

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

“It’s Not on Us, It’s On YOU”: Activism Against Sexual Violence on University of California Campuses

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7hq6t4jc>

Author

Ornelas, Alexandra

Publication Date

2019

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

“It’s Not on Us, It’s On YOU”: Activism Against Sexual Violence on University of
California Campuses

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Sociology

by

Alexandra Ornelas

Committee in charge:

Professor Verta Taylor, Co-Chair

Professor Denise Segura, Co-Chair

Professor Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval

Professor Beth Schneider

December 2019

The dissertation of Alexandra Ornelas is approved.

Beth Schneider

Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval

Denise Segura, Committee Co-Chair

Verta Taylor, Committee Co-Chair

November 2019

“It’s Not on Us, It’s On YOU”: Activism Against Sexual Violence on University of
California Campuses

Copyright © 2019

by

Alexandra Ornelas

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not exist without the women of color activists at UC Santa Barbara who inspired this work. This dissertation is dedicated to you and all the activists who gave me a chance to listen to their stories. Your work will not be forgotten.

This dissertation was made possible with the support of my advisors: Verta Taylor, Denise Segura, Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval, and Beth Schneider. Thank you for your support and valuable feedback since beginning this project. I want to especially thank Verta Taylor for her unwavering support and belief in me and in this project. Your encouragement gave me the fuel I needed to finish writing this project. I would also like to thank Laurys Oaks for her mentorship and guidance throughout my graduate studies.

I would like to thank the administrative staff in the Department of Sociology who supported my graduate work in many different ways, especially Sharon Applegate for her support and making the Sociology Department a more welcoming space. I also want to thank the graduate students who have supported me and my research in various ways: Ciera Sorin, Marisa Salinas, Corrie Grosse, Jonathan Gomez, Andrea Martinez, and Janelle Pham. A big thank you also to the students, faculty, and staff who contributed to this project at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara.

Most of the support that helped me complete this research came from my family and friends. I want to thank Heather Gifford and Carmen Emilia Lara Preciado for your constant encouragement and support through the difficult times in my life. I never would have completed graduate school and this dissertation without the support of my family. You inspire me every day and your encouragement pushes me do things I thought were impossible to achieve. To my mom and dad, thanks for your unwavering support and for all the sacrifices you have made in order for my sister and I to have a better life. To my sister, Diana, for always being there for me and making me laugh throughout this difficult journey. Lastly, I would like to thank my husband Francisco Beltran for his love, patience, and support. I would not have completed this without you. Thank you for making this journey fun. *¡Te amo!*

VITA OF ALEXANDRA ORNELAS
December 2019

EDUCATION

- Ph.D. Sociology, University of California Santa Barbara, 2019**
Dissertation: “It’s Not On Us, It’s On YOU”: Activism Against Sexual Violence on University of California Campuses”
Committee: Verta Taylor (co-chair), Denise Segura (co-chair), Ralph Armbruster-Sandoval, Beth Schneider
- M.A. Sociology, University of California Santa Barbara, 2015**
Thesis: “Changing the Face of the Organization”: Including Latinas into a Formerly Predominantly White Rape Crisis Center”
- B.A. Sociology, Boise State University, 2011**
Minors: in Mexican American Studies and Latin American & Latino/a Studies
Magna Cum Laude

RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS

Social Movements; Violence Against Women; Race, Class, and Gender; Feminist Studies; Qualitative Methods; Latina/o Sociology

PUBLICATIONS

- 2010 “Support for Success: An Exploration of the Support Networks of Latino Students in the College Assistance Migrant Program.” *McNair Scholars Research Journal*, Vol. 6: Spring 2010.

FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS

- 2017 UCSB Sociology Department Dissertation Research and Writing Award
2018 Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship, Alternate
2013-2016 Ford Foundation Pre-Doctoral Fellowship
2013 UCSB GSA Excellence in Teaching Award, Nominee
2011-2012 UC-DIGSSS Graduate Department Fellowship, University of California Santa Barbara
2011 Top Ten Graduating Scholars Award, Boise State University
2010 Summer Research-Early Identification Program, Stanford University
2005-2010 Tschudy Family Scholarship, Boise State University

RESEARCH GRANTS

- 2017-2018 UCSB Humanities and Social Sciences Research Grant
2016-2017 The Flacks Fund for the Study of Democratic Possibilities Research Grant
2016-2017 Chicano Studies Institute Dissertation Research Grant
2013, 2016 UCSB Sociology Department Research Grant

RESEARCH EXPERIENCE AND ASSISTANTSHIPS

- Summer 2012 Graduate Student Research Assistant to Professor Denise Segura: research on Latina feminist organizations and organization of reading lists, UC Santa Barbara.
- 2011-2012 Graduate Student Research Assistant to Professor Victor Rios: field researcher for project on achievement gap between white and Latino high school students, UC Santa Barbara.
- Summer 2010 Undergraduate Student Research Assistant to Professor Tomás Jiménez: research and organization of secondary sources for policy paper on immigrant integration in the United States, Stanford University.
- Summer 2009 Principle Investigator under McNair Scholars Program, mentored by Professor Sergio Romero: conceptualized, collected data, and critically analyzed primary sources. This study identified and analyzed the support networks of students in the College Assistance Migrant Program and the influence these ties had on their educational aspirations, Boise State University.

RESEARCH PRESENTATIONS

- 2017 “It’s Not On Us, It’s On YOU”: Activism Against Sexual Violence on University of California Campuses.” Presented at the Flacks Fund for the Study of Democratic Possibilities in the UCSB Sociology Colloquium Series, Santa Barbara, CA: October 18.
- 2017 “It’s Not On Us, It’s On YOU”: Activism Against Sexual Violence on University of California Campuses.” Presented at the Chicano Studies Institute Graduate Dissertation Colloquia, Santa Barbara, CA: June 5.
- 2016 “Intersectional Oppressions: The Convergence of Age, Class, and Race in a Diverse Feminist Organization.” Presented at the Society for the Study of Social Problems Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA: August 19-21.
- 2015 “Ending Sexual Assault: The Inclusion of Latinas into a Predominantly White Rape Crisis Center.” Presented at the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL: August 22-25.
- 2015 “From Theory to Praxis: The Inclusion of Women of Color into a White Feminist Organization.” Presented at the Pacific Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Long Beach, CA: April 1-4.
- 2014 “Ending Sexual Violence: The Transition of a White Feminist Organization into a Bilingual and Bicultural Feminist Organization.” Presented at the 2014 Conference of Ford Fellows, Irvine, CA: September 26-27.

- 2010 “Immigrant Integration in the United States.” Presented at The Leadership Alliance National Symposium 2010, East Brunswick, NJ: July 30-August 1.
- 2010 “Support for Success: An Exploration of the Support Networks of Latino Students in the College Assistance Migrant Program.” Presented at the 7th Annual Undergraduate Research & Scholarship Conference, Boise State University: April 12.
- 2010 “Diverse Latino Health: A Review of Differentiation as a Factor for Wellbeing.” Presented at the Pacific Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Oakland, CA: April 8-11 (with Dr. Arthur Scarritt).
- 2010 “Support for Success: An Exploration of the Support Networks of Latino Students in the College Assistance Migrant Program.” Presented at the Pacific Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Oakland, CA: April 8-11.
- 2009 “The Social Support Systems of Latino Students in the College Assistance Migrant Program.” Presented at the 18th Annual National McNair Research Conference and Graduate Fair, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee: November 6-8.
- 2009 “The Social Support Systems of First-Year Students in the College Assistance Migrant Program.” Presented at the 2009 Pacific Northwest Regional Conference of the National Association for Chicana and Chicano Studies, Ellensburg, WA: October 30-31.
- 2009 “The Social Support Systems of First-Year Students in the College Assistance Migrant Program.” Presented at the 2009 McNair Summer Research Symposium, Boise State University: August 18.
- 2009 “The Social Support Systems of First-Year Students in the College Assistance Migrant Program.” Research proposal presented at a poster session for the 17th Annual Pacific Northwest Regional McNair/ EIP conference, University of Washington: May 1-2.

INVITED PRESENTATIONS

- 2017 “EOP Chicanx/Latinx Graduate School Panel.” Participated in a panel discussing the graduate school application process with first-generation Chicanx/Latinx undergraduates, UC Santa Barbara.
- 2015 “Graduate School Panel.” Participated in a Q&A event among first-generation Latinx/Chicanx undergraduate and graduate students regarding the graduate school application process, UC Santa Barbara.

- 2015 “Sexual Assault Activism on College Campuses.” Invited guest lecturer for Introduction to Sociology undergraduate class, Sociology Department, UC Santa Barbara.
- 2015 “Chicana Graduate Student Panel.” Invited panelist for Chicanas and Mexican Women in Contemporary Society undergraduate class, Sociology Department, UC Santa Barbara.
- 2014 “Graduate Student Panel.” Invited panelist for Professional Development Seminar, Sociology Department, UC Santa Barbara.
- 2013 “Ford Fellowship Workshop.” Invited panelist, Graduate Division, UC Santa Barbara.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

University of California Santa Barbara

Teaching Associate: Qualitative Research Methods

Teaching Assistant: Studying People; Race, Ethnicity & Nation; Women of Color; Methods of Cultural Analysis; Introduction to Sociology; Current Issues in Social Psychology; Sociology of Human Rights; Research Methods; Chicana/o Community; Sociology of Education

UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

University of California Santa Barbara

- 2018-2019 Student Ambassador, Women’s Health, Gender and Empowerment Center of Expertise (WHGE-COE)
- 2018-2019 Graduate Mentor, Graduate Scholars Program
- 2016 Graduate Student Representative, Marginalized Communities Subcommittee
- 2016 Graduate Student Representative, Sexual Violence Subcommittee
- 2015-2016 Co-founder and Member, Social Movements Reading Group
- 2016 Volunteer, Sociology Graduate Student Recruitment Week
- 2015-2016 Graduate Student Representative, Work Group of the UC President’s Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault, UC System-Wide
- 2015-2016 Graduate Student Representative, Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault Metrics Subgroup of the UC President’s Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault, UC System-Wide
- 2015-2016 Graduate Student Representative, Sociology Graduate Program and Admissions Committee
- 2015-2016 Volunteer, Sociology Department’s 50th Anniversary Website
- 2015 Graduate Student Representative, The California Forum for Diversity in Graduate Education

2014-2015 Graduate Student Representative, Sociology Department Meetings
2014 Volunteer, Sociology Graduate Student Recruitment Week
2012-2014 Graduate Student Representative, Sociology Department Community,
Colloquium, and Space Committee
2012-2014 Graduate Student Mentor, Sociology Department

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Sociological Association
Pacific Sociological Association
Society for the Study of Social Problems
Sociologists for Women in Society

SKILLS

Spanish: Native reader, writer, and speaker

ABSTRACT

“It’s Not on Us, It’s On YOU”: Activism Against Sexual Violence on University of California Campuses

by

Alexandra Ornelas

A large scale multi-campus movement against sexual violence emerged in the early 2010s across the United States as a result of changes in gender relations and cultural, social, and political shifts since the 1970s. Gendered and political opportunity structures helped launch this successful movement, but they developed distinctly at the local level. Local contextual factors in the immediate environment of activists constrained or facilitated the broader opportunity structures that enabled this movement. My research examines these factors through the student movement against sexual violence on two University of California (UC) campuses, Berkeley and Santa Barbara, and provides an in-depth analysis of the activists campaigns that developed on each campus and the local factors that influenced them. UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara have the highest reported rates of sexual violence in the UC system, strong anti-sexual violence activist campaigns within the last five years, and a long history of student activism, but they have differed widely in terms of tactics and how sexual violence is framed. I address the following research questions: why and how did students mobilize a movement against sexual violence on UC campuses in the 2010s?; what factors influenced the students’ tactical repertoire and demands?; and what conditions prevented or facilitated the growth of activism against sexual violence on these campuses?

Utilizing qualitative methods, including participant observation, semi-structured in-depth interviews, and archival research, I examine the local and institutional factors that

affected various aspects of the campus movement including timing, tactical repertoire, and trajectory. For UC Berkeley, the involvement of student organizations, the school's prestige, and ties to a larger network comprised of survivor activists from colleges and universities across the country were critical in the development of the movement there. At UC Santa Barbara, the school's party culture and violent local events mobilized students, but they also diverted attention from issues of sexual violence to broader issues of safety. This had a deterring effect on the movement. The tactics used by students varied and were influenced by when in the cycle of protest the movements developed, the mass media, institutional factors, and the racial and class background of activists. UC Berkeley activist leaders came from more privileged backgrounds and their connections to activists from other schools affected their use of more conventional tactics including Title IX complaints and lawsuits. UC Santa Barbara student leaders were mostly working-class women of color who did not have the resources and social and cultural capital to pursue some of the conventional tactics UC Berkeley students used. Instead, they relied on nonviolent direct action to push the university to address sexual violence.

Although there were key differences across both campuses, emotional labor was key to the emergence of the movement on both campuses. The examination of activist campaigns and efforts showed the invisible emotional labor student activists engaged in and the consequences it had for the movement. Survivor activists disclosed their experiences of sexual assault and mistreatment by their universities through different tactics, but they had the similar effect of evoking collective trauma resonance, or the empathy and emotional connection shared among people who have gone through similar traumatic experiences, among other students. The emotional unpaid labor or managing their emotions while helping survivors of sexual violence took a toll on the activists themselves and the movement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction: Student Movements Against Sexual Violence	1
Chapter 2: Methodology	47
Chapter 3: Institutional Shame Through Formal Politics at UC Berkeley	72
Chapter 4: Mobilizing at a Party School: Nonviolent Direct Action at UC Santa Barbara.....	110
Chapter 5: UC Berkeley's Conventional Repertoire of Contention.....	148
Chapter 6: UC Santa Barbara's Confrontational Local Tactical Repertoire	177
Chapter 7: Challenges in Organizing Against Sexual Violence	207
Chapter 8: Conclusion.....	241
References.....	254
Appendix A.....	283
Appendix B.....	285
Endnotes.....	286

Chapter 1: Introduction: Student Movements Against Sexual Violence

Introduction

“My name is Sofie Karasek and I am a second-year student at the University of California, Berkeley. I was sexually assaulted my freshman year by a student leader who also assaulted four of my peers. Today on behalf of a coalition of survivors, we are filing a complaint against the University of California, Berkeley for violating the Jeanne Clery Act on ten counts including but not limited to: discouraging survivors from reporting to local law enforcement or participating in formal disciplinary processes, underreporting sexual assault threats to the campus community, and failing to update survivors of the decisions and outcomes of their cases.

I was not notified until 7 months after I filed a report in May 2012 with the Center for Student Conduct that there had never even been an investigation into my assault. I never received confirmation of anyone having read my statement, and I was never called upon to provide more evidence. Last fall, I found out from a friend that my assailant had admitted to sexually assaulting me to leaders of the campus organization and that the administrators had found him in violation of the student Code of Conduct. I finally received two 3-sentence emails, one of which only said that the case had been solved through an “early resolution process” and the other saying that he had been found in violation of the code of conduct without explaining whether or not he had been held for any disciplinary action. I then learned that he was going to graduate a semester earlier than I expected – in two weeks from when I received the email. This effectively removed my case from the jurisdiction of the university...”

*Sofie Karasek, survivor activist at UC Berkeley
May 22, 2013*

*Gloria Allred “Rape & Sexual Assault on
College Campuses” Press Conference in New
York City, NY*

“Dear UCSB: Here is my open letter to you. I, Alejandra Melgoza, from Hayward, California, a city residing in the bay area, daughter of two immigrant parents, from a low-income household, the first in my family to graduate from high school and now a full time second-year Latina college student, part-time worker, and student leader. I, Alejandra Melgoza, was sexually assaulted on your campus, on university property at the Santa Catalina dorms on the evening of January 18th, 2014. A year, three months, and 26 days later I have yet to receive justice, compassion, effective policies and the sense of pride to attend my dream school, the University of California, Santa Barbara...”

On March 4th, 2014 I took the decision to contact the CARE office on campus for the first time after talking to the counseling services on campus. After speaking with a CARE advocate I took the decision to report it to Judicial Affairs. The day of March 13th [2014], I remember how I had a knot in my throat and felt sick to my stomach telling my story to Judicial Affairs officials and trying to

embark on a journey to fight for justice...I can describe that feeling perfectly because it remains haunting me even at this moment. I remember asking for his removal from living in my residence hall. My request was denied because it was too much work. Judicial Affairs suggested I should move from my residence hall. They also reiterated how reporting would be a long process and I probably would not win my case due to lack of evidence. However, the most engraved words throughout this experience were the words a Judicial Affairs officer stated to me after I told her my experience. She said that maybe I had not been satisfied with his “performance.” She reduced my trauma, the violation of my body, and my emotional turmoil to a simple night of bad sex...

January 13th [2015], my caseworker and her team at Judicial Affairs found my perpetrator responsible for sexually assaulting me...February 6th a day after my birthday, 3 midterms, and hosting a series of events on campus, I had to go through a four hour and a half hearing. I missed classes and work to attend and to only endure the torture of sitting next to my perpetrator at a very close proximity along with his best friend who harassed me. I had to define the word coercion. I had to hear him state how he completely did not remember the act. He questioned my mental health and the worst part was the fact that we “crossed examined” each other...

February 10th, I received an email by the hearing board, which was cc'd to acting Vice Chancellor Mary Jacobs stating that they voted 3-0 that my perpetrator was guilty...After 15 days on March 2nd, Mary Jacobs determined a two quarter suspension including spring and summer of 2015 would be in effect...Spring quarter, the quarter I had fought so long and arduously to get a sense of safety turned out to be another experience of dehumanization, humiliation, and excessive toll on my emotional well-being. My perpetrator has been spotted countless times on campus and who knows how many more especially since only a small group of friends know his identity...”

*Alejandra Melgoza, survivor activist at UC
Santa Barbara
May 13, 2015
Student-organized rally outside UC Santa
Barbara Library in Santa Barbara, CA*

The narratives described by the two women above detail part of their experiences in reporting their sexual assaults to their campus.¹ Sofie, a sophomore at UC Berkeley in 2013, recounted the mishandling of her case and spoke on behalf of several survivors and students from her campus during a press conference hosted by Gloria Allred. She accused UC Berkeley of discouraging survivors from reporting their cases to the school and law enforcement, underreporting sexual violence statistics, and not communicating adequately

with survivors with respect to their cases. Students and professors from five other universities were also present and were filing Title IX and Clery Act complaints against their own universities.² Alejandra, a sophomore at UC Santa Barbara in 2015, detailed the hardships she experienced while reporting her case to Judicial Affairs, the trial, and sanctions against her perpetrator during a rally outside the library, just prior to taking over the chancellor's office for 13 hours with other survivors and students. Alejandra described how she was discouraged from reporting her assault, how her experience of sexual violence was questioned by staff in Judicial Affairs, and during the university hearing she had to cross examine her perpetrator. She also believed the sanctions against him were too lenient, and as described at the end of her excerpt, not enforced.

Sofie and Alejandra described similar complaints against their universities, but they came from different campuses, used different tactics, and were assaulted in different years. These women along with hundreds of other survivors and activists across the United States were part of a movement against institutions of higher education protesting how they handled sexual violence in the 2010s.³ Student activists from universities across the nation waged successful campaigns against sexual violence that helped make this a priority issue for university administrations and politicians (Clark and Pino 2016; Dick, Ziering, and Matthiessen 2016; Germain 2016). The handling of sexual violence by institutions of higher learning is still a highly contentious issue, despite many reforms and attempts to address it (Anderson 2016). Scholars and policy makers have recognized and highlighted individual activists and campaigns, however, missing from these reports is an in-depth and systematic analysis of the activism occurring on individual campuses and the social processes that have influenced the formation of the movement against sexual violence. My research will provide

one of the first analyses of the emergence of the anti-sexual violence movement targeting universities and the use of different tactics by activists, particularly the law to enact institutional change.

This large scale movement was facilitated by changes in gender relations and cultural, social, and political shifts in the United States since the 1970s. The emergence of this movement, however, differed across campuses and was dependent on a number of local factors such as the local political climate, the culture of the campus, and school policies, resources, and characteristics. Drawing on archival research, in-depth qualitative interviews, and participant observation at two University of California (UC) campuses, Berkeley and Santa Barbara, I demonstrate how local and institutional histories and factors influenced the emergence and trajectory of the anti-sexual violence movement on these two campuses. This research reveals an uneven development of broader gendered and political opportunity structures at the ground level on individual campuses.

The movement against sexual violence on university campuses is a forerunner to recent campaigns that laid the groundwork for what has now become a national conversation. Through an analysis of the wider social and political context, my research not only identifies critical junctures that led to the rise of this contemporary movement, but also clarifies the evolution of past efforts against sexual violence. Recent campaigns such as “#Metoo” and “We Know What You Did” have a long history behind them and did not occur in a vacuum. These efforts built on previous struggles led by white, black, Latina, Asian, and Native American women across different movements such as the feminist and civil rights movements. My dissertation is a part of a larger genealogy of movements against sexual violence that have all built upon each other. It uncovers critical moments that have

created openings for different widespread campaigns, like the ones we are experiencing right now.

In this chapter I provide an overview of my research and the research questions I am addressing. I then offer a broad overview and history of the two campuses and reasons for focusing on these two case studies. In the third section, I discuss the history of campus anti-sexual violence activism in the United States and the theoretical framework used to explain the emergence of this campus movement in the 2010s. I end with an outline and description of the chapters in this dissertation.

Dissertation Overview and Research Questions

The increase of activism targeting institutional change is often linked to the claim that one out of five women in colleges and universities experience some form of sexual violence (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, and Martin 2007), which makes it seem like this is a recent “crisis,” but it isn’t. This estimate has continually been reported since the 1980s (Abbey, Ross, McDuffie, and McAuslan 1996; Copenhaver and Grauerholz 1991; Humphrey and White 2000; Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski 1987; Mills and Granoff 1992). As will be discussed later this chapter when examining the history of student activism on college campuses, students have been pushing their universities to address sexual assault since the 1970s. Given this consistent trend of sexual violence and activism on college campuses, what led to the increase of activism against sexual violence that targeted colleges and universities in the 2010s? Although a broader movement against sexual violence developed, what did this movement look like on individual campuses? How did local and school factors affect the reach of this broader movement and what the school was able to contribute to the wider movement?

One of the main reasons this movement gained traction in the 2010s was the changes and reinterpretations of Title IX. Federal complaints and lawsuits since the 1970s culminated in the issuance of the “Dear Colleague Letter” in April 2011 by the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education. This letter addressed to schools, colleges, and universities across the United States provided guidance and clarification on their responsibilities in fulfilling Title IX and addressing sexual violence (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights 2011). Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in any federally funded program and sexual harassment and sexual assault are included under sex discrimination. Under Title IX, colleges and universities are required to adequately respond to reports of sexual assault on campus. Title IX complaints have been a defining and critical tool for this movement targeting colleges and universities.⁴ In 2016, the number of colleges and universities under Title IX investigation for mishandling reports of sexual violence was 195 (Kingkade 2016b).⁵ Before 2006, the most common type of Title IX complaint was academic discrimination followed by athletic complaints. But, in 2006 sexual harassment complaints began increasing and by 2014 they reached parity with athletic and academic discrimination complaints (Reynolds 2019). There has been a shift in the implementation and focus of Title IX on gender equality in athletics to policing sexual violence on college and university campuses (Reynolds 2019). Other federal laws have been amended and their implementation has shifted to address sexual violence on college and university campuses. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) in 2013 imposed new reporting obligations and policies on universities to address campus sexual violence. These changes under the Campus Sexual Violence Act (SaVE Act) provision in VAWA extends the crime categories mandated under

the Clery Act to include domestic violence and stalking, and adopts certain disciplinary procedures and institutional policies to address and prevent campus sexual violence.

One of the most critical factors in these changes in policy and discussions of sexual violence on college and university campuses has been the ongoing activist work of current and former college students targeting institutions of higher learning.⁶ The movement against sexual violence in educational institutions is part of a wider movement to end sexual violence. Campus activism against sexual violence has been going on since the 1970s and it has addressed date rape and sexual assault. It has also focused on rape culture, consent, sexuality, and bodily autonomy by focusing on cultural change. The distinctive increase of activism targeting universities appears to have emerged from and merged with this longstanding and ongoing activism. Today's activism seems to be a continuation of a movement that has its roots in the 1970s and much earlier, but is distinguished by its focus on structural and policy reform. This foundation has helped build the movement targeting institutions in the 2010s where activists have protested the institutional cover-up and mishandling of cases of sexual violence in colleges and universities across the nation. Using a wide variety of tactics, activists have been successful in creating change at the cultural and political level within their own campuses and collectively at the state and national level. Given the gravity of the issue, the current reform efforts to address sexual assault on college campuses, and the pressure from pending Title IX investigations and lawsuits, it is important to understand how activists helped bring this issue to the forefront of college, state, and national agendas and the outcomes of their work.

My dissertation examines the emergence of the movement against sexual violence on two UC campuses in the 2010s. It focuses on the increase of anti-sexual violence student

activism at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara that has targeted institutions through policy and structural change. My research addresses the following questions: 1) why and how did students mobilize a movement against sexual violence on university campuses in the 2010s?; 2) what factors influenced the students' tactical repertoire and demands?; and 3) what challenges did students face while mobilizing and how did it affect the movement? The UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara case studies will allow me to compare the activist campaigns against sexual violence on these two campuses and identify local and school factors that affected the development and trajectory of the movements. These schools were chosen because they have the highest reported rates of sexual violence in the UC system, a long history of student activism, and strong anti-sexual violence campaigns from 2013 to 2017. The activist campaigns against sexual violence, however, have evolved differently on each campus. The outcomes and tactics varied widely, and the social, cultural, and political climate of each campus, along with the history and reputation of the universities, have affected the activism and outcomes.

A critical examination of these two case studies will bring new insight on the processes that facilitate and hinder social movement formation and help build a growing sociological literature on activism against sexual violence. By focusing on two universities, I will be able to provide a more nuanced account of the activism occurring on each campus and the challenges faced by activists in their struggle to hold their universities and the entire UC system accountable for the mishandling of sexual violence cases. My research captures the activism and stories of student activists on college campuses that tends to get lost in the statistics, policy reforms, and media. My study will also examine the diversity of the movement and the tensions that arose within the campaigns.

Case Studies

California has taken a leadership role in addressing sexual violence on college campuses. The “yes means yes” regulation passed in 2014 in California made it the first state in the nation to have a clearer definition of consent (Chappell 2014). Activist survivors have made this and other policy and legislative changes possible through intensive campaigns on universities and colleges across California and the nation. In California, student activists in public and private schools have been organizing against sexual violence in institutions of higher education since 2012. Revisions and additions to existing federal laws in the early 2010s has given activists a new set of “tools” with which to fight campus sexual violence, including Title IX complaints, the Clery Act, group lawsuits, and social media (Heldman and Dirks 2014). The following California schools had a Title IX investigation opened before June 30, 2014: Samuel Merritt University (1/24/14), Pitzer College (3/29/12), Occidental College (5/2/13), Butte College (2/27/13), University of Southern California (5/26/13), and UC Berkeley (3/24/14) (The Chronicle of Higher Education 2017).

Student activists from community colleges and private universities in California organized against sexual violence around the same time or earlier than students from UC campuses, however, it was the activism from the public colleges and universities that prompted the involvement of the state of California on this issue. Student activists on UC campuses have been pivotal in making the UC system more responsive to issues of sexual violence and their activist campaigns pushed state officials to get involved in this issue. In August 2013, California state legislators approved an audit of the sexual violence policies at four public universities: UC Berkeley, UCLA, California State University, Chico, and San

Diego State University. This audit was requested by Assemblyman Anthony Rendon (D-Lakewood) who was contacted by nine UC Berkeley students who had filed a Clery Act complaint (Song 2013).

In my dissertation I focus on the movement against sexual violence at UC campuses for several reasons. The UC system is comprised of ten highly selective research institutions and its governance is shared across four groups: The Regents, the President of the UC system, the Chancellors, and the Academic Senate.⁷ Even though each UC campus is under the same governing body, each campus has its own culture, history, and policies. Each campus also has some level of autonomy in implementing policies which has been the case for addressing sexual violence and programs for survivors. As such, activism against sexual violence within each campus has taken many forms and differed across many important factors such as when the movement began, who made up the movement, and the tactics used by activists. The high profile of the UC system and the leadership role it has taken on many issues, including sexual violence, make it an important university system to study. The UC system often influences other post-secondary schools and state and national policies. It is critical to understand then how activism on UC campuses helped influence local and systemic policy reform on sexual violence within the UC system and outside of it. UC schools are diverse on many features including geographic location, culture, and history. Each UC campus has student populations that differ widely in terms of race, ethnicity, and class. As such, it is important to see whether or not the new UC policies are effectively addressing the needs of a rapidly growing and diverse student population. Activists against sexual violence are diverse and have challenged universities to be more inclusive.

UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara were chosen based on their high rates of sexual violence, long history of student activism, and differences in mobilizations against sexual violence. These two campuses have the highest rates of sexual violence in the UC system and both have a long history of student activism. Table 1 below provides the rates of sexual assault reported on all 10 UC campuses for 2014.

Table 1: Rates of Sexual Assault on all UCs

University of California Campuses	2014 Campus Climate Survey		2014 Clery Act Statistics	
	Total respondents	Undergraduate Respondents	Rapes	No. of Rapes per 1,000 Students
UC Berkeley	4% (507)	7% (386)	29	.77
UC Davis	2% (443)	4% (248)	16	.46
UC Irvine	2% (196)	3% (148)	11	.37
UCLA	3% (419)	5% (252)	25	.60
UC Merced	2% (43)	--	1	.16
UC Riverside	3% (117)	4% (91)	7	.33
UC San Diego	2% (279)	4% (160)	9	.29
UC San Francisco	2% (140)	--	0	0
UC Santa Barbara	8% (632)	13% (569)	28	1.21
UC Santa Cruz	4% (246)	5% (218)	6	.34

-- Figure not provided by report.

Out of the 10 UC campuses, UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley had the highest rates of reported sexual violence. The first source of data comes from Campus Climate Project Final Reports published in 2014.⁸ The UC system wide report identified sexual assault as a problem that needed to be addressed. Three percent of all UC students had reported unwanted sexual contact while at a UC campus (Rankin & Associates Consulting 2014c). The report found that higher percentages of undergraduates experienced sexual

assault. Reports of unwanted sexual contact, however, varied among the different UC campuses. At UC Berkeley, four percent of respondents experienced sexual assault (Rankin & Associates Consulting 2014a), while eight percent of UC Santa Barbara respondents reported unwanted sexual contact, which was the highest rate among all the UCs (Rankin & Associates Consulting 2014b). Data from the annual Clery reports also show that there were higher rates of sexual assault at UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley (U.S. Department of Education 2014a).⁹ In 2014, there were 28 rapes reported at UC Santa Barbara and 29 at UC Berkeley.¹⁰

UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara have a long history of student activism that stems back to the 1960s. UC Berkeley is widely known for the Free Speech Movement of 1964, which has had lasting effects on the campus, student activism, and the national civil liberties movement. The Free Speech Movement helped put UC Berkeley in the national spotlight and cemented their status as a politically and socially active campus. In the 1960s and 1970s, several movements have been supported by UC Berkeley students, such as Vietnam anti-war protests, the Third World Liberation Front, and the Women's movement. Since the 1990s, several movements have occurred on the campus: saving ethnic studies, worker rights, Occupy, and others. UC Santa Barbara also has a strong history of activism. In the 1960s, students of color organized and fought for recognition from the university and provided the foundation for national movements. In 1968, students from the Black Student Union took over North Hall demanding the renaming of North Hall and the development of Black Studies. In 1969, Chicana/o students united at UC Santa Barbara and wrote "El Plan de Santa Barbara" which called for the formation of Chicana/o Studies departments and was influential for the national Chicana/o movement. In the late 1960s, students were heavily

involved in the anti-war movement, culminating in the burning of the Bank of America building and riots in Isla Vista in 1970 (Whalen and Flacks 1980, 1984, 1989). Tensions between students and authority figures (administration and police) played a key role in the riots and the burning of the building. Since then, students have participated in many different social movements including improving Chicana/o Studies (Armbruster-Sandoval 2017), queer social movements (Miller, Taylor, and Rupp 2016; Rupp, Taylor, Regev-Messalem, Fogarty, and England 2014), climate justice (Grosse 2017), and feminist student groups (Crossley 2015, 2017). UC Santa Barbara students have also been politically involved off-campus in Isla Vista in housing and community relations.

Despite sharing a long history of activism and a problem of sexual violence, the movement against sexual violence has differed widely on both campuses. At UC Berkeley, discussions of sexual violence on campus began in 2012. That year, there was an increase in reported rapes among the college-aged population in Berkeley and conversations on the mishandling of sexual violence on the campus began taking place. This led to the involvement of the undergraduate student government, the Associated Students of University of California (ASUC) and the California State Auditor in investigating the handling of sexual harassment and sexual violence at UC Berkeley. In February 2014, 31 current and former UC Berkeley students filed Title IX and Clery Act complaints with the U.S. Department of Education. Within a month of the complaints, the U.S. Department of Education opened a Title IX investigation at UC Berkeley, making it the first UC to be under federal investigation for the mishandling of sexual violence and sexual harassment on campus.¹¹ In July 2015, three UC Berkeley students filed a civil lawsuit against the school for failing to properly address their sexual assault complaints.

At UC Santa Barbara, discussions around sexual violence on campus did occur, but much later. In 2014, the results of the UC Campus Climate survey were released. This report showed that UC Santa Barbara had the highest rates of sexual violence out of all the UCs, which prompted university officials within the campus to identify it as a major area for improvement both on campus and in Isla Vista, home to a large portion of the undergraduate population. In September 2014, several students filed Title IX and Clery Act complaints against UC Santa Barbara; however, the Office of Civil Rights never opened an investigation and UC Santa Barbara was not listed as one of the universities under investigation. In spring of 2015, anti-sexual violence activists organized several nonviolent direct actions against the university including a sit-in and rallies. From these protests emerged an organization, nowUCsb, that has been tracking the fulfillment of the demands signed by the chancellor and has been addressing sexual violence and harassment on campus. During the 2015-2016 academic year two separate lawsuits were filed against the university. In December 2015, a former UC Santa Barbara student filed a Title IX civil lawsuit against UC Regents for mishandling her sexual assault case. In January 2016, a student filed a personal-injury lawsuit against UC Santa Barbara for the injuries she sustained in a gang rape in February 2014.

The differences in the development and trajectory of the movements against sexual violence will be examined in this research. Despite the fact that both schools are a part of the UC system, each campus has a different history and is located in cities with distinct social, cultural, and political climates that influence the university's climate and administration. The reputation of the universities and the local social and political environment in which each university is located have influenced the activist campaigns and how they have handled

sexual violence on each campus. UC Berkeley is a prestigious university and is regarded as an example for the rest of the UCs and other colleges and universities. UC President Janet Napolitano has stated that UC Berkeley is the premier campus and must take the lead in fixing the problem of sexual violence, particularly sexual harassment (Tucker 2016). This pressure on UC Berkeley stems from a series sexual harassment scandals that broke out during the 2015-16 academic year. In March, President Napolitano reprimanded UC Berkeley Chancellor Nicholas Dirks for lack of communication with the UC Office of the President and called for stricter policies and zero tolerance for administrators who have violated UC sexual harassment policies. This had far-reaching consequences. Several top administrators resigned: Sujit Choudhry, Dean of the UC Berkeley School of Law; Claude Steele, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost; and Chancellor Dirks. At UC Santa Barbara, the conservative political climate and a steady rise of right-wing groups on campus following the election of Donald Trump created challenges for activists at UC Santa Barbara and added to issues that activists already had to contend with, such as homophobia and racism. On several occasions right-wing conservative male students directly challenged activists against sexual violence. The rest of this section will provide a brief history and characteristics of each campus.

University of California, Berkeley

UC Berkeley is the flagship campus of the UC system. It was founded in 1868 and is one of the largest campuses in terms of student population. UC Berkeley is organized into 14 schools and colleges and offers over 350 degree programs through its different academic departments. It is regarded as one of the top public universities in the world. It is consistently one of the top five public and global universities in U.S. News & World Report

surveys and reports. In 2015, total student enrollment was 38,204. Of these, 27,496 were undergraduates and 10,708 graduate students. In 2015, the racial and ethnic composition of its undergraduate population was comprised of 39 percent Asian and Pacific Islander, followed by 26 percent White, and 14 percent Chicano/Latino (Office of Planning and Analysis 2016). Table 2 below describes key characteristics of both campuses.

Table 2: Undergraduate campus profile of UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara for 2015-2016¹²

	UC Berkeley	UC Santa Barbara
Location	Northern California	Central California
Campus	Urban	Suburban
Undergraduate Enrollment	27,496	20,607
Race/ethnicity of Undergraduates		
<i>American Indian/Alaskan</i>	<1%	1%
<i>Black/African American</i>	3%	4%
<i>Chicano/Latino</i>	14%	25%
<i>Asian/Pacific Islander</i>	39%	26%
<i>White</i>	26%	35%
<i>Other/Unknown/Decline Answer</i>	4%	1%
<i>International Students</i>	14%	7%
Gender		
<i>Women</i>	52%	53%
<i>Men</i>	48%	47%
First Generation	29%	42%
Pell Grant Recipients	30%	39%
Living on Campus	26%	38%*
Greek Affiliated	10%	11%
Graduation Rate	91%	83%

Notes: Figures refer to the 2015-2016 academic year.

*This figure includes graduate students

The campus is located in downtown Berkeley, California, a city of over 112,000 people, and lies 14 miles northeast of San Francisco. Berkeley borders Oakland and is near San Francisco, perhaps the most liberal and progressive city in the U.S., but still retains a small city feel with a busy and bustling downtown area and Victorian homes throughout the city. In 2010, the population of Berkeley was comprised of 59.5% white, 10% Black or African American, .4% American Indian and Alaska Native, .2% Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, and 4.4% multiracial (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2010). About 10% of the city identified as Hispanic or Latina/o.¹³ Berkeley has been commonly referred to as a “bastion of liberalism” and has a reputation for being a progressive city. For example, in 2012 Berkeley became the first city in the United States to recognize bisexual pride day and in 2014 approved a tax on sodas and sugary drinks. In the last couple of years, Berkeley has been a site of clashes between liberal and conservative groups fueled by the present political and racial climate. For example, in February 2017 violent protests erupted prior to an appearance by Milo Yiannopoulos, a right-wing commentator, at UC Berkeley. This event was cancelled hours before it was to take place, but it caused about \$100,000 in campus damage. Clashes between left- and right-wing groups has extended outside the campus and protests have erupted in the city as well.

UC Berkeley is highly selective in its admissions. In 2017 it admitted 18.3% of its 85,000 applications from freshmen students. The school draws most of its students from California; from 2014-2018, 76 percent of the undergraduate student population was from California. A little over a quarter (29%) of all undergraduate students enrolled identify as first generation students and 30% of them are Pell Grant recipients. The high cost of living in the Berkeley area and the housing crisis have affected the number of students being able

to live on or near the campus. The campus has the lowest percentage of beds for the student body out of any UC campus. In 2017, UC Berkeley housed about 22% of undergraduates and 9% of graduate students while the UC system-wide average is 38.1% for undergraduates and 19.6% for graduate students (UC Berkeley Housing Task Force 2017).

Academics are very important at UC Berkeley, and students are expected to excel academically and be involved in resume-building activities such as student government, internships, and research. Students and residents in Berkeley tend to be socially and politically engaged as evidence by the frequent marches and rallies around campus and in the city. Although there is a heavy focus on academics, UC Berkeley has a large athletics program that has struggled financially for the past decade. The campus has 30 NCAA Division I level teams that are part of the Pac-12 Conference. The football team has a long and celebrated history, particularly the “Big Game”, an annual game against rival Stanford. This is one of the oldest football rivalries that is now an important tradition, especially the Big Game Bonfire Rally. About 10% of undergraduates are involved in Greek life, a similar rate to that of UC Santa Barbara. “Fraternity Row” is an area close to campus where most of the fraternities and sororities are located and is central to the party scene at UC Berkeley (Sreekanth 2018).

University of California, Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara was founded in 1891 as the Anna Blake School, a teacher’s college, and in 1944 it became the fourth campus of the UC system. It offers more than 200 majors, degrees and credentials and is comprised of three undergraduate colleges, three professional schools, and a graduate division. The total enrollment of students at UC Santa Barbara in 2015 was 23,497. Undergraduates made up 20,607 of this, while graduate

students comprised 2,890. In 2015, Chicanos/Latinos comprised 27 percent of the undergraduate student body, Asians/Pacific Islanders 28 percent, and whites made up the largest group with 38 percent (Office of Budget & Planning 2016). In 2015, UC Santa Barbara was designated a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities for consistently enrolling Hispanic undergraduate students (25% or more).

Nestled between Isla Vista and Goleta, UC Santa Barbara is located about 10 miles northwest of downtown Santa Barbara. In 2010, Santa Barbara had a population of over 88,000. In terms of racial identification, 75.1 percent identified as white, 1.6 percent Black or African American, 1 percent American Indian and Alaska Native, 3.5 percent Asian, 14.7 percent other race, and 3.9 percent as two or more races (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2010). Hispanics or Latinas/os comprised 38 percent of the population. Santa Barbara has been referred to as the “American Riviera” and is a tourist destination that attracts thousands of tourists every year. Santa Barbara is a conservative city, but is surrounded by more liberal towns/cities such as Isla Vista. Santa Barbara city officials often support conservative measures that marginalize communities of color such as gang injunctions. Indicative of the conservative nature of Santa Barbara, one of the city’s daily newspapers, *The Santa Barbara News-Press*, was the only newspaper in California to endorse Donald Trump for President in 2016. In the past, it has openly supported the criminalization of undocumented immigrants such as denying them licenses to operate motor vehicles in California. Santa Barbara holds tightly to its colonial heritage, which can be seen in its Spanish-style architecture throughout the city and yearly celebrations of the historical legacy of Spain.

UC Santa Barbara is a selective institution that admitted 32.8% of its applicants in 2017. The majority of its undergraduate population (88% in 2017) are from the state of California. A large percentage (42%) of undergraduate students at UC Santa Barbara are first generation students and 39% of them receive the Pell Grant. Similar to Berkeley, there is a shortage of affordable houses in the Santa Barbara area that has pushed working-class people and people of color to live further away. In terms of housing students, UC Santa Barbara houses 38% of all its students. Historically, a higher percentage (40% in 2015) of students tends to live in Isla Vista, an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County adjacent to the campus. This unincorporated status has resulted in many issues including lack of funding for infrastructure and the reliance on the surrounding cities for resources. Given the high concentration of students in Isla Vista, jurisdiction of the area has been a highly contentious issue, with administrators wanting to stay away from the area, while students wanting the university to take some accountability for what happens there.

UC Santa Barbara's location next to the ocean helps give it a beach feel. Students are often seen dressed in shorts and sandals and riding skateboards and bicycles around campus and Isla Vista. The campus was named a "Bicycle Friendly University" by the League of American Bicyclists and the "Greenest" Public University by the Princeton Review in 2015. The high concentration of undergraduate students in Isla Vista and the lack of a formal government has helped create a distinct party culture at the campus that has become widely known. UC Santa Barbara has been consistently named a top five party school in the past and more recently (2015) was ranked third by the Princeton Review. About 11% of students are affiliated in Greek organizations, which is similar to UC Berkeley, but the partying at UC Santa Barbara is not centered around Greek life, but in Del Playa Drive in Isla Vista,

right next to the beach. Recent events in Isla Vista have made the campus take greater initiative in participating in what goes on in Isla Vista. This has increased policing in the area, which has tamed the party scene significantly. UC Santa Barbara has 19 NCAA Division I sports and many compete in the Big West Conference. Athletics are not a central focus of the school, but the men's soccer team tends to draw the largest crowds.

Campus Anti-Sexual Violence Activism

Anti-sexual violence activism has a long history in the United States. It can be traced back to the late 1880s during Reconstruction and much of this early work was done by black women and other women of color (Heldman, Ackerman, and Breckenridge-Jackson 2018).¹⁴ In this section, I will discuss the history of activist work against sexual violence on college and university campuses.

Activism against sexual violence was first documented on campuses during the peak of the Women's Movement in the 1970s. The Women's Movement in the United States has been critical for the advancement of women's rights and has been characterized by different periods of intense and highly visible mobilization. The feminist mobilizations of the 1960s and 1970s consisted of multiple feminist movements (Gluck, Blackwell, Cotrell, and Harper 1998), that emerged from activist women who were organizationally distinct from each other and largely organized along racial-ethnic lines (Roth 2004). Women's movements in the 1960s focused on different issues and several sub-movements developed. One of the key movements to emerge was the anti-rape movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Schechter 1982).¹⁵ The anti-rape movement was largely comprised of white women from the feminist movement, particularly the radical branch (Bevacqua 2000).¹⁶ This movement was founded on the idea that violence against women is a critical factor in the social control

of women. It called for the transformation of discourse from describing women as “victims” to “survivors” of sexual assault (Matthews 1994). Literature on rape by feminist women emerged during this time and it helped develop these principles on which the movement was found.¹⁷ The development of this rape consciousness can be attributed to its roots in the radical feminist branch, particularly its use of consciousness raising groups. These groups provided a space for women to share personal experiences openly in a group. In consciousness-raising groups, “rape was discussed candidly and nonjudgmentally, and participants in the movement came to understand rape as a common women’s experience with political implications” (Bevacqua 2000:30). Other factors were critical in raising awareness about rape and politicizing it: being willing to talk about sensitive issues in public, engage in what is considered unfeminine behavior, and believe that “the personal is political” (Bevacqua 2000). Speak-outs organized by feminist groups also provided a space for survivors to share their experiences out in public and in front of the media (Matthews 1994). In addition to raising consciousness about rape, early efforts focused on challenging commonly-held view that rapes were committed by a “few sick men” (Arnold 2017) and targeted male dominated institutions that re-victimized survivors such as law enforcement (Campbell, Wasco, Ahrens, Sefl, and Barnes 2001; Koss and Harvey 1991).

Rape crisis centers came out of this movement and helped hold the movement together. Rape crisis centers provided basic services to survivors such as a 24-hour crisis hotline for sexual assault survivors, counseling, and advocacy (Campbell and Martin 2001). Many different tactics were used by activists in rape crisis centers to raise awareness of the problem of rape in women’s lives. Scott (1993), in her comparative analysis of two rape crisis centers, described the diverse strategies they used in working towards ending rape.

Women from one rape crisis center engaged in more conventional and non-disruptive tactics, and focused on educating the public through lectures and programs. Women from another rape crisis center used more innovative and unruly tactics. They engaged in confrontations with rapists and producing newsletters that listed descriptions of rapists. Over time, rape crisis centers changed from small collective organizations to more conventional hierarchical organizational structures. This came as a result of their need for funding and resorting to state funding which transformed rape crisis center from grassroots-activist organizations to “professionalized social service” organizations (Matthews 1994). Currently, most are private, non-profit organizations. Many programs and organizations fighting sexual violence formed and were developed during this time such as Feminist Alliance Against Rape and the National Organization for Women. These groups were pivotal in creating legislative reform that expanded the rights and support of survivors of sexual violence.

College and university campuses were critical in the anti-rape movement that developed in the 1970s. Rape crisis centers worked closely with college campuses and some rape crisis centers were founded by women’s centers and coalitions on university campuses (Gold and Villari 2000; Matthews 1994). For example, in 1972 students from UC Santa Cruz took a class on rape and after conducting a survey and realizing how common sexual assault and physical violence was in their community, formed the Santa Cruz Women Against Rape, a rape crisis center (Scott 1993). Campuses were also a critical source of activists and provided a strong communication network between feminist groups and students that helped foster the anti-rape movement (Bevacqua 2000; Gold and Villari 2000; Matthews 1994). In Los Angeles, students from UCLA and California State University, Los Angeles were critical in the formation of two different rape crisis centers (Matthews 1994).

Anti-rape groups were able to host events on college campuses and collaborate on events and resources with school groups and programs (Bevacqua 2000). In the 1970s, students began pressuring their universities to address sexual assault through takeovers and marches. Administrators were forced to address sexual violence after several rapes were reported on campuses. These efforts include escort services and safety lights (Bevacqua 2000). Students from universities across the nation led protests on their campuses in response to rapes that had occurred locally, including in UC Berkeley, which led to the UC system-wide adoption of campus sexual assault programs in 1976 (Hatch 2017).

Key legislation was passed in the 1970s that was critical in the campus movement against sexual assault in the 2010s. The Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 was signed, prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sex in any federally funded education program or activity. Title IX was originally intended to address disparities in hiring, employment, and admissions to universities, but was mostly used for increasing the number of women in college sports. Over time through complaints and lawsuits, sexual harassment and sexual violence were included in Title IX under sex discrimination. One of the first cases to do this came in 1977, when a group of female students at Yale College and a faculty member filed the first sexual harassment case under Title IX. In *Alexander v. Yale*, the group of women accused the university of failing to combat sexual harassment against female students and investigate such cases. More importantly, they claimed that sexual harassment interfered with their education and that it was discrimination. Although the case was thrown out in 1980 because most of the plaintiffs had graduated, the court upheld the legal argument that sexual harassment is discrimination. The legal framework used in this case was developed by Catharine MacKinnon, a law student at Yale who advised the group of women

filing the lawsuit, which was foundational and became widely used by subsequent cases. In addition to Title IX, the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) was enacted in 1974. FERPA protects the privacy of student education records and prohibits schools from disclosing anything from a student's records without their permission. Schools often cite FERPA as the reason for not sharing information about sexual assault disciplinary cases.

Beginning in the 1980s and going into the early 1990s, there was a surge in research on the topics of sexual assault on college campuses that began highlighting this issue as a social problem. This literature focused on the high incidences of sexual violence (Bohmer and Parrot 1993; Copenhaver and Grauerholz 1991; Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski 1987; Mills and Granoff 1992) and rape culture on college campuses (Buchwald, Fletcher, and Roth 1993; Ehrhart and Sandler 1986; Martin and Hummer 1989; Sanday 1990; Stompler 1994).¹⁸ Mary Koss, a psychologist, was critical in leading this research and helped create a national debate on sexual violence (Heldman et al. 2018). She also focused on the prevalence of sexual assault among college-aged women (Koss 1985; Koss et al. 1987). Campus rape was first documented as a problem in 1982 in an article titled "Date Rape: A Campus Epidemic" by Karen Barrett in *Ms.* magazine (Heldman 2015). Three years later, *Ms.* magazine published another article on the topic titled "Date Rape: The Story of an Epidemic and Those Who Deny It" (1985) by Ellen Sweet. This article featured findings from Koss's research that one in four college women were victims of rape or attempted rape, and that many of these women did not consider their experience as rape (Sweet 2012; Warshaw 1988). Koss led the *Ms.* Project on Campus Sexual Assault whose research was used in the article mentioned and it was the central focus in Robin Warshaw's book *I Never Called It Rape* (1988). The work of Koss and others began normalizing the existence of

“acquaintance rape” and “date rape” during the 1980s and early 1990s, which was intensely debated in magazines and popular media (Heldman et al. 2018). This countered widely-held ideas that rape was perpetrated by strangers and that acquaintance rape did not constitute rape. It also helped the campus movement against sexual violence to grow. Feminists began making connections between college life and date rape, and the problem of campus rape became linked to the growing attention to sexual assaults by dates and acquaintances (Bevacqua 2000:164).

In the 1980s, anti-rape education and groups in colleges and universities started developing across the country (Bevacqua 2000; Greensite 1999; Warshaw 1988). In some of these groups their work resembled that of the early anti-rape movement in the 1970s: speak outs and take back the night marches with the goal to raise awareness of the problem (Bevacqua 2000). Most of their efforts focused on maintaining sexual autonomy and preventing acquaintance rape (Bevacqua 2000) and men formed groups that focused on workshops and educational programs for other men (Gold and Villari 2000). In 1981, Claire Walsh founded Sexual Assault Recovery Services (SARS) at the University of Florida and a year later helped form Campus Organized Against Rape (COARS), one of the earliest nationally recognized peer education programs (Gold and Villari 2000). These efforts by students and high profile cases of sexual assault pushed schools to enact sexual violence policies by the early 1990s, including the University of Michigan in 1985 and the University of Minnesota in 1986 (Gold and Villari 2000).

A key feature of the activist work done during this time was the development of peer education programs that began to be implemented nationwide by the early 1990s (Gold and Villari 2000). In 1989 students from the University of Pennsylvania, who saw the need to

educate people on the issue and advocate for the rights of survivors, developed the anti-rape group, Students Together Against Acquaintance Rape (STAAR) (Marcotti 1992). This group hosted the First Annual Student Conference on Campus Sexual Assault in 1992 and gathered over 200 representatives from schools across the country (Marcotti 1992). The conference was developed after students from STAAR saw an overwhelming request for help in starting similar groups in other schools and organized it with the intent to “create a student-led think tank which would establish links between various programs across the country” (Marcotti 1992).

In the early 1990s, student activism against sexual violence continued and several cases garnered national attention. In 1990, Brown University was in the national spotlight after students created a “rape list” in women’s bathroom stalls, writing down the names of men who had assaulted women on campus (Gold and Villari 2000). In Antioch College a college group was formed by students after two rapes had been reported on campus in 1990. The group called the Womyn of Antioch, convened that year and demanded a number of changes to address sexual assault that included a support group for survivors, a rape education program, and immediate notification to the entire campus when a sexual assault occurred (Hatch 2017). They helped re-write the Antioch Sexual Offense Policy that was approved by the university in 1992. This policy gained national attention for its requirement of affirmative consent, which was revolutionary and ahead of its time. The policy stated that “consent must be obtained each and every time there is sexual activity” and that “each new level of sexual activity requires consent.” The policy, however, was criticized for being an example of political correctness gone too far and was mocked on national TV. In 1991, Katie Koestner detailed her experience of being raped while attending the College of

William and Mary in a documentary and a feature story in *Time* magazine, sparking a nationwide conversation about date rape. Despite these individual cases occurring on several campuses, there were coalitions formed across schools. In 1991, the North American Student Conferences on Campus Sexual Violence and the Coalition of Campuses Organizing Against Rape (CCOAR) formed, uniting students from different universities through conferences and formation of networks of people advocating for this issue (Gold and Villari 2000).

In the 1990s, several key pieces of legislation were passed that were critical to the wider movement addressing violence against women. In April 1986, the rape and murder of Jeanne Clery at Lehigh University led to the 1990 passage of the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act that required colleges and universities to disclose crimes committed on campus, including sexual violence. In 1992, the Federal Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights was enacted as part of the Clery Act, which gave survivors certain basic rights such as their options of academic and living accommodations and notification of counseling services. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) passed in 1994, and was the first federal law that addressed sexual assault and domestic violence as crimes and created federal resources to address violence against women. Erica Strohl, a University of Pennsylvania student and founder of STAAR testified during the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings for VAWA, discussing the problem of acquaintance rape and the importance of rape prevention education in addressing this issue on campuses (Gold and Villari 2000).

There were also key cases that continued changing the interpretation of Title IX. In 1991, four students at Carleton College filed a landmark lawsuit against the university for

failing to protect them from known perpetrators and mishandling their complaints, which led to changes in the school's policies and practices (Hatch 2017). A year later, in *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools*, a high school student filed a lawsuit against her school district after being subjected to sexual harassment by a teacher. In this seminal case the Supreme Court upheld the award of monetary damages under Title IX, meaning that students who are subjected to sexual harassments in schools that receive federal financial assistance can sue for monetary damages under Title IX. In *Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School District* (1998) the Supreme Court ruled that schools can be liable for monetary damages if a teacher sexually harasses a student and officials with authority to address the harassment have knowledge of it but act deliberately indifferent in responding to it. In *Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education* (1999) the Supreme Court ruled that schools are liable for student-on-student sexual harassment under Title IX. The first known application of Title IX to sexual assault was in 1995 when the Department of Education found that Evergreen State College had failed to provide a fair and timely resolution to a student's sexual assault case against a professor (Heldman et al. 2018). The school had violated Title IX by applying the "clear and convincing" standard of evidence rather than "preponderance of evidence" standard.

In the 2000s and 2010s, research studies on the prevalence of campus sexual assault were conducted that contributed significantly to our understanding of the problem and issue.¹⁹ Student activism against sexual violence continued in the 2000s. In 2000, Columbia University students started the organization Students Active for Ending Rape (SAFER) that fought rape culture and sexual violence through student-led policy reform campaigns. They provided resources to students to help them mobilize and make policy changes on campuses.

A lot of the work done to address sexual assault at the time was not framed as anti-rape or against sexual assault. The experiences of sexual violence and its consequences were embedded in discussions of sex, sexuality, reproductive rights, and bodily autonomy. Attention on activism around sexual autonomy and sexuality highlights one way in which there was continuity between the second and third wave feminists (Gilmore 2005). Although not explicit, sexual violence has been tied to different issues affecting women and arises through many different tactics that have been used such as performances of *The Vagina Monologues* and organizing Slutwalks.²⁰ These forms of activism and ways of bringing awareness to issues of sexual violence may go under the radar but they constitute the continuation of the anti-rape work that was started in the 1970s and earlier.

In the 2000s, Title IX was further clarified and applied to sexual violence. In 2001, the Department of Education “formally included sexual misconduct as a violation of Title IX” (Heldman et al. 2018:45) and there were several litigation cases that were “game changers” for school sexual misconduct (Hatch 2017).²¹ One case that brought national attention to campus sexual violence and the enforcement of the Clery Act was the rape and murder of Laura Dickinson, an undergraduate student at Eastern Michigan University in 2007. In the weeks after her death, the school did not disclose the cause of death and said there was no foul play. It wasn’t until two months after her death that the university revealed the truth to the campus community and her parents. This resulted in the firing of top administrators including the president of the university and a \$350,000 fine for violating the Clery Act. The school also paid \$2.5 million in a settlement with the Dickinson family. Title IX complaints against prestigious schools were also critical to the movement and development of Title IX during this time. Wendy Murphy, a lawyer and professor of sexual

violence law, filed Title IX complaints against Harvard in 2002 and 2010 and Princeton in 2010, which led to policy reform and the Department of Education's 2011 Dear Colleague Letter (Weldon 2018).

Beginning in 2010, media attention, student-led activism, and government involvement in campus sexual assault led to the widespread emergence of the campus movement against sexual violence across the country. In 2010, in a special investigative series conducted by the Center for Public Integrity and National Public Radio titled "Seeking Justice for Campus Rapes" highlighted how universities had been failing to protect women from campus rape and their inadequate response to sexual assault cases. In the 2010s, there were amendments and clarifications to existing legislation addressing sexual assault and gender discrimination that were the foundation to the contemporary campus movement against sexual assault. The reinterpretation of old laws was key to the emergence of this movement. The Department of Education did not formally recognize sexual violence as gender discrimination affecting the equitable learning environment until 2001, but it did not address it concretely until 2011 (Heldman et al. 2018). In April 2011, the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education issued a "Dear Colleague Letter" to schools and universities that provided clarification and guidance on the schools' responsibilities in addressing sexual violence and being compliant with Title IX. This letter served as a warning for schools to take campus sexual violence more seriously. This required schools to provide preventative measures and resources/accommodations to survivors of sexual violence, to clarify the adjudication process, and mandated the use of "preponderance of evidence" ("more likely than not" rather than "clear and convincing" or "beyond a reasonable doubt") standard in adjudication cases involving sexual violence. The Office of

Civil Rights released a 53-page “Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence” in 2014 clarifying the 2011 letter and in 2015, it issued another “Dear Colleague Letter” reminding schools that they must designate an employee to coordinate the school’s efforts to comply with Title IX. These guidelines and clarifications marked President Barack Obama’s efforts to take campus sexual violence more seriously.

During this time, students began publicly discussing their experiences of sexual assault and how colleges and universities were not properly handling their cases. One early example of this was Angie Epifano’s account of her sexual assault at Amherst College as a freshman in the school newspaper, *The Amherst Student*, in 2012. Epifano’s and others’ efforts pushed universities to begin reviewing their policies for handling sexual assault cases and the media began focusing on this issue, and more importantly inspired other survivors to speak out about their experiences. In 2013, Title IX complaints addressing sexual assault started being filed by students and alumni from several different colleges and universities across the United States. According to Heldman et al. (2018) there were two different waves of Title IX complaint filings. The first one occurred in 2013 and it was a “tactic to gain legitimacy for the concerns of the movement, to demonstrate that campus violence is a national problem, and to garner media attention” (Heldman et al. 2018:54). This first wave of complaints helped make campus sexual assault a key issue in the media and it helped foster the formation of networks of activists on social media that facilitated filing of later complaints and other tactics. The second wave of complaints took place in 2014 and by the end of the year there were 110 open investigations (Heldman et al. 2018).

The beginning of the campus movement is marked by these waves of Title IX complaints in 2013 that continued into 2016. This attracted widespread public attention and

media coverage that kept the movement in the spotlight. With the help of media coverage and social media, students across universities formed networks and connections that helped them with the filing of federal complaints and the use of other tactics. For example, in 2013 a group of students and faculty from Occidental College, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, Swarthmore, and UC Berkeley who had filed complaints against their universities created End Rape on Campus. This advocacy organization provided free and direct assistance to survivors who wanted to file Title IX and Clery Act complaints.

The momentum of this movement was carried into 2017 through key events and high profile cases that occurred during this time. In April 2014, Emma Sulkowicz, a student-survivor from Columbia University, gained national and international attention for her senior thesis titled *Mattress Performance (Carry That Weight)*. Sulkowicz carried around a mattress on campus to signify the weight she had to carry as a survivor of sexual violence. This continued the spotlight on campus sexual assault and inspired many campuses to engage in this performance protest tactic. One key story that created challenges to this emerging movement was the November 2014 *Rolling Stone* article “A Rape on Campus.” The story described the gang rape of “Jackie” by members of a fraternity at the University of Virginia. The details, however, were questioned by the fraternity and administrators, and news organizations including *The Washington Post* found discrepancies in the article. The article was retracted and there were three lawsuits against the magazine and its author, Sabrina Erdeley. This article created backlash for the campus movement and its activists.

Two documentaries were produced during the early years of the movement that told the story of several survivors and the endemic problem occurring on campuses across the country. The first one, *It Happened Here* (2014), was directed by Lisa F. Jackson and

produced by Marjorie Schwartz Nielsen. It detailed the stories of six students, including Angie Epifano, and how they were mistreated by their universities. In 2015, Kirby Dick and Amy Ziering released *The Hunting Ground*. This film primarily focused on Annie Clark and Andrea Pino from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and their crusade to make colleges and universities accountable for their mishandling of sexual assault cases through Title IX complaints. *The Hunting Ground* garnered a lot of attention and was aired several times on CNN. That same year, Jon Krakauer published *Missoula: Rape and the Justice System in a College Town*, documenting several of the rapes that had occurred between 2008-2012 at the University of Montana that had garnered national attention. He described the survivors' experiences and the injustices they faced while reporting to the school and local law enforcement.

In 2015 and 2016, a sexual assault at Stanford University pushed the issue into the spotlight again. In January 2015 Brock Turner sexually assaulted a woman behind a dumpster on campus. While assaulting the unconscious woman, two international graduate students intervened and held Turner until police arrived (Miller 2019). He was charged and found guilty of three counts of felony sexual assault. During the sentencing "Emily Doe," as the survivor was known, read a statement describing how her life had been impacted by the sexual assault, which ended up being widely shared across the news and social media. Judge Aaron Persky's six-month sentence to Turner drew public outrage and a recall campaign to remove him from office. In 2018 Persky was removed from the Santa Clara County Superior Court. The case gained attention again in 2019 when Chanel Miller, known as "Emily Doe," ended her anonymity and revealed her identity as the woman who was assaulted by Turner. On September 24, 2019 Miller released her memoir, *Know My Name*, which has garnered

wide media attention and acclaim for telling her story of trauma and struggle to hold her perpetrator accountable.

During Barack Obama's presidency, campus sexual assault was made a primary issue. In addition to the "Dear Colleague" letter released in 2011 by his appointee Assistant Secretary of Civil Rights in the Department of Education Russlyn Ali, President Obama signed a presidential proclamation in 2010 making April National Sexual Assault Awareness Month. In addition, the White House Council on Women and Girls released a report, "Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action in 2014" highlighting the problem of sexual violence and the inadequate response of the criminal justice system. In 2014, President Obama established the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, which addresses campus sexual assault and rape. In April of that year, the Task Force released a report that called on colleges and universities to "step up" and take responsibility of this problem. In 2013, VAWA was reauthorized and the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE Act) was passed as an amendment to the Clery Act. The SaVE Act expanded on the crime statistics in which schools had to report on to include instances of dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking. It also required colleges and universities to guarantee rights for survivors and provide certain accommodations.

The primacy of campus sexual violence took a backseat after the election of Donald Trump in 2016. Trump, who has been referred to as the "Sexual Predator-in-Chief," has been accused by at least 17 women of sexual assault. His election has helped create momentum for a wider women's movement and movement against sexual harassment and sexual violence. However, it has also resulted in the rollback of key protections to survivors of campus sexual violence. In 2017, Betsy DeVos rescinded Obama's Title IX guidance to

handling sexual violence. In November 2018, the Department of Education released proposed changes to Title IX that would limit schools' liability and increase the rights of individuals accused of sexual violence. It also narrowed down the definition of sexual harassment and gave colleges the option of using informal resolution procedures and a higher standard of proof. Despite this, campus activists continue to work on issues of sexual violence not only on their campuses but outside of it as well. The rise of the #MeToo movement created a space to work on this issue outside of the walls of campuses and into many arenas including the entertainment business, media, politics, and sports.

Theoretical Framework

In order to understand the student mobilizations on university campuses in the 2010s, I draw on social movement theory to help explain the emergence of this movement. I rely on insights from political opportunity theory (Eisinger 1973; Costain 1992; McAdam 1982; Meyer 2004; Meyer and Staggenborg 1996; Staggenborg 1991; Tarrow 1989, 1998; Tilly 1978, 1995) to help explain the environment and forces outside the social movement itself that influenced its formation. I provide a brief overview of political opportunity structures and the criticisms of this framework which have led to the examination of contexts outside politics. I then focus on gendered opportunities framework (McCammon, Campbell, Granberg, and Mowery 2001; McCammon, Muse, Newman, and Terrell 2007; Taylor 1989, 1996, 1999) and use them to explain the emergence of this larger campus movement. Although gender and political opportunities developed on a wider and more national scale, these did not develop evenly across the country. There were local and university factors that affected how the movement would develop locally and its relation to the larger movement. By examining the emergence and development of the campus movement against sexual

violence at two institutions, I will uncover some of the institutional and local factors that affected the larger gender and political opportunities that enabled this larger movement to form.

Gender and Opportunity Structures

Political process theory or the political opportunity framework began emerging in the 1970s and it shifted how social movements were conceptualized. Earlier theoretical models viewed collective behavior as arising during a period of social disorder and outside the political process (Marx and Wood 1975; McAdam 1982; Morris and Herring 1987) and focused on why social movements emerge. The protests of the 1960s led to a profound change in the study of protest, particularly emphasizing the economic and political factors that affect how movements emerge.²² The political process theorists focused on politics and viewed protest as a political act. The focus was the wider political contexts in which activists mobilized and shifted social movement theory towards viewing social movements as politics by non-legitimate means. The basis of this framework is that protest outside mainstream politics is closely linked to mainstream institutional politics (Meyer 2004). At the core of the political process perspective is the political environment or context in which social movements develop and how it influences their emergence; the focus is outside the social movements being studied. “The wisdom, creativity, and outcomes of activists’ choices – their *agency* – can only be understood and evaluated by looking at the political context and the rules of the games in which those choices are made – that is, *structure*” (Meyer 2004:128). The concept of the “political opportunity structure” was introduced by Eisinger (1973) in his work on riots in the United States. He found that protest activity was related to the degree to which groups are able to gain access to power or the political

opportunity structure within cities. Tilly (1978) built on Eisinger's work by using resource mobilization concepts and incorporating the role of the state, which had been largely ignored by most resource mobilization theorists in how it shaped opportunities for movement participants. Tilly, along with Doug McAdam (1982) and Sidney Tarrow (1983) laid the theoretical foundations for this approach by establishing a connection between social movements and politics.

Several dimensions of political opportunity have been identified: the openness or closeness of the political system, instability or stability within the elite, availability of elite allies, and the state's capacity and propensity for repression (McAdam 1996; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996). Social movement scholars have identified many other key variables to their cases and have developed a wide range of factors that affect social movements (Meyer 2004). This accumulation of environmental elements, however, has stretched its conceptualization to include any contextual variable that could affect social movements (della Porta and Diani 2006; Goodwin and Jasper 1999). "The concept of political opportunity structure is in trouble, in danger of becoming a sponge that soaks up virtually every aspect of the social movement environment" (Gamson and Meyer 1996:275). This has been one of the main limitations of the political opportunity framework: the lack of consensus as to which political opportunities are relevant and how the term has been interpreted (McAdam 1996). Other criticisms include its neglect of activist agency and a strong structural bias (Goodwin and Jasper 1999; Meyer 2004).

The political opportunity theory's focus on political dynamics and environment has been another source of criticism (Goodwin & Jasper 1999; McCammon et al. 2001; Van Dyke, Soule, and Taylor 2004; Young 2002). The framework is based on movements that

target the state and it tends to treat the state as the primary target of social movements (Van Dyke et al. 2004). While the state has been the target of many social movements, modern movements have also been known to target others institutions or entities and the frequency with which the state is targeted often differs by movement (Van Dyke et al. 2004). Research on social movements in the United States has documented mobilizations in other institutions such as education (Binder 2002; Rojas 2007; Yamane 2001); the medical establishment (Banaszak-Holl, Levitsky, and Zald 2010; Epstein 1996; Taylor 1996); the military and religion (Katzenstein 1998); and the workplace (Fonow 2003; Kurtz 2002; Raeburn 2004).

More recently scholars have begun to explore opportunity structures beyond the political context. This has opened the door to exploring different aspects of the external world that affect the development of social movements and how that influences its development. Gender relations is one of the dynamics that has been studied. McCammon et al. (2001) critique the political process model, particularly its focus on political dynamics. They examine the U.S. state suffrage movement and the contexts in which they mobilized, particularly what led states to adopt full, primary, or presidential suffrage prior to the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment. They move beyond focusing solely on the political opportunity structure and incorporate a society-centered approach to argue that the “broad context” in which movements operate also affects movement success (2001:50). Part of this broader context are gender relations that continually shift and can affect decision-makers. McCammon et al. (2001) argue that “political dynamics *and* changing gender relations both influenced whether political actors voted for suffrage, but through different mechanisms: one through changing political interests; and the other through changing attitudes about women’s roles in society” (51). They found gendered opportunities,

particularly women's growing presence in the public sphere, helped foster suffrage success and that political opportunities were gendered in different ways, which indicates that formal politics are not the only important factor for social movement success (65). This concept is critical in identifying the effects of gender and other social constructs on the formation and outcomes of social movements.

This dissertation builds on the concept of gendered opportunity structures developed by McCammon et al. (2001) and the importance of changing gender relations in social movement continuity and success (McCammon et al. 2001; Rupp and Taylor 1987; Taylor 1989, 1996). They define gendered opportunity structures as “opportunities emerging from changing gender relations and altered views about gender” (66). They argued that changing gender relations in the 19th century and early 20th century provided a gendered opportunity for suffrage movement success (53). McCammon et al. (2001) identified several factors that helped change gender relations and the role of women in society: involvement in charitable and public activities, the rise of the “new woman” in early 1900s that saw women working outside the home, receiving extensive education, and entering professional careers. Also important were the legal changes such as previous suffrage successes that expanded women's political rights and redefined gender relations by giving women formal access to politics.

Gender is a primary frame for organizing society as it serves as a cultural device for coordinating social relations (Ridgeway 2011). Through interaction, gender is performed along with different social and cultural expectations for each gender (West and Zimmerman 1987). Gender, however, is not merely a performance, but it has real life consequences and is an organizing principle of all social systems, including work, schools, and family (Correll,

Thébaud, and Benard 2007). It is deeply embedded in social processes and practices of many institutions and plays a key role in shaping women's and men's life experiences (Acker 1992). As an organizing mechanism, gender constrains men and women's perceived options by defining what is acceptable and appropriate. This has created a gender order in which women have been relegated to the private sphere of domestic work and child-rearing, and men have been catapulted to the public sphere of work and making money. The separation has excluded women from key institutions such as politics and limited what they could do within the institutions they were already a part of.²³

This demarcation of culturally and socially appropriate roles for men and women has been changing since the early 1900s. Women have been moving into traditionally male dominated domains which has helped create a new social order that has weakened the assumption that women's place is in the home. Women have increasingly been involved in politics. For example, from 1973-1975, at the height of the women's movement there was a total of 16 women in U.S. Congress, all in U.S. House of Representatives (Center for American Women and Politics 2019a). By 2019, women comprised of 23.7% of Congress; 25 women in the U.S. Senate and 102 in the U.S. House of Representatives (Center for American Women and Politics 2019b). In terms of education, women have surpassed men in terms of college and university enrollment. In 2019, women comprised 56.8% of all students attending colleges (National Center for Education Statistics 2019). Women's participation in these and other areas where they were not well-represented has helped change gender relations and perceptions of women. This along with legislation to address gender discrimination and inequality have created gendered and political opportunities for the emergence of the campus movement against sexual violence.

I use the concept of gendered opportunity structures to argue that changes in gender relations helped generate a cultural and social shift in discussions of gendered issues, particularly around sex discrimination and sexual violence, that helped give rise to the campus anti-sexual violence movement in the 2010s. There were several factors that created changes in gender relations and opened gendered and political opportunities, including the increased and continued presence of women in higher education as students, faculty, and in leadership positions. Women in these positions have fought against sex discrimination and inequality for decades in education and other arenas which has led to legislative and policy changes, improved rights and resources, and increased sensitivity to women's issues. Another key factor has been the legislation and federal policies protecting women since the 1970s, particularly Title IX, the Clery Act, and VAWA. These legal protections have increased discussions around these issues and more importantly given women legal resources to continue fighting gender inequality. Although not originally intended to address sexual violence, over the years, legal action against schools has refined and led to the reinterpretation of Title IX to now include sexual harassment and sexual violence. This malleability has allowed women to fight against different forms of gender discrimination in educational institutions.

Student activism, particularly the sharing of personal experiences of sexual assault and violence in public spaces was a critical factor in this movement. This occurred on social media sites, personal blogs and newspapers. The sharing of personal stories helped create emotional resonance among student survivors across the nation through "collective trauma resonance" (will be discussed in chapter four), which is the empathy and emotional connection shared among people who have gone through similar traumatic experiences.

Survivors not only connected with the experiences of sexual violence, but also with how the universities mistreated them and mishandled their cases. Collective traumatic resonance helped survivors to not feel alone in their experiences of sexual violence and to publicly share their own experiences. On a wider scale, the telling of these personal stories helped students form networks and to see the mishandling of sexual violence cases by universities as more than isolated and individual school problems, but endemic across institutions of higher learning. There were also gendered political opportunities that helped the campus movement emerge. Allies and a White House administration that was attentive to women's issues played a critical role. As was discussed in the previous section, Barack Obama's openness and receptiveness to campus sexual violence helped make it a top-priority issue during his presidency. The 2011 Dear Colleague Letter and creation of a White House task force to address campus sexual assault helped campus activists fight their colleges and universities to improve resources and rights to survivors.

These factors created gendered and political opportunities that helped foster a successful national campus movement against sexual violence, but local and school factors affected what the movement looked like on individual campuses. Although the wider social and political climate was ripe for the development of the campus movement, there were local and school factors such as local events and school culture and prestige that affected the timing of the movement and the tactical repertoire used by students (Crossley 2017). For example, Title IX complaints were key and defining tactics used by activists in the 2010s, however, as will be shown in this research, this was not always used by all campus activists nor was it accessible to some of them.

This uneven local development of gendered and political opportunities will be explained through this research by examining the campus movements against sexual violence at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. The movement manifested differently from place to place and is a result of different factors including the university's history, location, student demographics, administration, and social and political environment. This research identifies key local factors that affected the development and trajectory of the campus movements at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara and their relation to the larger gendered and political opportunities.

Chapter Outline

In the following chapter I discuss the inspiration for this research and the various research methods used in this study. I reflect on my experience conducting research on activism against sexual violence and the difficulties this presented. In chapters three and four, I discuss the emergence of the movement against sexual violence at each campus and develop a timeline of events and discussions related to campus sexual violence. I address how and why students mobilized and show the differences in not only timing and trajectory of each movement, but also how the campus culture, university prestige, and local events influenced it. In chapter three, I focus on UC Berkeley and discuss the development of the movement in 2013 that with institutional support, particularly the undergraduate student government, facilitated network formation among survivors and activists, centralized activist efforts, and helped give it legitimacy. Chapter four details UC Santa Barbara student efforts to address sexual violence; first in May/June 2014 and then again in April/May 2015. Tragic events delayed the emergence of the movement and without institutional support, students

relied on direct action tactics to gain legitimacy and push this issue to the top of the administrators' agendas.

In chapters five and six, I discuss the demands and tactics used by activists, particularly the factors that influenced their tactical repertoire and demands, the organizations that facilitated their work, and their reasons for selecting the tactics they used. I show how local campus politics and policies, and the students' racial and class background influenced the selection of tactics and the demands they made. In chapter five, I discuss the campus movement at UC Berkeley and how its leadership, mostly comprised of white, upper middle class women influenced their demands and tactics. UC Berkeley students had the social and cultural capital and institutional knowledge to pursue conventional tactics such as federal complaints and lawsuits. Their connection to the larger movement via a national network on social media also facilitated the use of these conventional tactics. Chapter six explains how the working class women of color leading the movement at UC Santa Barbara drew on the tactical repertoire of the campus rather than the larger multi-campus movement against sexual violence. UC Santa Barbara students were not part of the national networks that UC Berkeley students were a part of and they did not have the resources, nor social and cultural capital to pursue conventional tactics. They used non-violent direct action to improve services and change policies to address the diverse needs of the student community, such as the creation of a survivor fund and increasing diversity in offices that interact with survivors of sexual violence.

In chapter seven, I discuss the challenges the activists on both campuses experienced, particularly the invisible emotional labor they had to engage in. They experienced vicarious trauma and survivor activists had to deal with their own assault and

the aftermath of publicly disclosing their stories. I also discuss the backlash against activists in this movement that developed as a response to their work and the rise of Donald Trump. I highlight how the racial, ethnic, and class background of activists shaped their activist work and posed challenges to students of color and working-class students. I discuss how the diversity and intersectionality in these movements influenced their development and trajectory. For example, middle- and upper-class students were able to devote more time and effort into the movement while working-class students often had to work and could not fully devote much of their time to it. Some women of color feared their families finding out about their sexual assault and/or activism which deterred them from engaging in legal tactics and limited their work in the movement. In the last chapter, I review major themes of the preceding chapters and summarize the main findings of my dissertation research.

Chapter 2: Methodology

Inspiration for this Study

This research evolved from my personal and academic experiences as a Mexican American woman in higher education. Throughout my research career, I have sought to study the experiences of marginalized communities in different contexts. As a graduate student, I started to focus on diversity in community organizations which led me to volunteer at a rape crisis center in Southern California. This became the basis of my Master's thesis project. For three years, I volunteered at a rape crisis center and worked on my thesis on how the organization became more inclusive of the Latina/o/x community and how they struggled to maintain diversity in the administration, staff, and clientele. This work and the different disclosures of sexual violence from close family and friends led me to focus on sexual violence, particularly the efforts to bring healing, justice, and visibility to survivors of sexual violence. After finishing my Master's thesis project in spring 2015, I struggled to find a topic for my dissertation. I initially wanted to focus on binational efforts that addressed sexual violence against women along the U.S.-Mexico border. One of my advisers suggested that I look into the campus anti-rape movement occurring on campuses nationwide. I politely said I would think about it, but in my mind I knew I did not want to focus on it. The activism against sexual violence on university campuses had been widely covered by mainstream media for some time. I had been keeping up with what was going on, however, the movement was being presented as one being led by white, middle-class women. Something was definitely missing. Where were the voices of women of color? On May 13th, 2015, I finally heard them. Two Latina women organized and led a 13-hour sit-in and demanded several changes to how UC Santa Barbara handled cases of sexual assault,

particularly sensitivity to how different racial and ethnic groups experience sexual violence. As I sat in the chancellor's office during the sit-in, I knew that this was something I wanted to explore and study in my dissertation. The mainstream story of this movement was hiding the many faces, stories, and struggles of marginalized groups who have been actively trying to instill institutional change, but have either been ignored or overlooked. In this dissertation, I hope to highlight the diversity of the movement and its complexities.

In this chapter I review my data collection methods for this research and my experiences conducting research on the campus movement against sexual violence. I begin by providing an overview of the methods I used: ethnographic fieldwork, interviews, and archival research. I then explain my methods of analysis and reflect on my experiences conducting research, particularly awareness of my role as a researcher and how my background affected this study. I follow this by explaining the difficulties I experienced conducting research on sexual violence and how I overcame them. I close by discussing the problems I encountered conducting this research and the limitations of this project.

Methods

I used the comparative case study approach in order to provide a holistic description and explanation of complex phenomena and processes (Creswell 2007; Yin 2003) occurring on both campuses. The case study method provides an in-depth, qualitative study of one or a few cases (Hagan 2006). This research is not generalizable to other schools or experiences of student activists on other campuses and it was never intended to be. This approach helped me develop a full and deep examination of each case that would highlight local and school factors that affected the development and trajectory of the campus movement at each university. This approach included ethnographic fieldwork, in-depth interviews, and archival

research which is described in detail in the following sections. In addition to providing a more in-depth understanding of the activism on each campus, this multiple-method approach also helped verify the data I was collecting and obtain a richer and more substantive picture of what was happening (Berg and Lune 2017).

Ethnographic Fieldwork

Ethnographic field research involves the study of people in their day-to-day lives over an extended period of time. It “aims to uncover the perspectives, priorities, and systems of meaning within the studied culture or group” (Lune and Berg 2017: 98). My research involves fieldwork completed over multiple sites and several short trips to some of the research sites. Because I was interested in understanding how the movement would differ across two educational institutions, ethnography became very important in understanding the culture or “feel” of each campus, and the surrounding area. It also allowed me to meet activists, develop relationships with activists and people in the field, understand the issue from the activist and administration perspective, and observe what was going on at each campus. Fieldwork facilitated gaining entry to the activist community and my previous volunteer work at a rape crisis center helped with this as well. I had been a volunteer at a rape crisis center in Southern California for three years, from 2012 to 2015.

This project began at UC Santa Barbara, after the 13-hour sit-in led by two Latina women on May 13th, 2015. Many student activists on campuses across the nation had already been protesting their institution’s handling of sexual violence over the three years. I began to read the literature and kept up with the news on the campus movement against sexual assault, but what I was seeing on my campus did not reflect this. In order to help understand this discrepancy, I set out to do a comparative study to understand the factors

that influenced the development and trajectory of the campus movement and provide an in-depth analysis that captures a fuller picture of the activists who participate and not just those thrust into the spotlight by the media. I chose UC Santa Barbara because of the anti-sexual violence activism occurring at the time and its long history of activism, but also out of convenience – I was a graduate student there. I decided to examine UC Berkeley because of its long history of activism and because it was receiving a lot of media coverage on issues of sexual violence. They had a strong movement against sexual violence and were the first UC to be under investigation for Title IX violations. Although UC Berkeley was a “hotbed” of activism on this issue, it provided some difficulties for me as a researcher. One issue was that I had no connections to anyone on the campus or area. I had to make and build connections with students and staff. I will discuss this and the difficulties this presented for me and this research in the limitations section below. I decided to examine two UC schools because they would be under the same governing board and be guided by similar policies and initiatives. This would help distinguish the differences across campuses due to local environment, history, and policies.

I conducted fieldwork at UC Santa Barbara from January to June 2016 and attended meetings and key events in May and October 2015, and from January to June 2017. The bulk of the fieldwork at UC Berkeley was conducted from August to December 2016. I also attended conferences, rallies, and conducted interviews in three short trips to Berkeley in April and August 2016 and April 2017. In the field, I was engaged as a researcher and an ally to the movement. Whenever possible I participated in protests, rallies, and conferences on both campuses. At Santa Barbara I had more of a participant observer role by joining nowUCsb and helping plan some events and assisting them in every way I could. At

Berkeley I was more of an observer. Since I was not a student there, I did not help organize any events. I mainly attended events and talked to people who attended and hosted these events. I explored each campus and their culture by attending events related to issues of sexual violence and others that were not such as the UC Berkeley Chancellor Search Committee Listening Session with students and campus wide meetings about campus climate at UC Santa Barbara. Fieldwork consisted of attending organization meetings, rallies, marches, sit-ins, plays, film screenings, teach-ins, and conferences. I participated and attended meetings of several organizations that dealt with issues of sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara (Take Back the Night and nowUCsb) and UC Berkeley (Sexual Violence Commission and Greeks Against Sexual Assault). I also attended events organized by other organizations that addressed sexual violence: Hermanas Unidas at UC Berkeley and the Womyn's Commission at UC Santa Barbara. In these settings, I wrote detailed fieldnotes to capture the group dynamics and issues being discussed. During events such as protests and rallies, I used my phone to make jottings or observation notes, and during meetings I used my notebook or laptop to take notes of events during fieldwork. I wrote detailed fieldnotes on my computer after each field site visit or event. There were several events I attended that informed my research, but I did not make jottings or include in my fieldnotes. This is because survivors of sexual violence would speak out about their own experiences of sexual violence. In order to respect the survivors and the spaces they shared with me, I did not include their stories in my fieldnotes.

Although the bulk of ethnographic fieldwork was conducted in 2016, this research is informed by the protests and public meetings between students and staff at UC Santa Barbara in 2015, which I attended, took detailed notes, and sometimes audio recorded. I also

continued to attend events addressing sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara and kept track of news stories and events at the UC Berkeley campus throughout 2017. When I was writing the proposal for this research in 2015, the campus movement against sexual assault was very active and had been for about three years. Because I was still taking coursework at UC Santa Barbara, fieldwork began at this school first and then UC Berkeley. The timing of when the student activists began protesting how their university handled cases of sexual violence varied and will be discussed further in the limitations section and how I mitigated some of the problems this presented in my research.

Interviews

I conducted a total of 53 semi-structured in-depth interviews and 38 informal, not audio-recorded, interviews and conversations between January 2016 and June 2018. A total of 20 formal interviews and 28 informal interviews were conducted with people affiliated with UC Berkeley and 28 formal and 9 informal interviews with individuals attending/working for UC Santa Barbara. I intentionally conducted more informal interviews at UC Berkeley because of my unfamiliarity with the school and area, and to offset the difficulty I was having getting people to do formal interviews. These were mostly conducted in fall 2016. Table 3 below describes the number of students, staff, and administrators that were interviewed. I also conducted 5 formal interviews with students and staff not affiliated

Table 3: Total number of formal and informal interviews

	UC Berkeley	UC Santa Barbara
Formal Interviews	20	28
<i>Students</i>	14	17
<i>Staff and Administrators</i>	6	11
Informal Interviews	28	9
<i>Students</i>	17	4
<i>Staff and Administrators</i>	11	5
** 5 formal interviews with no affiliations to UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara.		

with either school. These included students from Occidental College, UCLA, UC Davis, and University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and an administrator from UC Office of the President. All formal interviews were audio-recorded.

I interviewed a total of 31 current and former students from both UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. These individuals worked to bring awareness to different aspects of sexual violence on their campus and in various ways sought to create change in how their universities and communities handled cases of sexual violence. Although I use the term activists in this research to describe the work they did for the campus movement against sexual violence, not all would use term to describe their individual work and contributions. Some students cited not doing enough work to be considered an activist and others did not like the term itself because they thought it carried a negative connotation. Throughout this research, I use the term activist to show respect and honor all the different kind of work participants engaged in to address campus sexual violence. I hope interviewees who identified with other terms forgive my preference for the term activist.

Interviews ranged from 25 minutes to four hours and 36 minutes. Interviews with activists were much longer and ranged from 60 minutes to four and a half hours. The average length of interviews from activists for each school was very similar: UC Santa Barbara 133 minutes and UC Berkeley 135 minutes. Interviews with administration and staff were shorter, they ranged from 25 minutes to two and a half hours with the average being 56 minutes. Length of interviews varied according to how much they were willing to talk and how much work they had done on this issue. I also believe my position as an interviewer and researcher could have impacted what interviewees were willing or not to share with me. Many interviews were completed in more than one session. This is because interviewees had

done a lot of work on the issue and/or needed a break from discussing labor that was emotionally difficult and triggering. I conducted two or more interview sessions with 13 of the student activists. Out of the 53 formal interviews I conducted, 27 were conducted via phone, 21 in person, and five a combination of in-person and over the phone or Skype. Most of the formal interviews conducted from students and staff from UC Santa Barbara were done in person (16), while eight were conducted over the phone or Skype and four a combination of in-person/phone. For UC Berkeley, five were conducted in person, nine over phone, and one in-person/Skype. All interviews were tape-recorded and I often took handwritten notes during the interviews. Interviews that were conducted in person took place in library study rooms, coffee shops, and their homes and offices.

There were several themes I explored during the interviews: personal and educational history, activism against sexual violence, activist work in other movements, and the academic setting. Under personal and educational history, I inquired about the person's familial and educational background (where they grew up, academic field of study, and why they decided to attend that university). For the section on activism against sexual violence, I asked about the activist's individual and organizational involvement on issues of sexual violence. I asked about the activities they engaged in while they were college students, outcomes of their activism, and their connection with other activists within and outside their campuses. Under activist work in other movements, I delved into the person's activism in other social movements. I asked about what other social struggles they had been a part of and how their activism had shaped their lives. For academic setting, I asked activists their opinions on the campus climate and culture to learn about how the university's culture and activist history affected their activist work against sexual violence. The interviews gave me

deep insights on the activists' work on each campus and shed light on the many different ways they created change and fought sexual violence and rape culture.

In order to recruit participants for this research, I advertised my study widely on each campus and relied on snowball sampling to distribute flyers and information to individuals who might have been interested in participating in the study. Although not advertised on the flyers or when recruiting participants, I did offer compensation of \$10 for each one-hour interview session. I explained this prior to their participation in interviews and it was in the consent form. I tried to follow the same pattern of distribution of flyers and advertisement at both schools. Interviewing began in May 2016 after receiving approval from UC Santa Barbara's Institutional Review Board. I began interviews with student activists from UC Santa Barbara. I advertised my study through social media, email, and on campus. I posted flyers advertising my study in public campus spaces and in the Student Resource Building (different cultural centers and the Women's Center). It was also posted in the campus' Resource Center for Gender and Sexual Diversity weekly e-newsletter. I also contacted student organizations and offices that provide support to sexual violence survivors and got permission to announce my study during their meetings. I contacted organizations such as Take Back the Night and the Campus Advocacy, Resource, & Education (CARE) Office on campus and the Santa Barbara Rape Crisis Center. I presented in the organizations weekly and monthly meetings and passed out flyers. The rape crisis center emailed my flyer to all of their volunteers. One of the most successful ways of advertising my study was through Facebook. I shared my flyer on my Facebook page and on Facebook groups and asked friends to share it. Most of the interviews (13) with UC Santa Barbara student activists were

completed by summer 2016. Two interviews were conducted over the phone while at Berkeley in fall 2016 and two were conducted in December 2017 and January 2018.

The interviews of UC Berkeley student activists began in September 2016. In my first fieldwork trip to Berkeley in April 2016, I conducted informal interviews with activists and visited different organizations that addressed issues of sexual violence which helped me devise a plan to advertise my study in a similar manner that I did at UC Santa Barbara despite not being a student. I advertised my study via social media, email, and on campus. Flyers advertising my study were placed in public spaces on campus, including Sproul Plaza, the Free Speech Movement Café, inside buildings, and in the Gender Equity Resource Center. Officers in student organizations were contacted and I asked to present in their meetings. This was successful at UC Santa Barbara, but not at Berkeley. Only Greeks Against Sexual Assault allowed me to present in their weekly meetings. I did meet with student leaders and staff heading efforts on campus including the Sexual Violence Commission, Intimate Partner Violence Commission, Bears that Care, PATH to Care, and the Chancellor's Senate/Administration Committee on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment. I contacted the local rape crisis center, Bay Area Women Against Rape, who emailed a flyer and information about my research to their volunteers. The Gender Equity Resource Center on campus allowed me to leave flyers in their office and also included information about my research in several of their weekly e-newsletters to students. After my extended trip to Berkeley ended in December, I had conducted only five interviews with student activists. A difficulty I encountered was that many of the students who were involved in the beginning of the movement in 2012-13 had already graduated. The content analysis of the newspapers and social media I had already done helped me compile a list of

past and current UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley students, administrators, community members, and local leaders who were involved in campus anti-sexual violence activism and policy changes. This list was useful in contacting activists from UC Berkeley who had already graduated by the time I was doing fieldwork in 2016. I contacted people whose contact information was publicly available via social media and email with great success. The limitations of this will be discussed later in the chapter. From January 2017 to February 2018, I was able to complete nine interviews.

Through reflexivity, I attempted to be attentive of my role as a researcher and its consequences for the participants (Acker, Barry, and Esseveld 1991; hooks 1990; Oakley 1981). In the interviewing process I tried to diffuse the power relations between participants and myself although it can never be fully eliminated in this and other aspects of the research process (Acker et al. 1991; Oakley 1981). I did my best to give participants choices and autonomy. I gave them different options to participate (in-person, phone, Skype, etc.) and to make them as comfortable as possible. Prior to starting the interviews, I described what the interview entailed and that participation was voluntary and could be stopped or paused at any time. I often checked in with participants in the middle of the interview to see if they needed a break. I also explained the consent form where I gave participants the option to remain anonymous or for me to use their real names in my research. Some participants requested to see the transcripts and told me which sections they wanted me to use their name and which ones they wanted to be anonymous. Most participants wanted to be named; fifteen out of the 53 participants wanted to remain anonymous.

The focus of this research is on the student activism, therefore the bulk of the analysis for this project was based on the interviews from the student activists. The

interviews from staff, administrators, and those not affiliated with the schools were critical in learning and understanding policies, procedures, and offices that deal with sexual violence on each campus, as well as understand the changes that have taken place in regards to service provision to survivors. These participants worked in student affairs, confidential care advocate offices, counseling, judicial affairs, UC Police Department, Title IX, and health clinics.

The majority of the students who participated identified as women (29 out of 31).²⁴ Their ages ranged from 19 to 32, with the average being 22. Based on their self-categorizations, 40% of all participants identified as white, 26.7% Latina/Hispanic, 16.7% Asian, 10% multiracial, and 6.6% African American. Half of all participants identified as heterosexual and middle-class. Out of the 31 participants, eight requested to have a pseudonym and 20 disclosed having been a survivor of some form of sexual violence. All described having had family and/or friends who had experienced sexual violence. Appendix A provides demographic information of the student participants in this research.

There were some differences in the samples from each school. The sample from UC Santa Barbara was slightly more diverse than Berkeley. Out of 17 participants from UC Santa Barbara, 47.1% identified as Latina/Hispanic, 35.2% white, 5.9% Asian, 5.9% African American, and 5.9% as multiracial. From Berkeley, 46.1% identified as white, 30.8% as Asian, 15.4% multiracial, and 7.7% African American. The self-described socioeconomic backgrounds of participants also differed. About 71.4% of the participants from UC Berkeley identified as middle class, compared to 37.5% of UC Santa Barbara participants. Four UC Santa Barbara students and one UC Berkeley student were graduate students or had received their Master's from the school. Most of the participants (11 out of 17) from UC

Santa Barbara were interviewed while they were still undergraduate students and the majority of UC Berkeley participants (10 out of 14) had already received a bachelor's degree at the time of the interview. The implications and limitations of this will be discussed later in the chapter.

Archival Research

I started archival research in summer 2015. Archival research consisted of a wide range of written materials: newspaper articles, policies, reports, and meeting minutes. I examined a wide-range of local and state newspapers to capture a fuller story of sexual violence and the activism that developed on UC campuses. I examined two of the most-read newspapers in California: *The Los Angeles Times* and *The San Francisco Chronicle*. I also conducted an extensive content analysis of student-run newspapers produced at UC Berkeley (*The Daily Californian*) and UC Santa Barbara (*The Daily Nexus* and *The Bottom Line*) and local newspapers/news sites in Santa Barbara (*The Santa Barbara Independent*) and Berkeley (*Berkeleyside* and *East Bay Express*). I compiled an extensive amount of information on the activism against sexual violence on both campuses, as well as California legislation and UC policies addressing sexual violence at California post-secondary institutions. By looking at these different perspectives, I got a wide range of opinions from various publications, actors in influential political positions, and different social and geographical locations. These sources helped me create a timeline of the major movement campaigns and events, and changes in policy on each campus, as well as in the UC system and the state. This situates campus anti-sexual violence activism within the larger cultural, social, and political context within which it is embedded in.

I supplemented this with organizational and institutional materials such as: fliers, emails sent to listservs, and social media posts made by public groups that deal with sexual violence on campuses. I also used social media and the internet as a form of archival research to examine the development and trajectory of the campus movements at UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley. Social media was key to my archival research because sites like Facebook and blogs were critical in helping coordinate the emergence of this movement. Survivors took to these platforms to share their experiences of sexual assault and how the university mishandled their cases, which helped connect students across schools through collective trauma resonance that led to collective identity formation among survivors and activists. I examined Facebook groups and individuals posts that were publicly available on the platform. This helped form a timeline of major activist campaigns and important events that affected their work. I also used Wayback Machine, an internet archive, to examine the development of services and resources to survivors as they were advertised by the schools in different time periods.

The archival component of this research was intended to uncover the unique histories and campus cultures of UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. It sought to identify how these factors along with key events and local politics and characteristics affected the emergence and evolution of the movement on each campus. The archival research also helped with the triangulation of data, particularly the verification of interview and fieldwork data. Some of the activists I interviewed reported not remembering dates or some of the events they had participated in because the work was so traumatic to them. Archival work helped verify dates and campaigns they were engaged in and fill in the holes of things they had forgotten. Collectively, my fieldwork and the archival and qualitative data provided a more nuanced

and complete picture of the campus movement against sexual violence at each institution and how they developed over time.

Analyzing Data

I transcribed all interviews verbatim using Dragon Dictate software and ExpressScribe. I used ATLAS.ti software to organize and code interviews and fieldnotes. I coded according to emerging themes and then coded within themes for additional topics. After coding data, I sorted through themes and identified patterns that helped me develop my theoretical framework for the analysis. I engaged in “grounded theory” (Glaser and Strauss 1967) by grounding my analysis in the data. Rather than testing a theory, I wanted to be open to the data and for it to guide my use of theory. The archival data was not systematically coded. The primary purpose of the archival data was to construct a timeline of the social, cultural, and political narrative of events at the national, state, and local level that affected the campus movement against sexual violence. I conducted archival research before, during, and after the interviews and fieldwork which helped with the analysis and triangulation of data.

Reflexivity

Attention to how my background and orientations affected this study have been very important. As a researcher, I was part of the world being studied, and I was not a neutral detached observer (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011). Therefore, I attempted to be aware of my role as a researcher and practice reflexivity in all stages of my research (Acker et al. 1991). In conducting fieldwork and interviews, I constantly reflected on my experiences conducting research, particularly noting others reactions to me while in the field and in interviews. This also became helpful in processing my own feelings and emotions while

conducting research that was emotional and at times difficult. I found myself journaling when not writing fieldnotes to try to process my feelings and reactions to the topic and research I was conducting. This also helped when several high profile cases occurred during the data collection of this research that brought up a lot of anger and other emotions in my participants and I.

Critical self-reflection has also allowed me to understand my insider/outsider role in conducting this research. I was critical of my positionality, an educated working-class Latina, and how it gave me inside/outsider status throughout my study and how this changed across settings. Being a woman facilitated my research efforts and may have given me more legitimacy studying this. The campus movement against sexual violence has been mostly comprised of women and has been framed as disproportionately affecting women. As a woman, I believe students may have been more inclined to participate, particularly women to share their experiences of sexual violence and efforts to make change. In this study, all except two student participants identified as women. As a Latina, I maintained an “outsider” status to some of the student populations I wanted to interview, particularly at UC Berkeley. Although making up about 14% of UC Berkeley’s student population, I did not interview any Latina/o/x or Hispanic-identified participants. Most of the students I interviewed were white or came from other communities of color. At UC Santa Barbara, being a Latina may have given me an insider status, given that a lot of the efforts there were led by Latinas and other women of color.

Being a student granted me both insider and outsider status as well. As a student from UC Santa Barbara, I had an insider status while conducting research at this school. I was familiar with the school and some of the student activists prior to conducting research

which facilitated the recruitment process and gaining access to activist communities. At UC Berkeley I had an outsider status. I had only visited the campus twice before doing the bulk of the fieldwork in fall 2016 so I was not familiar with the school, city, culture, and campus community. I was an outsider who did not have access to the same resources and networks. Although I was able to connect to key informants and activists, I did not have full access to the activist networks. For example, there was a Facebook group addressing sexual violence at UC Berkeley that I was invited to be a part of, however, this was only open to individuals with a UC Berkeley email address. This created difficulties, particularly in recruiting participants for interviews. Many faculty and administrators declined to interview and cited being “too busy” to meet with me. Since I was not a student from the school, they may have not have been as compelled to participate.

As a student at UC Santa Barbara I had an insider status across both universities. For the most part, the fight to address the mishandling of sexual assault cases and improve the rights and resources of survivors has been framed as occurring between students and staff/administration. This was the case at both schools. At UC Santa Barbara during monthly meetings between students and staff, students tended to sit together and across from the staff. At times meetings got heated, but it always appeared to be students against staff/administration. This divide between students and staff was also evident at UC Berkeley, where students reported in interviews their distrust of administration and working along with them. At UC Berkeley, however, there were a group of students that worked with administration and staff which reportedly created a divide among activists – those that did not trust or work with administration and their efforts, and students who worked on efforts led by the school. I was able to maintain this insider status of being a student by

participating in student events at both schools and often helping organize events at UC Santa Barbara.

Although being a student gave me a broad insider status, my status of being a graduate student mitigated some of this, particularly at UC Berkeley. The emergence of the campus movement began with issues of sexual assault among undergraduates and over time it extended to issues of sexual harassment and included other members of the campus community such as graduate students and staff. At UC Berkeley the movement began this way and when I was conducting fieldwork in fall 2016 there was activism addressing sexual harassment of faculty towards graduate students and staff, but it seemed separate from the activism that had begun in 2012-2013 by undergraduates. I did not see many collaborations between graduate students and undergraduate students, and students described this kind of alliance as “rare” and almost never occurring. Being a graduate student while conducting this research at UC Berkeley gave me an outsider status among undergraduate students. One student from UC Berkeley described not liking graduate students while being an undergraduate and described them as “very condescending” which kept her from trying to work with them on issues of sexual violence. Undergraduate students’ experiences with graduate students at UC Berkeley may have put them off to participating in this research and possibly led them to distrust me. At UC Santa Barbara, this demarcation between graduate students and undergraduate students did not really exist. Both group of students worked together and at times this collaboration became a mentoring relationship. During the 2015 sit-in of Chancellor Henry Yang’s office, several graduate students were present and they provided support and guidance to undergraduate students. While doing fieldwork, I became a member of nowUCsb which was comprised of both graduate and undergraduate students.

As a member, I saw both groups working together and addressing issues affecting both student populations. At UC Santa Barbara, being a graduate student did not give me outsider status. Undergraduate student there were more open to working with graduate students and to what they could contribute to their cause.

While conducting research at UC Santa Barbara in spring 2016, I became involved with student groups and efforts addressing sexual violence. This helped me establish an insider status and rapport among students. These efforts while at UC Santa Barbara helped me establish ties among activists in this community and to activists at UC Berkeley. There were some students at UC Berkeley who wanted to learn about efforts being done at Santa Barbara and wanted to collaborate across different UC schools. My participation in activist campaigns at UC Santa Barbara were seen favorably by some students at Berkeley. However, not all activist work done at UC Santa Barbara was seen in a good light. Hannah, a UC Berkeley undergraduate reported having negative experiences working with some students from UC Santa Barbara and she did not have interest in working with students there. I am not a campus sexual violence survivor and this did not appear to affect my insider/outsider status. I never discussed if I was or wasn't a survivor of sexual violence and I was never asked.

Difficulties Conducting Research

As I was planning for this research, I anticipated possible risks and safeguards for participants. I prepared for the possible psychological risks my research would pose to participants. I anticipated some would feel uncomfortable sharing their experiences and that discussing their activist work would bring forth some of the trauma of their assaults. I was prepared to address this if it came up. I was a certified Sexual Assault Counselor in

California and had volunteered at a local rape crisis center for a several months and was trained to provide crisis counseling and emotional support. I had also developed a list of school and community resources for participants in both schools that I planned to distribute to participants during interviews. Fortunately, my questions did not trigger any crises. But it was evident that the recounting of activist work and experiences was uncomfortable and painful for some of them. There was one student who was visibly triggered by one of the questions I asked and she just declined to answer it. But after this question, her answers became short and superficial.

Something I had not anticipated nor was prepared for was the emotional toll this research took on me. Researchers are not trained nor prepared to deal with the emotions they experience while producing research (Schwartz 1997). We are supposed to be detached from participants and the topic and to hide our emotions and emotional attachment to it. However, it is important to recognize the powerful emotions that exist around sexual violence and researching it. This work can be hard and the emotional effects and difficulties from studying sexual violence and its toll on the researcher's well-being have been well-documented (Campbell 2002; Kelly 1988; Kleinman and Copp 1993; Mattley 1997; Moran-Ellis 1996; Schwartz 1997; Stanko 1997). I follow in the steps of these and other researchers to continue shedding light on the invisible emotional labor researchers engage in while collecting data (Blee 1998) and in other aspects of the research process.

For me several parts of the research process were emotionally difficult to deal with. Some of the interviews were difficult to conduct. Although not recorded on the voice recorder, I could often see sadness in participants' eyes when telling me they were survivors of sexual violence and discussing how this was affecting their lives and activist work.

Students also expressed anger and outrage at how they had been mistreated by police and school staff. Some students disclosed that talking to me was the first time they had openly talked about their activism and what they went through. One UC Berkeley student said that it was the first time in two years she had talked about her activist work and disclosed to me that she was a survivor of sexual violence but had never been public about it. Fieldwork also presented difficulties. There were some student-organized events where students told of their experiences of being survivors and these were highly emotional spaces. The writing and analysis portion of this research was not easy. I had to read books and articles written by student activists detailing their painful and traumatic stories of sexual violence, betrayal, and activism. Exposure to rape survivors' stories can generate feelings of pain, anger, and fear for researchers that can affect their relationships and other areas of their personal life (Campbell 2002).

Throughout these research phases, I became overwhelmed with different emotions including sadness, anger, and disgust. These emotions arose from hearing survivors stories all the time and from reflecting on how they were still fighting the battle their mothers and grandmothers had been fighting both out in public and silently in their private lives. The experiences the survivor activists were describing in the 2010s were similar to what women described in the 1970s and 1980s. Some students in the 2010s described the schools' response to their experience of sexual violence as worse than the assault itself. Women in the 1970s described the mistreated at the hands of law enforcement as a "second rape." Sexual violence survivors continued to not be believed and faced further re-victimization at the hands of different institutions – a fight that continues to this day. Working and thinking about this topic did not stay within my time working on this research. It often went with me

home. I found myself feeling anxious and burned out. As I was finishing data collection and beginning data analysis, the #MeToo movement broke out in 2017, making me feel like I couldn't escape this topic. Although excited to see the fight against sexual violence move into other arenas, this also became a lot to deal with. My Facebook page became bombarded with "Me too" and my email account was full of news articles people had been sending me about it. Everywhere I went, people were talking about sexual violence.

It was hard to deal with all of this. At first, I did not know how to deal with this. I tried to keep to myself but it became too much. While doing fieldwork at UC Berkeley in fall 2016, I struggled doing this work and being away from my family and friends. I ended up attending a healing circle hosted by the school's Restorative Justice Center. The space was for survivors and allies. I attended this event not as part of my research but to deal with the secondary traumatic stress I had been experiencing. Although it turned out to be more of people telling their stories of sexual violence, this space allowed me to express the feelings and emotions I had been repressing and afraid to show because as a researcher I was supposed to be detached from what I was studying. The facilitator of the healing circle and co-founder and coordinator of the Restorative Justice Center, Julie Shackford-Bradley, talked to me privately before leaving the circle and offered to meet with me one-on-one to talk about my struggles. We met in November and she taught me about different strategies for dealing with my emotions while doing work on sexual violence. Julie was very helpful and instrumental in helping me manage my emotions while doing this work. I began to see my emotional response as normal and instead of pushing the emotions away, I acknowledged them. I kept an "emotion field journal" (Mattley 1997) where I wrote about my research and my reaction and emotions to it. In addition to the journal, I also began

talking to my mom and then boyfriend (now husband) about the emotions I had been experiencing and how difficult the work was. I also began meditating and taking time off for self-care. This helped me manage my emotions and allowed me to return to my work with a fresh and clearer perspective.

Sexual violence researchers' emotional responses to this work has been described as "resources" (Stanko 1997). Emotions can add "power" to the analysis of their research (Kleinman and Copp 1993) and it can bring valuable insights to the research process and topic (Campbell 2002). Reading literature on conducting research on sexual violence helped me understand my emotional responses to the work I was doing and reinterpret them in a new way. Hearing and reading so many stories of sexual violence was difficult and traumatic, but it gave me a greater awareness and understanding to the lives of survivors and activists. It pushed me to create a narrative in this research that humanizes their efforts and stories, and portrays them as agents of change rather than victims of violence which is why I center their work in this research. It also motivated me to continue and finish this project.

Limitations

There are limitations in terms of access on each campus. As a student at UC Santa Barbara, I was more familiar with its campus culture, the movement, and activists on campus. I had access to organization meetings and was acquainted with many of the activists against sexual violence. This made data gathering and interviewing a lot easier. For UC Berkeley, my outsider status posed some challenges. Most of the organizations had Facebook group pages or other spaces online, but it was only open to UC Berkeley students.

Another issue that I encountered was the timing of my fieldwork. I began fieldwork at UC Santa Barbara in spring 2016 and had been on campus when it began taking off a year

prior to this. So I was able to do fieldwork while the movement was beginning. When I began fieldwork at UC Berkeley in fall 2016, the movement had already been going on for about three years. I was not able to capture the beginning of this movement nor its early trajectory. This affected who I was able to interview. From UC Santa Barbara I was able to interview people who were students at that time, while from Berkeley, the majority of participants had already graduated. Since the movement began a lot earlier at UC Berkeley, I had to rely on archival and interview data to get a fuller picture of the movement. I used archival research and the film *The Hunting Ground*, which heavily featured UC Berkeley students and details some of the early efforts done at the school, to fill in the gaps. I also relied on media, social media, and referrals from people to create a list of contacts for interviews, which meant that I continued to highlight the same people being portrayed in the media – a thing I wanted to avoid. This left out people who did work behind the scenes and who were not so public about their work on the issue.

This research focuses on undergraduate efforts at addressing sexual violence. At UC Santa Barbara graduate students were involved with undergraduate efforts, but for the most part and as was the case at UC Berkeley, undergraduate student efforts were critical in the emergence of this campus movement. Although I did interview staff, faculty, and graduate students, most of this research is based on the activist work done by participants during their undergraduate years. Therefore, this research is not able to fully capture graduate student and staff/faculty efforts to address sexual violence or sexual harassment. When recruiting for student participants, I did not specify graduate or undergraduate, but it was mostly undergraduate students who reached out to participate. One possible reason for lack of graduate student participation is that they have to juggle classes, research, employment, and

family responsibilities, which limits the free time they have available. Another possible reason that could have affected both graduate and undergraduate participation was the use of the term “activist” to recruit participants. The use of activist may have deterred some individuals from participating because they may not see themselves as activists, despite doing work that may be considered by others to be activism. Several of the participants who I interviewed from both schools discussed some of the negative connotations with the label activist and they did not want to use that term to describe themselves or their work.

In examining the emergence of the movement against sexual violence on two campuses, my study provides information not generalizable to other movements against sexual violence occurring on other campuses. While the activist stories I collect might be unique to people in these sites, a comparison of these two cases expands our knowledge of the movement and informs social movement theory. It uncovers critical local factors that affected the development and trajectory of the campus movement against sexual violence and provides a fuller and more in-depth look at the activist work done by a diverse group of students.

Chapter 3: Institutional Shame Through Formal Politics at UC Berkeley

Introduction

The emergence of the campus movement against sexual violence in the 2010s was marked by its focus on changing institutions of higher education in how they address sexual violence. As previous chapters showed, the foundations of this movement began decades ago and it was previous anti-sexual violence activism against many different institutions and settings that helped this mass movement in the 2010s emerge and gave students the tools to fight. Although gendered opportunity structures emerged broadly, the social movements that developed on individual campuses varied according to local history, culture, resources, policies, events, and the student composition of the schools.

In chapters three and four I discuss the emergence of the movement against sexual violence at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. I establish a timeline of events and discussions related to sexual violence occurring on both campuses. When relevant, I discuss state and national politics to contextualize what was going on more broadly and affecting the campuses. I give a broad overview of major events that affected how sexual violence was handled by the schools, particularly student-organized protests and events. The main goal of these chapters is to address the research question as to how and why students mobilized a movement against sexual violence targeting universities. I discuss how students within their schools and across the nation connected to form networks that facilitated the emergence of this movement. By focusing on each school individually, my goal is to establish a timeline that demonstrates the differences in not only the timing and trajectory of each movement, but also how the campus culture, university prestige, and local events influenced it.²⁵ In this

chapter I focus on UC Berkeley and provide a timeline of key events and campaigns affecting the movement from January 2010 to June 2015. I discuss the social movement communities students were a part of and how the formation of networks nationally and locally affected the movement at Berkeley.

UC Berkeley

From 2010 to 2012, sexual violence was not a big issue or discussion at UC Berkeley. There were several reports in the school newspaper of sexual violence experienced by women on campus and the community and events that touched on issues of sexual violence. In spring 2011, the campus started discussing the school's handling of cases of sexual violence and drawing complaints from the campus community. The school newspaper, *The Daily Californian*, detailed the experiences of Angelica Guevara and Oriana Sandoval, students at UC Berkeley's School of Law, who reported sexual harassment and battery by a fellow law school student (Banning-Lover 2011). Guevara and Sandoval discussed the difficulties they experienced reporting to the campus Center for Student Conduct and Community Standards, such as last-minute hearing cancelations, miscommunication, and not being provided with sufficient information on the standing of their cases. Sandoval was not able to participate in the hearing because she was out of state and there was no alternative way of her to participate, and witnesses to the cases claimed they were never contacted by Denise Oldham, the interim Title IX officer at the time. Guevara was quoted in the newspaper saying, "The tragedy is that it makes me not want to come forward if something worse were to happen in the future. I'm disappointed to know that if a woman comes forward, her voice is still diminished" (Banning-Lover 2011). This case is significant because it recognized the difficulties students experienced in filing cases

of sexual violence to the university. Activists in later years, publicly amplified these difficulties and highlighted how the university was not properly handling their cases of sexual violence. In late April 2011, Robert Keves, a former UC Berkeley health center doctor was charged with 19 counts of sex crimes against former male student patients between March 9, 2006 and March 9, 2011 (Bach-Lombardo 2011). Keves had been a doctor on the campus for almost 22 years. He was placed on administrative leave on March 31 and resigned two weeks later on April 14, 2011 (Bach-Lombardo 2011).

In June 2011, the campus's Code of Student Conduct Task Force released a report of its recommended changes to the UC Berkeley Code of Student Conduct (Bidwell 2011).²⁶ Although not the focus of this report, sexual harassment was addressed. The task force recommended an alternative conflict resolution option, such as restorative justice or mediation to cases, but not to cases of violence or sexual harassment/battery (Code of Student Conduct Task Force 2011). One of the 18 recommendations included the review of the sexual misconduct process at UC Berkeley. The report indicated that the campus was aware of Title IX investigations occurring on other campuses and it recommended the campus to take the initiative of examining its sexual violence policies. This did occur, but not until 2013 after students began to publicly complain about their experiences reporting to the school.

As the 2011-2012 academic year began, the campus began promoting a new initiative to increase awareness about sexual assault, domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence. These new efforts included: in-person education for all incoming UC students, creation of a new website that detailed information on resources for each UC campus, and specialized training to campus police and student conduct officers on responding to these

crimes. This initiative was part of a UC system wide effort that was funded by a 2007, \$1 million grant from the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Violence Against Women. The website provided links to each UC campus and provided information for survivors of sexual violence such as resources available on each campus and UC wide policies and procedures. As this initiative was being launched, several cases of sexual battery on and near campus were reported, and the Berkeley Police Department released preliminary statistics of crimes occurring in the first six months of 2011 that showed a 36% increase in rapes. This increased awareness and concern for safety issues in the campus community.

Spring 2012 began a series of changes in administration at UC Berkeley. On March 13, UC Berkeley Chancellor Robert Birgeneau announced he would step down as chancellor in December of that year after being the school's leader since 2004. Eleven months later, Nicholas Dirks, dean of faculty for Columbia University was approved by the UC Board of Regents to be UC Berkeley's 10th chancellor. Several other top administrators at UC Berkeley would step down within the next two years.

In March, news sources revealed that Diane Leite, a former assistant vice chancellor was demoted and received a decrease in pay for improperly giving raises to an employee she was having a sexual relationship with. The employee she was having a relationship with had an over 30% increase in pay in one year. She was found to have violated the school's sexual harassment policy, and her pay decreased from \$188,000 to \$175,000 and she lost her position as Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Research Enterprise Services. The campus community publicly condemned the punishment she received and in May, Leite was fired from the university. As the year progressed, discussion around sexual violence increased.

Sexual violence cases on campus and in the city increased during the fall and spring of the 2012-2013 academic school year and raised alarm in the UC Berkeley community. In early October, UC Police Department (UCPD) released the annual campus crime statistics which showed an increase in the number of cases of sexual violence in 2011. It increased from 4 in 2010 to 24 in 2011. Appendix B provides the sexual assaults reported on campus from 2010 to 2018 in the yearly UC Berkeley campus security reports. In February, the city released crime reports that showed an increase in crime, including rapes. In 2011, there were 20 reported rapes and this increased to 39 rapes in 2012 (Nguyen 2013). This crime report raised concerns in Berkeley and reaffirmed UCPD's earlier report of increased number of sexual assaults in the community. Students began using the campus newspaper to raise concerns and awareness about sexual violence and consent.²⁷

In 2013, sexual assault became more widely discussed on campus and students began to publicly denounce the university for mishandling cases of sexual violence. The Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) is the undergraduate student association or student government and it is one of the largest in the country. Elections are highly competitive and happen every year around March/April. In March 2013, undergraduate political parties started announcing their candidates for various positions in the ASUC for the 2013-2014 school year. There are multiple parties that are recognized by the ASUC and in which undergraduate students can run for various positions. One of these parties is the Cal Students for Equal Rights & a Valid Education (CalSERVE) which is "a coalition of progressive students and student organizations" that often addresses issues of "recruitment and retention of marginalized students" (CalSERVE 2017). DeeJay (full name is Donna-Jo) Pepito, an ASUC Senator during 2012-2013, ran as CalSERVE's presidential

candidate. One of her platforms was increasing campus safety and included addressing sexual assault. DeeJay stated that she wanted to establish a Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Women's Issues to address sexual violence and crimes on campus. DeeJay was quoted in the newspaper discussing this: "We see the number of reported (sexual assault) cases increasing, but the resources we have for sexual assault survivors and the reporting system we have doesn't do service and justice to our students. The task force I want to create will be composed of administrators and different UCPD to really reassess how we're serving sexual assault survivors" (Rondoni 2013a). Her focus on the issue is significant because she was the only candidate at the time addressing sexual violence and bringing awareness to how the university was handling such cases. The federal government was also making changes that affected how schools handled cases of sexual violence. On March 7, President Obama signed into law the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, which imposed new crime reporting requirements, modified parts of student discipline procedures, and created new requirements to educate students and employees on sexual violence.

DeeJay's awareness of the issue did not come out of the blue. About a year prior to this, students who had experienced different forms of sexual violence began discussing their experiences. Aryle, a sophomore during spring 2013 semester and activist against sexual violence described in an interview how students started connecting with one another:

"It really started when Anais who is more [of] an advocate than an activist, she was just concerned with helping students, that is what she wanted. She is an angel come from heaven. She introduced me to Sofie, and Sofie and I have friends, and our friends have friends, and their friends have friends, and that's how we started to talk about it. You know you'd be talking to your friends and they'd go "Oh, you know so and so? Yeah. They told me about what happened to them." And then you talk to so-and-so and they would say "Yeah, that happened to me and it also happened to my friend." And then you talk to the friend and so it was very much a who you know.

Because it was so rampant you always knew somebody who knew somebody who was assaulted. You all know an assault victim; you just don't know it or of an assault victim. Somebody in your social circle. So to me that's how it kind of formed.”

Students’ discussions of their experiences of sexual violence helped them see that this was a wider issue affecting a larger number of students. These discussions also led to students talking about their experiences reporting their incidents of sexual violence to the university. Within an organization on campus, women started coming forward with experiences of sexual assault by one male leader in the group. Several of them reported it to the Title IX office on campus and Anais, the president of this club at the time, was an advocate for these women and helped them through the reporting process. In an interview, Anais, who graduated from UC Berkeley in 2013, described the experiences the women who reported were having:

“[they] had never been contacted for any follow up. They didn’t even know what was going on. They thought it was just sort of forgotten about. So that in fall semester 2012, that really sparked in me, like an idea that the Title IX office wouldn’t protect students so I started to talk to other survivors of sexual violence that had happened on campus. We heard very similar stories and decided to go with women to the Title IX office when they did report. They would invite me to go with them. They would just recount their stories and I would see sort of a pattern from the Title IX office of not investigating and not really pushing anything forward on their cases for months and months and months.”

These connections among students and the similar experiences they had when reporting allowed the women to form an informal network on campus. This network was not only pivotal in the growth in number of activists involved but also in the longevity of the movement on campus. This network slowly grew especially after students went public with their allegations against the university for mishandling cases of sexual violence. This and their connection to a national network of activists will be discussed in the following sections.

In April 2013 several undergraduate students began speaking out about the mishandling of their sexual assaults cases by the university. On April 3rd, the ASUC Senate passed bill, SB 130, that declared it had “no confidence” in UC Berkeley’s disciplinary policies and procedures regarding sexual assault cases. The bill was authored by three CalSERVE senators, including DeeJay Pepito who was running for ASUC president, Anais, CalSERVE party chair at the time and former Cal Berkeley Democrats president, and Aryle, a survivor of sexual assault. Anais said the bill was written with “the intent of having student government participate in a public inquiry of students’ experiences with Title IX. After hearing many stories about the Title IX officer Denise Oldham that really made me fear what survivors were facing in the days after their assault” (interview with Anais). Aryle spoke out about the experiences of survivors when reporting to the university. The bill specifically targeted the Title IX Compliance Office and the Center for Student Conduct and made recommendations to improve the policies and procedures. Some senators expressed concern with the bill, along with some staff that were present at the meeting. Title IX Coordinator, Denise Oldham was interviewed for the newspaper and said “our concern is that misinformation about how these cases are handled might deter students from coming forward with complaints or, at the very least, cause confusion about how these cases are handled” (Rondoni 2013b). Students I interviewed reported pushback from administrators and were warned by them that the bill “would create a chilling environment on campus if people didn’t trust their Title IX office” (interview with Anais). Despite reservations, the bill was passed. *The Daily Californian* (2013b) praised the ASUC Senate for passing the bill and encouraged them and campus officials to continue addressing this issue.

These allegations of mishandling cases of sexual violence marked a pivotal moment for the movement against sexual violence at UC Berkeley. The recognized student government supported and united with survivors and it publicly gave a space for survivors to tell their stories and share their experiences reporting their cases. Aryle, called the ASUC's vote of no confidence an "impetus" for the movement against sexual violence and that it helped the movement to expand and get bigger. Other UC Berkeley students who had experienced sexual violence and difficulties in reporting their cases to the campus started reaching out to the authors of the bill and people who had supported the bill. Students would contact them in person, via email or Facebook. Nicoletta, a senior at the time SB 130 was passed reached out to one of the members of student government who put her in touch with Sofie, an undergraduate who was leading efforts on campus. Sofie had been assaulted in spring 2012 and had reported her case to the university, but it had been improperly investigated. Nicoletta described the importance of learning about other women who had similar negative experiences when reporting to the university:

"Without this group of other people who had had similar experiences as me, but who decided to do something, I probably wouldn't have done anything...It didn't even occur to me [that] the process was very long and very frustrating. And it didn't even occur to me that it shouldn't be that way, that I deserved better...I think more importantly is that when I sort of entered the process no one informed me of what the process should look like or what my rights were. So when things went badly, I didn't know that what was happening was below what the standard should be of handling these cases. It wasn't until I connected with the other girls coming forward with their stories where I thought actually, yeah, this person treated me really badly and my case took over a year. It really shouldn't have been that way. So without these other girls, I don't think I ever would have processed it, that my experience was so bad and I probably wouldn't have done anything."

Nicoletta highlights how she was not aware of her rights as a survivor and did not know what to expect when reporting. Women's stories of how their cases were mishandled and how they were mistreated by officers within different departments made her realize her

experiences were wrong and actually common. Women continued connecting and helping each other out. This network that had been forming for a while also helped the women emotionally in dealing with the aftermath of their sexual assaults. Nicoletta in an op-ed to the campus newspaper described how the group of women helped her “heal and grow.”

In spring 2013, the ASUC increasingly became involved with issues of sexual violence. Sometime between February and March, the ASUC Senate passed a bill, SB 41 condemning the prevalence of sexual assault in the city of Berkeley (Butler, LaVoie, Lieu, Majd, and Pepito 2013). With this bill, the ASUC acknowledged the increase of reported sexual assaults and national statistics related to campus sexual assault. This bill called for ASUC executive members to request data from the university on the “number of rapes and sexual assaults which have occurred and have been disciplined, formally or informally, on campus over the last five years” (Butler et al. 2013). At the same time, Senators Megan Majd and DeeJay Pepito launched the “6,000 in Solidarity” campaign to fight sexual assault. The name for this campaign came from the approximate 6,000 students who would experience sexual assault before they graduated from UC Berkeley. It asked students to sign a pledge to agree to engage in consensual sex, be an effective bystander, report sexual assaults when they happen, and “join the call for the Center for Student Conduct to start taking sexual assault seriously by publishing data relating to the occurrence of sexual assault at UC Berkeley” (Butler et al. 2013). Sexual violence became one of the issues debated during the ASUC presidential forums. In the end, DeeJay Pepito won the ASUC presidency and would end up helping make sexual assault a key issue on the campus the following school year.

The ASUC continued to work on sexual assault by sponsoring a workshop, “Fight Back” with the goal of raising awareness of sexual assault on campus during May 2013. The administration also began responding to the students’ concerns and claims that the campus was not adequately addressing sexual violence by sending a letter to the campus community. The letter began by stating that UC Berkeley was just one of many universities reviewing their response to sexual assault and described their efforts at the time which included the formation of a campus advisory group that would convene in the fall to improve resources to survivors and education to the community about sexual violence.

After the 2012-2013 academic year ended, more UC Berkeley students began to be public about their experiences with reporting their cases of sexual violence to the university. On May 22nd nine UC Berkeley students filed a Clery Act complaint with the U.S. Department of Education. The complaint was filed in coordination with students from Dartmouth, Swarthmore, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), and the University of Southern California (USC). The complaints were announced at a press conference in New York with Gloria Allred, whose law firm represented students from Occidental and USC. A week prior to these complaints, Yale had been fined over \$160,000 for failing to disclose sex offenses that had occurred on campus, a violation of the Clery Act (Sander 2013). Several other universities were also receiving fines for failing to comply with the Clery Act. Sofie Karasek was the only UC Berkeley student in attendance at this press conference and spoke on behalf of a “coalition of survivors” from the university. According to Sofie, the complaint was filed because the university “discourag[ed] survivors from reporting to local law enforcement or participating in formal campus disciplinary processes,

underreport[ed] sexual assault threats to the campus community, and fail[ed] to update survivors of the decisions and outcomes of their cases” (Karasek 2013).

This complaint was made possible through the formation of a larger network. As survivors at UC Berkeley were forming a network within their campus, survivors from universities across the United States were forming a larger network, called the “IX Network.” This network was a private Facebook group where survivors and allies could connect and it provided a way for them to communicate with each other. This network was not a secret; several newspapers and survivors talked about this IX Network, including *The New York Times* and *The Huffington Post*. Annie E. Clark, an alumna from UNC and leader in the formation of this network, said that the goal of the network was to “show that there is a pervasive culture of sexual assault which needs to be addressed on a national level” (Kingkade 2014a). UC Berkeley student activists found out about this wider network after *The New York Times* published an article in March 2013 titled, “College Groups Connect to Fight Sexual Assault.” This article describes how different colleges and universities had connected with one another and shared information on how to fight their schools through the federal government with civil rights cases. Sofie, Lucy, and other UC Berkeley students read this article and reached out to the people mentioned in the article who were members of this national network of activists. Sofie described what happened after the ASUC signed the bill of no confidence:

“I saw this article in *The New York Times* that was like, college activist network to fight against sexual assault. And there was this map of all these schools, and I was just like, “Oh my God! This is exactly what is happening here right now”...And now Berkeley deals with this shit, with this stuff [laughs] and so I got super excited and started looking through peoples’ names in the article and adding them on Facebook and being like, “Hey, this is what’s going on here. We are doing this stuff. What are you doing?” So we connected over social media and started to learn about how we could file a federal complaint against Berkeley, and have that become a media story.

That was the beginning of the involvement. So basically, we had this conversation with these activists from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where they told us about the Clery Act, [and] told us about Title IX. At that point the strategy was to file these complaints on two separate occasions because then it's two different media events and they could have multiple opportunities to tell the story of how institutions were sweeping this under the rug. And so, we were like, "Ok, let's do a Clery [Act] complaint first." So we got together, I think it was eight of us, and we also included the bill of no confidence as an additional narrative in the complaint. It just came together through Google docs. Like, this is the Clery Act complaint we are filling against Berkeley, and it had the narrative of people and various situations, and what we were alleging. So then we were coordinating with the students from UNC because they were coordinating with students from [other universities]."

This larger network that spanned across the country comprised of students from many colleges and universities. Lucy, sophomore at UC Berkeley, provided her story to the Clery Act complaint anonymously and was part of the IX Network. She described the group as a "strong" and "supportive" space where students could post their stories and support each other's work and campaigns (interview with Lucy). The IX Network was a support network that served as a space to share tactics and learn about different efforts to address sexual violence. End Rape On Campus (EROC), a survivor advocacy organization, was developed in summer 2013 by a group of students and professors who were a part of this network. Sofie was one of the original co-founders of EROC.

Beginning in spring semester and extending into the summer, several of the students engaged in different campaigns to highlight the mishandling of sexual violence cases by UC Berkeley. Sofie, Anais, and Lucy compiled a timeline and created a board with the help of Aryle showing the history of sexual violence at UC Berkeley. Anais described this visual installation as not having "an explicitly political message, but wanting to show that [their] case was not isolated at all...It wasn't just a recent craze that it had been happening at UC Berkeley over time" (interview with Anais). Student also wrote several pieces in *The Daily Californian* in support of survivors. About a week after the Clery Act complaint was filed,

two of the nine survivors who filed the federal complaint against UC Berkeley wrote an op-ed for the school newspaper. Sofie and Anais, explained that they filed the complaint in order to hold the university accountable for mishandling their cases and the policies and practices that perpetuated violence and rape on the campus (Karasek and LaVoie 2013). Sofie and Anais drew on events occurring in 1979, when a group of students known as Women Organized Against Sexual Harassment filed a Title IX complaint against the university to show how the campus has had a “long history and documented history of silencing survivors of sexual violence and under-disciplining offenders” (Karasek and LaVoie 2013). In early July, an anonymous student wrote an op-ed that challenged the widely-held idea that rape is “a forceful, brutal assault, either fiercely protested against or performed upon someone with no agency” (Anonymous 2013). The woman went on to describe the difficulties and the victimization she faced after a sexual assault. She wrote:

“While I write this in the hopes that other women who may have undergone similar experiences will read it and take to heart that they are not alone, I also write it because I feel I must for my own sake. I have to speak. I have to talk about what happened, or else it’s like it never did to everyone else but me... So I say this to every woman out there who has felt disrespected, disregarded or dismissed: Your words are the most powerful instrument you have with which to be an advocate for yourself. Silence is what allows rape culture to exist. Don’t allow what had been done to you to define you; instead, acknowledge that you have the right to your emotions, which no one can take away from you. And never stop speaking” (Anonymous 2013).

In addition to their work in newspapers, several UC Berkeley students participated in the documentary *The Hunting Ground* which began filming in the summer. The film took over two years to complete, and Sofie who was the first UC Berkeley student to be involved with the film began connecting the producer and director with other UC Berkeley students (interview with Sofie).

During the summer, there were a lot of leadership changes. Nicholas Dirks began his role of chancellor at UC Berkeley on June 1st. The UC Board of Regents confirmed Janet Napolitano to be the 20th president of the UC system on July 18th. She became the first woman to hold this position and she took office on September 30th.

California political stakeholders began to focus on issues of sexual violence in state colleges and universities in August 2013. On the 21st of August, the California State Legislature approved an audit of UC Berkley's sexual assault policies along with another UC and two California state colleges that were to be determined at a later date.²⁸ The Joint Committee on Legislative Audit unanimously voted for this investigation to begin in November (Song 2013). Assembly Member Anthony Rendon (D-Lakewood) requested the audit after he was contacted by Lindsay Bubar, a politically active woman in the Los Angeles Area who had supported students from USC when they had filed a federal complaint against their university for mishandling cases of sexual assault. At this hearing, two UC Berkeley undergraduate students, Sofie and Aryle, gave testimony in support of this audit. In addition, there were five UC Berkeley students and one UCLA student who gave public comments in support of this review. Also giving public comments, was Annie E. Clark, a graduate from UNC.

Given the recent audit, the ASUC bill of no confidence, and the Clery Act complaint filed by students, the administration began damage control and focused on addressing sexual violence. The administration advertised the medical, counseling, reporting, and educational resources available to students on campus and reiterated to the campus community their current and on-going efforts to address and prevent sexual assaults. Chancellor Dirks commissioned a Title IX Compliance Advisory Committee to review the university's

policies and educational efforts regarding sexual assault and harassment and discrimination (Dirks 2014). The Title IX Compliance Advisory Committee was comprised of faculty, staff, and students and was tasked with oversight over Title IX issues on campus and reporting directly to the chancellor (Dirks 2014). The university established a new Interim Sexual Misconduct Policy that clarified the reporting process and allowed survivors to appeal the resolutions to their cases (Dirks 2014). This policy was updated on September 27, 2013 and would be in effect until December 31, 2015 (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights 2018). In addition, the university hired a new investigator in the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination, which handles Title IX investigations on campus (Dirks 2014).

Student activists' work on this issue continued and intensified during the 2013-2014 academic year. During the fall 2013 semester, there was a heavy focus on consent education and supporting survivors. DeeJay Pepito, the ASUC President for the 2013-2014 school year, formed the ASUC Office of the President's Sexual Assault Task Force within the first month of school and it was comprised of student activists and members from several ASUC executive offices (Pepito 2013). The mission of this task force was to "transform campus sexual assault policies, consolidate and improve services for survivors and engage in greater educational awareness campaigns around the issue" (Pepito 2013). Within this group, the Cal Consent Campaign was launched in October in order to raise awareness of sexual assault and the importance of consent when engaging in sex (Yoon 2013). The focus was on safe party practices for Halloween and it consisted of posting posters around campus and on social media. It included images of men and women dressed in costumes with statements such as "my dress is not a yes," and "my costume is not my consent." On November 3rd,

DeeJay partnered with Bay Area Women Against Rape (BAWAR), a rape crisis center in Oakland to host a 5K race to raise awareness of sexual assault and prevention (Johnson 2013). This race was part of the Cal Consent Campaign and it raised money for BAWAR. Her office sponsored survivor solidarity circles to create a space for survivors to share with each other and build community (Pepito 2013). In an opinion piece in *The Daily Californian*, DeeJay informed students of the creation of the UC Berkeley Title IX Compliance Advisory Committee and cited the “students organizing around the issue” as a catalyst in the formation of this committee and administration’s decision to address it (Pepito 2013).

The ASUC Sexual Assault Task Force was critical in giving the movement on campus momentum. It helped students to connect with one another and served as a network within the campus. Iman, a sophomore at the time reached out to ASUC President DeeJay Pepito, who then put her in contact with people within the task force, which is where she met Sofie. Iman described her involvement with the group:

“When I joined the task force that was pretty much the hub. I met the majority of students who were working on this and even then, you kind of make connections through people who are working on different sub-departments of sexual assault activism, whether its education and/or disciplinary action, legislative policy or school policy. So I think starting out with the task force, it kind of gave me an initial network.”

The task force served as a network for activists at UC Berkeley. Student survivors and allies were able to join and learn about student efforts to address sexual violence on campus, including student activists. Hannah, a sophomore in fall 2013, got connected with activists on this issue through the task force. Here she described how she got involved:

“I was at the commission meeting and Sofie was mentioning filing a Title IX complaint and asked if anyone wanted to get involved. So Sofie said like “You want to get involved in the Title IX complaint at all?” And I said “What’s a Title IX

complaint?” Because Title IX wasn't why I got involved in the first place. And then that's how I learned that...the university is supposed to have a policy, they are supposed to make that policy clear, and should be easy to find who to report to. And when I had been a peer educator, one of my assignments had been to go over the internet resources and when I did that, I had found that there was no easy way to report, but there was like a flowchart on what to do if you were accused...I didn't even know it was an option and the university had failed to make clear that it was. Obviously, there was very complex reasons why I didn't report so it was only part of it, but it's still a violation of Title IX.”

The group was a space for students to learn about this issue, it centralized activists within one organization, and brought more activists to fight sexual violence. It also continued building on the network that had already been developing for over a year.

In November, the undergraduate political party CalSERVE (DeeJay belonged to this political party) launched a Know Your IX campaign aimed mostly at educating UC Berkeley students about sexual assault survivor rights' under Title IX. This campaign tried to expand people's understanding of Title IX as affecting more than just sports and giving examples of how Title IX applied to survivors of sexual assault (Arman 2013). The campaign occurred locally, but a wider Know Your IX campaign was going on nationally on other campuses as well. In late November, the ASUC Office of the President's Sexual Assault Task Force held a town hall meeting to discuss students concerns about sexual violence. Students continued to express dissatisfaction at how the campus had been handling cases of sexual violence and also with the task force itself, particularly that it only included ASUC members (Veklerov 2013).

In 2014 there was a more concerted effort to address sexual violence by national and state political stakeholders. The White House began addressing sexual assault more broadly as a social problem plaguing colleges and universities. On January 22, President Barack Obama established the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault.

The task force was co-chaired by Vice President Joe Biden and the White House Council on Women and Girls and included members from the heads of several agencies including the Attorney General and the Secretary of Education.²⁹ In January, the California state legislature continued to be involved on this issue. State Assembly Member Mike Gatto introduced AS Bill 1433 which would require campus officials to report to local law enforcement any sexual assaults, hate crimes, and certain violent crimes students disclosed to them. The goal of the bill was to have reports of crime more readily available to the public rather than wait for the Clery Act report that is published once a year. On February 10, Assembly Member Bonnie Lowenthal and Senators Kevin de Leon and Hanna-Beth Jackson announced Senate Bill 967 which would require California colleges and universities to adopt affirmative consent in sexual assault investigations. Commonly referred to the “yes means yes” law, this bill would require individuals to give an “affirmative, conscious, and voluntary agreement to engage in sexual activity” and that if a person was intoxicated, asleep, or unconscious, they could not give consent. This bill was announced in a press conference in Sacramento by the three legislators sponsoring the bill and were surrounded by about 20 students from California colleges and universities, including several UC Berkeley students.

Student efforts in pushing UC Berkeley to improve its handling of sexual assault cases and improving its resources and services extended into 2014. Students continued to be public about their sexual assaults and the difficulties they experienced reporting their assault to the university and deciding to stay in school.³⁰ ASUC President DeeJay Pepito continued the Office of the President’s Sexual Assault Task Force and restructured it to be more representative of the student body and brought together student leaders around this issue

(Pepito 2014b). The task force re-launched the Cal Consent Campaign with a new set of posters discussing affirmative consent and myths around consent (Simmonds 2014). In an op-ed, DeeJay urged UC President Janet Napolitano to take “action to implement system wide Title IX policy reform adopted from comprehensive student input that actually protects the rights of survivors of sexual assault” (Pepito 2014a). Other ASUC executive members like the Student Advocate also supported the increase of resources for survivors and helped with revising sexual violence and harassment policies.

The last week of February was particularly a big week for the campus in dealing with sexual assault. On Wednesday, February 25th, Chancellor Nicholas Dirks sent a message to the campus community updating them on the improvements the university had been working on in regards to sexual assault. Dirks discussed the formation of the Title IX Compliance Advisory Committee and their efforts to update policies to create a “more effective and coordinated response to sexual misconduct on our campus” (Dirks 2014). In addition to updating the local policies around sexual violence on campus, there were several key changes made to improve the access to resources for survivors.³¹ Chancellor Dirks also discussed the school’s involvement in system wide efforts to ensure compliance with the Campus SaVE Act, a new component of VAWA.

The next day, February 26th, students responded to this by continuing their criticism of the university’s handling of sexual assault in two separate events. In the morning, 31 current and former students filed Title IX and Clery Act complaints against UC Berkeley. The announcement of the federal complaints occurred during a press conference at the Graduate School of Journalism, where several students gathered to show support. Six of the complainants discussed their experiences of sexual assault and described the frustration,

pain, and victimization they experienced when reporting their cases to the university. For some student activists, the press conference was the first time they had publicly discussed their assault. They accused the university of favoring assailant's rights over those of survivors, failing to inform survivors of their rights or give information on their cases, and discouraging survivors from reporting. These complaints were a revision of the Clery Act complaint filed in May 2013. The national and local press coverage of this initial complaint and students' efforts on campus helped survivors to connect with the original nine complainants, particularly those who were public with their stories. Sofie, discussed how she was able to triple the number of students involved in the second Clery Act complaint and Title IX complaint:

“I tried to do a lot of interpersonal organizing, so I reached out to a lot of people being like, “[Do] you know anyone who might be interested in talking to me for this?” I also talked to the progressive senators to tell them, “If anyone from your community would be interested in participating, you can send them with me.” But also a lot of people had also reached out to me after seeing a lot of the media coverage that was happening around this issue. So people had been sharing their stories with me already so I was like, “Hey, this is an opportunity that’s available to you.” Then also just within my friend group, like basically all of us had been assaulted, and so, a lot of the people who participated in the complaint were people who were part of the progressive organizing community at Cal and were people that I knew... And we also had the Sexual Assault Commission that started when [DeeJay] Pepito became president of Berkeley, the student body president. So we had like 15 people that were part of this commission in the student government, and so, several of us from there were part of the complaint. And so, it was like word of mouth really.”

Twenty-two current and former students added their story to the Title IX and Clery Act complaints. After nine months of not hearing back from the Department of Education about their initial Clery Act complaint (Felch 2014), students grew impatient and wanted to see change from the university. The goals and intentions of these complaints and other campaigns will be discussed more in-depth in chapter five.

That Wednesday evening, the student government unanimously passed a bill (SB 11) criticizing the university and making recommendations for their sexual assault policies (Luschei 2014). The ASUC Senate had been working on this bill for about a month and demanded several changes: enforcing stricter penalties for assailants; making investigative process more accessible and transparent for survivors; increasing funding to offices handling cases and hiring more individuals in those offices (with student input); and broadening policy to protect persons of all genders (Luschei 2014). Caitlin Quinn, a CalSERVE Senator at the time and who was running for External Affairs Vice President for the following school year, introduced this bill in early February, but tabled it in order to strengthen the language and coordinate with the 31 survivors who had filed the Title IX and Clery Act complaints (Quinn 2014).

The centrality of sexual violence and the school's handling of it had become a big issue of concern for the entire community. ASUC elections began in March and most of the candidates for senate and executive positions were running on a platform that addressed sexual violence. Several CalSERVE candidates ran on this platform, but candidates from other political parties promised to work on the issue as well. ASUC President DeeJay Pepito and her task force continued work on this issue towards the last part of spring semester. In March, the task force hosted a whole week of workshops addressing different aspects of sexual violence. Pepito's office was exploring opportunities to institutionalize the task force and continue the ASUC's dedication to addressing sexual assault (Kim 2014).

In March the University of California released a new sexual violence and sexual harassment policy that conformed to the new requirements of VAWA. The March 7th deadline mandated colleges and universities to provide more comprehensive services to

survivors of domestic, dating, and sexual violence. President Janet Napolitano stated, “We have no tolerance for these crimes and welcome the opportunity to standardize and clarify our policies and procedures against them” (Napolitano 2014). This new presidential policy clarified the reporting and investigation process, specified sanctions, detailed the resources available to survivors, such as support services and requests for accommodation, protected survivors’ confidentiality, and required training for students, staff, and faculty (Napolitano 2014). The policy was set to replace UC Berkeley’s prior policies on sexual violence and harassment (Fu and Ho 2014). In an interview with *The Daily Californian*, President Napolitano discussed this new policy and how it was not related to the recent student activism: “The timing (of the new UC policy) was interesting because you could infer that there was a cause-and-effect relationship (with the students’ federal complaints), but in fact, the policy had been under way for quite some time. We will continue to make some changes to it as we move forward, but we begin with the basic principle that this kind of behavior will not be tolerated and that people on our campuses need to treat each other with respect. I want to make sure that in this area, that ethos is preserved” (Grubaugh 2014).

The month of April kicked off Sexual Assault Awareness Month, which was highly publicized by the university in the campus newspaper with several advertisements, op-eds, and articles.³² A key resource that was highlighted was the creation of new website (survivorsupport.berkeley.edu) that centralized resources and information for students who had experienced sexual violence and for those wanting to learn about the policies and how to support survivors.³³ As is typical of these events (Taylor and Whittier 1995), the Take Back the Night Rally held in the middle of April included performances from various student groups and an open mic session towards the end that allowed people to tell their experiences

of sexual violence and speaking out against those who treated their experiences as insignificant (Shokry 2014).

ASUC elections were held this month and a couple of anti-sexual violence student activists won seats: Caitlin Quinn for Academic Affairs Vice President and Haley Broader as Senator. Towards the end of April, the ASUC Senate amended its by-laws to create the ASUC Sexual Assault Commission, which would continue the work President DeeJay Pepito had started in the Sexual Assault Task Force. The mission of the commission was “holding the university accountable for transforming university sexual assault policies and resources; improving, expanding, and publicizing services and resources for survivors; improving educational awareness and consciousness raising among students; and otherwise fostering a culture of consent on our campus and in the community to ensure student safety and to create a more inclusive campus climate” (ASUC Senate 2014). The Sexual Assault Commission would still be under the Office of the President and report to the Senate.

On April 15, 2014 U.S. Representatives Barbara Lee and Jackie Speier visited UC Berkeley to meet with Chancellor Dirks and a group of student survivors who had been fighting to improve sexual violence policies on campus. Many of these students were complainants in the Title IX and Clery Act complaints filed in late February. Speier was working to introduce the Hold Accountable and Lend Transparency (HALT) and the Campus Sexual Assault Act which would strengthen prevention and enforcement of policies. Among the things it called for were annual climate surveys and increased penalties for Clery Act violations. According to Speier, Chancellor Dirks was committed to working with her and to change the culture at UC Berkeley when it came to sexual assault (Kleinfeld 2014). Speier said, “It’s chilling that there is this level of indifference at universities. I

believe this university must step forward and be a model for the rest of the country on how we'll proceed" (Kleinfeld 2014). On April 18, the U.S. Department of Education confirmed that it was investigating UC Berkeley for Title IX violations (Murphy 2014) and investigators had already been meeting with survivors (Veklerov 2014). The Office for Civil Rights had sent a letter to the complainants on March 25th about the opening of the investigation (Kingkade 2014b).³⁴

On May 1st, The U.S. Department of Education released a list of 55 higher education institutions with open investigations for violating Title IX in handling sexual violence cases (U.S. Department of Education 2014b). UC Berkeley was one of the schools listed and the fourth California school to be investigated. This list was the first comprehensive look at the campuses that were being reviewed by the Office for Civil rights; in the past, the Department would only confirm individual Title IX investigations (U.S. Department of Education 2014b). This was done in an effort to bring more transparency to the investigations and enforcement of federal regulations. A few days after this announcement and the state audit still underway, Congresswomen Jackie Speier and Barbara Lee met with Chancellor Dirks again and gave him a list of recommendations (Achezkai 2014). These recommendations were aimed at enhancing prevention and response to sexual assault incidents and included: enforcing mandatory training, additional sensitivity training to staff who handle sexual assault cases, peer-to-peer counseling, making "rape kits" available on college campuses, and improving academic support and accommodations for survivors (Achezkai 2014).

UC President Janet Napolitano announced the formation of a system wide task force to oversee efforts trying to prevent and address sexual violence on all UC campuses in June

2014 (UC Office of the President 2014). In a press release, President Napolitano stated “We aim to be the national leader in combating sexual violence on campus, and the mission of this new task force is to continue to review and improve our efforts to make sure the University of California employs innovative, evidence-based and consistent practices across the system” (UC Office of the President 2014). This task force would be led by Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Sheryl Vacca and include UC Board of Regents Bonnie Reiss and Karen Leong Clancy, representatives from UCPD, Title IX, victim advocacy groups, administration from each UC campus, and two students. The formation of this task force came the day after the U.S. Department of education proposed new rules for colleges and universities in addressing sexual violence. The draft regulation would alter parts of the Clery Act, expand the definition of rape, and clarify the rights accorded to perpetrators. These and other changes were up for review and comment for the public until July 21st.

A few days after this, the California State Auditor released the report from the audit on UC Berkeley and three other universities. The report released on June 24th, revealed that the four campuses audited didn’t always comply with state law, and that not all faculty and staff were sufficiently trained on responding and reporting student incidents of sexual violence, with some being the first point of contact for survivors (California State Auditor 2014). In addition, none of the schools were consistent in distributing policies on how to respond and handle incidents of sexual violence and sexual harassment, which is required by state law. The auditor recommended universities improve communication between student survivors and employees handling investigations at all times during the process; provide annual training and education on sexual violence; and improve the dissemination of the

sexual harassment policy. The report also listed a number of recommendations for the legislature to address sexual violence such as amending laws to require education on sexual violence and harassment to all university employees and students, especially incoming students.

Efforts to improve resources for survivors continued both at UC Berkeley and the federal level. In mid-July, the position for survivor advocate for UC Berkeley was advertised. This would be the first confidential advocate for the campus and would be the director of a resource center for survivors of sexual violence. Most of the UCs already had a survivor advocate. UC Berkeley was the only UC to not have one. In late July, two bills were introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives aimed at improving universities' response to sexual violence and holding them accountable to addressing this problem. The Campus Accountability and Safety Act, a bipartisan bill, would require schools to increase penalties for violations of the Clery Act to \$150,000 and fines of up to 1% of their total operating budgets for Title IX violations. The Survivor Outreach and Support Campus Act (SOS Campus Act) would require the hiring of a confidential advocate for survivors of sexual violence in all colleges and universities.³⁵

Different groups of students on the Berkeley campus and across the UCs began prioritizing sexual assault on their agendas. The ASUC and UC Berkeley students continued to work on legislation affecting sexual violence policies. On August 4th, students from UC Berkeley under the ASUC program of Lobby Corps made their way to Sacramento along with students from UC Davis and UC Santa Cruz to lobby for several bills affecting students, including SB 967, the affirmative consent bill. UC leaders in the University of California Student Association (UCSA), a student advocacy group that advocates on behalf

of all UC students, selected UConsent as one of the three, two-year campaigns on all ten UC campuses during the annual UCSA Congress meeting. This campaign was intended to support survivors of sexual assault and aimed to “promote a culture of consent through awareness, education, and advocacy.”³⁶

The changes that the UC Berkeley administration had been making around sexual violence continued to be implemented during the fall semester. They began a poster campaign and created small postcard size flyers advertising the newly created survivor support website around campus and in the campus newspaper. Orientations for incoming students included completion of an online sexual assault education program called Haven and participation in Bear Pact, a sexual assault awareness program. There was also additional training for new members of the Greek system. UC Berkeley also continued the hiring process for the Director of Sexual Assault Prevention and Advocacy. Two student representatives were a part of the hiring committee: ASUC Student Advocate Rishi Ahuja and ASUC Senator Haley Broader. They reviewed applications and were involved in the interview process.

In late August 2014, SB 967 passed the California State Senate unanimously and would then be presented to Governor Jerry Brown. On September 16, students from UC Berkeley, UC Davis, and UCLA held a press conference in front of the state capital urging Governor Brown to sign the “yes means yes” law. Several students, including Savannah Badalich from UCLA and Meghan Warner and Aryle Butler from UC Berkeley, spoke about their sexual assault experiences and how the bill would make a difference. After the press conference they marched to Governor Brown’s office to continue to advocate for the signing of this bill. On September 28, the governor signed SB 967 into law. Although it made

California the first state with a clearer definition of consent (Chappell 2014), the UC system had formally adopted an affirmative consent standard in March 2014 when it updated its policies to comply with the new VAWA requirements. The following day, Governor Brown also signed AB 1433, which would require campus officials to immediately report any violent crime, sexual assault, or hate crime reported to them to the local police departments without identifying the victim unless they gave consent to be identified. This was made a requirement for participants in the Cal Grant program. California state legislators continued engaging with the issue of sexual assault on university campuses. Assembly Member Das Williams, who was the Chair of the Assembly Committee on Higher Education hosted a series of roundtable discussions on different UC campuses to learn about their prevention and response efforts. The first one was held at UC Berkeley on September 24 where Williams questioned administrators and staff. Several student leaders were part of the roundtable: Caitlin Quinn, Meghan Warner, Sofie Karasek, and Rishi Ahuja.

There was increased discussions around sexual assault on campus during the month of October that extended to the end of the semester. UC Berkeley released its annual security report showing an increase in forcible sex offenses from the previous year. In 2012, the number of sexual assaults was 23 and in 2013 it was 33. This was the first year that the report included data on stalking and dating and domestic violence – a new requirement from the VAWA Act that was signed in 2013. The Greek system came under fire beginning in October 2014 after a series of sexual assaults were reported in fraternities or were committed by members of fraternities.³⁷ Some of the sexual assaults were reported after football games and parties. UC Berkeley has a party scene that is centered in the Greek system in an area known as “fraternity row” near campus (Sreekanth 2018). Sexual assault

has been an on-going issue for the Greek system there. For example, while I was conducting fieldwork in Berkeley in fall 2016, the Greek Council on campus temporarily banned parties with alcohol after two separate sexual assaults were reported at fraternity parties.

The reported sexual assaults brought a lot of attention to issues of sexual violence in fraternities at UC Berkeley. On August 28, 2014 the Inter-Fraternity Council had issued a letter to the campus community saying it would begin collaborating with campus partners to change the culture that allows sexual assault to occur. This statement was a response to vandalism on campus that equated fraternities with rape (Benham 2014). The state audit report published in June 2014 revealed that out of the 80 cases of sexual harassment and sexual violence from the four universities it reviewed, 20 cases involved fraternity or sorority members or had occurred at a Greek sponsored event (California State Auditor 2014). All these events, prompted UC Berkeley's Interfraternity Council (IFC) to address sexual violence. In an op-ed to the school newspaper, a leader in the IFC discussed how the organization was going to host a sexual assault forum and require every chapter affiliated with IFC to participate in consent and active bystander training every semester (Stewart 2014). Although expressing support for survivors, the author also asked for the privacy of the accused to be protected.

Sexual assault was being addressed by the university and different departments/groups within the university, but activist survivors were critical of their work on the issue. On October 10, Sofie Karasek and Meghan Warner (2014) wrote an op-ed in *The Daily Californian*, titled "Sexual Assault Will Not Be Solved by Public Relations". The article, also signed by several student leaders and activists on the issue, criticized the administration and the Greek system. They called on the university to hire additional staff to

enhance the investigation process and to educate students on consent, bystander intervention and available resources. Sofie and Meghan wrote, “Instead of taking action, UC Berkeley used valuable resources to solely appear to care about sexual violence, effectively avoiding having to seriously address it...it’s easy to make a few public changes and act like it’s revolutionary. But when it comes down to the important, private meetings where investigators meet with students, nothing is changing.” A problem that was brought up by most of the students in the Title IX complaint was individual people within the Office for Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination. They said that the campus was making changes, but not really addressing the most pressing problems they had been bringing up. Sofie and Meghan also expressed concern with how the Greek system was addressing this problem, particularly the lack of participation of fraternities in Greeks Against Sexual Assault, a student-led organization that raises awareness about sexual assault within the Greek community through peer-to-peer training. They criticized sororities for reprimanding their own members for “jeopardizing” the house’s reputation when bringing up incidents of sexual violence. Student activists on campus consistently tried to hold the university accountable and focused on effectively addressing the issue.³⁸ During the last part of the fall 2014 semester, the university hired its first full-time survivor advocate and director of a new center for sexual assault prevention it was planning to create. The significance of this will be examined in chapter five when I discuss the resources available to survivors on campus prior to this.

UC Berkeley continued its efforts to address sexual violence in 2015. It launched the White House’s “It’s On Us” sexual prevention campaign in January.³⁹ As this was going on, the Title IX investigation against UC Berkeley continued. On February 3 and 4, the U.S.

Department of Education visited UC Berkeley as part of the review process of the school's compliance with Title IX. Staff from the Office for Civil Rights met with representatives of some student groups and held office hours for students to share their experiences. The Office for Civil Rights was gathering information to understand the school's preventative measures, how the campus responded to notices of sexual violence, and the campus climate with respect to sexual violence (Dirks 2015a).

One of UC Berkeley's efforts included hosting the National Conference on Campus Sexual Assault and Violence on February 24 and 25 in 2015. The conference was intended for higher education professional, public officials, and student leaders to "join a meaningful conversation on making our campuses a safer place to learn and live...reflect on the challenges colleges face and share best practices for enhancing prevention, changing the culture, and moving beyond compliance" (University of California, Berkeley 2014). The conference hosted individuals from over 70 institutions of higher education and had nearly 80 speakers throughout the two-day conference (Dirks 2015b). The conference sold out months before it took place.

The conference was not well-received by everyone, particularly the students. They protested the conference and criticized the campus for hosting it amid a Title IX investigation for mishandling cases of sexual violence. In the school newspaper, Sofie said, "For (the campus) to act as a role model in this conference is insulting" (Saric 2015). Meghan in another newspaper said, "It's hard to see that people are going through pain, the same horrible stuff, and meanwhile the university is saying it's a national leader" (Murphy 2015). Lucy, in an interview with me expressed a similar sentiment: "We just filed a lot of federal complaints against you that are not finished. You are not good yet. Don't hold this

conference for all these other institutions. People came from all over the country to learn about what Berkeley was doing to handle sexual assault the correct way. And it was like no, no, no, no, hold on. That's not what we're doing yet. We are not there." Students also criticized the university for making the conference inaccessible to students. The conference was held off-campus, about three miles away at the Berkeley DoubleTree Hotel and the school only reserved 100 seats for students. Half of these were for UC Berkeley students, who had to pay \$20 for tickets, which was a discounted rate (Saric 2015). Students criticized the conference planners for not including students working on this issue in the planning of the conference (Saric 2015).

Students planned protests during the conference to express their anger and disappointment. One of the events they protested was a panel titled "Ensuring a Fair Process" that focused on how administrators can "ensure a process that encourages reporting, is fair and equitable, and offers appropriate confidentiality for all parties." They were protesting Denise Oldham, UC Berkeley's Title IX Officer and Director for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination who was the moderator for the session. This was the sexual assault investigator "nearly all" of the survivors reported having issues in the Title IX complaint filed in February 2014 (Karasek and Warner 2014). Students stood up during the panel with their mouths taped shut and held up signs describing the things the Title IX investigator had said to survivors (interviews with Hannah and Lucy). On the second day of the conference, students protested the closing keynote of the conference in Wheeler Auditorium, the only event held on the campus. The keynote featured Anita Hill and UC President Janet Napolitano and was moderated by Chancellor Dirks. Hannah described what she and other students did for this event:

“We collected quotes of things that the Title IX coordinator and other university employees and administrators had said across the UC. We distributed that I think through an op-ed and a Google docs form to try to get as many as we could. But obviously we were limited with time and especially money. But we still got hundreds of quotes, at least over 100. And we wrote them down on construction paper and we taped them to the steps of Wheeler Hall, which was where Anita Hill was talking with Dirks, who was the chancellor at the time and that one was my idea. That one is one of the proudest activisty things we've done because we had very few resources and it was very impactful and everybody saw it and we contacted the press and everything.”

Students collaborated with students from other UCs to protest the biggest event of the conference where UC Regents and leaders from many universities were in attendance.

Activists used this to their advantage to put pressure on the university and generate more attention to UC Berkeley’s handling of sexual violence.

The ASUC’s involvement in sexual violence remained strong into spring semester as well. In March the ASUC Senate introduced a wellness referendum (passed in April) to promote mental health and would also provide funding for sexual assault prevention and support programs. The ASUC Sexual Assault Commission continued their Cal Consent Week during spring semester which included workshops, photo shoots, and displays on campus (Yoon-Hendricks 2015). Student running for the ASUC senate and executive positions for the following school year continued to run on platforms promising to address sexual assault and came from different political parties.

Late in the spring 2015 semester sexual harassment cases against UC Berkeley faculty began to emerge. In April, Vice Chancellor for Research Graham Fleming resigned after a former campus employee, Diane Leite accused him of sexual harassment (Matier 2015). Leite was fired in 2012 for having a romantic relationship with a male employee who was her subordinate and whose salary had dramatically raised during the duration of their relationship. Fleming announced he would be leaving for personal reasons and denied the

sexual harassment allegations. His resignation came after UC Office of the President's investigation into the allegations found evidence that his behavior was inappropriate.⁴⁰ Although he would no longer serve as vice chancellor for research, after a year of sabbatical, he would be able to resume teaching in the Chemistry department (Matier 2015).

On June 29, three women who were assaulted while attending UC Berkeley filed a civil lawsuit against the UC Board of Regents and UC Berkeley for violating Title IX laws and failing to educate students on how to prevent sexual violence. Aryle, Nicoletta, and Sofie announced the lawsuit in press conference describing the difficulties they experienced reporting their cases. The students, who were also a part of the Title IX and Clery Act complaints filed in 2014, wanted to further push the university to make changes in how it was addressing sexual violence. The persistent efforts by these and other UC Berkeley students, and their use of litigation and federal complaints will be examined in later chapters, particularly why they used these tactics.

Conclusion

The movement against sexual violence at UC Berkeley happened early on in the cycle of protest of the wider movement and it was influenced by the institutional support it received within the university. At UC Berkeley, undergraduate students began to publically discuss how the university had been mishandling cases of sexual violence in April 2013 and continued into June 2015. Key to this persistent effort was student involvement. The first public event at which UC Berkeley students disclosed their experiences of sexual assault and how they had been treated by the university was at an ASUC meeting where the Senate voted it had no confidence in how the university had been handling cases of sexual assault. The ASUC is an institutionalized group with power within the university. The ASUC

President during the 2013-2014 school year was DeeJay Pepito who championed addressing sexual violence in the university and formed a one-year task force that later became a commission within the ASUC that lasted several years. This was critical because it gave institutional support to the movement against sexual violence, facilitated network formation among survivors and activists on campus, and centralized activists and some efforts on this issue.

In terms of tactics, UC Berkeley students used federal complaints, lobbying state legislators to address sexual violence, op-eds, civil lawsuits, and protests. They also used the school's prestige to their advantage. Student activists often held press conferences to announce complaints and lawsuits. Being from a prestigious university helped UC Berkeley students get the media's attention to expose the problems occurring at the UC's premier campus.

A critical factor that affected the emergence of the movement against sexual violence at UC Berkeley was the formation of networks within the campus and across other campuses. New social movement literature from the 1980s theorizes that social movements emerge from "submerged networks" rather than from a collection of movement organizations (Melucci 1989). Within these networks, collective action can emerge and it is how collective identities are continually constructed and maintained. The concept "social movement communities" (Buechler 1990; Staggenborg 1998) was developed to highlight the importance of informal networks in collective action. Social movement communities have been defined as "a network of individuals and groups loosely linked through an institutional base, multiple goals and actions, and a collective identity that affirms members' common interests in opposition to dominant groups" (Taylor and Whittier 1992:107).

Within UC Berkeley, the “informal” networks, as was referred to by some activists, served as social movement communities where activists could come together as survivors of sexual violence or allies to share personal stories and struggles, and learn about efforts led by survivors. It also provided in some instances a healing space for survivors and helped them see that the mishandling of their cases within their schools was part of a wider problem.

The wider national network, IX Network, that developed could be considered a social movement online community (SMOC), which Caren, Jowers, and Gaby (2012) define as “a sustained network of individuals who work to maintain an overlapping set of goals and identities tied to a social movement linked through quasipublic online discussions” (167). Caren et al. (2012) found that SMOCs allowed participants from diverse geographical locations to connect and helped form a distinct community within the virtual space they had created (187). Social media networking sites, such as Facebook, have been known to provide activists with access to larger networks of individuals and help create community online and at the face-to-face organizational level (Crossley 2015). The IX Network allowed students from universities across the country to unite on a private Facebook page to share stories and tactics. It also allowed participants in this online network to see their struggles within their schools as part of a wider institutional problem occurring across hundreds of colleges and universities. All the networks that formed were facilitated through the use of technology, such as email, texting, and messaging through social media.

Beyond student involvement, UC Berkeley’s reputation of being one of the most prestigious public universities in the nation deeply influenced the development of the movement on campus. Students got more media attention and had a wider platform because they were students from the university when discussing the mishandling of their cases of

sexual assault. There was also a higher expectation and standard to which they were being held, particularly by UC and California political leaders. This pressure from within and outside the university compelled the school to change its policies and resources available to survivors. The campus made a great public effort to address the issue as can be seen in their hosting of a national conference on campus sexual assault and sexual violence amid a Title IX investigation. The prestige and prominence of UC Berkeley served as a resource or asset for the student activists. Political stakeholders looked to UC Berkeley as a leader and model for other schools to follow (Kleinfeld 2014). The media was quick to focus on Berkeley to highlight the movement occurring on the campus. This helped the students in shaming and generating negative publicity for the school.

In the next chapter, I focus on the emergence of the campus movement against sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara. I provide a timeline of key events and discuss key differences between the development of the movements at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. I also discuss the importance of telling personal stories and how this helped the formation collective identity among students on both campuses.

Chapter 4: Mobilizing at a Party School: Nonviolent Direct Action at UC Santa Barbara

Introduction

The formation of networks and social movement communities that were facilitated by social media and technology were critical to the emergence of the campus movement against sexual violence. Through networks and communities, students were able to connect to one another across the country and within their own campus to learn about efforts and strategies students were engaged in. There was an emotional aspect to the work students were doing that facilitated not only the formation of networks and communities, but also collective identity and solidarity among survivors and allies. The telling of personal stories and traumas was critical to this movement. This helped survivors connect with one another and construct a collective identity based on being survivors of sexual violence and institutional betrayal, and around the awareness that their experiences were not individual problems, but rather institutional problems that reflected a wider rape culture affecting their experiences as survivors within their schools.

In this chapter I discuss how the movement against sexual violence emerged and developed at UC Santa Barbara. I discuss how students connected with one another and the formation of local networks and communities of activists. I provide a timeline of key events and discussions related to sexual violence that influenced the movement between January 2012 and June 2017.⁴¹ The movement against sexual violence was beginning to take off in 2014 after a violent sexual assault, but local events delayed the movement for about a year. The campus party culture and the consistent high incidence of sexual violence in the community also affected the development of the movement. In the conclusion, I highlight

key findings and differences between the two campuses. I also discuss the importance of telling personal stories and its effect on the movement.

UC Santa Barbara

In 2011 and 2012, sexual violence on college campuses began to be addressed by President Barack Obama and his administration. In 2011 the “Dear Colleague” letter was issued by the Office for Civil Rights and in 2012, Vice President Joe Biden started speaking out about the importance of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act that had expired the previous year. These national discussions extended to the UC Santa Barbara campus as well. Undergraduate student government candidates running for office began listing sexual harassment as part of their platforms. In fall 2012, there was an increase in reported sexual assaults in Isla Vista and media coverage of it also increased. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Michael D. Young, sent an email to the campus wide community on November 8 expressing concern over the increase crime in Isla Vista and gave out a list of resources on campus and safety tips. The undergraduate student government, the Associated Students (A.S.) of UC Santa Barbara issued in late October the “Resolution to Take Action Against Gendered Based and Sexual Violence.” The resolution called for student senators to participate in a rally condemning this violence. That same quarter the university began making a 90-minute workshop, called “GauchoFYI” mandatory for all incoming freshmen that discussed alcohol, drugs, stress management, and safety in Isla Vista.

Although the university administration has tried to stay away from what happens in Isla Vista, the students who live in Isla Vista see it as part of the campus community. Students often show concern for what happens there and they try to take action. A large

number of students, particularly undergraduates from different colleges and universities in the area live in Isla Vista. In 2011-2012, 42% (n=9,086) of all UC Santa Barbara students lived in Isla Vista (Office of Budget and Planning 2011), however, the majority of these are undergraduates. Students often hold events in Isla Vista and they tend to see it as an extension of the campus. For example, in January 2013 student senators addressed safety concerns due to poor lighting and nonfunctioning lights on the streets of Isla Vista during an A.S. meeting. The following month, the A.S. government continued to address sexual violence in Isla Vista by passing the Violence Intervention and Prevention Program that was started at UC Irvine. Its goal was to train students in campus organizations to become peer advisors for sexual assault and violence. A.S. Senator Kyley Scarlet, who authored and introduced this resolution said, “Sexual assault is the third highest crime that IV [Isla Vista] Foot Patrol has to deal with on our campus and, therefore, it is really important for us to stand in support of survivors” (Cain 2013). Students not involved in student government continued to respond to the increase in sexual assault alerts sent to the campus community. Several campus and community organizations held rallies and different campaigns to bring awareness to the problem.

It is important to highlight how sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara has tended to be connected to larger issues of safety and is one of the many problems facing the campus and community. Isla Vista is an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County that lacks a formal local government. Being an unincorporated area has resulted in many issues including lack of funding to improve infrastructure, such as street lighting, and reliance on the county of Santa Barbara, surrounding cities, and UC Santa Barbara for resources, such as law enforcement and fire departments. Sawyeh Maghsoodloo, a member of the Board of

Directors in the Isla Vista Recreation and Parks Department discussed the poor lighting that exists in Isla Vista: “When it’s dark, it’s easier to get away with crime. Studies have shown that in more well-lit areas, crime rates do go down, especially in regard to sexual assault. These are problems we do have in IV [Isla Vista]...Replacing them [lights] is one easy step we can take to not only increase safety but to also make residents feel safer” (Kulp and Quiambao 2013). In addition to poor infrastructure, Isla Vista’s status as an unincorporated area has created problems in terms of jurisdiction when it comes to reporting crimes and solving them, particularly sexual violence.

Sexual violence is often associated with the campus party culture. Lexi, a graduate of UC Santa Barbara who attended the school from 2013 to 2015, described the culture of Isla Vista as “definitely very party centric and very hook-up centric too...Like people kind of expect people to be down to drink and be down to you know hookup sometimes. And there’s kind of a general feeling of like party-all-the-time kind of culture” (interview with Lexi). The drinking and hookup culture that underscores the party reputation of UC Santa Barbara is often seen as a source of many of the problems in Isla Vista, particularly sexual violence. Janel, a UC Santa Barbara alumna who attended the school from 2009 to 2015 said, “The use of alcohol and drugs is really rampant. And I think that's common for any college, but I feel like here it's just a problem because I don't know if it just allows for certain things to be normalized such as hooking up when you're drunk. Which you know leads to sexual assault a lot” (interview with Janel). Tim, an alumnus of UC Santa Barbara who attended graduate school from 2014-2016 believed that the party culture in Isla Vista was connected to incidences of sexual violence: “There was the frat that had a banner up with a naked woman bending over on it and it was like women walk by this every day. The influence of Greek

life on the consumer and party culture is just terrible I think. I think it [party culture] has a strong connection to the rates of sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara” (interview with Tim). The students described not only the party culture of the campus, but also the rape culture that existed. Rape culture is an environment where there are a set of values and beliefs that are conducive to rape (Boswell and Spade 1996), and based on the above student comments, this is present at UC Santa Barbara.

Part of the rape culture in Isla Vista is the normalization and acceptance of sexual violence as part of the culture by everyone in the community. For example, in October 2013 Dr. Edwin Feliciano, a psychiatrist and director of UC Santa Barbara’s Behavioral Health Services at Student Health, wrote an opinion piece for students on how to have a “happy, healthy Halloween.” He wrote, “No doubt, Halloween is a fun time in any place and at any age. In some settings though, there is risk involved — a college town like Isla Vista is obviously one of those settings. It may sound like I’m being a downer, but the truth is that sexual assaults, alcohol poisoning, drug overdoses, violence and arrests occur at exponentially higher rates during this otherwise wonderful holiday.” In this article, Dr. Feliciano highlighted how sexual violence was a risk people may experience if they attended parties in Isla Vista during the Halloween weekend. Articles like this were actually common in the school newspapers – warning students on how to stay safe during big party weekends. This speaks to the normalization of sexual violence and how people in the campus community have come to accept this as an inevitable part of living and being in Isla Vista.

The students I interviewed discussed not only the party and the rape culture that existed in Isla Vista, but also brought up how difficult it was to do activist work on issues of sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara. Jessica, an alumna who attended UC Santa Barbara

from 2012 to 2016 discussed how Isla Vista influenced her activist work: “I definitely think having a social climate that is very like party heavy is something that has kind of been difficult to work with because I think that people don't want to think about sexual assault when they are going out on a Friday night. But that is something that, statistically speaking you need to be the most aware of it. So that's definitely been a struggle” (interview with Jessica). Although they reported the struggles they experienced, some students reported that it motivated them to do work around this issue on campus. Alejandra, a graduate of UC Santa Barbara who attended the school between 2013 and 2017, discussed rape culture and how it affected her:

“I think it was the end of my first year and she [a professor] played a clip and it was about these guys at a university in the east coast and they were saying something like “no means yes, and yes means anal”...I remember that everybody laughed at that. And it made me so angry because I was like how are they laughing at this? This is horrible. They should not be laughing at this. And so I think that's when I really realized, wow, rape culture is alive and well at UCSB [UC Santa Barbara]. And I think that really made me realize that what had happened to me, happens to other people and a lot. And yet a lot of people normalize it and they make it feel like it's okay. So I think that that reaction from the class I really took it to heart and that really motivated me to want to fight that culture at UCSB.”

The rape culture in Isla Vista affected students differently and created difficulties in addressing sexual violence. The prevalence of sexual violence and rape culture at UC Santa Barbara and its effects on the resources and services provided to survivors of sexual violence will be discussed in chapter six.

In 2014, sexual violence became a much bigger issue both nationally and locally. The White House, the UC Regents, and the UC Office of the President began to address sexual violence more directly. Locally, the A.S. Senate called on the campus to reform sexual assault policy and supported increasing sexual assault prevention education. In February, a former undergraduate student filed a lawsuit against the UC Board of Regents

over allegations of sexual abuse by a teaching assistant in the English Department. That same month, several sexual assaults shook up the UC Santa Barbara community, particularly a violent gang rape that occurred on campus on February 23rd which galvanized the students and administration into action. Students organized rallies and events to raise awareness of sexual assault. Tara Atrian, Co-Chair for Take Back the Night at UC Santa Barbara told *The Bottom Line* that the organization was working with A.S. Senators to “put pressure on our administration to focus on issues of sexual violence and publicize/provide more resources for survivors” (Ricapito 2014). The sexual assaults and students’ efforts to bring awareness to sexual violence helped make this a top priority issue for the university and Isla Vista community. In a letter sent to the campus community three days after the gang rape, Chancellor Henry T. Yang reported the steps the university had taken to ensure the safety of students and campus community: increase campus police force by five officers, work on a systematic plan for installing new lighting and security cameras; increase police on campus and Isla Vista, and increase the patrols of Community Service Officers (Yang 2014b). In addition to these safety measures, the administration committed to “immediately increasing staffing to support sexual assault prevention and our campus’s advocacy and counseling response for survivors of sexual violence.” Part of the response to the sexual assaults was to push to make Isla Vista into a Community Services District. All these efforts coincided with the UC wide release of an updated sexual violence and sexual harassment policy that had been released in early March to conform with the new VAWA requirements.

The focus on issues of sexual violence on campus continued towards the end of the 2013-2014 academic school year, with many referencing the high profile and violent gang rape that occurred on campus. On March 19, the results from the UC Campus Climate

Survey were released by the University of California Office of the President. This survey was administered on all 10 UC campuses in 2012 and 2013, and it revealed that UC Santa Barbara had a high reported rate of unwanted sexual contact, 8%. In April, several of the undergraduate students running for A.S. Government for the 2014-2015 academic year ran with platforms that promised to address issues of sexual violence. One of the students, Beatrice Contreras (an Off-Campus Senator in 2013-2014), had been very vocal and supportive of improving how the university handled sexual violence was accused of sexual assault. On April 23, a blog, Coalition for Survivors, started by the UC Santa Barbara student who accused Contreras of sexual assault published a post online about her experience as a survivor and the backlash she had endured for speaking out (Coalition for Survivors 2014). Contreras won the election for External Vice President of Local Affairs, but the political party that she ran with called for her resignation and students protested during the swearing in of new executives in May. Contreras ended up resigning in September 2014.

On April 30, the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Education, Catherine E. Lhamon, visited the campus. The visit was part of a nationwide university tour by President Obama's top administration officials honoring the 20th Anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act. The eleven campuses that were part of this tour had been recipients of the Grant to Reduce Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence and Stalking on Campus Program in the Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women. UC Santa Barbara received this grant in 2011 for \$297,799 and again in 2014 for \$299,004. This grant was intended to help institutions of higher education strengthen and adopt "comprehensive responses to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating

violence, and stalking” (U.S. Department of Justice 2018). Lhamon met with administrators and student leaders in closed meetings to discuss the efforts to address and prevent sexual violence by the campus and the U.S. Department of Education. Some UC Santa Barbara students, however, criticized the decision to have closed meetings with a few students and the short amount of notice before the visit (Slovinsky 2014). In May, several student organizations organized the first annual UC Santa Barbara Fighting Sexual Violence benefit concert with all money going to a non-profit providing resources to survivors of sexual violence.

Students continued to address sexual violence and the rape culture in Isla Vista into spring quarter. However, all the progress and momentum generated took a backseat after a couple of events that occurred in Isla Vista threatened the safety of the community. On April 5th, riots broke out during Deltopia, an annual party hosted by students living in Isla Vista that often attracts hundreds of out of town college-aged people and is usually held during the first weekend of April. The “Deltopia riots” occurred after college-aged people in the street party in Isla Vista threw bottles and rocks to police officers, injuring several of them. Police shot tear gas and rubber bullets to help regain control of the situation. On May 23, 2014, twenty-two-year-old Elliot Rodger killed six UC Santa Barbara students and injured fourteen across several sites in Isla Vista before killing himself. Rodger’s stabbing and shooting rampage was fueled by his hatred of women that had been well documented in the videos he posted on YouTube.⁴² This tragedy along with the “Deltopia riots” shifted the conversation of safety on the campus and community.

The university, students, and community focused on issues of broader safety in Isla Vista and sexual violence became one part of a larger issue that needed to be addressed.

Sexual violence on its own was no longer a top priority at the time as the campus and community was trying to make sense of the tragedy and heal from it. Administrators, students, and the local community focused on improving public safety and changing the culture of Isla Vista. The university became more involved in Isla Vista by investing in its infrastructure and supporting measures that would enhance the safety of its residents. In the months following the tragedy, the campus completed a lighting and security assessment, installed more lighting across campus, and committed funds to the Santa Barbara County to improve infrastructure in Isla Vista (Yang 2014c). The campus invested over \$200,000 to improve the lighting in Isla Vista. UCPD had a greater presence in Isla Vista and campus, and increased police patrols in these areas over the weekends. In addition to UCPD from UC Santa Barbara, UC police officers from other UC campuses were also present in Isla Vista and campus for the remainder of spring quarter. For Halloween in 2014, one of the biggest party events for the campus, the school and surrounding areas imposed parking restrictions and UCPD brought 100 UC police officers from other UC campuses to police the campus and Isla Vista (Jackson 2014).

The university also sought to increase its presence in Isla Vista and be more proactive by integrating Isla Vista into their long-term planning. The university established the Chancellor's Coordinating Committee on Isla Vista, co-chaired by Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall and Academic Senate Chair Kum-Kum Bhavnani, which would help develop and implement recommendations and plans, and coordinate and interact with stakeholders in Isla Vista (Yang 2014d). George Thurlow, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Alumni Affairs was also appointed as Special Assistant to the Chancellor to help the campus meet its goals to improve Isla Vista (Yang 2014d). The university began considering a

master lease program where they could lease an entire apartment complex from a landlord/manager and then issue individual leases under the university's housing policies and practices (Yang 2014a). In fall 2014, one of the university's projects was to create university-owned spaces in Isla Vista. In January 2015, UC Santa Barbara received a \$570,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Project School Emergency Response to Violence to help with mental health services following the shooting in May (U.S. Department of Education 2015). The campus used this funding to sign a five-year lease on seven offices in the Isla Vista Clinic building (Kolosta 2015, Yang 2015). The Gaucho Support Center opened in fall 2015 and it housed four counseling psychologists, a social worker, an advocate for survivors of sexual violence, and a student mental health coordinator (Isla Vista Safe Committee 2016). Although all these resources were being spent on broader issues of safety and mental health during this time, the university also invested in its Counseling & Psychological Services and the Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education (CARE) office which provides confidential advocacy and support to students, staff, and faculty affected by sexual violence. This will be discussed in chapter six, particularly its effects on the movement against sexual violence that developed at UC Santa Barbara.

Local politicians, the university, and community became more supportive of Isla Vista becoming self-governing. Many meetings and public town halls were sponsored by the A.S. Government, California State Assembly Member Das Williams and Third District Supervisor Doreen Farr on the problems Isla Vista faced due to being an unincorporated area and how becoming a self-governing entity could improve and bring solutions to some of its problems.⁴³ In early December, Assembly Member Williams introduced the Isla Vista

self-governance bill to the California State Assembly, which would create the Isla Vista Community Services District and be able to improve its utilities, infrastructure, and public services. The bill was passed in October of 2015. Prior to the passing of this bill, UC Santa Barbara had pledged \$200,000 a year for seven years to increase the budget of the Isla Vista Community Services District and overall improve the safety and environment of residents living in Isla Vista (Ortiz 2015). Williams noted the shift in UC Santa Barbara's stance towards Isla Vista: "while UCSB has historically not done enough to serve the needs of Isla Vista, their actions over the last year represent a renewed dedication to improving the public safety and quality of life for residents" (Ortiz 2015).

Despite the tragedy that occurred in Isla Vista, UC Santa Barbara students continued to address sexual violence. Something new emerged in the issues they were bringing up: student survivors began to discuss how UC Santa Barbara had been mishandling their cases of sexual assault. On May 5th, 2014 a UC Santa Barbara student, by the name of Rachel wrote about her sexual assault in Isla Vista on the blog, Campus Assault and Rape Survivors Online Network (CARSON). This blog was "a safe place for survivors of campus rape and assault to share their stories and learn that they are not alone in their experiences." This blog post detailed Rachel's experience in reporting her sexual assault and how the university had mishandled her case. The student wrote that the purpose for writing her story was "to demonstrate how institutional incompetence and blatant disregard for both the mental and physical effects of sexual assault undermines the safety amongst the female population at UCSB" (Campus Assault and Rape Survivors Online Network 2014). This same story with some edits and under the name of Myra was later posted on Coalition for Survivors on June 11. This story was not discussed in the local or school's student newspapers.

On September 3, 2014, Myra Crimmel, the lead complainant, along with five current and former UC Santa Barbara students filed Title IX and Clery Act complaints against the university. The students reported how the university fostered a hostile environment for survivors, discouraged reporting these crimes, failed to conduct thorough investigations, and gave lenient punishment to perpetrators. Myra was quoted in a newspaper saying, “I was victimized twice, both by my perpetrator and my university, but the silver lining is that I am now more strong and resilient. Going forward, prompt action must be taken against perpetrators of sexual assaults, and survivors must be treated with respect. What happens in Isla Vista does not stay here. Things must change” (Quiambao 2014). The complaints that were filed did not lead to federal investigations, unlike other UCs like Berkeley.

Myra had just graduated from UC Santa Barbara when she took part in these complaints. End Rape on Campus (EROC), a survivor advocacy organization helped Myra and the other students in filing the complaint. She received assistance from Sofie Karasek, a UC Berkeley student at the time who was one of the co-founders of EROC (The Hunting Ground 2016). The story shared on the blog in May and June under the names Rachel and Myra was probably Myra Crimmel. There were a lot of similarities between the stories shared on the blogs and Myra Crimmel’s accounts of sexual violence and mishandling by the university in the federal complaints against the university. The posting on blogs was very important to the campus movement against sexual violence. Blogs like CARSON and Facebook groups like the IX Network provided a space for survivors to share their stories of sexual assault and discuss how universities were handling their cases. More importantly, they helped students connect with one another within their own schools and campuses across the nation.

The university, with the help of students, launched state and national campaigns on campus. The CARE office and its undergraduate interns heavily marketed the White House's "It's On Us" campaign that aimed to end sexual assault on campuses by initiating conversations around the issue and asking students to pledge to combat sexual assault. Several opinion pieces were submitted by undergraduate staff members of the CARE offices on consent, alcohol, and bystander intervention. The UC-wide UConsent Campaign was also launched at UC Santa Barbara in October 2014. This same month, UCPD released UC Santa Barbara's annual crime statistics report, which complies with the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act. The report showed that the number of forcible sexual offenses had increased in the past three years (23 in 2013; 12 in 2012; and 7 in 2011). Appendix B provides UC Santa Barbara's yearly on-campus sexual assault rates from 2010 to 2018.

In addition to the university bringing attention to sexual violence on campuses, local politicians continued getting involved on this issue and hosted two events on campus on it. On November 12, 2014, California Assembly Member Das Williams and Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson hosted a meeting at UC Santa Barbara. The meeting titled, "Sexual Assault and Harassment on Campus: A Roundtable Discussion of UC Santa Barbara's Prevention and Response Efforts" brought together many different stakeholders: staff and administrators from UC Santa Barbara and Santa Barbara City College (SBCC), UCPD, Santa Barbara County District Attorney's Office, Santa Barbara Sheriff's Office, UC Santa Barbara student organizations that address issues of sexual violence, students from UC Santa Barbara, and Sofie Karasek from UC Berkeley. During this meeting, Jackson and Williams moderated the discussion on how the campus handled cases of sexual assault. Students

spoke about their experiences reporting sexual assaults, and offices described their difficulties in handling cases. I attended this meeting and witnessed the moderators heatedly ask questions to school administrators and expressed outrage at how the cases were being handled. On April 23, 2015, they hosted a second part to this discussion on campus, where they highlighted a series of bills they had introduced to the California State Assembly and Senate addressing sexual assault on college campuses.

During winter and spring quarters 2015, sexual violence continued to be addressed by the university, community, and students. In fall 2014, the UC Office of the President had asked each UC campus to formulate an action plan to address issues that arose from the 2012-2013 Campus Climate Survey. UC Santa Barbara was the only UC campus that identified sexual assault as one of the three issues it needed to address. It created a Sexual Violence subcommittee within the Campus Climate Survey Implementation Committee comprised of faculty, staff, and students that sought to decrease sexual assaults on campus and in Isla Vista. With this goal in mind they developed a set of metrics to assess their progress towards this goal, a timeline to complete it, and how they would achieve it. The local rape crisis center was awarded a grant from the Fund for Santa Barbara, a community foundation that provides financial support to nonprofits in Santa Barbara County. The organization was awarded \$10,000 a year for three years to expand their services to Isla Vista.

In April there were a lot of events and protests that centered around sexual violence on campus. In April 2015, the film *The Hunting Ground* was screened on campus and was hosted by various campus offices and community organizations. On April 13, 2015, Alejandra, a sophomore at UC Santa Barbara at the time organized and led a demonstration

outside the Student Resource Building (SRB) on campus, where Judicial Affairs is located. Alejandra along with several supporters stood outside the building from 8am to 6pm chanting and holding signs protesting how the university had handled her case of sexual assault that had occurred during her first year on campus. Her perpetrator was suspended on March 2015, yet he was still around campus. She also described how she was discouraged from reporting and how it had been preventing her from taking part in many activities at the campus.

Protests against sexual violence helped mobilize students and other survivors on this issue. Alejandra described how she first got involved in activism against sexual violence on campus:

“the first time I got involved with this was right after the young woman who was raped by the recreational center or by the track, when the three other men had raped her. Because that happened in February 2014, and by this time my assault had already happened...So when that happened I was like, oh my gosh, this is something huge and this is something that is important. But I hadn't really connected the dots between my experience and that. So I remember there was a march that people organized and it was by the SRB and I went to that. And I remember I went with friends from like M.U.J.E.R. [a Chicana/Latina organization on campus], the organization I was in and also Girl Up [off-campus organization]. And we had all gone together and so I was like, oh wow, people really care about this issue and so I think that was the first time that I got involved by going to the march and just attend[ing] that protest.”

This was the beginning of her work on this issue. Private conversations with her friends and disclosing her assault helped her realize that what she had survived was assault and not something she had made up in her mind. The violent gang rape of a UC Santa Barbara student was a critical event in the consciousness and awareness of sexual violence in the community. For Alejandra, this assault and the protests that followed helped her see that sexual violence was an important issue and that people could be supportive of survivors. Several students I interviewed brought up this case and its effect on them.

Alejandra's protest outside the SRB brought a lot of supporters to her cause and case. Melissa, a senior at UC Santa Barbara finishing her last quarter took part in the protest. This was the first time she had been involved in activism on this issue. During an interview, Melissa discussed the similarities between her experience reporting her assault and Alejandra's experience. She said:

“It was like taking part in her protest and then just getting to know her story. A lot of the same issues that I went through with the institution and reporting my assault with the policies. There were a lot of similarities and it was just not correct because they made it seem like it was just like a once in a current situation, that it [had] never happened [before]. But it had been happening.”

Melissa and Alejandra would end up organizing more protests and events discussing how their cases of sexual violence had been mishandled by the university. Both Alejandra and Melissa realized that their experiences were not unique or isolated, but connected. As was seen at UC Berkeley, public disclosure of being a survivor of sexual violence and their experiences of institutional betrayal were critical in mobilizing survivors and students at UC Santa Barbara as well.

During undergraduate government elections for the 2015-2016 school year, Alejandra and several other students running for government positions included sexual assault as part of the issues they wanted to address. Alejandra ran as an off-campus senator and advocated for change in how the university handled cases of sexual assault. During an open forum, she said “I am a survivor of sexual assault on this campus. I have been working effortlessly to make changes and awareness over and over and over again not only with students, because I am a part of Take Back the Night, but also as well regarding my own case. It is not easy exposing myself to everyone, and I am making sure that policy changes are made” (Zimmerman and Lebens 2015). Two other women of color also ran for positions

promising to address sexual violence. Lacy Wright, a freshman at the time who had publicly admitted she was a survivor of sexual assault, was running for an on-campus senator position and advocated for the expansion of counseling services for survivors and ensuring counselors are well-trained to respond to sexual assaults (Schmidt and Brennan-Greenbaum 2015). Paola de la Cruz ran for External Vice President of Local Affairs and supported a year-long sexual assault campaign in Isla Vista (Brennan-Greenbaum 2015). All three won the positions they ran for.

On May 13th, Alejandra and Melissa, with the help of undergraduate and graduate students, and Latina/o faculty organized a press release outside the UC Santa Barbara library at 12pm. A group of about 30-40 students gathered around the students, faculty, and community members that spoke through a portable microphone and speaker. Alejandra and Melissa symbolically wore teal bandanas over their mouth and took them off to recount their experiences of sexual violence to the crowd that had gathered. They also discussed how the university had been mishandling their cases. At the end, Alejandra and Melissa announced they were going to march to Cheadle Hall and demand to speak to Chancellor Yang. The women along with about 20-30 students walked up to the chancellor's office in the 5th floor and held a sit-in beginning at around 1:15pm. The women along with another undergraduate student, Lexi, drafted up a set of 13 demands that addressed: creating minimum sanctions for perpetrators, increasing educational training on consent and healthy relationships, creating a Survivor Fund, increasing diversity of the offices that deal with survivors of sexual violence, improvement of the appeal process for cases, accountability for past mishandling of cases, publishing reports on the number of sexual violence incidents the university receives; and improved resources for survivors. Chancellor Yang did not arrive

until 8:30pm. Negotiations with the activists ended at almost 3am. The sit-in lasted 13 hours and Chancellor Yang signed off on the demands on the early hours of May 14th.

The sit-in galvanized the campus on this issue. Around the time of the sit-in, an undergraduate student circulated a petition on Change.org pressuring California and UC leaders to change sexual violence policies and sanctions (Hernandez 2015). The author of this petition used Alejandra's and Melissa's mishandled cases as examples of how the university was failing to support survivors. On May 15th, immediately after the sit-in, Take Back the Night hosted a community forum titled "Building Alliances for Fighting Sexual Assault on Campus." It is important to highlight that Alejandra and Lexi were part of the Executive Board of Take Back the Night, a student funded and run organization of A.S. that raises awareness on issues of sexual violence. The goal of the meeting was for students on campus to share the work they were doing on sexual violence and try to see how they could assist one another. The meeting was led by Alejandra and Melissa, who shared what happened at the sit-in and discussed the demands the Chancellor had just signed. As part of the demands, the campus paid for the travel of Alejandra, Melissa, and Lexi to the UC Regents Meeting in May 20-21. They did not make it to the meeting, however, because their flights were cancelled. They scheduled and eventually met with Sheryl Vacca, the Senior Vice President and Chief Compliance and Audit Officer from the UC Office of the President. Vacca was the lead in the UC President's Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault. On May 29th, Alejandra, Lexi, and Melissa hosted an open forum with Chancellor Yang, which was part of the stipulations from the agreement they negotiated on May 13th. This forum was advertised on Facebook as an event to learn more about the demands and their implementation, and an opportunity to

discuss other issues of sexual assault since “getting a meeting with the Chancellor had been incredibly difficult.” This public forum was moderated by the three students and was mostly attended by administration and staff, and focused on clarifying the demands and how they would be implemented.

The women involved in the sit-in, Alejandra, Melissa, and Lexi, later formed a group called nowUCsb. The name of this group was originally used as a hashtag before, during, and after the sit-in. Although nowUCsb was not affiliated with the campus, it did facilitate network and collective identity formation among survivor activists and activists at UC Santa Barbara. This group united undergraduate and graduate students passionate about addressing sexual violence and were able to push the university to address the demands made on May 13th for a couple years. University affiliated groups were important in the campaigns directed and organized by nowUCsb at UC Santa Barbara, particularly Take Back the Night. Alejandra and Lexi met while being members of Take Back the Night during the 2014-2015 academic year. This organization fostered a safe space around issues of sexual violence, particularly for survivors. Lexi described Take Back the Night as a “second family” and “people who get it.”⁴⁴ When I asked her what she meant by this she responded:

“They understand what it’s like to be a survivor. There’s not a lot of people – I mean now it’s different, but here in Mission Viejo, I can talk to my family which is really lucky, but they don’t totally understand it. And so if I’m having a weird moment, I can just talk to people from Take Back the Night or Melissa and know that they understand. They’re not going to judge what I’m about to say and they’re not going to feel awkward.”

Organizations like Take Back the Night and nowUCsb provided survivors a space to connect with other survivors who understood what it was like to experience sexual violence, the consequences, and the healing process. It also provided opportunities for non-survivors who wanted to advocate and create change around this issue to take action. Take Back the Night

was not the only organization with connections to nowUCsb. Members of nowUCsb were also members or had close ties to students in other UC Santa Barbara student groups such as the Graduate Student Association and the A.S. Government. nowUCsb members' ties to campus organizations were important as it helped facilitate the formation of solidarity across groups and gave nowUCsb access to resources to host events on campus. The formation of this group and analysis of the demands will be discussed in chapter six.

Students who were not a part of nowUCsb were involved in groups outside the university as well. Lacy, who attended UC Santa Barbara from 2014 to 2016 before transferring to another school, was involved in the UCSA. Through this work Lacy was able to form a social media group connecting students across the UCs:

“I did a workshop at UCSA Congress on the issue of sexual violence policies in the UCs. We got a lot of good feedback so I tried to make a discussion group and you got a lot of people talking about workshops so I created a Facebook group for all of those who were in the room and they all added their friends. So we had a small UC activist group going on that's UC wide so you definitely see people posting there asking for opinions and to share. And it makes it easier to blast things out, like, “Hi. Can more people sign on to this letter? Here it is.”

This Facebook group was called the UC Sexual Assault Advocacy and Awareness Organizers and it was comprised mainly of non-UC Santa Barbara students. This group enabled some UC activists to connect and share the work they were engaging in locally. Although some UC Santa Barbara students had connections to students on other UCs and universities, a lot of the work done by student activists focused on Isla Vista and the campus community.

During the 2015 summer, sexual violence continued to be addressed by several different groups in the Santa Barbara community. The UCSA focused on addressing sexual violence and through UC Santa Barbara students it was able to push for changes. During the

July UC Regents meeting, Cat Pham, a UC Santa Barbara undergraduate was chosen to speak in front of the Regents to advocate for continued sexual violence policy reform. In August, Mohsin Mirza, the A.S. Students External President for Statewide Affairs, was elected as the Undergraduate Committee Chair for the UCSA and would be implementing UCSA campaigns and addressing issues undergraduates were facing. Sexual assault and mental health were among the issues he planned to address in this position. At the state level, Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson's bill 186 was passed in September, allowing California's community colleges to discipline students for sexual assaults occurring off campus. This was significant to the Isla Vista community because students from UC Santa Barbara and Santa Barbara Community College often lived together in this area. Leaders in Santa Barbara continued efforts to address crime and the party culture in Isla Vista by developing an ad campaign with the goal of rebranding Isla Vista as a safe place and highlighting improvements to the community such as lighting and increased police presence. These efforts, however, were heavily criticized because they failed to include people from the community and primarily focused on improving the public image of Isla Vista.

The non-official student group, nowUCsb continued their work during fall 2015 to ensure the administration met the demands made during the May sit-in and to advocate for policy reform. On October 19th, nowUCsb hosted a public forum and went over proposed changes to the UC wide sexual violence policy. Alejandra and Tim led the discussion and focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the policy. They were highly critical of the mandated reporter clause and lack of mandatory minimum disciplinary sanctions. They created an electronic document for individuals to suggest changes to the policy draft. Other student groups put on different campaigns to discuss sexual violence, particularly right

before the Halloween parties. The Inter-Fraternity Council hosted a forum on sexual assault and masculinity, local activists focused on promoting consent culture through awareness campaigns, and Take Back the Night held a rally to prevent Halloween harassment and hosted a safe space during Halloween. In December, a former UC Santa Barbara student filed a Title IX lawsuit against the UC Regents for failing to adequately address and investigate her sexual assault in October 2014. It's important to highlight that during fall quarter conservative student groups began making their presence known on campus. Individual members from the libertarian group Young Americans for Liberty (YAL) began writing opinion pieces opposing the campus sexual violence movement on campus and advocating for men's rights.

During the 2016 winter and spring quarters, sexual violence continued to be in the spotlight in the Santa Barbara community. In January, the survivor from the violent gang rape that occurred in February 2014 filed a lawsuit against the UC Regents. The lawsuit described how UC Santa Barbara had been partially responsible for the assault for failing to properly maintain an area of thick foliage on campus where her attack took place and other crimes had previously been reported. It also discussed UCPD's inadequate response to this crime and their failure to reach out to better equipped law enforcement agencies to assist with the investigation. Her assault was described as "the worst case of sexual assault" on the campus. At the time of the lawsuit, there were no suspects, but about two weeks after it was filed, Daniel Chen, a former UC Santa Barbara student was arrested after his DNA taken for an unrelated felony charge matched the DNA from the crime scene. This assault galvanized students to address sexual violence in 2014 and the lawsuit added pressure to the campus to continue its efforts to improve their response to sexual violence.

The administration and staff continued making efforts to discuss sexual violence issues with students. The May 2015 sit-in began conversations between students and administration, which prompted the administration to take the initiative to host monthly meetings with students. The Student Affairs Division initiated these meetings with the goal of “creating and maintaining open and sustained communication on these important issues.”⁴⁵ The first meeting took place on February 3rd and members from select student organizations were invited to join staff from Student Affairs, CARE, Title IX Office, and Judicial Affairs.⁴⁶ These meetings continued every month during the school year and many different issues were discussed including bystander intervention training, improving services in CARE, graduate student issues, and funding for the Survivor Fund. Faculty and staff working in the Sexual Violence Subcommittee under the larger Campus Climate Survey Implementation Committee also worked to prevent and address sexual violence. Members of this subcommittee, which formed in spring 2014 after the Campus Climate Report revealed a high incidence of sexual assaults, submitted a proposal for funding to do research on sexual violence on campus and improve collaborative efforts to be more inclusive of the student community. The proposal was eventually denied and not much came out of the Sexual Violence Subcommittee.⁴⁷

The revised UC Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy went into effect on January 1, 2016. The UC Office of the President continued to address issues of sexual harassment and sexual violence, however, the focus now was on administrators and faculty. This was sparked by a series of high profile sexual harassment cases at UC Berkeley. In March, UC President Janet Napolitano established the Systemwide Peer Review Committee, comprised of 12 members that would review and approve sanctions for all senior university

leaders found to have violated the sexual violence and sexual harassment policy (Napolitano 2016a). President Napolitano also directed all UC Chancellors to make sure all senior leaders take UC's mandatory sexual harassment training by the end of the month. In a separate letter sent in April, Napolitano announced plans to reform processes and procedures for handling cases involving faculty accused of sexual harassment and sexual violence (Napolitano 2016b). In addition to this, The UC President's Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault collaborated with UC Davis and the UCSA to host the UC-Wide Student Peer Education Symposium on Sexual Violence at UC Davis in early April. This event gathered almost 200 students from all the UCs to share peer education best practices, provide students with facilitation toolkits and give students opportunity to network. Students were critical in organizing this event, particularly Sam Alavi, a UC Davis student who was member of the UC-wide Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault Task Force Work Group and a Sexual Violence Prevention Campaign Director at UC Davis. Several other UC students, including Alavi, led several of the workshops and discussions around peer education. Several members of nowUCsb attended this peer education symposium.

Locally on campus, UC Santa Barbara students extended their efforts of bringing awareness and educating students on their rights. In the first week of April, nowUCsb organized two events. The first one was a double screening of the documentary *The Hunting Ground* followed by discussions led by nowUCsb members. Counselors and advocates from the campus and community were present, as well as the Dean of Student Life. Prior to the beginning of the second screening of the film, seven white men entered the room holding two signs and stood in the front of room facing the audience. The men, members of YAL,

attempted to engage with Alejandra and other nowUCsb members. At one point, one of the men filmed Alejandra on their phone. During the discussion of the film one of the members of YAL made comments questioning the facts and statistics presented in the film. This counterprotest was the first direct physical campaign against the work of nowUCsb. In February 2016, YAL member, Jason Garshfield had written an opinion piece against the affirmative consent laws saying they were a violation of the rights to privacy and due process.⁴⁸ That same month, YAL announced they had invited Milo Yiannopoulos to come to campus in May. In chapter seven, I discuss the challenges this countermovement at UC Santa Barbara presented to student activists and the movement against sexual violence.

The second event nowUCsb hosted was a Title IX teach-in. With the help of Take Back the Night and the Office of the External Vice President of State Wide Affairs from UC Santa Barbara, student activists were able to organize this event where they discussed the rights and protections given to students through Title IX and the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act. They also described the history of nowUCsb and their work on campus. Two weeks after this event, Alejandra ran for A.S. President and planned to improve mental health services and continue improving sexual violence policies during the upcoming school year. Despite being endorsed by *The Daily Nexus*, Alejandra did not win the A.S. presidency. During this time Alejandra, along with Melissa and Lexi, met with Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson to discuss their activist work and advocate for policy reform for their campus. This resulted in Senator Jackson writing a letter to Chancellor Yang in regards to sexual violence policy reform and the progress of the 13 demands he had signed and agreed to a year before.

To commemorate the one-year anniversary of the sit-in, nowUCsb organized a rally outside the Davidson Library. About 10-15 women stood on the lawn carrying different banners with supportive messages for survivors of sexual violence and others condemning Chancellor Yang and the university. nowUCsb also took the opportunity to highlight how the university had not yet fulfilled all of the demands. Lexi in a newspaper interview said that the demonstration was to “show we won’t be satisfied until every demand they agreed to last year is put into effect” (Yelimeli 2016). Members of YAL also counterprotested this event by holding up pro-due process signs directly in front of nowUCsb members and supporters. A few days after this event, YAL hosted a panel discussion titled “Is there a Rape Epidemic?: Rape Hysteria, Due Process, and Free Speech,” where they disputed the statistics and evidence usually provided in support of sexual violence reform.

In fall 2016, student efforts to address sexual violence decreased. nowUCsb didn’t host any events, but its members attended the two Sexual Violence/Sexual Assault Monthly Meetings hosted by the staff and administration. They continued to engage with administrators and pushed them to continue improving sexual violence policies and resources available to survivors. In October, a group of activists known as the Feminasty Guardians and the Santa Barbara Student Activist Network organized a march through Isla Vista to protest against patriarchy and rape culture in the community. This event was started after, Kat Kepski, an Isla Vista resident and leader of the protest, had encountered a man verbally abusing his girlfriend after she had been sexually assaulted by the man’s best friend while being unconscious (Kepski 2016). One of the speakers for the event, Brittney Rachelle Smith, described why she had attended: “I’m here because I know that I.V. [Isla Vista] is a small community and we’re packed in so tightly and we’re known to be partiers and drinkers

but that is no excuse for this to be normalized in our society. That is no excuse for them to say ‘it’s college, what did you expect?’” (Lee 2016). This march confronted the party and rape culture that is prevalent in the community and tried to bring awareness to this problem.

Although there was not much activist activity in fall 2016, the first part of 2017 would see a kick start in student activism. In early 2017, there were new laws addressing sexual violence that went into effect, including SB 1322 that eliminated the criminal statute of limitations for rape cases and AB 2888 which required people found guilty of sexual assault to get a mandatory prison sentence. This prohibited the granting of probation or suspending a sentence if the person was convicted of rape. This bill was inspired by the Brock Turner case where he was sentenced to six months in prison and three years of probation, but ended up only serving three months in prison. At the UC-wide level there were also changes. Kathleen Salvaty was appointed to be the first UC Systemwide Title IX Director. In this role, Salvaty would lead efforts against sexual violence for the UC system and oversee local Title IX Coordinators to ensure consistency and coordination in implementing policies (UC Office of the President 2017). Students were demanding changes in the Board of Regents, particularly the resignation of UC Regent Norman Pattiz. The UCSA called for the resignation of Pattiz after an audio tape of him asking to hold a woman’s breast during a podcast was made public in November 2016. Despite this and other groups pressuring the regent to resign, this did not occur until February 2018. Betsy DeVos was confirmed as the U.S. Secretary of Education in February 2017, which had far-reaching consequences for the campus movement against sexual violence. Beginning in fall 2017, DeVos started repealing Obama-era Title IX guidelines which weakened many protections for survivors.

At the local level, UC Santa Barbara administrators and staff continued to hold the monthly meetings until February. According to administrators, they had received feedback from students that made them reconsider the monthly meetings and wanted to find a new way to engage with students interested in addressing sexual violence.⁴⁹ Their reason for pausing these meetings may also have been due to student criticism of the meetings and how the school had been addressing sexual violence. In the February meeting after staff updates, Ro'Shawndra, an undergraduate student, began discussing how she had been sexually assaulted in Isla Vista and her case was being mishandled by the police. Later, a graduate student member of nowUCsb, Jenny, described feeling not heard during the meetings and that the monthly meetings were not effective and did not address key student concerns. Staff and administrators felt attacked and got very defensive. In April, administrators announced a new approach to the meetings which would consist of meetings with individual student organizations.⁵⁰ Notably missing from this list was nowUCsb, whose members had been present at all the monthly meetings. I attended the meeting with Womxn's Commission, but I cannot verify if they held meetings with all the student groups they listed.⁵¹

In March 2017, UC Berkeley's school newspaper, *The Daily Californian*, obtained hundreds of documents through a California Public Records Act request that revealed that there had been 113 cases of sexual misconduct across the UC system between 2013 to 2016 (Lee and Ramaiyer 2017). *The Daily Nexus* from UC Santa Barbara obtained these documents as well and wrote a feature story highlighting the six faculty and staff members from UC Santa Barbara who had violated Title IX policy between January 2013 and April 2016 (Garfield, Ortiz, and Rubio 2017). This called attention to how cases of sexual violence were being handled, particularly those involving faculty. During this time, students

accused of violence began fighting back, particularly the investigation process. In March, an incoming freshman from UC Santa Barbara, who had been suspended since August for a video that depicted him threatening to assault a young woman, sued the university to remove his suspension. A month later a judge lifted his suspension and highlighted how the Title IX investigation took longer than the university's 60-business day deadline. There was also an opinion piece discussing men who were wrongfully accused of sexual assault and provided resources for those facing this.⁵²

In April and May 2017, student-led advocacy and activism focused attention on sexual violence on campus. During Sexual Assault Awareness Month, Take Back the Night hosted a number of events that increased awareness of sexual violence and fought against rape culture. These events included a slut walk, rally, march, and bringing to campus The Monument Quilt.⁵³ On May 3rd, students once again galvanized the student community to address sexual assault. Ro'Shawndra, who had attended the February monthly sexual violence staff meeting and discussed her sexual assault in Isla Vista, and Paola de la Cruz, a student leader in A.S. and Isla Vista, along with Alejandra crafted a new set of demands and organized a second sit-in of Chancellor Henry Yang's office. The protests on May 3rd, started in a student meeting with Kathleen Salvaty, the UC Systemwide Title IX Coordinator, who was visiting UC Santa Barbara to "meet important stakeholders involved in Title IX issues, and particularly issues of sexual harassment and sexual violence."⁵⁴ Ro'Shawndra had met Alejandra prior to the 2017 sit-in through a mutual friend. Both had been in contact and it was Alejandra who told Ro'Shawndra about Salvaty's visit and suggested going to the Senate meeting and then the chancellor's office.⁵⁵ Ro'Shawndra gathered a group of about eight students and walked into the meeting with protest signs. In

the meeting, Ro'Shawndra described to Salvaty how she had been drugged and raped in Isla Vista in January. She reported her assault to police, but she was not treated well and her case was mishandled and later dropped by the District Attorney. After the meeting with Salvaty, the group divided, with some students going to the chancellor's office to keep the doors open and the other students rushing to the weekly A.S. Senate meeting where Salvaty would also be present.

During the senate meeting, Ro'Shawndra shared with the A.S. Senators her experience and mistrust of local law enforcement and the campus. She said, "UCSB washed their hands of me just because I was raped in Isla Vista and not on campus" (Lee 2017). Although she had sought out the CARE office that helps survivors on campus, they were not able to help her with the legal aspects of her case.⁵⁶ Ro'Shawndra's case shows the challenges survivors of sexual violence and victims of other crimes face when reporting to law enforcement in Isla Vista, one of the most densely populated communities in the country. Law enforcement jurisdiction in Isla Vista, an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County, is split between UCPD and Santa Barbara Sheriffs' Office (Isla Vista Foot Patrol is part of this). UCPD has operational responsibility and are first responders for crimes occurring on the university campus or university owned and operated properties, while the Sheriff's Office is responsible for crimes in the unincorporated areas. This opens the door for miscommunication and disputes over responsibility between both law enforcement agencies. In addition, there has always been contention when it comes to the school's reporting of crimes particularly those that occur in Isla Vista since a very large percentage of the student population lives there. In fall 2001, UC Santa Barbara extended jurisdiction over student conduct beyond the physical boundaries of the campus. This would include students

accused of physical and sexual abuse, stalking, and hazing. Before this, UC Santa Barbara's disciplinary policies did not apply to students who were accused of committing these offenses. However, the decision of whether to exercise off-campus jurisdiction would rest on a campus committee comprised of administrators, faculty, and students, who would look at several factors in making this decision. Even though UC Santa Barbara has extended jurisdiction, the crimes occurring in Isla Vista tend to not be reported in their annual security reports.⁵⁷

After the A.S. meeting, students then moved to the Chancellor's office for the sit-in. Students sat in the area outside the chancellor's office, halls outside the bathrooms and elevators, and the conference room on the 5th floor of Cheadle Hall. The sit-in lasted about nine hours and students crafted a list of demands. Ro'Shawndra discussed the sit-in during an interview:

“we took some of Ale[jandra]'s old demands and we put them with my demands and then Paola was like reach for the stars cuz I didn't have personal demands at first...[so] I put tuition and a transfer [to another school]...I know now that the university signed the demands so quickly just like the fossil fuels, even though it wasn't quick, because that can't get out of the university...Anytime, anything gets out about sexual assault for a university. It's like a black eye on their campus. So they signed them demands fast as shit because they didn't want this to get out.”

The demands made during the 2017 sit-in combined some of the demands made during the 2015 sit-in. The demands focused on strengthening collaboration among institutions in the community that deal with survivors of sexual violence. Ro'Shawndra added some personal demands including having her tuition debt be paid in full and transfer to another UC campus. Chancellor Yang signed off on the demands in the early hours of May 4th.

Ro'Shawndra believed that the university's quick response and willingness to agree to their demands was mostly related to keeping this out of media and from creating a scandal for the

campus. Two weeks after the sit-in, a town hall was held to discuss the implementation and status of the second sit-in. Quarterly town halls became instituted as part of the demands of the 2017 sit-in. In chapter six I provide more details as to the demands and outcomes of the students' activism. I also discuss students' motivation for engaging in the tactics they used.

Conclusion

The timing and trajectory of the movement against sexual violence differed across both UC campuses. At UC Berkeley, the movement began taking off in spring 2013 and received a lot of institutional support from the undergraduate student government. At UC Santa Barbara, undergraduate efforts began in May/June 2014 and then resurfaced again in April/May 2015. Although students were involved, there was no institutionalized organization giving legitimacy to the issue on campus. The student government passed resolutions addressing sexual assault, but it did not gain traction and support from all student officials within A.S. It is important to note that there were some students running for office in 2014 who wanted to address sexual violence, however, one of the students who won an executive position was accused of sexual assault and ended up resigning from this position. The student government at UC Santa Barbara was not really involved during this time period in addressing sexual violence, until the 2015-2016 school year when several survivor activists won seats in the Senate and executive offices.

The schools used different tactics to bring attention to how their universities had been handling cases of sexual violence. Although students from UC Santa Barbara used similar tactics to those used by UC Berkeley students, such as federal complaints and protests, some of these factors were outside their control. For example, both schools had Title IX complaints filed against them, but the Department of Education only opened an

investigation at UC Berkeley, which gave momentum to the movement there. UC Santa Barbara students used civil disobedience, which proved to be effective on the campus and will be discussed in more detail in chapter six.

The formation of networks was also important for students at UC Santa Barbara. Networks among students in Santa Barbara, however, tended to be local and mostly involved other students from the university and Isla Vista community. Students were involved in school organizations and knew each other from there. Engaging in protest campaigns, such as the sit-ins helped other survivors and students learn about efforts addressing sexual violence and connected them with the activists leading those efforts. For example, one of the results of the 2015 sit-in was the creation of nowUCsb, an informal group of student activists that actively engaged in this issue for over two years and helped facilitate the formation of solidarity. At UC Berkeley, students developed networks among their own student population and they were also part of the IX Network connecting student activists across the country. These social movement communities on both campuses were facilitated by technology, particularly social media sites such as Facebook. In these communities, students were able to share their personal stories and learn about different activist campaigns students were engaging in across other schools. In these spaces, students were able to see their experiences of sexual violence and the mishandling of their cases as endemic across institutions of higher education.

There was an emotional aspect to the formation of these networks. Research on emotions and social movements show that feelings and emotions are involved in many aspects of social movement dynamics, including emergence and recruitment (Goodwin, Jasper, and Polleta 2001, 2007; Jasper 1998; Taylor 1996; Whittier 2001, 2009, 2012, 2017).

Framing or the creation of meaning within movements is very important. Framing helps explain how individuals within movements assign and interpret relevant conditions and events in ways that mobilizes supporters, gets support from non-followers, and demobilizes opponents (Snow and Benford 1988). Schrock, Holden, and Reid (2004) developed the concept of “emotional resonance” to help understand the role of emotions in frame resonance. They defined it as “the *link* between targeted recruits’ emotional lives and the emotional messages encoded in social movement organization framing” (62). The emotional resonance of movement frames can enhance the emotional receptivity of people outside the movement (Cadena-Roa 2005).

Survivors of sexual violence often spoke out about their personal experiences of sexual violence and the difficulties they experienced reporting it to their schools. This campus movement began to emerge and grow after students started disclosing their experiences, thus giving others the courage to come forward and do the same. Student activists in the movement against campus sexual violence created emotional resonance with other students through a process I call “collective trauma resonance” which is the empathy and emotional connection shared among a group of people who have gone through a similar traumatic experience. This resonance happened when activists publically shared their experiences of sexual violence and non-movement participants identified with their struggles and experiences. This process could apply to different traumatic experiences, but in the case of this movement it was sexual violence. In this movement, collective trauma resonance was experienced on at least two levels. First, in having experienced sexual violence while being college students, and second, in the difficulties and distressing experiences they shared in reporting their assaults to their university.

Collective trauma resonance facilitated collective identity formation and was a result of the emotional labor activist survivors engaged in (Whittier 2001). In her work on the movement against child sexual abuse, Whittier (2001, 2009) discussed how displaying emotions of trauma can evoke empathy and acceptance of those emotions by people outside of the movement. Whittier (2001) writes, “Open display of the emotions of trauma can evoke similar feelings in others as they are reminded of their own experiences or feel that it is acceptable to express such feelings. They also evoke a feeling of anger (activists talk about how it is sometimes easier to feel angry about someone else’s mistreatment than one’s own), a sense of not being alone that includes feeling connected to others, supported, and “safe,” the absence of fear, and relief of shame (“I’m not the only one who experienced this, therefore it’s not my fault”)” (p. 240). Student activists from both campuses disclosed their experiences of sexual violence and mistreatment by their university through many different tactics, but they had the similar effect of evoking collective trauma resonance among other students. Collective trauma resonance was coupled with other emotional factors known to influence social movements, such as moral shocks, collective identity, and injustice frames (Jasper 1998), which helped the movement garner wider support. The emotional labor (Hochschild 1983) the activists in this movement did was not unique; emotional labor has been used by activists in other movements (Gould 2009; Groves 1997; Jasper 1997; Reger 2004; Whittier 2001). In chapter seven, I will discuss the difficulties activists experienced while engaging in this emotional labor and how this affected the movement.

There were two school and community factors that influenced the trajectory of the movement at UC Santa Barbara. The first one was the campus party culture where the prevalence of sexual violence and rape culture has been normalized and somewhat accepted

as part of this party culture. The normalization of sexual violence and acceptance of it as part of the culture has probably deterred survivors from coming forward and shifted the blame on them when they did come forward. UC Berkeley has a party scene centered around the Greek system, but it is not the dominant image of the campus nor what it is known for. While at UC Santa Barbara, the party culture is what the school is widely-known for and the party scene extends beyond the Greek system to larger areas of Isla Vista and often involves a larger number of students. The high incidence of sexual violence on the campus has been well-documented and the campus has had resources in place for survivors for several years. In chapter six I will discuss how UC Santa Barbara had more resources for survivors of sexual violence than UC Berkeley and how this affected the demands made by survivors and the timing of the movement.

The second factor was the local events that influenced resources and discussions around sexual violence. In February 2014, a gang rape on campus mobilized students into action and administration to increase resources to offices that handle cases of sexual violence. The “Deltopia riots” in April and the shooting in May of 2014 shifted the school and community’s attention and priorities from sexual violence to broader issues of safety. Sexual violence was addressed indirectly through the increase of resources to Isla Vista and the improvement of safety in the community. The infusion of resources to counseling may have also had a delaying effect on the development of the movement there.

In chapters five and six, I extend the discussion on resources and policy changes by focusing on the tactics and demands of the students on each campus. The students’ demands varied according to the resources and implementation of policies on each campus.

Chapter 5: UC Berkeley's Conventional Repertoire of Contention

Introduction

The movement against sexual violence across the country aimed to improve the policies, rights, and resources available to survivors. Many different strategies and tactics were used by activists and were shared across informal networks formed among them and through media coverage. The tactics used by protest groups has implications for movement success and is dependent on the novelty, militancy, variety, size, and cultural resonance of the tactics (Taylor and Van Dyke 2007). Social movements are seen as a series of political campaigns and strategies that connects protesters, their targets, and the wider public through performances that are called repertoires (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001; Tilly 2004, 2008; Tilly and Tarrow 2007). These repertoires of contention make up the recurrent, predictable, and narrow “toolkit” of protest tactics that are available and used by collective actors to express their claims and interests to their targets (Beckwith 2000; della Porta and Diani 1999; McAdam and Snow 1997; Mueller 1999; Taylor 1996; Tilly 2008). Tactical repertoires are important because of their three key features: it involves *contestation* in which bodies, symbols, identities, practices, and discourses are used to create or prevent changes; they are *intentional* and strategic; and they mobilize supporters through the construction of *collective identity* (Taylor and Van Dyke 2007; Taylor, Kimport, Van Dyke, and Andersen 2009). A key tactic of the repertoire of contention of the campus anti-sexual assault movement has been Title IX and Clery Act complaints. Although many activists across hundreds of schools resorted to these tactics, many other tactics were used as well. For example, students at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara used different tactics, such as sit-ins and demonstrations in addition to Title IX and Clery Act complaints to demand

change by the university in how they handled cases of sexual violence and in making the issue a priority on campus.

In chapters five and six I discuss the demands and tactics used by activists at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. The main goal of these chapters is to explore the factors that influenced the students' tactical repertoire and demands on each campus, the organizations that facilitated collective action, and their reasons for selecting the tactics they used. I focus on the different demands students on each campus made, which highlights the discrepancy in policies and resources across UC campuses. I then discuss the different tactics used by each campus and the reasons behind using them. This reveals the influence of local campus politics and policies in the selection of tactics and demands, as well as the critical role the racial and class background of students on each campus had in the tactical repertoire used. I end each section by discussing the broad outcomes of the activism on both campuses. I discuss the outcomes of their demands and changes they wanted. Although, I cannot ascertain direct causality of the outcomes to the activist work of the students, the work they did played a critical role in the revision of policies and procedures and improvement of services on their campus and across other UCs. In this chapter I focus on UC Berkeley and how its early emergence in the protest cycle of this movement, mass media, and connections to a national network of activists was influential in their use of a more conventional repertoire of contention.

UC Berkeley

Demands and Targets

The actions taken by activists at UC Berkeley centered on the broad goal of systemic and cultural change. Their main focus was on improving policy and resources to survivors of

sexual violence and getting justice for past mishandlings of sexual violence cases. They targeted the school, administrators, policy-makers, and students. Part of their work in creating cultural change involved educational campaigns targeting students that emphasized consent and peer education, bystander intervention training, awareness of sexual assault, and the rights guaranteed to survivors in federal policies. In this section I will focus on the policy changes and resources students were demanding.

Students at UC Berkeley wanted to change the school's policies and improve the rights and resources available to survivors. Their critiques of the university and demands were clearly outlined in the ASUC's Senate Bill 130 passed on April 3, 2013. In this bill, the ASUC declared it had "no confidence in UC Berkeley's disciplinary policies regarding sexual assault" (Butler et al. 2013). The authors of the bill, Aryle Butler, Anais LaVoie, Senator Klein Lieu, Senator Megan Majd, and Senator DeeJay Pepito, meticulously described how different policies that addressed sexual violence and sexual harassment restricted the rights and resources of survivors.⁵⁸ In this section I focus on this bill and describe the challenges policies presented to survivors at the time. As discussed in Chapter three, Aryle and Anais were two of the complainants in the Title IX and Clery Act complaints filed along with several other students and were connected to other student activists at the time and the informal network that formed at UC Berkeley. The critiques and changes they recommended were for the most part the changes students in the federal complaints and in the ASUC wanted the campus to make.

In the Berkeley Campus Code of Student Conduct, the authors of the bill described how policies and procedures regarding sexual assault were vague and fell under a broader range of conduct issues including plagiarism and criminal behavior. They pointed out how

the Title IX office held a lot of discretionary power. It was the Title IX office that decided if cases of sexual assault and sexual harassment made it to the Center for Student Conduct. Officers in the office could seek early resolution and not a formal disciplinary hearing and thus “effectively designating the Title IX Compliance Officer as a judge in a case before all evidence and testimony is collected or reviewed” (Butler et al. 2013). The Berkeley Campus Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment had similar problems: “disciplinary bodies are not similarly mandated to respect the requests of survivors as to how a case they report will be considered...any protections for survivors are provided at the discretion of the investigator, only if and when a formal investigation is launched” (Butler et al. 2013).

Students highlighted how the Berkeley Campus Code of Conduct provided those accused of sexual violence with more rights and these were clearer in the policy. If disciplinary action was taken by the Center for Student Conduct but there was not sufficient evidence for further investigation, there was no appeals process for the survivor to challenge this (Butler et al. 2013). The Center for Student Conduct provided a flowchart of the disciplinary process for the students accused of sexual violence and allowed them to challenge decisions by requesting an administrative hearing (Butler et al. 2013). For survivors, there was no mention of the rights they have during the reporting and review process, and no information on the disciplinary process after a report is submitted (Butler et al. 2013). Authors of the bill also called attention to the decrease in disciplinary actions after students graduate.

Students also criticized the Berkeley Campus Student Policy and Procedures Regarding Sexual Assault and Rape for feminizing sexual trauma and silencing survivors.

The policy's definition for "unlawful sexual intercourse" put the burden on survivors to prove they were not consenting and if individuals were too impaired to freely consent to sexual activities, one or both of the people involved could be charged with violating the policy (Butler et al. 2013). There were no confidential services to survivor at the time so any reports made to any office that provided services to survivors with the exception of UCPD, were reported to the Title IX office for investigation. This created problems for survivors who may not have wanted to report their assault and restricted the resources available to them. In the bill of no confidence students also made a list of seven recommendations for changing policies: modify the definition of consent to one that does not blame the survivor nor puts the burden of proof on them; ending the discretionary and concentration of power of the Title IX office by including representatives from other offices on campus; to expand the duties of the Title IX Officer to include annual publication of sexual assaults reported to the office and the disciplinary actions it took, and a map showing the location of sexual assaults; allow survivors to request a formal hearing of their cases; be able to request representation from the Student Advocate's Office in all proceedings related to their case; an appeals process for survivors who were dissatisfied with the handling of their reports; and a disciplinary process for former students where were accused of sexual violence and had graduated or left the university before their cases had been resolved (Butler et al. 2013).

Policies at UC Berkeley were not very clear on the rights and procedures for survivors and at times punished them. Unlike UC Santa Barbara, UC Berkeley did not have a centralized office dedicated to issues of sexual violence. Students were often referred to the Gender Equity Resource Center, a center that provides the campus community resources and education related to gender and sexuality and sexual violence. The Center provided

explanations of rape and sexual assault, and information on what to do if students or someone they knew had been sexually assaulted. It encouraged people to get medical attention and to “report the assault to police and university officials, whether or not [they] plan[ned] to file charges.”⁵⁹ The services they did provide were very limited. The Center referred students to Social Services for counseling and confidential services. For services focused on sexual assault, they would be referred to the local rape crisis center, Bay Area Women Against Rape (BAWAR), located in Oakland about 5 miles away from campus.

The lack of a centralized location that provided confidential services and resources to survivors was very difficult for them. Students reported being advocates and counselors when their friends or other students were sexually assaulted. Several of the student activists I interviewed were very open on the hardships this created for them. Aryle, a UC Berkeley student from 2012 to 2015, discussed in an interview how she would help survivors with the reporting process through an informal resource network formed by students. Lucy, who attended UC Berkeley from 2012 to 2016, described in an interview how she had served as an unofficial advocate for survivors of sexual violence:

“I kind of became the point person for anyone who had been assaulted to come to. So it kind of turned into just my apartment was a place where everybody stayed after they were assaulted. I took everybody to the hospital and tried to get them counseling and tried to work with the Tang Center counseling office to get them support, which never worked. It was horrible!... I would be walking to class and I was the visible face of campus sexual violence and people would stop me that I had no idea who they were and [they would] just tell me “Oh, I’ve been assaulted, oh I’ve been assaulted, I’ve been assaulted.” And I’d have to – of course I was happy to do it, but [I’d] take them to the Tang center and find aid or get them campus support. And this is pre-campus advocates office days, but I was kind of the go to person for that. Where all these random people who I had no idea who they were would stop me on my way to a midterm and then I’d miss the midterm and be like “sorry Prof. I had to deal with this.”

UC Berkeley's lack of adequate resources for survivors of sexual violence pushed students to do the work among themselves and help each other out through traumatic experiences. Many times these individuals were survivors themselves and did not have the proper training to help others and themselves after dealing with this. Students organized among themselves to support each other when the university failed to do so. This kind of work by students probably continued until early 2015 when the university began providing the services of a confidential care advocate.⁶⁰

Outside of advocating for policy changes and increasing resources and rights to survivors, many of the students I interviewed focused on changing the campus culture. Students wanted a safer campus and increased awareness of sexual violence and consent. Students worked on their own and as part of different groups on campus to address this. They engaged in several different campaigns to educate the student body on consent and bystander education, and showed support and solidarity with survivors of sexual violence. Some students in particular worked to highlight the silence and cover up of sexual violence by the university. In the next section I discuss the different tactics activists at UC Berkeley used and why they used them to change the school's policies and improve resources to survivors.

Tactics

UC Berkeley students used a range of different tactics to create cultural and systemic change on campus. They did not limit their actions to their campus; they engaged with local, state, and national political stakeholders to increase pressure on the campus to change. Their tactics ranged from conventional tactics such as lobbying, to more confrontational tactics such as protesting a panel in a national conference and publicly naming and shaming rapists.

I will focus on the different tactics used by students to enact policy changes and help change the culture of the campus. I discuss the different tactics, resources that helped them with the different campaigns, and why they decided to use those tactics.

The majority of students I interviewed stated that changing the school's policies regarding sexual violence as one of their main goals and reasons for getting involved in this movement. Several different tactics were used to create pressure for the school to change its policies and improve the services and rights afforded to survivors of sexual violence. Most of the students I interviewed used tactics that were more conventional and non-confrontational and focused on pressuring the school to change, such as lawsuits and Title IX and Clery Act complaints. Students used tactics to create pressure for the school within the campus and also outside of it and most of this was through legal and institutionalized means.

UC Berkeley students used lobbying and worked with political stakeholders at different levels of government. One of the first tactics they used was working with the undergraduate student government, the ASUC, to write the bill of no confidence in UC Berkeley's disciplinary policies and procedures regarding sexual assault cases that was passed by the ASUC Senate in April 2013. The bill specifically targeted the Center for Student Conduct and the Title IX Compliance Office and one of its officers, Denise Oldham. The purpose of the bill was to publicly discuss the negative experiences survivors had when reporting to the Title IX office and to involve the student government in a "public inquiry" of their experiences (interview with Anais). This bill started the conversation around the problems with sexual violence policies at the time and set forth recommendations on how to improve them. In addition to involving a powerful organization on campus on this issue,

going through the ASUC to make the survivors' experiences public gave legitimacy to the issue and served to get the attention of the campus community. Aryle discussed in an interview why she and other students wanted to get the student government involved in how the school had been handling cases of sexual violence.⁶¹ She said:

“So really it was an opportunity for us. We thought of it [as] an amplification tactic. So we had done most of our organizing through one-on-one conversations with women who had really bad experiences and the bill was a way to change it to a systemic conversation and say this isn't just individual experiences with this office, but this is a pattern of many survivors coming forward and not being treated like they should. So if we could get press attention or student government attention to that issue, we thought we would be more successful in pushing the Title IX office to make changes.”

Aryle called the student government's involvement on this issue an “amplification tactic” and served as a way to get the media and school's attention. This helped put pressure on the university to begin addressing this issue. As the flagship campus of the UC system, Berkeley cannot afford any negative publicity that might damage its reputation and image. Involving the ASUC on this issue was critical and helped institutionalize it. The ASUC President during the 2013-2014 school year, DeeJay Pepito, created the President's Sexual Assault Task Force that was later renamed to the Sexual Assault Commission.⁶² Through this group, the student activists were able to get access to many resources such as an organizational structure and human resources. It gave legitimacy to the grievances presented by survivors and provided material resources to campaigns that would help change the culture of the campus. The ASUC had consent campaigns and workshops to educate students on the rights available to survivors and awareness of sexual assault. As discussed in chapter three, one of the most important resources it gave the movement at UC Berkeley was the development of networks among survivors, activists, and allies. It helped centralize activists on this issue in one group and it connected survivors to efforts by other activists.

Involvement of the ASUC early in the movement provided resources that allowed students to use other tactics.

UC Berkeley activists also worked with government officials outside the university. They also used lobbying to create policy change at the state and national level. UC Berkeley students targeted different elected officials, including U.S. Congress members, California state legislators, and UC Regents. Students provided testimony during hearings, participated in press conferences and meetings, and provided comments to proposed legislation. The students' work with state lawmakers was critical in pressuring not only UC Berkeley, but the UC system as a whole to address this issue. It also pushed state lawmakers to propose legislation addressing sexual violence and to question how the UC system was tackling this issue. A key bill UC Berkeley students lobbied for was SB 967, the affirmative consent bill that was signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown in September 2014.

The tactics that garnered the most media attention were the federal complaints filed against the university. In May 2013, nine UC Berkeley students filed a Clery Act complaint in coordination with other college and university campuses. Nine months later, 31 current and former students filed Title IX and Clery Act complaints against the university. Through these complaints, students detailed the different ways in which UC Berkeley had violated the Clery Act and the Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights, and their failure to comply with Title IX, particularly failing to adequately respond to reports of sexual assault on campus. I interviewed seven of the women who participated in the Title IX and Clery Act complaints. They cited different reasons for participating in the complaints. Aryle, Anais, Iman, and Hannah joined the complaints because the university had been violating the law and the many problems they or their friends encountered while reporting cases of sexual

violence to the school. Iman, an African American, working/middle class woman, described why she was a part of this complaint:

“I realized how invasive the reporting process was at my school and how protective it was of the assailant. And I felt like I needed to say something, do something so people would realize that this is happening and it didn’t have to be on a small scale. And so I felt that was the best way to get involved [file Title IX and Clery Act complaints].”

Other students, such as Lucy and Sofie, wanted UC Berkeley to be held responsible for their actions. Sofie, a white, middle-upper class woman who was the lead organizer of the complaints, described her reasons for filing the federal complaints:

“We wanted to have something done about how they were sweeping sexual assault under the rug and that it was [an] extremely pervasive culture. I felt like this was morally wrong and that they should be held accountable for their inaction. And when it became increasingly clear how systemic it was, just the gravity of the situation became clearer and clearer, where it was just like, oh my God! They are just covering [up] rape. Something has to be done about this, like they had been able to count on the silence of survivors and people not being connected to one another. But now, we’re starting to share our stories with each other about what we’ve experience or why we didn’t come forward, or just a variety of experiences that people had that we’re just painting – a much fuller picture of what is going on. And once it became clear like, oh, they just don’t care, like they don’t. They’re actually sweeping this under the rug and have no interest in protecting us. That just made me furious. So that was the motivation for wanting to file that complaint. This cannot continue.”

In an interview, Sofie described the federal complaints as a form of protest/activism and a way to fight the culture of silence and the dismissal of sexual violence. Nicoletta, a white upper-middle class woman, who also participated in the federal complaints discussed in an interview how she wanted to target the school and get their attention. She felt that “some official sanction would have been necessary to make the school respond in a meaningful way to what was going on.” This tactic was effective on two levels, first, it led the federal government to examine the policies and practices, which later led to a full investigation, and second, it created negative publicity for the university in a time where campus sexual

violence was increasingly being discussed and was becoming a national issue. The student activists were very intentional with their use of media as a tool for public shaming and to generate negative publicity for the school. This was done through press conferences and op-eds in various different newspapers. Given the prestige of UC Berkeley, the media was quick to publish cases and stories of the mishandling of cases. The media served as a source of power for student activists at UC Berkeley, and one they knew how to navigate and use to amplify their voices and generate pressure for the campus to change.

The filing of these complaints was facilitated by several factors. The networks formed within the campus allowed students to connect with one another and share their stories. The ASUC was a key resource in the filing of the federal complaints. The Sexual Assault Task Force within the ASUC allowed movement participants to recruit people for the complaints and helped expand the network that was forming among activists and survivors. Outside the campus, the IX Network was critical to UC Berkeley students filing the federal complaints. It was through people in this network that they learned what the Clery Act and Title IX were and how they were being used by other colleges and universities to force their schools to improve policies and resources for survivors. The ASUC and the IX Network served the critical function of fomenting collective identity among survivor activists within the campus and to those on other campuses.

Three of the students involved in the federal complaints filed a civil lawsuit against UC Berkeley in June 2015. In the lawsuit, Aryle, Sofie, and Nicoletta, accused the university of failing to train, educate, and protect students from the risk of sexual violence and gender-based discrimination. In an interview, Nicoletta discussed the reasons for filing a lawsuit against the university.

“I think the motivation behind it was that okay, we've been trying to make this stuff public. There's been sort of like public forums with administrators about this issue and there's this Title IX complaint that is still under investigation, but it's taken years to resolve. And at most they'll get a small financial penalty. So I think it was just frustration that nothing we were doing was really going to make a difference. So we thought that the lawsuit would be a way to actually bring the issue into the public and make Berkeley administrators care about the issue.”

The lawsuit was intended to continue the pressure on UC Berkeley to change how it was handling sexual violence and it came two years after the vote of no confidence by the ASUC Senate. Nicoletta described this lawsuit as a continued effort to create change and discussed how she and the other activists were becoming frustrated by the lack of change despite the many actions they had taken already. Many of the students I interviewed described feeling frustrated due to the university's inaction on the issue and making changes that were not directly addressing the problems survivors were experiencing when reporting their cases of sexual violence.

Another student I interviewed filed a lawsuit against another university for how they responded to her case of sexual violence. Aarefah, a Pakistani, Arab, and Persian middle-class woman, who transferred to UC Berkeley in Fall 2014, filed a lawsuit against Mt. San Antonio College, a community college in Southern California she attended prior to transferring to UC Berkeley. She and another student from the college filed the lawsuit against the school and other individuals for damages and violations of their civil rights. Aarefah filed this lawsuit with the help of BAMN, the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration and Immigrant Rights and Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary. This leftist and militant group based in California and Michigan focuses on several issues and tends to use confrontational tactics, such as occupying buildings, and litigation to achieve its goals. In addition to the lawsuit, Aarefah and BAMN organized several rallies,

used social media to tell her story and gain supporters, and used a tactic she called “name the rapist,” where survivors name and expose the person who had sexually assaulted them. This tactic consisted of a photo of the perpetrator, their name, and what they are accused of doing through flyers and public testimony (Interview with Aarefah). In the interview, Aarefah discussed the tactics she and BAMN used for her case:

“The main tactic is to name the rapist and their college administrators that have been covering up for them. We’ve seen with a lot of other organizations [that they are] reluctant to name the assailant because they are afraid of you know some kind of backlash, but BAMN is not afraid of that [laughs]. And it's basically to not be afraid of speaking the truth, that was our main tactic. And to really not give these people any room to get away with what they've done and just exposing them to the fullest extent as possible.”

The tactics that Aarefah and BAMN used were more confrontational and aimed at keeping her perpetrator off campus and the administration at Mt. San Antonio College from covering up sexual violence. Aarefah’s activist work against Mt. San Antonio College continued while she was at UC Berkeley, where there is a strong BAMN chapter. Aarefah discussed her experience of sexual assault at a Take Back the Night rally sponsored by the campus in 2015, where she met other survivors who wanted justice in their cases. One student was Stephanie Nicole Garcia, a Latina UC Berkeley student at the time who had been sexually assaulted by another Berkeley student. Her perpetrator was expelled after violating a “no contact” order, but was granted several appeal hearings to fight back his expulsion. Although Aarefah’s activist work was not against UC Berkeley, it influenced Stephanie’s activism which centered on the university enforcing its policies on sexual violence. Aarefah and BAMN supported Stephanie throughout her fight to keep her perpetrator off UC Berkeley and included a lot of different tactics: petitions, rallies, and publicly naming perpetrators of sexual violence.

In November 2015, BAMN hosted a tribunal on “naming your rapist and building movement to win justice (BAMN 2015). Stephanie, Aarefah and other people spoke about their cases and reasons for publicly naming their perpetrators during the tribunal. Stephanie discussed some of the reasons she decided to go public with her case and name her rapist:

“Most importantly I did it for my autonomy and my agency. I felt like the university and the police were taking my life into their own hands and construing it how they wanted it to be...And by going public and by putting this person’s name – exposing their name and putting their picture and putting it all around campus, I’m able to get justice for myself. What looks like justice for myself, even if it has to be revolutionary...It’s a way for me to take back my power, the power that I lost that night, that morning. That he could take the day, but I’m going to take back the night. It’s a way for me to reclaim this and reclaim myself...I also did this because I want to reverse the stigma on rapists because the person, the victim is stigmatized and I didn’t want that. I lost a whole social circle, people were looking at me differently, people weren’t speaking to me, and he’s the one that needs to be stigmatized because he’s out here dehumanizing and raping people, hurting people...It’s also to make an example...to deter them and to deter anybody else from thinking that they can take advantage of somebody’s body. And let them know, this is what’s going to happen; a witch hunt is going to happen. Your face is going to be all over this campus...In a more legal sense, it’s also to put pressure on the university so that they follow through with what they say. They agree with me, they agreed that this person did wrong, and they spoke to two administrations. They spoke to the investigation department and the center for student conduct, which runs this whole school. Both of them agreed, yes, he did this, and he spoke to both of them. And they both agreed, he should be dismissed. So I just need them to follow through. But you know the university and the way the game goes. By me doing this and having all of you support me and come to support me on the hearing, there’s no way they can say no or be like “ehhhh, I don’t think we want to do dismissal anymore” or “I don’t think he’s guilty anymore” (BAMN 2015).

By going public with her case and perpetrator, Stephanie was able to put pressure on the university, address the cultural stigma around sexual violence, and get a personal sense of justice. She also cited lack of enforcement of Title IX procedures as part of the reason she decided to work with BAMN and engage with these tactics. The involvement of BAMN in Aarefah’s and Stephanie’s cases provided material and human resources for their fight against UC Berkeley and Mt. San Antonio College. Aarefah’s work at her community

college influenced the activist work done in Stephanie's case. Most of their work took place in 2015-2016 which was at the height of the campus anti-sexual violence movement at UC Berkeley. They used both confrontational and non-confrontational tactics. Their tactic of naming the rapist was deemed to be "more impactful" by Aarefah (interview), but at UC Berkeley, many students shunned their work because they viewed this tactic as controversial. During fieldwork, I spoke to an activist who was a part of the ASUC Sexual Assault Commission, who called their tactic of going into classrooms and passing out fliers with the photo of Stephanie's perpetrator "triggering" and "problematic."

Policy changes were aimed at changing how the university addressed sexual violence. The policy changes were also a part of a wider goal of the students I interviewed, which was changing the culture of silence and shaming around sexual violence. One of the big changes student activists wanted was a cultural change in how sexual assault survivors were treated and seen by the university and community. The policy and legislative changes were part of changing the culture on campus, but student activists also relied on other tactics in order to accomplish this such as writing blogs, posting on social media, circulating petitions, creating consent and know your rights campaigns, participating in documentaries, writing op-eds, and participating in numerous media interviews. Educational and awareness campaigns have been critical to the movement at UC Berkeley. This educational component included learning about what sexual violence is and its prevalence, how to support survivors, consent and bystander education, and creating a safe space for survivors.

Some of these tactics were done through student organizations and were partly funded by them. Student activists did work under several organizations and groups: ASUC President Sexual Assault Task Force (later changed name to Sexual Assault Commission

and then Sexual Violence Commission), CalSERVE, ASUC Senate, Greeks Against Sexual Assault, End Rape on Campus, BAMN, and the Gender Equity Resource Center. Some students did not organize under a specific group, but being involved in student organizations such as the Cal Berkeley Democrats and the Sexual Violence Commission facilitated the formation of an informal network of survivors who shared similar grievances in reporting to the university. These groups provided resources for them to engage in a wide range of tactics in order to change policies, laws, and the culture.

One organization that was solely focused on raising awareness about sexual assault and creating a culture of consent was Greeks Against Sexual Assault. This organization focused on peer-education within the Greek system at Berkeley. Andrew, an Asian Pacific Islander, White, and Native Hawaiian, middle-class student leader in the group helped train peer educators and helped organize 20-30 presentations a semester on consent and sexual violence. The Sexual Violence Commission and the offices of individual senators and executive officers did a lot of critical work under the ASUC.

Senators in the ASUC were critical in the work to address sexual violence. Three of the women I interviewed had served one-year senate terms from 2014 to 2017. Lucy, a white middle class ASUC Senator served on several committees and helped hire the first confidential advocate for the campus. Aanchal Chugh, a South Asian Indian, upper middle class senator during the 2015-2016 school year hosted the Sexual Violence Conference, a two-day event focusing on healing and dialogue around sexual violence, particularly addressing all forms of sexual violence that students face and how their experiences differ by identity and background. Aanchal decided to organize this conference in response to the administration's National Conference on Campus Sexual Assault and Violence in 2015

which was largely inaccessible to UC Berkeley students (Chugh 2016). The Sexual Violence Conference was free, organized by students and created for students, and would take place over the weekend. Senator Rosa Kwak, a Korean middle class woman, continued the work Aanchal had done and hosted the second Sexual Violence Conference in 2017, focusing on “strength through healing” and breaking the stigma and silence about sexual violence.

Other students went outside the university to address the rape culture and culture of silence within the university. Several of the students I interviewed participated in the documentary *The Hunting Ground* and were heavily featured in it. Some of the students were also a part of Lady Gaga’s performance of the film’s song, “Til It Happens to You” at the 2016 Academy Awards. This film about sexual assault on college campuses helped propel the issue and movement against sexual violence on university campuses into the national spotlight even further. Sofie, Anais, Aryle, and other students wanted to highlight the history of sexual violence and cover up by the university. In 2013, they created a timeline and presentation of the history of sexual violence from 1894 to 2013.⁶³ In March 2016, after the high-profile sexual harassment allegations against two UC Berkeley professors (Geoffrey Marcy and Sujit Choudhry), Sofie, Jo Wu, and other students created a blog documenting this history of sexual violence. Through this blog, students wanted to: “illuminate [the] many ways in which Berkeley has systematically swept sexual harassment and sexual violence under the rug for more than forty years. Archived articles from *The Daily Californian*, divided by decade, depict how the university has protected its own, silenced survivors, and benefitted from the perpetual resetting of the campus’s institutional memory every four years.”⁶⁴

Students from UC Berkeley engaged in a wide range of tactics to create policy and cultural change on the campus. Their consistent efforts went beyond their time at Berkeley and it helped create significant change on the campus.

Outcomes

In chapter three on the emergence of UC Berkeley's movement against sexual violence and in this chapter, I capture the activism of some of the students involved in this movement. This movement extended beyond their work and new students continued it. Sexual violence continued to be an important topic at UC Berkeley, but its focus shifted. The activists I interviewed and include in these chapters mostly deal with cases of sexual violence among undergraduate students. In fall 2015, graduate students and staff began detailing cases of sexual harassment and violence perpetrated by faculty and staff. Several high profile cases, such as Geoff Marcy, a Professor of Astronomy for sexually harassing female graduate students for several years and Sujit Choudhry, Dean of the Law School for sexual harassing an executive assistant, helped continue the scrutiny and pressure placed on the campus to address sexual violence and how it handles all kinds of cases of sexual violence, not just those occurring among undergraduates. This led to policy review and changes, and substantial increases in funding to offices that handle sexual violence.

There were significant changes in policies and improvements to resources to survivors of sexual violence at UC Berkeley and the entire UC system. Changes in federal laws and regulations, along with student activism helped bring about these changes. In February 2014, Chancellor Dirks started addressing policies and increasing resources to survivors. UC President Janet Napolitano, particularly the task force on sexual harassment and sexual violence she established, updated the UC wide policy on sexual violence in

January 2016 and created system wide changes to create uniformity across all ten UC campuses. The changes made by the task force addressed some of the key demands made by survivors at UC Berkeley. These included clarification of policies through the adoption of a system wide standard investigation and adjudication standards. It also required mandatory education and training for all members of the UC community. There was also the creation of a confidential advocacy office for sexual violence on all UC campuses. This was a big change for UC Berkeley since it did not provide any confidential services to survivors prior to this. The campus hired its first full-time survivor advocate in November 2015 and it developed the PATH to Care Center, which now employs about 10 people. The Title IX office (Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination) increased from one employee in 2014 to eight employees in 2016. The definition of consent was modified. In February 2014, the UC adopted an affirmative consent standard and expanded and clarified its policy on sexual violence and sexual harassment to include date rape, domestic violence, and stalking. This adoption of the affirmative consent standard came before the passage of SB 967 in California, which created an affirmative consent standard, one that required individuals to give affirmative, conscious, and voluntary agreement to engage in sexual activity. This took away the burden on the survivor on whether they consented or not.

Not all of the changes students advocated for happened. Many of the students from UC Berkeley complained about the discretionary power the Title IX office had and reported negative experiences when reporting their case to the Title IX office, particularly Denise Oldham. The Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination investigates all cases of sexual violence and harassment on campus continues to determine whether a formal instigation will be opened. Title IX officers make the initial assessment of reports to

determine whether it is an act of prohibited conduct and whether it's appropriate for the university to intervene. Oldham continues to work in this office.

In March 2014 the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights opened an investigation on UC Berkeley's handling of sexual violence cases. This was a month after 31 current and former students filed a Title IX complaint against the campus. The investigation was completed in February 2018, almost four years after it was opened, and resulted in a 31-page report of its findings (U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights 2018). This review included 128 reports/complaints of sexual violence and harassment from the 2011-2012 to 2013-2014 academic years and 71 reports/complaints filed during the 2014-15 academic year. The Office for Civil Rights investigated found that the university was not in compliance with Title IX requirements between the 2010-2011 and 2013-2014 academic years. Policies and procedures lacked required information and there were issues with the alternative resolution process. Cases through the alternative resolution process were being resolved without the voluntary agreement of complainants or respondents, or they were not notified of the outcomes. The Office for Civil Rights and UC Berkeley reached a resolution agreement where the university would revise system wide policies and procedures and continue to provide and improve sexual harassment and sexual violence training to graduate students, faculty, and staff. The university would also review eight cases of sexual misconduct and continue to be monitored by the Office for Civil Rights.

The activist work of students at UC Berkeley also helped change the culture on the campus around sexual violence. There was less tolerance for sexual violence and increased support and acceptance towards survivors of sexual violence. For example, the high profile sexual harassment cases against faculty and heavy criticism in how the university handled

the cases led to the resignation of several top administrators including Nicholas Dirks as chancellor and Claude Steele as Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. The selection of the successor to Dirks as chancellor of UC Berkeley partly focused on whether the candidate would be able to effectively address sexual harassment and sexual violence on campus. During the Chancellor Search Committee Student Listening Session with UC President Napolitano, William Morrow and Iman Sylvain, the ASUC President and Graduate Assembly Officer respectively, discussed findings from an ongoing student survey on the search for a new chancellor that showed campus sexual violence was one of the top four issues students wanted the new chancellor to focus on during their first few years on campus.⁶⁵ Carol Christ, who became the first female chancellor of the university and successor to Dirks, was lauded for her history of advocating for women's issues, diversity, and Title IX. The activist work of the activists I captured in my research was part of a larger and longer movement at UC Berkeley that went beyond their years at the school and helped create policy and cultural changes on the campus.

Conclusion

Much of the work done by UC Berkeley students was facilitated by organizations. Existing organizations and the creation of organizations to deal with issues of sexual violence were critical resources that facilitated the emergence and maintenance of the movement at UC Berkeley. McCarthy and Zald (1977) have highlighted the importance of social movement organizations and resources in the emergence of social movements. They have shown that resources, organizations, and opportunities are crucial to explaining social movement mobilizations. Many of the activists at UC Berkeley were part of student groups, particularly the ASUC Sexual Violence Commission which was created to address this

specific issue in 2013 and various offices within the ASUC. Student groups provided material and human resources to the work done within the groups, but also outside of them. Some students distrusted the administration and decided to not work in offices such as the Gender Equity Resource Center and the ASUC, so they did anti-sexual violence work outside of the institution. Through involvement in the ASUC, students received access to networks, legitimacy, money, and campus resources which facilitated the movement on campus. The ASUC also facilitated the collective identity formation among survivors on campus. As discussed in chapter three, UC Berkeley was connected to the IX Network, a group comprised of survivors and activists against sexual violence from universities across the nation, which also provided resources to UC Berkeley activists, particularly access to the tactical repertoire of the wider campus movement.

In terms of demands, UC Berkeley students aimed to change the local policies and offices particularly the Title IX Office where many survivors had reported negative experiences with one particular staff member. Their work also centered around getting confidential advocates to help survivors of sexual violence. There wasn't a centralized office dedicated to solely helping survivors and providing confidential services to them. If students were assaulted, they would be referred to the Gender Equity Resource Center, Social Services, or the local rape crisis center five miles away from campus.

A factor that may have affected the demands UC Berkeley students were making was the timing of the movement or when the movement began during the cycle of protest. Sidney Tarrow (1994) developed the concept of cycles of protest to show that protest events occur in normal and cyclical patterns. He defined cycles of protest as "a phase of heightened conflict and contention across the social system" (1994:153). Cycles of protest have three

features: strong expansion of contention across social groups and sectors, transformation of contention (strategies, alliances, etc.), and the contraction of contention (Koopmans 2007). UC Berkeley students started publically organizing in spring 2013, when the campus movement against sexual violence was beginning to gain traction across the country. This may have led to students focusing on broad issues and trying to frame sexual assault as a social problem at UC Berkeley. This began during the first stage of expansion during the cycle of protest.

There were several factors that influenced the tactical repertoire used by activists at UC Berkeley. As mentioned above, the three different stages of protest cycles affect not only the timing and demands of a movement, but also the tactics used. Cycles of protest play a critical role in the expansion and refinement of the repertoire of contention available to movement activists (Tarrow 1997). Disruptive tactics dominate the early stages of a cycle, but over time, as these tactics are repeated, they lose their shock value and begin to take on a ritualized quality (Taylor and Van Dyke 2007). This leads to the increase use of disruptive tactics and sometimes violence over the course of a protest cycle (Taylor and Van Dyke 2007). UC Berkeley students began mobilizing in 2012-2013, they engaged in both conventional and confrontational tactics and did not limit their work to the campus community. They targeted not only students, staff, and administrations, but also state and national policy stakeholders. Over time, as students did not see the changes they wanted, they started resorting to more confrontational tactics and got more people involved in the tactics they were using. For example, they protested a national conference on campus sexual assault and re-issued a federal complaint a year after it was initially filed with over 20 more complainants.

Diffusion processes also played a role in the tactics used by activists. Meyer and Whittier (1994) found that coalition formation and cooperation among social movement groups influences tactical repertoires. Direct network ties facilitate the diffusion of protest tactics (Morris 1981). UC Berkeley had students who were members of the IX Network which impacted the tactics they used. It was through this network that they learned about the Title IX and Clery Act complaints students on other campuses were filing. They also learned how to file their own complaints against UC Berkeley and about other tactics, such as lawsuits and protests. There were connections between UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. Sofie, a UC Berkeley student who was one of the co-founders of End Rape on Campus, helped Myra Crimmel and five other students from UC Santa Barbara to file Title IX and Clery Act complaints. However, these did not lead to investigations by the Department of Education. Indirect ties and media also played a role in the diffusion of tactics. Indirect ties can help with the diffusion of tactics, collective identity, ideology, and symbols (Soule 1997, 2007). In the case of the campus movement, students who formed indirect ties to people on social media and students transferring and moving to different colleges and universities helped the diffusion of tactics.

UC Berkeley's use of legal tactics is significant and is one of the key differences in the tactics used between the two UC schools. Legal decisions can provide interpretative frameworks for defining and shaping everyday social life (Ewick and Silbey 1998; Sewell 1992) and can set precedents and allocate material resources (Bernstein 2003; Ewick and Silbey 1998; McCann 1994). It has structural power that can help construct commonsense understandings of life and how it should be organized (Bernstein, Marshall, and Barclay 2009) and can adapt to changing social and political conditions (Ewick and Silbey 1998;

Sewell 1992). Social movements, through the participation in legal processes, provide an ongoing challenge to make law more responsive to marginalized communities and their needs (Bernstein et al. 2009:8). The successful use of the law by different social movements has been common and well documented (Andersen 2009; Burstein 1991; McCann 1994; Stearns and Almeida 2004; Vanhala 2012). The campus movement against sexual violence drew on legal tactics to work on the interpretation and enforcement of federal laws affecting campus sexual violence and gender discrimination. Although Title IX had been in place for several decades, students' grievances were rooted in its interpretation and lack of enforcement. Student activists worked to have federal laws interpreted in ways that aligned with the lived realities of experiencing and reporting sexual assaults and its effects on the lives and education of survivors. Title IX and Clery Act complaints and lawsuits began as grassroots efforts by women on college and university campuses educating themselves on their rights and then spreading this knowledge to other schools through media and social media networks. My research shows how this legal education, a form of legal mobilization (Katuna and Holzer 2016), helped make knowledge of federal laws more accessible to a wider population of students, but engagement with the law was not equally accessible to all individuals. As will be discussed in the next chapter, Title IX complaints were affected by the political climate and the ethnic and class background of students. White middle-class students were able to engage in legal tactics, while working-class students of color often hesitated and opted to engage in confrontational and non-violent tactics. Research has shown that marginalized groups are often not included in legal institutions and proceedings (Bauman 2002; Halley and Brown 2002; Kelman 1987), which then tends to "recreate the

relationships of power and domination that gave rise to oppression in the first place” (Bernstein et al. 2009:4).

Mass media plays an important role in the diffusion of protest and is important in sustaining collective action (Myers 2000). Mass media has been considered to be an important element of political opportunity in movements targeting the state (Gamson and Meyer 1996; McAdam 1996) and in institutional opportunities targeting corporations (Raeburn 2004). Expanded media access can facilitate collective action (Raeburn 2004). The campus movement against sexual violence has received national attention and has been widely covered by mainstream and local news sources. Baumgartner and McAdon (2017) found not only an increase in news coverage of sexual assaults by *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *USA Today*, from 1980 to 2016, but also a shift in framing. These newspapers shifted from covering “episodic” or single incidents of sexual violence to more “thematic,” addressing cultural settings and social attitudes in 2014. This change in news coverage in 2014 came after “the White House Task Force on Sexual Assault created not only a huge surge of media attention but also a shift toward thematic coverage; that followed (and was likely prompted by) a groundbreaking, multi-outlet 2009 series on campus sexual assault by investigative journalist Kristen Lombardi at the Center for Public Integrity, followed by the development of nationally oriented survivor groups bringing attention to the ubiquity of the issue, not focusing on a particular case” (Baumgartner and McAdon 2017). Several of the students I interviewed at both campuses mentioned doing research on the activism taking place on other campuses. UC Berkeley students learned about the Title IX Network after *The New York Times* published an article in March 2013 on the activist groups and network forming across colleges.⁶⁶ UC Berkeley students contacted the people

mentioned in the article via Facebook and got added to the group on social media. UC Berkeley's connection to the IX Network gave them access to the cultural and tactical repertoires of the wider campus movement against sexual violence, which may have influenced the framing of the issue as mainly a gender discrimination issue, and helped with the formation and sustenance of collective identity among survivor activists. In the next chapter, I will discuss the racial and class differences between activists from UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara in the tactics they used.

Lastly, institutional factors also played a role in the tactical repertoire used by students, particularly the schools' response to protesters and access to administrators. The effects of protest policing on social movements has not produced consistent findings (della Porta and Fillieule 2007; Earl and Soule 2010). There is not a unique causal relationship between protestors and the police as protest tactics influence police tactics through iterative processes (della Porta and Fillieule 2007). Groups exposed to police violence were sometimes radicalized and other times pushed them to retreat from unconventional tactics (Wilson 1977). Literature has also shown that a higher degree of repression has led to the radicalization of participants' behavior (della Porta and Fillieule 2007). Students from UC Berkeley for the most part, did not discuss the use of police against protesters even though there is a history of police brutality and excessive policing on the campus. One student, Aarefah, in an interview discussed how police officers would show up at BAMN's table while passing out flyers and how they had "brutalized" one of their protesters. Another student, Emily, a lower middle-class, mixed race woman, discussed how UCPD was heavily militarized and were present at every protest (interview). She said that the school's "anticipation of protest is to shut it down." This research cannot determine whether this may

have deterred students from engaging in more confrontational tactics. UC Berkeley students, however, consistently discussed how difficult it was to schedule meetings with the chancellor and how inaccessible top administrators were, particularly for students who were not in leadership positions in student government and other organizations.

In the next chapter, I discuss the demands and tactics used by UC Santa Barbara students and highlight key differences between the two campuses.

Chapter 6: UC Santa Barbara's Confrontational Local Tactical Repertoire

Introduction

The wider campus movement against sexual violence developed a distinct repertoire of contention that included Title IX and Clery Act complaints and lawsuits. The movement's distinct use of the federal law and legal tactics were defining features of this movement that diffused across campuses in various ways including news media coverage and development of networks that facilitated collective identity formation. Even though many students used tactics from this repertoire of contention, some were not successful and/or students decided to engage in other tactics. UC Santa Barbara was one example of this. As described in chapter four, UC Santa Barbara students filed Title IX and Clery Act complaints in September 2014, but they did not lead to investigations by the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights. Chapter four also described the students' use of non-violent civil disobedience tactics to successfully get the campus to address sexual violence. Although the repertoire of contention from the campus movement was available to students of UC Santa Barbara, they opted to draw from the confrontational and non-violent tactical repertoire of their campus. There were several factors that affected not only the tactics they used to pursue their objectives, but also the demands they made. These include: campus policies, procedures and resources, local history and politics, timing of the protests, and the racial and class background of the activists.

In this chapter I focus on the demands and tactics used by activists at UC Santa Barbara and describe the factors that influenced their tactical repertoire and demands. In discussing the rationale behind the tactics used by UC Santa Barbara students, I show the significance of the racial and class background of the student activists. The movement at UC

Santa Barbara was predominantly led by working-class women of color whose background influenced their use of sit-ins and the changes they were seeking to make on campus. UC Santa Barbara's mobilization in 2015, two years after it began at UC Berkeley, and institutional factors also influenced the repertoire of contention Santa Barbara student activists drew from. This chapter is divided into three sections: demands and targets, tactics, and outcomes. In the conclusion, I highlight the key findings from this chapter and compare it to the movement at UC Berkeley.

UC Santa Barbara

Demands and Targets

Student activists at UC Santa Barbara who worked on issues of sexual violence had similar broad goals to those of students from UC Berkeley. They wanted cultural and systemic change on campus as well, but their focus for the most part was centered on the campus and the UC system. Some students did lobby to local and national politicians, but students mainly wanted change within the area of UC Santa Barbara. Their targets included administrators, students, survivors of sexual violence, policy-makers, and law enforcement. UC Santa Barbara students wanted policy changes that included standardized sanctions for perpetrators found guilty of sexual violence and increased resources and rights to survivors. Students also sought justice for the mishandling of their cases and change to the culture of the campus, particularly the rape culture endemic to Isla Vista through educational events that focused on consent, rights of survivor, and rape culture. Although not the focus of all the students, activists who organized and led the two sit-ins of Chancellor Henry T. Yang's office outlined a list of demands for changes in which many of the students I interviewed

had worked on. I will describe the demands of each sit-in and then the changes students worked on outside of the sit-ins.

The first sit-in was organized in May 2015 by two Latina, working-class students at the time, Alejandra and Melissa, and later joined by a white, middle-class woman, Lexi. These women outlined a list of thirteen demands that focused on cultural and policy changes. The policy changes included: immediate suspension and a minimum suspension of four quarters (unless survivors have different requests) for perpetrators found guilty, immediate removal of perpetrators from housing and from spaces where the survivor would be present, the creation of an appeals process for survivors, quarterly publication on the number of sexual violence cases taken to the university, the creation of a survivor fund, additional confidential advocates in certain dorms and in Isla Vista, and mandatory training and education for students, faculty, staff, and law enforcement. The training the activists advocated for demonstrated some of the culture changes they were hoping for. They wanted training on consent and healthy relationships for student employees to “promote change of rape culture.” They also requested that police officers in the Isla Vista Foot Patrol to undergo sexual violence and sexual harassment training due to past inappropriate behavior of some officers to female students.⁶⁷ Alejandra, Melissa, and Lexi asked for a space for survivors in Isla Vista during big party events such as Halloween and Deltopia where police would be present. These last demands highlight their focus on changing the rape culture in Isla Vista and providing support during events that are known for high alcohol consumption and the influx of college-aged students from other schools. Three of their demands focused on diversity: increase female presence in Isla Vista Foot Patrol, increase diversity (race, class, gender, sexuality, etc.) within all the offices that deal with sexual violence on campus,

and mandatory cultural sensitivity training to faculty and staff. In addition to this, they wanted the Office of Judicial Affairs to be held accountable for past mishandling of cases. Days after the sit-in, UC Santa Barbara funded a trip for the three students to attend the UC Board of Regents meeting. After the sit-in nowUCsb, a student group unaffiliated with the campus was formed to work on the demands and other issues around sexual violence. This will be discussed in the following section.

The second sit-in of the Chancellor's Office was organized by Ro'Shawndra, a working-class black woman, in May 2017. She had been sexually assaulted in early 2017 and had worked on a list of demands specific to her case in March 2017. During the sit-in she worked with Alejandra, Paola de la Cruz, and other students to revise her demands into the list of fifteen demands presented and later signed by Chancellor Yang. The demands from this sit-in focused mostly on policy and institutional changes and were different from the sit-in that occurred two years earlier. They targeted different entities and called for collaboration across different institutions. The following demands were directed at UC Santa Barbara: the creation and funding of a Survivor Resource Center, improve the psychological services to survivors and their families, include the option for survivors to transfer to other schools, organize a meeting with all UC Chancellors to address the resource needs of each campus, incorporate education on queer and trans communities into reporting and trainings, provide incentives for faculty and students to develop research and courses examining the rape culture of Isla Vista, and update students on the progress of the demands. If inadequate progress was being made or they failed to communicate to students, the administration would have to make donations to the Survivor Fund.

Several of the demands from the 2017 sit-in called on the university to collaborate with the local government and schools to address the mishandling of cases. Students wanted UC Santa Barbara to work with the local government to improve lighting on some roads in Isla Vista and to evaluate local law enforcement agencies and government institutions in how they handle sexual violence and the educational programs they provide to the community. They also requested UCPD, Isla Vista Foot Patrol, and other law enforcement agencies in the area to update the Memoranda of Understanding among them to include “mandatory sensitiv[ity] trainings on sexual assault/interpersonal violence which address race, gender, class, and sexuality, jurisdiction and protocol as to how cases are managed, and investigation into previous and current mismanaged cases of sexual assault reporting by law enforcement officials.” Ro’Shawndra and other activists also wanted UC Santa Barbara to work with the Santa Barbara City College (SBCC) to improve communication and transparency on violations of Title IX and cases involving both schools. These demands highlight the difficulties that students faced while living in Isla Vista, an unincorporated area that is populated by mostly college-aged students from different colleges and universities in the area. Students demanded that the UC President conduct yearly tours of all UC Campuses and hold public town halls on sexual violence to allow students to communicate their needs and grievances. Ro’Shawndra also had three personal demands: her tuition debt be paid by the school, be allowed transfer to another UC, and have access to the Survivor Resource Center in the future.

Each of the sit-ins’ demands stemmed from the different experiences the activists had navigating different institutions while reporting their cases, which led them to different sets of demands. Alejandra, Melissa, and Lexi experienced difficulties reporting their case to

the university and thus focused on improving the process within the school and how cases were handled. Ro'Shawndra was sexually assaulted in Isla Vista by a student who did not attend UC Santa Barbara. She experienced difficulties reporting her case to law enforcement and the university so her demands focused on how the campus handles Isla Vista, increasing collaboration across different institutions, and improving services to not just UC Santa Barbara students, but residents of Isla Vista as well.

Although these demands were central to the overall work of the movement against sexual violence on campus, these were not the only changes students at UC Santa Barbara sought to achieve. Many students did activist work addressing the rape culture on campus and surrounding area by targeting students. Students did this work individually and in organizations they were involved in and focused on raising awareness on the issue of sexual violence and rape culture, increasing conversations around consent, and providing a healing and supportive environment for survivors. At UC Santa Barbara, undergraduates were not the only ones fighting for these issues. Graduate students were critical in supporting their efforts and were able to push for graduate student issues as they related to sexual violence such as increasing resources available to them and addressing relationship violence.⁶⁸

Students also worked on other policy changes not addressed in the sit-in demands. UC Santa Barbara students pushed for changes in the definitions of sexual violence to be more inclusive of LGBTQ issues and experiences of sexual violence, and definitions of dating and domestic violence to include psychological and financial abuse. Other students sought to address the discrepancies between the UC wide policy and UC Santa Barbara's policies for handling sexual violence. Lacy, a lower-middle-class Asian woman who attended UC Santa Barbara between 2014-2016 worked on removing the statute of

limitations in reporting cases of sexual violence to the university. UC policy on sexual harassment and sexual violence did not set a time limit in reporting cases, but UC Santa Barbara's policies stated that in order for the cases to be adjudicated, cases of sexual assault must be reported to the university within 12 months of the assault. In the next section, I describe the different tactics and why students used them to create changes at UC Santa Barbara.

Tactics

Student activists from UC Santa Barbara used several different tactics to bring about policy and cultural change to obtain justice for the mishandling of their cases. Their actions were mostly held on campus and addressed the UC Santa Barbara community, but there were instances where they engaged with local politicians and staff in the UC Office of the President. Their tactics were more confrontational and students often worked within existing campus organizations to draw on their resources to help them organize protest events. Although the student government at UC Santa Barbara was not very involved in advocating and addressing sexual violence, students on this campus relied on campus and non-campus organizations to form networks and for resources. Most of the students I interviewed from UC Santa Barbara focused on policy changes and improving services to survivors by encouraging more inclusive practices within the different offices that dealt with sexual violence in the university and the community. They engaged in many tactics, but relied more on confrontational ways to make the university more responsive to addressing sexual violence.

Similar to UC Berkeley, the desired policy changes advocated by the students often emerged during their own experiences reporting to the university. Much of the work at UC

Santa Barbara started as getting justice for how their cases of sexual violence were handled and turned into policy changes in order to improve the experiences of other survivors who may decide to report to the school and/or law enforcement. One of the first major protest events of the student activists I interviewed took place outside the Student Resource Building (SRB), where the Office of Judicial Affairs is located, on April 13, 2015. Alejandra organized and led this rally after her case had been investigated and adjudicated by the school, which took over one year. Her perpetrator got a two quarter suspension, and she tried to appeal it with no success. Driven by anger and by several sightings of her perpetrator on campus during the quarters he was suspended, Alejandra decided to organize this rally. In the following excerpt, Alejandra describes why she decided to organize this event:

“For me growing up, if a kid was suspended from high school or middle school, you're not on campus. They kick you out. Literally they kick you out, like security guards will kick you out. How is it the university that has so much money, that is so prestigious can't do that? Low income schools do that to kids. They literally take security guards and they grab them and they put them out of campus. I'm like you can't do that with an adult that attends your prestigious institution? And she [staff from Office of Judicial Affairs] was just like “Oh okay. We'll see. We'll work on it. We'll give them a warning.” Like he violated the suspension like what are you talking about? I'm just like okay, whatever. I'll let you. And I thought that I was going to get over it, but I couldn't get over it. And so then that's when I started to just hit up all my friends and I talked to *mujeres* at like MUJER [a campus Latina/Chicana organization]. I talked to folks in Girl Up [an off-campus organization] and talked to other friends that I just knew and I was like, you know what? I need to do something. So I think I ended up staying up with my friends until 3 AM that night – the night before making posters with my friends... I remember 3 AM I went home. I probably slept for like two hours because I was planning to be at the SRB from 8 AM until 6 PM – so a whole working day. I remember I didn't go to work that day. I didn't go to classes because I was like I'm going to put everything on the line. And I'm going to make this happen. And I'm going to make someone pay attention to me because obviously they are not paying attention to me.”

Alejandra was angry and frustrated because the university did not comply with the sanctions it had given her perpetrator. This was intolerable to her and led her to give up her school and work responsibilities to be at the rally most of the day. Alejandra strategically planned this

event on the first day of elections for the A.S. government, where she was running for a seat in the A.S. Senate. She drew on friends and members from organizations she was a part of and from other organizations such as IDEAS, a campus organization serving undocumented students and El Congreso, a campus Chicana/Latina political student organization. Alejandra was also a member of Take Back the Night, a committee within the A.S. undergraduate student government. She was the External Coordinator for the 2014-2015 academic year, where she connected the work Take Back the Night was doing to other campus organizations. Alejandra's involvement in the A.S. Senate as a Senator, Take Back the Night, MUJER, and other groups provided critical support and resources as she engaged in her activist work against the university.

As discussed in Chapter four, the rally outside the library was a precursor to the first sit-in and takeover of Chancellor Yang's office on May 13, 2015. During the rally, Alejandra publicly described her case and garnered support for her case and this issue. It also helped her make connections to other survivors including Melissa. After the rally outside the SRB, Melissa and Alejandra met to discuss their experiences of violence as women of color and how UC Santa Barbara had been handling their cases. With the help of friends, student organizers, and professors and graduate students from social science departments, Alejandra and Melissa organized a demonstration and sit-in targeting the university in May. Days before the sit-in, they released a press release inviting local politicians, administrators, and students to rally outside the library on May 13th where students would be speaking about the school's sexual violence policies and procedures. Alejandra and Melissa came up with a name for their campaign against the university, nowUCsb. This was used as a hashtag for all their posts on social media and it was the name

of the Twitter and Facebook page they created to announce and discuss their activist work and issues around sexual violence. According to Melissa, nowUCsb was created to put “responsibility on the university to do something.”

On May 13, 2015, a large group of about 30 to 40 students gathered outside the library, a heavily transited area of campus, where faculty and students spoke out in support of survivors of sexual violence. Towards the end of the rally, Alejandra and Melissa, publicly discussed their experiences of sexual violence and domestic violence. They wore teal bandannas over their mouths when not speaking symbolizing how the university had silenced them. After the rally ended, students marched to Cheadle Hall and up to the 5th floor where Chancellor Yang’s Office is located. Although the chancellor was not on campus at the time, students waited until he arrived around 8pm. Lexi, who was an executive member of Take Back the Night and a friend of Alejandra, arrived at the chancellor’s office as the sit-in was starting and helped Alejandra and Melissa write the 13 demands that Chancellor Yang would end up signing in the early morning hours of May 14th.

The rally and sit-in was planned in a short amount of time. According to Diana, a working-class Chicana graduate student who helped organize the protests and was present the entire time, estimated the planning occurred over five days and explained that they wanted to do it before finals and Melissa’s graduation. The ultimate goal behind the rally and sit-in was to meet with the Chancellor to discuss the school’s sexual violence policies and procedures and present a set of demands that would address their shortcomings. Alejandra, Melissa, Diana, and the other organizers had considered different tactics

including a hunger strike to do this. In an interview, Alejandra described the different reasons they had in engaging in these confrontational tactics:

“I think Melissa was very like “Let's do a hunger strike.” And I said “no” [laughs]. I know I don't eat that much but I love food and also I don't want to dishonor the work that other students have done, especially with the 1994 hunger strikes [at UCSB]. I don't want to do that to students' work and their activism so I was like I don't know if I could do that. One, because I don't want to disrespect their work, which I think if we would have done it, we wouldn't have, but at the same time their demands still haven't been honored so I don't think that we should use that tactic. But then also that argument is flawed because there's also a lot of other sit-ins that have happened and those demands haven't been completed either. And then I had proposed a sit-in...I feel like one, it'll give them bad press. I knew that our school probably wouldn't arrest us because you know [in] schools like UC Berkeley and UC Davis we probably wouldn't have been able to get away with what we did. We probably would have been arrested, if we had done it at Berkeley or Davis. But I just felt that here at UCSB, I feel like they wouldn't risk it. And that was just me knowing how UCSB works and their value on their reputation and also just knowing our Chancellor and how he thinks. He's all about PR. He's all about how our school is seen. And so I think that they wouldn't do that. And then I was also thinking like if we do this, we can put enough pressure on them and I think it was mostly just like the buildup. We had already done the buildup with a protest at the SRB. Students were talking, students were angry, and then with just the sit-in, it was just like icing on the cake.”

A hunger strike was proposed by Melissa, but other organizers did not want use this tactic because it would be hard on their bodies. As Alejandra stated above, she believed using hunger strikes would be disrespecting the labor of previous student of color activists on campus. She specifically referred to the 1994 hunger strikes where nine Chicana/o and Latina/o students took part of a hunger strike in order to make several demands that included stopping fee hikes, establishing a PhD program in Chicano studies, and preserving existing resources to Chicana/o and Latina/o students. Alejandra discussed being knowledgeable of how UC Santa Barbara works and how Chancellor Yang reacts to protests. Alejandra said that Chancellor Yang was “easier to access because if you have a concern and you request a meeting, I think that he will take it” and was patient for allowing them to speak their minds without time limit during the sit-in. A sit-in would give the university bad publicity and put

pressure on them to address their concerns. She also stated that the university would be less likely to use force against them and call on the campus police. Alejandra mentions UC Berkeley and UC Davis, although not explicitly mentioned in this excerpt, she is referring to the administrations' response to student protesters during the Occupy Movement in Fall 2011. At UC Berkeley, six students and a professor were arrested and at UC Davis, a police officer pepper-sprayed demonstrators. UC Santa Barbara has had several takeover of buildings, sit-ins, and hunger strikes, but the administration has tended to be more accommodating to their demands and has not used excessive police force.

Alejandra, Melissa, and Lexi turned the campaign of nowUCsb into an informal group with the same name. The group nowUCsb was formed in October 2015 and it was comprised of undergraduate and graduate students. There were about ten core members, including Melissa and Lexi who had graduated in June 2015. The group was a “survivor-driven grassroots protest focused on UC Santa Barbara” and sought to “expose and reform broken policies on sexual violence.”⁶⁹ nowUCsb traced its roots to the April 13th rally outside the SRB. “It emerged out of anger at a university that re-traumatized survivors who needed help” and “experienced callousness and delays at a university that violates Federal Title IX regulations and fails to keep students safe and healthy.”⁷⁰ This group facilitated collective identity formation among UC Santa Barbara survivor activists and activists, and maintained this collective identity over several years. Through this group, Alejandra, Melissa, and Lexi were able to work and keep track of the progress on the demands by the university. They pressured the university to keep its promises and pushed for changes beyond what was on the demands. Although not connected to the university, several of its members were officers in other campus organizations such as the Graduate Student

Association, Take Back the Night, and the A.S. Through their connections to these groups, nowUCsb was able to get resources to host events, such as funding for food and spaces to hold meetings. From 2015 to 2018 nowUCsb helped centralize a core group of activists that formed a united front when meeting with administrators during monthly sexual violence/sexual harassment meetings and quarterly town halls. The group organized policy forums and a Title IX teach-in where they were able to create a space for students to give feedback on policies and to learn about their rights as students.

On May 3, 2017, almost two years after the first sit-in, Ro'Shawndra organized and led a second sit-in of Chancellor Yang's office centering on a different set of demands. Prior to this, she had organized a march around Isla Vista and had been rallying support by sharing her experience of reporting her sexual assault to law enforcement and their response to it. The protest began in a series of meetings and culminated in a sit-in of Chancellor Yang's office that lasted almost nine hours and went into the early hours of May 4th. According to Ro'Shawndra, her decision to do a sit-in was not influenced by the 2015 sit-in: "It was my idea cuz I didn't know about her [Alejandra] sit-in until after March. And in March, I wanted to sit-in but I didn't want to sit-in the Chancellor's office. I wanted to do it in the police station." Her initial target was the Santa Barbara Sherriff's Office, but later included the university as well. Ro'Shawndra thought a sit-in would be more effective than other tactics. Here she discusses why other methods would not work to help make the changes she wanted:

"Well, a petition wasn't going to work for me because I was already going around saying my story and I didn't just have the university as a target... A petition to get the detective out of here is what you do after you publicly call him out. I can't start a petition when nobody knows why I started the petition or [the] origins of it. But then seeing, not just me, like we got in that room and everybody was talking about the same officers. Same officers that make us feel uncomfortable and they work for this

university and things like that. That's making sure people are held accountable. Petitions can be anonymous. But we were all in there, like nobody had nothing over their faces, and we called out names so that – I felt like they were more effective, that's my opinion, than the petition.”

Ro'Shawndra highlighted that she had been targeting more than just the university and that the sit-in provided a space to discuss key issues and problems occurring on campus and the community. To her it was important to not be anonymous and be open about her and others' experiences. This would help with holding the university and law enforcement accountable and could lead to the use of different tactics. The sit-in led by Ro'Shawndra was supported by various groups and students. Alejandra and Ro'Shawndra had been in contact with each other prior to this sit-in and both were present during the 2017 sit-in. The title for the demands for this sit-in was “nowUCsb Demands 2.0: May 3-4, 2017” and it drew from the 2015 demands. Ro'Shawndra also drew different forms of support and resources from the organizations she was a part of: the African National Women's Organization (ANWO), the UC Santa Barbara's Black Student Union, and the Santa Barbara Student Activist Network. She received emotional support and assistance in ensuring the demands were fulfilled.

The students leading the sit-ins had considered other tactics to address the mishandling of cases by UC Santa Barbara. Several of them considered doing Title IX complaints and lawsuits against the university. Ro'Shawndra with the help from a member of End Rape on Campus started a Title IX complaint against UC Santa Barbara, but didn't file it because she was told that Betsy DeVos, the Secretary of Education under President Donald Trump, would be cutting back on those offices. Even though she did not file the Title IX complaint, she did tell the administrators at the sit-in that it was an option for her. Students leading the 2015 sit-in had seriously considered filing a lawsuit, but they ended up not doing it. Lexi discussed in an interview how she and the other leaders of the 2015 sit-in had been in

contact with students from UC Berkeley, who had been coaching them through filing a complaint and lawsuit. Lexi decided not file a lawsuit because she had a lot going on personally. She said:

“There’s so much going on and it’s mentally taxing enough to deal with. You know helping the nowUCsb campaign and then having to go through everything I went through senior year with reporting my own case and everything. Like I’m in a good place with it right now and I just don’t want to have to relieve it and then add on the layer of you know going with the school...it’s a lot to handle.”

Lexi had reached a place she was content with and did not want to continue dealing with her case and the university. Alejandra had been in contact with lawyers about filing a lawsuit, but did not pursue it because of the media attention she would receive. Lawyers told her she would need to hold a press conference and be willing to talk about her sexual assault, which would further re-traumatize her. This posed a problem for her because her family did not know about her assault and she had been carefully tailoring her activist work to keep them from finding out. To Alejandra, family support was a key resource and support that other survivors, such as white women would have to back them up when they spoke out about their assaults, but she doubted her family would support her if she did the same. In discussing intersectionality as an important issue in addressing sexual violence, she said that “not everyone has the same access to resources. Not everyone has the same access to knowing what to say, how to act, like how these institutions work.” Alejandra felt she could have done more work around the issue and inflicted “much more damage to UC Santa Barbara” if she would have had more resources such as family support. In the next chapter I will discuss the emotional labor and trauma activists experience while doing this work and how it affected their activism. I will also expand on the challenges many students of color experienced doing activist work against sexual violence, particularly coming from cultures

where topics around sex and sexual violence are taboo.

The sit-ins and the demands students made addressed both policies and the culture of the campus. Policy change and getting justice for how their cases were mishandled focused on problems with the culture such as blaming survivors and the lack of training on how to help survivors from working class backgrounds and communities of color. Alejandra, Melissa, Lexi, and Ro'Shawndra wanted to increase mandatory training on consent and sexual violence to students, staff, faculty, and law enforcement. In addition to this, they wanted people who came into contact with survivors to get cultural sensitivity training that addressed race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. They also wanted increased resources in Isla Vista during big party events and called on the university to examine the rape culture in Isla Vista. Part of addressing the culture was empowering survivors, showing solidarity with them, and fighting back against rape culture.

Their focus on rape culture and education was not limited to the sit-in. Activists from both sit-ins organized different events. In early April 2016, nowUCsb hosted two screenings of the documentary *The Hunting Ground* and a Title IX Teach-In. These events were geared towards educating students about sexual violence on university campuses and their rights under federal policies. Jenny, a white, upper-middle class graduate student in Engineering, got involved in nowUCsb in fall 2015 during her first year at UC Santa Barbara. As an undergraduate student at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), she knew students who had filed Title IX complaints at other universities and was introduced to this work. She filed a Clery Act complaint against MIT for how they handled her sexual harassment case. Jenny brought the knowledge and work she did at MIT to UC Santa Barbara. She was one of the lead graduate student organizers involved in the film screening

and teach-in. In the following excerpt, Jenny describes the usefulness of the Title IX Teach-In:

“Obviously you don't always get what you're guaranteed but it's helpful to know what the standards are so you can go to a meeting armed with knowledge and I always think, especially related to sexual violence, the best way to defend yourself is to arm yourself with knowledge...And whether you report or not it's like you have a right to certain accommodations if you need them. I think these are all things that can help students heal and also have an easier time after an incident of sexual violence...And obviously you know that doesn't negate the effects of the assault, but I think when students understand that there are certain things that they, even if they aren't getting it are guaranteed, like bodily safety and also academic accommodations when their bodily safety is violated. I think that can be very empowering to understand.”

Being informed of federal policies helps survivors know what rights and resources they should be getting after an experience of sexual violence. To Jenny, knowledge of your rights is a source of power and can be empowering to survivors. In March 2017, Ro'Shawndra led “The Survivor's March” addressing rape culture in Isla Vista and in October helped organize a vigil for survivors of campus sexual assault. The vigil was part of a national event of solidarity with survivors and a protest to Betsy DeVos' announcement of repealing Obama's Title IX policies. During the vigil, the word “uhuru” (means freedom in Swahili) was outlined with candles on the floor and written on the board where attendees were asked to write down what freedom meant to them.

All of the students I interviewed did work to address sexual violence through organizations. These included: ANWO, Santa Barbara Student Activist Network, Black Student Union, Santa Barbara Rape Crisis Center, Women's Ensemble Theater Group, Take Back the Night, nowUCsb, Womyn's Commission, Flor, Men of Strength, Campus Advocacy, Resources and Education Office (CARE), UCSA, Graduate Student Association, Lobby Corps, and the Office of the External Vice President for Statewide Affairs. Some of

the work they did included doing internships with CARE, helping organize the annual Take Back the Night Rally in Isla Vista, and volunteering as crisis counselor at a rape crisis center. Selene, a Latina/Middle Eastern lower-middle class woman, was a member of the Women's Ensemble Theater Group that produces the Vagina Monologues annually at UC Santa Barbara. Selene used theater as activism and to tell stories. For her senior thesis in the Department of Theater and Dance, she wrote and directed a play for sexual assault survivors. She focused on the healing process of sexual assault survivors and her main goal was to create empathy for survivors.

Most of the students at UC Santa Barbara focused their work within the campus community. There were two students, Tim and Lacy, who did work at UC Santa Barbara, but also outside of it. For example, Lacy, an Asian, lower-middle class woman who attended UC Santa Barbara from 2014-2016 and then transferred to a school in the East Coast, was an A.S. Senator and was one of the UConsent Coordinators on campus who often did lobbying and other work outside the campus. She was a representative of Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network's (RAINN) Speaker's Bureau, wrote articles for websites and online news platforms such as *Elite Daily*, and hosted workshops at various conferences addressing sexual violence and mental health. UC Santa Barbara students' work was critical in making this a top issue within the campus administration and forced them to deal with the issue head-on. Below I discuss the fulfillment of the demands and the effects of their activism.

Outcomes

The activist work done by the UC Santa Barbara students has extended beyond their time at the campus. All of the leaders from the sit-ins have graduated, but several of the graduate students who were a part of nowUCsb are still on campus and incoming

undergraduate students have continued their work on sexual violence on campus and in Isla Vista. The issue of sexual violence has been important to the campus and the community, but it has not been a priority issue like at UC Berkeley, which has had pressure from local and national political stakeholders, a Title IX investigation, and a series of high profile sexual harassment cases. At UC Santa Barbara, the rise of Donald Trump as the presidential nominee for the Republican Party and eventually to the presidency brought out a group of conservative students that formed a countermovement to several existing progressive and radical movements on campus including the movement against sexual violence in 2015-2016. This group directly antagonized the activists I interviewed and counterprotested some of the events organized by anti-sexual violence activists. This presented challenges that were unique to the campus, which will discuss more in-depth in the following chapter. At UC Santa Barbara, this conservative countermovement served to distract and divert power from these movements.⁷¹ Despite the challenges they presented, student activists were able to make changes in how the campus and community handled sexual violence.

The 2015 sit-in led by Alejandra, Melissa, and Lexi began a series of changes on campus in how it dealt with sexual violence, particularly increasing resources to survivors and the school's responsiveness to this issue. Beginning in May 2015 staff, administration, and students began meeting regularly. Monthly meetings began in February 2016, but were cancelled a year later and turned into quarterly town halls where students could voice their concerns and address the demands from both sit-ins. On May 16, 2016, Alejandra, Lexi, and other nowUCsb members organized a peaceful demonstration outside the library to commemorate the one-year anniversary of the 13-hour sit-in and to call out the university for not fulfilling all of the demands. They also met with State Senator Hannah-Beth Jackson,

who wrote a letter to Chancellor Yang inquiring about the progress of the demands. The campus has addressed several of the demands which includes revising GauchoFYI (the mandatory training on sexual violence for new undergraduate students), implementing the survivor fund, clarifying the complainant appeal process in the policy and procedures, increasing diversity in CARE and the Office of Judicial Affairs, and hiring more female officers in UCPD. The January 2016 revision of the UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment addressed the demands on sanctions by including a mandatory minimum suspension for two years for students found guilty and mandating training for all faculty, staff, and student employees. Students involved in nowUCsb were frustrated and not happy with how they were implementing the demands and believed the administration could do better. For example, the campus did not ask for student feedback or included it in implementing some of the demands, and meetings and town halls between staff and students were not well advertised and some of the staff had not been attending consistently. Also, Take Back the Night and students have had to take on the responsibility to organize a safe space in Isla Vista during major party events. In the demands, students asked for quarterly reports on the number of sexual violence cases brought to the university. Campus officials did not want to provide this information in order to protect the privacy of students and avoid revealing the identity of individuals. Instead, beginning in fall 2016, they began publishing yearly statistics on the cases reported to CARE, Title IX, and Judicial Affairs. Some of the demands that have not been addressed by the school: immediate suspension for perpetrators found guilty, immediate removal from housing, and having CARE advocates in one of the dorms.

The 2017 sit-in led by Ro'Shawndra and other students continued to put pressure on the university to address the demands made by students. Although some of the 2015 demands were implemented by the administration, they took a backseat after the 2017 sit-in. As of 2018, many of the 2017 demands were met: increasing staff working on interpersonal violence and diversifying the days and times of counseling group sessions, implementing Queer Connect, organizing a town hall with a UCOP representative, and hosting regular meetings and updates on the demands. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between UCPD and Isla Vista Foot Patrol was signed to promote collaboration between the school and the county and to enhance their response to sexual violence and other crimes. In fall 2018, the first interpersonal violence investigator for Isla Vista was hired. Officers from the Title IX offices at UC Santa Barbara and SBCC met and provided cross-trainings for their staff to improve coordination between the campuses. There were several demands that have been ongoing and have required more time to complete such as lighting on Slough Road in Isla Vista, UC Chancellors meeting at UC Santa Barbara, Isla Vista report card for sexual violence, and the survivor resource center. Initially, nowUCsb worked with Ro'Shawndra during the sit-in, but soon after the group broke ties with her and the demands made during the 2017 sit-in. Leaders from nowUCsb thought the 2017 demands did not represent the needs of the wider community and focused on the specific needs of one person.

In Spring 2018, a group of UC Santa Barbara students formed Students Against Sexual Assault (SASA). This group is a committee within the Human Rights Board which is part of the A.S. that is "dedicated to the elimination of sexual assault and sexual harassment on the University California, Santa Barbara, SBCC, and their surrounding communities" (Students Against Sexual Assault 2018). Their work was been inspired by the demands from

the 2017 sit-in and has worked on the creation of a survivor resource center in Isla Vista. Their work does not appear to be connected to the people or groups who worked on the sit-ins and they have worked on their own set of demands with the university who are in the process of being negotiated and addressed by the staff and administration. Although the leaders of the sit-ins and many of the students I interviewed have all graduated, the legacy of their work continues and current students have continued this work. Their work pushed the university to address the issue and made the campus more responsive to survivors' needs.

Conclusion

Students from UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara wanted their schools to improve how they handled cases of sexual violence and the resources provided to survivors of sexual assault. Although both are UC schools, the policies, procedures, and resources to survivors varied on each campus. Chapters five and six highlighted the inconsistencies across these two campuses in terms of policies and resources for survivors, which affected the changes students wanted. The policy changes and the formation of the task force by UC President Janet Napolitano that began in 2014 were aimed at resolving the inconsistencies in the response and prevention of sexual violence across all UC campuses. In addition to the schools' local policies and resources, the timing of the movements, local history and politics, and who made up these movements played a role in the demands and tactics used by students on each campus.

Similar to UC Berkeley, UC Santa Barbara students also worked on anti-sexual violence issues through many school and community organizations. Students leading the 2015 sit-in formed a non-school affiliated organization, nowUCsb, to organize students on campus working on this issue. Students forming nowUCsb were members of several

different campus-recognized groups who often drew on the resources from these institutionalized groups to do work within nowUCsb. Although the undergraduate student government was not heavily involved in the activism occurring at UC Santa Barbara, student activists were able to garner resources and support through their involvement in other organizations such as Take Back the Night, MUJER, UCSA, Graduate Student Association, and some executive offices from the A.S. At both schools, the students were members of the same organizations, where they had a preexisting communications network and resources, from which they were able to recruit for different protests (McAdam 1988; Oberschall 1973). Students on both campuses received legitimacy, access to networks, labor and leaders, money, and access to other resources. These moral, social-organizational, human, and material resources (Edwards and McCarthy 2007) facilitated the mobilizations on these campuses, especially through the formation of collective identity and maintaining it over time.

UC Santa Barbara students aimed to change and improve local policies on campus, particularly the code of conduct and sanctions to perpetrators found guilty. They also wanted changes that would address the needs of student living in Isla Vista, an unincorporated area of the County of Santa Barbara that had historically lacked a formal local government and relied on the county, surrounded cities and UC Santa Barbara for resources. Students wanted changes from the university, especially from local entities that address sexual violence in Isla Vista, where over 30% of UC Santa Barbara students live along with other college-aged people. The campus had well-developed services to survivors, therefore, many of the changes activists were demanding centered on improving existing services and resources. In

fact, the advocacy model developed in the CARE program at UC Santa Barbara was adopted UC system wide for other UC schools to follow (Leachman 2015).

UC Santa Barbara students' demands were probably affected by the timing of the movement in the cycle of protest. UC Santa Barbara students had attempted to organize in 2014, but it wasn't until spring 2015 that their work was able to make sexual violence a key issue for the campus. By this time, campus sexual violence had been widely accepted as a social problem and the UC system was already making changes and updating the UC wide sexual violence policy that would be implemented on all UC campuses in January 2016. While mobilizations at UC Berkeley began during the first stage of the protest cycle, the movement at UC Santa Barbara seems to have taken off during the second stage of the protest cycle: transformation of contention. Many of the issues activists against sexual assault had been demanding were in the process of being met in 2015, however, students at UC Santa Barbara addressed issues of diversity and inclusivity and challenges unique to them, such as living in Isla Vista. As discussed in Chapter four, students at UC Santa Barbara had attempted to organize around 2014, but the shooting and gang rape in Isla Vista that same year elevated other issues to the top of the community's agenda. This highlights the importance of local issues and location for understanding mobilization of movements.

Another critical factor affecting the demands made on each campus was the racial and class make-up of the students in those movements. The literature on the second and third wave of the feminist movement has documented the differences in experiences and needs between women of color and white women (Blackwell 2011; Gluck, Blackwell, Cotrell, and Harper 1998; Reger 2005; Roth 2004). White women have tended to focus on gender oppression and have often overlooked the needs of women of color, while women of

color have had a more complex view of gender oppression, one that examines how race, class, sexuality shape gender oppression (Blackwell 2011; Cotera 1980; Davis 1981; Garcia 1997; Giddings 1984; hooks 1981, 1984; Hull, Bell-Scott, and Smith 1982; Maätita 2005; Matthews 1994; Moraga and Anzaldúa 1979; Morgen 2002; Reger 2005; Roth 2004; Sandoval 1990; Schechter 1982; Schilt 2005; Segura and Pesquera 1995, [1992] 2001). Similar to what has happened in earlier forms of activism advancing gender equality, there was a difference in how women of color and white women survivors experienced the reporting process, sexual violence policies, and resources available in their schools. This led to working class, women of color to make demands that addressed the racial and class disparities in the policies, procedures, and resources available to survivors of sexual violence. Intersectional motivations can influence why people protest (Fisher, Jasny, and Dow 2018) and some groups treat intersectionality as a collective action frame (Terriquez 2015). Several of the activist leaders from UC Berkeley were white women, from middle to upper class backgrounds who tended to focus on broad issues of sexual violence. There were some women of color leaders at Berkeley who addressed intersectionality, by hosting conferences that addressed the difficulties experienced by LGTBQ communities, people of color, and differently abled people. But this came around 2015.

Many of the leaders from UC Santa Barbara were working class, women of color who sought to improve services and change policies in order to address the diverse needs of the student community. UC Santa Barbara students were using intersectionality as a social movement strategy (Chun, Lipsitz, and Shing 2013), particularly when making demands. The students sought to address different forms of interlocking oppression as they interfaced with sexual violence. For example, they advocated for the creation of a survivor fund to

provide financial support to students who were experiencing financial difficulties. They also called for the increased diversity of offices that deal with survivors and mandatory sensitivity training to faculty, staff and administration. White women were also involved at UC Santa Barbara and they helped address issues affecting LGBTQ survivors and graduate students. The racial, ethnic, and class variation among UC Santa Barbara students was important in how they organized and the tactics they used (discussed below). This research contributes to a growing literature documenting the importance of intersectionality to various aspect of social movements (Brown, Ray, Summers, and Fraistat 2017; Chun et al. 2013; Clay 2012; DeTurk 2014; Einwohner 1999; Fisher, Jasny, and Dow 2018; Frederick 2010; Kurtz 2002; Luna 2016; Milkman and Terriquez 2012; Pastrana 2006, 2010; Pulido 1996; Roth 2008; Stockdill 2003; Terriquez 2015; Townsend-Bell 2011; Ward 2008), particularly how social movements practice intersectionality and how race, ethnicity, class, and gender shaped the direction, demands, outcomes, and tactics of the campus anti-sexual assault movement. In the next chapter, I discuss the challenges and tensions that racial, ethnic, and class differences created for activists and how it affected each movement.

Some of the factors that affected the demands made also influenced the activists' tactical repertoire. The stage in which the movement begins during the protest cycle affects how the tactics are used, developed and modified over the course of the cycle (Tarrow 1997). Disruptive tactics are typically used in the early stages and they continue to get more disruptive over time (Taylor and Van Dyke 2007). UC Berkeley's mobilization in the early stages featured both conventional and disruptive tactics and over time continued to use more disruptive tactics. UC Santa Barbara students began mobilizing in 2014-2015, about two years after the early risers in the protest cycle. Their tactics were more confrontational and

they targeted various community groups: students, staff, administration, law enforcement, and Isla Vista.

Network formation and mass media played a critical role in the diffusion of tactics for UC Berkeley. Students there connected to the IX Network through news coverage of the campus movement. This led to UC Berkeley learning about Title IX and Clery act complaints and connecting to activists from across the country. Although UC Santa Barbara students had done research on the activist campaigns on other campuses, they did not have ties to the national IX Network. They formed their own network across the Santa Barbara campus and to other UC campuses. The formation and maintenance of a collective identity at UC Santa Barbara centered around their campus networks and organizations. It appears that UC Santa Barbara students did not draw from the specific tactical repertoire of the campus anti-sexual violence movement, but from the tactical repertoire of the campus (confrontational and non-violent actions), which has been successful for UC Santa Barbara students in the past, particularly for students of color (Armbruster-Sandoval 2017). UC Santa Barbara students also drew on the tactical repertoire of the Civil Rights Movement. In an interview, Melissa described how she and other organizers “studied a little bit about what was successful to get policy reform in the Civil Rights Movement, just what ended up being successful for them and getting their voices heard and a lot of it was just putting your body on the line and just sharing your story.” The women of color from this campus drew on non-violent, direct action tactics such as sit-ins that had been successful during the Civil Rights Movement and for people of color on their campus (Morris 1984).

There was a racial and class difference among UC Berkeley students and between UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara students in the tactics they used. Research has shown

that the structural power of protesters influences the tactical repertoire of a group (Gamson 1989; Schwartz 1976; Taylor 1996; Taylor and Van Dyke 2007; Tilly 1978; 1986).

Individuals in social and economic subordinate positions are more likely to engage in disruptive protests because they lack access to institutional sources of economic and political power (Piven and Cloward 1979; Scott 1985). At UC Berkeley, many of the white, upper middle-class women and middle-class women of color used more conventional tactics such as Title IX and Clery Act complaints, lawsuits, and press conferences to make the university change its policies and how it handled sexual violence. These students tended to come from wealthier backgrounds and they had the social and cultural capital and institutional knowledge to pursue these tactics. Some of the students of color from working class to middle class backgrounds engaged in more confrontational tactics like naming the rapist. This difference may also be due to political ideology in deciding to engage in these tactics where more radical and militant students decide to be a part of BAMN and engage in more confrontational tactics. UC Santa Barbara students who led the movement on campus were mostly working-class, women of color who were not connected to national networks that had been forming for several years on this issue and more importantly did not have the resources and social and cultural capital to pursue some of these tactics. UC Berkeley students who came from higher income families had better connections to activists and movements on other campuses and had more resources that enabled them to engage in tactics that have been deemed conventional for this campus anti-rape movement such as Title IX and Clery Act complaints. Students at UC Santa Barbara considered and attempted some of the conventional tactics used by UC Berkeley student but for different reasons decide not to go through with them or were unsuccessful. The political climate, personal

reasons, and access to resources were cited by the women leading the sit-ins as reasons for not engaging in more conventional tactics of the movement such as lawsuits and Title IX complaints. This would support previous research that shows that the cultural resources, skills, and sense of justice of participants in social movements affects the tactics they engage in (Tilly 1978; Mansbridge and Morris 2001).

The schools' response to protesters and access to administrators were important institutional factors that affected the tactical repertoire used by students. Unlike UC Berkeley which has a history of excessive policing and police brutality on campus, UC Santa Barbara has not had such a hostile response to its students. Alejandra, one of the UC Santa Barbara student leaders, said that the school's less aggressive approach to protesters and the accessibility of Chancellor Yang influenced their decision to do a sit-in. For the campus movement against sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara, the school's history of not using police force on student protesters appears to have influenced them to engage in more confrontational tactics.

Elite turnover in organizations has been recognized as an important factor in facilitating collective action. Raeburn (2004) developed a multilevel "institutional opportunity framework" that highlights the contextual conditions that facilitate favorable outcomes for institutional activists. The meso-level institutional opportunities consist of the immediate environment of institutional challengers. At this level, Raeburn (2004) identifies organizational realignments or the companies' elite turnover as a dimension of organizational opportunity that can facilitate a movement's outcomes. High turnover among top elites or administrators is a source of innovation (Mezias 1985) and new policies and strategies (Pfeffer 1983), while low turnover can lead to rigidity of the institutional values

and behaviors (Raeburn 2004). The administration turnover on both campuses does not support literature on this topic. At UC Santa Barbara Chancellor Yang has held the top administration position since 1994, while there has been a high turnover rate in the chancellor position at UC Berkeley for the past 30 years. UC Berkeley has had five chancellors since 1990. Possible explanations for accessibility could be personal characteristics of the people holding these positions and the size of the school. Chancellor Yang may be more amenable to students and their needs, while the large bureaucracy at UC Berkeley may present a hurdle for students.

In the next chapter, I discuss the challenges activists on each campus experienced while organizing on their campuses and how this affected the trajectory and effectiveness of their campaigns. I describe the challenges of doing this kind of activism and some of the tensions among activists.

Chapter 7: Challenges in Organizing Against Sexual Violence

Introduction

Personal narratives were critical to the effectiveness of the campus movement against sexual violence at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. This often consisted of survivors of sexual violence discussing their experiences of violence and trauma. Students in this movement had to hear stories of sexual violence on a daily basis and many of them were survivors themselves. Often untold in this movement is the emotional labor activists had to engage in to make changes on this issue and the effects this had in their lives and the movement. This emotional labor created challenges and made it difficult to engage in the movement for long periods of time. This and other challenges activists experienced affected their engagement in activist campaigns and their relationships with fellow activists.

This chapter focuses on the challenges activists experienced while organizing on their campuses. In the first section, I discuss the emotional labor activists put into the movement. They endured vicarious trauma and survivor activists had to deal with their own assault and publicly telling their stories of sexual violence. Fighting for change in communities where most of its members had endured trauma posed additional challenges and tensions among activists. In the second section, I describe how the racial, ethnic, and class background of activists shaped their activist work but also posed challenges particularly to students of color and working-class students. In the last section, I discuss the backlash that developed on both campuses in response to student activism against sexual violence. I focus on the conservative countermovement that developed at UC Santa Barbara during the 2015-2016 academic year that targeted the activists from the anti-sexual violence movement. The main goal of this chapter is to examine the different challenges activists

faced when engaging in activist and advocacy work against sexual violence and how this affected the trajectory of the movement on each campus.

Emotional Labor and Emotional Management

Activists against sexual violence work around a sensitive and heavy issue that can elicit emotional pain and trauma. Students from both campuses reported similar challenges in terms of emotional labor and emotional management. Out of the 31 students I interviewed, the majority (25) discussed how emotionally difficult it was to engage in activist work on this issue. The work in general was difficult, particularly talking about sexual violence on a daily basis which was reported by students to be depressing, triggering, and traumatizing. Students also reported feeling frustration from the lack of school support, working to make people care about this issue, and dealing with survivor-blaming. The emotional aspect of this work exacerbated existing mental health issues for some students and others felt discredited because it was an emotional issue. In discussing the primary problems facing activists against sexual violence, Aanchal, a UC Berkeley student, described how emotionally and mentally taxing the work was for activists.

“Being drained, being tired, being tired of talking about sensitive things all the time. Being tired of being devaluated and misunderstood. And being devaluated and being put down and condescended for the thing we are passionate about. There’s definitely compassion overload where there’s only so much that we want to feel at a certain given time. And while we want to validate and hear all survivors, we can’t always talk about this issue. It is physically, mentally, and emotionally exhausting.”

Aanchal discussed how difficult it was to talk about sexual violence and its effects. Aanchal and many of the students from both UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara described how difficult it was to constantly have to hear the stories of sexual assault and sexual violence that others had experienced. Aanchal in the excerpt above used the term compassion overload to discuss how activists were overburdened emotionally when doing this work.

With this term, Aanchal was probably referring to compassion fatigue, a form of secondary stress experienced by people who know/learn about other people's experiences of distress or traumatizing events. She was not the only student to discuss this. Other students used the terms "secondhand trauma" and "vicarious trauma" to describe the stress and trauma they, as activists, had experienced from engaging in this work and constantly hearing stories of sexual violence. Vicarious trauma and secondary traumatic stress affects the mental and spiritual health of people who work directly with individuals who have experienced trauma and is very common among counselors, therapists, and individuals who care for others. This phenomenon has been widely researched and discussed in the field of psychology. Students' use of psychological terminology and awareness of this issue shows a deep knowledge of this topic and its effects on their mental and emotional health. Although knowledgeable in this area, they were not trained professionally to deal with this secondary trauma or how to manage it. They learned about this through their activist work. Their experiences of vicarious trauma and secondary traumatic stress also reveals another dimension of their activist work against sexual violence: the invisible emotional labor they engaged in to change school policies and increase rights to survivors.

Vicarious trauma and secondary traumatic stress were experienced by both survivors and non-survivors in the movement. There was, however, additional emotional labor and difficulties that survivors of sexual violence experienced when advocating for the rights of survivors of sexual violence. Students who were survivors often discussed during interviews the mental, physical, and emotional difficulties they experienced in dealing with their own assaults in addition to the secondary trauma they experienced when doing this work. Survivor activists described experiencing PTSD, anxiety, and depression. Some described

experiencing mental breakdowns and struggled with their mental and emotional health.

Rosa, a UC Berkeley student discussed the emotional labor survivor activists experienced working on this issue:

“People who usually do this work are sometimes or majority of the time at Cal (UC Berkeley) have been survivors who are on the frontlines doing this work... Sometimes people feel very triggered and traumatized but feel [the] need to continue this work. One of [the] main problems because they are so passionate about this work, but at the same time it’s hard to prioritize us when it can induce a lot of emotion and feelings that sometimes can’t be avoided.”

Survivor activists put in a lot of emotional labor in this movement and as Rosa described, it is often driven by the passion they feel in doing this work. Many of the survivor activists were engaged in advocacy work while processing their own experiences of violence and trauma. This created difficulties in working on this issue and in many aspects of their lives. Students discussed how hearing other people’s stories of sexual violence was triggering for them and it affected them deeply. Alejandra, a survivor activist from UC Santa Barbara was aware of how triggering it was to tell traumatic stories to survivors which led her to avoid talking about her experiences of sexual assault to other survivors. She didn’t want to trigger other survivors but this led to her feeling isolated and had to rely more on activists who were not survivors when discussing personal problems. Several of the activists who were not survivors of campus sexual violence discussed how they often had to step up in this work when survivors were feeling overwhelmed and triggered.

A critical aspect of the emotional labor that survivor activists contributed to the movement and was foundational to it was publicly disclosing their stories of sexual assault and sexual violence. Lucy, an activist from UC Berkeley used the term “public survivor” to describe people who had disclosed that they were survivors of sexual violence. Students from both campuses recognized survivors who were out publicly as “central to the

community” because people would pay attention to them.⁷² Sandy, a UC Santa Barbara student, described how she felt there was pressure from people to justify the importance of this issue by describing how activists were personally impacted by sexual violence. She went on to discuss how it seemed that people gave more credibility to activists engaged in this activist work when they had been personally affected by sexual violence. Similar to what Sandy said, Emily from UC Berkeley discussed how graphic and dramatic stories of sexual violence helped to give legitimacy to survivors and made people “more inclined to care.” This seems to indicate that the more horrific the story, the more likely it was to gain the attention of the public. Despite believing that the movement centered on public survivors, Lucy saw this notion of the public survivor as problematic. According to her, the centering of the movement on public survivors puts “the onus on people who have experienced violence to have to come forward and relive their trauma when that shouldn’t have to be part of it.” Lucy continued to say, “You do not have to publicly identify yourself as somebody who has gone through this to be [a] part of making change.” Ro’Shawndra, from UC Santa Barbara, also found the notion of being a public survivor problematic, but found it necessary to disclose her private life in order to address how her case was being mishandled by different institutions. In the next section I discuss this notion of a public survivor and how it is inextricably tied to the activists’ backgrounds and lived experiences.

Several of the survivor activists described how the different activist campaigns they engaged in such as protests, rallies, sit-ins, and press conferences were difficult and triggering for them. Mostly because they had to talk about their own experiences of sexual violence. Iman, a survivor activist from UC Berkeley, discussed the challenges she experienced when having to tell her story and having to “relive the incident.”

“Every time you talk about it, your mind just goes there. Especially when typing out my narrative and I used a number of things like sounds and smells – it’s pretty hard to get them out of your head...It’s tiring to numb yourself and talk about something that you never really want to talk about but know that you have to over and over again.”

Similar to what Iman discussed above, Lexi, a UC Santa Barbara student, found speaking out about her experiences of sexual violence to be difficult.

“It’s really, really hard to speak out on this because it’s already something that makes you super vulnerable when it happens to you. And then to go ahead and label yourself a survivor, like now you’re even giving up more power in a sense. Because now people think this of you and they’re going to judge you however they feel like. And now it has to be your whole identity because you’re the girl who was raped or you’re the guy who was raped. You know it takes on a life of its own. It’s really hard to center yourself so I feel like it’s kind of hard to be a constant activist in this kind of sense because it’s hard to hold on to who you are and what makes you happy and who you are apart from what happened to you.”

Lexi described how being a public survivor made her vulnerable and took away some of her power. Identifying as a survivor becomes part of the person’s identity and it makes it difficult for them to separate from it. An activist survivor from UC Berkeley who wanted to remain anonymous described her decision to not be a public survivor.

“I have so much respect for Sofie, Andrea, Annie, and Meghan, some of the other people that were public...But so many people knew Meghan and Sofie and Annie and Andrea’s stories vividly. They were getting all of that horrible, horrible stuff on such a mega level and their stories getting picked apart nonstop...That just re-traumatizes you over and over again and so for me, my anonymity was so important and it was kind of a shield and it was part of this protective layer because I don’t want to be known for this for the rest of my life. I want to do a lot of other stuff and I didn’t want this to necessarily follow me forever. I didn’t want a public story of whatever happened to me.”

This activist chose not to disclose that she was a survivor of sexual assault while doing activist work against sexual violence. She expressed admiration for those that did, but knew that there were risks with going public with something so personal. She had been traumatized once through her assault and did not want to be re-traumatized by becoming public about it.

This activist also did not want this experience to be a defining aspect of her life nor for it to follow her to the work and life she would have outside of UC Berkeley.

The emotional labor and management extended to the interactions and maintenance of the activist communities formed within each campus. Almost half (14) of the students I interviewed discussed tensions and problems within the activist communities they were in. Some of the problems stemmed from the sexual violence many of the activists had experienced in the past. Students discussed how conflicts and tensions arose because of the trauma many of the activists were dealing with while advocating for this issue. This led to the comparison of stories of violence and activist work, people lashing out and being cruel to each other, and exiling people.⁷³ Jenny, a graduate student at UC Santa Barbara, discussed how trauma affected activist communities:

“Activist circles always have a lot of issues in them, but I honestly think one of the biggest problems that we face is that people don't know how to respond to their own trauma and their learned abusive behaviors. And they don't really know how to interact in a way that's not abusive towards their fellow activists...I think trauma survivors are so used to being treated horribly that they then don't always know how to interact with each other in a way that doesn't become overly aggressive and less and less collaborative ...How are we, as trauma survivors, behaving and are our responses useful or are they informed more just by PTSD, anxiety, depression, which it is very hard to deal with? And it's very hard to parse because PTSD can make people very irrationally angry. But also people can get very rationally angry so it's hard to have a cut and dry line...I think learning how to manage the trauma is really one of the hardest parts.”

Jenny described some of the difficulties activists experience when dealing with their own trauma and people who have experienced trauma. Mental health conditions and trauma resulting from sexual violence informed the actions and reactions among activists with one another and within their communities. Lacy, who attended UC Santa Barbara for two years, also expanded on these challenges activists experienced.

“There’s also a lot of fights between those [survivor] communities... We’re not necessarily all unified together and there are times you do fight. Whose situation was worse? Whose was more brutal? And it kind of fractures the movement, which makes it harder to move forward. And then it makes the survivor community at least to everyone else seem weaker because we’re all not united as a same flag supposedly.”

Lacy highlighted some of the fighting that went on in activist communities against sexual violence, the comparison of stories particularly their experiences of sexual violence. This fragmented the movement. Tensions and problems among activists was more openly discussed by students from UC Santa Barbara.⁷⁴ Lacy said that the reason she transferred to another school was due to the infighting occurring within survivor communities at UC Santa Barbara. In an interview, Lacy discussed how survivors had accused her of “faking being a survivor” and of sleeping her way into one of the executive offices in the undergraduate student government. This was upsetting to Lacy, especially after putting so much work in advocating for this issue.

“It was really insulting to me...like I read all these stupid fucking policies. I was just doing all of this lobbying work, and everything I did. In the end, I must have slept my way to the office according to other survivors. I get that from people in general, but to have people who you’re supposed to be working with and is supposed to be in solidarity with you, screwing you over?”

Lacy expected loyalty from other survivors but instead found them to be attacking her. Legitimacy based on the kind of violence activists experienced also posed a problem within the group nowUCsb. Melissa, one of the founders of nowUCsb, described some of the inner group dilemmas she encountered while organizing against sexual violence.

“When you look at policies at UCSB, interpersonal violence and dating violence count as sexual assault. And although I wasn't raped, I was hurt by my partner that I was with. And the other two people that I did organize the sit-in around, they were actually sexually assaulted and well, raped. And there was an issue with one of the members saying that because I wasn't raped [or] that I wasn't sexually assaulted, that I shouldn't be part of the movement and what not. And it just felt very hurtful just because I thought we had all been on that same page where we knew what it felt like

to go through these policies and be hurt and want to do something about it. And I guess we weren't on that same page and we had to sit down with some CAPS [Counseling and Psychological Services] counselors just to be able to talk through our issues to continue to move forward with the campaign.”

Melissa had experienced domestic and interpersonal violence, but this was not seen as legitimate by one of the other members who had been sexually assaulted. This survivor activist believed that in order to advocate for sexual assault, the person needed to be impacted in that way. This created tensions among the members of nowUCsb, but they were able to work through some of this via a therapy session with one of the school's psychologists. There were other issues that arose that fragmented the group. There was a graduate student member who was accused of sexual harassment by another graduate student not in the group. This made students in the group uncomfortable and drove the student accused of this to leave the group.

The emotional labor and management of emotions that arose as a result of being survivors and hearing stories of sexual violence created many challenges for those students involved in the movement. This labor was critical to the success of these movement but was “traumatic” to the majority of those who participated. Many of the activists left the movement early and stopped doing advocacy work on this issue because of the emotional toll of working on this issue. Some, particularly public survivors, expressed concern as to how this work would affect them in the future. Nicoletta from UC Berkeley discussed some of the negative consequences of being so public with her experience of sexual assault.

“I mean being involved in this meant that everybody knew what [had] happened to me. It was very public and I never really knew who knew what about me. There were some weird things. The actual complaint that we filed against – the lawsuit, like if you go online you can find the lawsuit. The lawsuit has very explicit information about my assault and there was one time where my – I worked in a lab the year after I graduated and my lab mate told me that our boss had read the complaint and then wished that he hadn't because it had all of this graphic information. So it was kind of

uncomfortable in the way that my boss read this very explicit description of this. So it was weird – it has been weird, it continues to be weird to go through my life knowing that the first thing that comes up when you Google me is this activism, which is fine, but then like this private information about my experience with my assault is also available to people. That has been a challenge. I'm kind of used to it now.”

Public survivors have to deal with their personal information being out in the internet for people to read. Nicoletta struggled with this at first, but she has gotten accustomed to it. Several of the women expressed concern as to how their work, particularly going public with their stories of sexual violence would affect their careers and personal lives. As Nicoletta demonstrated in the excerpt above, involvement in this movement can follow them for the rest of their lives and can affect their professional and personal lives.

This section elaborated on the invisible emotional labor that many activists had to do to make campus sexual violence a priority issue and to create change on their campuses. Discussing sexual violence on a daily basis, hearing stories of sexual assault, and often times dealing with their own assaults made working on this issue very difficult and it affected their involvement in the movement. In the following two sections I focus on other challenges activists experienced and show how they affected the trajectory and effectiveness of the campaigns they waged on their campuses.

Race, Ethnicity and Class

The racial, ethnic, class, and cultural background of the student activists who made up the movements against sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley played a critical role in the work they did. It presented both challenges and privileges in organizing. In this section I discuss the different ways in which the students' race, ethnicity, and cultural and class background affected their activist work against sexual violence.⁷⁵ This influenced

their socialization and resources available to them which in turned affected how they organized against sexual violence and what they were able to do.

The ethnic and cultural background of the activists shaped their socialization of sex and sexual violence. Seven of the women I interviewed from both campuses – Aanchal, Rosa, Iman, Lacy, Janel, Jocellyn, and Alejandra, described how discussions of sex, sexual assault, and activism against sexual violence were taboo in their families and should be kept private. This had a deep influence on their activist work. It pushed them to talk about sexual violence and dating violence in their respective communities while in college, but it also pushed them to be careful in how they participated in the movement. These women came from South Asian/Indian, Asian American, African American, and Chicana/Latina backgrounds. For Rosa and Lacy, two Asian American women who attended UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara respectively, sexual violence was not talked about in their families and was portrayed as something shameful, which led them to address dating violence and sexual violence within the Asian American communities on their campuses. Aanchal, a South Asian/Indian woman who attended UC Berkeley had a similar experience:

“My family grew up in India and they brought their culture here with them, and they have embedded it into every single thing that we do. But I think that it’s been really hard for me because I was born and raised here, and I was born and raised in a pretty white neighborhood where I would go to my friends’ houses and hear my friends talk very openly about things that I would never even consider talking to my parents about. Things like relationships or dating or topics like sexual violence. Even just that word, sexual violence, or phrase, is taboo in my community. Like I go to family/friend events or parties or weddings or whatever it is and they ask me “What are you working on at UC Berkeley?” I could tell them everything I’m working on but I know that I couldn’t at the same time because that would lead to a bunch of negativity; not just about me but about my family. Because the way our culture works is that you represent your family and for them doing activist work like this, interacting with this kind of issue is seen as a negative thing... I think because I was never given a space to talk about it that it made me want to talk about it more. And that gave me more passion and it made me want to connect to people more because if I didn’t have that space at home, then I had to find it elsewhere.”

Topics of dating, sex, and sexual violence were taboo in Aanchal's family and community, which pushed her to create spaces in college to discuss them. Aanchal was born in the United States and her parents in India. Her family socialization and embeddedness in a white middle-class neighborhood enabled her to see differences across cultures particularly as to how dating and sexual violence are discussed. Iman, an African American student from UC Berkeley, also discussed how there was a difference in how sexual violence was discussed in white and black families.

“Since most of the women that I did talk with and work with around this issue were white, I kind of saw that my situation was a different perspective and I realized that within the black community, sexual assault is not something that's often talked about or that is acknowledged. Honestly it needs to change. I saw a stark difference in communities, especially even talking with family members, they would ask, “Why would you talk about something like this? It's private and so embarrassing.” Realizing that in hearing that from others, those weren't the conversations going on in their households and their families. Oh, gosh, maybe this is a cultural issue that we kind of keep it under the rug and we don't talk about them. So that stuff is motivating me to keep talking about things to ensure that when I do talk about this subject I am also specifically gearing the conversation towards people of color.”

Iman, like the other women of color I interviewed, used her family's lack of discussion around sexual violence to motivate her to talk about the issue and focus on the needs of people of color. Chicana/Latina women I interviewed also described sexual violence as being a taboo topic in their families. Latina students discussed how family was a key resource and source of support after being assaulted, but some of them did not feel supported by their family. For example, in the previous chapter I discussed Alejandra, a Latina UC Santa Barbara student, who did not pursue a lawsuit against the university because her family did not know about her assault and would not have been supportive of this. The lack of awareness of her sexual assault and expected lack of support from her family led Alejandra to try to hide her activist work.

“I also had to cover my tracks with my family. I had to be very careful with what I was posting on social media. Make sure that I blocked every single family member and blocked mutual friends that most family members had so that they wouldn’t be able to see what I was doing in Santa Barbara. And I think that if I wasn’t so afraid about coming out to my family about the situation, then I could have done so much more damage to UC Santa Barbara. I feel like I could have done a lot more, but I didn’t do it. And that’s also why I think I didn’t pursue a Title IX lawsuit because if I had done it, every lawyer that I was talking to at the time told me, “oh, we need to have a press conference,” which shows that people only care about the conversation about sexual assault if you are willing to tell your story.”

Alejandra was careful with how she used social media, which was one of the main organizing forums for students at UC Santa Barbara, so her family would not find out about her assault and the activist work she was doing. Other students also reported being careful with what they posted on social media because of fear their families would find out about their experiences of sexual violence and/or activist work against sexual violence. Alejandra was dissuaded from seeking legal action against the school, mainly because lawyers had told her she would need to do a press conference and go public with her assault. As discussed above, the notion of a public survivor was central to the movement, but there were factors that prevented survivors from participating in this movement so publicly. Alejandra, fearing her family’s reaction, hesitated going public with her story. She did publicly disclose being a survivor, but to the UC Santa Barbara and UC community first and eventually her immediate family. Alejandra said she could have pushed the university more through media, but she did not want her family to find out so she did not engage with media as much as she would have liked. The push for press conferences shows a cultural preference for how sexual assault should be dealt with in a white society, and this is then used as a mold for how other people (those who are not white) should address their own experience.

Student of color engaging in this activist work encountered challenges that white students did not. The two black women I interviewed described challenges not reported by

the other students. UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley have small African American populations among its undergraduate students. The African American undergraduate population for both campuses has been at or under five percent every year for the past six years, making these communities small for both campuses. Iman, who reported working mostly with white women in advocating for the rights of survivors of sexual violence, experienced challenges within the African American community at UC Berkeley.

“After the incident, I really didn’t hang out with my [African American] community much more after because the backlash was so bad. There was so much controversy over what happened to me that I really didn’t participate as a woman of color, as a black woman in activism on campus much more after that. It was kind of awkward to go to those events... With my narrative in particular the person who assaulted me was a close friend of mine and we had a lot of mutual friends. We lived in the same [African American] dorm community so they were all very upset with me that I had now possibly ruined this person’s life and was now holding him accountable. I don’t know if people believed me or not. I kind of became a social pariah so after that I didn’t really participate in a lot of the African American events on campus.”

Iman’s activism against sexual violence created controversy within the African American community and created backlash against her, particularly after she had accused a black man of sexual assault. This backlash was probably a result of the high incarceration rate of black men and the long racist history that extends back to slavery that characterizes black men as dangerous, hypersexual, and sexual predators. She described feeling guilty after reporting her assault and that she was attacking her community by holding her perpetrator accountable. This led to her becoming an outcast within this community and alienating her even further within the campus. Iman’s experiences reveals the pressure African American women may feel when experiencing sexual violence at the hands of a man from their own community to not report nor engage in activist work on this issue.

Ro’Shawndra, from UC Santa Barbara, also encountered unique challenges that other women of color and white women did not experience advocating for survivors.

Ro'Shawndra said that it was "extremely difficult" to this work while being a black woman. She felt that people did not believe her experiences of sexual violence and disregarded her activist work. Ro'Shawndra connected this to the long history of sexual, gender, and racial subjugation black women have been subjected to in the United States. She described several instances of racial microaggressions she had experienced when she reported her case to law enforcement and the school. For example, a District Attorney from the city of Santa Barbara asked to touch her hair. She also discussed how the school tokenized the few black women in administrative positions and made them work with her. In addition, Ro'Shawndra described how her use of Ebonics created challenges for her, despite "code-switching" when talking to administrators.

"They [the administration] literally had to go to someone's office just to communicate with Title IX. Because apparently, they can't understand me? I speak the same language as everybody else and I do not have an "accent." But Title IX couldn't understand me so I gotta get somebody else as a black woman to say the same words that I've been saying in an email and in person."

Despite code-switching, school officials had to get someone to "translate" what Ro'Shawndra was saying because they didn't understand her. Her attempts at "interpret[ing] things to them differently" did not work and she eventually stopped code-switching. This shows how much work institutions still need to do to understand and better serve the student populations on campus. Iman's and Ro'Shawndra's experiences show how black women experience sexual violence differently which also affects their experiences as activists on this issue.

Chicana/Latina women also experienced challenges when engaging in activism. Diana, a graduate student at UC Santa Barbara described how during a meeting with UCOP and UC Santa Barbara administrators, the Chicana/Latina students in nowUCsb were

“disrespected” and “harassed” by officials from these offices. According to her, the Chicana/Latina activists were treated differently from the white activists.

“I saw them disrespect us to our face and then all of the sudden white graduate students, who are in support of these committees and are doing good work and whatnot, walked in the room and I saw how dramatically different they were treated. It completely disgusted me...they know the talk, they play polite – these white students who are putting in this work. They are respected, they use the jargon, they’re dressed up in suits to have these meetings and it's like no I don't come here for that. Like I’m pissed off.

In this excerpt, Diana discussed how white students, who were dressed professionally and were “playing nice” got more respect from university officials and were received differently than the Chicana/Latina students. Students of color were not the only ones to notice a difference in treatment and reception to their activist work, white students noticed it as well. Nine of the students I interviewed who identified as white discussed how their racial background gave them privilege when doing activist work against sexual violence. According to them, their white racial background gave them more credibility. They were looked at more sympathetically, and were sought out more frequently for expertise on this topic. Hannah from UC Berkeley said:

“I know I had more of an ability to be believed and looked at as a sympathetic victim or survivor because I fit a lot of those [rape survivor] stereotypes... for the most part the perfect victim narrative in some ways and largely because I am white. So I could be believed more and I had probably more legitimacy in the eyes of administrators.”

Hannah described how her white racial background and fitting into this “perfect victim narrative” which is often a white woman, gave her credibility and legitimacy when talking to school officials. Lucy, also from UC Berkeley, described how the centering of white women in this movement is what helped the movement get attention and gave her and other white women legitimacy when doing this work. Lexi, from UC Santa Barbara discussed how her whiteness gave her legitimacy when doing activist work:

“People listen to me and believe me and I’m who they turn to when me, Ale, and Melissa are talking. They look to me first. And that’s really gross but it’s like I have that advantage and it’s been really like a process because I didn’t even realize that for a while. They had to point it out to me and I’ve had to relearn to understand why people are looking at me when they do and why people default to me. And it’s not because I’m some guru, it’s because I’m white.”

Lexi described how people usually acknowledged her and went to her first when doing activist work with women of color. Despite Alejandra and Melissa, two working-class Latinas, doing the bulk of the work of organizing the sit-in and rallies in 2015 and being the lead organizers, people usually went to Lexi first. Race and ethnicity played critical factors in how students engaged in anti-sexual violence work. For students of color it created challenges and helped direct their activist work to focus on addressing the needs of their own communities. For white students, it gave them privileges that facilitated this work and gave them authority and legitimacy over this issue.

In addition to race and ethnicity, class background was another key factor shaping the students’ involvement in the movement against sexual violence. Students from middle- and upper middle-class backgrounds had more time to devote to advocacy and activist work than working-class students. For example, Aanchal did not have to work every day so she had time and energy to devote to this issue and other things that she was passionate about. Sofie, one of the lead organizers at UC Berkeley, was able to focus on activist work and organize the Title IX and Clery Act complaints because her family was able to pay for her education and she did not need to work for pay. Not having to work for pay allowed students to work on things that they were interested in and they did not need to worry about money. These students could attend meetings and they did not have work conflicts when engaging in this work. They also did not have the added stress and worry of how they would be paying for rent, school, and food. Jenny discussed how financial aid and external aid affected her

activist work at MIT and UC Santa Barbara.

“I've had a lot more opportunity to do this kind of work. It's comparatively less dangerous for me than other people. I'm not heavily dependent on the school for financial aid. I didn't have significant amounts of financial aid in undergrad and I don't have significant amounts of financial aid now because I have an NSF [National Science Foundation] fellowship, so I'm not dependent on the school for my income. And as a result I think that I have been gifted the ability to be louder and be angrier and complain more without risking things like my financial aid getting messed up and being dropped from all my classes and other kinds of low level retaliation that I imagine are common for people who are more dependent on the school for financial aid and stuff like that.”

Jenny described how being financially independent from the universities she has attended has allowed her to be more openly critical against the university and she did not have to fear retaliation. Working-class students were not able to devote as much time as they would have liked to fighting sexual violence nor engage in the activities they were passionate about. Many of the students I interviewed from UC Santa Barbara were working class and they had to engage in fundraising activities to advocate for the rights of survivors. For example, after the rally outside the library and on their way to Chancellor Yang's office on May 13, 2015 a student began collecting money to help send Alejandra and Melissa to a UC Regent's meeting. Ro'Shawndra also raised funds to help organizers do their work. A student from UC Santa Barbara, who wanted to remain anonymous, discussed how there were attempts at collaboration between organizers from UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley, but lack of financial resources played a factor in this not working out.

“There was a survivor from UC Berkeley that we were working with who was really frustrated because we couldn't make it up there to meet with her in person. And in reality it was because we couldn't afford to go to travel to San Francisco to meet with her for a weekend, when Alejandra had to work and in reality I couldn't afford the fare to go up there... It just wasn't something feasible for us... [she was] frustrated that we weren't serious about the issue or that we didn't want to be [a] part of the group. And then when we asked for survivors who are working on policy reform and advocacy to get supported financially – like how anybody else working for the school would get compensated. They think that it's unfair and in our reality

we are also students and we're trying to work on these issues. This is a lot of stress both emotionally and mentally, and financially to be doing this work. When we asked for that, we didn't have that support that we would [have] like[ed] from them.”

The anonymous student described how UC Santa Barbara students' inability to pay for travel to San Francisco was read by a UC Berkeley student as not being interested in this issue. They also described how UC Berkeley did not support their quest to compensate students working on issues of sexual violence for their time and work. Some students from UC Berkeley were not understanding of issues and struggles that working-class women of color experience and did not result in collaboration between both campuses.

The racial, ethnic, class, and cultural background of student activists affected their involvement in the campus movement against sexual violence. This created challenges and privileges that informed the tactics and how they engaged in this issue. They also shaped the notion of public survivor. In the next section, I discuss the backlash students faced that added to the emotional stress described in the previous section.

Backlash to the Movement

The activists who were involved in the movements against sexual violence on both campuses experienced backlash to their work. They were subjected to hateful and hurtful comments on the internet and by the media. Student activists from UC Santa Barbara experienced a more intense conservative backlash not reported by activists from UC Berkeley. This was mostly due to Santa Barbara being a conservative area and that the movement against sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara began to take off in 2015, around the same time that Donald Trump announced his campaign for president and there was the emergence of a conservative countermovement that targeted many of the liberal and progressive movements on campus. This created challenges for activists and added to the

already existing emotional stress of doing work on issues of sexual violence. In this section I describe the general backlash students experienced from engaging in anti-sexual violence work and then focus on the conservative backlash that directly targeted activists against sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara.

Activists from both campuses reported there was a backlash to the work they were doing that involved attacking their activist work and survivors of sexual violence. As the national campus movement against sexual assault gained traction, there were laws and policies that were passed that supported survivors and increased their rights. Sexual violence disproportionately affects women and this movement has been portrayed as a women's movement, which has led to the increase of men's rights groups and the attack of legislation and policies that they perceive would undermine men's rights. This consisted of publicly denouncing statistics and campaigns led by activists. This backlash also extended to the individual activists and their experiences of assault. Anais from UC Berkeley discussed how there were male internet trolls who called activists "horrible things on the internet." Students also reported hate messages via social media, internet, and news article comments. Alejandra, from UC Santa Barbara, discussed the personal attacks that she, Melissa, and Lexi received. She said students would write "oh they deserved to get raped," and "they're too ugly, who would want to rape them?" She went on to describe other comments she read in the school and local newspapers and the effects this had on her.

"I remember reading in *The Independent* [a local Santa Barbara newspaper] at one point, I was called an agitator, a liar, and a slut. I remember reading in the school newspaper comments – I think they said something about Melissa, Lexi, and myself and they were like "oh, you all are not that pretty anyways." Things like that. Also I think that for me like walking into UCSB any time, I'm always kind of anxious and I'm just kind of like who can see me? Who knows who I am? And do they know my story? And if they do, how do they take it? Are they supportive or do they want to do some harm to me?"

Alejandra described the hateful and negative comments she and other activists received after their sit-in which created anxiety for her. She and other survivors who were public with their stories of sexual violence were subjected to these negative comments which added to the emotional labor they had to manage and engage in.

Students from UC Santa Barbara endured a more intense backlash to their activism. Conservative students, mostly white men that supported Donald Trump for president, formed a countermovement to the liberal and progressive movements on campus, including the campus anti-sexual violence movement. This countermovement was mostly done under the group Young Americans for Liberty (YAL), a national “libertarian youth organization advancing liberty on campus and in American electoral politics” (Young Americans for Liberty 2019).⁷⁶ Members of this organization often wore attire in support of Trump (such as “Make America Great Again” baseball-style caps) and hosted controversial speakers, such as Matt Walsh and Milo Yiannopolous. Some of the events they hosted include “Feminism is Cancer,” “Is there a Rape Epidemic?: Rape Hysteria, Due Process, and Free Speech,” and “An Encroachment on Liberty: How the Left Exploits Transgender Laws.”

YAL created a hostile environment for the LGBTQ community, survivors of sexual violence, people of color, and women. In addition to hosting their own events, they often showed up at other organizations’ events and disrupted them. For example, they showed up at the Women of Color Conference, Million Student March, pro-Bernie Sanders rallies, and several anti-sexual violence events. In spring 2016, chalkings with hateful messages were written all over campus: “All Lives Matter,” “Trump, Build the Wall,” “There Are Only Two Genders,” “Rape Culture is a Lie,” and “*The Hunting Ground* is Full of Lies, 1 in 4 Women Are Not Raped.” All this created an unwelcoming and hostile environment for

many communities on the campus. Several of the UC Santa Barbara students I interviewed described feeling “uncomfortable,” “unsafe,” and “scared.” Janel stated that campus was not a safe space for survivors and sexual violence activism. Alissa, a member of nowUCsb, described how YAL affected the group.

“This year [2016], Young Americans for Liberty has come out and they've definitely been a huge challenge for us, I would say. They're always protesting our events and coming at us with different statistics of why we may be incorrect or why the problem isn't as big as we're making it out to be. And that's been a major problem because it's a lot of pushback towards the movement that we're trying to do to help people. And then at the same time, it's really frustrating.”

Cierra, a graduate student at UC Santa Barbara and member of nowUCsb, also discussed how YAL targeted nowUCsb, which made it hard for the group to continue their advocacy and activist work. She said: “It's been hard to have real discussions because so much of what we are trying to do in those spaces gets taken over by them and then it becomes about responding back to them.” Cierra and Alissa described how these conservative counter-protesters shaped the anti-sexual violence activist work they engaged in and the conversations they were having on campus. Cierra in an interview admitted that the conservative backlash nowUCsb received in 2016 played a role in why the group did not organize more events towards the end of the school year.

Many of the events and protests organized by nowUCsb were attended and interrupted by members of YAL. One of these was the double screening of *The Hunting Ground* in the University Center in April 2016. Five white men stood in front of the screen with signs saying “Pro-Due Process ≠ Anti-Women” and “*The Hunting Ground* = Propaganda.” One of these men kept trying to engage with Alejandra and at one point took out his phone to film her. During this film screening, some of the members of nowUCsb had to step out and leave for a moment because they got overwhelmed and frustrated with the

counter-protesters. Other members of nowUCsb had to step in to lead the film and discussion. Cierra mentioned that it seemed to her that the protesters were “trying to hurt the survivors in the room.” A year after the 2015 sit-in, nowUCsb organized a demonstration outside library protesting how their demands had not been met. A group of about ten women including nowUCsb members held up large signs denouncing the administration and the campus. Two white men, members of YAL, showed up with signs of their own and attempted to engage with the anti-sexual violence activists. The members from the conservative groups went beyond just protesting events hosted by nowUCsb. Some of the members from nowUCsb reported being stalked and harassed by members of YAL. This targeting of nowUCsb and its members made some of the students “freak out” and fearful for their safety. Several of the students I interviewed did not feel that the university was responding adequately to the students from YAL harassing and creating unfavorable conditions for their activist work on campus and that of other groups. Staff and administrators’ response to protesters was telling nowUCsb members to ignore them.

nowUCsb was not the only anti-sexual violence group targeted by these conservative groups. The CARE office at UC Santa Barbara that provides advocacy and resources to survivors on campus was also targeted. Sandy, who was a student worker at CARE, described how members from these conservative groups disrupted school-sponsored events.

“[At] our Men Can Stop Rape event, speakers were very interactive with the audience and they [YAL] just kind of wanted to derail the conversation. You know it was interactive but they kind of had a point that they were leading up to and it would kind of derail the conversation.”

In addition to protesting events, members from YAL wrote op-eds and response columns in the school newspapers about the events hosted by CARE. This affected the work of other students in trying to bring awareness to sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara. For example,

one of the sororities on campus was planning to host a screening of *The Hunting Ground* in spring 2016 in one of the large lecture halls located in Isla Vista, but were advised by their national chapter to change the location to their sorority house after students threatened to protest and trolled their Facebook event page.

The backlash reported by both campuses indicates the formation of a countermovement to the campus anti-sexual violence movement. UC Berkeley experienced it, but students from UC Santa Barbara reported a stronger movement and response to their work. This backlash is indicative of the changing political climate and threat this movement posed to cultural, social, and political norms at the time. The backlash activists received added to the anxiety and mental health problems they were already experiencing. For students from UC Santa Barbara, this backlash affected the work they did and created challenges that hindered their efforts at bringing awareness to sexual violence.

Conclusion

The study of emotions in social movements and sociology more broadly has expanded since the cultural approach that developed in the 1980s. There has been a wide range of research on emotions in protests, political conflict, and social movements beginning in the 1990s (Fernandez 2000; Goodwin, Jasper, and Polleta 2001; Groves 1997; Petersen 2002; Taylor 1995). Although not grounded in social movements, Arlie Hochschild developed the concept of emotional labor in her book, *The Managed Heart* (1983) to describe the process by which workers manage their emotions and feelings according to the guidelines and rules of their workplace. Hochschild's canonical work has inspired research in the area of emotions in sociology and this literature has been focused on two major streams of research: "the first uses emotional labor as a vehicle to understand the

organization, structure, and social relations of service jobs, while the second focuses on individuals' efforts to express and regulate emotion and the consequences of those efforts" (Wharton 2009: 147). Most of this literature focuses on the workplace and paid labor, but it also applies to the free labor students in this research were engaging in. Although not paid for their labor, activists against sexual violence were candid with the emotional difficulties they experienced while working on this issue. Part of this emotional labor involved managing their emotions while helping survivors of sexual violence and often listening to experiences of sexual violence. It also entailed dealing with self-care and addressing the vicarious trauma and secondhand traumatic stress they experienced as a result of this. The emotional labor activists against sexual violence reported highlights a critical dimension of the invisible and often unacknowledged labor they engaged in to improve the rights of survivors. They experienced secondhand traumatic stress and vicarious trauma, and survivors had to deal with their own experiences of violence. This also led to problems and tensions within activist communities they were a part of.

A critical part of the emotional labor survivor activists did was to tell, over and over again, their stories of sexual violence and trauma. Personal stories and narratives are critical to social movements and they affect the emergence, identity building, internal dynamics, and recruitment in social movements (Davis 2002). Story-telling as a social movement tactic is important in the development of collective identities (Terriquez 2015; Taylor 1996; Whittier 2001; 2009, 2012, 2017) and evoking moral emotions that can move people to act (Jasper 1997, 1998; Jasper and Joulson 1995; Luker 1984; Taylor 1996; Whittier 2001, 2009, 2017). The public survivor and story-telling were key to the emergence and development of this movement. In chapter four, I discuss collective trauma resonance as the empathy and

emotional connection people share after enduring similar traumatic experiences, often occurring when activists publicly share their experiences of sexual violence and institutional betrayal. In those chapters, I argue that collective trauma resonance played a significant role in the movement garnering wider support. Although collective trauma resonance did help the movement and it helped in the development of a collective identity based on surviving sexual assault, it took an emotional toll on the survivors who had to constantly tell and relive their experiences of sexual violence. The movement centered on public survivors and put pressure on them to publicly disclose they were survivors of sexual violence and to detail their experiences. The sharing of experiences of sexual violence is a visibility tactic that involves coming out (Whittier 2012, 2017), which entails “the disclosure of silenced or politicized identities (rape survivor, queer, person with AIDS, person who has had an abortion) in daily life or in public events” (Whittier 2017: 383). The public disclosure of silenced identities can cause a cognitive and emotional shift in that person’s identity and affect how outsiders view them (Whittier 2012). For the campus movement, coming out as survivors of sexual violence and telling their stories of being survivors and experiences reporting their assaults to their universities helped mobilize other survivors to join the movement and maintain a collective identity based on these experiences.

Scholars such as Whittier (2001) and Groves (1997) have focused on the use of emotions in creating moral outrage and in legitimating their claims. Although not the focus of this research, examining how activists against sexual violence used emotions to legitimate their claims and garner support, would add another dimension to the emotional labor that activists were reporting to be doing already. For example, Whittier (2001) discussed how activists were urged to manage and tailor their emotions and displays of pain according to

the setting they were in. In conferences and meetings, survivors expressed anger, grief, shame, and pride in their overcoming of victimization. While in courts to press claims for crime victims' compensation, survivors were encouraged to express grief, fear, and shame, but to refrain from expressing anger or pride. Whittier's research focuses on the emotional labor activists engage in while displaying emotions in public contexts. It doesn't, however, discuss the effects of reliving trauma and constantly hearing stories of violence as a form of emotional labor, and the possible effects of this on the social movements they are participating in. My research found that reliving experiences of sexual violence and hearing such stories on a daily basis affected the movements the activists were in by forcing them to drop out of the movement and sometimes this work all together.

The constant discussion of experiences of sexual violence and the media's response to it was seen as problematic by some students. Alejandra from UC Santa Barbara brought up trauma porn and how "society loves to live off of it," but it was not effective. She connected the constant need to tell traumatic experiences to the consumption of trauma by media and general public. Trauma porn is "the exploitative sharing of the darkest, creepiest, most jarring parts of...trauma specifically for the purpose of shocking others. It can be engaging for some non-survivors because of the shock value, but is not only unhelpful to survivors, but often actually harmful...because it can trigger...PTSD" (Zipursky 2018). Tarana Burke, founder of the #MeToo Movement has warned about sexual violence stories becoming trauma porn. Burke said, "What I have watched over the last two years is the world trade on the labor of survivors. They trot us out to tell these gory stories, and nobody takes into account what that does to us. We should be careful that people don't turn our stories into fodder for their trauma porn" (Wulforth 2019). The sharing of traumatic

experiences can bring awareness to an issue and even start social movements, however, what is often overlooked is the emotional labor it takes to do this and its effects on survivors. The campaigns and protests are well documented by media and academics, but not much is said about the emotional labor survivor activists have to put in nor the psychological toll it takes to engage in a movement that focuses on violence and where many of the participants have experienced trauma themselves.

This chapter also highlights the importance of race, ethnicity, class, and gender in the lives of the activists I interviewed. Scholars (such as Kimberlé Crenshaw 1991, Patricia Hill Collins 1999, and Acker 2006) have developed different terms to examine the different social categories or identities that intersect together to affect people's lives, particularly women of color. These terms help us to understand how an activist's background can affect the type of work they do against sexual violence. Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) coined the term intersectionality to highlight the ways in which social movement organizations and advocacy around domestic violence do not take into consideration the needs and vulnerabilities of women of color. She uses intersectionality to refer to the various ways in which gender and race interact to shape multiple areas of black women's lives. An intersectional framework complicates the notion of the public survivor that has been so central to this movement and explains the challenges women of color and working-class students experienced. How do race, ethnicity, class, and gender affect who is able to be a survivor activist and how they engage in this movement? This chapter shows that the ability to be a public survivor is not simple and that issues of race, ethnicity, class, and gender are deeply embedded in it and who is able to afford to be a public survivor. This work contributes to the recent and growing academic literature (Brown, Ray, Summers, and

Fraistat 2017; Chun et al. 2013; Clay 2012; DeTurk 2014; Fisher, Jasny, and Dow 2018; Frederick 2010; Luna 2016; Milkman and Terriquez 2012; Pastrana 2010; Roth 2008; Terriquez 2015; Townsend-Bell 2011; Ward 2008) that applies an intersectional approach to social movements.

The activists' race, ethnicity, class, and gender influenced their involvement in the movement and presented challenges to students of color and working-class students. Some women of color described how sexual violence was a taboo topic in their families while growing up. Some feared their families' finding out about their sexual assault and activism, which kept them from engaging in legal tactics and limited the work they could do in the movement. One of the black women I interviewed described feeling guilty for holding her perpetrator, a black man, accountable and that the African American community at her campus felt attacked because of this. This brings into question the relationship between the campus movement against sexual violence and the criminal justice system. Carceral feminism relies on policing, prosecution, and imprisonment to solve sexual and gendered violence, and to advance women' liberation (Bernstein 2010, 2012). Carceral feminism is criticized for failing to account for the racist nature of the carceral state and how it tends to harm communities of color (Richie 2012). The dominant response to campus sexual assault has been to use punitive powers on behalf of women (Whittier 2016). My findings indicate that the effects and reliance on punitive powers in the campus sexual violence movement should be further examined. An intersectional feminist approach would uncover the different social, economic, and political factors that interact to influence their experiences of violence and the solutions necessary to address them (Arnold 2013; Naples 2009).

My research reveals that women of color have different experiences from that of white women and that they are typically not discussed as part of this movement against sexual violence. White student activists were seen as more legitimate, credible, and looked at more sympathetically while doing anti-sexual assault activism. There was a normative and socially acceptable notion of what a “perfect survivor” was that benefitted the white women involved and helped them while doing work in the movement. These findings were consistent with descriptions of the movement in the recently published book *The New Campus Anti-Rape Movement* by Heldman, Ackerman, and Breckenridge-Jackson (2018). They discussed how white women were the most visible activists in the movement and the barriers women of color faced:

“The most prominent voices in the struggle belong to white women. This bias stems from who is comfortable speaking and who is listened to the most. Survivors of color, men of all races, and LGBTQ individuals have greater barriers when it comes to speaking up. Coming forward as a survivor is never easy, but survivors who do not fit the media stereotype of a rape survivor (a heterosexual white woman) face even more intense scrutiny and severe and additional consequences for coming forward, outing themselves as victims and survivors, or standing up for themselves and others. We have witnessed firsthand the unique pressures women of color faced when being the face of the movement – being fired outright, ostracized by the people they thought they could rely on the most, being repeatedly told that they need to support men of color, having administrators engage in protectionism for men of color over their needs, worrying about their families, worrying about their immigration status or those of their families. These structural and organizational issues “permit” only certain women or men (with privilege in various forms) to be able to be out in front” (p. 67-68).

Students from UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara reported similar experiences to those described by Heldman et al. (2018). The authors also discuss a class bias in the movement in the sense of who can afford to attend colleges and universities, but they fail to address how it affected the activists’ tactics and involvement in the movement against sexual violence. This chapter demonstrated how class background not only affected the material resources

available to the students, but also the time they were able to devote to this movement. Middle- and upper-class students were able to devote more time and effort to do activist and advocacy work, and could be more critical because they were financially independent from their school. Working-class students had less time to engage in this work and at times, because of the need to work to pay for school or simply to survive, could not fully devote time to activist campaigns and alliances. Their need to work and inability to put in more hours to the movement was sometimes misread as being disinterested and not serious about making changes on issues of sexual violence.

Students from UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara confronted backlash for the work they did against sexual violence. This consisted of negative and hateful comments on the internet and in person. The backlash these students experienced was not unique. This was reported in many other campuses and it occurred at the national level as well via conservative organizations and leaders. Heldman et al. (2018) distinguished this backlash into four distinct categories: denying the problem exists (challenging data), blaming victims, vilifying whistleblowers (attacking survivors), and protecting perpetrators (p. 161). The last category has occurred mostly in the legal realm and has been led mainly by men. In recent years, men found responsible for sexual misconduct have sued institutions of higher education (Heldman et al. 2018) to affirm their right to due process.

The backlash that the campus movement confronted signals a strong countermovement. Meyer and Staggenborg (1996) defined a countermovement as “a movement that makes contrary claims simultaneously to those of the original movement” (p. 1631). Countermovements are generated or intensified by another movement and emerge when a movement has experienced success (Andrews 2002; Meyer and Staggenborg 1996;

Mottl 1980; Whittier 2007; Zald and Useem 1987). For example, Andrews (2002:919) in his study on the patterns of white resistance to school desegregation in Mississippi found that three factors helped explain white counter-mobilization: credible threats that desegregation will be implemented (success), blacks having the organizational capacity to protest within newly desegregated schools, and whites having the organizational capacity and resources to resist desegregation. Countermovements tend to emerge where successful movements threaten a population with strong potential political allies (Meyer and Staggenborg 1996) and the involvement of power elites can also be responsible for the mobilization of a countermovement (Mottl 1980; Pichardo 1995). Countermovements impact the social movements they oppose (Fetner 2001; Meyer and Staggenborg 1996; Zald and Useem 1987). Fetner (2001) in her research on how opposing movements impact each other found that Christian anti-gay activism influenced the frames, tone, and language used by the Lesbian and Gay movements, but no change on issues in which the anti-gay movement remained silent. At times opposing movements join forces to fight for a common cause. Whittier (2018) uses the term “frenemies” to describe the different relationships developed between feminists and conservatives in criminalizing pornography, child sexual abuse, and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). The countermovement at UC Santa Barbara shaped the conversations and work activists against sexual violence were engaged in. In the United States, countermovements have mobilized around many different issues including abortion, the Equal Rights Amendment, gay rights, animal rights, and busing.

The antifeminist countermovement that developed as a response to the campus movement against sexual violence in the 2010s was not new. Anti-feminist issues were one of the many issue campaigns led by the New American Right that developed in the 1960s

(Staggenborg 2011). Previous feminist and anti-sexual violence efforts have seen the emergence of countermovements, including the suffrage movement in late 1800s and the feminist movements of the 1970s (Pelak, Taylor, and Whittier 1999). Anti-feminist countermovements in the past have consisted of vested-interest groups comprised typically by men and voluntary grassroots associations made up of women (Chafetz and Dworkin 1987). These groups responded to threats created by the feminist movement: men and vested-interest groups perceived a class-based threat, and women saw their status of traditional women threatened (Chafetz and Dworkin 1987). In the early 1990s there was a backlash against anti-rape work. This came after an increase in research and discussions of rape on college campuses and several high-profile cases of sexual violence including Anita Hill and Desiree Washington (Heldman et al. 2018). The backlash consisted of men's rights organizations, journalists in mainstream media, and academic researchers that questioned rape statistics and what constituted rape, and dismissed the prevalence of sexual violence (Heldman et al. 2018).

The backlash experienced by UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara students varied slightly. This was probably due to the timing of the movements. The UC Berkeley movement began in 2012-2013 which means they were doing this work before it became a priority issue. Activists reported the vilifying and blaming of survivors and challenges to their claims, but it wasn't as intense as that reported by UC Santa Barbara students. The movement at UC Santa Barbara began taking off in 2015, well into the prime of the movement that had been relatively successful. Activists from Santa Barbara experienced a stronger and more intense backlash that was directly targeting the movement and its participants. Factors that affected this backlash include the conservative social and political

climate of Santa Barbara, the racialized and misogynistic elements of the presidential campaign of Donald Trump, and the success of the campus movement nationally. The campaign and eventual election of Donald Trump as president emboldened the countermovement against sexual violence and other liberal movements.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

My dissertation examines the emergence and trajectory of the campus movements against sexual violence at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara in the 2010s. These movements, along with hundreds of others, coalesced to form a national movement against sexual violence targeting institutions of higher education. These efforts laid the groundwork for more recent movements including #MeToo and Times' Up and were critical in making sexual violence part of a national conversation. This research is a part of a larger history of movements against sexual violence that have built upon each other and created tools and resources for each subsequent mobilization.

The emergence of the national campus movement against sexual violence was made possible by changes in gender relations and cultural, social, and political shifts in the United States since the 1970s. These gendered and political structures helped foster a successful national campus movement against sexual violence – but they developed distinctly at the local level. Although conditions were ripe for the emergence of this campus movement, there were key differences in the emergence and trajectory of this movement across campuses. Following Raeburn's (2004) multi-level "institutional opportunity framework" that highlights the macro- and meso-level contextual conditions that facilitated favorable outcomes for institutional activists, this research acknowledges the broad and macro-level gendered and political opportunities as critical, however, there were other local contextual factors in the immediate environment of the activists that constrained or facilitated the broader opportunities that enabled this movement. This research identifies the local and institutional factors and histories that affected the timing, tactical repertoire, and trajectory

of the movement on two UC campuses. In the following section, I discuss the main findings from the chapters.

Chapters three and four discussed how and why students created a movement against sexual violence at UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara. It established a timeline that describes how differences in timing and development of each movement was influenced by the campus culture, university prestige, local events, and the formation of networks among activists. The movement at UC Berkeley took off in 2012 and used more conventional tactics including federal complaints, lobbying to legislators, and civil lawsuits. One key factor in the early development of this movement at Berkeley was the involvement of the undergraduate student government, the ASUC, in 2013. That year DeeJay Pepito, who was elected to be the ASUC President, focused her presidency on addressing sexual assault and formed a one-year task force that later became a commission within the ASUC that lasted several years. The involvement of the ASUC was critical because it gave the campus movement against sexual violence institutional support and legitimacy, centralized activists and efforts on this issue, and facilitated network formation among survivors and activists on campus. The prestige of UC Berkeley as one of the top public universities was beneficial to the movement there and activists used it to their advantage to make sexual assault a key issue for the university to address. Students held press conferences to detail how the university had failed them and to announce federal complaints and lawsuits against the university. The media was quick to cover the student movement at Berkeley because of the reputation of the school. The media kept their focus on student efforts there, especially after the opening of a Title IX investigation. The prestige of UC Berkeley, seen as the flagship campus of the UC system, helped the movement garner more media attention which gave

student activists a wider and more public platform and also increased scrutiny from many UC and political leaders.

Another key factor that influenced the early trajectory of the movement at Berkeley was the connection of UC Berkeley students to the IX Network. Berkeley students contacted students from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill after reading a newspaper article in *The New York Times* which ended up connecting them to the IX Network, a Facebook group made up of student activists from universities across the country. There, UC Berkeley students learned about federal complaints and press conferences which that they ended up using. This engagement with other activists in the IX Network led them to use tactics that later became conventional to the wider campus movement such as Title IX complaints and lawsuits.

At UC Santa Barbara, the campus movement began in May 2014 and then resurfaced again in April 2015. There was no institutionalized organization or individuals giving support or legitimacy on the issue on campus. It was not until the 2015-2016 academic year that the student government started to address the issue after several survivor activists won seats in the senate and executive offices. UC Santa Barbara students used civil disobedience, particularly sit-ins to get the school to change policies and improve resources to survivors. Students had filed Title IX and Clery Act complaints in 2014, but investigations were never opened. The networks that formed among survivor activists and activists was for the most part local, emerging among UC Santa Barbara students.

There were two key factors at UC Santa Barbara that affected the trajectory of the movement. The first one was the campus party culture where the prevalence of sexual assault and rape culture was seen as normal and accepted as part of the party culture for

which UC Santa Barbara is known for. This probably deterred survivors from coming forward. The second factor were key events occurring in 2014. In February there was a gang rape that mobilized students to address sexual violence, but the Deltopia riots in April and the shooting in Isla Vista in May shocked the campus. The two latter later events galvanized the community to unite and focus on broader issues of safety that also included addressing sexual violence. The infusion of resources to address sexual violence and the shooting appear to have deferred the campus movement against sexual violence by almost a year. This shows how local events and issues may affect mobilization (Crossley 2017).

In chapters five and six, I explored the factors that influenced the student activists' tactical repertoire and demands on each campus. This research demonstrates how the schools' policies and resources, local history and politics, and the racial and class background of the activists influenced the tactical repertoire used on each campus and the demands activists made. The timing of the mobilizations within the cycle of protest was also a critical factor determining the repertoire of contention. At UC Berkeley, students wanted changes within the Title IX office, which had a history of mistreating survivors in the reporting process – particularly in the adjudication of cases. The campus did not have a centralized office dedicated solely to helping survivors and providing confidential services to them. Students reported being advocates for each other and taking survivors to the nearest rape crisis center which was five miles away from campus. In terms of timing, Berkeley students began publicly organizing in 2013 when the movement was beginning to take off across the country. During this first stage of expansion of the movement, the students focused on broader issues around sexual violence, particularly trying to establish campus sexual assault as a social problem. Several of the student leaders of the movement at UC

Berkeley were white women from middle- to upper-class backgrounds who wanted broader changes and initially did not address issues that would affect marginalized communities.

The services and resources at UC Santa Barbara were much more developed than those at UC Berkeley. The advocacy model developed at Santa Barbara was adopted UC system wide. Much of the work student activists demanded centered on improving existing services and resources for survivors and addressing the needs of students living in Isla Vista. The movement at UC Santa Barbara began to take off in 2015 during the second stage of the protest cycle when campus sexual assault was already recognized as a nation-wide problem and changes to policies and resources were in the process of being implemented. Therefore, the changes activists were fighting for addressed issues of diversity and inclusivity, and focused on the challenges they faced as students, such as living in Isla Vista. The student leaders of the movement at Santa Barbara were mostly working class women of color who sought to improve services and change policies to address the needs of the diverse student community. They advocated for the creation of a survivor fund to provide financial support to students who experienced financial difficulties and called for the increased diversity and cultural competency in offices that dealt with survivors.

The tactics used by students from each campus varied and were influenced by when in the cycle of protest the movements developed, the mass media, the racial and class background of activists, and institutional factors. Disruptive tactics dominate in the early stages of a movement but over time they lose their shock value and begin taking a ritualized quality which leads to the use of more disruptive tactics and sometimes violence (Taylor and Van Dyke 2007). This was the case at UC Berkeley, where students began mobilizing in 2012 and 2013 using conventional tactics and over time started using more confrontational

tactics and got more people involved. The mass media played a critical role in the diffusion of protest and in sustaining collective action (Myers 2000). Students from UC Berkeley learned about the IX Network after reading an article in *The New York Times* and became part of this national network on Facebook. Through this network, they got access to the cultural and tactical repertoire of the wider campus movement against sexual assault which probably influenced the tactics they used and the framing of the issue as gender discrimination. The racial and class background of the student activists also influenced the tactics they used. Several of the student leaders from UC Berkeley were white and came from middle and upper-middle class backgrounds. These students had the social and cultural capital and institutional knowledge to pursue more conventional tactics such as Title IX and Clery Act complaints, lawsuits, and press conferences. There were two key institutional factors that appear to influence the students' tactical repertoire: campus response to protesters and the accessibility of the administration. UC Berkeley's lack of confrontational tactics such as sit-ins which were used by students at UC Santa Barbara, may have been influenced by the campus' long history of excessive policing and police brutality. In addition, students consistently discussed how it was very difficult to schedule meetings with top administrators to voice their concerns. Usually student leaders in government and organizations had access to them. It seems that the large size of the school and bureaucracy may have been a hurdle for students in gaining access to the chancellor and other key leaders.

At UC Santa Barbara, the movement began in 2014-2015, two years after the movement began and their tactics were more confrontational from the beginning. Santa Barbara students reported doing research on the activism going on other campuses, however, they did not have ties to the IX Network. They did not draw from the specific tactical

repertoires of the campus movement against sexual violence, but from their school's confrontational and non-violent tactical repertoire, which had been successful for students of color on campus in the past (Armbruster-Sandoval 2017). Most of the UC Santa Barbara student leaders were working class women of color who did not have the resources and social and cultural capital to pursue some of the conventional tactics UC Berkeley students used. UC Santa Barbara students cited access to resources, political climate, and personal reasons for not filing lawsuits and Title IX complaints. In terms of institutional factors, the accessibility of administrators was a critical factor in deciding which tactics they were going to engage in. A student cited the schools' less aggressive approach to protesters and the accessibility of Chancellor Yang as key in their decision to do a sit-in of the chancellor's office. Chancellor Yang has held the top administrative position on campus for over 20 years, which has allowed students to know his work style and response to their activism. The chancellor appears to be more amenable to students and their needs, and may also want to avoid media attention to issues brought up by students by quickly agreeing to their demands.

Chapter seven focused on the internal and external challenges activists experienced while organizing on their campuses and how they affected the effectiveness of their campaigns and trajectory of the movement. One challenge students from both campuses reported was the emotional labor they had to engage in. Survivor activists and activists had to manage their emotions while helping survivors of sexual violence and often had to listen to stories of sexual violence. This led to experiences of secondhand traumatic stress and vicarious trauma. This work took on an additional emotional toll on the survivor activists who had to constantly tell and relive their experiences of sexual violence. It often triggered

their own traumatic experiences and they had to learn how to manage it while doing this work and helping others. The emotional labor student activists did highlights the unacknowledged and often invisible work they engaged in to improve the rights of survivors. This emotional labor forced activists to step in and out of this movement to deal with their emotional and psychological well-being, and at times forced some of them to drop out of the movement and work all together.

The racial, ethnic, class, and gender make-up of the movement was critical in determining who was able to engage in this activist work and the tactics they used. Public survivor activists were centered in this work and able to foster change, however, who was able to be a public survivor activist was not simple and was rooted in the activists' race, ethnicity, class, and gender. White women were seen as more legitimate, credible, and looked at more sympathetically when doing this work. White women fit the normative and socially acceptable notion of what a "perfect survivor" is and it benefitted them and helped them while doing work against sexual violence. Women of color, however, faced challenges. Some women of color described sexual violence and sex as a taboo topic in their families while growing up. Others feared their families finding out about their sexual assaults and activism, which kept them from engaging in legal tactics and limited the work they could do in this movement. The class background of students affected the material resources and the time they were able to devote to this movement. Middle- and upper-class students were able to devote more time and effort to do this activist work and could be more critical because they were not dependent on financial aid from the school. Working-class students had less time to engage in this movement because they had to work for pay. They

could not fully devote their time to activist campaigns and developing alliances, which was at times misread as not being serious about this work.

The campus movement against sexual violence confronted backlash that consisted of negative and hateful comments on the internet and in person. There were challenges to the data, blaming and attacking survivors, and protecting perpetrators (Heldman et al. 2018). This countermovement that developed was affected by two factors: the timing of the movements and the political climate at the local and national level. The movement at UC Berkeley, which began during the 2012-2013 academic year, focused on making this a priority issue and framing it as a social problem. Activists reported the vilifying and blaming of survivors and challenges to their claims. At UC Santa Barbara the movement developed around 2015, a time when the movement to address campus sexual violence was already experiencing success and was being addressed by local and national leaders. The backlash experienced by UC Santa Barbara students was more intense and directly targeted activists. A key part to this intense backlash was the political climate at the time and Santa Barbara's political conservatism. In June 2015 Donald Trump launched his presidential campaign which emboldened conservatives and hate groups across the nation. Santa Barbara's conservative social and political climate enabled the formation of conservative student groups on campus that fed off Trump's racist and misogynistic presidential campaign and it emboldened them to attack the movement against sexual violence at UC Santa Barbara and its activists. The countermovement at UC Santa Barbara shaped the conversations and work student activists against sexual violence were engaged in and added to the emotional labor they had to engage in, often making it very difficult to carry out campaigns.

Contributions and Future Research

This research examines the local and institutional factors that affects various aspects of social movements including the timing, tactical repertoire, and trajectory. This analysis uncovers the importance and effects of meso-level contextual conditions on the development of social movements. Although conditions can be ripe for a larger movement to emerge, its development may not be the same at the local level. This research identifies key factors that affect how the movement operated locally. It's important to not generalize broad movements that are made up of mobilizations across hundreds of places in the country. By doing a comparative case study approach, I was able to focus on two campuses and identify the local factors in the immediate environment of activists that facilitated and constrained the broader opportunities that enabled this movement nationally. This research showed not only the diversity of this movement on both campuses, which counters the mainstream coverage of this movement as a white women's movement, but also illuminates how the racial, ethnic, gender, and class background of those who made up the movements affected its strategies, tactical repertoire, and trajectory.

Most research on activism against sexual violence relies primarily on historical and feminist analytical frameworks that developed from the anti-rape movement of the 1970s and lacks in-depth analysis of social movement formation and sustainment. My research addresses this critical gap by investigating a contemporary movement against sexual violence through a social movements lens that has been seldom applied to this movement. My focus on the campus movement helps place it as part of a larger genealogy of movements against sexual violence and offers critical knowledge about this kind of movement. The campus movement was built upon past efforts and struggles led by diverse

groups of people. The campus movement helped lay the groundwork for more recent movements like #MeToo and Time's Up. The wide acceptance of these recent movements was made possible by previous efforts including the campus movement that was comprised of individuals who struggled to make their voices heard and spoke publicly about very private, painful, and traumatic experiences. They often faced criticism and were blamed for their experiences, but their efforts to change the rape culture that is prevalent in almost every aspect of society often overshadowed the challenges they personally experienced. Their efforts uncovered the difficulties and injustices survivors of sexual violence experienced, normalized the public discussion of sexual violence, and highlighted how common sexual violence is. This research hopes to honor part of the history of these efforts and provide a record of their work before it is forgotten. Future research should examine the connections among efforts to address sexual violence to empirically see how they have built upon each other. There should also be an examination as to how movements against sexual violence have persisted through periods of abeyance (Crossley 2017; Taylor 1989), particularly how the institutionalization of this issue by campuses has affected efforts and how students incorporated issues of sexual violence in other mobilizations and campaigns since the 1970s.

Another contribution of this research is the examination of the emotional labor activists engaged in to convince college and university campuses to increase resources and rights to survivors. Emotions were critical to this movement. Survivor activists often spoke about their personal experiences of sexual violence and the difficulties they had in reporting it to their schools. The disclosure of these experiences gave courage to other survivors to come forward with their own stories of sexual violence, thus increasing the size of the movement. This connection among survivor activists through their experiences of trauma

created emotional resonance with each other through collective trauma resonance. The sharing of personal experiences of sexual violence and stories of how they were treated by their universities facilitated empathetic and emotional connections among the people who had gone through similar traumatic experiences (Whittier 1995, 2001, 2009, 2012, 2017). Collective trauma resonance played a critical role in the movement garnering wider support and in helping activists develop a collective identity based on surviving campus sexual violence and experiencing institutional betrayal. My work extends Whittier's work (2001, 2009) on the childhood sexual assault movement that documents the important role of emotions as movement tactics and the emotional labor activists engage in to bring about social change.

Although the sharing of stories of sexual violence helped the movement to grow and united activists, there were negative consequences to this. This research highlights the invisible emotional labor student activists had to do in order to be a part of this movement. Student activists engaged in unpaid emotional labor that involved managing their emotions while helping survivors of sexual violence. This often entailed constantly listening to stories of sexual assault which left activists experiencing secondhand traumatic stress and vicarious trauma. Activists who were survivors had to deal with the added stress of managing their own experiences of sexual violence in addition to that of others. Public survivor activists took on an additional emotional toll by having to relive their sexual assaults and deal with the negative backlash that accompanied that. Although the display of emotions may be deliberately managed (Groves 1997; Whitter 2001), it still affects activists. This work highlights the often overlooked effects of reliving trauma and telling/hearing stories of sexual violence as a form of emotional labor and its effects on the movement they are

involved in. Further research on the role of emotions and emotional labor done within movements of sexual violence is needed. A more in-depth analysis on the emotional labor put in by activists and its effects on the activists themselves and the movement, particularly noting differences across social categories including gender, race, and ethnicity. The concept of collective trauma resonance deserves further exploration in how it helped form a collective identity among survivors and activists. It should also be examined in terms of its relevancy to other forms of trauma that may unite activists in social movements.

References

- Abbey, Antonia, Lisa Thomson Ross, Donna McDuffie, and Pam McAuslan. 1996. "Alcohol and Dating Risk Factors for Sexual Assault among College Women." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 20:147–69.
- Achekzai, Tahmina. 2014. "Congresswomen Urge Dirks to Improve Campus Sexual Assault Prevention and Response." *The Daily Californian*, May 5. Retrieved December 10, 2017.
- Acker, Joan. 1992. "Gendered Institutions: From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions." *Contemporary Sociology* 21:565-569.
- . 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class and Race in Organizations." *Gender and Society* 20(4):441-464.
- Acker, Joan, Kate Barry, and Johanna Esseveld. 1991. "Objectivity and Truth: Problems in Doing Feminist Research." Pp. 133-53 in *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*, edited by M. M. Fonow and J. A. Cook. Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Ambrosio, Christine and Allan Creighton. 2013. "Valentines and Violence." *The Daily Californian*, February 12. Retrieved April 6, 2017.
- Andersen, Ellen A. 2009. *Out of the Closets and Into the Courts: Legal Opportunity Structure and Gay Rights Litigation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Anderson, Michelle J. 2016. "Campus Sexual Assault Adjudication and Resistance to Reform." *The Yale Law Journal* 125(7):1940-2005.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. 2002. "Movement-Countermovement Dynamics and the Emergence of New Institutions: The Case of "White Flight" Schools in Mississippi." *Social Forces* 80(3):911-936.
- Anonymous. 2013. "Redefining Rape Culture." *The Daily Californian*, July 1. Retrieved April 14, 2017.
- Arman, Alicia. 2013. "Title IX About More Than College Athletics." *The Daily Californian*, November 19. Retrieved April 20, 2017.
- Armbruster-Sandoval, Ralph. 2017. *Starving for Justice: Hunger Strikes, Spectacular Speech, and the Struggle for Dignity*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Arnold, Gretchen. 2013. "Reframing the Narrative of the Battered Women's Movement." *Violence Against Women* 19(5):557-578.

- . 2017. "U.S. Women's Movements to End Violence Against Women, Domestic Abuse, and Rape." Pp. 270-290 in *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Women's Social Movement Activism*, edited by H. J. McCammon, V. Taylor, J. Reger, and R. L. Einwohner. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ASUC Senate. 2014. "Senate Bill No. 85: A Bill in Support of the ASUC Sexual Assault Commission." Senate Resolutions, April 30.
- Bach-Lombardo, Jordan. 2011. "Former Campus Doctor Faces Charges." *The Daily Californian*, April 29. Retrieved December 2, 2016.
- BAMN. 2015. *BAMN Tribunal on Naming Your Rapist and Building a Movement to Win Justice*. Youtube, November 15, 2015. Retrieved March 4, 2019 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=89RIkDNjbu4>).
- Banaszak-Holl, Jane C., Sandra R. Levitsky, and Mayer N. Zald, eds. 2010. *Social Movements and the Transformation of American Health Care*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Banning-Lover, Rachel. 2011. "Handling of Harassment Hearing Draws Complaints." *The Daily Californian*, February 24. Retrieved December 1, 2016.
- Barrett, Karen. 1982. "Date Rape: A Campus Epidemic?" *Ms.*, September.
- Bauman, Richard. 2002. *Ideology and Community in the First Wave of Critical Legal Studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Sarah McAdon. 2017. "There's Been a Big Change in How the News Media Covers Sexual Assault." *The Washington Post*, May 11. Retrieved May 21, 2019 (https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/05/11/theres-been-a-big-change-in-how-the-news-media-cover-sexual-assault/?utm_term=.54b2061adf9e).
- Beckwith, Karen. 2000. "Hinges in Collective Action: Strategic Innovation in the Pittston Coal Strike." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 5(2):179-199.
- Benham, Becca. 2014. "Campus Fraternities Take Steps to Prevent Sexual Assault in Greek System." *The Daily Californian*, October 5. Retrieved September 2, 2016 (www.dailycal.org).
- Berg, Bruce L. and Howard Lune. 2017. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Bernstein, Elizabeth. 2010. "Militarized Humanitarianism Meets Carceral Feminism: The Politics of Sex, Rights, and Freedom in Contemporary Antitrafficking Campaigns." *Signs* 36(1):45-71.
- . 2012. "Carceral Politics as Gender Justice? The 'Traffic in Women' and Neoliberal Circuits of Crime, Sex, and Rights." *Theory and Society* 41(3):233-259.
- Bernstein, Mary. 2003. "Nothing Ventured, Something Gained?: Conceptualizing Social Movement 'Success' in the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *Sociological Perspectives* 46(3):353-379.
- Bernstein, Mary, Anna-Maria Marshall, and Scott Barclay. 2009. "The Challenge of Law: Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Social Movements." Pp. 1-17 in *Queer Mobilizations: LGBT Activists Confront the Law*, edited by S. Barclay, M. Bernstein, and A. M. Marshall. New York: New York University Press.
- Bevacqua, Maria. 2000. *Rape on the Public Agenda: Feminist and the Politics of Sexual Assault*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Bidwell, Allie. 2011. "Task Force Submits Final Conduct Code Suggestions." *The Daily Californian*, June 27. Retrieved March 10, 2017.
- Binder, Amy J. 2002. *Contentious Curricula: Afrocentrism and Creationism in American Public Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Blackwell, Maylei. 2011. *¡Chicana Power! Contested Histories of Feminism in the Chicano Movement*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Blee, Kathleen M. 1998. "White-Knuckle Research: Emotional Dynamics in Fieldwork with Racist Activists." *Qualitative Sociology* 21(4):381-399.
- Bohmer, Carol and Andrea Parrot. 1993. *Sexual Assault on Campus: The Problem and the Solution*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Boswell, A. Ayres and Joan Z. Spade. 1996. "Fraternities and Collegiate Rape Culture: Why Are Some Fraternities More Dangerous Places for Women?" *Gender and Society*, 10(2):133-147.
- Brennan-Greenbaum, Noah. 2015. "EVPLA and EVPSA Candidates Debate Student Housing, Self-Governance, More." *The Daily Nexus*, April 15. Retrieved October 11, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Brown, Melissa, Rashawn Ray, Ed Summers, and Neil Fraistat. 2017. "#SayHerName: A Case Study of Intersectional Social Media Activism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40(11):1831-1846.

- Brownmiller, Susan. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Buchwald, Emilie, Pamela R. Fletcher, and Martha Roth, eds. 1993. *Transforming a Rape Culture*. Minneapolis, MN: Milkweed Editions.
- Buechler, Steven. 1990. *Women's Movements in the United States: Woman Suffrage, Equal Rights, and Beyond*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Burstein, Paul. 1991. "Legal Mobilization as a Social Movement Tactic: The Struggle for Equal Employment Opportunity." *American Journal of Sociology* 96(5):1201-1225.
- Butler, Aryle, Anais LaVoie, Klein Lieu, Megan Majd, and Donna-Jo Pepito. 2013. "A Bill of No Confidence in UC Berkeley's Disciplinary Policies Regarding Sexual Assault." California State Assembly, Committee on Higher Education. Retrieved September 15, 2007 (<https://ahed.assembly.ca.gov/sites/ahed.assembly.ca.gov/files/hearings/SB%20130%20ASUC%20Vote%20of%20No%20Confidence.pdf>).
- Cadena-Roa, Jorge. 2005. "Strategic Framing, Emotions, and Superbarrio – Mexico City's Masked Crusader." Pp. 69-86 in *Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective*, edited by H. Johnston and J. A. Noakes. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cain, Lily. 2013. "AS Senate Passes Resolution Supporting Violence Intervention Program." *The Bottom Line*, February 27. Retrieved January 8, 2018 (<http://thebottomline.as.ucsb.edu>).
- California State Auditor. 2014. "Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence: California Universities Must Better Protect Students by Doing More to Prevent, Respond to, and Resolve Incidents." Report 2013-124. Retrieved September 25, 2016 (<https://auditor.ca.gov/pdfs/reports/2013-124.pdf>).
- CalSERVE. 2017. "CalSERVE Homepage" and "About Us." Retrieved January 14, 2019 (<https://www.calserve.org>).
- Campbell, Rebecca. 2002. *Emotionally Involved: The Impact of Researching Rape*. New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, Rebecca, and Patricia Y. Martin. 2001. "Services for Sexual Assault Survivors." Pp. 227-246 in *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*, edited by C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, and R. K. Bergen. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Campbell, Rebecca, Sharon M. Wasco, Courtney E. Ahrens, Tracy Sefl, and Holly E. Barnes. 2001. "Preventing the "Second Rape": Rape Survivors' Experiences with

- Community Service Providers.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 16(12):1239-1259.
- Campus Assault and Rape Survivors Online Network. 2014. “UCSB Failed Justice.” Campus Assault and Rape Survivors Online Network, May 5. Retrieved October 26, 2018 (<http://campus-survivors.org/post/84845532386/ucsb-failed-justice>).
- Caren, Neal, Kay Jowers, and Sarah Gaby. 2012. “A Social Movement Community: Stormfront and the White Nationalist Movement.” Pp. 163-193 in *Media, Movements, and Political Change, Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change in Volume 33*, edited by J. Earl and D. A. Rohlinger. Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing.
- Center for American Women in Politics. 2019a. “History of Women in the U.S. Congress” Center for American Women and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. Retrieved September 13, 2019 (<https://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/history-women-us-congress>).
- . 2019b. “Women in the U.S. Congress 2019.” Center for American Women and Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University. Retrieved September 13, 2019 (<https://www.cawp.rutgers.edu/women-us-congress-2019>).
- Cerezo, Ley. 2013. “Rape Culture, Right Here in the United States.” *The Daily Californian*, February 12. Retrieved April 6, 2017.
- Chafetz, Janet S. and Anthony G. Dworkin. 1987. “In the Face of Threat: Organized Antifeminism in Comparative Perspective.” *Gender and Society* 1(1):33-60.
- Chappell, Bill. 2014. “California Enacts ‘Yes Means Yes’ Law, Defining Sexual Consent.” *NPR*, September 29. Retrieved August 4, 2015 (<http://www.npr.org>).
- Cho, Nadia. 2012. “The Talk (That Must Be Had).” *The Daily Californian*, November 6. Retrieved April 5, 2017.
- Chugh, Aanchal. 2016. “Sexual Assault Too Often Presented as a Single Narrative.” *The Daily Californian*, March 4. Retrieved March 16, 2016 (www.dailycal.org).
- Chun, Jennifer J., George Lipsitz, and Young Shin. 2013. “Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38(4):917-940.
- Clark, Annie E. and Andrea L. Pino, eds. 2016. *We believe you: survivors of Campus sexual assault speak out*. New York: Holt Paperbacks.
- Clay, Andreana. 2012. *The Hip Hop Generation Fights Back: Youth, Activism, and Post-Civil Politics*. New York: New York University Press.

- Coalition for Survivors. 2014. "Dear UCSB Community." Coalition For Survivors, October 26, 2018 (<https://coalitionforsurvivorsucsb.wordpress.com>).
- Code of Student Conduct Task Force. 2011. "Final Report." University of California, Berkeley. Retrieved December 13, 2018 (<http://sa.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/Final%20Report-Code%20of%20Student%20Conduct%20Task%20Force.pdf>).
- Collins, Patricia H. 1999. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. London: Harper Collins.
- Commins, Nicoletta. 2014. "Breaking the Silence Surrounding Sexual Assault." *The Daily Californian*, January 14. Retrieved February 4, 2017.
- Copenhaver, Stacey and Elizabeth Grauerholz. 1991. "Sexual Victimization among Sorority Women: Exploring the Link between Sexual Violence and Institutional Practices." *Sex Roles* 24:31–41.
- Correll, Shelley J., Sarah Thébaud, and Stephen Benard. 2007. "An Introduction to the Social Psychology of Gender." Pp. 1-8 in *Social Psychologies of Gender*, edited by S. J. Correll. New York: Elsevier.
- Costain, Anne N. 1992. *Inviting Women's Rebellion: A Political Process Interpretation of the Women's Movement*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cotera, Marta. 1980. "Feminism: The Chicano and Anglo Versions." Pp. 217-234 in *Twice a Minority: Mexican American Women*, edited by M. Melville. St. Louis, MO: C. V. Mosby Company.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43(6):1241-1299.
- Creswell, John W. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crossley, Alison D. 2015. "Facebook Feminism: Facebook, Blogs, and New Technologies of Contemporary U.S. Feminism." *Mobilization* 20(2):253-269.
- . 2017. *Finding Feminism: Millennial Activists and the Unfinished Gender Revolution*. New York: New York University Press.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1981. *Women, Race, & Class*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Davis, Joseph E. 2002. *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- della Porta, Donatella and Mario Diani. 1999. *Social Movements: An Introduction*. New York: Blackwell.
- . 2006. *Social Movements: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- della Porta, Donatella and Olivier Fillieule. 2007. "Policing Social Protest." Pp. 217- 241 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- DeTurk, Sara. 2014. *Activism, Alliance Building, and the Esperanza Peace and Justice Center*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Dick, Kirby, Amy Ziering, and Constance Matthiessen, eds. 2016. *The Hunting Ground: The Inside Story of Sexual Assault on American College Campuses*. New York: Hot Books Press.
- Dill, Bonnie T. 1994. "Fictive Kin, Paper Sons, and Compadrazgo: Women of Color and the Struggle for Survival." Pp. 149-169 in *Women of Color in U.S. Society*, edited by M. B. Zinn and B. T. Dill. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Dirks, Nicholas. 2014. "Letter from the Chancellor (February) – Sexual Assault and Harassment." University Statements, February 25. Retrieved May 19, 2018 (<https://chancellor.berkeley.edu/university-statements>).
- . 2015a. "An Important Message from Chancellor Nicholas B. Dirks." Berkeley News, January 24. Retrieved May 22, 2016 (<https://sexualassault.berkeley.edu/category/news/>).
- . 2015b. "Message from the Chancellor (April) – National Conference Spurred Meaningful Dialogue Around Confronting Campus Sexual Assault." University News, April 29. Retrieved May 22, 2016 (<https://sexualassault.berkeley.edu/category/news/>).
- Earl, Jennifer and Sarah. A. Soule. 2010. "The Impacts of Repression: The Effect of Police Presence and Action on Subsequent Protest Rates." Pp. 75-113 in *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change (Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change, Volume 30)*, edited by P. G. Coy. United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Edwards, Bob and John D. McCarthy. 2007. "Resources and Social Movement Mobilization." Pp. 116-152 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ehrhart, Julie and Bernice Sandler. 1986. "Party Rape." *Journal of the Center for Women*

Policy Studies 9(1):2-5.

- Einwohner, Rachel L. 1999. "Gender, Class, and Social Movement Outcomes: Identity and Effectiveness in Two Animal Rights Campaigns." *Gender & Society* 13(1):56-76.
- Eisinger, Peter K. 1973. "The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities." *American Political Science Review* 67(1):11-28.
- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, second ed. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, Steven. 1996. *Impure Science: AIDS, Activism, and the Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ewick, Patricia and Susan S. Silbey. 1998. *The Common Place of Law: Stories from Everyday Life*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Feimster, Crystal N. 2009. *Southern Horrors: Women and the Politics of Rape and Lynching*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Felch, Jason. 2014. "31 Women Accuse UC Berkeley of Botching Sexual Assault Investigation." *The Los Angeles Times*, February 26. Retrieved September 2, 2016 (<https://www.latimes.com>).
- Fernandez, Damian. 2000. *Cuba and the Politics of Passion*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Fetner, Tina. 2001. "Working Anita Bryant: The Impact of Christian Anti-Gay Activism on Lesbian and Gay Movement Claims." *Social Problems* 48(3):411-428.
- Fisher, Dana R., Lorien Jasny, and Dawn M. Dow. 2018. "Why Are We Here? Patterns of Intersectional Motivations Across the Resistance." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 23(4):451-468.
- Fonow, Mary M. 2003. *Union Women: Forging Feminism in the United Steelworkers of America*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frederick, Angela H. 2010. "Practicing Electoral Politics in the Cracks." *Gender and Society* 24(4): 475-498.
- Fu, Alison and Sophie Ho. 2014 "UC Releases New Sexual Harassment Policy." *The Daily Californian*, March 10. Retrieved April 25, 2017.
- Gamson, Joshua. 1989. "Silence, Death, and the Invisible Enemy: AIDS Activism and Social Movement "Newness."" *Social Problems* 36(4):351-367.

- Gamson, William A. and David S. Meyer. 1996. "Framing Political Opportunity." Pp. 275-290 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framing*, edited by D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, and M. M. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Garcia, Alma M. 1997. *Chicana Feminist Thought: The Basic Historical Writings*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Garfield, Allison, Josh Ortiz, and Stephany Rubio. 2017. "Documents show 6 UCSB Employees Violated Title IX Policy." *The Daily Nexus*, March 2. Retrieved October 31, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Germain, Lauren J. 2016. *Campus Sexual Assault: College Women Respond*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Giddings, Paula J. 1984. *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America*. New York: W. Morrow.
- Gilmore, Stephanie. 2005. "Bridging the Waves: Sex and Sexuality in a Second Wave Organization." Pp. 97-116 in *Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women's Movement*, edited by J. Reger. New York: Routledge.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anseim L. Strauss. 1967. *A Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.
- Gluck, Sherna Bergar, Maylei Blackwell, Sharon Cotrell, and Karen S. Harper. 1998. "Whose Feminism, Whose History? Reflections on Excavating the History of (the) U.S. Women's Movement(s)." Pp. 31-56 in *Community Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class, and Gender*, edited by N. A. Naples. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gold, Jodi and Susan Villari, eds. 1999. *Just Sex: Students Rewrite the Rules of Sex, Violence, Equality, and Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Goodwin, Jeff and James M. Jasper. 1999. "Caught in a Winding, Snarling Vine: The Structural Bias of Political Process Theory." *Sociological Forum* 14(1):27-54.
- Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper, and Francesca Polleta. 2001. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2007. "Emotional Dimensions of Social Movements." Pp. 413-432 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Gould, Deborah. 2009. *Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP's Fight Against AIDS*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Greensite, Gillian. 1999. "History of the Rape Crisis Movement." In *Support for Survivors: Training for Sexual Assault Counselors*. California Coalition Against Sexual Assault.
- Grosse, Corrie J. 2017. "Working Across Lines: Resisting Extreme Energy Extraction in Idaho and California." PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Groves, Julian M. 1997. *Hearts and Minds: The Controversy Over Laboratory Animals*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Grubaugh, Connor. 2014. "Napolitano Discusses Sexual Assault, Diversity, Budget." *The Daily Californian*, March 17. Retrieved April 25, 2017.
- Hagan, Frank E. 2006. *Research Methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Halley, Janet E. and Wendy Brown, eds. 2002. *Left Legalism/Left Critique*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hatch, Alison E. 2017. *Campus Sexual Assault: A Reference Handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Heldman, Caroline. 2015. "Why Are University Presidents Leaving Campus Rape Survivors Out in the Cold?" *Ms.*, March 18. Retrieved August 26, 2019 (<https://msmagazine.com>).
- Heldman, Caroline, Alissa R. Ackerman, and Ian Breckenridge-Jackson. 2018. *The New Campus Anti-Rape Movement: Internet Activism and Social Justice*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Heldman, Caroline and Danielle Dirks. 2014. "Blowing the Whistle on Campus Rape." *Ms.* (Winter/Spring):32-37.
- Hernandez, Jocelin. 2015. "We Want the University of California to Stop Underpinning Acts of Sexual Violence On Their College Campuses and Restructure Policies That Protect Survivor Rights On Campuses, State, and Federal Level; Specifically at UCSB." Change.org. Retrieved November 15, 2018 (https://www.change.org/p/petitioning-the-university-of-california-santa-barbara?recruiter=295720589&utm_source=share_petition&utm_medium=facebook&utm_campaign=share_facebook_responsive&utm_term=des-lg-no_src-no_msg&fb_ref=Default).
- Herschberger, Ruth. 1948. *Adam's Rib*. New York: Pellegrini & Cudahy.
- Hochschild, Arlie R. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feelings*.

- Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Holmes, Claire. 2014. "Combat Sexual Assault, Not Administration." *The Daily Californian*, October 14. Retrieved September 2, 2016 (www.dailycal.org).
- hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- . 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- . 1990 *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hull, Gloria T., Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds. 1982. *All the Women Are White, All the Men Are Black, but Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies*. Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press.
- Humphrey, John and Jacquelyn White. 2000. "Women's Vulnerability to Sexual Assault from Adolescence to Young Adulthood." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 27(6):419–24.
- Isla Vista Safe Committee. 2016. "Isla Vista Safe: Report To The People." County of Santa Barbara. Retrieved November 11, 2018 (https://www.countyofsb.org/da/msm_county/documents/IVSafeReport.pdf).
- Jackson, David. 2014. "A.S. Senate Convened for First Meeting of Fall Quarter." *The Daily Nexus*, October 9. Retrieved October 7, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1998. "The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and Around Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 13(3):397-424.
- Jasper, James M. and Jane Poulsen. 1995. "Recruiting Strangers and Friends: Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests." *Social Problems* 42(4):493-512.
- Johnson, Michelaina. 2013. "A Morning Run to Raise Awareness." *The Daily Californian*, November 4. Retrieved April 20, 2017.
- Karasek, Sofie. 2013. "Press Conference Speaker Statements." Gloria Allred Website, Retrieved January 18, 2019 (<https://www.gloriaallred.com/Gloria-s-Videos-and-Statements/5-22-2013-Press-Conference-Speakers-Statements-2.pdf>).
- Karasek, Sofie and Anais LaVoie. 2013. "Help Us Give Support to Sexual Violence Victims." *The Daily Californian*, May 30. Retrieved April 13, 2017.

- Karasek, Sofie and Meghan Warner. 2014. "Sexual Assault Will Not Be Solved by Public Relations." *The Daily Californian*, October 10. Retrieved September 2, 2016 (www.dailycal.org).
- Katuna, Barret and Elizabeth Holzer. 2016. "Unobtrusively Stretching Law: Legal Education, Activism, and Reclaiming Title IX." *Social Movement Studies* 15(1):80-96.
- Katzenstein, Mary F. 1998. *Faithful and Fearless: Moving Feminist Protest Inside the Church and Military*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kelly, Liz. 1988. *Surviving Sexual Violence*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kelman, Mark. 1987. *A Guide to Critical Legal Studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kepski, Kat. 2016. "When Rape Culture Rears Its Ugly Head." *The Daily Nexus*, October 4. Retrieved October 6, 2016 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Kim, Ivy. 2014. "Cal Consent Week Aims to Fight Sex Assault." *The Daily Californian*, March 6. Retrieved April 25, 2017.
- Kingkade, Tyler. 2014a. "College Sexual Assault Survivors Form Underground Network to Reform Campus Policies." *The Huffington Post*, January 23. Retrieved January 19, 2016.
- . 2014b. "Education Department Investigating Claims UC Berkeley Botched Sexual Assault Reports." *The Huffington Post*, April 21. Retrieved November 24, 2016.
- . 2016a. "Federal Campus Rape Investigations Near 200, And Finally Get More Funding." *The Huffington Post*, January 1. Retrieved October 13, 2016 (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/federal-funding-campus-rape-investigations_us_568af080e4b014efe0db5f76).
- . 2016b. "There Are Far More Title IX Investigations of Colleges Than Most People Know." *The Huffington Post*, June 16. Retrieved September 10, 2016 (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/title-ix-investigations-sexual-harassment_us_575f4b0ee4b053d433061b3d).
- Kleinfeld, Zoe. 2014. "Congresswomen Meet with Dirks, Student Sexual Assault Survivors on Campus." *The Daily Californian*, April 15. Retrieved September 1, 2016.
- Kleinman, Sherryl and Martha Copp. 1993. *Emotions and Fieldwork*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Kolosta, Danny. 2015. "County to Revamp, Lease Clinic Offices." *The Daily Nexus*, May 14. Retrieved October 12, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Koopmans, Ruud. 2007. "Protest in Time and Space: The Evolution of Waves of Contention." Pp. 19-46 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Koss, Mary P. 1985. "The Hidden Rape Victim: Personality, Attitudinal, and Situational Characteristics." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 9(2):193-212.
- Koss, Mary, Christine Gidycz, and Nadine Wisniewski. 1987. "The Scope of Rape: Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Higher Education Students." *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology* 55(2):162-70.
- Koss, Mary P. and Mary R. Harvey. 1991. *The Rape Victim: Clinical and Community Interventions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krebs, Christopher P., Christine H. Lindquist, Tara D. Warner, Bonnie S. Fisher, and Sandra Martin. 2007. *The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study*. U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved August 3, 2015 (<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>).
- Kulp, Patrick and Carissa Quiambao. 2013. "A.S. To Look into Lack of Proper Lighting in I.V." *The Daily Nexus*, January 16. Retrieved October 4, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Kurtz, Sharon. 2002. *Workplace Justice: Organizing Multi-Identity Movements*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Leachman, Shelly. 2015. "You Are Not Alone." *The UC Santa Barbara Current*, January 21. Retrieved December 7, 2017 (www.news.ucsb.edu).
- Lee, Chantelle and Malini Ramaiyer. 2017. "Majority of 124 Investigations Occurred before Latest UC Sex Misconduct Policy Update." *The Daily Californian*, March 1. Retrieved March 3, 2017 (www.dailycal.org).
- Lee, Jean. 2014. "Sen. Boxer Pushes Bill Supporting Survivors of Sexual Assault." *The Daily Californian*, August 29. Retrieved April 26, 2017.
- Lee, Madeleine. 2016. "Rally Against Rape Culture Turns Heads for a Cause." *The Bottom Line*, October 16. Retrieved January 23, 2018 (<http://thebottomline.as.ucsb.edu>).
- . 2017. "Sexual Assault Survivor Sit-In Unfurls at Cheadle Hall." *The Daily Nexus*, May 3. Retrieved February 4, 2018 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).

- Lerner, Gerda. 1992. *Black Women in White America: A Documentary History*. New York: Vintage.
- Luna, Zakiya. 2016. ““Truly a Women of Color Organization”: Negotiating Sameness and Difference in Pursuit of Intersectionality.” *Gender & Society* 30(5):769-790.
- Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Luschei, Savannah. 2014. “Bill Urges Reform on Penalizing Sex Assault.” *The Daily Californian*, February 28. Retrieved April 25, 2017.
- Maätita, Florence. 2005. “Que Viva La Mujer: Negotiating Chicana Feminist Identities.” Pp. 23-38 in *Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women’s Movement*, edited by J. Reger. New York: Routledge.
- Mansbridge, Jane J., and Aldon D. Morris (eds.). 2001. *Oppositional Consciousness: The Subjective Roots of Social Protest*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcotti, Gabriele. 1992. “STAAR Hosts Rape Conference.” *The Daily Pennsylvanian*, March 30. Retrieved August 26, 2019 (https://www.thedp.com/article/1992/03/staar_hosts_rape_conference).
- Martin, Patricia Y., and Robert A. Hummer. 1989. “Fraternities and Rape on Campus.” *Gender & Society* 3(4):457-473.
- Marx, Gary T. and James L. Wood. 1975. “Strands of Theory and Research in Collective Behavior.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 1:363-428.
- Matier, Phil. 2015. “UC Berkeley’s Chief of Research Exits as Sex Charges Fly.” *The San Francisco Chronicle*, April 12. Retrieved September 2, 2016.
- Matthews, Nancy A. 1989. “Surmounting Legacy: The Expansion of Racial Diversity in a Local Anti-Rape Movement.” *Gender and Society* 3(4):518-532.
- . 1994. *Confronting Rape: The Feminist Anti-Rape Movement and the State*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mattley, Christine. 1997. “Field Research With Phone Sex Workers: Managing the Researcher’s Emotions.” Pp. 101-114 in *Researching Sexual Violence Against Women: Methodological and Personal Perspectives*, edited by M. Schwartz. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- . 1988. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1996. "Conceptual Origins, Current Problems, Future Directions." Pp. 23-40 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framing*, edited by D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, and M. M. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug, John McCarthy, and Mayer Zald. 1996. "Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Processes: Toward a Synthetic, Comparative Perspective on Social Movements." Pp. 1-20 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*, edited by D. McAdam, J. McCarthy, and M. Zald. New York: Cambridge University.
- McAdam, Doug and David Snow, eds. 1997. *Social Movements: Readings on their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McCammon, Holly J., Karen E. Campbell, Ellen M. Granberg, and Christine Mowery. 2001. "How Movements Win: Gendered Opportunity Structures and U.S. Women's Suffrage Movements, 1866 to 1919." *American Sociological Review* 66(1):49-70.
- McCammon, Holly J., Courtney S. Muse, Harmony D. Newman, and Teresa M. Terrell. 2007. "Movement Framing and Discursive Opportunity Structures: The Political Successes of the U.S. Women's Jury Movements." *American Sociological Review* 72(5):725-749.
- McCann, Michael W. 1994. *Rights at Work: Pay Equity Reform and the Politics of Legal Mobilization*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6):1212-1241.
- McGuire, Danielle L. 2004. "It Was Like All of Us Had Been Raped: Sexual Violence, Community Mobilization, and the African American Freedom Struggle." *The Journal of American History* 91(3):906-931.
- . 2010. *At the Dark End of the Street: Black Women, Rape, and Resistance – A New History of the Civil Rights Movement from Rosa Parks to the Rise of Black Power*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1989. *Nomads of the President: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- Mendes, Kaitlynn. 2015. *Slutwalk: Feminism, Activism, and Media*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Messerly, Megan. 2013 "Number of Rape Reports in Berkeley Spikes to 39." *The Daily Californian*, February 12. Retrieved April 6, 2017.
- Meyer, David S. 2004. "Protest and Political Opportunities." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:125-145.
- Meyer, David S. and Suzanne Staggenborg. 1996. "Movements, Countermovements, and the Structure of Political Opportunity." *American Journal of Sociology* 101(6):1628-1660.
- Meyer, David S. and Nancy Whittier. 1994. "Social Movement Spillover." *Social Problems* 41(2):277-298.
- Mezias, Stephen J. 1995. "Using Institutional Theory to Understand For-Profit Sectors: The Case of Financial Reporting Standards." Pp. 164-196 in *The Institutional Construction of Organizations: International and Longitudinal Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Milkman, Ruth and Veronica Terriquez. 2012. "'We Are the Ones Who Are Out in Front': Women's Leadership in the Immigrant Rights Movement." *Feminist Studies* 38(3):723-752.
- Miller, Chanel. 2019. *Know My Name: A Memoir*. New York: Viking Press.
- Miller, Shaeleya D., Verta Taylor, and Leila J. Rupp. 2016. "Social Movements and the Construction of Queer Identity." Pp. 443-470 in *Advances in Identity Theory and Research, Volume II*, edited by J. E. Stets and R. Serpe. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mills, Crystal and Barbara Granoff. 1992. "Date and Acquaintance Rape among a Sample of College Students." *Social Work* 37(6):504-09.
- Moraga, Cherríe, and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 1979. "Introduction." In *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, edited by C. Moraga and G. Anzaldúa. Watertown, MA: Persephone Press.
- Moran-Ellis J. 1996. "Close to Home: The Experience of Researching Child Sexual Abuse." Pp. 176-187 in *Women, Violence, and Male Power*, edited by M. Hester, L. Kelly, and L. Torres. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Morgen, Sandra. 2002. *Into Our Own Hands: The Women's Health Movement in the United States, 1969-1990*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Morris, Aldon. 1981. "Black Southern Sit-in Movement: An Analysis of Internal Organization." *American Sociological Review* 46(6):744-767.
- . 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: Free Press.
- Morris, Aldon D. and Cedric Herring. 1987. "Theory and Research in Social Movements: A Critical Review." *Annual Review in Political Science* 2:137-198.
- Mottl, Tahi L. 1980. "The Analysis of Countermovements." *Social Problems* 27(5):620-635.
- Mueller, Carol M. 1999. "Escape from the GDR, 1961-1989: Hybrid Exit Repertoires in a Disintegrating Leninist Regime." *American Journal of Sociology* 105(3):697-735.
- Murphy, Connor. 2014. "It's Time We Have a Talk About the Other Rape Victims." *The Daily Californian*, January 21. Retrieved February 4, 2017.
- Murphy, Katy. 2014. "UC Berkeley Sexual Assault Policies Draw U.S. Agency Probe." *The Mercury News*, April 18. Retrieved September 1, 2016.
- . 2015. "UC Berkeley Sex Assault Conference Draws Student Protest." *East Bay Times*, February 23. Retrieved September 25, 2016 (<https://www.eastbaytimes.com/>).
- Myers, Daniel J. 2000. "The Diffusion of Collective Violence: Infectiousness, Susceptibility, and Mass Media Networks." *American Journal of Sociology* 106(1):173-208.
- Naples, Nancy. 2009. "Teaching Intersectionality Intersectionally." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 11(4):566-577.
- Napolitano, Janet. 2014. "Letter to UC Community on Updated Sexual Harassment Policy." UCNet, March 7. Retrieved November 11, 2016 (<https://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/forms/pdf/president-napolitano-letter-to-uc-community-on-updated-sexual-harassment-policy.pdf>).
- Napolitano, Janet. 2016a. "Letter to UC Community on Additional Oversight Measures for Sexual Assault/Harassment Cases." UC Office of the President, March 18. Retrieved November 26, 2016 (<https://link.ucop.edu/2016/03/21/president-napolitano-announces-additional-oversight-measures-for-sexual-assault-harassment-cases/>).
- . 2016b. "President Napolitano's Letter to Joint Committee Regarding Report on Faculty Discipline Process in Sexual Harassment Cases." UC Office of the President, April 18. Retrieved November 26, 2016 (<https://sexualviolence.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/documents/Pres-Napolitano-letter-joint-committee-of-administration-academic-senate.041816.pdf>).

- National Center for Education Statistics. 2019. "Back to School Statistics." Institute of Education Science, National Center for Educational Statistics, retrieved September 13, 2019 (https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372#College_enrollment).
- Nguyen, Andy. 2013. "City Thefts Shooting Up." *The Daily Californian*, February 8. Retrieved April 6, 2017.
- Oakley, Ann. 1981. "Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms." Pp. 30-61 in *Doing Feminist Research*, edited by H. Roberts. Boston, MA: Routledge.
- Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Office of Budget and Planning. 2011. "2011-2012 Campus Profile, UC Santa Barbara." Retrieved November 11, 2018 (<http://bap.ucsb.edu/institutional.research/campus.profiles/>).
- . 2016. "2015-2016 Campus Profile, University of California-Santa Barbara." Retrieved November 11, 2018 (http://bap.ucsb.edu/IR/Campus_Profiles.html).
- Office of Planning and Analysis. 2016. "University of California, Berkeley Undergraduate Profile." Retrieved January 9, 2018. (<http://opa.berkeley.edu/campus-statistics>).
- Ortiz, Josh. 2015. "UCSB Pledges \$1.4 Million to Isla Vista Self-Governance." *The Daily Nexus*, September 6. Retrieved October 23, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Pastrana, Antonio, Jr. 2006. "The Intersectional Imagination: What do Lesbian and Gay Leaders of Color Have To Do With It?" *Race, Gender and Class* 13(3/4):218-238.
- . 2010. "Trump(et)ing Identities: Racial Capital and Lesbian and Gay Organizing." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 7(2):93-104.
- Pelak, Cynthia F., Verta Taylor, and Nancy Whittier. 1999. "Gender Movements." Pp. 147-175 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by J. S. Chafetz. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Pepito, DeeJay. 2013. "Protecting the Campus." *The Daily Californian*, November 5. Retrieved April 20, 2017.
- . 2014a. "Dear UC President: Hear Student Voices." *The Daily Californian*, February 11. Retrieved April 25, 2017.
- . 2014b. "Thinking Back, Looking Forward." *The Daily Californian*, February 6. Retrieved December 10, 2017.

- Perez-Peña, Richard. 2013. "College Groups Connect to Fight Sexual Assault." *The New York Times*, March 13.
- Petersen, Roger D. 2002. *Understanding Ethnic Violence: Fear, Hatred, and Resentment in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1983. "Organizational Demography." Pp. 299-357 in *Research in Organizational Behavior (Vol. 5: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews)*, edited by L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Pichardo, Nelson A. 1995. "The Power Elite and Elite-Driven Countermovements: The Associated Farmers of California During the 1930s." *Sociological Forum* 10(1):21-49.
- Pitcher, Michelle. 2015. "Campus Encourages Intervention with New Sexual Assault Prevention Campaign." *The Daily Californian*, February 2. Retrieved March 28, 2016 (www.dailycal.org).
- Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movement*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Pulido, Laura. 1996. "Development of the 'People of Color' Identity in the Environmental Justice Movement of the Movement of the Southwestern United States." *Socialist Review* 26(3/4):145-180.
- Quiambao, Carissa. 2014. "Students File Federal Complaint Alleging UCSB Mishandled Sexual Assault Cases." *The Daily Nexus*, September 9. Retrieved October 6, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Quinn, Caitlin. 2014. "An Email is Not Enough: University Must Become Better at Preventing Sexual Assault." *The Daily Californian*, March 11. Retrieved April 25, 2017.
- Raeburn, Nicole C. 2004. *Changing Corporate America From Inside Out: Lesbian and Gay Workplace Rights*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rankin & Associates Consulting. 2014a. "University of California Berkeley Campus Climate Project Final Report." Retrieved August 5, 2015 (<http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/results/index.html>).
- . 2014b. "University of California Santa Barbara Campus Climate Project Final Report." Retrieved August 5, 2015 (<http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/results/index.html>).
- . 2014c. "University of California System Campus Climate Project Final Report." Retrieved August 5, 2015 (<http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/results/index.html>).

- Reger, Jo. 2004. "Organizational 'Emotion Work' Through Consciousness-Raising: An Analysis of a Feminist Organization." *Qualitative Sociology* 27(2):205-22.
- , ed. 2005. *Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women's Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2012. *Everywhere & Nowhere: Contemporary Feminism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reynolds, Celene. 2019. "The Mobilization of Title IX Across U.S. Colleges and Universities, 1994-2014." *Social Problems* 66(2):245-273.
- Ricapito, Giuseppe. 2014. "Isla Vista Reeling from Report of Beating and Rape of UCSB Student." *The Bottom Line*, February 26. Retrieved January 10, 2018 (<http://thebottomline.as.ucsb.edu>).
- Richie, Beth. 2012. *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*. New York: New York University Press.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. 2011. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rojas, Fabio. 2007. *From Black Power to Black Studies: How a Radical Social Movement Became an Academic Discipline*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rondoni, Ally. 2013a. "CalSERVE Announces Presidential Candidate." *The Daily Californian*, March 4. Retrieved April 11, 2017.
- . 2013b. "Senate Blasts Campus Sexual Assault Policies." *The Daily Californian*, April 4. Retrieved April 11, 2017.
- Rosen, Hannah. 2009. *Terror in the Heart of Freedom: Citizenship, Sexual Violence, and the Meaning of Race in the Postemancipation South*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Roth, Benita. 2004. *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America's Second Wave*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Roth, Silke. 2008. "Dealing with Diversity: The Coalition of Labor Union Women." Pp. 213-231 in *Identity Work in Social Movements*, vol. 30, edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. 1987. *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rupp, Leila J., Verta Taylor, Shiri Regev-Messalem, Alison Fogarty, and Paula England. 2014. "Queer Women in the Hookup Scene: Beyond the Closet?" *Gender & Society* 28(2):212-235.
- Sanday, Peggy Reeves. 1990. *Fraternity Gang Rape: Sex, Brotherhood, and Privilege on Campus*. New York: New York University Press.
- Sander, Libby. 2013. "Yale University Is Fined \$165,000 Under Crime-Reporting Law." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 16. Retrieved January 11, 2017 (<https://www.chronicle.com/article/Yale-U-Is-Fined-165000/139343>).
- Sandoval, Chela. 1990. "Feminism and Racism: A Report on the 1981 National Women's Studies Association Conference." Pp. 55-71 in *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*, edited by G. Anzaldúa. San Francisco, CA: An Aunt Lute Foundation Book.
- Saric, Ivana. 2015. "Students Demonstrate in Opposition to UC Berkeley's Handling of National Conference on Campus Sexual Violence." *The Daily Californian*, February 24. Retrieved December 10, 2016.
- Schechter, Susan. 1982. *Women and Male Violence*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Schilt, Kristen. 2005. "'The Punk White Privilege Scene': Riot Grrl, White Privilege, and Zines." Pp. 39-56 in *Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women's Movement*, edited by J. Reger. New York: Routledge.
- Schmidt, Alyssa and Noah Brennan-Greenbaum. 2015. "A.S. Candidates Discuss Community Issues." *The Daily Nexus*, April 16. Retrieved October 11, 2017 (<http://daily nexus.com/>).
- Schrock, Douglas, Daphne Holden, and Lori Reid. 2004. "Creating Emotional Resonance: Interpersonal Emotion Work and Motivational Framing in a Transgender Community." *Social Problems* 51(1):61-81.
- Schwartz, Martin D., ed. 1997. *Researching Sexual Violence Against Women: Methodological and Personal Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schwartz, Michael. 1976. *Studies in Social Discontinuity*. New York: Academic.
- Scott, Ellen K. 1993. "How to Stop the Rapists? A Question of Strategy in Two Rape Crisis Centers." *Social Problems* 40(3):343-361.

- . 1998. "Creating Partnerships for Change: Alliances and Betrayals in the Racial Politics of Two Feminist Organizations." *Gender and Society* 12(4):400-423.
- . 2005. "Beyond Tokenism: The Making of Racially Diverse Feminist Organizations." *Social Problems* 52(2):232-254.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Segura, Denise A. and Beatriz M. Pesquera. 1995. "Chicana Feminisms: Their Political Context and Contemporary Expressions." Pp. 617-631 in *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, Fifth Edition, edited by J. Freeman. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- . [1992] 2001. "Beyond Indifference and Antipathy: The Chicana Movement and Chicana Feminist Discourse." Pp. 389-410 in *The Chicano Studies Reader: An Anthology of Aztlan, 1970-2000*, edited by C. A. Noriega, E. R. Avila, K. M. Davalos, C. Sandoval, and R. Perez-Torres. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
- Sewell, William H. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(1):1-29.
- Shokry, Youssef. 2014. "Take Back the Night 2014 Uses Art to 'Shatter the Silence' Around Sexual Assault." *The Daily Californian*, April 15. Retrieved September 1, 2016.
- Simmonds, Robin. 2014. "ASUC Campaign Aims to Promote Consensual Sex." *The Daily Californian*, February 18. Retrieved April 25, 2017.
- Slovinsky, Daniel. 2014. "DOE Official Discusses Sexual Assault." *The Daily Nexus*, May 1. Retrieved October 6, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Smith, Andrea. 2005. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Snow, David A. and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization." *International social movement research* 1(1):197-217.
- Snow, David A., Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2007. "Mapping the Terrain." Pp. 3-16 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Song, Jason. 2013. "State to Audit Sexual Assault Policies at UC Berkeley." *The Los Angeles Times*, August 21. Retrieved August 23, 2017 (<http://articles.latimes.com/2013/aug/21/local/la-me-assault-audit-20130822>).

- Soule, Sarah A. 1997. "The Student Divestment Movement in the United States and Tactical Diffusion: The Shantytown Protest." *Social Forces* 75(3):855-883.
- . 2007. "Diffusion of Processes within and across Movements." Pp. 294-310 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Sreekanth, Ananya. 2018. "What It's Like Living on Fraternity Row When You're Not in Greek Life." *The Daily Californian*, April 10. Retrieved August 27, 2019 (www.dailycal.org).
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1991. *The Pro-Choice Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1998. "Social Movement Communities and Cycles of Protest: The Emergence and Maintenance of a Local Women's Movement." *Social Problems* 45(2):180-204.
- . 2011. *Social Movements*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stanko, Elizabeth A. 1997. "'I Second That Emotion: Reflections on Feminism, Emotionality, and Research on Sexual Violence.'" Pp. 74-85 in *Researching Sexual Violence Against Women: Methodological and Personal Perspectives*, edited by M. Schwartz. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stearns, Linda B. and Paul D. Almeida. 2004. "The Formation of State Actor-Social Movement Coalitions and Favorable Policy Outcomes." *Social Problems* 51(4):478-504.
- Stewart, James. 2014. "We Are Part of the Problem, We Will Be Part of the Solution." *The Daily Californian*, November 7, 2014. Retrieved September 2, 2016.
- Stockdill, Brett C. 2003. *Activism Against AIDS: At the Intersections of Sexuality, Race, Gender and Class*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Stompler, Mindy. 1994. "Buddies" or "Slutties": The Collective Sexual Reputation of Fraternity Little Sisters." *Gender & Society* 8(3):297-323.
- Stremlau, Rosemarie. 2005. "Rape Narratives on the Northern Paiute Frontier: Sarah Winnemucca, Sexual Sovereignty, and Economic Autonomy 1844-1891." Pp. 37-60 in *Portraits of Women in the American West*, edited by D. Garceau-Hagen. New York: Routledge.
- Students Against Sexual Assault. 2018. "Mission." Retrieved May 9, 2019 (<https://www.sasa-ca.org/index.php/about/>).

- Sweet, Ellen. 1985. "Date Rape: The Story of an Epidemic and Those Who Deny It." *Ms.*, October.
- . 2012. "Date Rape Revisited." *Women's Media Center*, February 23. Retrieved August 26, 2019 (<http://www.womensmediacenter.com>).
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1983. *Struggling to Reform: Social Movements and Policy Change During Cycles of Protest*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Center for International Studies.
- . 1989. *Democracy and Disorder: Protest and Politics in Italy, 1965-1975*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1997. "Cycles of Collective Action: Between Moments of Madness and the Repertoire of Contention." Pp. 328-339 in *Social Movements: Readings on their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics*, edited by D. McAdam, and D. Snow. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing.
- . 1998. *Power in Movement*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Verta. 1989. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance." *American Sociological Review* 54(5):761-775.
- . 1995. "Watching for Vibes: Bringing Emotions into the Study of Feminist Organizations." Pp. 223-233 in *Feminist Organizations: Harvest of the New Women's Movement*, edited by M. M. Ferree and P. Y. Martin. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- . 1996. *Rock-a-by Baby: Feminism, Self Help, and Postpartum Depression*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1999. "Gender and Social Movements: Gender Processes in Women's Self-Help Movements." *Gender & Society* 13(1):8-33.
- Taylor, Verta, Katrina Kimport, Nella Van Dyke, and Ellen Andersen. 2009. "Culture and Mobilization: Tactical Repertoires, Same-Sex Weddings, and the Impact on Gay Activism." *American Sociological Review* 74(6):865-890.
- Taylor, Verta and Nella Van Dyke. 2007. "'Get up, Stand up': Tactical Repertoires of Social Movements." Pp. 262- 293 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

- Taylor, Verta and Nancy Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." Pp. 104-129 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A. Morris and C. Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . 1995. "Analytical Approaches to Social Movement Culture: The U.S. Women's Movement." Pp. 163-187 in *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by H. Johnston and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Terriquez, Veronica. 2015. "Intersectional Mobilization, Social Movement Spillover, and Queer Youth Leadership in the Immigrant Rights Movement." *Social Problems* 62:343-362.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education. 2017. "Title IX Tracker." Retrieved May 22, 2017 (<http://projects.chronicle.com/titleix/>).
- The Daily Californian. 2013a. "An Unacceptable Reality." *The Daily Californian*, February 15. Retrieved April 6, 2017.
- . 2013b. "Support for Survivors." *The Daily Californian*, April 12. Retrieved April 12, 2017.
- The Hunting Ground. 2016. "Meet Some of the Survivors Who Made This Year's Oscars Unforgettable." *The Hunting Ground Film*, March 1. Retrieved November 24, 2016 (<http://thehuntinggroundfilm.com/2016/03/meet-some-of-the-survivors-who-made-this-years-oscars-unforgettable/>).
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- . 1986. *The Contentious French*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- . 1995. *Popular Contention in Great Britain 1758-1834*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2004. *Social Movements 1768-2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- . 2008. *Contentious Performances*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles and Sidney Tarrow. 2007. *Contentious Politics*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Townsend-Bell, Erica. 2011. "What is Relevance? Defining Intersectional Praxis in Uruguay." *Political Research Quarterly* 64(1):187-199.
- Tucker, Jill. 2016. "Napolitano: UC Berkeley Must Lead Change in Sex Harassment Culture." *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 7. Retrieved September 18, 2016

- (<http://www.sfchronicle.com/bayarea/article/Napolitano-UC-Berkeley-must-lead-change-in-sex-7235203.php>).
- UC Berkeley Housing Task Force. 2017. "Housing Master Plan Task Force Report." Retrieved August 28, 2019 (http://evcp.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/housing_master_plan_task_force_final_draft_january_2017.pdf).
- UC Office of the President. 2014. "Task Force Targets Sexual assaults on Campuses." University of California Website, June 20. Retrieved November 11, 2016 (<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-forms-task-force-fight-sexual-assault>).
- . 2017. "UC Hires First Systemwide Title IX Coordinator." University of California Website, January 12. Retrieved October 8, 2018 (<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-hires-first-systemwide-title-ix-coordinator>).
- University of California, Berkeley. 2014. "National Conference on Campus Sexual Assault and Violence." Retrieved February 8, 2019 (<https://csav.berkeley.edu/>).
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2010. "American Fact Finder: 2010 Demographic Profile." Retrieved September 21, 2016 (http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml).
- U.S. Department of Education. 2014a. Campus Safety and Security. Retrieved September 24, 2016 (<http://ope.ed.gov/campussafety/#/>).
- . 2014b. "U.S. Department of Education Releases List of Higher Education Institutions with Open Title IX Sexual Violence Investigations." *Press Release*, May 1. Retrieved September 2, 2016 (<https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-releases-list-higher-education-institutions-open-title-i>).
- . 2015. "U.S. Department of Education Awards Nearly \$570,000 Grant to University of California, Santa Barbara Following a Shooting Last Year." *Press Release*, January 13. Retrieved November 11, 2018 (<https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-awards-nearly-570000-grant-university-california-santa-b>).
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights. 2011. Dear Colleague Letter, April 4.
- . 2018. "Office for Civil Rights Report: Complaints Against the University of California, Berkeley (Case No. 09-14-2232, 09-15-2392, and 09-16-2399)." Berkeley Compliance Response. Retrieved March 1, 2018 (<http://compliance.response.berkeley.edu/ocr-report.shtml>).
- U.S. Department of Justice. 2018. "Protecting Students From Sexual Assault." Retrieved

October 23, 2018 (<https://www.justice.gov/ovw/protecting-students-sexual-assault#campusclimate>).

- Van Dyke, Nella, Sarah A. Soule, Verta A. Taylor. 2004. "The Targets of Social Movements: Beyond a Focus on the State." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change* 25:27-51.
- Vanhala, Lisa. 2012. "Legal Opportunity Structures and the Paradox of Legal Mobilization by the Environmental Movement in the UK." *Law & Society Review* 46(3):523-556.
- Veklerov, Kimberly. 2013. "Students Hold Town Hall About Sex Assault." *The Daily Californian*, December 2. Retrieved April 20, 2017.
- . 2014. "Civil Rights Office Looks Into Claim of Title IX." *The Daily Californian*, April 21. Retrieved April 26, 2016.
- Ward, Jane. 2008. "Diversity Discourse and Multi-Identity Work in Lesbian and Gay Organizations." Pp. 233-256 in *Identity Work in Social Movements*, vol. 30, edited by J. Reger, D. J. Myers, and R. L. Einwohner. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Warshaw, Robin. 1988. *I Never Called It Rape: The Ms. Report on Recognizing, Fighting, and Surviving Date and Acquaintance Rape*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Weldon, Michele. 2018. "Entitled to Equality: Lawyer Works Fiercely For Legal Protections For Women." Take The Lead Website, September 28, 2018. Retrieved September 12, 2019 (<https://www.taketheleadwomen.com/blog/entitled-to-equality-lawyer-works-fiercely-for-legal-protections-for-women>).
- West, Candace and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125-151.
- Wharton, Amy S. 2009. "The Sociology of Emotional Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 35:147-165.
- Whittier, Nancy. 1995. *Feminist Generations: The Persistence of the Radical Women's Movement*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- . 2001. "Emotional Strategies: The Collective Reconstruction and Display of Oppositional Emotions in the Movement Against Child Sex Abuse." Pp. 233-250 in *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*, edited by J. Goodwin, J. M. Jasper, and F. Polletta. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2007. "The Consequences of Social Movements for Each Other." Pp. 531-551 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

- . 2009. *The Politics of Child Sexual Abuse: Emotion, Social Movements, and the State*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2012. "The Politics of Visibility: Coming Out and Individual and Collective Identity." Pp. 145-169 in *Making History: Movements, Strategy, and Social Change*, edited by J. Goodwin, R. Kutz-Flamenbaum, G. Maney, and D. Rohlinger. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2016. "Carceral and Intersectional Feminism in Congress: The Violence Against Women Act, Discourse, and Policy." *Gender & Society* 30(5):791-818.
- . 2017. "Identity Politics, Consciousness-Raising, and Visibility Politics." Pp. 376-397 in *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. Women's Social Movement Activism*, edited by H. J. McCammon, V. Taylor, J. Reger, and R. L. Einwohner. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2018. *Frenemies: Feminists, Conservatives, and Sexual Violence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willick, Jason. 2012. "Guilty Until Proven Innocent." *The Daily Californian*, October 29. Retrieved April 5, 2017.
- Wilson, John. 1977. "Social Protest and Social Control." *Social Problems* 24(4):469-481.
- Wulfhorst, Ellen. 2019. "Stories of Sexual Violence Can Become 'Trauma Porn,' #MeToo Founder Says." *Reuters*, June 6. Retrieved July 10, 2019 (<https://www.reuters.com>).
- Yamane, David. 2001. *Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Color Line in Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Yang, Henry T. 2014a. "A Message for Faculty – IV Safety Progress Report." Office of the Chancellor, Memos to Campus, July 30. Retrieved November 5, 2018 (<https://chancellor.ucsb.edu/memos/>).
- . 2014b. "A Message from Chancellor Yang." Office of the Chancellor, Memos to Campus, February 26. Retrieved November 5, 2018 (<https://chancellor.ucsb.edu/memos/>).
- . 2014c. "Campus and Isla Vista Safety." Office of the Chancellor, Memos to Campus, May 30. Retrieved November 5, 2018 (<https://chancellor.ucsb.edu/memos/>).
- . 2014d. "Chancellor's Coordinating Committee on Isla Vista." Office of the Chancellor, Memos to Campus, September 25. Retrieved November 5, 2018 (<https://chancellor.ucsb.edu/memos/>).

- . 2015. "Campus Welcome and Update." Office of the Chancellor, Memos to Campus, October 21. Retrieved November 5, 2018 (<https://chancellor.ucsb.edu/memos/>).
- Yelimeli, Supriya. 2016. "Students Claim Administration Has Not Fulfilled Sit-In Demands." *The Daily Nexus*, May 16. Retrieved May 20, 2016 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yoon, Jennie. 2013. "Campaigning for Consent." *The Daily Californian*, October 28. Retrieved April 20, 2017.
- Yoon-Hendricks, Alexandra. 2015. "ASUC Commission Aims to Promote Sexual Violence Awareness with Cal Consent Week." *The Daily Californian*, April 13. Retrieved September 2, 2016 (www.dailycal.org).
- Young Americans for Liberty. 2019. "Mission." Retrieved July 16, 2019 (<https://yaliberty.org/about/>).
- Young, Michael P. 2002. "Confessional Protest: The Religious Birth of U.S. National Social Movements." *American Sociological Review* 67(5):660-688.
- Zald, Mayer and Bert Useem. 1987. "Movement and Countermovement Interaction: Mobilization, Tactics, and State Involvement." Pp. 247-71 in *Social Movements in an Organizational Society: Collected Essays*, edited by M. N. Zald and J. D. McCarthy. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Zemans, Frances K. 1983. "Legal Mobilization: The Neglected Role of the Law in the Political System." *The American Political Science Review* 77(3):690-703.
- Zimmerman, Peekka and Beth Lebens. 2015. "Candidates Engage Students in Q&A." *The Daily Nexus*, April 16. Retrieved October 11, 2017 (<http://dailynexus.com/>).
- Zipursky, Alisa. 2018. "When They Want Trauma Porn Instead of Your Truth." The Healing Honestly Blog, January 12, 2018. Retrieved July 10, 2019 (<https://healinghonestly.com/pop-culture/when-they-want-trauma-porn-instead-your-truth>).

Appendix A: Table of Study Participants

UC Santa Barbara

Name	Age	Race/ Ethnicity	Gender	Sexual Orientation	Social Class	Year in School
Alissa	20	Mexican	Female	Heterosexual	Working/ Middle	Sophomore (spring 2016)
Janel	23	Chicana	Female	Queer	Middle	Graduating Senior (June 2015)
Sandy*	22	White	Female	Heterosexual/ questioning	Middle	Graduated June 2016
Selene	21	Latina/ Middle Eastern	Female	Heterosexual	Lower Middle	Graduated June 2016
Jenny	22	White	Female	Bisexual	Upper middle	Second year of graduate school (fall 2016)
Melissa	24	Latina	Female	Heterosexual	Did not respond	Graduated June 2015
Madeline	21	White	Female	Heterosexual	Middle	Senior (fall 2016)
Diana*	32	Chicana	Female	Heterosexual	Working	Fourth year of graduate school (fall 2016)
Tim	26	White	Male	Queer	Working	Graduated with MA June 2016
Lexi	23	White	Female	Heterosexual	Upper middle	Graduated June 2015
Jocellyn	23	Hispanic/ Latina	Female	Bisexual	Working	Senior (fall 2016)
Yessica	21	Mexican	Female	Gay	Working	Senior (fall 2016)
Cierra	23	White	Female	Pansexual	Working	Second year of graduate school (fall 2016)
Lacy	20	Asian	Female	Bisexual	Lower/ middle	Transferred to another school June 2016
Alisha*	19	Hispanic	Female	Heterosexual	Working	Sophomore (fall 2016)
Ro' Shawndra	22	African	Female	"I like who I like"	Working	Senior (fall 2017)
Alejandra	22	Latina	Female	Heterosexual	Working	Graduated June 2017

UC Berkeley

Name	Age	Race/ Ethnicity	Gender	Sexual Orientation	Social Class	Year in School
Aanchal	21	South Asian/ Indian	Female	Unsure	Upper-Middle	Graduated May 2016
Andrew*	21	Asian Pacific Islander, White, Native Hawaiian	Male	Heterosexual	Middle	Senior (fall 2016)
Sarah	23	White	Female	Heterosexual	Working	Graduated May 2016
Anita*	20	South Asian/ Indian	Female	Queer	Upper Middle	Sophomore (fall 2016)
Aarefah	23	Pakistani, Arab, Persian	Female	Heterosexual	Middle	Senior (fall 2016)
Aryle**	23		Female		Working	Graduated May 2015
Rosa	21	Korean	Female	Bisexual	Middle	Senior (fall 2017)
Anais	26	White	Female	Queer	Working	Graduated May 2013
Iman	23	African American	Female	Heterosexual	Working/ Middle	Graduated May 2016
Lucy*	23	White	Female	Heterosexual	Middle	Graduated May 2016
Emily*	22	Native America, Mexican, Vietnamese	Female	Queer	Lower-Middle	Graduated May 2017
Hannah*	23	White	Female	Heterosexual	Upper-Middle	Graduated May 2016
Sofie	24	White	Female	Queer	Upper-Middle	Graduated May 2015
Nicoletta	26	White	Female	Queer	Upper-Middle	Graduated with BA May 2013; MA May 2016

Note: Asterisk after the name denotes pseudonym. Age and year in school as reported at the time of the first interview.

**Some of the information for Aryle is not available. Only part of the interview was completed and she did not respond to attempts at making a follow-up interview.

Appendix B: Sexual Assaults Reported on Campus*

Year	UC Berkeley	UC Santa Barbara
2010	4	6
2011	24	7
2012	2	12
2013	5	23
2014	15	11
2015	16	14
2016	25	18
2017	20	24
2018	19	20

Note: This is based on the yearly campus security reports released by the universities in October as required by the Clery Act.

Endnotes

¹ This movement began by using the term sexual assault. Over time some activists began using the term sexual violence to be inclusive of the other forms of violence students on campus experience. In this research I use the term sexual violence to be inclusive of the experiences of survivors on campuses and the activist work many of the students did.

² These five colleges and universities included: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Swarthmore College, University of Southern California, Dartmouth College, and Occidental College.

³ Snow, Soule, and Kriesi (2007) define social movements as “collectivities acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional or organizational channels for the purpose of challenging or defending extant authority, whether it is institutionally or culturally based, in the group, organization, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part” (p. 11). Based on this definition, the increase of activism against sexual violence targeting colleges and universities can be considered a movement, but this may differ by school where there may not have been recurring activism or continuity of action. Literature on this movement is emerging and scholars such as Danielle Dirks refer to it as the “campus sexual violence movement,” and Heldman, Ackerman, and Breckenridge-Jackson (2018) refer to it as the “campus anti-rape movement (CARM).”

⁴ Many different tactics have been used, but the use of the law (Title IX and Clery Act complaints, lawsuits) has been one of the most notable tactics. Title IX complaints are one way in which the law has been mobilized (Reynolds 2019) and I argue to be a defining feature of this movement particularly the shift to addressing sexual violence. Zemans (1983:700) states that the law is mobilized “when a desire or want is translated into a demand as an assertion of one’s rights” and “contains an implicit threat to use the power of the state on one’s own behalf.” The law has been used in the past to address sexual violence in colleges and universities, particularly sexual harassment.

⁵ The number of schools under investigation does not reflect the actual number of investigations because several of the colleges and universities have multiple cases open.

⁶ Elementary and secondary institutions are increasingly being targeted as well. As of December 2015, over 60 elementary and secondary schools were being investigated for failure to comply with Title IX regulations for sexual violence (Kingkade 2016a).

⁷ The Board of Regents is the main governing body of the UC system. It appoints the university president and its principal officers overseeing all campuses and approves university policies and tuition and fees. The Office of the President is the system-wide headquarters that provides support to all campus operations and consults with the Academic Senate and Chancellors regarding university policies. Chancellors serve as the top administrator on each campus and are responsible for the operation and organization of their respective campus, including the implementation of policies created by the UC system and their own campus. To see the university-wide and campus organization charts go to <https://www.ucop.edu/business-operations/universitywide-organization-charts.html>.

⁸ The reports released by the University of California Office of the President utilized data from campus climate surveys administered on all 10 UC campuses in 2012-2013.

⁹ The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, passed in 1990, requires colleges and universities who receive federal funding to disclose and maintain information about crime on and near campuses. Schools are required to send timely warnings about crimes that occur as well as an annual security report.

¹⁰ These numbers only reflect the rapes that are reported to each university’s police or security departments. Since the majority of rape and other forms of sexual violence tend to go unreported to police and authorities, this number should be much higher for all UCs.

¹¹ In July 2015, a second Title IX investigation was opened at UC Berkeley. In 2016, there were four other UCs under investigation for violating Title IX regulations: Davis, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Santa Cruz. The U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights completed UC Berkeley's Title IX investigations in February 2018.

¹² Sources: UC Berkeley's Office of Planning and Analysis and UC Santa Barbara's Office of Budget and Planning.

¹³ The U.S. Census collects data on race and ethnicity separately.

¹⁴ Work such as: *Southern Horrors: Women and the Politics of Rape and Lynching* by Feimster (2011); *The New Campus Anti-Rape Movement: Internet Activism and Social Justice* by Heldman et al. (2018); *Black Women in White America: A Documentary History* by Lerner (1992); "It Was Like All of Us Had Been Raped: Sexual Violence, Community Mobilization, and the African American Freedom Struggle" (2004) and *At the Dark End of the Street: Black Women, Rape, and Resistance – a New History of the Civil Rights Movement from Rosa Parks to the Rise of Black Power* (2010) by McGuire; *Terror in the Heart of Freedom: Citizenship, Sexual Violence, and the Meaning of Race in the Postemancipation South* by Rosen (2009); *Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* by Smith (2005); and "Rape Narratives on the Northern Paiute Frontier: Sarah Winnemucca, Sexual Sovereignty, and Economic Autonomy 1844-1891" by Stremlau (2005).

¹⁵ Anti-rape work in the U.S. did not begin with this movement. It has been going on since the 1880s or before and in marginalized communities as well. For example, Feimster (2009) documented the anti-rape work in the South in the 1880s. Also, McGuire (2010) discussed Black women's activism against sexual violence in the 1940s and its importance to the Civil Rights Movement.

¹⁶ The anti-rape movement emerged from the white women's movement, but women of color have been involved in the movement since it began. There is some literature on women of color and their involvement in the anti-rape movement, but it does not provide a very in-depth discussion of their involvement or in the development of rape crisis centers. Some works that do discuss women of color: (Bevacqua 2000; Greensite 1999; Matthews 1989, 1994; Scott 1993, 1998, 2005).

¹⁷ Works such as: *Adam's Rib* (1948) by Ruth Herschberger; *Against Our Will* (1975) by Susan Brownmiller.

¹⁸ Bohmer and Parrot (1993) stated that sexual assault on college campuses was as major problem and described how few sexual assault cases were reported to universities and if they were reported, universities would often mishandle such cases.

¹⁹ These include: The National College Women Sexual Victimization Survey by Fisher and Turner (2000); the Campus Sexual Assault Survey by Krebs et al. (2007); and the Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct by American Association of Universities (2015).

²⁰ Some works on contemporary women's movements that discuss some of the ways activism against sexual violence has been sustained: *Feminist Generations: The Persistence of the Radical Women's Movement* (1995) by Nancy Whittier; *Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women's Movement* (2005) edited by Jo Reger; *Everywhere & Nowhere: Contemporary Feminism in the United States* (2012) by Jo Reger; and *Slutwalk: Feminism, Activism, and Media* (2015) by Kaitlynn Mendes.

²¹ These cases include: *Jackson v. Birmingham Board of Education* (2005); *Lisa Simpson et al. v. University of Colorado* (2007); *Tiffany Williams v. Board of Regents of the University Systems of Georgia* (2007); *Melissa Jennings & Debbie Keller v. The University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill* (2007); and *Fitzgerald v. Barnstable School Committee* (2009) (Hatch 2017).

²² Resource mobilization theory was the economic model that emerged in the early 1970s as a response to the inadequacies of the collective behavior theories. McCarthy and Zald (1977) contended that resources, and organization were crucial to explaining social movement mobilizations. They stated that "explaining collective

behavior requires detailed attention to the selection of incentives, cost-reducing mechanisms or structures, and career benefits that lead to collective behavior” (1977: 1216).

²³ This is a very broad and general view of gender. Separation of the public and private sphere for women did not apply to all women. Women of color did not have the “protection and buffering of a patriarchal family” and often had to work to provide for their families (Dill 1994:149).

²⁴ Only the demographic information that was provided by participants will be discussed in this section. Demographic information is not complete for Aryle. She only completed half of the interview.

²⁵ The timeline and discussion of events in this chapter draws on local, school, and national newspapers. I particularly draw on UC Berkeley’s *The Daily Californian*.

²⁶ The task force was created in October 2010 by Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost George Breslaur to modify the code of student conduct after criticism and debates about it (Code of Student Conduct Task Force 2011). These recommendations came after faculty and students complained about the policies and implementation of them following student conduct proceedings from “disruptive” campus protests against tuition increases in November 2009 (Code of Student Conduct Task Force 2011).

²⁷ See Jason Willick’s “Guilty Until Proven Innocent” published on October 29; Nadia Cho’s “The Talk (That Must Be Had)” published on November 6; Megan Messerly’s “Number of Rape Reports in Berkeley Spikes to 39” published on February 12; Christine Ambrosio and Allan Creighton’s “Valentines and Violence” published on February 12; Ley Cerezo’s “Rape Culture, Right Here in the United States” published on February 12; and an editorial “An Unacceptable Reality” published on February 15 in *The Daily Californian*.

²⁸ UCLA, Chico State University, and San Diego State University were the campuses selected for the audit.

²⁹ Three months later the task force released a report detailing recommendations for universities on how to improve their response to sexual assault and reduce its prevalence. They also announced the creation of a website NotAlone.gov that provided information and resources for students and schools.

³⁰ See Nicoletta Commins’ “Breaking the Silence Surrounding Sexual Assault” published on January 14 and Connor Murphy’s “It’s Time We Have a Talk About the Other Rape Victims.” published on January 21 in *The Daily Californian*.

³¹ These include: establishing the new Interim Sexual Misconduct Policy; the creation of a new position (Confidential Survivor Advocate) to assist survivors in reporting and accessing emotional support after an assault; hiring an additional investigator to The Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (Title IX Office); UCPD providing more resources and guidance on reporting and legal options, and how to obtain resources; and the creation of a “one-stop website” about preventing, reporting, and adjudicating sexual misconduct cases (Dirks 2014).

³² ASUC President DeeJay Pepito and Christine Ambrosio, the Director of Women’s Resources in the Gender Equity Resource Center at UC Berkeley, wrote an op-ed together highlighting and praising the university’s current efforts in addressing sexual violence and describing the different ways students could educate themselves and help address this issue. The op-ed was published on April 8, 2014.

³³ The website was launched on April 8, 2014.

³⁴ No investigation on the Clery Act complaint had been opened yet.

³⁵ In a letter to Senator Barbara Boxer, UC President Napolitano wrote in support of the SOS Campus Act. Senator Boxer, returned the correspondence in late August urging the UC system to support the SOS Campus Act bill and encouraged them to voluntarily adopt the recommendations of the bill before it was approved (Lee 2014).

³⁶ The campaign was started by Meghan Warner, a UC Berkeley undergraduate, and Savannah Badalich, a UCLA undergraduate, and was based on Savannah's UCLA campaign 7,000 in Solidarity. Although focusing on consent, the campaign would vary and be tailored to each campus to fit their individual needs and unique environment.

³⁷ During the last weekend of September, two separate sexual assaults were reported in fraternities and a third one that may have occurred in a fraternity were reported to UCPD. Two weeks after the three reported sexual assaults, five people reported being drugged and sexually assaulted at Delta Kappa Epsilon, a fraternity not recognized by the university. A week after this (10/17), a leader in Theta Delta Chi reported to UCPD that a member of the fraternity had been sexually assaulted by another member of the fraternity.

³⁸ Four days after the students' op-ed was published, Claire Holmes (2014), the Associate Vice Chancellor of Communications and Public Affairs wrote a letter to the editor in the campus newspaper rebutting their claims. She expressed disappointment over the students "grossly misrepresent[ing]" the campus efforts and refuted the accusations made against administrators. Holmes called on students to not fight the administration, but sexual assault.

³⁹ The campaign was tailored to Berkeley's needs and it was a staff and student collaboration (Pitcher 2015). The poster campaign was directed by staff who led education and prevention efforts on campus and posters were designed by students and featured them as well.

⁴⁰ The investigation also found that he had shown "sexual interest in her" and that he had used his position to "actively interfere with UC efforts to fire her" (Matier 2015).

⁴¹ The timeline and discussion of events in this chapter draws on local, school, and national newspapers. I particularly draw on UC Santa Barbara's *The Daily Nexus* and *The Bottom Line*.

⁴² This inspired the creation of the hashtag #YesAllWomen, where women documented experiences of fear, harassment and sexual violence they face on a daily basis.

⁴³ Isla Vista has attempted to become a city three different times in the 1970s and 1980s, but failed every time.

⁴⁴ Interview with Lexi, August 3, 2016.

⁴⁵ Email from Debbie Fleming, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, to student leaders on January 28, 2016.

⁴⁶ Student groups included: A.S. Womxn's Commission, A.S. Executive Officers, A.S. Commission on Public Safety, Graduate Student Association, Take Back the Night, nowUCsb, Residential Housing Association, the Resource Center for Sexual & Gender Diversity, Greek Leadership, Student Representatives to the UC System-wide Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault Taskforce and Workgroups.

⁴⁷ In October 2018, UC Santa Barbara was approached by researchers from UC San Diego to conduct a survey, similar to the MyVoice Survey conducted at UC Berkeley in early 2018 that gathered information on the campus efforts regarding sexual violence and incidences of sexual assaults. This fully funded project, however, never happened as Chancellor Yang did not allow this project to proceed.

⁴⁸ Opinion piece titled, "The Underlying Problems of SB 967 and Affirmative Consent," published February 12, 2016 in *The Daily Nexus*.

⁴⁹ Email from Debbie Fleming to student leaders, staff, and administrators on March 6, 2017.

⁵⁰ These groups included: Take Back the Night, A.S. Womxn's Commission, CARE Interns, Graduate Student Association, A.S. Public Safety Commission, Queer Commission, Hermanas Unidas, Black Student Union, Student Activist Network, Greek Leadership Councils, ICA Student Leadership, Club Sports, and Human Rights Board. Debbie Fleming email to student leaders, staff, and administrators on April 17, 2017.

⁵¹ In the staff meeting with Womxn’s Commission, two staff members attended the meeting for 30 minutes asking students about how to improve the dissemination of information about survivor resources, revisions to policy, challenges it faces, and how to help prevent sexual violence.

⁵² See opinion piece titled “Walking the Tightrope of Ruin: Being Male on Campus,” published April 27, 2017 in *The Daily Nexus*.

⁵³ The Monument Quilt is a collection of stories by survivors of sexual and intimate partner violence that is stitched, written, and painted onto red fabric.

⁵⁴ Email from Kathleen Salvaty to a small group of UC Santa Barbara student leaders, April 30, 2017.

⁵⁵ Interview with Ro’Shawndra, November 29, 2017.

⁵⁶ Interview with Ro’Shawndra, November 29, 2017

⁵⁷ See *The Daily Nexus* article, “Officials Break Down Clery Report Statistics,” published on November 5, 2008.

⁵⁸ Anais LaVoie’s last name changed to Lieu.

⁵⁹ The website for the Gender Equity Resource Center changed in the last four years. It currently is <https://campusclimate.berkeley.edu/students/ejce/geneq>. In order to see the resources provided in 2009 to 2014, I accessed their old website (<http://geneq.berkeley.edu>) on Wayback Machine, a digital archive of information on the internet.

⁶⁰ This later became the PATH to Care Center.

⁶¹ Demographic information for Aryle is not available. Only one part of the interview was completed and she did not respond to attempts at making a follow-up interview.

⁶² In 2016, the commission was renamed to the Sexual Violence Commission in order to be more inclusive of the different experiences of survivors.

⁶³ For a short video of the presentation: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mMvyigstPBo>

⁶⁴ Website address of blog: <https://berkeleysexualassault.wordpress.com/>

⁶⁵ Chancellor Search Committee Student Listening Session with UC President Janet Napolitano, November 2, 2016.

⁶⁶ See article by Richard Perez-Peña titled “College Groups Connect to Fight Sexual Assault,” published in *The New York Times* on March 13, 2013.

⁶⁷ The Isla Vista Foot Patrol began in 1970 and is made up of officers from the UC Santa Barbara Police Department, Santa Barbara County Sheriff’s Department, and the California Highway Patrol. Although the Santa Barbara Sheriff’s Department holds primary jurisdiction over Isla Vista, all three departments work together to staff the Isla Vista Foot Patrol.

⁶⁸ At UC Berkeley, Nicoletta who attended the school as an undergraduate and then a graduate student for two years, worked on issues of sexual violence mostly while she was a graduate student. She focused mostly on her sexual assault that occurred while she was an undergraduate and had been mishandled, and on issues affecting undergraduate students.

⁶⁹ nowUCsb, “Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)”. Handout given out during a public forum on proposed policy changes on October 19, 2015.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ A similar conservative movement arose at UC Berkeley and in 2017 the city of Berkeley has seen a clash between radical/socialist groups and far right white nationalist groups. Most of the activists I interviewed worked on issues of sexual violence before 2017 and did not report direct backlash from conservative groups.

⁷² Interview with Emily, UC Berkeley graduate.

⁷³ Interviews with Aryle and Hannah, UC Berkeley students.

⁷⁴ Students from UC Berkeley did discuss comparison of stories and activism, but most said they weren't comfortable sharing the tensions and conflicts that did arise within their activist communities and networks.

⁷⁵ The majority of the students I interviewed were women. Most described how women were seen as more credible and legitimate in this movement, which facilitated to some extent the work they did.

⁷⁶ At this time, a White Student Union group was formed on campus as well.