Gender-based violence in academic and research workplaces

Pervasiveness in higher education and research performing organisations

Sofia Strid, Jeff Hearn

Sofia Strid, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg. E-mail: sofia.strid@gu.se. ORCID: 0000-0001-7822-4563

Jeff Hearn, Senior Professor, Human Geography, Örebro University, Sweden; Professor of Sociology, University of Huddersfield, UK; Professor Emeritus, Hanken School of Economics, Finland; Extraordinary Professor, Women's and Gender Studies, University of Western Cape, South Africa. E-mail: jeff.hearn@hanken.fi. ORCID: 0000-0002-9808-1413

Gender-based violence (GBV) at work or study place often falls outside of the mainstream violence research interests. However, it is now well established that violence is far from rare in work and workplaces, in organisations, and for certain occupations. This is all the more so when violence is understood in a broad sense to include harassment, bullying, psychological violence, and further violations, as in feminist conceptualisations of GBV. In this paper, we address GBV in a particular arena which, it would be hoped, would be designed to enhance well-being, safety, knowledge and education: namely, higher education (HE) and research performing organisations (RPOs). Importantly, from our perspective, HE and RPOs are not only educational and research sites, but also need to be understood as work, workplace, employment, occupational, organisational, professional and managerial sites. We draw on recent research within the EU funded UniSAFE, a large multi-country research and innovation project on GBV in HE and RPOs. UniSAFE has aimed to provide reliable, comparable data on different forms of gender-based violence in HE and RPOs in order to understand the extent of the problem among staff and students, assess institutional responses, and develop tools to address that problem. The materials include a survey of prevalence and consequences of GBV in HEI and RPOs (n=42 000), in-depth case studies, a strategic mapping of GBV policy and measures in 46 HEI and RPOs , and a mapping of national policy on GBV in HE.

Introduction: Where is violence?

The problem of gender-based violence in higher education and research performing organisations is urgent, widespread, systemic and complex, with severe negative consequences for many institutions and individuals in relation to health, and study and career outcomes (Anitha & Lewis 2018; Bondestam & Lundqvist 2020; Humbert et al. 2022; Latcheva 2017; *Violence Against Women* 2019*)*.

Violence, and specifically gender-based violence, often conjure images of individualised interpersonal violence, such as 'domestic violence' or 'intimate partner violence' (IPV), or violence on the street or in other public places, such as pubs and clubs. In addition, violence, especially as depicted in the media, often highlights violence in war and civil conflict, itself heavily gendered, whether in direct military conflict or associated sexual violence. Eurobarometer data for 2016 show that this reflects the perceptions of the population across Europe. Violence against women is perceived as more likely occurring at home (86%) than any other setting, such as at workplaces (17%) or in school or university (5%). Accordingly, gender-based violence at work or study place often falls outside of the mainstream violence research interests. At the same time, it is now well established that violence is far from rare in work and workplaces, in organisations, and for certain occupations, and indeed both practices and perceptions on this have probably shifted in some sectors following #MeToo campaigns. This is all the more so when violence is understood in a broad sense to include harassment, bullying, psychological violence, and further violations, as in feminist conceptualisations of gender-based violence.

This paper addresses gender-based violence in a particular arena which, it would be hoped, would be designed to enhance well-being, safety, knowledge and education: namely, higher education instiutions (HEI) and research performing organisations (RPOs). Importantly, from our perspective, HEI and RPOs are not only educational and research sites, but also need to be understood as work, workplace, employment, occupational, organisational, professional and managerial sites. We address these questions by way of an approach that is primarily informed by feminist understandings of gender, violence, intersectionality and multiple inequalities, drawing on long-term research and policy experience on gender inequalities and violence (e.g Hearn et al. 2016; Strid et al. 2013), both individual and collective. More specifically, we draw on recent research within a large multi-country research and innovation project on gender-based violence in HE and RPOs.[1] This project has aimed to provide reliable,

comparable data on different forms of gender-based violence in HE and RPOs in order to understand the extent of the problem among staff and students, assess institutional responses, and develop tools to address that problem.

Research on gender-based violence in higher education and research performing organisations

While some forms of gender-based violence have long been addressed within research and policy debates on gender inequalities in HE, gender-based violence is now receiving increasing attention, in research studies, policy development, media reports, and awareness-raising more generally in Sweden and other parts of Europe (EC 2024). While the earliest studies tended to focus mainly on sexual harassment, for example, the study conducted by the Oxford University Students Union Women's Committee in 1984, and the unpublished prevalence study on sexual harassment at Uppsala University in 1989, recent studies tend to focus on more forms (Agardh et al. 2020; Ebintra et al. 2018; *Enkätstudie om genusbaserad utsatthet …* 2022; also see Bondestam and Lundqvist 2020). There is now well-established research and policy literature, as well as high-profile public debate in some parts of Europe, on gender-based violence in some educational fields (Anitha & Lewis 2018; Fajmonová et al. 2021; Huck et al. 2021; Ljubljana Declaration 2021; Call for Action 2022; EC 2024).

However, national prevalence studies of gender-based violence in universities and RPOs in Europe are few (Strid et al. 2021). While none cover prevalence of all forms of gender-based violence, some have started to provide broader coverage, few prevalence studies include both staff and students. Most existing studies are regional or local, address victims, rather than perpetrators and bystanders, and are limited in scope, covering sexual harassment and sexual violence; few prevalence studies include online violence, and none economic violence or organisational violence (Strid et al. 2021).

Most studies adopt a binary approach when reporting gender differences, usually finding that women and men can experience violence, but that disproportionately women are victims and men perpetrators. More vulnerable groups of staff may experience overlapping moral, sexual or other forms of harassment, sometimes with elements of coercion and economic violence. While there are in-depth studies that examine the mechanisms of gender-based violence in specific academic workplaces and local/national contexts (see, e.g., overviews of workplace bullying, mobbing and harassment in academia, Bondestam & Lundqvist 2020; Keashly 2021), quantitative research and knowledge about the extent of the problem remains limited.

Methods and materials

The paper is based on three datasets from the EU Horizon 2020 research and innovation project UniSAFE: an online survey of prevalence and consequences of gender-based violence in 46 RPOs in 15 countries (Lipinsky et al. 2022), a mapping of the European policy baseline on gender-based violence in higher education and RPOs in 34 countries (Fajmonová et al. 2021) and an institutional inventory of policy and measures on gender-based violence in higher education and RPOs in 48 RPOs in UniSAFE 15 country sample (Huck et al. 2022). The integration of these datasets provides an analysis of the relationship between the prevalence and consequences of gender-based violence, overall and in relation to specific forms (physical violence, psychological violence, economic violence, sexual violence, sexual harassment and online violence), in relation to selected national and organisational characteristics (Humbert et al. 2022).

The survey was designed as an online survey and implemented between January and May 2022 in 46 participating RPOs in 15 countries in Europe. The sample includes data from 42,186 respondents, the UniSAFE survey is thereby the largest cross-cultural survey in Europe on gender-based violence in the context of universities and other research organisations. The sample consists of 43% staff and 57% students. In terms of gender, 53% identify as women, 44% as men and 3% as non-binary. Most respondents (79%) stated they were heterosexual, with the remaining 21% composed of people who stated they were bisexual (11%), homosexual (4%), queer (2%), asexual (2%), or a sexual orientation not listed in the survey (1%). Overall, 11% of respondents report having a disability or chronic illness; 6% identify as belonging to an ethnic minority group; 6% report being international staff or students.

The inventory of institutional level policies, measures and actions adopted to address gender-based violence in universities and research organisations was conducted at 48 RPOs, with regard to their size, disciplines and whether they are universities or RPOs) in the same 15 countries as the survey. The period covered was the past six years, between 2015 and May 2021 (for further details see Huck et al., 2022, pp. 14-18). The mapping of national level policies on gender-based violence in HEI and RPOs was conducted in 34 countries and also covered the past six years, between 2015 and May 2021, (for further details see Fajmonová et al., 2021, pp. 17-23).

The integration of the datasets (survey, inventory, mapping) enables an analysis of the relationship between the prevalence of gender-based violence and its consequences, and characteristics of national and institutional policies. For national policies, charachteristics inlcude whether they are generic (i.e. focus on gender equality in RPOs more widely, though include the issue of gender-

based violence) or dedicated to gender-based violence. For institutional policies, charachteristics include whether they are generic (i.e. focus on gender equality in the institutional more widely, though include the issue of gender violence) or dedicated specifically to gender-based violence; whether they consider intersectional groups; whether they consider potentially vulnerable groups; procedural aspects: objectives, indicators, monitoring, evaluation and budget.

Gender-based violence in higher education and research

The results first provide a descriptive analysis of the prevalence and consequences of gender-based violence within different gender identity groups, their variation in the context of the different RPOs and countries in which the respondents worked or studied.

Prevalence

Of the 42,000 university staff and students, 62% respondents in the 15 countries reported one or more forms of gender-based violence at their work or study place (Lipinsky et al. 2022; Humbert et al. 2022) (Table 1). Slightly more staff than students report having experienced gender-based violence: 73% of staff and 58% of students. While overall the prevalence is shockingly high, it is unequal across different groups of respondents. Respondents from minoritised groups (based on gender identity, sexual orientation, ethnicity, or disability) were more likely to disclose gender-based violence than other groups. Women and non-binary people were more likely than men to experience all forms of gender-based violence, except for physical violence, which more men than women indicated, but the gender identity at most risk are non-binary people. Moreover, respondents who identified as LGBQ+, who reported a disability or chronic illness, or identified as belonging to an ethnic minority group were more likely to have experienced at least one incident of gender-based violence compared to those who did not identify with these characteristics (Table 1).

Consequences

The consequences of gender-based violence are measured across four different aspects: social exclusion, feeling unsafe, feeling unwell, and consequences for work (for staff only) and consequences for studies (for students only). These consequences are summarised in Table 2 overall, and broken down by gender identity in Table 3, and by staff/student group in Table 4.

Consequences are consistently higher among staff and students who have experienced any form of gender-based violence. It is most marked for social exclusion, which 70% of those having experienced gender-based violence report,

compared to 19.8% of those who did not experience any gender-based violence. Staff and students who experienced gender-based violence are also more likely to feel unsafe in selected locations (38.7% compared with 11.3%). Adverse consequences for work or studies, respectively, are also higher among those that experienced gender-based violence (86.8% compared with 61.7% among staff; 89.5% compared with 76.7% among students). Differences are less pronounced, though still present between people who experienced gender-based violence and those who did not in relation to well-being. The vast majority had felt unwell at some point, though this was reported by 95.9% of those who experienced gender-based violence compared to 90.7% of those who did not. (Table 2).

A breakdown of the consequences by gender identity shows that across the different types of consequences, men are the least affected. Women and non-binary people are more likely than men to feel excluded, to feel unwell or to feel unsafe (Table 3). The experiences of non-binary individuals have often remained invisible, although they are the gender identity group most affected (see also Humbert & Strid 2024b).

Table 1. Prevalence (and 95% confidence interval) of GBV overall and across different forms by groups

	Total	Staff	Students	Women	Men	Non-binary
Any form	62.1% (56.5%; 67.3%)	73.7% (68.3%; 78.5%)	57.7% (53.7%; 61.5%)	66.2% (60.6%; 71.4%)	56.2% (49.6%; 62.6%)	74.1% (70.4%; 77.4%)
Physical violence	6.4% (5.5%; 7.4%)	5.3% (4.2%; 6.6%)	6.8% (5.7%; 8.2%)	5.4% (4.4%; 6.5%)	7.2% (6.3%; 8.3%)	12.9% (10.4%; 15.8%)
Psychological violence	57.2% (51.1%; 63.1%)	70.2% (64.4%; 75.4%)	52.1% (47.9%; 56.3%)	61.2% (55.1%; 66.9%)	51.6% (44.4%; 58.7%)	67.8% (62.7%; 72.6%)
Economic violence	9.7% (6.9%; 13.5%)	19.3% (16.4%; 22.6%)	5.8% (4.6%; 7.2%)	9.8% (6.7%; 14.0%)	9.5% (6.8%; 13.1%)	11.4% (8.7%; 14.9%)
Sexual violence	2.8% (2.0%; 4.0%)	1.2% (1.0%; 1.4%)	3.5% (2.5%;4.8%)	3.5% (2.5%; 5.0%)	1.7% (1.1%; 2.6%)	6.2% (4.3%; 9.1%)
Sexual harassment	31.1% (26.3%; 36.3%)	35.3% (29.0%; 42.1%)	29.3% (25.1%; 33.9%)	37.5% (31.3%; 44.1%)	22.4% (18.0%; 27.5%)	43.9% (37.2%; 50.9%)
Online violence	7.6% (6.5%; 8.8%)	7.4% (5.7%; 9.6%)	7.7% (6.6%; 8.9%)	7.2% (6.3%; 8.2%)	7.5% (6.1%; 9.2%)	15.7% (12.3%; 19.9%)

Note: weighted percentages.
Source of the data: UniSAFE survey dataset (Lipinsky et al. 2022); calculations (Humbert et al. 2022).

Table 2. Consequences (and 95% confidence interval) of GBV overall and across different forms

	Overall		
Experience GBV (any form)	Total	No	Yes
Social exclusion	51.5%	19.8%	70.2%
	(47.4%; 55.6%)	(17.9%; 21.9%)	(67.5%; 72.7%)
Feeling unsafe	28.4%	11.3%	38.7%
	(21.2%; 36.8%)	(7.0%; 17.9%)	(29.0%; 49.3%)
Feeling unwell	93.9%	90.7%	95.9%
	(92.4%; 95.2%)	(88.2%; 92.7%)	(94.2%; 97.2%)
Consequences for work	80.3%	61.7%	86.8%
	(72.7%; 86.2%)	(51.2%; 71.2%)	(82.4%; 90.2%)
Consequences for studies	84.1%	76.7%	89.5%
	(80.8%; 86.9%)	(71.6%; 81.2%)	(87.3%; 91.4%)

Note: weighted percentages.
Source of the data: UniSAFE survey dataset (Lipinsky et al. 2022); calculations (Humbert et al. 2022).

Table 3. Consequences (and 95% confidence interval) of GBV overall and across different forms by gender identity

	Women		Men		Non-binary	
Experience GBV (any form)	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Social exclusion	21.9%	72.5%	17.5%	66.1%	25.7%	77.4%
	(19.4%; 24.7%)	(69.2%; 75.6%)	(15.4%; 19.8%)	(63.0%; 69.0%)	(18.6%; 34.4%)	(72.2%; 81.8%)
Feeling unsafe	16.9%	44.7%	5.7%	27.7%	19.6%	61.9%
	(10.4%; 26.3%)	(34.5%; 55.5%)	(3.3%; 9.9%)	(19.7%; 37.4%)	(12.4%; 29.7%)	(50.2%; 72.4%)
Feeling unwell	94.2%	97.6%	87.3%	93.3%	94.6%	98.3%
	(92.2%; 95.7%)	(96.8%; 98.3%)	(83.9%; 90.1%)	(91.0%; 95.1%)	(89.6%; 97.3%)	(94.1%; 99.5%)
Consequences for work	60.7%	88.5%	61.9%	84.8%	81.7%	87.3%
	(51.6%; 69.2%)	(83.4%; 92.2%)	(50.6%; 72.1%)	(80.4%; 88.5%)	(64.3%; 91.7%)	(82.5%; 90.9%)
Consequences for studies	77.6%	89.8%	75.3%	88.4%	87.1%	94.2%
	(72.7%; 81.9%)	(87.2%; 92.0%)	(69.8%; 80.1%)	(86.4%; 90.2%)	(80.9%; 91.5%)	(91.6%; 96.0%)

Note: weighted percentages.
Source of the data: UniSAFE survey dataset (Lipinsky et al. 2022); calculations (Humbert et al. 2022).

Table 4. Consequences (and 95% confidence interval) of gender-based violence overall and across different forms by groups

Experience of any form of gender-based violence	Staff		Students	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
Social exclusion	20.4%	75.7%	19.6%	67.1%
	(17.8%; 23.3%)	(72.5%; 78.6%)	(17.8%; 21.6%)	(64.0%; 70.2%)
Feeling unsafe	6.1%	28.6%	12.7%	44.3%
	(2.6%; 13.9%)	(20.6%; 38.2%)	(8.1%; 19.4%)	(35.1%; 53.8%)
Feeling unwell	85.5%	93.3%	92.0%	97.4%
	(82.8%; 87.8%)	(91.8%; 94.6%)	(89.3%; 94.1%)	(96.8%; 97.8%)
Consequences for work	61.7%	86.8%	-	-
	(51.2%; 71.2%)	(82.4%; 90.2%)	-	-
Consequences for studies	-	-	76.7%	89.5%
	-	-	(71.6%; 81.2%)	(87.3%; 91.4%)

Note: weighted percentage.
Source of the data: UniSAFE survey dataset, 2022

The analysis of the integrated datasets (survey, inventory, mapping) focuses on the relationship between the prevalence of gender-based violence and its consequences, and the characteristics of national policy and institutional policy. The analysis of countries, RPOs and individual responses shows that prevalence is largely unrelated to policy: the prevalence is relatively uniform across both RPOs/institutions and countries (Table 5). For the overall prevalence of gender-based violence, the majority of the variance (96%) happens between individuals within RPOs, rather than between RPOs within countries (3%) or between countries (1%). For the overall prevalence of gender-based violence, only 4% of the variance happens between RPOs. A breakdown by different forms of gender-based violence also shows that the majority of the variance in prevalence is located between individuals within RPOs rather than between RPOs within countries or between countries (from 84% for sexual violence up to 97% for online violence). Variance between countries is very low for all forms of gender-based violence, suggesting that the prevalence of gender-based violence is relatively uniform across countries. Similarly, variance is low between RPOs, suggesting that the prevalence of gender-based violence is approximately the same across RPOs in which respondents work or study.

Table 5. Three-level variance components models (countries and RPOs) for overall prevalence of gender-based violence and its different forms

	Any form	Physical violence	Psychological violence	Economic violence	Sexual violence	Sexual harassment	Online violence
e^{β_0}	1.67	0.07	1.36	0.09	0.03	0.43	0.09
v_0	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.19	0.14	0.01	0.00
u_0	0.09	0.22	0.07	0.14	0.47	0.17	0.11
VPC_v	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.00
VPC_u	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.12	0.05	0.03
VPC_e	0.96	0.93	0.96	0.91	0.84	0.95	0.97
ICC_v	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.00
ICC_u	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.09	0.16	0.05	0.03
Countries (n)	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
RPOs (n)	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
Individuals (n)	39,504	39,426	37,712	34,751	34,021	33,600	33,113

Source: Humbert et al. 2022.

Discussion and conclusions

The findings suggest that the prevalence of gender-based violence in HEI and RPOs is high and uneven across groups: Already marginalised groups and groups at points of intersection of multiple inequalities are at higher risk of increased levels of violence; younger women, women with less secure employment conditions and temporary contracts, and minorities are more likely to have experienced gender-based violence than other groups. Non-binary people are the most likely group to experience gender-based violence (Humbert & Strid 2024b). The findings also suggest that the prevalence of gender-based violence are relatively uniform across countries and variance is low between RPOs. This suggests that the prevalence of gender-based violence is largely unrelated to the RPOs in which respondents work or study, and/or to the country in which they reside. While the higher prevalence of gender-based violence in society may relate to the acceptance of gender-based violence within the RPO, the UniSAFE analysis found very little variation in gender-based violence across countries and institutions (Humbert el al. 2022; Humbert & Strid 2024a).

We suggest that these results should be understood in the specific context of academic and research workplaces. At the most general level are macro-societal structures of social inequalities, within and through which organisations are formed and reproduced. Indeed, the conditions of formation of an organisation

can have lasting effects on organisational processes, not only in formal structures, but in continuing pain, anxiety and other emotions and effects, as with the legacies of slavery in some universities. Macro-societal power relations contextualise the meso-level of academic workplaces with their internal organisational structures, hierarchies, cultures, and power relations. Supposedly neutral HE "management practices" or "decision-making", but also organisational cultures, authority structures and policy development, are focal here. For example, academic managers, as in the form of the rectorate, reproduce discourses, procedures and practices that facilitate or inhibit gender-based violence, including harassment, bullying, and so on. The micro-level concerns day-to-day practices through which people are exploited and violated, often within routine micro-organisational processes of teaching, learning and research, in classrooms, labs, supervision, and so on.

Typically, there are several meso and micro features of HE and RPOs that are significant for both analysing and reducing gender-based violence. HE and RPOs are often characterised by strong age-, class-, ethnicised/racialised- and gender-differentiations, structures, segregations, and hierarchies. In many cases, there are relatively fixed layers of older professorial and senior staff, where men are over-represented, along with shifting, temporary populations of women and men members, students, and less established staff. Many academic and research organisations are still characterised by men's overall dominance as managers, gatekeepers and leaders. In addition, the long timespan of academic careers and lack of permanent positions can mean that even well-established researchers may stay on temporary contracts much or all of their career. Furthermore, some academic and research institutions, research groups and activities, such as fieldwork or conferences, involve both formality, conformity and competition, on one hand, and informality, questioning and close collaboration, on the other, bringing social and interpersonal ambiguities. Hierarchical aged, gender, sexual and emotional dynamics may be coupled with high personal commitment, work intensity and passion for teaching, learning and research (Hearn & Husu 2019).

The interrelations of macro, meso and micro levels is of great importance for HE and RPOs. There may be complex cause-effect relationships between and across boundaries/spheres and outside/inside the RPO. At both macro-societal and meso-organisational levels, further work is needed on the effects of such issues as cultural factors and how much violence is tolerated within institutions and the society in question; social norms and expectations, as they frame the acceptability of certain behaviours in institutions and beyond, the effectiveness of policies and their (lack of) implementation (Bondestam and Lundqvist 2020), and inconsistencies between national laws and institutional regulations. Thus far, the multi-level effect of both the organisation and society on the prevalence of violen-

ce in academic organisations has hardly been considered or analysed empirically.[2] Indeed, gender-based violence enacted outside RPOs can have major implications within RPOs, and may be responded to by colleagues, supervisors and managers in ways that may assist or worsen the situation (Jones et al. 2024). Here, the extent of "work and violence embeddedness" (Krigel & Benjamin 2021) is likely to be accentuated with digital gender-based violence (Hearn et al. 2023).

References

Agardh, A., Andersson, U., Björklund, H., Elén, E., Emmelin, M., Lindell, L., Palmieri, J., Priebe, G., & Östergren, P-O. (2020). *Tellus - sexuella trakasserier, trakasserier och kränkande särbehandling vid Lunds universitet.* Resultat baserade på enkät-, intervju- och fokusgruppsdata från anställda, doktorander och studenter. Lund: Lunds universitet.

Anitha, S., & Lewis, R. (Eds.) (2018). *Gender based violence in university communities: Policy, prevention and educational initiatives.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Bondestam, F., & Lundqvist, M. (2020). Sexual harassment in global higher education: A systematic review. *European Journal of Higher Education 10*(4), 397–419. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2020.1729833

Call for Action (2022). Working towards safe and respectful higher education and research for all. Call for action to end gender-based violence. https://genderaction.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Call-for-Action_GBV-2022_fnal.pdf

Ebintra, E., Kjellgren, C., Sundström, P., & Tersmeden, M. (2018). *Berättelser om sexuella trakasserier och övergrepp på Linnéuniversitetet.* Växjö/Kalmar: Linnéuniversitetet.

Enkätstudie om genusbaserad utsatthet och sexuella trakasserier i svensk högskolesektor. (2022). Karolinska Institutet; Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan; Malmö universitet; Nationella sekretariatet för genusforskning, Göteborgs universitet. https://ki.se/media/246914/download

European Commission: Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. (2024). Zero-tolerance code of conduct: Counteracting gender-based violence, including sexual harassment, in the EU research and innovation system. Publications Office of the European Union. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2777/044501.

Fajmonová, V., Huck, A., Andreska, Z., Dvořáčková, J., Linková, M., Struzińska, K., Strid, S., Hearn, J., Husu, L., Allori, A., & Wuiame, N. (2021). *UniSAFE D3.2 Report on the European policy baseline.* Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5780037

Gracia, E., & Merlo, J. (2016). Intimate partner violence against women and the Nordic paradox. *Social Science and Medicine* 157, 27–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.03.040

Hearn, J., & Husu, L. (2019). Age-gender relations in the academic profession: Putting the challenges of entry and early career into context. In T. Adams & M. Choroszewicz (Eds.), *Gender, age and inequality in the Professions.* London: Routledge, pp. 193–212.

Hearn, J., Hall, M., Lewis, R., & Niemistö, C. (2023). The spread of digital intimate partner violence: Ethical challenges for business, workplaces, employers, and management, *Journal of Business Ethics,* 187, 695–711. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-023-05463-4

---

2. This contrasts with studies on gender-based violence in societal contexts, where when acceptance of gender-based violence is higher disclosure may be lower. This has been debated through the so-called 'Nordic paradox' (Gracia and Merlo 2016), where the disclosed prevalence of gender-based violence appears, on the surface, as positively related to gender equality, less prejudiced attitudes to gender-based violence, and greater societal awareness (Humbert et al. 2021).

Hearn, J., Strid, S., Husu, L., & Verloo, M. (2016). Interrogating violence against women and state violence policy: Gendered intersectionalities and the quality of policy in The Netherlands, Sweden and the UK. *Current Sociology, 64*(4), 551–567. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116639220

Huck, A., Andreska, Z., Dvořáčková, J., & Linková, M. (2022). *UniSAFE D5.1 Inventory of policies and measures to respond to GBV in European universities and research organisations.* Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5939082

Humbert, A. L., & Strid, S. (2024a). Intersectionality and gender-based violence: An empirical multi-level examination of prevalence and frequency in universities and research organisations. *Violence Against Women, 0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012241265363

Humbert, A. L., & Strid, S. (2024b). Institutional confidence, underreporting and academic consequences of gender-based violence among university staff and students in Europe. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2440544

Humbert A. L., Strid, S., Hearn, J., & Balkmar, D. (2021). Undoing the 'Nordic Paradox': Factors affecting rates of disclosed violence against women across the EU. *PLoS ONE 16*(5), e0249693. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249693

Humbert, A. L., Ovesen, N., Simonsson, A., Strid, S., Hearn, J., Huck, A., Andreska, Z., Linková, M., Pilinkaitė Sotirovič, V., Blažytė, G., & Pereira, B. (2022). *UniSAFE D6.1: Report on the multi-level analysis and integrated dataset.* Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7540229

Humbert, A. L., Ovesen, N., Simonsson, A., Strid, S., Hearn, J., Huck, A., Andreska, Z., Linková, M., Pilinkaitė Sotirovič, V., Blažytė, G., & Pereira, B. (2022). *UniSAFE D6.1: Report on the multi-level analysis and integrated dataset.* Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7540229

Johnson, P., Widnall, S., & Razier, B. (2018). *Sexual Harassment of Women. Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. Washington: National Academy of Science.

Jones, C., Farrelly, N., & Barter, C. (2024). UK Prevalence of university student and staff experiences of sexual violence and domestic violence and abuse: A systematic review from 2002 to 2022. *European Journal of Higher Education,* 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2024.2302568

Keashly, L. (2021). Workplace bullying, mobbing and harassment in academe: faculty experiences. In P. D'Cruz, E. Noronha, L. Keashly & S- Tye-Williams (Eds.) *Special Topics and Particular Occupations, Professions and Sectors,* pp. 1–76. Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5154-8_13-1

Krigel, K., & Benjamin, O. (2021). Women working in the shadow of violence: Studying the temporality of work and violence embeddedness (WAVE). *Women's Studies International Forum, 84*, 102433.

Latcheva, R. (2017). Sexual harassment in the European Union: A pervasive but still hidden form of gender-based violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 32*(12), 1821–1852. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517698948

Oxford University Students Union Women's Committee. (1984). *'The ones who just patronize seem genial by comparison…': An Enquiry into Sexual Harassment of Women in Oxford University.* Oxford: Oxford University Students Union.

Strid, S., Humbert, A. L., Hearn, J., Bondestam, F., & Husu, L. (2021). *UniSAFE D3.1 Theoretical and conceptual framework*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7333232

Violence Against Women. (2019). Special Issue: Transforming Campus Cultures: Activism to End Gender-Based Violence *25*(11).