

REVIEW ARTICLE

THE EFFECT OF AMOROUS RELATIONSHIP AMONG EMPLOYEES AT THE UNIVERSITY

Dinah Rachael Owusu*, Kenneth Abdul Karim

Kumasi Technical University, P. O. Box 854, Kumasi, Ghana.

*Corresponding Author Email: mensema@gmail.com

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License CC BY 4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History:

Received 21 April 2022

Accepted 27 May 2022

Available online 01 June 2022

ABSTRACT

Consensual sexual relationships (CSRs) have traditionally been overlooked by university officials. CSRs are frequently involved under canopy rules regarding sexual harassment where policies do exist, even though these interactions may never constitute such. Several universities have worked to enact partial or full prohibitions on every faculty romantic relationship, mostly as these connections easily can become for the university, sexual harassment difficulties. Given that differentials of power between members of faculty appear to be controversial over whether CSRs should be allowed or avoided. Descriptive design with quantitative research was used for the study. The population comprises faculty members from both public and private universities in Kumasi, Ghana. Ethical consideration was highly observed to ensure confidentiality of data collection. The study revealed that faculty members' perceptions of power differentials showed a positive and significant relation with perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs. It was recommended that future studies explore perceptions of power differentials in at least three different government institutions.

KEYWORDS

Amorous Relationship, University Employees, Sexual Harassment, Perceptions, Power Differentials

1. INTRODUCTION

Dual connections, in which the limits between employee associations are unclear owing to friendships, mentorships, or even sexual relations, are a common occurrence on campuses of college (Bercovitch and Grant-Kels, 2018). Consensual sexual relationships (CSRs), a sort of double engagement, are often overlooked at the level of university (Carrillo et al., 2019). Until sexual harassment's formal charge is made or other employee interfered by the partnership, the extant literature on such partnerships has typically indicated a laissez-faire stance from universities (Madsen et al., 2021; Little and Thompson, 1989). CSRs have traditionally been overlooked by university officials (Richards and Nystrom, 2022). CSRs are frequently involved under canopy rules regarding sexual harassment where policies do exist, even though these interactions may never constitute such (Igarashi et al., 2022).

The number of institutions with particular CSR rules (as opposed to policies of sexual harassment) grew from seventeen percent to fifty-seven percent between the late 1980s and the mid-2000s (Sullivan, 2004). While there has been a significant increase in policies that are stand-alone for CSRs, there are many institutions lacking such policies. Though several universities lack a comprehensive plan establishing their own CSR policies (Richards et al., 2014). Several universities have worked to enact partial or full prohibitions on every faculty romantic relationship, mostly as these connections easily can become for the university, sexual harassment difficulties (Ceesay, 2020). Policy establishment of Yale University forbidding every sexual connection among members of faculty in 2010 is an example of a main adjustment of policy that is emblematic of the way universities have changed their technique of handling CSRs. As said, Yale's previous policy ban that solely banned sexual interactions among members of faculty, was now enlarged (Richards et al., 2014).

Other universities, including Northwestern, Harvard, and Stanford, have executed inclusive policies prohibiting CSRs among student population and the whole faculty, and individual policy acknowledges they were specifically created to tackle imbalanced power (or rank) in any relationship comprising a student and staff/faculty member. Furthermore, if one partner has influence over the other, Stanford's standards necessitate any romantic connections between mature workers, comprising teachers, to be revealed (Stanford, 2019). As said, despite a recent movement on college campuses to amend CSR and sexual harassment rules, there is little research on this kind of double interaction of role (Richards et al., 2014).

Though certain dual partnerships amongst faculty members could be considered exploitative. Many institutions have consistently ignored consensual sexual relationships unless there was school direct threat. On the other hand, sexual harassment liability is documented well on campuses of college (Richards et al., 2014). The fundamental difficulty with CSRs is determining the amount to which there is a power differential between members of faculty and the way these differentials affect the relationship, and the decisions participants make and are engaged in such conducts. Given that differentials of power between members of faculty appear to be controversial over whether CSRs should be allowed or avoided, the current study aims to:

1. Determine what elements are associated to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials.
2. Determine if faculty members' perceptions of power differentials influence their perceptions of the similarities and differences between CSRs and sexual harassment.

Quick Response Code



Access this article online

Website:
www.aiem.com.my

DOI:
10.26480/aiem.01.2022.11.15

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Before sexual harassment became a liability concern on university campuses in the last few decades, most academics, comprising officials of university, did not prevent or discourage CSRs (Nystrom, 2020). Letter publishing from Department of Education alerting institutions of their sexual harassment responsibility has sparked a fresh wave of such rules tackling CSRs (Flaherty, 2018). Many sorts of dual partnerships between instructors and students, including consensual sexual connections, have received both valid criticism and support in previous study. Similar to sexual harassment charges, critics contend that power imbalance existence makes it questionable if consent can legitimately be granted by the pupil (Sullivan, 2004; Carlson, 2001). On the other hand, contrary research implies that consensual associations between students and staff are appropriate and must be not regulated; rules prohibiting such relations are seen as intruding on privacy right, given that both parties are lawful adults (Dank, 2008; Abramson, 2007).

While academic and privacy freedom are important considerations in the community of university, students' (and faculty's) right to safety may outweigh these concerns, as these personal interactions' nature and context might disclose major ethical and moral challenges (Sullivan, 2004; Jafar, 2003; Gerdes, 2003). The majority of the literature on campus views regarding CSRs has concentrated on student perceptions, with little study on faculty attitudes toward these connections (Zakrzewski, 2006; Jafar, 2003). Whereas research demonstrate that teachers and students tolerate platonic relationships, students appear to have various tolerance levels for romantic relations between students and staff depending on their standing. For example, whereas students considered sexual connections between undergraduate pupils and professors as wrong, they viewed interactions between graduate assistant or graduate pupils and teachers as acceptable more, according to one research (Quatrella and Wentworth, 1995).

According to this could be as undergraduates do not believe differentials of power in graduate student-faculty relationships are as strong as they are in undergraduate-faculty relationships because they believe involved both parties are closer typically in age, and in some circumstances, pupils are older than or the same age members of faculty (Quatrella and Wentworth, 1995). Graduate pupils might also be on similar paths of career and have a higher status of academic (specifically, degrees) than pupils who are undergraduates. Undergraduate students, in particular, appear to be far more accepting of dual non-sexual partnerships between pupils and teachers. As said by undergraduates stated that relationships of business between students and professors, for example working for a professional partnership or babysitting, were acceptable generally, nonetheless that a professor having a relationship sexually with a student or spending time with the pupil outside of academia alone was considered unsuitable (Ei and Bowen, 2002).

As said by whereas the latter instances were judged unethical, pupils engaging with professors in groups for lunch, drinks, and even addressing them by their initial names were not considered unethical (Ei and Bowen, 2002). It was suggested that friendly professors is satisfactory, nonetheless professors having relationships sexually with pupils crosses a line, highlighting a perfect variance in tolerance for sexual and non-sexual dual associations, despite power differentials' presence between pupils and faculty in both. As said by whereas research majority has been conducted with undergraduate pupils, graduate pupils have comparable attitudes concerning CSRs between fellow members of program and teachers (Stites, 1993). Graduate students, for instance, believe that relationships sexually between graduate pupils and members of faculty are unsuitable, are unethical, and create inherent conflicts of interest, akin to employer-employee interactions (Stites, 1993).

Further research into teacher and student friendliness reveals that, while a friendlier interaction between professors and students is desirable, an overabundance of friendliness can be detrimental to the student's educational well-being as well as the faculty member's professional reputation (Chory and Offstein 2018). A pupil-focused method to teaching at level of college that inspires a closer association between students and faculty will not encourage pupils to step out of their comfort zones or experience the usual uneasiness that some difficult topics can carry (Chory and Offstein, 2017).

2.1 Antecedents Forecasting Engagement Decision in Romance at Workplace

Women and men are not viewed as going into relationships intimately at work for the same reasons. The projected gender differences between the observers did not materialize. Furthermore, whether or not observer of

the third-party was involved personally in such an association, the motivations assigned to one of the office romance partners did not alter (Anderson and Fischer, 1991). In addition to official professional ties, casual relationships (those formed outside of the business) are linked to personal results and positive work. For instance, as said by beauty among coworkers enhances collaboration, communication, and teamwork (Reich et al., 2010). Furthermore, as said by romances at workplace are connected to a positive work environment and happier workers (Riach and Wilson, 2014). Ego-related motivations and work were likely more to be connected with sex. Men were thought to go in relationships for excitement, ego fulfillment, sexual experience, and adventure, whilst women considered career success or romantic relationships as more important (Anderson and Fischer, 1991). Quinn, who described 3 frequent motives for participation in office romance, can be linked back to the beginnings of romantic liaisons at work (love, ego, and employment) (Quinn, 1977).

Motive of the ego are individuals who engage in relationships romantically for sexual experience, exploit, and the thrill; a motive of work-associated is related with workplace advancement desire, for instance by acquiring job security and increased power; and a romantic aim are individuals who engage in relationships romantically for sexual experience, exploit, and the thrill (Quinn, 1977). As said by internal motivation of work, satisfaction of job, other characteristics of work performance, and organizational emotional commitment were found to be predicted by attachment and romance in the workplace reasons, nonetheless the research did not concentrate on satisfaction of life and workplace romance and motivation (Belinda, 2017). Relationships among workers with no business interests in common might be acceptable more than sleeping with a boss or client. Due to the topic, studies in this discipline are well recognized to be tough. It must, however, persist if firms are to adopt sensitive rules to behavior of adult (Belinda, 2017). According to all research, stated by the topic of workplace romance is delicate, and pledges of anonymity might not be enough to acquire an actual occurrence rate (Harms et al., 2011).

3. METHODOLOGY

Descriptive design with quantitative research was used for the study. The study was taken at universities in Kumasi, Ghana. There are 12 universities in Kumasi, Ghana. The researcher sent a letter of permission and consent form to the human resource manager of the various universities. The population comprise of faculty members from both public and private universities in Kumasi, Ghana. Consent forms were sent in addition to invites through email demanding faculty members' participation in the study. A 30-item survey with many question lines was given to the participants, which included thoughts and demographic info and about various faculty relationship forms, such as intimate relationships, friendships, and mentorships. SPSS was used for analysis of the study. Ethical consideration was highly observed to ensure confidentiality of data collection.

4. RESULTS

4.1 The Elements Associated to Faculty Members' Perceptions of Power Differentials

Table 1: The Elements Associated to Faculty Members' Perceptions of Power Differentials		
	Mean	Standard deviation
Progress evaluations	3.19	1.327
Final authority over decisions	3.11	1.406
Protection, security, and safety	3.01	1.332
Clarification and upkeep of role boundaries	3.00	1.362
Confidence in the knowledge, training, and expertise of their caregiver	2.98	1.316
Sensitivity, impartiality, and consideration	2.97	1.374
Accountability chain	2.56	1.306
Assigned responsibilities	2.46	1.357
Easier task and goal completion	2.31	1.363
Access to a larger picture and a broader view of people and situations	2.27	1.303
Direction, attention, treatment, guidance, and support are all provided	2.19	1.250

Table 1 showed that progress evaluations had a higher factor of 3.19 among the other items. This means that progress evaluations are an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.327. Final authority over decisions had the second-highest factor of 3.11. Meaning that final authority over decisions is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.406. Protection, security, and safety had the third-highest factor of 3.01. Meaning that protection, security, and safety are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.332. Clarification and upkeep of role boundaries had the fourth-highest factor of 3.00. Meaning that clarification and upkeep of role boundaries is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.362.

Confidence in the knowledge, training, and expertise of their caregiver had the fifth-highest factor of 2.98. Meaning that confidence in the knowledge, training, and expertise of their caregiver is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.316. Sensitivity, impartiality, and consideration had the sixth factor of 2.97. Meaning that sensitivity, impartiality, and consideration are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.374. Accountability chain had the seventh factor of 2.56. Meaning that accountability chain is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.306. Assigned responsibilities had the eighth factor of 2.46. Meaning that assigned responsibilities is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.357.

Easier task and goal completion had the ninth factor of 2.31. Meaning that easier task and goal completion are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.363. Access to a larger picture and a broader view of people and situations had the tenth factor of 2.27. Meaning that access to a larger picture and a broader view of people and situations is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.303. Provided direction, attention, treatment, guidance, and support had the last factor of 2.19. Meaning that provided direction, attention, treatment, guidance, and support are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. The standard deviation that widely distributed the distribution is 1.250.

4.2 The Influence of Faculty Members' Perceptions of Power Differentials on Their Perceptions of The Differences and Similarities Between Sexual Harassment and Csrs

In Table 2, the R value is .230. Meaning that the association between faculty members' perceptions of power differentials and perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs is positive and strong. The R Square is .053 meaning that faculty members' perceptions of power differentials' significant impact make up 5.3% of factors' contribution that influence perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs. The Std. Estimate Error between the variables is 1.101. The model is good. The model's F Change is 13.128 which is significant. Faculty members' perceptions of power differentials in Table 3 showed a positive and significant relation with perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs ($B = .230, t = 3.623, p = .000$).

Table 2: Model Summary on The Influence of Faculty Members' Perceptions of Power Differentials on Their Perceptions of The Differences and Similarities Between Sexual Harassment and CSRs							
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.230 ^a	.053	.049	1.101	.053	13.128	.000 ^b

Predictors: (Constant), faculty members' perceptions of power differentials

Dependent Variable: perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSR

Table 3: Coefficients on The Influence of Faculty Members' Perceptions of Power Differentials on Their Perceptions of The Differences and Similarities Between Sexual Harassment and Csrs						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.060	.175		6.068	.000
	Faculty Members' Perceptions of Power Differentials	.188	.052	.230	3.623	.000

a. Dependent Variable: perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs

5. DISCUSSION

Findings revealed that progress evaluations is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Final authority over decisions is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Protection, security, and safety are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Clarification and upkeep of role boundaries is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. A pupil-focused method to teaching at level of college that inspires a closer association between students and faculty will not encourage pupils to step out of their comfort zones or experience the usual uneasiness that some difficult topics can carry (Chory and Offstein, 2017). Also, confidence in the knowledge, training, and expertise of their caregiver is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Sensitivity, impartiality, and consideration are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials.

Accountability chain is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Assigned responsibilities is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Easier task and goal

completion are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Access to a larger picture and a broader view of people and situations is an element to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. Provided direction, attention, treatment, guidance, and support are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials. research demonstrate that teachers and students tolerate platonic relationships, students appear to have various tolerance levels for romantic relations between students and staff depending on their standing. For example, whereas students considered sexual connections between undergraduate pupils and professors as wrong, they viewed interactions between graduate assistant or graduate pupils and teachers as acceptable more, according to one research (Quatrella and Wentworth, 1995).

According to this could be as undergraduates do not believe differentials of power in graduate student-faculty relationships are as strong as they are in undergraduate-faculty relationships because they believe involved both parties are closer typically in age, and in some circumstances, pupils are older than or the same age members of faculty (Quatrella and Wentworth, 1995). Findings also revealed that the association between faculty members' perceptions of power differentials and perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs is positive and strong. Before sexual harassment became a liability concern on university campuses in the last few decades, most academics, comprising officials of university, did not prevent or discourage CSRs (Nystrom, 2020). Faculty members' perceptions of power differentials' significant impact make up 5.3% of factors' contribution that influence perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs.

Many sorts of dual partnerships between instructors and students, including consensual sexual connections, have received both valid criticism and support in previous study. Similar to sexual harassment charges, critics contend that a power imbalance existence makes it questionable if consent can legitimately be granted by the pupil (Sullivan, 2004; Carlson, 2001). Faculty members' perceptions of power differentials showed a positive and significant relation with perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs.

Undergraduate students, in particular, appear to be far more accepting of dual non-sexual partnerships between pupils and teachers. As said, undergraduates stated that relationships of business between students and professors, for example working for a professional partnership or babysitting, were acceptable generally, nonetheless that a professor having a relationship sexually with a student or spending time with the pupil outside of academia alone was considered unsuitable (Ei and Bowen, 2002).

As said by whereas the latter instances were judged unethical, pupils engaging with professors in groups for lunch, drinks, and even addressing them by their initial names were not considered unethical (Ei and Bowen, 2002). It was suggested that friendly professors is satisfactory, nonetheless professors having relationships sexually with pupils crosses a line, highlighting a perfect variance in tolerance for sexual and non-sexual dual associations, despite power differentials' presence between pupils and faculty in both. Was said by whereas research majority has been conducted with undergraduate pupils, graduate pupils have comparable attitudes concerning CSRs between fellow members of program and teachers (Stites, 1993).

6. CONCLUSION

This study determined what elements are associated to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials and if faculty members' perceptions of power differentials influence their perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs. Descriptive design with quantitative research was used for the study. The study was taken at universities in Kumasi, Ghana. The population comprised of faculty members from both public and private universities in Kumasi, Ghana. SPSS was used for analysis of the study. It was revealed that faculty members' perceptions of power differentials showed a positive and significant relation with perceptions of the differences and similarities between sexual harassment and CSRs. Also, progress evaluations, final authority over decisions, protection, security, and safety, clarification and upkeep of role boundaries, confidence in the knowledge, training, and expertise of their caregiver, sensitivity, impartiality, and consideration, accountability chain, assigned responsibilities, easier task and goal completion, access to a larger picture and a broader view of people and situations, and provided direction, attention, treatment, guidance, and support are elements to faculty members' perceptions of power differentials.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that future studies explore perceptions of power differentials in at least three different government institutions.

REFERENCES

- Abramson, P.R., 2007. *Romance in the ivory tower the rights and liberty of conscience*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Anderson, C.J., Fisher, C., 1991. Male-female relationships in the workplace: Perceived motivations in office romance. *Sex Roles.*, 25, Pp. 163–180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289852>
- Belinda, C., 2017. *Adult Attachment and Workplace Romance Motives: An Examination Of The Association*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Appalachian State University, Boone, NC. http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/asu/f/Belinda,%20C_2017%20Thesis.pdf
- Bercovitch, L., Grant-Kels, J.M., 2018. Romance, love, and sex in the dermatology department and residency program. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 78 (1), Pp. 220-222.
- Carlson, R.R., 2001. Romantic relationships between professors and their students: morality, ethics and law. *South Texas Law Review*, 42, Pp. 493. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2017.1293922>.
- Carrillo, A., Crittenden, C., Garland, T., 2019. Faculty perceptions of consensual sexual relationships between university faculty and students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 17 (4), Pp. 331-343.
- Ceesay, H., 2020. Fattoo Khan, the Colonial Commissioner's Mistress: An Amorous Relationship In Colonial Gambia. *IGWEBUIKE: African Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 6 (2).
- Chory, R.M., Offstein, E.H., 2017. Your professor will know you as a person evaluating and rethinking the relational boundaries between faculty and students. *Journal of Management Education*, 41 (1), Pp. 9–38.
- Chory, R.M., Offstein, E.H., 2018. Too close for comfort? Faculty–student multiple relationships and their impact on student classroom conduct. *Ethics & Behavior*, 28 (1), Pp. 23–44.
- Dank, B.M., 2008. Out of the campus closet: student professor CSRs. *Sexuality and Culture*, 12 (3), Pp. 192–192. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-007-9016-4>.
- Ei, S., Bowen, A., 2002. College students' perceptions of student-instructor relationships. *Ethics & Behavior*, 12 (2), Pp. 177–190. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327019EB1202_5.
- Flaherty, C., 2018. *Relationship Restrictions*. Retrieved from: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/05/24/academe-sees-new-wave-faculty-student-relationship-restrictions-era-me-too>
- Fleming, M.B., Cooley, A.H., McFadden-Wade, G., 2009. Morals clauses for educators in secondary and postsecondary schools: legal applications and constitutional concerns. *BYU Educ. & LJ*, 67. Retrieved from: <https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/elj/>
- Gerdes, C., 2003. The case for university consensual relationship policies. *Wayne Law Review*, 49, Pp. 1031 Retrieved from: <http://waynelawreview.org/>.
- Harms, P.D., 2011. *Adult Attachment Styles in the Workplace*. Management Department Faculty Publications. 81. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/managementfacpub/81>
- Igarashi, Y., Staples, J., Vigil, S., Pero, G., Gardner, R., Thomat, A., Abascal, L., 2022. The impact of psychological flexibility in the relationship between discrimination and internalized transnegativity among transgender and gender expansive adults. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science*, 24, Pp. 42-50.
- Jafar, A., 2003. Consent or coercion? Sexual relationships between college faculty and students. *Gender Issues*, 21 (1), Pp. 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-003-0021-0>.
- Little, D., Thompson, J.A., 1989. Campus policies, the law, and sexual relationships. *Thought and Action*, 5 (1), Pp. 17–24.
- Madsen, S., Bercovitch, L., Grant-Kels, J.M., 2021. *Workplace Romance in Dermatology*. In *Dermatoethics*, pp. 199-208. Springer, Cham.
- Nystrom, A., 2020. *An Examination of Faculty-Student Consensual Sexual Relationship Policy Prevalence in a Nationally Representative Sample of Institutions of Higher Education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska at Omaha).
- Quatrella, L.A., Wentworth, D.K., 1995. Students' perceptions of unequal status dating relationships in academia. *Ethics & Behavior*, 5 (3), Pp. 249–259. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327019eb0503_4.
- Quinn, R., 1977. Coping with Cupid: The Formation, Impact, and Management of Romantic Relationships in Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22 (1), Pp. 30-45. doi:10.2307/2391744
- Riach, K., Wilson, F., 2007. Don't screw the crew: Exploring the rules of engagement in organizational romance. *British Journal of Management*, 18, Pp. 79-92.
- Richards, T.N., Crittenden, C., Garland, T.S., McGuffee, K., 2014. An exploration of policies governing faculty-to-student CSRs on university campuses: current strategies and future directions. *Journal of College Student Development*, 55 (4), Pp. 337–352.
- Richards, T.N., Nystrom, A., 2022. Examining faculty-to-student consensual sexual relationship policies on campus: Have there been changes in the era of# MeToo. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 37 (3-4), NP1835-NP1859.

Stanford. 2019. Guidelines on Consensual Relationships. Retrieved from: <https://harass.stanford.edu/beinformed/guidelines-consensual-relationships>

Stites, M.C., 1993. What's Wrong with Faculty-Student Consensual Sexual Relationships? In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. New York: SUNY Press.

Sullivan, E., 2004. Perceptions of Consensual Amorous Relationship Policies (CARPs). *Journal of College and Character*, 5 (8).

Zakrzewski, R.F., 2006. A national survey of American Psychological Association student affiliates' involvement and ethical training in psychology educator-student sexual relationships. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37 (6), Pp. 724. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.37.6.724>.

