviewees were confident that they would be able to handle cases of FM because they were used to dealing with students in very difficult situations, and apparently were assuming that such difficult situations are more or less alike, which is not the case. Some interviewees also were confident that they would be able to do the right thing even though they were not aware of resources on campus or in the community. While it is possible that they might do the right thing, such confidence may also be misplaced when it is based in a lack of understanding of the particular nature of different forms and contexts of abuse.

5.4 Lack of systematic institutional efforts

Some of the interviewees said that they had begun to develop a more systematic response within their units or departments to issues of FM/VAW, and others mentioned that their institution was trying to become more strategic in the delivery of student services in general. No interviewees said that their institution had a systematic and comprehensive response specifically to address FM/VAW. Similarly, systematic staff development about FM/VAW was rare but there were promising exceptions to this rule. Individual staff members did report that they had had specialist training, either before joining the institution or out of personal interest. In addition, in a couple of institutions presentations to staff about FM had been organised, for instance in collaboration with the FMU. Similarly, relationships with community agencies seemed to depend largely on individual staff knowledge, experience, and commitment. No institution in our sample appeared to be integrated into formal multi-agency working on FM/VAW with community-based specialist services providers or statutory agencies. Interviewees from specialist services providers also mentioned that to some extent universities have the power to keep outsiders out and thus can make it more difficult for community-based specialist services to go into the institutions and reach out to students (and staff).

5.5 Visibility of FM/VAW on university websites

When interpreting the results of the keyword searches the following should be kept in mind. First, available content is not stable over time. Websites are dynamic repositories of content; pages that were returned by the search on the day of the search (as indicated in Table 5) may be taken down in the future. Additionally, content may be recent or old. Many websites include archived material that was several years old as well as news of recent and future events. Particularly important for making comparisons is that the absolute number of hits returned by a search engine needs to be taken with a grain of salt. Some search engines may identify duplicate hyperlinks, whereas others may not. Non-duplicate links may still refer to the same event (such as several links to a conference).Some search engines seemed to return more links to the same document than other search engines, and some of the hits returned referred to unrelated content that appeared on the same page as content about FM/VAW (such as listings of events or latest news). When it was clear that spurious links were being returned, these were not counted (this included some uses of the word stalking in unrelated content as well as links to the unrelated content about oil seed rape; it is also debatable whether references to rape in fiction and drama should be counted under awareness). Finally, larger institutions tend to have more staff to create content that could be put up on the institution's website (such as research reports), and perhaps also more staff to maintain the website and upload available material. Thus, comparing the number of hits across institutions or within institutions across the four categories of support, policies, corporate intent and awareness is not straightforward. In particular, it seems not warranted to make much of small numerical differences. Consequently, the number of hits returned were categorised as no (no hits), yes, (1-20 hits), and many (over 20 hits).

Notwithstanding the factors that may influence the number of hits returned their frequency distribution shows a relatively consistent pattern. Content in the awareness category was by far the largest content domain, in particular at larger research institutions where there may be one or more staff producing research and course content on FM/VAW.

Table 5 summarises the results of the scan for 16 HE websites. None means no hits were returned for the respective keyword for any of the websites scanned. One means, that for one website, at least one hit was returned; few means that for at least one or two institutions one or more hits were returned; many means for many institutions one or more hits were returned; most means for most institutions one or more hits were returned; and all means that for each website in the scan one or more hits were returned. With regard to arranged marriage, the N/A entry means that issues of support, policy and corporate intent are not applicable in the way they are to the other keywords because arranged marriages, if they truly are arranged and not forced, are not problematic in the way forced marriage, rape or sexual harassment are problematic.

Table 5: Links to content on HE websites (public pages; July 2013)

Search term	Content category			
	Support	Policies	Corporate Intent	Awareness
FM	Few	One	One	Many
AM	N/A	N/A	N/A	Most
VAW	One	None	None	Most
GBV	None	None	None	Most
SA	Many	Few	Few	Most
Rape	Many	Few	One	Most
DV	Many	One	Few	All
ST	Few	Few	Few	Most
SH	Many	Many	Many	Most
BU	Many	Most	Many	All

Links to support content regarding sexual assault (SA), rape, domestic violence (DV), sexual harassment (SH), and bullying (BU) were returned for many HE institutions in the scan, links to support for forced marriage (FM) and stalking (ST) for few institutions, links to support for violence against women (VAW) for one and links to support for gender-based violence (GBV) for no institution. For most websites the search returned between 1 and 20 links to content with support information; at one institution, a large research university, over 20 links were returned.

The scan for content category support parallels findings from the interviews in the sense that forced marriage was barely on the radar. Furthermore, with one exception content on the support pages was not framed in terms of violence against women or gender-based violence but rather in the semantically gender-neutral terms sexual assault/rape and domestic violence, even though, according to the interview findings, most victims who received support had been women. The gender-neutral framing mirrors similar trends in the field where gender-neutral language may be seen as a reflection of an approach aimed at gender equality, although it has been argued that, rather than contributing to gender equality, gender-neutral language obscures gender inequalities (Sørensen, 2013; Wright & Hearn, 2013).

Links to institutional policies about sexual assault/rape, sexual harassment, and stalking were returned for a few institutions, links to policies mentioning forced marriage or domestic violence were returned for one institution each, and no policy documents were returned for VAW and GBV. Many websites held policies about sexual harassment and almost all websites held policies about bullying; for a few institutions the search returned over 20 pages referencing bullying policy. Where policies about sexual assault/rape, sexual harassment and stalking were referenced, between 1 and 20 links were returned.

Even more so than with regard to support language, policy language appears to emphasise "neutral" framings under which a range of problems are subsumed. Apparently, most of the policy documents are eschewing language that suggests gender-related problems (VAW, GBV) as well as language that references forced marriage directly. Moreover, at many institutions a broad range of abusive practices, that disproportionately affect women (FM, SA, rape, DV, SH, ST) are subsumed in single policies against bullying and/or against harassment (without the word sexual in the title of the policy). Thus, phenomena as diverse as forced marriage and bullying by a co-worker are addressed under one general policy and, to the extent that these policies are linked to complaint procedures, with one route for filing complaints.

This may sound reasonable but creates numerous problems in practice. Based on anecdotal case feedback from the interviews and the indicative scan these problems include:

• Lack of privacy in the location on campus where students can go to file a complaint. This lack of privacy may actually be aggravated when the location or facility is organised in a centralised "one-stop shopping" fashion where students with any sort of complaint wait in a common area and may overhear the disclosure of a sexual assault or forced marriage. This has serious implications in the context of FM for the willingness and ability to report where fear of community involvement often bears heavily on a victim, and where the person making the initial intake of complaints may not be trained to respond properly to disclosure of FM/VAW.

• Lack of disaggregated record keeping that makes it difficult (and de facto impossible) to keep track of cases of FM/VAW if they are not coded as such. One institution posted a reply to a freedom of information request in which it rejected a request for information about the number of sexual assaults against students over a certain time period. The reason for the rejection was that it would be too expensive to go through the entire case files, which would be needed as they were not coded for sexual assault. One of the interviewees who was aware of issues related to FM reported keeping records under an anonymised system to ensure the required level of confidentiality in FM cases.

• Lack of specialised staff training. At another institution a sexual assault complaint by a female victim was addressed under a general anti-harassment policy; the staff member responsible for applying the policy felt unqualified to address issues of violence against women.

The findings for content category policy suggest a semantic and procedural neutralisation of diverse problems that require specific forms of recognition, support and intervention (the need for specific support and intervention, tailored, to the problem, was emphasised by one of the police officers interviewed).

This neutralisation is also evident with regard to content related to corporate intent. Although most websites did not produce any content on corporate intent regarding the keywords used, some websites did. In most cases this included references to equality schemes and annual equality reports. In all of these cases, it was again the bullying keyword that returned corporate intent content most consistently. In a few cases, it was the sexual harassment keyword, and in one case, keywords forced marriage, rape, and stalking (in addition to bullying) appeared in reference to corporate intent. Bullying discourses have become increasingly prominent in relation to sexual harassment, homophobic taunting, and various forms of intimidation among school pupils. Ringrose (2008), among others, argues that bullying discourses, by and large, ignore gender and heterosexism as well as other cultural or race-related factors that influence power relations and interpersonal dynamics among children in school. Moy (2008) found that to some extent bullying discourses offered school officials a way of "explaining" all violence without needing to go into further detail about the social or cultural circumstances under which specific forms of abuse arise. The point here is that for the actual provision of services to students affected by FM/VAW it may not be helpful to rely too much on broad notions of abuse or "personal problems" because such broad notions allow specific forms of support to "slip in" that may be fine with some forms of abuse but inappropriate with others. This is particularly an issue in regard to the apparently quite common notion among university staff that problems related to FM could be resolved by talking with the student's parents. Even if that was possible in an individual case, as a general strategy for how to address FM talking to parents, other family members, or community members is dangerous and the FMU as well as many specialist services providers warn against it.

Awareness was the most common content category by far. Each website scanned held awareness content referencing one or more of the keywords used. However, for some websites this was relatively minimal (up to 20 hits) and in cases seemed to be related to the research and teaching activity of a single staff member. Awareness content about sexual assault/rape and domestic violence was the most common across all websites searched, with some websites producing over 20 (and up to over 100) references for these keywords. Awareness content about forced marriage (or arranged marriages) was the least common, suggesting that this is a larger gap that could be filled. Very large numbers of pages which were returned in the search (over 100) tended to be indicative of large research institutions where staff generated significant amounts of research and teaching content related to the keywords. This does not mean that these institutions also have similarly large amounts of policy or support content. Rather, it suggests that the production of awareness content and of content concerning policy, support, and corporate intent are relatively distinct activities, even within the same institution.

On balance, findings from the indicative scan of the public pages of university websites, even with the methodological caveats mentioned above, seem to be relatively consistent with findings from the interviews. The scan appears to have been useful in both confirming and complementing the interviews. This concerns in particular the near-complete absence of forced marriage from content related to support, policy or corporate intent. In addition, there is a parallel between interview and scan findings with regard to the ways in which institutional responses to a wide and diverse range of problems are narrowed and homogenised. In the interviews this emerged in references to having "generic" counselling skills; in the scan it is visible in subsuming the issue in "generic" policies about bullying and "generic" equality plans. In addition, the scan shows that there is a lot of awareness content about FM/VAW on university websites, and that these sites are a rich resource of awareness information, which is accessible to anyone with access to the Web. At the same time, the scan also suggests that the presence of awareness content is distinct from policy, corporate intent or even support, probably reflecting that the production of these contents requires different kinds of activities. Most of the awareness content is related to the research and teaching activity of individual staff members, whereas the other content categories require collective activity in committees and work teams (and institutional commitment supporting such activity).

Thus, an institutional website may be loaded with awareness content, while at the same time being nearly void of content referencing institutional support, policy, or intent. This difference between individual and institutional activity also mirrors the overall interview finding that responses to FM/VAW seem largely a matter of individual staff expertise and motivation rather than systematic institutional action.

5.6   Visibility of FM/VAW on further education college websites

With one exception, none of the FE colleges we had approached for interviews responded to our enquiry. One college did initially respond but then did not come through in the end. We had indirect information about one FE college from the interview with one staff member who worked for a specialist NGO and served on a college board. Thus, it is not possible to compare scan findings with interview findings as we did for HE institutions. However, there are structural differences between HE and FE institutions that are likely to reflect their self-presentation on institutional websites. FE institutions primarily teach young people aged 16 to 19. Thus, a large proportion of their student body is legally under age, which is likely to influence the way in which FE institutions interpret their institutional responsibilities such as requiring more emphasis on safeguarding. Furthermore, FE institutions typically do not engage in research of the kind HE institutions undertake and they do not teach the broad portfolio of social science courses found at universities where issues of FM/VAW may be addressed. However, many FE institutions prepare students for jobs in policing and thus do address a field where FM/VAW is a significant issue. Nonetheless, one would expect a lot less content about "awareness" activities compared to HE websites. Furthermore, even though many female students in FE may legally be considered girls, they are nonetheless at the age where violence against women begins to peak (Smith et al., 2011). Finally, the colleges were randomly selected from the geographic regions for which the FMU had reported cases of forced marriage in 2012. One could therefore assume that forced marriage is an issue in these regions and may be an issue for FE colleges there.

A total of 40 college websites was searched with the same search terms used for HE websites (forced marriage, arranged marriage, violence against women, gender based violence, sexual assault, rape, domestic violence, stalking, sexual harassment, and bullying). Two websites seemed to have no search function, so an additional two colleges (from the Greater London area) were added to the original random sample of colleges.

Table 6 summarises the results of the scan of 40 FE websites. As in Table 5, none means no hits were returned for the respective keyword for any of the websites scanned. Few means that for at least one or two institutions one or more hits were returned, many means for many institutions one or more hits were returned, most means for most institutions one or more hits were returned, and all means that for each website in the scan one or more hits were returned. With regard to arranged marriage, the N/A entry again means that issues of support, policy and corporate intent are not applicable in the way they are to the other keywords because arranged marriages, if they truly are arranged and not forced, are not problematic in the way forced marriage, rape or sexual harassment are problematic.

Table 6: Links to content on FE websites (public pages; July 2013)

	Content category			
Search term	Support	Policies	Corporate Intent	Awareness
FM	Few	None	One	Few
AM	N/A	N/A	N/A	None
VAW	None	None	None	One
GBV	None	None	None	None
SA	One	None	One	None
Rape	Few	None	None	One
DV	Few	One	One	Few
ST	None	None	None	One
SH	One	Few	Few	One
BU	Many	Many	Many	Many

Links to support-related content regarding bullying were present on many (but less than half of all) FE websites. Links to support for violence against women (VAW), gender-based violence (GBV), and stalking (ST) were returned on no website. Sexual assault (SA) and sexual harassment (SH) were mentioned in relation to support on one website and domestic violence (DV) on another. The terms forced marriage (FM) and rape appeared in support content pages of two websites. For over half of the websites scanned none of the search terms were found in support-related content pages.

By and large, content about support related to any of the search terms was scarce, and the exceptions to this were due to three websites out of a total of 40. FE websites do mention support or services for students but they do so in even more generic terms than HE websites, eschewing almost entirely any specific references to sexual or gendered violence. The FE institutions in the sample seemed to be significantly smaller than the HE institutions. Thus, instead of referencing a counselling centre or department, there might be a reference to the counsellor. On other websites, support was simply expressed as a statement of commitment without references to counsellors or support centres. Quite different from HE institutions, some of the FE websites referenced services for parents in the sense of content addressing parents directly and ways for parents to engage with the institution. Thus, FE institutions framed recipients of support differently and more broadly (students and parents) than HE institutions.

Links to institutional policies specifically about FM, VAW, GBV, SA/rape, and stalking were not found (although one website held a safeguarding policy in which the word rape appeared but the search engine did not find it). One website had a link to a policy specifying DV, a few sites had links to policies specifying SH, and many sites had policies specifying bullying. The latter often named bullying and harassment, but did not name sexual harassment. Incidentally, when the word sexual appeared it was most frequently in relation to sexual orientation in the context of equality and diversity plans.

Similar to the findings for HE websites, on FE websites, too, generic policies addressing bullying were much more common than specialist policies addressing sexual violence (or gendered violence). Even so, on over half of the FE websites the search for bullying did not return policies. While in the HE sector the most common policy framing to address unwanted interpersonal behaviour was in terms of bullying (often along with harassment but not sexual harassment), in the FE sector, the most common policy framing was in terms of safeguarding children (and vulnerable adults). To some extent this framing included language reflecting child sexual abuse discourses ("fondling"). Similar to the findings for HE websites, policy language on FE websites avoided explicit reference to gendered or sexual violence and was dominated by "neutral" framings under which a range of problems are subsumed, with the additional difference that these problems were framed primarily in terms of safeguarding rather than in terms of unwanted conduct. With one notable exception, no links to forced marriage in policy-related content were found.

The situation was similar with regard to the content category of corporate intent. There seemed to be no references to VAW, GBV, rape, or ST; only one reference to FM, rape and DV, all on the same website; few references to SH and many to bullying, including cyber-bullying. For over half of the FE websites no links were found to corporate intent content for any of the search terms. Nonetheless, many FE websites held equality and diversity statements and reports as well as minutes from the meetings of corporate boards addressing the Equality Duty and devising single equality schemes. Thus, similar to institutional policy, the issue—to the extent that it is reflected in the content of institutional websites—is not only the relative lack of relevant policies but the semantic and procedural homogenisation of different problems that require specific forms of support and intervention.

Unsurprisingly, there were noticeably fewer links to awareness content on FE websites than on HE websites. Links to AM, GBV, or SA awareness appeared on no website. Links to FM awareness appeared on one website, and to rape awareness on another. A link to VAW awareness notably appeared on one website, the only time this keyword appeared at all in any of the content categories. Links to DV awareness appeared on six different websites. Many websites held content about bullying awareness. For just over half of all websites no links to awareness regarding any of the keywords were found. Even considering that FE institutions would not produce awareness content in the context of research or course offerings, the scarcity of awareness content on FE websites is striking.

On balance, findings from the indicative scan of the public pages of FE college websites suggest that these websites hold little information on FM/VAW, be it in relation to support, policy, corporate intent or awareness (and in at least one case such information could not be found by search engine, only by downloading and searching a policy document). Although references on institutional websites to safeguarding appear to be routine in the FE sector, the absence of references to sexual violence or gendered violence is noticeable, in particular in the context of prevalence data suggesting that VAW victimisation begins to peak around age 16 (and through to around 24 years) and is likely to affect young women at the age where they might be attending an FE college. Similarly, many victims of FM are in this age range and the FE institutions in the sample are located in regions where the FMU had cases of FM in 2012.

Offering more specialist support on campus may be entirely beyond the capacity of a small institution. However, facilitating access to specialist support off campus, for instance by linking to such support on the college's website, may be well within the means even of small colleges. Indeed, it is somewhat surprising that not more of them did so. Because the younger students are still minors, FE colleges work more closely with parents. Perhaps this increases the pressure on an institution to focus on generic support and safeguarding and avoid mentioning sensitive topics like forced marriage or sexual assault. Also, parents paying for children's education may not welcome interference in family issues which they consider to be private and cultural. However, this is speculation and the reverse argument could be made that parents might welcome a college that is proactive on these known and common social issues. Moreover, the fact that a significant amount of available content was held by one and

the same website raises the question of whether this institution was unusual (an "outlier") or whether additional well-informed websites simply did not happen to be in the sample. Considering that the sample was a random sample within regions with known cases of FM one might suspect that the well-informed website is an outlier.

In any case, there seems to be considerable room for increasing access to support and awareness information for FE students. This could be done either by offering such content directly on FE websites or by linking to external organisations including local specialist services providers but also neighbouring universities. This might offer a more joined-up approach to supporting victims of FM – concerns from FE colleges could be communicated to HE institutions where the potential victim will continue study, rather than being lost in the gap which exists between the two forms of education: One victim, one support route.

5.7 Feedback from Germany and Turkey

According to the feedback gathered in Germany, German universities have traditionally not seen it as one of their responsibilities to address FM/VAW against students, which is in contrast to the way HE institutions in the United States are held responsible (at least in principle). Major legislation such as Title IX, Clery Act, and Violence against Women Act (see above) create what may be a relatively unique U.S. HE context. This may reflect in part the legacy of the US interpretation of the historical doctrine of "in loco parentis", which allows an educational institution to act in the best interest of students (The UK also has the "in loco parentis" doctrine but clearly has not interpreted it in the same way). In many ways the doctrine may have disappeared from U.S. higher education (for instance, by imposing less restrictions on freedom of students' speech and movement), but in other ways the sentiment that HE institutions should control or regulate student life lives on in the above mentioned legislation as well as in the tradition of anti-rape work on campus.

The feedback from Germany suggests that, by and large, German HE students are considered adults responsible for their interpersonal and sexual relationships. Indeed, sexual violence against women, which one could argue is a major impediment to gender equality, seems to be relatively low on women's equality agendas in HE. Higher on the agenda are issues such as the small percentage of female full professors at German universities, pay equity, work-family-balance and women in the STEM fields (science, technology, engineering and math; in Germany particularly engineering and physics). This is somewhat surprising considering that the abuse of female students by male teaching staff and thesis advisors was a recurring theme in the conversations (Bußmann & Lange, 1995). Within the German university system full professors traditionally have held powerful positions within the university hierarchy and were largely shielded from disciplinary action related to abuse of students.

Several cases that had come to the attention of frontline staff members at German universities involved male students stalking and harassing female students, including ex-partners. Several of these cases ended in the female students filing charges with the police. In a case in which a male student repeatedly raped a female student he eventually was charged and sentenced but continued to stalk the woman while on parole. In another case a renowned male professor sexually assaulted and stalked one of his female advisees who was afraid to press charges against him. The university worked out a support plan for the victim, which included allowing her to change advisors. The perpetrating professor received a warning that there would be consequences should he do something like this again. There were no further consequences, either in terms of more severe university action against the professor or in terms of prosecution in the criminal justice system.

In discussing these cases it was clear that, much like at British universities, individual German staff members feel strongly about student welfare and are motivated to provide victims of FM/VAW as much support as possible. With regard to disciplinary action against the perpetrator, two observations stood out. It seemed that it was largely up to individual victims to do anything about the perpetrator and for the most part this would have been filing formal charges with police. There was a sense that a university's hands are bound with regard to students who are perpetrators and that even should an institution expel a student perpetrator he would probably be able to take legal action that would force the university to readmit him. The sense that once police are involved the university is out of the picture also echoes findings from the interviews at British universities.

The second observation concerns the way in which high status and prestige seem to continue to shield male professors from disciplinary action. The interviewees thought that victims would want to keep things quiet for fear of repercussions that would make their lives at the university difficult. However, students are not passive about sexual harassment and may engage in other strategies when they feel that taking more confrontational steps would be too risky. These strategies may include more informal and indeed collective forms of resistance among students. For instance, information about specific male staff known to harass or sexually violate female students may circulate among students by word-of-mouth, along with suggestions on how to deal with these men. A university may have a formal policy against sexual assault but when circumstances discourage victims and survivors to use the policy, alternative forms of resistance may co-exist alongside formal policy.

The German interviewees emphasised the importance of low barriers to accessing services, such as visibility of available services, simple procedures for contacting a support person or making an appointment and confidentiality, as well as the importance of good working relationships with other staff members.

As Feltes and colleagues in the European multi-country study had found, some universities may be reluctant to address FM/VAW for fear that their reputations might suffer. When asked whether German universities are concerned about their reputation, the German interviewees felt that German universities were concerned with gender and diversity and that current institutional self-perception and self-representation emphasises universities as places that promote educational justice rather than as places that take good care of students. It is puzzling that gender and educational justice are foregrounded without simultaneously addressing sexual violence and harassment, which are major factors compromising justice and equality. This may be due to limited resources and the need to prioritise; it may be related to the worry that sexual violence and harassment are unpopular topics and unlikely to garner support from university leadership; or it may reflect lack of awareness of issues related to FM/VAW. Yet, maybe this is not that much different from writing gender out of policy documents by using neutral language. In both cases, some of the most difficult and disturbing aspects of gender as manifested in gender-based abuses remain unspoken and are apt to be bypassed by institutional action.

Regarding Turkey we heard from one academic who has initiated a programme for students who were abused by their family. In a first step, seminars were organised about domestic violence, which created opportunities to address these issues with students. In a second step university staff worked with students to solve university-related problems and build further trust so that sensitive family issues could be addressed. The Turkish academic mentioned dealing with three cases of students who were abused by their family. Drawing on university resources and links to legal associations in the community, the students were supported in different ways including psychological and financial support, help with accommodation, legal support and assistance through court proceedings. 2012/2013 was the first year in which this type of initiative had been tried, and the academic expects that more students will come forward in the future.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

In the context of the European multi-country study Feltes et al. (2012) had asked whether "university policy and responses to violence reflect the modern realities of the phenomenon" (p. 21). Based on the findings reported here our short answer is: not yet.

Although universities are in a good position to provide support, intervene in and possibly even prevent incidents of FM/VAW, and although individual staff members may be doing this effectively, on the whole, and in particular in terms of systematic strategies, universities are not yet doing enough. While awareness may be widespread that FM/VAW are serious problems in society, practical measures to address them in the context of PSE institutions are still in their infancy. And while concern for student well-being has been institutionalised in student services departments and students' unions for quite a while, issues of FM/VAW against students remain largely invisible. It is clear that many student services staff care deeply about the welfare of students, and individual staff members do have specialist expertise on FM/VAW and good knowledge of local community resources.

However, in terms of institutional responses these assets remain piecemeal and at risk of collapsing when staff members leave their posts, retire or fall ill. What is lacking is initiative at management level to make strategies against FM/VAW one of the core institutional responsibilities (Klein, 2013). This needs to include strategic and sustainable efforts to systematically advance specialised policy and staff training, and work collaboratively with off-campus partners, in particular in the FM/VAW specialist sector.

Because we had little feedback from FE colleges we direct our recommendations primarily at HE institutions, although we believe that the principle of pursuing a systematic strategy that specifically addresses FM/VAW (rather than subsuming these issues under harassment, bullying or safeguarding) may be useful for FE institutions as well and likely to be beneficial to victims of FM. As we did in the pilot study (Freeman & Klein, 2012; Cohen & Swift, 1999) we direct our recommendations at several levels of institutional governance. Further research into FE responses to FM/VAW would be desirable as would be research into the uptake of the recommendations made in this report.

Recommendations

Top leadership: Resolve to make a systematic response to FM/VAW one of the university's ongoing core responsibilities and charge a committee of staff, students, and specialist services providers with developing a comprehensive organisational strategy that specifically addresses FM/VAW in policies, staff training, and information campaigns and that is integrated into and clearly visible in key institutional documents such as strategic plan, health & safety policies, conduct codes, and complaint procedures. In addition, leadership could encourage ongoing research into the subject of FM/VAW.

Middle management: Create systematic relationships with specialist community agencies, for instance by having their representatives on a university committee charged with developing a comprehensive university strategy, or by participating in local multi-agency working with community-based specialist service providers, law enforcement and others, or by developing more systematic referral practices that will function even when individual, well-connected staff leave the university.

Develop written policies and response protocols that give specific guidance on steps to take when students disclose FM/VAW, train line managers and frontline services staff on these policies, and monitor policy implementation on a regular basis. As guided by such policies, line managers aim to be better able to offer consistent support for front line staff dealing with cases of FM/VAW, including support for specialised training opportunities, and encouraging ideas from frontline services staff on how to improve the university's comprehensive response to FM/VAW. Support ongoing research on FM/VAW.

Frontline services staff: Ask for specialised training on VAW/FM, including in-house training by local specialist services providers and the Forced Marriage Unit, and participating in off-campus workshops or conferences. Use opportunities to collaborate on research on FM/VAW.

Use university resources such as Students' Union, Student Services, Marketing, IT and New Media departments as well as pertinent academic courses to develop and implement an information campaign for the university that offers accurate, frequently updated and accessible information about resources for those affected by FM/VAW (including campus-based and community-based resources). Accessible information is information that is visible throughout the institution on print and digital media and that is visible in public and private places (cafeteria, bulletin boards, offices, Students' Union spaces, and toilets).

7.   References

Branch, K.A., Hayes-Smith, R., & Richards, T.N. (2011). Professors' experiences with student disclosures of sexual assault and intimate partner violence: How "helping" students can inform teaching practices. Feminist Criminology, 6(1), 54-75.

Bußmann, H. & Lange, K. (1995, eds). Peinlich berührt – Sexuelle Belästigung von Frauen an Hochschulen ["Embarrassingly touched" – Sexual harassment of women at universities]. München: Verlag Frauenoffensive.

Cohen, L. & Swift, S. (1999). The Spectrum of Prevention: Developing a comprehensive approach to injury prevention. Injury Prevention, 5, 203-207.

Coy, M., Lovett, J. & Kelly, L. (2008). Realising rights, fulfilling obligations: A template for an integrated strategy on violence against women for the UK. London: End Violence Against Women.

Feltes, T., Balloni, A., Czapska, J., Bodelon, E., & Stenning, P. (2012).Gender-based violence, stalking and fear of crime. Final report to European Commission, Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security, Project JLS/2007/ISEC/415.

Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. Research report. U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Forced Marriage Unit (2009). Multi-agency practice guidelines: Handling cases of forced marriage. Forced Marriage Unit, HM Government.

Forced Marriage Unit (2010). The right to choose: Multi-agency statutory guidance for dealing with forced marriage (2nd. Ed.). Forced Marriage Unit, HM Government.

Freeman, M. & Klein, R.C.A. (2012). University responses to forced marriage and violence against women in the UK: Report on a pilot study. International Family Law, September 2012, 285-299.

Gill, A. & Anitha, S. (2011). Forced marriage: Introducing a social justice and human rights perspective. London: Zed Books.

Horsman, J. (2006). Moving beyond "stupid": Taking account of the impact of violence on women's learning. International Journal of Educational Development, 26(2), 177-188.

Humphreys, C. & Thiara, R. (2003). Mental health and domestic violence: "I call it symptoms of abuse". British Journal of Social Work, 33, 209-226.

Kazimirski, A, Keogh, P., Kumari, V. et al. (2009). Forced marriage: Prevalence and service response. National Centre for Social Research.

Kelly, L., Lovett, J. & Regan, L. (2005). A gap or a chasm? Attrition in reported rape cases. Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

Klein, R. (2013). Language for institutional change: Notes from U.S. higher education. R. Klein (Ed.). Framing sexual and domestic violence through language. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Klein, R. (2012). Responding to intimate violence against women: The role of informal networks. New York/Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Moy, L.C. (2008). Disrupting 'bully' talk: Progressive practices and transformative spaces for anti-violence work in schools. Doctoral dissertation. The University of British Columbia.

NUS (2010). Hidden marks: A study of women students' experiences of harassment, stalking, violence and sexual assault. National Union of Students.

Ringrose, J. (2008). 'Just be friends': exposing the limits of educational bully discourses for understanding teen girls' heterosexualized friendships and conflicts. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 29(5), 509-522.

Simmons, F. & Burn, J. (2013). Without consent: Forced marriage in Australia. Melbourne University Law Review, 36, 970-1008.

Sloane, C. & Fitzpatrick, K. (2011). Talk about it survey. National Union of Students (Australia).

Smith, K., Coleman, K., Eder S., & Hall, P. (2011). Homicides, firearm offences, and intimate violence 2009/10-Supplementary volume 2 to Crime in England and Wales. Home Office Statistical Bulletin, 01/2011.

Stenning, P., Mitra-Kahn, T., &Dunby, C. (2012).Gender-based violence, stalking and fear of crime. Country report United Kingdom. European Commission, EU-Project 2009-2011 JLS/2007/ISEC/415.

Ullman, S.E. (2010). Talking about sexual assault: Society's response to survivors. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Responding to Forced Marriage and Violence against Women:

Good practice guide for post-secondary education institutions

Developed in project "College and University Responses to Forced Marriage", funded by the Forced Marriage Unit

30 August 2013

This guide suggests practical steps universities, and perhaps also further education colleges, can take to strengthen their response to forced marriage and violence against women (FM/VAW). The development of this guide was supported by funding from the Forced Marriage Unit. Its theoretical and empirical underpinnings can be found in Freeman & Klein (2013) and Freeman & Klein (2012).

In many regards, PSE institutions are well positioned to contribute to recognition, intervention, prevention and support in cases of FM/VAW. They have access to a population at high risk for FM/VAW and have support systems in place such as counselling, financial advice, pastoral care, and personal tutors. PSE institutions have a skilled workforce that is highly motivated to support students. For some victims, time at university may be a safe place, and one of few opportunities, to access support, in particular for FM.

However, current PSE responses to FM/VAW fall short. Based on our research two shortcomings stand out: one is the lack of comprehensive institutional strategies that are supported by top leadership, and the other is the tendency to take a generic approach toward staff training and policy development. This generic approach seems to assume that general counselling skills or a broad policy against harassment or bullying will suffice to address problems of FM/VAW where they are recognised as being within the ambit of a PSE institution's responsibilities. This assumption is misplaced because FM/VAW require specific and well-informed responses about what to do and what not to do, and accurate knowledge of existing services, not assumptions of what might exist, or about which skills may be required to deal with these specialist situations

We recommend that PSE institutions make it one of their core institutional responsibilities to address FM/VAW by pursuing the following steps: (1) improve access to specialist services in the community; (2) invest in systematic specialist staff training and policy development; (3) participate in multi-agency working with community-based specialist service providers and statutory agencies; and (4) articulate FM/VAW in information campaigns that show that the institution not only is aware of these issues in theory but also knows how to address them in practice.

The following recommendations are aimed at HE institutions, although the principle of pursuing a systematic strategy that specifically addresses FM/VAW (rather than subsuming these issues under harassment, bullying or safeguarding) may be useful for FE institutions as well and may be adapted to FE contexts. Specialist services providers in the field of violence against women have produced guidance on how to respond to VAW, and the Forced Marriage Unit offers guidance specifically on addressing FM, which will be referenced in the resources below.

The guidance here is written with the internal processes of PSE institutions in mind. The intent is to make it easier for institutions to apply existing good practice recommendations to their own organisation. This guidance is deliberately kept short. Its goal is to improve practice, not accumulate documents. Although we are in favour of written policies, the purpose of such documents is not to exist for their own sake, but to practically guide and reflect actual interpersonal and organisational practice. Thus, the social and institutional processes of authoring and adopting policy, of training staff members on policy, of providing informed support and of periodically assessing actual practice, are infinitely more important than the document as such. The written word can be seductive. However, the point is not to sound good on paper but to work effectively in practice.

Top Leadership

- Resolve to make a systematic response to FM/VAW one of the university's ongoing core responsibilities

- Charge committee of staff, students, and representative from the FM/VAW specialist sector with developing a comprehensive organisational strategy that specifically addresses FM/VAW in policies, staff training, and information campaigns and is integrated into and clearly visible in key institutional documents such as strategic plan, health & safety policies, conduct codes, and complaint procedures.

- Encourage and facilitate continued research on FM/VAW.

Middle Management

- Create systematic relationships with the FM/VAW specialist sector
  - By having their representatives on a university committee charged with developing a comprehensive university strategy
  - By participating in local multi-agency working with community-based specialist service providers, law enforcement and others
  - By developing more systematic referral practices that will function even when individual, well-connected staff members leave the university.

- Develop written policies and response protocols that give specific guidance on steps to take when students disclose FM/VAW

- Train line managers and frontline services staff on these policies. As guided by such policies, line managers can offer consistent support for front line staff dealing with cases of FM/VAW, including support for specialised training opportunities, and encouraging ideas from frontline services staff on how to improve the university's comprehensive response to FM/VAW.

- Monitor policy implementation on a regular basis.

- Encourage and facilitate continued research on FM/VAW.

Frontline Services Staff

- Participate in specialised training on FM/VAW. This could include
  - In-house training by local specialist services providers and the Forced Marriage Unit
  - Participation in off-campus workshops or conferences.

- Use university resources such as Students' Union, Student Services, Marketing, IT and New Media departments as well as pertinent academic courses to develop and implement an information campaign for the university that offers accurate, frequently updated and accessible information about resources for those affected by VAW/FM (including campus-based and community-based resources). Accessible information is information that is visible throughout the institution on print and digital media and that is visible in public and private places (cafeteria, bulletin boards, offices, Students' Union spaces, and toilets).

- Collaborate in continued research on FM/VAW.

Resources

Forced Marriage Unit (2009). Multi-agency practice guidelines: Handling cases of forced marriage. HM Government. [Includes advice for educational institutions] https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/35530/forced-marriage-guidelines09.pdf [accessed 9.8.2013]

Forced Marriage Unit (2010). The right to choose: Multi-agency statutory guidance for dealing with forced marriage. HM Government. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/35532/fmu-right-to-choose.pdf [accessed 9.8.2013]

Freeman, M. & Klein, R. (2013). College and university responses to forced marriage. Report to the Forced Marriage Unit. London Metropolitan University. August 2013.

Freeman, M. & Klein, R.C.A. (2012). University responses to forced marriage and violence against women in the UK: Report on a pilot study. International Family Law, September 2012, 285-299.

National Union of Students (2010). Hidden marks: A study of women students' experiences of harassment, stalking, violence and sexual assault. National Union of Students.

Web template. This is a short suggestion of content for PSE institutions to put up on their websites. It contains a general statement and links to resources. Local resources need to be inserted by the institution as appropriate (separate document).

Appendix 2

Web template developed in project College and University Responses to Forced Marriage, funded by the Forced Marriage Unit. (2012–2013)

Suggested language to put up on website of post-secondary education institution, inserting appropriate local information:

"Violence against Women and Forced Marriage (VAW/FM) are social problems that can affect the university community in different ways.

[Name of university] takes a proactive approach to addressing these issues. National and international research has shown that VAW/FM affects students and staff, whether as victims, loved ones, or service providers, and regardless of whether abuse occurred at the university or elsewhere (NUS, 2010; Feltes, Balloni, Czapska, Bodelon, & Stenning, 2012; Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2000). While some men experience sexual and domestic abuse and forced marriage, young women are disproportionally affected. The majority of perpetrators of sexual harassment and sexual violence are men.

From the expert communities of researchers and the VAW specialist sector we know that everybody in society must contribute if VAW/FM is to end.

[Name of university] believes that the post-secondary education sector needs to become more proactive and that we as institutions need to take a close look at what we can do and not shy away from difficult questions or uncomfortable realities.

[Name of university] is in the process of overhauling its response to VAW/FM. We want to have a comprehensive strategy of leadership support, designated policies, staff training, community relations and information. This is work in progress and must be reassessed and refined as we learn more about the issues and integrate feedback from the university community. At the moment we have the following in place:

University VAW/FM specialist services [only if university has specialist services]

Local VAW/FM specialist services [insert names and links as appropriate]
* Local rape crisis centre
* Local domestic violence project
* Local project addressing forced marriage, honour-based violence

National and regional VAW/FM specialist services [sample selection]
* http://www.rapecrisis.org.uk/ [England and Wales]
* http://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk/about/ [Scotland]
* http://www.hennafoundation.org/
* http://www.karmanirvana.org.uk/
* Forced Marriage Unit, https://www.gov.uk/forced-marriage
* Women's Aid, http://www.womensaid.org.uk/

Other University Services [insert titles and links as appropriate]
* Counseling centre
* Faith community
* Students' union
* Health centre

University Policies [examples given; insert titles and links as appropriate]

- Policy against VAW/FM
- Annual report on university strategy against VAW/FM
- Policy against sexual harassment
- Policy against harassment, bullying
- Equality and equal opportunity policies
- Single equality scheme
- Annual equality report

Research references

- Feltes, T., Balloni, A., Czapska, J., Bodelon, E., & Stenning, P. (2012).Gender-based violence, stalking and fear of crime. Final report to European Commission, Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security, Project JLS/2007/ISEC/415. . http://vmrz0183.vm.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/gendercrime/index.html [last accessed 9.8.2013]
- Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. Research report. U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. http://www.nij.gov/pubs-sum/182369.htm [last accessed 9.8.2013]
- Freeman, M. & Klein, R.C.A. (2012). University responses to forced marriage and violence against women in the UK: Report on a pilot study. International Family Law, September 2012, 285-299.
- Freeman, M. & Klein, R. (2013). College and university responses to forced marriage. Final report to the Forced Marriage Unit.
- NUS (2010). Hidden marks: A study of women students' experiences of harassment, stalking, violence and sexual assault. National Union of Students. http://hiddenmarks.org.uk/2010/ [last accessed 9.8.2013]"

The Centre for Family Law & Practice
Faculty of Law, Governance & International Relations
London Metropolitan University
16 Goulston Street
London E1 7TP

Email:flp@londonmet.ac.uk
www.londonmet.ac.uk/flp