

A BIG DEAL: EXAMINING ROUTINE ACTIVITIES VARIABLES RELATED TO SEXUAL
VICTIMIZATION ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
Agriculture and Applied Sciences

By

McKenzie Ann Wood

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Department:
Criminal Justice and Political Science

March 2015

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

A Big Deal: Examining Routine Activities Variables Related to Sexual
Victimization on the College Campus

By

McKenzie Ann Wood

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this *disquisition* complies with North Dakota State
University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Amy J. Stichman

Chair

Carol A. Archbold

Kjersten Nelson

Christina Weber

Approved:

March 11, 2015

Date

Jeffrey Bumgarner

Department Chair

ABSTRACT

The sexual assault and sexual coercion of women on college campuses is a pervasive and ongoing problem. It is estimated that over 15% of women attending college experience some type of sexual assault or coercion each year (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). While sexual victimization ranging from mild, verbal, sexual coercion, to rape has been studied, more recently a newer form of sexual victimization has been researched: Stalking. The current study uses results from 873 surveys at a Midwestern university to examine the prevalence of sexual victimization and stalking on a college campus. Cohen and Felson's (1979) routine activities theory is used to explain why sexual victimization and stalking are common on university campuses, and what variables might contribute to their occurrence.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Amy Stichman, for allowing me to work with you on this survey research. Thank you for your mentorship and encouragement throughout this dissertation process and during my time here at NDSU. Your guidance, counsel, and support have been priceless.

Thank you Dr. Carol Archbold for the time, energy, and effort you put into making my graduate school experience exciting and productive. Thank you for your dedicated advising, encouraging me to take meaningful courses, and giving me research and teaching opportunities.

Thank you Dr. Kjersten Nelson and Dr. Christina Weber for your involvement on my dissertation committee. Your feedback and advice greatly contributed to the outcome of this dissertation.

DEDICATION

To my husband, Andrew. Thank you for running this marathon of life with me. I can't wait to see where the next mile takes us.

To my parents, Don and Nan. Your faithful support carried me.

I love you all beyond measure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	7
Prior Research.....	7
Conceptualizing Sexual Victimization and Stalking.....	7
Rape.....	8
Sexual Coercion.....	9
Sexual Victimization.....	9
Stalking.....	9
Prevalence of Sexual Assault on College Campuses	9
Effects of Sexual Victimization.....	13
Prevalence of Sexual Coercion on College Campuses.....	14
Fraternity Affiliations.....	17
Alcohol and Drug Consumption	19
Relationship and Location.....	24
Stalking Behaviors.....	26
Help-Seeking Behaviors.....	32
Theoretical Foundation	35
Prior Theories.....	36
Rape Myths and Rape Scripts.....	36

Feminist Theory.....	37
Self-Control Theory.....	38
Current Theory.....	39
Routine Activities Theory.....	40
Research Questions.....	45
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY.....	47
Survey Distribution.....	47
Sampling.....	47
Survey.....	48
Variables.....	49
Dependent Variables.....	49
Sexual Assault and Coercion.....	50
Stalking.....	51
Independent Variables.....	52
Demographic Characteristics.....	52
Suitable Target.....	52
Capable Guardianship.....	55
Motivated Offender.....	56
Help-Seeking Behaviors.....	56
Analytical Strategy.....	56
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS.....	59
Total Female Sample Sexual Victimization Univariate Findings.....	59
Victim-Only Sexual Coercion and Assault Univariate Findings.....	61

Bivariate Findings.....	62
Multivariate Findings.....	68
Stalking Findings.....	72
Help-Seeking Behavior Findings.....	74
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION.....	77
Prevalence of Sexual Coercion and Assault.....	77
Total Female Sample Victimization.....	78
Predictors of Sexual Coercion and Assault.....	79
Examining the Relationship Between Sexual Victimization and Stalking.....	82
Routine Activities Theory.....	84
Help-Seeking Behaviors.....	88
Limitations.....	90
Future Research.....	91
Policy Implications.....	94
Final Thoughts.....	98
REFERENCES	100
APPENDIX. SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	111

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Measures of Sexual Coercion.....	51
2. Measures of Sexual Assault.....	52
3. Measures of Stalking.....	52
4. Total Female Sample Characteristics.....	60
5. Coercion and Assault Frequencies.....	61
6. Victim-Only Characteristics.....	63
7. Bivariate Chi-Square Test of Victimization among the Total Female Sample.....	64
8. Bivariate Chi-Square Test of Coercion and Assault among Victims Only.....	64
9. Correlation Matrix of Victimization among the Total Female Sample.....	65
10. Correlation Matrix of Coercion and Assault among Victims.....	66
11. Logistic Regression Model of Likelihood of Sexual Victimization among the Total Female Sample.....	69
12. Logistic Regression Model of Likelihood of Sexual Victimization among the Total Female Sample (with Stalking).....	70
13. Logistic Regression Model of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Coercion among Victims.....	70
14. Logistic Regression Model of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Coercion among Victims (with Stalking).....	71
15. Logistic Regression Model of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Assault among Victims.....	72
16. Logistic Regression Model of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Assault among Victims (with Stalking).....	72
17. Logistic Regression Model of Total Female Sample Stalking at University.....	73
18. Logistic Regression Model of Total Female Sample Stalking at or Before University.....	74

19. Help Seeking Behaviors of Coerced and Assaulted Victims.....75

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

College campuses are unique environments for many reasons. Among them is the notion that they provide a central location for thousands of individuals to congregate daily. Often, these individuals are young adults who are away from their parents or living on their own for the first time. Traditional college students are generally in an age range considered to be “high risk” (Koss & Oros, 1982). Some scholars have argued that the stereotypical college lifestyle comes with inherent risks, including binge drinking, unprotected sex, and casual sex, (or “hooking up”) (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Koss & Oros, 1982). Hooking up is a trending behavior across North America that involves engaging in casual sexual activity without a relational commitment (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012; Tomsich, Schaible, Rennison, & Grover, 2013). This trend is popular among college-aged students, and students attending universities, with many individuals reporting that hookups frequently take place in college venues, including dormitories or fraternity housing (Paul & Hayes, 2002). When combined, precarious sexual activities and extensive drug and alcohol use can lead to a variety of problematic issues, including being at a higher risk of sexual victimization.

Currently, sexual victimization is one of the more persistent, prevalent, and pervasive attributes plaguing society. It has been reported in work environments, universities, schools, churches, and homes. It is devastating in a variety of ways, and often leaves victims with fear, depression, and feelings of despair (O’Neil & Morgan, 2010). According to a study conducted by O’Neil and Morgan (2010), “sexual violence impacts all parts of American society and happens more frequently than most members of the public realize” (p. 9). Damages left by sexual victimization often extend beyond what the victim internalizes and moves into societal establishments, resulting in increased costs to social institutions (such as the criminal justice

system and medical community), as well as declines in social morale, and an increase in fear across homes, schools, and neighborhoods (O'Neil & Morgan, 2010). Furthermore, research using the National College Health Risk Behavior Survey found that forced sexual intercourse may both directly and indirectly lead to health concerns, such as mental health issues, disrupted immune systems, and health care neglect or misuse (Brenner, McMahon, Warren, & Douglas, 1999).

Sexual victimization on college campuses has been a topic of interest for over half a century, with the earliest studies emerging in the late 1950s (Kirkpatrick & Kanin, 1957; Cantalupo, 2011). Studies reveal that women who attend college are at a higher risk of sexual victimization than their counterparts who choose not to attend college (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005). These findings are not specific to public universities, but are also similar on military campuses and private colleges (Brubaker, 2009; Koss et al., 1987). Forbes and Adams-Curtis (2001) stress the importance of studying college students in conjunction with sexual victimization, noting that college students are likely to have experiences with dating aggression, and are then likely to use their dating history as a model for future dating patterns. College students are also in an environment where sexual coercion and sexually aggressive behaviors may be viewed as culturally acceptable, and are therefore prevalent (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001; Schwartz & Dekeseredy, 1997).

One study of college students found that 64% of females and 78% of males had engaged in consensual sex during their time at college (Patton & Mannison, 1995, p. 95). While most sexual encounters on and off campus are consensual, in many instances they are not. Nonconsensual sexual activity can occur in a number of ways, encompassing behaviors from verbally pressuring an individual to engage in sexual activities they are uncomfortable with, to

using excessive violence and physical force to extract sex against someone's will. According to O'Neil and Morgan (2010) sexual violence is not purely physical. Instead, it occurs on a continuum that spans both physical characteristics of the act as well as nonphysical (verbal and emotional).

While sexual victimization ranging from verbal coercion to rape has been widely studied, more recently a newly defined form of sexual victimization has been researched: obsessive relational intrusion, or stalking (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Stalking, or repeated and unwanted contact that invokes fear in an individual is often rooted in the desire to have a sexual relationship, or seated in the rejection when a sexual relationship has ended (Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Stalking is considered a sexual behavior due to its personal, intimate nature (Fisher et al., 2010). Studies have found that stalking and other sexual crimes are closely related to each other (Geitsman et al., 2013; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000), and other research reveals that both victims and perpetrators of each have similar profiles, with females more likely to be stalked, and males more likely to be the stalkers (Fisher et al., 2010; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999).

The actual number of sexual victimizations (including stalking) that occur each year are unknown because it is believed that a high number go unreported (Abbey et al., 2001; Brubaker, 2009; Karjane et al., 2005; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Due to the extremely personal nature of the act it is likely that sex crimes are the most underreported of all violent crimes (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Karjane et al., 2005). Often, these assaults go unreported because the perpetrator is someone who knows the victim (Karjane et al., 2005). The relationship between the victim and perpetrator can make reporting uncomfortable and humiliating, as well as leave the victim fearful of retaliation by the offender or acquaintances of the offender (Fisher et al., 2010). In addition,

students who are assaulted may be fearful about maintaining discreetness throughout the reporting process. While over 80% of campuses guarantee confidentiality during and after the reporting process, less than half of universities offer students the opportunity to report sexual victimizations anonymously (Karjane et al., 2005).

Security measures in place across campuses are essential to students' feelings of safety, particularly perceptions of safety about violent crimes and sexual victimization. Seventy percent of undergraduate college students surveyed by Chekwa and colleagues (2013) reported that safety was one of their top priorities when selecting a college. After being asked about their perception of safety on their college campus, the majority of respondents in the Chekwa study reported that they felt unsafe (Chekwa, Thomas, & Jones, 2013). Because personal safety is of utmost importance, many college administrators have taken action to address this issue.

Increased awareness of sexual victimizations on college campuses has led to the establishment of new laws and policies to protect victims, educate students, report assaults, and create action plans for addressing sexual harassment related issues (Karjane et al., 2005). In conjunction with these new regulations and policies, in 1990 federal law mandated the creation of the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, also known as the Jeanne Clery Act, in an effort to track numbers and patterns of sexual assaults at each individual university across the U.S.

(Chekwa et al., 2013; Karjane et al., 2005).

Traditionally, studies have used prevalence and incidence of sexual assaults on college campuses as their primary focus. Although sexual assault in adulthood happens to both males and females, the vast majority of sexual assault victims are females (Abbey, 2002) who are assaulted by males (Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998). Because approximately 95% of

individuals who are sexually assaulted are females, the bulk of research focuses on this female victim and male perpetrator dynamic (Abbey, 2002, p. 118).

While many theories have studied victim-perpetrator relationships, ecological theories specifically investigate the circumstances surrounding how victims and perpetrators find each other across space and time (Cohen & Felson, 1979). One of the most regarded ecological theories is routine activities theory. Routine activities theory purports that individuals who are more socially active and mobile will be less guarded, therefore increasing the risk of being victimized (Cohen and Felson, 1979). Depending on the circumstances, these victims may come in contact with a “likely offender,” creating an ideal opportunity for a predatory crime to take place (Belknap, 1987).

Individuals who have been sexually victimized on or near a college campus may seek help formally or informally. Formal help comes through professional avenues, such as local law enforcement, university officials, or medical assistance. Informal help comes in the form of friends, dorm mates, or families. While many campuses offer sexual assault victimization services in the form of counseling, formal reporting assistance, and medical resources, this assistance is often not utilized (Fisher et al, 2000). Studies have determined that less than half of all rapes are reported to the police (Greenfeld, 1997). University-specific studies reveal an even lower reporting rate, with less than 5% of college-age women who were sexually victimized reporting their experience to law enforcement (Fisher et al, 2000). College women who do not report their victimization to professional law enforcement are likely to discuss it with their friends, but not their family or other members of their social group (Fisher et al, 2000). A study investigating why individuals in college choose not to report their victimization found that women perceived shame, guilt, and embarrassment as their number one reporting barrier,

followed by fear of retaliation from the perpetrator, apprehensions related to the confidentiality of the report, and fear of not being believed (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallegher, 2006). Results of former studies reveal a need for further investigation into not only who victims report their assaults to, but also why they chose not to report (Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003). As Fisher and colleagues recommend, campus administrators need to be made aware that while formal reports of assault may not be made, several students roam the university with information about victimizations their friends have experienced (Fisher et al, 2003). Gathering information related to help-seeking behaviors can lead to policy implications in regards to encouraging victims to report their experiences and seek medical and emotional assistance, as well as aid in the development of prevention policies, educational programs, and bystander awareness (Sable et al, 2006).

Due to the social nature of a college campus it is likely that universities generate an environment that is conducive to suitable victims and likely offenders. The current study will use survey data to determine the frequency of stalking, sexual assault, and sexual coercion that occurs on or near a college campus located in a medium-sized land grant university in the Upper Midwest. By applying Cohen and Felson's (1979) routine activities theory, this study will also investigate several variables surrounding the victimization, including variables related to attractive targets, motivated offenders, and the presence or absence of capable guardians. Furthermore, this study will determine the relationship between sexual victimization and stalking behaviors. Lastly, this study will critically examine the help-seeking behaviors of victims of sexual assault and coercion, including who they tell about their assault, and perceived barriers to reporting their victimization, as well as offer suggestions for policy implications and campus sexual assault prevention programming.

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Prior Research

When studying sexual victimization many factors need to be considered, including: determining proper definitions of key terms, separating sexual assault from sexual coercion, clarifying the sexual nature of stalking, and investigating situational variables that contribute to victimization, such as alcohol and drug use, the role of fraternity affiliation, the location and time of the victimization, and victim-offender relationships. In addition, attention needs to be paid to the help-seeking behaviors that victims of sexual crimes participate or fail to participate in. In an effort to create a comprehensive picture of the different dimensions related to sexual victimization, each of these contributing factors will be addressed in this review of the literature.

Conceptualizing Sexual Victimization and Stalking

Although abundant research has been conducted on both sexual victimization and stalking, the definitions of each are often undefined, poorly defined, or differing across studies. Clear, consistent definitions are essential in these studies to maintain clarity and ensure that valuable information accrued from each study does not get neglected or misinterpreted (Fisher et al., 2010). For instance, a study regarding types of rape will likely offer a definition for rape, but may fail to properly identify the definition of an acquaintance compared to a stranger (Ward, Chapman, Cohn, White, & Williams, 1991). These distinctions are necessary for readers to determine differences between acquaintance rape versus stranger rape (Ward et al., 1991). Furthermore, because social definitions of “sex” are relatively fluid, and vary across cultures, respondents who participate in studies related to sexual activity or abuse may be easily confused without clear, blatant definitions. For example, one study found that following the infamous Bill Clinton and Monica Lewinsky episode many students did not associate oral sex as a form of

sexual intercourse (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004). Additionally, some students reported that sexual penetration was not “sex” if it did not result in an orgasm. In research, these varying conceptions of what “sex” is can produce misleading results. Prior studies that have not explicitly defined what is meant by “sex”, “sexual activity” or other key terms should be questioned as to their validity (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004).

Finding universal definitions for key terms such as sexual assault, rape, sexual coercion, and sexual victimization can be difficult because states create their own criminal codes, allowing for differences across regions. In addition, schools have the option of creating their own definitions for key terms, such as “sexual misconduct” (Karjane et al., 2005, p. 5). Although schools are instructed by the federal government to adopt their definitions from the Uniform Crime Report description established by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, these classifications are neither all-encompassing nor descriptive (Karjane et al., 2005). For instance, they may neglect to include definitions of sexual coercion, or fail to include definitions that comprise the vast array of unwanted verbal or physical behaviors a victim may encounter. The current study will use Bonnie Fisher’s (2010) definition of sexual assault, Adam-Curtis & Forbes’ (2004) definition of sexual coercion, and Geistman, Smith, Lambert, and Cluse-Tolar’s (2013) definition of stalking. The definition for rape comes from the Bureau of Justice Statistics, as stated in Fisher’s (2010) book *Crime in the Ivory Tower*. In an effort to eliminate any ambiguity primary definitions used for the current study are presented below.

Rape

Forced sexual intercourse including both psychological coercion and physical force. Forced sexual intercourse means vaginal, anal, or oral penetration by the offender(s). This category includes incidents where the penetration is from a foreign object such as a bottle.

Includes attempted rapes, male as well as female victims, and both heterosexual and homosexual rape (Fisher et al., 2010, p.33-34).

Sexual Coercion

Any situation in which one party uses verbal or physical means (including administering drugs or alcohol to the other party either with or without her consent) to obtain sexual activity against freely given consent (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004, p. 99).

Sexual Victimization

A broad term that includes sexual harassment, sexual coercion, sexual assault, attempted rape, and rape (Ogletree, 1993, p. 149).

Stalking

Repeated harassing or threatening behavior by an individual, such as following a person, appearing at a person's home or college, making harassing phone calls, leaving written messages or objects, or destroying a person's property (Geistman, Smith, Lambert, & Cluse-Tolar, 2013, p. 51).

Prevalence of Sexual Assault on College Campuses

According to Mouliso, Fischer, and Calhoun (2012) sexual assault can occur in a variety of forms, including "fondling, kissing, and vaginal, oral, and anal penetration," (Mouliso, Fischer, & Calhoun, 2012 p. 78). Sexual assault encompasses activities ranging from verbal threats to rape. Numbers of sexual assaults on college campuses vary according to study. One of the oldest studies of sexual assaults on college campuses, executed by Kirkpatrick and Kanin (1957), found that approximately 55% of their sample had been sexually assaulted at least one time during the past school year (p. 53). Of the 55% who were sexually assaulted, 6.2% of the assaults met the legal definition for rape (Kirkpatrick & Kanin, 1957, p. 53). In 1957 Kirkpatrick

and Kanin surveyed 291 college women. Of those surveyed, 55.7% reported they were subjected to some degree of “erotic aggressiveness” during the previous school year. Erotic aggressiveness was defined as “attempts at necking, petting above the waist, petting below the waist, sex intercourse, and attempts at sex intercourse with violence or threat of violence” (pg. 53). Almost 21% of the women surveyed indicated they were offended by attempted sexual intercourse by force, and 6.2% reported that they were victims of attempted sexual intercourse by “menacing threats or coercive inflictions of physical pain” (pg. 53). Although being one of the first published studies on this topic Kirkpatrick and Kanin’s research has many limitations. Mainly, their definitions of degrees of “erotic aggressiveness” are unclear. Their variables are ambiguous and could easily be misinterpreted by the subjects who participated in their survey.

More recent studies suggest slightly lower numbers of sexual assaults and rapes (Fisher et al., 2000; Humphrey & White, 2000; Koss et al., 1987; Koss & Oros, 1982). Koss and Oros (1982) conducted the first nationally representative study of college students using the Sexual Experiences Survey. Using this innovative new survey, designed to clearly define sexually-related terms, Koss and Oros (1987) found that over 50% of women surveyed had experienced some type of sexual victimization. They concluded that 15.4% of students reported being raped, with another 12.1% experiencing attempted rape since the age of 14. These findings deviated greatly from the National Crime Survey (NCS) that portrayed rape incidences as ten to fifteen times less likely. A smaller study using a sample of 341 women enrolled in a psychology class at a southwestern university found that 77% of women had experienced an incident of sexual aggression, with 14.7% having been subjected to sexual intercourse against their will during either their high school or college years (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987).

These cross-sectional findings are similar to longitudinal studies investigating the prevalence of sexual victimization among college students. One study that investigated prevalence rates from adolescence through college found that 9.9% of the sample experienced attempted rape during their 4 years at college (3.8% in collegiate year 1, 2.4% in collegiate year 2, 2.4% in collegiate year 3, and 1.3% in collegiate year 4) (Humphrey & White, 2000). Over 20% of the sample reported being raped at one point during their college career (6.4% collegiate year 1, 4.8% collegiate year 2, 5% collegiate year 3, and 3.9% collegiate year 4). However, these numbers may be inflated because the same woman may have experienced attempted rape or completed rape multiple times during her time in college.

While several studies on the prevalence of sexual assault across college campuses were conducted, problems associated with research on the topic have been identified. Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000) identify a number of these issues in their report to the U.S. Department of Justice. First, earlier studies were limited on the information they were reporting. They focused mainly on rape and neglected other forms of sexual victimization. Second, the survey instruments used were subject to bias, such as using leading questions, or failing to provide explicit definitions. Finally, they didn't include information that surrounded the sexual assault, such as location, relationship to offender, or alcohol and drug use, which limits useful information for potential policy implications.

To date, the largest, most extensive study of sexual assaults on college campuses was conducted by Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000). In an effort to alleviate some of the previous methodological errors, and portray a more accurate picture of sexual assaults on college campuses, Fisher and colleagues (2000) conducted the National College Women Sexual Victimization Study (NCWSV hereafter). This study was a nationally representative sample of

women who were attending college during 1996. The study spanned seven months (February-May 1996). Using telephone interviews, the researchers asked questions regarding sexual assault, sexual coercion, stalking behaviors, and the events surrounding reported incidences. A multi-stage measurement design and screen questions were used to reduce misinterpretation of questions (Fisher et al, 2000). The NCWSV determined that over the seven-month research period 2.8% of women studied experienced either a rape or an attempted rape. This equates to 4.9% of the sample being raped or experiencing an attempted rape over a 12-month calendar year (Fisher et al., 2000). The NCWSV study also determined that overall, 15.5% of women across college campuses are sexually victimized in some way each year. Fisher and associates (2000) separated the type of victimization between those that used force or threat of force and those that did not. Of the sample, 7.7% were sexually victimized by force or threat of force.

Although the quality of studies vary significantly, research has revealed that the prevalence of rape and attempted rape on college campuses ranges anywhere from as low as 2.8% (Fisher et al., 2000), to as high as 55.7% (Kirkpatrick & Kanin, 1957). Due to the sensitive nature of the topic, and the stigma that surrounds it, it is likely that these numbers are minimized. Many women are reluctant to report sexual victimization because of embarrassment, shame, or fear of retaliation from their offender (Brubaker, 2009).

It is important to note the vast discrepancies between the number of females who report they have been victims of sexual aggression and the number of males who disclose they have exhibited sexually aggressive behaviors. A large study looking at college freshman from Millikin University found that over half of the females surveyed indicated they had been victims of a sexually aggressive experience, while less than a quarter of the males reported they had perpetrated in a sexually aggressive manner (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001). Approximately a

quarter of the women in the sample had some type of force used against them in their sexual experience, and 2.8% of the female sample reported that they had been raped. The inconsistencies in reporting continued with no males reporting that they had perpetrated rape, and less than 1% of the males signifying that they had ever used force to garner sexual activity from a woman (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001, p. 881).

Reasons for broad differences among findings include lack of acknowledgement about the incident. Women who have been raped may not recognize or accept the assault as an actual rape. A study looking at college women who had rape experiences found that 64% of the respondents did not classify the events that took place as rape (Bondurant, 2001, p. 302). Those who did acknowledge that they were raped were more likely to report that they experienced higher levels of physical force while the rape was occurring than women who did not identify themselves as rape victims. In that same vein, women who acknowledged that they had been raped were more likely to report that they both verbally and physically tried to resist the rapist than those who did not acknowledge their rape (Bondurant, 2001). It is possible that rape myths, accepted by both men and women, also impact rape acknowledgement (Edwards, Turchik, Dardis, Reynolds, & Gidycz, 2011).

Effects of Sexual Victimization

As a student, experiencing a sexual assault can be particularly detrimental. It can interfere with studies, limit movement around campus, and lead to anxiety about attending classes. One study found that women attending universities fear rape, particularly at nighttime on college campuses (Fisher & Sloan, 2003). To combat fear of rape many women take protective measures, such as avoiding specific campus locations, carrying weapons or creating makeshift weapons, and finding companions to accompany them if they have to walk around when it is

dark (Fischer & Sloan, 2003). Although these alterations to their lifestyle might help dissolve some fear, they can create extra burdens on women due to the time, money, and energy put into employing these protective actions.

Rape victims often blame themselves. Unacknowledged rape victims are those who have been raped but refuse to accept that they were a victim of such an action. These unacknowledged rape victims often harbor deep feelings of culpability, including self-blame, for entering the location where the rape occurred, consuming alcohol prior to the rape, or wearing revealing attire (Fisher et al., 2010). Victims who do not acknowledge their rape often label the experience as a “miscommunication” (Koss & Deniro, 1980). A study of college women who had reported rape experiences found that those who acknowledged they were raped were more likely to feel self-blame than those who did not acknowledge they had been raped (Bondurant, 2001). It has been proposed that college women, who are generally accustomed to busy schedules, harsh academic demands, and the stressors of college life, might feel less self-blame when they are raped than individuals of the same age and gender who are not in college, or who have dropped out of college (Bondurant, 2001). It is hypothesized that students who did not enroll in, or dropped out of college may not possess the same cognitive aptitudes or ability to work under pressure, leading to increased self-blame (Bondurant, 2001). Even if a student feels a lower-level of self-blame than her contemporaries sexual assaults can leave lasting mental and emotional damages.

Prevalence of Sexual Coercion on College Campuses

Sexual coercion is inherently different from sexual assault in that although the sexual activity is unwanted, the victim gives in, and engages in the activity. Women who do not want to have sex but submit to persistent pleadings, pressure, or arguing are often left feeling vulnerable, used, guilty, and depressed. Sexual coercion can be briefly defined as a situation in which an

individual is pressured into engaging in a sexual act that they did not want (Lottes & Weinberg, 1996). This can include instances of constant badgering, taking advantage of situations where the victim may be intoxicated due to drugs or alcohol (or providing a victim with drugs or alcohol for the purpose of eliciting sexual activity), or using one's position of authority to pressure an individual into sex (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Lottes & Weinberg, 1996). Sexual coercion happens frequently and often occurs under the guise of a societally normalized behavior. While individuals may be sexually coerced prior to entering college, the college environment produces an atmosphere where sexual coercion is deemed not only common, but also acceptable (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

A study from Millikan University determined that over half of the female students in the sample had at least one experience with sexual coercion by the time they were a college freshman (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001). Although numerous women frequently experience sexual coercion, many are reluctant to report it out of fear of being mocked, ignored, or having their feelings disregarded. As one researcher put it, "Clearly a stolen kiss is not the equivalent of a forceful rape. However, it is important to recognize that a stolen kiss is a violation of another individual's personal and sexual autonomy. Merely because such activities are common and often dismissed as insignificant, particularly by the perpetrator, does not render them right, acceptable, or harmless" (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004, p. 99).

There are several methodological concerns with previous studies on coercion, particularly with the concept of consent and how coercion is defined (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004). In addition to foundational methodological concerns, lack of early identification of sexual coercion and use of multiple definitions, makes it difficult to compare reported coercion rates.

In a study that sampled female health education students at three Midwestern universities one researcher found that almost half of the surveyed students had been the victim of sexual coercion at some point during their college career (Ogletree, 1993). Approximately 70% of the women who were subjected to sexual coercion and engaged in unwanted sex experienced it in the form of consistent pressuring and arguing from their date. Thirty-one percent of the women who were sexually coerced and engaged in unwanted sex reported situations in which their date provided them with drugs or alcohol (Ogletree, 1993, p. 150). A small percentage of the women reported that they engaged in unwanted intercourse because their date was in an authoritative position and used his position to argue for sex (Ogletree, 1993). A similar study of Australian university students revealed that approximately 15% of the women in the study were coerced into sex because they thought their partner was so sexually aroused it would be useless to try to stop the intercourse, 10% reported they engaged in sex after they were repeatedly pressured, and 2% had sex after their partner threatened to end their relationship (Patton & Mannison, 1995, p.69). The amount of sexual coercion reported by females in the study was strikingly different from the amount of sexual coercion instigating reported by the male sample. Six percent of the men in the sample admitted to being so sexually aroused they couldn't stop the interaction, regardless of whether their partner wanted them to, 8% reported that their partner had submitted to sex with them due to their constant badgering or pressuring, and 1% admitted that they threatened to end the relationship if their partner did not engage in intercourse with them (Patton & Mannison, 1995, p.69).

Larger studies have exposed sexual coercion as a widespread concern across college campuses. Sexual coercion occurs more frequently than rape, and in many instances, may serve as a precursor to rape. A study conducted by Koss and associates (1987) found that over 40% of

the women in the sample reported they had been sexually coerced. Approximately 14% were coerced into unwanted sexual activity that did not result in penetration, while 12% were coerced into unwanted sexual intercourse. Two percent of the sample reported that a male using his authority to gain sexual benefits was the method of coercion. Results from the national college women sexual victimization survey conducted by Bonnie Fisher and associates (2001) revealed that sexual coercion, in the form of non-forceful victimization, was reported by 11% of the total sample. This type of victimization included pressuring, persuasion, and forms of dishonesty for the purpose of gaining sexual activity or sexual intercourse.

It has been suggested that sexual aggression and sexually coercive behaviors stem from cultural transitions and not from psychological factors (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001). A large study of college freshman attending a Midwestern university found that variables such as self-esteem, attitudinal measures, personality indicators, and childhood factors play an extremely limited role in whether or not an individual has experiences related to sexual assault and coercion (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001). These cultural transitions indicate that sexual coercion might be a behavior that is learned and practiced later in an individual's development, possibly upon their entrance into college or other environments where it is regarded as prevalent, and in some circumstances, socially acceptable (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

Fraternity Affiliations

Fraternity membership often invokes thoughts of partying, drinking, and sex. Despite the negative reputations that surround some fraternities, many young males desire to join a fraternal organization. One study determined that fraternity reputation did not matter to freshman males who were seeking fraternity entrance, as many seek membership into a fraternity regardless of the positive or negative reputation it emitted (Boswell & Speade, 1996). The emphasis on college

social life that fraternities encourage can lead to what some researchers have termed a “rape culture” (Boswell & Spade, 1996). Rape cultures are environments that encourage demeaning, bias, violent, and patriarchal behaviors (Boswell & Spade, 1996). Fraternal rape cultures that exist so close to campus provide dangerous circumstances for women who live on or frequent university grounds, or fraternize with students or members of their cohort who have a rape culture mentality.

Rape cultures provide atmospheres where attitudes and standards are favorable to the sexual objectification of women, using tools such as drugs and alcohol to elicit sex, and using aggressive tactics to persuade or demand sex from a date or acquaintance (Boswell & Spade, 1996). A study of undergraduate students at a northwestern public university found that males who were involved in a fraternity were more likely to report sexually assaulting women, receive support from other fraternity members for using dishonest or adversarial strategies to garner sex from women, and be pressured by peers to engage in sexual activity (Franklin, Bouffard, & Pratt, 2012). The acceptance of male dominant attitudes, coupled with an expectation that females should be submissive and sexually available can make fraternity houses and parties precarious locations for women. A qualitative study observing differences between gender relations, attitudes toward rape, and treatment of women found that fraternities labeled as “high risk” were less likely to have fraternity brothers who were in committed sexual relationships with women, and more likely to have members who had casual sex with women than members of low risk fraternities (Boswell & Spade, 1996). They were also more likely to disrespect women they or their fraternity brothers had slept with. Many members of these high risk fraternities did not identify certain behaviors, such as having sex with a woman so intoxicated she was unable to issue consent, as rape. The study also found that fraternity members were more likely to rape

women if they did not know them, thus making them “faceless victims” (Boswell & Spade, 1996, p.143). Fraternity members who got to know a woman over a period of time (as opposed to a one night stand) were less likely to attempt to coerce her into having sex.

While male members of fraternities are occasionally assumed to be sexual assault perpetrators, there are many males with no fraternity affiliation who victimize women. There is a large research gap regarding males as sexual assault perpetrators and sexual assault victims. Although the role of female sexual assault victims is frequently researched, the role of male sexual assault perpetrator is less commonly studied. Research has found that males who victimize women are unlikely to admit their part in a sexual crime (Ward et al., 1991). When a large group of male students at an American university were asked about their part as an offender in a sexual assault, less than 10% of the sample admitted to having a sexual experience with a woman against her will (Ward et al., 1991, p.69). Three percent of the male sample reported that this sexual experience resulted in intercourse. These numbers were vastly different from what female respondents from the same university described, with 34% reporting they were involved an unwanted sexual experience, and 10% reporting that their experience resulted in unwanted completed intercourse (Ward et al., 1991, p. 67).

Alcohol and Drug Consumption

One of the stereotypical attractions of college life is the high volume of alcohol that is relatively easy to access. Many students are enrolled in college when they turn the legal drinking age, giving them the prospect to legally imbibe, while also providing the opportunity for them to illegally purchase alcohol for underage classmates and friends. Not only is alcohol easy to obtain, but it is also a tool used to celebrate milestones, including an individual’s twenty-first birthday, the end of the semester, or Spring Break. Alcohol consumption among those in college

remains an issue that is frequently studied, along with the amount of alcohol that is typically consumed (Abbey, 2002; Vicary & Karshin, 2002).

According to Vicary and Karshin (2002) binge drinking is popular among college students. Binge drinking, also known as heavy episodic drinking, is dangerous for health and has been associated with liver disease, and both temporary and long-term mental impairment (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 2004). While young college males have historically had a reputation for heavy episodic drinking, the rate at which females engage in binge drinking has been increasing (Wechsler, Lee, Nelson, & Kuo, 2002). The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) defines binge drinking as consuming five or more drinks over a period of two hours for males, and consuming four or more drinks over a period of two hours for females (DHHS, 2004). This heavy drinking trend produces a faster and lengthier period of intoxication than slow and controlled drinking.

Alcohol has been studied as a contributor to sexual assaults on college campuses. Research has been conducted regarding alcohol's effects on male sexual aggression, alcohol's influence on a female's ability to evaluate and react to dangerous or uncomfortable situations, and alcohol's involvement in sexual expectations and misperceptions (Abbey, 2002). Studies have determined that as alcohol consumption increases the level of violence used in assaults increases (Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003). One study found that 42% of college women who have been sexually victimized reported they were under the influence of alcohol at the time of the assault, a number slightly lower than the percentage of male offenders who were drinking alcohol at the time of the assault (Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999). Due to the muscle and cognitive limitations that occur when alcohol is consumed it has also been found that offenders who are extremely intoxicated are less likely to complete their

rape (Abbey et al., 2003), largely because of a substantial decrease in operative and motor skills functioning.

Alcohol has an altering effect on the brain for both men and women; however, it has been found that female brains are more susceptible to the adverse effects of alcohol than male brains (DHHS, 2004). According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services alcohol use is related to several cognitive elements, including reaction time, memory, vision, speech, and movement (DHHS, 2004). After consuming only a small amount of alcohol a person may experience difficulty speaking and/or walking. Verbal limitations can make it difficult for individuals to adequately articulate their thoughts, and mobility restrictions may make it challenging for individuals to leave negative or potentially dangerous situations.

Studies have revealed that alcohol is connected with at least half of all sexual assaults among college students (Abbey, 2002), and some research has found these numbers to be much higher (Koss & Dinero, 1989). While it may be the case that only the victim or the perpetrator is drinking, it is most common for both the victim and the assaulter to be consuming alcohol during the events surrounding the assault (Abbey et al., 1996). There is little doubt that alcohol is a prominent contributor to half of all sexual assaults; however, questions have emerged about the pattern of events prior to a sexual assault that includes alcohol consumption (Franklin, 2011). It is unknown to what degree alcohol-related miscommunication, loss of inhibitions, and sexual anticipation is associated with the progression of the sexual victimization (Franklin, 2011).

A three-phase study using first-year female college students from a Southeastern university found that overall, students who reported binge drinking, and drinking frequently were more likely to report being sexually victimized (Mouilso et al., 2012). Although several studies have found a connection between women who drink and having a history of being sexually

assaulted, research is needed that investigates the relationship between women imbibing in alcohol at the time of their assault (Mouilso et al., 2012). While alcohol itself is not responsible for any sexual behaviors, it has been found to limit an individual's ability to focus on multiple social signals, instead leaving the consumer with a constricted cognitive perspective. Women who consume alcohol may experience a cognitive delay in realizing that they are being sexually assaulted, or that they are in a situation where a sexual assault is likely (Abbey et al., 2003). This "narrow perceptual field" (Abbey, 2002, p. 122) might contribute to an offender missing or dismissing refusal prompts and hints, and misinterpreting generic friendly cues as sexual advances. Researchers have referred to this alcohol-related restriction of mental reasoning as "alcohol myopia" (Steele and Josephs, 1990). An example of this discourse that might be exchanged between a male individual experiencing alcohol myopia and his female date is described by Antonia Abbey,

Imagine a man and a woman who have been dating several weeks. His underlying message is "let's go back there (to my place) to have sex" but he does not say that directly. The woman may respond, "Well, I guess I could come back for one drink, but I really can't stay long." Her underlying message is "I'd like to get to know you better but I'm not spending the night." However, she is also being indirect... In this example, the man may hear only the confirming part of this message, "I'll come to your apartment," and ignore the disconfirming part of the message, "I won't stay long." In contrast, the women focuses on the message she wants to hear, "I want to spend more time with you," rather than the message the man is trying to send, "I want to be alone with you so we can have sex. (Abbey, 2002, p. 123).

Due to narrowed cognitive abilities that alcohol produces, deficiencies often emerge when determining and verbalizing sexual expectations. As the above example illustrates, lines that are not clearly drawn and vocalized can be washed away or weakened by alcohol. Even though alcohol consumption by one or both parties often accompanies sexual assaults, a warning is issued against assuming that this common combination indicates that alcohol is responsible for, or the primary contributor to a sexual assault (Abbey, 2002). It is important to consider other factors that may be related to both alcohol consumption and sexual assault, including peer groups, behavioral dispositions, and low levels of self-control (Abbey, 2002).

Similar to alcohol use, drug use is also of concern in sexual victimization. A test of urine samples collected from rape victims suspected of drug use by a rape treatment provider determined that two-thirds of the samples tested positive for alcohol, drugs, or both. Of those that tested positive 63% contained alcohol, followed by marijuana (30%). Less than 3% of the sample tested positive for GHB and flunitrazepam, drugs commonly referred to as date rape drugs (Slaughter, 2000). A similar study found comparable results with 39.7% testing negative to all substances (including alcohol), and 60.3% testing positive to one or more substances. Alcohol was identified in 40.8% of the samples tested (n=1179) (Elsohly & Salamone, 1999).

While these percentages are helpful in understanding the relationship between alcohol/drug use and sexual assaults they may also be underestimated or overestimated considering many women do not report incidences of sexual victimization (Abbey et al, 2001). Although alcohol use is often a precursor to sexual victimization, and alcohol and drugs are both common risk factors for sexual victimization (Slaughter, 2000), it should not be used as a blaming tool. Abbey (2002) warns that other variables such as “impulsivity” and “peer group norms” may also be present in conjunction with alcohol use, all of which may contribute to

situations of sexual assault. Explanations of sexual assaults involving alcohol and drugs can focus on victim and perpetrator attitudes and experiences, as well as individual characteristics. Other factors, such as alcohol consumption, drug use, expectations, gender stereotypes, and situational variables, such as drinking locations, drinking habits, drug addiction, and drug and alcohol related mental impairments offer a more comprehensive view of sexual perpetration. (Abbey et al., 2001; Abbey, Ross, McDuffie, & McAuslan, 1996).

Relationship and Location

The sexual assault victim's relationship to the offender remains a historically understudied topic. Sexual assaults in the media are often presented as "stranger rapes," and as recently as 1990 prominent criminologists were supportive of that notion. In one popular theoretical manuscript rape is described as a situation where a "woman is alone and out of public view. A lone offender either lies in wait or follows and attacks her" (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990, p. 37). Several studies have since disproven this idea and it is now known that the majority of rapes and sexual assaults that occur are committed by an acquaintance of the victim (Bondurant, 2001; Fisher et al., 2000; Karjane et al., 2005; Ward et al., 1991).

Fisher and colleagues (2000) found that the majority of sexual assault victims know their offenders. Using data from a national sample Ullman and associates (1999) determined that fifty-five percent of women reported that they knew their assailant "moderately to very well". The NCWSV study found that 90% of women who were raped or experienced attempted rape knew their perpetrator. Commonly, these offenders were boyfriends, ex-boyfriends, other students, friends, acquaintances, or coworkers (Fisher et al, 2000). One study of college women who reported that they had been raped found that 39% of those raped were raped by a boyfriend, 29% were raped by a friend, 27% were raped by a casual acquaintance, and 6% were raped by a

stranger (Bonduarnt, 2001). Another study found slightly different results, concluding that the majority of college females in the sample who experienced unwanted sexual contact experienced it with a casual acquaintance, as opposed to a stranger or friend (Ward et al., 1991).

Another variable that is commonly understudied is the type of environment the assault took place in, or the environment where the victim and offender encountered each other immediately before the assault. Studying these situational factors is necessary to explore if certain areas, environments, or atmospheres are more likely to encourage sexual assault than others (Abbey et al., 2001). Prior research has found that locations where interactions surrounding sexual assaults take place tend to be private areas, such as the home of the victim or offender (Abbey et al., 2003). Both dorm rooms and off-campus housing are common locations where unwanted sexual contact occurs. Although on- campus and off-campus living areas are general establishments for sexual victimization, one study found that fraternity houses are the site of most college sexual assaults (Ward et al., 1991). It has also been determined that the occasions or pretenses that sexual assaults occur under are almost always “party-related” (Ward et al., 1991, p. 68).

Using Koss’s national sample data, Ulleman and colleagues (1999) found that almost 40% of the time the social context in which an assault occurred was on a date. It was also determined that dating assaults generally transpired at the male’s residence (36.6%). Another study investigating risk factors associated with sexual abuse in dating situations found that sexual abuse most commonly happened when participants engaged in the activity of “parking” (going somewhere with the purpose of kissing in a vehicle) (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987). Other significant locations where sexual abuse commonly took place were at parties, drive-in movie theaters, or in the woman’s apartment. Muehlenhard & Linton (1987) submit that these places

(particularly parking) have greater amounts of privacy, or suggest sexual implications, which can lead to men anticipating that sex will occur at higher rates than women. These findings are supported by Fisher's (2000) study that found 22.9% of threatened rapes, 35% of attempted rapes, and 12.8% of completed rapes occurred while the victim and offender were on a date.

The Fisher and associates (2000) research also determined that the majority of sexual assaults happened in the victim's residence, regardless of whether the residence was on or off campus. The NCWSV determined that other places where victimization frequently occurred were predominantly social settings, such as bars, nightclubs, and dance clubs. These locations tend to be areas where lighting can be restricted, alcohol is prevalent, and close human contact, such as dancing, is encouraged.

Other variables that are less frequently studied involve the time period in which the sexual assault occurred. The time frame surrounding sexual victimization has not been studied extensively. One study using a sample of males who admitted they had sexually assaulted women found that the average time of interaction surrounding the assault was six hours or longer (Abbey et al., 2003). This finding supports the notion that victims often know their offenders and may spend large quantities of time with them either one-on-one or in a group or public setting prior to the victimization. The NCWSV asked women specific questions regarding assaults in an effort to isolate a time frame that assaults most frequently occur. The researchers found that almost all assaults transpire after 6pm in the evening, and before dawn, with data revealing a spike in assaults occurring shortly after midnight (Fisher et al, 2000).

Stalking Behaviors

For the same reasons that colleges are environments where sexual assaults are able to transpire, stalking is also able to abound on the university campus. A study of undergraduate

students found that of those being stalked, 44% met their stalker at college (Geitsman et al., 2013, p. 52). Over the past thirty years stalking has received attention from the government, the field of criminal justice, and university campuses (Fisher et al., 2010). Although there are several explanations for why an individual might stalk another, the underlying motive is generally that of a sexual nature. As Fisher and associates point out, “We categorize stalking as a form of *sexual* victimization because it is largely conduct that involves the obsessive behavior of men toward women *on the basis of their gender*. We also suspect that stalking involves a desire for contact, intimacy, and/or sexual relations” (Fisher et al., 2010, p. 156). Stalking fundamentally consists of, “Having the same person exhibit repeated behavior that seemed obsessive and made the respondent afraid or concerned for her safety” (Fisher et al., 2010, p. 156).

Studies that have explored this relationship between stalking and sexual victimization have found correlations between the two (Finney, 2006; Geitsman, 2013; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). A study using a sample of British women found that half of those who reported they were stalked were also sexually assaulted by their stalker (Finney, 2006). Another study determined that 31% of women who reported they were stalked by a male they were previously intimate with also reported that they had been sexually victimized by that male (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). In addition, it has been found that stalking behaviors can also be a form of sexual victimization, particularly sexual assault or threats of sexual assault (Geitsman et al., 2013). Stalkers are also often perpetrators of previous sexual victimizations, coercing victims to have intercourse, and then stalking them when the victim attempts to cut ties with the offender (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999).

In the book *Unsafe in the Ivory Tower* Bonnie Fisher (2010) discusses several elements that contribute to the frequency of stalking on university campuses: First, there is a large amount

of young, unattached individuals who congregate daily in one area. Second, the campus provides an atmosphere where students are able to be mobile and largely unsupervised. Third, students attending college are schooled in the many uses of modern technology, allowing them to communicate through a variety of ways, including text messaging, e-mail, blogging, and other forms of social networking. Lastly, students are often at a transitional part of their relational progression, meaning that they encounter a variety of different people on a consistent basis, while trying to navigate friendships, platonic relationships, sexual relationships, and familial relationships. Combined, these factors create an environment where stalking can easily, and widely occur.

There are gendered differences among stalking behaviors. Overall, approximately one out of every 12 women will be stalked in their lifetime (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). While females are more likely to be stalked by someone they are currently, or were previously, intimate with, males are more likely to be stalked by a stranger or someone they only briefly met (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Although research has found that males are stalked, the majority of studies focus on the male-stalker female-stalking victim relationship (Fisher et al, 2010; Geitsman et al, 2013). The NCWVS found that 13% of the females in their sample had been stalked since the beginning of the school year (Fisher et al., 2010. p.166). Over 98% of the women stalked reported that their stalker was a male.

While the NCWVS study discovered that 13% of the sample of college women had been stalked, other studies have found this number to be much higher. One study that surveyed over 1,000 college females revealed that 18% of the sample had been stalked during their tenure in college (Jordon, Wilcox, & Prichard, 2007), while another study of undergraduate women at a university determined that 30% of them had been stalked at one point or another during their

college career (Fremouw, Westrup, & Pennypacker, 1997). A study of students attending a Midwestern university found that 35% of students sampled were victims of stalking at the time the survey was administered, with women comprising the majority of those stalked (Geistman et al., 2013, p. 52). These numbers equate to a large amount of women being stalked on campuses each academic year. Although the stalking rates on college campuses are not that different from stalking rates off college campuses, it is estimated that more than 8% women will be stalked at one point in their life (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

The nature of relationships across college students vary significantly, however, due to the age distribution of college students the majority are unmarried. While some are in a committed or co-habiting relationship, many are single and unattached. College students are also at an age where dating frequently occurs and relationships develop. Break-ups, rejections, and misinterpreting the level of interest of a partner might all be scenarios that contribute to stalking. When victims were asked to name reasons why stalking occurred over half attributed stalking to romantic or relationship miscommunication or fallouts (Geitsman et al., 2013).

Stalkers use a variety of methods to observe and contact their victims. Some stalkers seek to communicate with their victims, while others are content silently following or observing their victims from a distance. Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000) found that using the telephone was the most common method of contact employed by stalkers. This method was followed by the stalker waiting outside or inside of buildings for their victim to arrive or leave, watching their victim from a distance, following the victim during her daily and nightly routines, sending letters or emails, sending gifts, and showing up to residences or establishments uninvited. Overall, more than 60% of the stalking cases reported in the NCWVS study happened somewhere on a college campus (Fisher et al., 2010). Similar to women who are fearful of sexual assaults, many stalking

victims adjust their lifestyle by changing their schedules or increasing protective measures.

Preventative strategies stalking victims engage in include altering their phone number, changing their residence, and refusing to go out in public alone (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999).

The influx of modern technologies has produced a substantial number of methods for individuals to contact and communicate with one another. Transmitting messages through the World Wide Web have allowed new forms of stalking to evolve, particularly cyberstalking. Cyberstalking can be defined as "...A variety of behaviors that involve a) repeated threats and/or harassments b) by use of electronic mail or other computer-based communication c) that would make a reasonable person afraid or concerned for their safety" (Finn, 2004, p. 469). Comparable to the traditional definition of stalking, cyberstalking involves both an act on the part of the offender, as well as the perception of fear by the victim.

Research institutions, such as universities, are often at the forefront of contemporary advancements, giving students the opportunity to learn and access the fastest, most innovative ways of communication. While it has been found that fear of crime online tends to be much lower than fear of crime offline (Henson, Reynolds, & Fisher, 2013), being cyberstalked can create anxiety and fear in the person being electronically pursued. Some researchers suggest that cyberstalking is the greatest contributor to stalking problems that exist on university campuses (Finn, 2004). Cyberstalking can produce feelings ranging from mild annoyance to sheer terror. Stalking through electronic means can be just as intrusive as traditional stalking, but be more convenient for the stalker, particularly because the stalking can be done anywhere a person has access to the internet or messaging services.

Currently, many students are online daily, or multiple times a day. Studies have found that almost all college students access the internet at least once each week (Finn, 2004). Colleges

tend to be pro-electronic scholarship, meaning they often take measures to help students find and locate each other electronically. These actions can include creating address books containing all active students' e-mail addresses, giving classes' access to online profiles, and posting identifying information about students on university-sponsored websites (Finn, 2004). It is now common practice for institutions and instructors to set up classroom chat sessions, create course blogs, or develop class Facebook groups. These, coupled with a lack of adequate monitoring and the semi-anonymous nature of the Web, make it is easy for stalkers to find victims, search for information related to them, and electronically contact them. In response to this some campuses have established specific offices and policies to address cyber-security issues (Finn, 2004). Using undergraduate students from New Hampshire University Finn (2004) found that approximately ten percent of the study sample had experienced repeated cyber victimization, such as being threatened, insulted, or harassed via instant messaging or e-mail. Although levels of fear were not assessed in this study, the repetitive nature of the pestering and aggravation is indicative of stalking. Unlike offline stalking, males appear just as susceptible to online victimization as females (Finn, 2004).

Similar to the lack of reporting that exists among sexual crimes, victims of stalking are also unlikely to report their experiences to qualified professionals. While many individuals take personal measures to try to fend off the stalker, such as go out of their way to avoid the stalker, confront the stalker, or increase security around their house, the majority of stalking victims will not tell the police or campus security they are being followed (Fisher et al., 2010). Reasons for not reporting the stalking tend to be similar to not reporting rape or sexual assaults, such as being unsure that a crime or harm was intended, worrying that law enforcement will not take the

situation seriously, or feeling that reporting would be a lost cause because there is lack of proof (Fisher et al., 2010).

Help-Seeking Behaviors

It is not uncommon for a woman who has been sexually assaulted, sexually coerced, or stalked to desire help of some sort. While there are often several “help” options available on or near college campuses, many women choose not to exact help or assistance from them. A study by Roberta Ogletree of sexually coerced college students from three universities found that less than 30% of women sought help after engaging in unwanted sex due to sexual coercion (Ogletree, 1993). Of the women who did seek help, the vast majority sought assistance from a friend, and did not go to a professional or school sponsored source. The remaining few who did not seek assistance from a friend obtained help from a variety of sources, including counselors, the police, family members, rape crises facilities, or medical personnel (Ogletree, 1993).

It is possible that rape victims attempt to minimize the traumatic experience as a coping mechanism. In their NCWSV study Fisher and associates found that 65% of their sample who had been raped, and 76% of their sample who had experienced attempted rape chose not to divulge the rape to officials because they felt it was “not serious enough to report” (Fisher et al., 2010, p. 144). Victims may also second-guess the intentions of the offender after the assault, particularly in cases where alcohol and drugs were used by one or both parties. Forty-four percent of the women who were raped in the NCWSV study did not report the rape because they were unsure whether crime or harm was actually intended by the offender (Fisher et al., 2010).

While the majority of campuses offer confidentiality in reporting a sex crime, and several campuses offer anonymity, fear of others finding out about the coercion, assault, or rape prevents many victims from reporting the crime or seeking help (Fisher et al., 2010; Karjane et al., 2005).

Studies have found that close to half of all rape victims and a third of all attempted rape victims refuse to report the crime because they do not want other people to know about the assault, or they do not want their family to hear about the assault (Fisher et al., 2010). This lack of reporting contributes to the cloud of secrecy that surrounds sex crimes and prevents victims of these crimes from reaching out to available help options.

There are several reasons why women may not seek help after being a victim of sexual coercion. The first reason is that sexual coercion is markedly different from the typical rape story, which generally includes a stranger, late at night, who uses extreme and painful measures to molest their victim, leaving their victim with visible bruises, scratches, and marks (Ogletree, 1993). Because sexual coercion experiences generally include a person the victim knows (as opposed to a stranger), and there is commonly no evidence of a physical struggle, the victim may be reluctant to acknowledge that they were sexually coerced, and even more reluctant to report the coercion to a help-providing body.

Many universities have not only taken measures to treat sexual assault problems, they have also adopted preventative policies to help reduce victimization on campus. The majority of these are bystander prevention, intervention, and education programs that encourage those who might be witnessing potential sexual coercion or assault to step in and assist the victim (Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009; Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007; Burn, 2009). Generally, bystander programs use classroom training mechanisms and role play scenarios to educate bystanders about how to identify situations where sexual assault might take place, and provide informational tools regarding how to discourage or stop sexual victimization. Evaluations of these programs have produced mixed results, leaving their efficacy unclear (Banyard et al., 2007; Banyard et al, 2009; Burn, 2009).

Just because resources for sexual assault prevention, reporting, and treatment are available on college campuses does not mean that they are adequate or sufficient. Problems may arise when therapists and counselors harbor gender biases, buy into rape myths, or are unprepared to be sympathetic and understanding to the trauma that sexual assault victims are experiencing. It has also been proposed that there is a substantial disconnect between sexual assaults and prevention techniques, particularly among Americans (O'Neil & Morgan, 2010). While physical, mental, and emotional health are often probed by doctors, counselors, and psychologists, attention to sexual health is commonly neglected. O'Neil & Morgan (2010) propose that this lack of understanding of sexual health is due to confusing and conflicting messages about sex portrayed to American society. Their findings embrace an analogy that describes the importance of maintaining healthy sexual development that includes ensuring an individual feels they have complete control over their own body. When asked about what qualities sexual health consists of, a panel of professionals agreed it includes full control over one's body and sexual decisions, and the ability to participate in sexual activities without fear, force, or pressure (O'Neil & Morgan, 2010). The emphasis on sexual health is vital to sexual victimization prevention; however, it is commonly neglected or ignored due to the personal nature of the topic.

Many sexual assault prevention programs focus on reducing assaults through target hardening, which is taking personal measures to make sexual victimization challenging to enact. According to Franklin (2012) "Sexual assault reduction programs have focused on target hardening strategies that make sexual assault perpetration difficult by increasing the risk, reducing the rewards, and limiting the opportunity to aggress against would-be victims" (p. 281). While these changes might prove beneficial they often put the onus on the female victim, and fail

to assist male offenders with making cognitive behavioral changes to modify their abusive mentalities. Attitudes and behaviors need to be altered if sexual assault rates on campus and in other environments are going to be decreased. These attitudinal and behavioral alterations are not easy tasks to implement. One of the first steps, according to Paul and Gray (2011), is to introduce attitudinal and behavioral change to the theoretical foundations of sexual assault prevention curriculum.

Theoretical Foundation

Theories have been established regarding sexual assaults on college campuses to explain why these assaults happen, and more specifically, why male college students sexually victimize female college students (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Franklin et al., 2012). Although studies investigating sexual victimization, including stalking, have been criticized for being a-theoretical, or without theory (Fisher et al., 1998, p.673; Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait, & Alvi, 2001), in many instances attempts to use theory to explain sexual victimization have been successful. Routine activities theory provides a viable theoretical framework for research investigating sexual assault. The theory's focus on situational variables, location, relationship, and guardianship can offer insight into how, and why, sexual victimization occurs on the college campus. Below, prior theories explaining sexual victimization will be explored to offer historical perspective into the sexual victimization literature, as well as identify existing gaps in the literature that routine activities theory is able to address. Following these brief explanations the current theory, routine activities theory, will be introduced.

Prior Theories

Rape Myths and Rape Scripts

It is plausible that the social construction of gender contributes to American society's adoption of sexual attitudes and practices. As one researcher explained, "American gender role norms about dating and sexual behavior encourage men to be forceful and dominant and to think that 'no' means 'convince me.' Men often interpret a woman's sexual refusal as a sign that they should try a little harder or a little later rather than that they should give up" (Abbey, 2002, p. 120). Rape myths and rape scripts have been used to explain the progression of male-on-female rape and provide suggestions as to the nature of the rationalizations, justifications, and defenses used by both males who rape and females who have been raped. The primary rape myths, as identified by Edwards and associates include: husbands cannot rape their wives, women enjoy rape, women ask to be raped, and women lie about being raped (Edwards, Turchik, Dardis, Reynolds, & Gidycz, 2011). Individuals who use these rape myths to rationalize their behaviors perpetuate gender inequality and male-female power differentials.

Rape scripts, in contrast with rape myths, are behavioral patterns that become a potential precursor to rape. Common rape scripts include: too-much-to-drink, man-is-ready-for-sex, and friends-gone-too-far (Ryan, 2011). Similar to rape myths, these scripts are rationalizations and justifications, but the responsibility for the victimization is more equally distributed among both parties involved. These rape myths and rape scripts are perpetuated by the media, both through television sitcoms and pornography (Ryan, 2011).

Other scripts, such as "blitz" rape scripts and acquaintance rape scripts have also been studied. Blitz rape scripts occur when a woman is victimized in a manner that is extreme or infrequent. They usually include weapons, extreme physical violence or threats of weapons by

the perpetrator, and/or yelling and screaming from the victim (Bondurant, 2001). Bondurant (2001) found that rape victims who did not experience blitz rape scripts were less likely to acknowledge the rape experience as rape than women who were raped in a manner consistent with a blitz rape script.

While some studies have found evidence of a relationship between acceptance of rape myths and sexual victimization, others have found no such connection (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001). A study using college freshman determined that rape myth acceptance was not related to sexual aggression victimization as reported by the females, or sexual victimizing as reported by the males (Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001).

Feminist Theory

While many theories have been used to explain sexual assault one of the most predominant theories is the feminist perspective (Franklin et al., 2012). This perspective generally submits that rape and sexual assault are the results of male socialization and gender disparities. Some feminist theorists suggest that rape does not exist in all societies, arguing that sexual socialization differs across communities and countries (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Others agree that feminist myths might cloud research and create challenges for future woman abuse studies (DeKeseredy, 2011).

One branch of feminist theory that seeks to explain sexual assault, particularly on college campuses, includes peer support models, which focus on how a non-diverse environment might lend support to sexual abuse. More specifically, Schwartz and DeKeseredy's (1997) Male Peer Support theory posits that all-male environments, such as all male fraternities, athletic teams, or dormitories, create collective habitats for men who may lack respect and maturity to exhibit

aggressive and demeaning behaviors. These behaviors are then reinforced by other men in their peer groups, perpetuating an abusive and offensive cycle (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

Feminist theorists would estimate that due to America's culturally specific gender socialization history the U.S. will have higher rates of sexual coercion than other nations. When compared to a more liberal country (Sweden), one study found that American women attending a university reported being more sexually coerced in both a nonphysical and physical manner than Swedish women attending a university (Lottes & Weinberg, 1996). Feminists would argue that cultural differences may be responsible for the significant differences in sexual coercion rates between the two countries. For example, Sweden is known for endorsing equalitarian policies and practices on a consistent basis. In addition, their sexual education programs specifically promote respect for personal liberties and focus on basic human rights, such as teaching children that verbally pressuring someone to do something they do not want to do is unacceptable (Lottes & Weinberg, 1996).

Self-Control Theory

Control related theories have been suggested and tested as explanations for rape and sexual assault. Self-Control Theory, a general crime theory, describes instances of rape when an offender is "insufficiently restrained", endorsing the idea that men who lack self-control are idle, and unwilling to put the time and resources into dating, and are also impulsive, seeking immediate gratification with as little effort as possible (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990, p. 37). Just as males who report low levels of self-control are more likely to sexually assault, women who report low levels of self-control are more likely to be sexually assaulted. In a university study of undergraduates at a public school, researchers found that participants who reported low self-control were more likely to report being sexually assaulted, mainly due to alcohol

consumption (Franklin, 2012). An attempt to merge Male Peer Support theory and Self-control theory using data from self-administered surveys of undergraduate students at a public northwestern university found that low levels of self-control did not influence male peer support in the form of fraternity affiliation; however, fraternity affiliation was related to sexual assault (largely due to a combination of peer pressure from other fraternity members and alcohol consumption) (Franklin et al., 2012).

Current Theory

While several theories have been used to explain the prevalence of sexual assault, many fail to adequately explain the situational variables that surround a crime, and the routines of those who are involved in the crime (Deslauriers-Varin, & Beauregard, 2010). Routine activities theory uses a multifaceted approach to not only explain why some places might provide an ideal location for the commission of a sexual crime, but also why certain students are perceived as suitable victims, and why other students are likely offenders.

Early research on Routine Activities Theory revolved around property crimes. From these early studies new studies have evolved that incorporate violent and sexual crimes. While the tenets of the theory remain the same for any crime, the language used in the theory may sound victim-blaming, judgmental, or paternalistic when applied to violent and sexual crimes; specifically when using key theoretical terms, such as “attractive target” and “capable guardianship.” After a mass review of the literature the author decided that maintaining the language associated with the theory was necessary to avoid theoretical confusion. Using the phrasing associated with the theory is in no way intended to be shame-inducing or victim-blaming.

Routine Activities Theory

Routine activities theory is an ecological theory that explains how motivation, location, and situational variables contribute to the presence of a criminal act (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Ecological theories specifically focus on how criminal incidents are correlated with spatial and structural contexts (Felson & Cohen, 1980). Drawing from the early ecological work of sociologist Amos Hawley, Lawrence E. Cohen and Marcus Felson developed a theory that explains how negative social interactions and behaviors can occur under amenable circumstances (Cohen & Felson, 1979). Given the necessary ingredients, a collision between place, victims, and offenders can occur, leading to the commission of a crime (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Cullen & Agnew, 2003). This theory holds that crime is not a random or spontaneous event, but instead, the product of victim and offender social lifestyles coinciding during an opportunistic time (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Tunnell, 2006). As two scholars explain it,

The routine activities approach is based on two rather simple ideas. First, it argues that in order for crime to occur, motivated offenders must converge with suitable targets in the absence of capable guardians. Second, it argues that the probability of this occurring is influenced by our “routine activities,” including our work, family, leisure, and consumption activities (Cullen & Agnew, 2003, p. 284).

This theory asserts that patterns of actions and behavior can lead to predictions of the likelihood of a crime occurring. The premise of routine activity theory is derived from three main components. It is argued that for a crime to occur there must be an attractive target, a motivated offender, and the absence of a capable guardian (Cohen & Felson, 1979). This theory is appropriate for studies of college campuses because it is assumed that there are plenty of

motivated offenders, attractive targets, and the autonomous nature of the campus often offers few capable guardians (Franklin et al, 2011).

Traditional victimization theories, such as routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979) have long been used to explain victimization related to property crimes, and occasionally violent crimes, but have largely been passed over when explaining crimes of a sexual nature. Only a limited number of studies have been published regarding routine activities theory and sexual crimes, and even fewer exist that apply routine activities theory to sexual crimes on a college campus. In general, support has been found for routine activities theory in relation to sexual crimes. Using rape and attempted rape data from the National Crime Survey one researcher found that the situational variables of rapes supported Routine activities theory (Belknap, 1987). The data, which spanned years 1973-1982, revealed that rapes were most likely to occur during the summer, and at night. Single women were more likely to be raped than those who were married or widowed, and women who were mobile (frequently traveling to work and school) were more likely to be raped than women who were stationary (Belknap, 1987).

While it is well known that theft occurs often on university campuses due to the inability to provide capable guardianship to attractive targets, less is known about the influence of guardianship and suitable targets in regard to sexual assault (Fisher et al., 2010; Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998). According to Martin Schwartz and colleagues (2001, p. 626), “In sexual assault research, routine activities theory has been used only rarely despite its overall popularity.” Failure to properly test routine activities theory in conjunction with sexual victimization has led to a deficiency in the sexual victimization literature (Schwartz et al., 2001). The current research expands on previous studies of sexual victimization by employing Cohen and Felson’s (1979) routine activities theory as the theoretical basis for this work.

Traditional college lifestyles provide ample opportunities for suitable targets to be placed in situations without capable guardianship. High concentrations of young adults socially congregating on a regular basis give motivated offenders a variety of circumstances to take advantage of unsuspecting victims, particularly if the social activities they engage in include alcohol or drugs. A version of routine activities theory was proposed by Schwartz and Pitts (1995) to explain why sexual victimization is so high among women who report drinking alcohol. They proposed that women who drink alcohol frequently, and in large amounts, are more likely to have relationships with offenders, their drinking habits will make them attractive sexual targets, and frequent intoxication as well as participating in a college lifestyle will leave these women without a capable guardian (Mouilso et al., 2012; Schwartz et al., 2001). In short, this theory puts an emphasis on why certain men are more prone to be likely offenders, and why certain women may be perceived as attractive or suitable targets (Schwartz et al., 2001).

Other studies have suggested that women who drink may appear more vulnerable to male perpetrators; making them a more suitable and attractive target (Abbey et al., 2001). Attractive targets and lack of capable guardianship may be more prevalent in environments such bars, pubs, clubs, poorly lit areas, or situations where a woman is walking by herself (Fisher et al, 2010). “Risk heterogeneity,” or habitually performing a risky behavior, may lead to increased potential of victimization, especially if the behavior frequently puts an individual in an atmosphere where they are an attractive target without capable guardianship (Fisher et al., 2010, p. 122). For example, a woman who walks home alone from work every night has higher risk heterogeneity than a woman who carools with co-workers.

Capable guardianship can be measured in several ways, but traditionally has been measured by looking at whether the victim lives alone, carries protection, or has consumed drugs

or alcohol prior to the assault (Franklin 2011, Fisher et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2010). Not only does participating in a lifestyle that frequently has a lack of a capable guardian contribute to the likelihood of victimization, it also increases the probability of being revictimized (Fisher et al., 2010). Capable guardianship may largely be determined by location. One study found that male perpetrators of sexual crimes strategically enacted their crime in areas where there were few or no people (Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2010). These strategies included taking victims to unattended bathroom stalls, secluded outdoor areas, or empty bedrooms.

Similarly, a suitable target can also be measured in a variety of ways, including participation in risky sex practices, routine pornography consumption, engaging in sexual activities while intoxicated, and having a propensity to abuse alcohol or drugs (Fisher et al., 2000; Fisher et al., 2010; Franklin, 2011). Victims who are underage, intoxicated, engaging in illegal activity (such as prostitution), or displayed vulnerability (such as appearing lost, or asking for directions) may be perceived as lacking guardianship, thus making them more attractive victims (Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2010).

Females who routinely enter situations and locations that lack capable guardianship, and contain motivated offenders are at increased risk of being victimized (Fisher et al., 2010). Furthermore, females who practice risk heterogeneity are not only at risk of being sexually victimized, but also pose a greater likelihood of being sexually revictimized (Fisher et al., 2010). The small amount of literature surrounding routine activities theory and sexual assaults have focused on the suitability of targets and lack of adequate guardians, while the concept of a motivated offender has been largely understudied or ignored. Many have assumed that being male implies a motivated offender. As one author put it, "... it is clear that the single most important factor in the occurrence of sexual coercion is simply for a woman to be in the presence

of a man” (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004, p. 110-111). This assumption has been critiqued by some researchers who have attempted to determine what makes a male motivated to sexually victimize (Mouliso, Fisher, & Calhoun, 2012; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Schwartz & Pitts, 1995). Possible explanations for male offending have been explored, including gender socialization, cultural influences, and biological explanations (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). North American culture has a history of being a “rape-supportive environment” that supports and encourages physical masculinity and female objectification (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). This is evident by the high amounts of pornography that are consumed by American citizens, as well as the notion that female body parts are often put on display for humor or other forms of entertainment (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Tests of routine activities theory commonly use fraternity or sorority affiliation as proxies for motivated offenders (Franklin, 2011; Franklin et al, 2012; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Schwartz & Pitts, 1995). Affiliation with a sorority assumes that there will be close contact with members of a male fraternity, increasing the chances of being in close proximity to a likely offender (Franklin, 2011). It is suggested that involvement in a fraternal association breeds a “rape culture,” or an atmosphere where males support each other in sexually exploiting or victimizing women (Boswell & Spade, 1996; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

Failure to properly test routine activities theory in conjunction with sexual victimization has led to a deficiency in the sexual victimization literature (Schwartz et al., 2001). The current research expands on previous studies of sexual victimization by employing Cohen and Felson’s (1979) routine activities theory as the theoretical basis for this work.

Research Questions

College campuses continue to be plagued with sexual assaults, sexual coercion, and stalking. Women who are victims of these crimes can have their college experience transformed into a depressing, devastating reminder of the offenses they experienced. The author acknowledges that not all forms of sexual victimization are enacted against women, and not all sexual perpetrators are male, however, similar to other studies, this dissertation will look predominately at males as the sexual offender and females as the sexual victims (Forbes, & Adams-Curtis, 2001).

Using an adaptation of Koss & Oros' (1982) Sexual Experiences Survey this research will examine sexual victimization among college students attending a medium-sized Midwestern university. This study will add to the existing literature in three ways. First, it will include stalking in the analysis and determine the relationship between sexual victimization and stalking. Second, it will incorporate previously unstudied or understudied variables, including a new behaviorally-oriented variable for vulnerability, and adding a robust graduate student sample. Lastly, it will critically investigate help-seeking behaviors of female victims, and offer suggestions for viable policy implications.

Four research questions were developed to better understand sexual victimization and stalking relationships on this particular college campus. Each research question will be addressed below:

1. How prevalent is sexual assault and sexual coercion on this particular college campus?
2. Are women who report being stalked also more likely to be sexually victimized?

3. Do primary routine activities theory variables, such as an attractive target, motivated offender, and capable guardianship, predict sexual victimization on this particular college campus?
4. What type of help do victims of sexual assault and sexual coercion seek?

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Appropriate methodology for studying controversial subjects, such as sexual assault and sexual coercion, have been hotly debated. Disagreements related to definition conceptualization, operationalization, sampling, and coding have all emerged (Fisher et al, 2010). After reviewing literature from previous sexual assault on college campus studies, this study parallels Tjaden and Thoennes's (1996) National Violence Against Women study, and Fisher, Cullen, and Turner's National College Women Victimization Study (2001). The current research follows their example by using "behavioral indicators" to determine if sexual victimization occurred, using the "incident report" method to get further details about the incident, and utilizing dichotomous coding mechanisms to produce statistical results (Fisher et al, 2010).

Survey Distribution

Sampling

Subjects for this research were obtained using proportioned stratified sampling. A series of steps were implemented to get a sample of classes at the university: First, a list of all campus classes with two or more registered students were received from the school registrar. Second, these classes were grouped according to college, and lastly, using a random number generator, a random sample of classes was chosen from these classes within each college. Attempts were made to get a proportionate number of surveyed students to represent the total number of students in each college at the university.

After the designated number of sampling classes was decided, letters to instructors of these classes were issued. The letters indicated their class had been selected for this survey, and requested that the instructors contact the researchers if they were willing to participate. If no contact was made within a reasonable period of time, (2 weeks), follow-up letters were sent.

Once the instructors expressed a willingness to have their classes participate in the research a survey time was scheduled at the instructor's convenience. Overall, 46 instructors were solicited, and 21 agreed to allow researchers into his/her class. Certain classes were oversampled (i.e. pharmacy, engineering) to control for university percentages, and to ensure that enough males were included in the sample.

Survey

The survey distributed in this current research was constructed from portions of questionnaires used in earlier campus sexual assault studies. Measures of sexual assault, coercion, and social desirability were drawn from the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987), the National College Women Sexual Victimization survey (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000), and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Specific questions from each questionnaire were chosen in an effort to create a baseline study identifying the extent of the sexual abuse/coercion problems in a medium-sized campus in the Upper Midwest. Following the "incident report" technique, used in the National Crime Victimization Study, as well as the National College Women Sexual Victimization Study, if an individual responded in the affirmative to any question related to sexual assault or sexual coercion they were asked to answer several incident-related questions, developed to provide additional details about the sexual coercion/assault experience they remembered the most (Fisher et al, 2010, p. 54).

The self-administered surveys were distributed by the primary researchers and two assisting graduate students during the 2011-2012 academic year. At each survey distribution an advocate from the local Rape and Abuse Crisis Center was present to assist or advise students who wanted to discuss questions or issues regarding sexual assault, coercion, or rape.

Researchers were allotted 25 minutes of class time for survey administration, which they tried to schedule at the beginning of the class period, with most students taking approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Prior to beginning the survey, students were instructed not to take the survey again if they had already taken it in another class. After students completed the survey they were instructed to return the survey to a large box located at the front of the classroom. This procedure changed slightly after a student gave feedback to the primary researcher noting that students who have been sexually assaulted may take longer to fill out the survey, thus possibly making them identifiable if they are the last students to return the surveys to the box. The primary researcher worked with the Internal Review Board to create a resolution to this issue, and it was decided that all students would remain in their seats after they had completed their survey, and after a designated period of time the box would be passed around for students to put their completed surveys in.

Overall, the survey yielded a 97% response rate. According to Earl Babbie, this response rate is “very good,” and eliminates concerns related to response bias (Babbie, 2005, p. 272). Out of 899 questionnaires that were administered, a total of 873 questionnaires were received, with 495 (56%) from males and 378 (43%) from females.

Variables

Dependent Variables

Four dependent variables will be used in this study: Sexual victimization (which includes a composite of sexual coercion and assault), sexual coercion, sexual assault, and stalking.

Conceptualization and operationalization for each variable will be discussed below.

Sexual Assault and Coercion

Separating sexual coercion from sexual assault can be a difficult and arduous task. According to Fisher et al (2010), determining the “type of contact,” “degree of coercion,” and “degree of action” are all necessary to decide whether or not the victimization was assault or coercion (p. 90). For this study, sexual coercion involves any event where verbal pressures, misuse of authority, continuous and unrelenting verbal advances, or threats to end a relationship were used. Sexual assault involves any event where force or threat of force was used.

Prior to answering any sexual victimization questions female survey respondents were instructed to read the definition of sexual intercourse, which was recorded as:

By **sexual intercourse**, we mean penetration of a woman’s vagina, no matter how slight, by a man’s penis. Ejaculation is not required. By **oral sex**, we mean someone's mouth or tongue making contact with your vagina or anus, or your mouth or tongue making contact with someone else's genitals or anus. By **anal sex**, we mean putting a penis in your anus or rectum.

Male respondents were instructed to read a similar definition; however, the definition of oral sex was changed slightly to “someone’s mouth or tongue making contact with your penis or anus, or your mouth or tongue making contact with someone else’s genitals or anus.”

Following a review of the sexual intercourse definition respondents were asked to answer a series of yes or no questions, providing the most appropriate or fitting response. Respondents who answered yes to *any* question that reflected sexual coercion (see Table 1) were considered sexually coerced (coded as 1). Respondents who answered yes to *any* question that reflected sexual assault (see Table 2) were considered sexually assaulted (coded as 1). Those who answered no and were not considered sexually assaulted or sexually coerced were coded as 0.

Other large-scale sexual assault on college campus studies have used the same dichotomous coding schemes (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1996), as does the National Crime Victimization Survey (Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010). Fisher, Daigle, and Cullen (2010) note that this coding method is appropriate for trying to answer specific sexual victimization related questions (i.e. is the sexual victimization of college women a serious issue?).

Table 1. *Measures of Sexual Coercion*

Since you started attending (this university) have you ever...	Yes	No
A. Had anyone make or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by making promises of rewards, such as raising a grade, being hired or promoted, being given a ride or class notes, or getting help with coursework from a fellow student if you complied sexually?		
B. Given in to intercourse when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?		
C. Had intercourse because a man was so sexually aroused that it felt it was useless to stop him even though you did not want to have sexual intercourse?		
D. Had sexual intercourse with a man even though you really didn't want to because he threatened to end your relationship otherwise?		

Stalking

Stalking was operationalized as follows: (0) not a victim of stalking, and (1) victim of stalking. Stalking was originally measured by asking survey respondents “Not including parents, bill collectors, telephone solicitors or other sales people, has anyone, male or female in the last two years...” followed by a series of nine stalking-related questions (see Table 3). Respondents had the option of answering the question in one of four ways: 1) no, 2) yes, prior to attendance at this university, 3) yes, at this university, and 4) yes, both prior to and at this university. Only stalking incidents that happened at this university (including prior to *and* at the university) were considered for the analysis. If a respondent answered “yes” to any of the nine questions they were considered a victim of stalking. To determine if there were differences between women

who had been stalked at any point in their life, and women who had been stalked at this college campus, a separate measure was created and operationalized as (0) not a victim of stalking at university, and (1) victim of stalking at this university. Because stalking is occasionally a precursor to sexual assault, it will be used both as a dependent variable, and an independent variable to sexual assault and sexual coercion.

Table 2. *Measures of Sexual Assault*

Since you started attending (this university) have you ever...	Yes	No
A. Engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, petting) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down)		
B. Been in a situation where a man tried to get sexual intercourse with you when you didn't want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?		
C. Had sexual intercourse when you were unable to give your consent, because you were drunk or taking drugs at the time, or because you are a heavy sleeper, or because you were unconscious for any reason?		
D. Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't want to because he <i>threatened</i> to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate?		
E. Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't want to because he <i>used</i> some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)		
F. Engaged in sex acts (anal or oral sex) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used physical force?		
G. Had <i>anyone</i> use force or threat of harm to sexually penetrate you with a foreign object? By this, we mean for example, placing a bottle or finger in your vagina or anus.		
H. Been raped?		

Table 3. *Measures of Stalking*

Not including parents, bill collectors, telephone solicitors, or other sales people, has anyone, male or female in the last two years...	Yes	No
A. Followed or spied on you?		
B. Sent unsolicited letters or written correspondence?		
C. Made unsolicited phone calls to you?		
D. Stood outside your home, school, or workplace?		
E. Showed up at places you were even though he or she had no business being there?		
F. Left unwanted things for you to find?		
G. Tried to communicate in other ways against your will?		
H. Vandalized your property or destroyed something you loved?		
I. Sent you unwanted text messages checking on you multiple times a day?		

Independent Variables

Demographic Characteristics

Demographic variables in this study include age and race. Age was coded at the ratio level depending on the respondent's age at the time of the study. Only those 18 and older were included in this study. Ages ranged between 18 and 45 years old. Because 89% of the sample identified themselves as white/non-Hispanic, race was dichotomized as white/Non-Hispanic (1) and non-white (0). Non-white included Hispanic, African American, Native American, Asian American, Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian, Asian, African, and other¹.

Suitable Target

Several variables were included to determine whether or not a woman might appear to be a suitable target, these variables include: year in school, perceived vulnerability, sexual history, and relationship status. Because this study specifically focused on the sexual victimization of college students, year in school is a necessary variable to determine whether students who are new to the campus and college experience are more likely to be victimized than those who are nearing graduation. Year in school was coded as Freshman (1), Sophomore (2), Junior (3), Senior (4), and graduate student (5). Graduate students included those in a master's or doctoral program, as well as students in their fifth year of an undergraduate/graduate hybrid program (for example, this particular university offers a five-year undergraduate pharmacy program).

Women who appear vulnerable, unsure, or indecisive may be deemed attractive targets by "motivated male sexual aggressors" (Schwartz et al, 2001, pg. 629). Critics of routine activities theory have noted that in previous tests of the theory, vulnerability has been measured using unfitting variables such as background characteristics. According to Martin Schwartz and

¹Both African-American and African, and Asian American and Asian were included as race options because of the international student population at the university of study.

colleagues, “Victim’s vulnerability and capable guardianship generally have been assumed from demographic correlates rather than from actual measures of lifestyle” (Schwartz et al, 2001, p. 626). To counter this argument, and provide a new dimension to vulnerability, vulnerability was assessed by asking respondents a behaviorally oriented question: “On a few occasions I have given up something because I thought too little of my ability.” Responses were coded as no (0) and yes (1).

An individual who is visibly under the influence of alcohol or drugs may appear to be an attractive target to a sexual offender for several reasons (Franklin, 2011; Schwartz et al, 2001). First, they may lack the strength, balance, or mental clarity to defend themselves against an assault. Second, they may not clearly remember the assault, or the events preceding the assault, making them less likely to report the victimization to authorities. Lastly, depending on the level of their intoxication, they may appear to be easily persuaded to follow the offender to a private or secluded area where the assault takes place. The survey asked respondents who admitted they had been sexually victimized “Were you using any intoxicants (alcohol, drugs) on this occasion?” Respondents were given the option of reporting they were under the influence of drugs, alcohol, both drugs and alcohol, or none. Respondents who reported they “did not know” or “were not sure” were excluded from the analysis. Because only a small percentage of the sample reported they were under the influence of drugs, or *both* drugs and alcohol at the time of their assault (<.2%), alcohol and drug use were combined. Those who were under the influence of drugs or alcohol were coded as (1), and those who were not under the influence of drugs or alcohol were coded as (0).

Prior sexual history may also make a woman appear to be an attractive target. Because many assaults are perpetrated by someone the victim is intimately involved with, sexual

relationships with a current boyfriend/spouse, or prior sexual relationships with former boyfriends or spouses may put a female at a higher risk of being sexually assaulted. To determine sexual history respondents were asked whether or not they had ever had *consensual* sexual intercourse. Respondents who answered yes were coded as (1). Those who answered no were coded as (0).

The extent to which a woman knows and trusts an individual is also demonstrative of target suitability. The majority of sexual assaults are committed by an individual who is known to the victim (Fisher et al, 2000); however, the extent of that relationship is often unknown, making it an important variable to study. In this study individuals who reported being sexually victimized were asked “What was your relationship to this person (the offender)?” Those who were unsure, or whose responses fit in multiple categories, were instructed to select the response that best fit with their experience. Response options were coded as follows: Family member (1), Husband/Wife (2), Former Husband/Wife (3), Boyfriend/girlfriend (living together) (4), Boyfriend/girlfriend (not living together) (5), Former boyfriend/girlfriend (6), Date (7), Friend (8), Acquaintance (9), Co-worker (10), Employer (11), Teacher (12), Therapist (13), Clergy (14), Stranger (15), and other (16). Due to little variation among responses this variable was recoded into intimate relationship (0), and non-intimate relationship (1). Intimate relationship includes a current or former boyfriend, husband, or someone they had formally dated. A non-intimate relationship with the offender included friends, acquaintances, strangers, employees and coworkers, or anyone else not included in the intimate relationship category.

Capable Guardianship

On-campus housing can provide a form of guardianship that is often unavailable for students that live off-campus. Dormitory room advisors, hall directors, or other housing officials

provide visible rule-enforcement, which may dissuade sexual offenders from victimizing individuals on university grounds. This study measures capable guardianship by asking respondents who admitted to being sexually victimized “Did this experience happen on campus?” Responses were coded as no (0), and yes (1).

Another indicator of capable guardianship is the social atmosphere in which the victimization occurred in. Respondents were asked “Did the assault happen at a planned social event?” Answers were coded as no (0), and yes (1). Planned social events include events such as parties, group dates, or individual dates. Unplanned social events include spontaneous dates, meeting at friend’s house, or meeting in a dorm room. It is hypothesized that planned social events will increase capable guardianship because the victim may know the layout of the location, or be surrounded by family, friends, or close associates.

Lastly, respondents were asked what campus activities they participated in. Campus recreation may provide guardianship and oversight not offered at off-campus events, such as going to the bar or other forms of entertainment. Respondents who reported they participated in one or more of the following activities (sororities, honor society, university athletics, or intramural sports) were considered involved on campus (1), while those who reported not participating in university activities were considered not involved (0).

Motivated Offender

Ideally, variables related to offender motivation would be used in a routine activity theory analysis to determine the statistical strength of a motivated offender compared to target suitability and guardianship capabilities; however, the nature of the survey used for this study was such that only the victim was asked to respond to questions related to the victimization, and no information was provided from the offender. While certain questions answered by the victim

might provide insight as to the motivation level of the offender, such as offender intoxication, they are assumptions and cannot be verified. Furthermore, when added into a collinearity matrix, victim's perception of offender intoxication was highly correlated with self-reported victim intoxication, requiring that one of the variables be dropped from the equation (see Table 10). After multicollinearity and reliability issues were assessed it was decided that variables contributing to offender motivation would not be included in the logistic regressions. A theoretical assumption of routine activity theory assumes that because the offender participated in the victimization he was in some way motivated; however, the reasons behind the motivation will not be uncovered in this study.

Help-Seeking Behaviors

A univariate analysis of help seeking behaviors was conducted. Help-seeking will not be added to the regression equations due to lack of variation. Help-seeking behaviors are related to the reporting of sexual victimization to the police or other formal institutions/individuals. Participants were given a list of both official and non-official personnel, and were asked to identify who they contacted for help following their victimization. This study not only discusses whether or not sexual victimization was reported to law enforcement or university officials, but also looks at reasons why individuals chose not to report the incident, as well as whether or not they told any non-official persons (friend, family member) about the incident.

Analytical Strategy

Univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistics will be displayed. Because the dependent variables are binary, logistic regression was utilized to report bivariate and multivariate findings. Prior to running each regression correlation matrices and variance inflation factor tests were conducted to rule out any issues related to multicollinearity. The first tables presented display the

background characteristics of the total female sample, followed by descriptive statistics for victims only. Overall regression models were created to look at differences between the total female sample and those who were victimized and those who were not. Other regression models were developed to investigate victims only, those who reported they were victims of either sexual coercion or assault (or both). Each regression model was analyzed first with routine activity theory variables, and then again with routine activity theory variables and the inclusion of a stalking variable. This allowed the author to determine the relationship between sexual victimization and stalking.

The variables included in each regression model changed slightly depending on whether the regression uses the total female sample or the victims only sample. Only victims of sexual victimization were asked to fill out an “incident report” providing additional information about their attacks; therefore, there are no data from the total female sample regarding the victim’s relationship status with the offender, the location of the victimization, or whether or not the victim engaged in drug or alcohol use.

Two regressions were analyzed regarding stalking. The first stalking regression model looked at women who reported they had been stalked at any point in their life, and the second regression looked at women who reported they had been stalked on this particular college campus. Because “incident report” information was not available for stalking, a limited regression model was created that included information answered by the total female sample. In addition, frequencies were run to provide information regarding help-seeking behaviors, help agents, and reasons why women may not have sought help.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Analytic results are divided into several sections, including total female sample findings, victim-only findings, stalking findings, and results related to the help-seeking behaviors that victims choose to engage in. Total female sample findings include demographic characteristics related to the entire female sample, as well as regression models to determine differences between those who were sexually victimized and those who were not. Victim-only findings include frequencies related to individual characteristics of assault and coercion victims, as well as situational characteristics regarding the victimization (location, relationship with offender, etc.). Separate logistic regression models were conducted for coercion and assault victims. Separate stalking regression models were assessed for those who were stalked on the college campus used in this particular study, and those who were stalked at or before attending college. Finally, frequencies related to the help-seeking behaviors are evaluated and discussed, including the percentage of victims who sought formal and informal help, specific help agents, and reasons for not seeking help.

Total Female Sample Sexual Victimization Univariate Findings

Frequencies of the overall total female sample indicated that the overwhelming majority of women who participated in the sexual victimization survey were white (90%) (see Table 4). The age range of the sample was 18 to 45 years old, with the average female student being 21 years old. The majority of the sample were juniors and seniors, with less than 10% of the sample freshman. A large percentage of graduate students (18%) were included in the sample, offering insight into a student population that is generally not studied in regard to sexual victimization. Approximately 40% of the women in the sample were involved on campus either through honor society, intramural sports, university athletics, a sorority, or a combination of these activities.

Table 4. *Total Female Sample Characteristics*

Variable	N	%	Range	Mean
Age			18-43	21
Race				
Non-white	40	10.6		
White	338	89.4		
Year in School				
Freshman	31	8.2		
Sophomore	64	18.9		
Junior	89	23.5		
Senior	126	33.3		
Graduate	68	18.0		
Vulnerable				
Yes	205	54.4		
No	173	45.5		
Campus Involvement				
Yes	131	38.5		
No	209	61.5		
Live on Campus				
Yes	107	28.3		
No	271	71.5		
<i>Sexual History</i>				
Have you had consensual intercourse?				
Yes	262	70.9		
No	108	29.1		
Age of first sexual intercourse			13-23	17
<i>Stalking History</i>				
Stalked at University				
Yes	49	13.0		
No	329	87.0		
Stalked Overall				
Yes	163	43.1		
No	215	56.9		

Almost 30% of women surveyed reported they lived on campus, and over half demonstrated a vulnerable tendency. In regard to sexual history, 71% of women reported they had engaged in consensual sexual intercourse at some point in their lives, with the average age of first intercourse being 17 years old. Thirteen percent of the overall sample reported they had been stalked during their time at this particular university, while 43% reported that they had been stalked either at this university or prior to attending this university.

Coercion and assault frequencies indicated that almost 17% of the sample had been sexually coerced at some point during their college career (See Table 5). Slightly over 13% had been sexually assaulted, and almost a quarter of students had been sexually victimized (coerced and/or assaulted) during their tenure on the college campus. Of the total female sample, 2.7% of students specifically reported their victimization as rape; however, of those who were sexually assaulted, 12.3% specifically reported that they had been raped.

Table 5. *Coercion and Assault Frequencies*

Variable	N	%
Any Coercion		
Yes	63	16.8
No	311	83.2
Any Assault		
Yes	49	13.1
No	325	86.9
Overall Sexual Victimization		
Yes	83	22.2
No	291	77.8

Victim Only Sexual Coercion and Assault Univariate Findings

While reviewing sexual victimization among the total female sample provides insight into illicit sexual coercion and assault of college women, it is necessary to look at victims of

sexual victimization separately to determine if routine activity theory tenets specifically predict coercion and/or assault. The following table provides individual and situational characteristics of women who reported they were sexually victimized.

When looking solely at victims (those who reported being sexually coerced, assaulted, or both), 62% reported a tendency for vulnerability (see Table 6). This is slightly higher than the total female sample who reported vulnerability rates of 54.4%. In almost all instances the sexual victimization happened away from the college campus (89%). Forty-seven percent of victims said that their offender was an intimate associate, a current or former boyfriend, or someone they had formally dated, versus 52% who reported they had a non-intimate relationship with their offender, such as a friend, acquaintance, stranger, coworker, or someone they did not know very well. Sixty-five percent of victims were under the influence of either drugs or alcohol (or both) at the time of the sexual victimization. In 67% percent of incidents victims reported that the offender was using either drugs or alcohol or both at the time of the assault. In 17% of cases the victimization happened in a planned social context, such as a planned party, a date they were invited on, or a previously scheduled outing, as opposed to a spontaneous “hang-out” or casual trip to the bar.

Bivariate Findings

Bivariate Chi-Square tests were analyzed for both the total female sample and victims-only sample. Results from the Chi-Square test of the total female sample revealed significant differences between those who had been victimized and those who had not, particularly in relation to their sexual and stalking history (see Table 7). Interestingly, stalking differences are only seen at the bivariate level among the total female sample; stalking was not significant when looking at victims-only sample (see Table 8). When looking solely at victims of coercion no

significant differences transpired, however, several variables emerged as significant in the victim of assault model. Perpetrator and victim substance use, as well as the victim-offender relationship were both variables of interest.

Table 6. *Victim Only Characteristics*

Variable	N	%
Vulnerable		
Yes	52	62.7
No	31	37.3
Location of Victimization		
On Campus	8	10.5
Off Campus	68	89.5
Relationship with Offender		
Intimate	37	47.4
Non-intimate	41	52.6
Victim Intoxication		
Yes	46	65.7
No	24	34.3
Perceived Offender Intoxication		
Yes	47	67.1
No	23	32.9
Social Context		
Planned Event	13	17.3
Spontaneous Event	62	82.7

The correlation matrix among the total female sample revealed several significant relationships among the variables; however none were highly correlated. The following matrix (see Table 9) revealed that among the total female sample, year in school, sexual history, and stalking history were significantly correlated with victimization. As expected, year in school was also correlated with living on campus and a history of being stalked on campus.

Table 7. *Bivariate Chi-Square Test of Victimization among the Total Female Sample*

Variable	χ^2	df
Year in School	8.705	4
Race	3.334	1
Vulnerability	3.013	1
Campus Involvement	.015	1
Live on Campus	1.560	1
Sexual History	16.631***	1
Stalking (at university)	17.823***	1
Stalking (at or before university)	31.324***	1

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001

Table 8. *Bivariate Chi-Square Test of Coercion and Assault among Victims Only*

Variable	<u>Coercion</u>		<u>Assault</u>	
	χ^2	df	χ^2	df
Vulnerability	3.508	1	.104	1
Perpetrator Alcohol/drug use	1.242	1	6.216*	1
Victim Alcohol/drug use	3.339	1	7.704**	1
Relationship with offender	2.533	1	4.941*	1
Social Context	3.604	1	3.594	1
Stalking (at university)	.573	1	.000	1
Stalking (at or before university)	.298	1	1.802	1

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001

Table 9. *Correlation Matrix of Victimization among the Total Female Sample*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Victimization	-								
2. Year in School	.136**	-							
3. Race	.094	-.026	-						
4. Vulnerability	.090	.027	-.039	-					
5. Campus Involvement	-.007	-.035	.163**	-.156**	-				
6. Live on Campus	-.065	-.372***	-.108*	.021	.089	-			
7. Sexual History	.212***	.110*	.163**	.089	.004	-.234***	-		
8. Stalking ^a	.218***	.187***	.005	.021	-.017	-.085	.127*	-	
9. Stalking ^b	.289***	.091	-.048	.165***	-.078	-.025	.157**	.443***	-

^a= Stalking occurring at the university

^b= Stalking occurring at or before the university

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$

Table 10. *Correlation Matrix of Coercion and Assault among Victims*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Assault	-								
2. Coercion	-.469***	-							
3. Vulnerability	-.035	.206	-						
4. Perp. Intoxication	.298*	-.133	-.071	-					
5. Victim Intoxication	.332**	-.218	.046	.806***	-				
6. Relationship	.252*	-.180	.146	.500***	.469***	-			
7. Social Context	.219	-.219	.002	.334**	.268*	-.008	-		
8. Stalking ^a	.001	.083	-.101	-.171	-.223	-.179	-.010	-	
9. Stalking ^b	.147	.060	.036	-.060	-.210	-.051	-.014	.394***	-

^a= Stalking occurring at the university
 *p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001

^b= Stalking occurring at or before the university

The negative correlation associated with living on campus indicated that those who were juniors, seniors, and graduate students were most likely to live off-campus. This finding was anticipated because this particular college campus requires that all freshman students seek housing in campus residence halls. Following their freshman year students are given the option of moving off-campus. Freshman and sophomores were also less likely to have been stalked at some point during their time at the university. This finding was also expected as many freshmen had only been attending the university for three months when they participated in the survey. Race was positively correlated with campus involvement and sexual history, indicating the white students were more likely to be involved in a sorority, honor society, or intramural or university athletics, and were more likely to have had sexual intercourse than non-whites. Non-white students were negatively correlated with living on campus. Vulnerability was negatively correlated with campus involvement, and positively correlated with stalking before or during campus tenure. Sexual history was negatively correlated with living on campus, and positively correlated with stalking history. This indicated that many students who had been sexually active at some point in their life chose not live on campus, and that sexual history was related to both stalking on the college campus as well as before the student attended college. Both stalking variables were significantly correlated with each other, suggesting that prior victims of stalking might be re-victimized at some point during their college career, or that the measures and coding scheme were too similar to each other.

The correlation matrix of coercion and assault among victims also produced some interesting results (see Table 10). Surprisingly, sexual coercion was negatively correlated with sexual assault. The author is unsure why this is, but it may be that oftentimes, coercion does not lead to assault, thus making the two acts mutually exclusive. Further differences between sexual

assault and sexual coercion victims will be discussed in the Multivariate Findings section.

Assault was also significantly correlated with victim and perpetrator intoxication and victim-offender relationship status, but none of these were correlated with coercion.

Victim and perpetrator intoxication were highly correlated (Pearson $R^2 = .806$). This is not surprising, because in many instances, when the victim is in a location/situation that promotes alcohol or drug use (such as a bar), the perpetrator is too. Because of issues related to multicollinearity, perpetrator intoxication was dropped from further analysis. Both victim and perpetrator intoxication were significantly correlated with victim-offender relationship status, and social context (whether the event leading up to the victimization was spontaneous or planned). As in the total female sample correlation matrix, both stalking variables were significantly correlated with each other.

Multivariate Findings

Multivariate analysis was conducted for both the total female and victims-only samples. The following table provides a logistic regression model for the overall sample population predicting the likelihood of sexual victimization (see Table 11). Results revealed that year in school and sexual history were both predictors of sexual victimization. Year in school was coded ordinally to reveal that juniors, seniors, and graduate students were more likely to be victimized than freshman and sophomores. It is possible that the year in school variable was serving as a proxy for time on campus: the longer a student remains in the university environment the higher her opportunity to be victimized. Sexual history indicates that those who had consensual sexual intercourse in the past were more likely to be victimized than those who had not. Both significant variables (year in school and sexual history) are suitable target indicators; however, capable

guardianship did not appear to be significant in predicting likelihood of sexual victimization from the total female sample.

Table 11. *Logistic Regression Model of Likelihood of Sexual Victimization among the Total Female Sample*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Year in School	.279*	1.322	.127	4.839
Race	1.031	2.803	.639	2.601
Vulnerability	.271	1.311	.278	.945
Campus Involvement	-.026	.974	.285	.008
Live on Campus	.127	1.135	.348	.132
Sexual History	1.244***	3.468	.390	10.192
Constant	-4.306			
Model χ^2		25.420***		

* $p \leq .05$ ** $p \leq .01$ *** $p \leq .001$
 Cox and Snell R^2 .073 Nagelkerke R^2 .111

Table 12 includes a logistic regression model looking at the total female sample using the same variables as the previous table, with the inclusion of stalking. Once again, year in school and sexual history emerged as significant, indicating that juniors, seniors, and graduate students, and those with a sexually active past were more likely to be victimized than freshman and sophomores and those who never engaged in consensual intercourse. Stalking also appeared highly significant, indicating that women who had been stalked during their time at the university, or prior to attending the university, were more likely to be sexually victimized than women who reported never being stalked. Similar to the previous table, suitable target variables appeared significant while capable guardianship did not.

The following table investigates the individual and situational circumstances surrounding sexual coercion (see Table 13). This logistic regression used only data from coerced victims (as opposed to the total female sample and victims only sample). Findings indicated that women who display a tendency for vulnerability were more likely to be sexually coerced than those who

do not. The negative coefficient on relationship status indicated that victims were more likely to be sexually coerced by someone they knew intimately, such as a current or former boyfriend, as opposed to a friend, coworker, acquaintance, or stranger. As with the total female sample victimization regression, both significant variables were reflective of suitable target indicators, and no capable guardianship indicators were significant.

Table 12. *Logistic Regression Model of Likelihood of Sexual Victimization among the Total Female Sample (with Stalking)*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Year in School	.263*	1.301	.133	3.928
Race	1.246	3.478	.651	3.661
Vulnerability	.086	1.090	.290	.087
Campus Involvement	.002	1.002	.294	.000
Live on Campus	.135	1.145	.360	.141
Sexual History	1.127**	3.086	.400	7.935
Stalking	1.249***	3.485	.292	18.337
Constant	-4.928			
Model χ^2		44.893***		

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001
 Cox and Snell R² .126 Nagelkerke R² .191

Table 13. *Logistic Regression Model of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Coercion among Victims*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Vulnerability	1.195*	3.305	.620	3.716
Victim Intoxication	-.904	.405	.758	1.425
Relationship	-1.231*	.292	.637	3.731
Social Context	-.786	.456	.717	1.202
Constant	1.653			
Model χ^2		12.565*		

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001
 Cox and Snell R² .164 Nagelkerke R² .242

Using the same variables in the previous table, now with the inclusion of stalking, Table 14 again reviews the circumstances surrounding sexual coercion among victims. Vulnerability

and relationship status, both significant in the previous table, remained significant. Interestingly, when looking at victims only, stalking did not emerge as significant in relation to sexual coercion.

Table 14. *Logistic Regression Model of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Coercion among Victims (with Stalking)*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Vulnerability	1.196*	3.307	.625	3.657
Victim Intoxication	-.906	.404	.771	1.379
Relationship	-1.230*	.292	.640	3.699
Social Context	-.786	.456	.717	1.200
Stalking	-.007	.993	.666	.000
Constant	1.658			
Model χ^2	12.565*			

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001
 Cox and Snell R² .164 Nagelkerke R² .242

While multiple variables appeared significant when analyzing the circumstances surrounding victims of sexual coercion, only one variable was significant when analyzing the circumstances surrounding victims of sexual assault (see Table 15). Victim intoxication was the only significant variable in the above regression, indicating that females were more likely to be victims of sexual assault if they were under the influence of alcohol, drugs, or both. The next model uses the same variables as the previous model but introduces stalking to the equation. Again, only victim intoxication was significant.

Similar to the coercion regression with the inclusion of stalking, stalking did not appear to be a significant variable in relation to the circumstances surrounding sexual assault among victims (see Table 16). As seen previously in both the general population sample regressions, and the coercion victim regressions, variables related to suitable targets were significant, while capable guardianship variables were not.

Table 15. *Logistic Regression of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Assault among Victims*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Vulnerability	.281	1.325	.551	.261
Victim Intoxication	1.148*	3.151	.561	4.188
Relationship	1.060	2.887	.660	2.576
Social Context	1.074	2.926	.860	1.559
Constant	1.653			
Model χ^2	12.925*			

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001
 Cox and Snell R² .169 Nagelkerke R² .228

Table 16. *Logistic Regression Model of Circumstances Surrounding Sexual Assault among Victims (with Stalking)*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Vulnerability	.203	1.225	.562	.130
Victim Intoxication	1.385*	3.995	.605	5.235
Relationship	1.014	2.757	.667	2.315
Social Context	1.086	2.961	.870	1.558
Stalking	.836	2.308	.625	1.792
Constant	-1.582			
Model χ^2	14.768*			

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001
 Cox and Snell R² .190 Nagelkerke R² .257

Stalking Findings

During survey administration separate “incident reports” were not issued for victims of stalking, therefore, necessitating that the total female sample be used in the stalking regression models. Separate regression models were conducted for stalking occurring on the college campus of study and lifetime stalking history.

When looking at stalking that occurred solely on this particular college campus two variables appeared noteworthy (year in school and sexual history) (see Table 17). Similar to sexual victimization regression results, year in school was highly significant. Juniors, seniors, and graduate students were more likely to report being stalked than freshman and those in their

first few years of college. Sexual history was also significant, indicating that those who had sexual intercourse in the past were more likely to have experienced stalking. This was not surprising given that stalking is often a precursor or a follow-up to sexual relationships. While year in school and sexual history were both indicators of a suitable target, again, no capable guardianship variables displayed significance.

Table 17. *Logistic Regression Model of Total Female Sample Stalking at University*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Year in School	.567***	1.764	.172	10.889
Race	-.081	.922	.587	.019
Vulnerability	.022	1.022	.341	.004
Campus Involvement	-.048	.953	.356	.018
Live on Campus	.185	1.203	.438	.178
Sexual History	.981*	2.668	.474	4.295
Constant	-4.698			
Model χ^2	19.582**			

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001

Cox and Snell R² .057 Nagelkerke R² .105

The following model used the same stalking variables, but investigated characteristics related to stalking victims who were not only stalked while in college, but may have been stalked prior to their time at the university (see Table 18). As with the previous regression, sexual history was significant, indicating that those who had engaged in consensual sex were more likely to have been stalked than those who had not. When looking at overall stalking history, year in school was no longer significant, as it was when looking at college stalking history; however, vulnerability emerged as significant, suggesting that women who displayed vulnerable tendencies were more likely have been stalked at some point over the course of their lifetime than those who did not.

Table 18. *Logistic Regression Model of Total Female Sample Stalking at or Before University*

Variable	B	(B)exp	S.E.	Wald
Year in School	.140	1.150	.104	1.800
Race	-.480	.619	.387	1.538
Vulnerability	.569*	1.767	.230	6.128
Campus Involvement	-.179	.836	.239	.559
Live on Campus	.122	.836	.282	.187
Sexual History	.626*	1.870	.264	5.601
Constant	-.999			
Model χ^2		18.448**		

*p ≤ .05 **p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001

Cox and Snell R² .053 Nagelkerke R² .072

Help-Seeking Behavior Findings

Of the 83 women who were either coerced or assaulted (or both), only one made a formal report to a law enforcement agency (see Table 19). Over half of the victims made informal reports, mostly to friends and family members. Those who chose not to tell anyone about their victimization listed a variety of reasons for doing so. Three percent of women reported that they were discouraged from telling anyone about the incident; however, it is unknown who discouraged them. Many women did not report because they did not specifically identify their victimization as rape. Others failed to report because they were worried about their privacy or public exposure. Forty-six percent of women who did not tell anyone cited wanting to keep the incident private as the reason for their silence. Nineteen percent were worried about their parents finding out, and 9% were concerned that they themselves might get in trouble. Almost 8% of women expressed reluctance to report out of fear that no one would believe them. With only one woman reporting that she did not tell anyone because she thought the offenders' friends might harass and punish her, it is likely that many women do not report out of fear of social repercussions (concerns about their reputation, having friends and family find out about the

incident, etc.) as opposed to verbal and physical retaliation from the offender or his acquaintances.

Table 19. *Help-Seeking Behaviors of Coerced and Assaulted Victims*

Variable	N	%
Formal Reporting		
Yes	1	1.4
No	72	98.6
Informal Reporting		
Yes	33	45.8
No	39	54.2
Informal Help Agents*		
Friend	32	82.1
Family member	5	14.3
Medical worker	2	5.7
Resident assistant	0	0
Faculty or campus staff member	1	2.9
Counselor/therapist	3	8.6
Local rape crisis center	1	2.9
Other	1	1.2
Reasons for not reporting**		
Felt ashamed	16	23.9
Did not want to go through the court process	4	6.0
Did not think anyone would believe me	5	7.5
Wanted to keep it private	31	46.3
Thought the offenders' friends might punish me	1	1.5
Did not think the offender would be held accountable	5	7.5
Did not know how to report	6	9.0
Didn't identify it as rape	32	47.8
Didn't want my parents to find out	10	14.9
Didn't want the offender to get in trouble	13	19.4
Thought I might get in trouble	6	9.0
I was discouraged from reporting	2	3.0

*Percentages may not equal 100 because women may have told more than one person about the incident.

** Percentages may not equal 100 because women may have cited more than one reason for not telling anyone about the incident.

Many women demonstrated a lack of confidence in the social justice system, with 6% reporting they did not want to go through the court process, and almost 8% asserting that they did not think the offender would be held accountable. Nine percent of those who did not report the incident indicated that they did not know how, perhaps signifying a greater need for simplifying and advertising the reporting process on and near college campuses.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION

Prevalence of Sexual Coercion and Assault

The above findings produced several results that warrant discussion. Overall, 22% of women had been sexually victimized during their time at this university. Seventeen percent of this female college sample had been sexually coerced, and 14% had been sexually assaulted. Of those who reported they were assaulted, almost 12% specifically described their assault as rape (approximately 3% of the total female sample). These numbers are comparable, or slightly lower, than other recent studies on the subject. Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000) found that 15% of college students were victimized, and almost 3% were raped over the course of two semesters. Koss and Oros (1982) determined that about half of all college students have been victimized, and 15% have been raped, since the time they were 14 years old. Although the current study only asked about victimization rates during students' time on the college campus, it is likely that both coercion and assault rates would be much higher if the victimization questions extended beyond the women's college period.

While it is not surprising that coercion rates are higher than assault rates, what is surprising is that the coercion rates are not considerably higher. Prior studies suggest that coercion is the most frequently used method of sexual victimization (Zinzow & Thompson, 2015), and this study suggests that coercion may be the first in line on a sexual victimization continuum, with assault immediately following. Coercion rates at this university are significantly lower than national averages, with other studies finding that about 50% of college women are sexually coerced during their time at college (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2001; Ogletree, 1993). While it is unknown why coercion rates at this university are lower than the national average, it is possible that students are underreporting their coercion experience, that the

lack of diversity in the sample is leaving out a crucial student population, or that males at this university may be more educated about sexual victimization prevention, thus making them less likely to be perpetrators.

Total Female Sample Victimization

When looking at the total female sample sexual victimization regression model, year in school, and sexual history emerged as significant. The current study found that juniors, seniors, and graduate students were more likely to be victimized than freshman and sophomores. Other studies have found that freshman have the highest victimization rate (Humphrey & White, 2012; Mouliso et al, 2012). It is likely that freshman have the highest victimization rate in this study too, but that is not reflected because the researchers asked about overall campus victimization, not the year the victimization occurred. Thus it is fitting that those who have been on the campus longer are at a greater risk of having been victimized during their time at this university.

Sexual history has been studied in conjunction with a variety of social problems, including sexual assault and coercion. Among males, one study found that college men who victimized women generally had consensual sex at a younger age, as well as more consensual sexual partners than men who were not sexual perpetrators (Abbey, McAuslan, Zawacki, Clinton, & Buck, 2001). Another study determined that women who had sexual intercourse at an early age (14 or younger) were more likely to be victims of sexual coercion during their first sexual experience than those who had first intercourse when they were older (Dickson, Paul, Herbison, & Silva, 1998). Similar results have been acquired in other studies that found women who have been raped were more likely to have early consensual sex, as well as numerous sexual partners (Brener et al, 1999; Koss & Dinero, 1989). The current study revealed that women who had consensual intercourse in the past were at greater risk of being sexually victimized,

regardless of the age of first consensual intercourse. This is likely because women who are in, or have been in, sexual relationships make more attractive targets, prompting perpetrators to seek after these women, or to find them convenient targets because they are already in a sexual relationship with the perpetrator. In some circumstances, being sexually active may also mean being involved in a romantic relationship, increasing the risk of intimate-partner coercion and assault.

Race verged on significance ($p = .056$). This nearing of significance suggests that among the total female sample, whites were more likely to be victimized than non-whites. This diverges from other research that has found African Americans may be at an increased risk of victimization because they are at an increased risk of engaging in risky behaviors, such as binge drinking, multiple sex partners, and early sexual intercourse (Brener et al, 1999). Lack of racial variation in the current sample, coupled with the fact that race just verged on significance but did not reach the .05 significance level, makes this finding interesting but not exceptionally noteworthy. Although the racial make-up of this sample is comparable to the overall student population, to determine whether this pattern is consistent across the campus future research will need to be conducted with a larger sample of international and minority students.

Predictors of Sexual Coercion and Assault

When sexual coercion and assault were looked at in separate regression models thought-provoking findings emerged. In the coercion model two significant predictors were vulnerability and relationship status, indicating that victims were more likely to be sexually coerced by someone they know intimately, such as a current or former boyfriend, as opposed to a friend, coworker, acquaintance, or stranger. Neither of these were significant in the assault regression

model, suggesting that there are differences between what factors may lead to sexual coercion versus sexual assault.

Vulnerability may be significant in relation to sexual coercion because women who display vulnerable tendencies are possibly talked in to sexual behaviors they do not want, or may be reluctant to tell the offender to stop their behaviors. While this is likely in instances of verbal coercion, it is doubtful that pleading, discussing, or asking an offender to stop would make an impact during situations of sexual assault, possibly explaining why vulnerability was not a significant variable in the sexual assault models.

Victim-offender relationship was also significant in regard to sexual coercion. An intimate relationship was more likely to lead to coercion than a non-intimate, casual, or stranger relationship. Prior research reveals that these findings are consistent with other studies, and that oftentimes, women who are victimized by an intimate partner will continue to remain in a relationship with that partner (Edwards, Kearns, Gidycz, & Calhoun, 2012; Fisher et al, 2000). Women may be more likely to be coerced by an offender they have an intimate relationship with for several reasons, including the notion that they may have romantic attractions to the offender. Some women who are not ready for sex may give in to sexual advances from a serious dating partner out of fear of losing him, disappointing him, or making him angry. Other women may give in to these advances because they are sick of being pestered about having intercourse. Women who do not want to have sex and are dating someone casually, or simply hanging out with a friend may have fewer reservations about saying no.

Only one variable emerged as significant in the sexual assault models: victim intoxication. Findings revealed that victim intoxication increased the likelihood of sexual assault among victims (although there is no indication it increased the likelihood of sexual coercion).

These findings are consistent with other studies, although some studies suggest the alcohol victim relationship may be somewhat cyclical, with women who drink more having more sexual partners, thus putting them at increased risk of being a victim (Abbey et al, 2001; Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Corbin, Bernat, Calhoun, McNair, & Seals, 2001; Mouliso, Fischer, & Calhoun, 2012). Prior victims, on the other hand, may consume alcohol in an attempt to alleviate feelings of shame, sadness, or guilt.

While it is difficult to explain why intoxication is significant in cases of assault but not coercion, one study found that as alcohol use propensity increases so does the severity of the sexual victimization, indicating that highly intoxicated males might forgo efforts to coerce a victim and instead go straight to assault behaviors (Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 2004). Abbey and colleagues (2001) propose that further research should be conducted looking at a woman's drinking patterns (such as if she is consuming alcohol at a faster pace than usual), and the relationship between alcohol consumption and threat of a sexual assault.

The relationship between victim intoxication and sexual assault has been explained in several ways. First, intoxicated women can be seen as "vulnerable", making them appear to be a more suitable target (Mouliso et al, 2012, p. 89). Second, their intoxication may slow their reflexes, making them less likely to recognize or respond to the assault. Finally, they may be viewed as more sexual than sober women, which may contribute to men being more inclined to ignore refusals (Mouliso et al, 2012). It is possible that victim intoxication was only significant in the assault models and not the coercion models because men may feel they can skip the coercion step if a woman is inebriated, and go straight to the assault. Men might assume that women who are intoxicated will be unlikely to remember the assault or report the assault. Research suggests that men are less likely to identify their behavior as rape if the victim is under

the influence of alcohol (Mouliso et al, 2012; Norris & Cubbins, 1992), thus possibly making them more inclined to continue or finish the assault, despite protests from the victim, or the inability of the victim to stop the assault due to situational circumstances.

Examining the Relationship Between Sexual Victimization and Stalking

Stalking and sexual victimization are regularly linked together. As Geitsman (2013) found, of undergraduates who reported being stalked, over 40% met their stalker in college. The current study found that among the total female sample, 43% of females had been stalked at some point in their lifetime, while 13% had been stalked during their time at this university. Predictors of stalking, among the total female sample included attractive target indicators, such as sexual history, year in school, and perceived vulnerability.

In both the overall and university-only stalking regression models sexual history was significant. Due to the sexual nature of stalking, it is unsurprising that sexual history was linked to stalking occurrence. It is likely that stalking occurred as a relationship pre-cursor, as an effort to establish a relationship, or as a relationship follow-up, possibly an attempt to rekindle a relationship that a woman has extinguished. It is also possible that stalking occurred throughout the relationship, in an effort to maintain or acquire control of a person.

Year in school was significant only among women who were stalked while attending the university of study. This finding is likely due to stalking opportunity. Juniors, seniors, and graduate students had more time on campus, visited more areas of campus, may be involved in more campus activities, and know more people on campus than freshman and sophomores, thus giving offenders increased opportunity to see them, know them, find them, or establish relationships with them. Women who are more visible on campus and surrounding areas may be viewed as a more suitable target for stalking perpetrators.

Women who displayed perceived vulnerability were more likely to have been stalked at any point during their lifetime than women who did not report vulnerable tendencies. This is likely due to the notion that women who do not act or talk in potentially vulnerable manners are not viewed as attractive targets. Women who exhibit vulnerable attributes might appear weak, easy to persuade, and less likely to report the offense, thus making them appear more suitable for stalking and victimization. It is also possible that women who have been previous victims of stalking have had their self-esteem weakened, or feel fearful of others, making them appear more vulnerable.

In the total female sample regression stalking appears to be a significant predictor of the likelihood of being sexually victimized. Those who are stalked are also more likely to be sexually victimized. Univariate analysis revealed that 69.9% of women who reported they were sexually victimized also reported they were stalked at some point in their lifetime (compared to 43.1% of the total female sample). Furthermore, 26.5% of women who were sexually victimized reported they were specifically stalked during their time at the university (compared to 13% of the total female sample).

While stalking was a robust indicator of sexual victimization among the total female sample, it did not appear to be a noteworthy variable among victims of sexual coercion or assault. It is possible that while stalking is closely linked to coercion and assault victim selection, suitable target variables are stronger once the victim selection has occurred. For example, an offender may be more likely to sexually victimize a woman that he has been stalking, but the act of either coercion or assault may depend more on other variables, such as her perceived vulnerability or level of intoxication.

Routine Activities Theory

This study looked at two main tenets of routine activities theory (suitable target and capable guardianship) in the context of sexual victimization. Although former studies have found both components significant, this study did not. This is puzzling, because as a whole routine activities theory posits that all three fundamental theory variables need to be present for crime to occur (Cohen and Felson, 1979), but this dissertation suggests that perhaps sexual crimes occur when there is a motivated offender and suitable target, regardless of the type of guardianship that is present. The current study demonstrates that junior, senior, and graduate student women whose daily routines include displaying vulnerable tendencies, consuming alcohol, and being sexually active may be at greater risk of sexual victimization than women whose routines do not include perceived vulnerability, alcohol consumption, or sexual intercourse.

Unexpectedly, in every victimization and stalking scenario at least one suitable target variable was significant, while capable guardianship was not significant in any circumstance. There are three potential explanations for these findings. First, suitable target indicators are reminiscent of individual characteristics, while capable guardianship variables are akin to situational characteristics. This suggests that prior to offending perpetrators may take into account individual behaviors and tendencies (victim intoxication, vulnerability) more than the situational attributes (victim housing location, whether the social event was planned or spontaneous). This might be especially true if the offender has high levels of male peer support or rape myth acceptance, making him more likely to believe that a woman is partially responsible if she is raped while she is intoxicated, or that coercion and rape are sexually stimulating (Aronowitz, Lambert, & Davidoff, 2012; Schwartz, DesKeredy, Tait, & Alvi, 2006). Male peer support includes having friends who have abused women, believe that if a male spends money on

a date she owes him sex, or believe it is okay to hit a woman in certain situations. (Schwartz, DesKeredy, Tait, & Alvi, 2006). Living with or socializing with men who support female abuse, coercion, assault, and rape may increase an offender's motivation, as well as encourage them to seek out suitable targets.

Alcohol use is critically linked with sexual victimization. As shown in the above findings, the majority of sexual assault victims were consuming alcohol during, or immediately prior to, their victimization. Furthermore, intoxication was significantly linked with sexual assault (but not sexual coercion). This suitable target indicator appears significant in several other sexual victimization studies (Abbey et al, 1996, Abbey et al 2001, Abbey 2002; Abbey et al, 2003; Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; Franklin et al, 2012; Schwartz, Deskeredy, Tait, & Alvi, 2006 Ullman, Karabatsos, & Koss, 1999). Because victim alcohol consumption is such a powerful variable related to victimization, and almost always emerges in significance, it is not surprising that this individual characteristic produced significance while some situational variables did not. Had the location of the victimization been included as a situational variable, it is possible that alcohol establishments, or parties with heavy drinking would have also been significant.

Another explanation as to why alcohol consumption is such a significant variable is related to the motivated offender/suitable target dynamic. Men who have male peer support for rape and female abuse may seek women who appear to be suitable targets. Schwartz and colleagues suggest that motivated offenders specifically seek out women who appear intoxicated (thus making them appear to be an easier target), and sometimes encourage women to drink more or buy them drinks to increase their levels of intoxication. Oftentimes these men are heavy drinkers themselves, as their intoxication increases the more motivated they become, while as a

woman's intoxication increases the more the offender perceives her to be a suitable target (Schwartz, Deskeredy, Tait, & Alvi, 2006).

Depending on how alcohol consumption is measured, different results may occur. For example, one study measured alcohol consumption by using "time spent partying" as a proxy (Franklin et al, 2012). This study, by Franklin and colleagues (2012) categorized the response under "exposure", which is similar to capable guardianship. This alcohol-related variable appeared significant, as did other guardianship-related variables, such as days spent on campus each week. Interestingly, year in college and living on campus were not significant as they are in the current study (Franklin et al, 2012).

Suitable target indicators (individual victim characteristics) tend to be understudied in the broad realm of sexual assault research. While situational variables are frequently looked at, victim characteristics are often neglected. As Adams-Curtis and Forbes (2004) point out, these variables are understudied out of fear of potential victim-blaming that might emerge with the results. Although identifying these unique victim characteristics can be valuable to designing programs and policies, some scholars and policy makers are hesitant to identify victim and non-victim differences (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004).

Despite worries that suitable target research might lead to victim-blaming, other research that has studied victim characteristics have found there is not a significant difference between college sexual assault victims and non-victims (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004). This study found a few significant differences between victims and non-victims, with the most pervasive differences being stalking history, sexual history, and year in school. Women who are juniors, seniors and graduate students were found to be more suitable targets, and routines that include sexual activity or being exposed to a stalker may put them at greater risk of being sexually

victimized. While certain behaviors might put a woman at greater risk of coercion or assault, the onus of change should not be on the woman to reduce her risk of sexual victimization. For example, a woman should not have to change her drinking or sexual activity patterns to limit risk; instead, the change needs to come from a societal level, infiltrating all social, legal, and financial arenas (Schwartz & Pitts, 1995).

Second, perpetrators may place more emphasis on convenience than location. While it is possible that location may add to victimization convenience, it is more likely that a vulnerable, intoxicated victim may appear to be a more “convenient” victim, regardless of where the victim and offender are located. Routine activity theory posits that given the right circumstances (a motivated offender, attractive target, and lack of guardianship) the opportunity for crime increases. Other studies have found that sexual offenders may be “opportunists,” not premeditating their crimes, but jumping on a criminal opportunity when it is convenient for them (Felson & Massoglia, 2012). Compared to criminals who commit robbery, sexual predators are less likely to report that their crime was planned (Felson & Massoglia, 2012), indicating they jumped on a criminal opportunity when the situation allowed. Regardless of where the offender and victim are when they collide in time, if the social collision is opportune for the perpetrator he may instigate the victimization.

Lastly, methodological restrictions may have limited opportunity to include other significant capable guardianship variables. Small sample sizes for coercion and assault regressions severely limited the number of variables allowed in the regression equations. Future studies with larger samples may find different results by including additional capable guardian indicators, such as location of victimization, proximity to campus, or presence of sober friends.

Overall, this test of routine activity theory found that some behaviors, particularly those related to individual characteristics, explain risk of sexual victimization. As a whole, suitable target variables appear to be far more important than capable guardianship variables. If routine activity theory worked consistently both suitable target and capable guardianship variables would have emerged in significance, as this did not happen the explanatory power of routine activity theory is limited in this study.

Help-Seeking Behaviors

Despite the frequency of sexual victimization, it continues to be extremely underreported (Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006). Of the entire sample of victimized women, sadly, only one reported her victimization to a law enforcement agency. Almost half (45.8%) of those who were victimized revealed their abuse to an informal source, mainly friends or family. Other studies have determined that formal reporting rates for sexual assault victims vary between 0% and 13% (Sabina & Ho, 2014). A large meta-analysis by Sabina and Ho (2014) found that those who chose to report to the police were women who experienced severe physical assault (particularly with a weapon). Those who were victims of coercion or sexual violence perpetuated by an intimate partner or date were less likely to discuss their victimization with law enforcement. Nationally, official reporting rates hover between 2% and 5%, with approximately 2% of college women reporting their assaults to city police, and 3% reporting to some type of campus official (campus police, school administrator, etc.) (Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003; Sabina & Ho, 2014).

When asked why women did not report their coercion and/or assault, several women claimed that they did not view what happened as rape. Other studies have revealed similar findings. In a study by Bondurant (2001) investigating a sample of women who had been raped,

only 64% of them acknowledged that what happened to them actually was rape. A culmination of several sexual assault studies found that the overwhelming reason why females do not make official reports to the police is because they did not view their victimization as “serious enough” (Sabina & Ho, 2014, p. 16).

While it is possible that some women remain in denial after a sexual assault, or use refusal to acknowledge that this horrific event happened to them as a coping mechanism, it is more likely that many women are not reporting because they feel that their victimization is not severe enough, physical enough, or rare enough to warrant a formal report. This belief that their victimization is “not a big deal” was echoed in several qualitative statements made by victims. When asked why they did not seek help victims were able to choose from a variety of options, or write in their own response. Many of the women who wrote their own response seemed to feel that their experience was not worthy of a formal report. Three women reported they did not seek help because their experience “wasn’t a big deal.” One women said she did not tell anyone about her victimization because “it was not a big enough deal to report it”, and another wrote that the situation “didn’t feel that important.” These patterns of undermining episodes of coercion or assault continued with other women reporting that it “was not a big event, I didn’t feel harmed,” and that they “did not view it as a reportable thing.”

Some scholars have suggested that this ‘not a big deal’ mentality begins not with the individual, but with the university, filtering down to those who are victimized and abused. This may especially be true among universities that receive large amounts of endowments and funding, or universities with popular sports teams (Giroux & Giroux, 2011). By treating sexual victimization as petty or unimportant, schools strive to protect their school name, and use their energy and resources to promote grandiose achievements and athletics instead of ensuring that

students are supported and protected (Giroux & Giroux, 2011). While certainly not the case with all universities, this pattern of behavior has been witnessed several times over the past decade, most notably with Penn State. While Penn State was rocked with a coach-child sex scandal, it was later revealed that during that same time over 100 female Penn State students reported they were victims of sexual indiscretions (Giroux & Giroux, 2011). By ignoring signs of sexual assault, engaging in poor or negligent reporting practices, and failing to promote a campus environment that does not tolerate victimization it is likely that few, if any, of the reporting female victims received the help they were entitled to.

Limitations

As with all studies, there are several limitations to this dissertation. The most pervasive limitation revolves around the sample size of the victims-only sample. Victims made up less than a quarter of the total female sample, and included only 83 individuals. When those victims were split into victims of coercion and assault, grouped sample sizes became even smaller. These small sample sizes limited the number of variables that could be included in each regression, as well as prevented further analysis related to differences within the victimized sample.

Despite the small sample size several valuable findings emerged. This study was intended to be a baseline study, which would include a follow-up study four years after the initial survey launch. As the second survey wave is about to be distributed the total sample size has been heightened to ensure that more victims are represented in the follow-up study. Increased victim representation will allow for a more in-depth analysis of the victimization experience.

Other limitations related to methodological conditions include coding schemes and generalizability restrictions. Due to the small sample size many variables had to be coded dichotomously. It would have been opportune to include more categories related to race, victim-

offender relationship, and campus involvement, but lack of diversity among the sample prevented that from being a possibility. Other measures, such as vulnerability, would be more appropriate presented as a scale. Individuals likely experience perceived vulnerability in degrees, and a binary indicator does not reflect that. While a vulnerability scale would have been ideal, it was not included on the initial survey; therefore, the dichotomous measure was used.

The generalizability of the findings is also limited. While this study utilized a random sample, it is uncertain if these findings would extend beyond this particular campus. Because this medium-sized university is located in a rural state in the upper-Midwest, and contains a predominately white, middle-class student body, it is possible that these findings would differ in another social-geographical area.

Lastly, limitations exist relating to the missing motivated offender variable. The motivated offender variable poses several methodological conundrums for a researcher. While a motivated offender is a vital component to routine activity theory, it is also difficult to study in conjunction with capable guardianship and target suitability. Including offender motivation in a routine activity theory study requires the researcher to make decisions based on allowing the victim to provide assumptions about their offender's motivation, or create an intricate research design that provides feedback from both the victim and the offender. Suggestions for future research consist of including a qualitative component to the sexual assault survey, seeking interviews from men who confess to or are convicted of sexual victimization.

Future Research

There are several directions that need to be investigated in regard to future research. First, while this study focuses solely on women, male perpetration patterns should also be considered. A recent study investigating college males found that 23% of the sample (N=795) reported that

they had attempted or completed rape during their time at college (Zinzow & Thompson, 2015). This astronomical number reflects a need to not only look at victims, but also sexual offenders. While the author attempted to look at male perpetrators for the current study the endeavor was fruitless because so few males admitted to sexual offenses. Data from a robust sample of male offenders in conjunction with female victims will allow future findings that paint a more comprehensive picture of the sexual victimization paradigm.

Vulnerability remains a largely understudied variable (Green, 2007; Walklate, 2011). Future studies should include a greater focus on victim vulnerability, as well as the inclusion of resilience measures. As one scholar points out, the presence of vulnerability does not mean a lack of resilience (Walklate, 2011). A woman may be perceived as vulnerable while still being able to ward off criminal encounters. Using multi-dimensional vulnerability measures that incorporate questions related to both risk and harm will provide a broader view of the role of vulnerability in sexual victimization (Green, 2007).

While situational variables related to capable guardianship did not appear significant in this study, it is likely that the inclusion of time of day and day of week variables could alter the findings. Future studies should incorporate questions related to what hours the victimization took place, what day of the week it took place, and then determine if assaults are more likely during certain celebratory periods, such as following homecoming, championship football games or spring break. Furthermore, other factors such as number of days spent on campus, and amount of days per week spent partying (drinking, going to the bar, etc.) have been found to be significant guardianship and target variables related to sexual assault victimization that should be included in forthcoming research (Franklin, Franklin, Nobles, & Kercher, 2012). It is known that the majority of sexual assaults take place on weekend in the late night and early morning (Fisher et

al, 2000), but pin-pointing problem days, times, and locations can assist law enforcement and campus officials in creating policies to better protect women during these high risk periods.

In general, colleges amass a population of males with limited criminal backgrounds, and yet sexual victimization appears higher on college campuses than in the general population (Aronowitz, Lambert, & Davidoff, 2012; White & Smith, 2004). Additional research is necessary to determine who sexual assault perpetrators are, and what motivates college males to commit crimes of a sexual nature. Future study is needed regarding male rape myth acceptance, sexual norms among college students, and college rape cultures.

A substantial number of females in this study reported they have been victims of stalking either during their time at college, or at some point in their lifetime. While it is known that they were stalked, future research should be conducted placing an emphasis on the type of stalking that occurred. It is possible that several students were stalked via the internet or a handheld mobile device as opposed to being stalked in person. These differences might contribute to the level of fear the victim felt at the time of the stalking. While women might be more fearful of in-person stalking, cyber stalking is becoming increasingly pervasive. One study found that 40% of college students have been cyber-stalked at some point (Reyns, Henson, & Fisher, 2012). Type of stalking would also be pertinent to determine if certain stalking behaviors are more likely to contribute to sexual victimization. For example, it is possible that women who are stalked in person may be a more suitable assault target than women who are stalked electronically.

Due to restrictions on survey length and time allotted for survey completion “incident report” questions were not asked for the stalking questions; therefore, the survey left unanswered queries related to where the stalking took place, who did the stalking, and whether or not the victim sought help after or during the stalking episodes. Future research should be conducted to

further investigate stalking incidents on campus, as well as what resources are available for those who have been stalked.

Policy Implications

Across the nation campuses have taken measures to make their colleges safer and improve reporting mechanisms. Currently, campuses generally engage in an either/or sexual assault prevention approach. They either aim at reducing perpetration among males, or, they aim at giving females skills and tools to defend themselves against an attacker. Male and female combined prevention programs are inherently lacking. Both male and female prevention styles have been met with mixed, but not overwhelmingly successful, results (Joseph, Gray, & Mayer, 2013; Vladutiu, Martin, & Macey, 2011).

Other programs designed to specifically address problem areas within sexual victimization have seen successful, but do not provide comprehensive education and training regarding all the possible ways a woman can be sexually coerced, assaulted, and abused. For example, Rozee and Koss' Assess, Acknowledge, and Act program was designed to help women resist sexual assault (Senn, 2012). While it has proven successful in assisting women with identifying their risk of being a rape victim, and increasing their perceived ability to successfully defend themselves against an attack, it is unknown if these findings extend beyond acquaintance rape scenarios, or if the newfound skills will be retained after a long period of time (Senn, 2012).

Other non-comprehensive programs focus on alcohol training and education. Because drinking, (particularly binge drinking), is a high-risk behavior commonly associated with sexual assault, programs have been designed with a specific concentration on alcohol safety. While some of these programs have proven to educate students about the consequences of drinking, some have neglected to change drinking patterns (Wolfson et al, 2012).

Many programs, although designed with good intentions and best-practices in mind, fall short due to being too specific, failing to include other community agencies, or neglecting to include the appropriate student population (Banyard, 2014). These limitations leave many programs vulnerable to failure, as well as threaten to waste university resources on programs that have no significant or lasting effect on students. Focused efforts should be made across campuses to ensure that prevention policies and programs utilize experts, such as Title IX coordinators, and those policies and programs evolve as student needs change (Bennett, 2015). At this time, there is a need for a comprehensive, long-term sexual assault prevention program at many universities (Banyard, 2014).

While time, money, and other resources might prevent universities from adopting and implementing successful programs, there may be the possibility of applying prevention tactics in specific areas directly surrounding the university, such as local clubs, bars, and restaurants that college students frequent. The current study was executed on a college campus that has the unique arrangement of having several alcohol establishments directly across the street from the university. In some areas of the college students can look out their classroom window and see a local bar or food institution that offers alcoholic beverages. A popular student coffee shop, also directly across the street from campus, sells beer in addition to caffeinated beverages. With these bars, restaurants, and coffee shops conveniently close to campus, it is not uncommon for students to attend class in the morning, walk across the street to eat lunch and have a beer, and return for their afternoon class. This close proximity also makes the bars directly off campus a popular location for students to frequent at nights and on weekends.

Although bystander intervention programs aimed at teaching students to help other students who might be in distress have been met with mixed results (Banyard et al., 2007;

Banyard et al, 2009; Burn, 2009), to date there is no research related to bar-employee intervention training. Bar-tenders, waitresses, and other bar employees are in the exclusive position of seeing bar-room behaviors from a sober, birds-eye perspective. They often witness coercion, watch women reluctantly leave the bar with men, and witness behaviors that may potentially lead to sexual victimization. Because the first step to intervention is to “notice the event” (Burn, 2009), bartenders might be the first person to realize what is happening. These unsafe behaviors might be reduced if bar-employees receive training, teaching them legal definitions of sexual coercion and assault, educating them on how to assess possible dangerous situations, and providing them with options for how to help a victim, should they witness a potential coercive act or assault. These help-measures would include calling authorities, or requesting an offender to exit the bar.

Creative prevention programs that not only employ campus associates, but also utilize local community members can lead to a comprehensive message that not only does the college not tolerate inappropriate sexual behaviors, but the community also supports university policies. Local and campus agencies working together can assist with providing increased capable guardianship, and better protection for targets.

Despite measures taken by campus officials it is obvious that university administrators have a long way to go before women feel safe, comfortable, and prepared to report their victimization. Researchers have suggested several areas that need to be implemented or improved to ensure that sexual victimization reporting is handled quickly, properly, and quietly. Among the suggestions for improvement is the need to make reporting available and easy, not only for the mainstream college female but also for diverse demographics. Reporting processes may be designed for white, heterosexual females, making reporting difficult or uncomfortable for

non-English speaking students, males, or those who identify with the LGBTQ community (Sabino & Ho, 2014). Furthermore, college freshman, immediately out of high school may not be aware of the reporting services or counseling that may be offered on the campus. These services need to be visible and advertised so students know they exist, and can easily access their location or contact information. These services should also emphasize that they are concerned about what happened to the victim, not whether or not the victim was intoxicated or under the influence of drugs at the time. Providing victims with immunity from university sanctions for underage drinking or illicit drug use will encourage women who are scared to report their victimization out of fear of being in trouble to seek help.

Service visibility can be achieved in a variety of ways, including signs and pamphlets located in areas frequented by students (campus gym, dormitories, dining centers, etc.), campus e-mails, tours during freshman orientation, and the campus website. Sexual assault prevention information, as well as opportunities to report sexual assault should be available on the campus website. A study of university websites in Ohio during the 2010-2011 academic year found that many universities still have non-existent or inadequate sexual assault policies available on the Web. Of the 105 colleges included in the study, only 66% had information related to campus sexual victimization policies available online, and only 1% provided state or university definitions regarding exactly what constituted a sexual offense (Krivoshey, Adkins, Hayes, Nemeth, & Klein, 2013). While Ohio may not be reflective of all colleges and universities across the United States, schools that do not already have a sexual assault reporting option available through their campus website should remedy that immediately. Living in an internet-fueled age leaves many college students turning to the Web for assistance, support, and answers. Having an accessible and user-friendly website can allow victims to report their experience,

browse various help options, and locate resources for campus counselors, law enforcement and medical services, all within the comfort of their home.

By providing well-advertised contact information for campus help-centers, not only will the victim know about available resources, but those that the victim informally confide in can also help direct them to a campus help source. These confidants (particularly female friends) can play a large part in determining the future help-seeking actions the victim takes (Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012). One study found that women who informally disclose their victimization were likely to do it within two days of their abuse (Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012). Friends, family members, resident assistants, and other informal sources that are knowledgeable about these campus resources can encourage the victim to seek formal help instantaneously. An active respondent who listens to the victim, believes the victim, and suggests help-resources for the victim can make a large difference in the reporting and healing process.

Final Thoughts

Steps need to be taken to help women understand that any form of sexual victimization, from mild coercion to rape, is a “big deal.” As Orchowski and Gidycz said, “Understanding the factors that facilitate survivors’ ability to ‘break the silence’ regarding experiences of violence plays a key role in dismantling the relational, institutional, and societal factors that silence or shame survivors of sexual victimization” (Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012, p. 277). Rape myths, and systems that contribute to rape myths (media, certain fraternities, possible campus organizations) need to be uncovered and corrected (Joseph et al, 2013). This can possibly be achieved by creating educational programs related to legal and safe alcohol consumption, bystander awareness, and legal ramifications for sexual offenders.

Women who are left feeling like the pain, embarrassment, and fear that their sexual victimization created is “not a big deal” are likely to avoid seeking formal help, and experience stress, guilt, and other negative emotions. Changes to campus policies should happen systemically, beginning at the upper tiers of campus, passing down through student organizations, clubs, sports, and programs, and extending to every student until everyone on the campus is privy to the consistent message that sexual victimization is a big deal, it will not be tolerated, and comprehensive help programs are in place for those who have been victimized.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., McDuffie, D., & McAuslan, P. (1996). Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*(1), 147-169.
- Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., Clinton, A.M., & Buck, P.O. (2001). Attitudinal, experiential, and situational predictors of sexual assault perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(8), 784-807.
- Abbey, A., Zawacki, T., Buck, P.O., Clinton, A.M., & McAuslan, P. (2001) Alcohol and sexual assault. *Alcohol Research and Health, 25*(1), 43-51.
- Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 14*, 118-128.
- Abbey, A., Clinton-Sherrod, A.M., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P.O. (2003). The relationship between the quantity of alcohol consumed and the severity of sexual assaults committed by college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*(7), 813-833.
- Adams-Curtis, L.E, & Forbes, G.B. (2004). College women's experiences of sexual coercion: A review of cultural, perpetrator, victim, and situational variables. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 5*(2), 91-122.
- Aronowitz, T., Lambert, C.A., & Davidoff, S. (2012). The role of rape myth acceptance in the social norms regarding sexual behavior among college students. *Journal of Community Health Nursing, 29*, 173-182.
- Babbie, E. (2005). *The Basics of Social Research* (3rd ed.). Peking University Press.

- Banyard, V.L. (2014). Improving college campus-based prevention of violence against women: A strategic plan for research built on multipronged practices and policies. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15*(4), 339-351.
- Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M., & Crossman, M.T. (2009). Reducing sexual violence on campus: The role of student leaders as empowered bystanders. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(4), 446-457.
- Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M., & Plante, E.G. (2007). Sexual assault prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(4), 463-481.
- Belknap, J. (1987). Routine activity theory and the risk of rape: Analyzing ten years of national crime survey data. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Public Relations, 2*(4), 337-356.
- Bennett, L. (2015). Compliance: Review best practices, practical strategies for sexual assault prevention, response. *Campus Legal Advisor, 15*(6), 1-5.
- Bondurant, B. (2001). University women's acknowledgement of rape: Individual, situational, and social factors. *Violence Against Women, 7*(3), 294-314.
- Boswell, A.A., & Spade, J.Z. (1996). Fraternities and collegiate rape culture: Why are some fraternities more dangerous places for women? *Gender and Society, 10*(2), 133-147.
- Brener, N.D., McMahon, P.M., Warren, C.W., & Douglas, K.A. (1999). Forced sexual intercourse and associated health-risk behaviors among female college students in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67*(2), 252-259.
- Brubaker, S.J. (2009). Sexual assault prevalence, reporting and policies: Comparing college and university campuses and military service academies. *Security Journal, 22*(1), 56-72.

- Burn, S.M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779-792.
- Cantalupo, N. C. (2011). Burying Our Heads in the Sand: Lack of Knowledge, Knowledge Avoidance, and the Persistent Problem of Campus Peer Sexual Violence. *Loy. U. Chi. LJ, 43*, 205.
- Chekwa, C., Thomas, E., & Jones, V.J. (2013). What are college students' perceptions about campus safety? *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 6*(3), 325-333.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American sociological review, 588-608*.
- Corbin, W.R., Bernat, J.A., Calhoun, K.S., McNair, L.D., & Seals, K.L. (2001). The role of alcohol expectancies and alcohol consumption among sexually victimized and nonvicitimized college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 297-311.
- Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(4), 349-354.
- Cullen, F.T., & Agnew, R. (2003). *Criminological Theory: Past to Present (Essential Readings)* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (2011). Feminist contributions to understanding woman abuse: Myths, controversies, and realities. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16*(4), 297-302.
- Deslauriers-Varin, N., & Beaugard, E. (2010). Victims' routine activities and sex offenders' target selection scripts: A latent class analysis. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 22*(3), 315-342.
- Dickson, N., Paul, C., Herbison, P., & Silva, P. (1998). First sexual intercourse: age, coercion, and later regrets reported by a birth cohort. *BMJ, 316*(7124), 29-33.

- Edwards, K.M., Kearns, M.C., Gidycz, C.A., & Calhoun, K.S. (2012). Predictors of victim-perpetrator relationship stability following a sexual assault: A brief report. *Violence and Victims, 27*(1), 25-33.
- Edwards, K.M., Turchik, J.A., Dardis, C., Reynolds, N., & Gidycz, C.A. (2011). Rape Myths: History, individual and institutional-level presence, and implications for change. *Sex Roles, 65*(11-12), 761-773. doi: 10.1007/s11199-011-9943-2.
- EhSohly, M.A., & Salamone, S.J. (1999). Prevalence of drugs used in cases of alleged sexual assault. *Journal of Analytical Toxicology, 23*, 141-146.
- Felson, M., & Cohen, L. E. (1980). Human ecology and crime: A routine activity approach. *Human Ecology, 8*(4), 389-406.
- Felson, R.B., & Massoglia, M. (2012). When is violence planned? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(4), 753-774.
- Finn, J. (2004). A survey of online harassment at a university campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(4), 468-483.
- Finney, A. (2006). *Domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking: findings from the 2004/05 British Crime Survey*. London: Home Office.
- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2003). Reporting Sexual Victimization To The Police And Others Results From a National-Level Study of College Women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(1), 6-38.
- Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J. J., Cullen, F. T., & Lu, C. (1998). Crime in the Ivory Tower: The level and sources of victimization. *Criminology, 36*(3), 671-710.
- Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., & Turner, M.G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*. National Institute of Justice, Research Report.

- Fisher, B.S., & Sloan, J.J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the “shadow of sexual assault hypothesis” supported? *Justice Quarterly*, 20, 633-659. Doi:10.1080/07418820300095641.
- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., & Cullen, F. T. (2010). *Unsafe in the ivory tower: The sexual victimization of college women*. Sage.
- Forbes, G.B., & Adams-Curtis, L.E. (2001). Experiences with sexual coercion in college males and females: Role of family conflict, sexist attitudes, acceptance of rape myths, self-esteem, and the big-five personality factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(9), 865-889.
- Franklin, C. A. (2011). An investigation of the relationship between self-control and alcohol-induced sexual assault victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(3), 263-285.
- Franklin, C. A., Bouffard, L. A., & Pratt, T. C. (2012). Sexual Assault on the College Campus: Fraternity Affiliation, Male Peer Support, and Low Self-Control. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(11), 1457-1480.
- Franklin, C.A., Franklin, T.W., Nobles, M.R., & Kercher, G.A. (2012). Assessing the effect of routine activity theory and self-control on property, personal, and sexual assault victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(10), 1296-1315.
- Fremouw, W. J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking on campus: the prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 42(4), 666-669.
- Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology*, 16(2), 161.

- Geistman, J., Smith, B., Lambert, E.G., & Cluse-Tolar, T. (2013). What to do about stalking: A preliminary study of how stalking victims responded to stalking and their perceptions of the effectiveness of these actions. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 26(1), 43-66.
- Giroux, H.A. & Giroux, S.S. (2011). Universities gone wild: Big money, big sports, and scandalous abuse at Penn State. *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies*, 1-7.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford: CA: Stanford University Press.
- Green, S. (2007) 'Crime, Victimization and Vulnerability', in S. Walklate (ed.) *Handbook of Victims and Victimology*, pp. 91–118. Cullompton, Devon: Willan.
- Greenfeld, L. A. (1997). *Sex offenses and offenders: An analysis of data on rape and sexual assault* (pp. i-39). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Henson, B., Reyns, B.W., & Fisher, B.S. (2013). Fear of crime online? Examining the effect of risk, previous victimization, and exposure on fear of online interpersonal victimization. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 29(4), 45-497.
- Humphrey, J. A., & White, J. W. (2000). Women's vulnerability to sexual assault from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 27(6), 419-424.
- Jordan, C. E., Wilcox, P., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). Stalking acknowledgement and reporting among college women experiencing intrusive behaviors: Implications for the emergence of a "classic stalking case". *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(5), 556-569.
- Joseph, J.S., Gray, M.J., & Mayer, J. (2013). Addressing sexual assault within social systems: System justification as a barrier to college prevention efforts. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma*, 22, 493-509.

- Karjane, H.M., Fisher, B.S., & Cullen, F.T. (2005). *Sexual Assault on Campus: What Colleges and Universities are doing About it*. National Institute of Justice: Research for Practice.
- Kirkpatrick, C., & Kanin, E. (1957). Male sex aggression on a university campus. *American Sociological Review*, 52-58.
- Koss, M.P., & Oros, C.J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 50(3), 455-457.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 55(2), 162.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1989). Discriminant analysis of risk factors for sexual victimization among a national sample of college women. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 57(2), 242.
- Krivoshey, M.S., Adkins, R., Hayes, R., Nemeth, J.M., & Klein, E.G. (2013). Sexual assault reporting procedures at Ohio colleges. *Journal of American College Health*, 61(3), 142-147.
- Lottes, I.L., & Weinberg, M.S. (1996). Sexual coercion among university students: A comparison of the United States and Sweden. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 34(1), 67-76.
- Mouilso, E. R., & Fischer, S., & Calhoun, K.S. (2012). A prospective study of sexual assault and alcohol use among first-year college women. *Violence and victims*, 27(1), 78-94.
- Norris, J., & Cubbins, L. A. (1992). Dating, drinking, and rape: Effects of victim's and assailant's alcohol consumption on judgments of their behavior and traits. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16, 179-191.

- Ogletree, R.J. (1993). Sexual coercion experience and help-seeking behavior of college women. *Journal of American College Health, 41*, 149-153.
- O'Neil, M., & Morgan, P. (2010). *American Perceptions of Sexual Violence: A Frame Works research report*. Washington, D.C.: FrameWorks Institute.
- Orchowski, L.M., & Gidycz, C.A. (2012). To whom do college women confide following sexual assault? A prospective study of predictors of sexual assault disclosure and reactions. *Violence Against Women, 18*(3), 264-288.
- Patton, W., & Mannison, M. (1995). Sexual coercion in dating situations among university students: Preliminary Australian data. *Australian Journal of Psychology 47*(2), 66-72.
- Paul, L. A., & Gray, M. J. (2011). Sexual assault programming on college campuses: Using social psychological belief and behavior change principles to improve outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 12*(2), 99-109.
- Paul, E. L., & Hayes, K. A. (2002). The casualties of casual sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students' hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 19*(5), 639-661.
- Reyns, B.W., Henson, B., & Fisher, B.S. (2012). Stalking in the twilight zone: Extent of Cyberstalking victimization among college students. *Deviant Behavior, 33*, 1-25.
- Ryan, K. M. (2011). The relationship between rape myths and sexual scripts: The social construction of rape. *Sex roles, 65*(11-12), 774-782.
- Sabina, C., & Ho, L.Y. (2014). Campus and college victim responses to sexual assault and dating violence: Disclosure, service utilization, and service provision. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 1-26*.

- Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health, 55*(3), 157-162.
- Schwartz, M.D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support*. M. D. Schwartz (Ed.). Sage.
- Schwartz, M.D., DeKeseredy, W.S., Tait, D., & Alvi, S. (2001). Male peer support and feminist routine activities theory: Understanding sexual assault on the college campus. *Justice Quarterly, 18*(3), 623-649.
- Schwartz, M. D., & Pitts, V. L. (1995). Exploring a feminist routine activities approach to explaining sexual assault. *Justice Quarterly, 12*(1), 9-31.
- Senn, C.Y. (2013). Education on resistance to acquaintance sexual assault: Preliminary promise of new program for young women in high school and university. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 45*(1), 24-33.
- Spitzberg, B.H., & Rhea, J. (1999). Obsessive relational intrusion and sexual coercion victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence 14*(1), 3-20.
- Steele, C.M., & Josephs, R.A. (1990). Alcohol myopia: Its prized and dangerous effects. *American Psychology, 45*, 921-933.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). Institution Department of Justice, Washington, DC. National Inst. of Justice.; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey: Research Report*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice

- Tomsich, E.A., Schaible, L.M., Rennison, C.M., & Gover, A.R. (2013). Violent victimization and hooking up among strangers and acquaintances on an urban campus: An exploratory study. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 26(4), 433-454.
- Tunnell, K.D. (2006). *Living Off Crime* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MA: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Ullman, S.E., Karabatsos, G., & Koss, M.P. (1999). Alcohol and sexual assault in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(6), 603-625.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2004). *Alcohol Alert*.
- Vicary, J. R., & Karshin, C. M. (2002). College alcohol abuse: A review of the problems, issues, and prevention approaches. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 22(3), 299-331.
- Vladutiu, C. J., Martin, S. L., & Macy, R. J. (2011). College- or university-based sexual assault prevention programs: A review of program outcomes, characteristics, and recommendations. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 12(2), 67-86.
- Walklate, S. (2011). Reframing criminal victimization: Finding a place for vulnerability and resilience. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(2), 179-194.
- Ward, S.K., Chapman, K., Cohn, E., White, S., & Williams, K. (1991). Acquaintance rape and the college social scene. *Family Relations*, 40, 65-71.
- Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Nelson, T. F., & Kuo, M. (2002). Underage college students' drinking behavior, access to alcohol, and the influence of deterrence policies: Findings from the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health*, 50(5), 223-236.

White, J. W., & Smith, P. H. (2004). A longitudinal perspective on physical and sexual intimate partner violence against women. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, NCJ 199708.

Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). A multidimensional examination of campus safety victimization, perceptions of danger, worry about crime, and precautionary behavior among college women in the Post-Clery Era. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53(2), 219-254.

Zinzow, H.M., & Thompson, M. (2015). Factors associated with use of verbally coercive, incapacitated, and forcible sexual assault tactics in a longitudinal study of college men. *Aggressive Behavior*, 41, 34-43.

APPENDIX. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Information about you: Please place a check in the appropriate box.

1. Are you male or female?

1 Male 2 Female

2. How old are you? _____ years

3. What is your race/ethnicity?

1 White, non-Hispanic 2 Hispanic 3 African American
4 Native American/Alaskan Native 5 Asian-American, Pacific
Islander/Native Hawaiian
6 Asian 7 African
7 Other: specify _____

4. What year are you in school?

1 Freshman 2 Sophomore 3 Junior 4 Senior
5 Graduate student – Master’s 6 Graduate student -- Doctorate
7 Other – please explain _____

5. How long have you been attending NDSU? _____ years _____ months

6. What is your major or field of study (if a double major, please put your primary major)?

7. Are you currently living on or off campus?

1 On campus 2 Off campus

7a. Are you currently living in a sorority house or fraternity house?

1 Yes 2 No

8. Which of the following are you currently involved in? (Check all that apply)

1 Fraternity/sorority 2 Honor society 3 Intramural athletics 4 Student gov.
5 University athletics 6 Other student organization: _____

9. **Listed below are a number of statements concerning your personal attitudes and traits. Please read each item and decide whether the statement is *true* or *false* as it pertains to you personally. (Check one for each row)**

	True	False
a. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. On a few occasions, I have given up something because I thought too little of my ability.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
f. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
h. I'm always willing to admit when I've made a mistake.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
i. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
j. When I don't know something, I don't at all mind admitting it.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
k. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
l. I have never been irked when people express ideas very different from my own.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
m. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
n. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
o. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

10. Please read the following questions regarding unwanted behavior directed toward you and select the responses that best fit your experiences? (Check one for each row)

Not including parents, bill collectors, telephone solicitors or other sales people, has anyone, male or female ever...	Yes, prior to attending NDSU	Yes, at NDSU	Yes, both prior to and at NDSU	No
a. Followed or spied on you?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Send unsolicited letters or written correspondence?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Made unsolicited phone calls to you?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Stood outside your home, school, or workplace?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. Showed up at places you were even though he or she had no business being there?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
f. Left unwanted things for you to find?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
g. Tried to communicate in other ways against your will?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
h. Vandalized your property or destroyed something you loved?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
i. Sent you unwanted text messages checking on you multiple times a day?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

11. Listed below are a number of statements concerning sexual experiences you might have had. Please read each item and answer according to your experiences.

11a. Have you ever had consensual sexual intercourse?

1 Yes 2 No

11b. If yes, how old were you when you first had sexual intercourse? _____ years

11c. Were you in a committed relationship with that person?

1 Yes 2 No

11d. Are you currently in a sexual relationship?

1 Yes 2 No

12. These next questions deal with potentially unwanted sexual behaviors that do not involve physical injury.

Since you started attending NDSU, have you ever had...

	Yes	No
a. Someone make sexist remarks in front of you?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cat calls, whistles about your looks, or noises with sexual overtones?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Obscene telephone calls or messages?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Been asked questions about sex or romantic life when it's clearly none of their business?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. Heard false rumors about your sex life or others' sex lives?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
f. Someone expose you to pornographic pictures or materials when you did not agree to see them?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
g. Someone expose their sexual organs to you when you did not agree to see them?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
h. Anyone, without your consent, observe or try to observe you while you were undressing, nude, or in a sexual act?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
i. Anyone, without your consent, photograph, videotape, or audiotape you having sex or in a nude or seminude state?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
j. Anyone, without your consent, show other people or play for other people photographs, videotapes, or audiotapes of you having sex or in a nude or seminude state?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

The following questions are only for women. Men: please skip to question 25 on page 9.

Women may experience a wide range of unwanted sexual experiences in college. Women do not always report unwanted sexual advances to the police or discuss them with family and friends. The person making the advances is not always a stranger, but can be a friend, boyfriend, fellow student, professor, teaching assistant, supervisor coworker, someone you meet off campus, or even a family member. The experience could occur anywhere: on or off campus, in your residence, in your place of employment, or in a public place. You could be awake, or you could be asleep, unconscious, drunk, or otherwise incapacitated. Please keep this in mind as you answer the questions.

The following questions are about different types of unwanted sexual experiences you may have experienced since you started attending NDSU. Because of the nature of unwanted sexual experiences, the language may seem graphic to you. However, this is the only way to assess accurately the people in this study have had such experiences.

Please refer to these definitions for the following questions. By **sexual intercourse**, we mean penetration of a woman’s vagina, no matter how slight, by a man’s penis. Ejaculation is not required. By **oral sex**, we mean the someone's mouth or tongue making contact with your vagina or anus, or your mouth or tongue making contact with someone else's genitals or anus. By **anal sex**, we mean putting a penis in your anus or rectum.

13. Please read the following questions and select the responses that best fit your experiences?
(Check one for each row)

Since you started attending NDSU, have you ever...	Yes	No
a. Had a man misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, petting) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Had anyone make or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by making promises of rewards, such as raising a grade, being hired or promoted, being given a ride or class notes, or getting help with coursework from a fellow student if you complied sexually?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Been in a situation where a man tried to get sexual intercourse with you when you didn't want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate, but for various reasons sexual	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

intercourse did not occur?

e.	Given in to intercourse when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

f.	Had intercourse because a man was so sexually aroused that you felt it was useless to stop him even though you did not want to have sexual intercourse?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

g.	Had sexual intercourse with a man even though you really didn't want to because he threatened to end your relationship otherwise?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

h.	Had sexual intercourse when you were unable to give your consent, because you were drunk or taking drugs at the time, or because you are a heavy sleeper, or because you were unconscious for any reason?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

i.	Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't want to because he <i>threatened</i> to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

j.	Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't want to because he <i>used</i> some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	--	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

k.	Engaged in sex acts (anal or oral sex) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used physical force?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

l.	Had <i>anyone</i> use force or threat of harm to sexually penetrate you with a foreign object? By this, we mean for example, placing a bottle or finger in your vagina or anus.	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

m.	Been raped?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>
----	-------------	---	--------------------------	---	--------------------------

If you answered “yes” to any of the above questions 13a through 13m, (even if you answered “yes” only once), please continue with the following questions. If, however, you answered “no” to all of the above questions (13a through 13m), please turn in your survey at the front of the room, and thank you for your help.

14. For the assault experience you remember the most, how well did you know the person at the time?

- Not at all Slightly Moderately well
 Very well Extremely well

15. What was your relationship to this person? (select the response that best fits with your experience)

- Family member Husband/Wife Former
Husband/Wife
 Boyfriend/girlfriend (living together) Boyfriend/girlfriend (not living together)
 Former boyfriend/girlfriend Date Friend
 Acquaintance Co-worker
 Employer Teacher Therapist
 Clergy Stranger Other: please
explain _____

16. Did this experience happen on campus?

- Yes No

17. Did it happen in a fraternity or sorority house?

- Yes No

18. How long had you been at NDSU when this occurred?

- Less than one semester After one semester, but during first year here
 Second year Third year Fourth year
 Fifth year after 5th year

19. Did the assault happen at a planned social event?

- Yes No

20. How would you describe the planned social event (e.g., party, date) surrounding this experience?

- Party Group date Individual date
 Spontaneous date (met at a bar, friend's house, dorm room, etc.) Other _____

21. Was this person using any intoxicants (alcohol, drugs) on this occasion?

- ₁ Alcohol ₂ Drugs ₃ Both
₄ None ₅ Don't know/not sure

22. Were you using any intoxicants (alcohol, drugs) on this occasion?

- ₁ Alcohol ₂ Drugs ₃ Both
₄ None ₅ Don't know/not sure

23. Did you report this experience to any agency or anyone affiliated with an agency?

- ₁ Yes ₂ No

23a. If you answered "yes," to whom did you report this experience? (Check all that apply)

- ₁ NDSU Police ₂ Fargo Police ₃ Moorhead Police
₄ NDSU Office of Student Life ₅ Hospital ₆ Other police agency

23b. If you answered "no," why didn't you report this experience? (Check all that apply)

- ₁ Felt ashamed ₂ Did not want to go through court process
₃ Did not think anyone would believe me ₄ Wanted to keep it private
₅ thought the offenders' friends might harass/punish me
₆ Did not think offender would be held accountable ₇ Did not know how to report
₈ Didn't identify it as rape ₉ Didn't want my parents to find out
₁₀ Didn't want offender to get into trouble ₁₁ Thought I might get into trouble
₁₂ Discouraged from reporting criminal offense ₁₃ Other: Please explain _____

24. Other than a report listed above, did you tell anyone about this experience?

Yes

No

24a. If you answered "yes," whom did you tell? (Check all that apply)

Friend

Family member

Medical worker

Resident Assistant

Faculty or staff member on campus

Counselor/therapist

Local rape crisis center

Other _____

Women: Thank you for your help. Please return survey to the box at the front of the room.

The following questions are for **men only**.

The following questions are about different types of sexual experiences you may have experienced since you started attending NDSU. Because of the nature of sexual experiences, the language may seem graphic to you. However, this is the only way to assess accurately the people in this study have had such experiences.

Please refer to these definitions for the following questions. By **sexual intercourse**, we mean penetration of a woman's vagina, no matter how slight, by a man's penis. Ejaculation is not required. By **oral sex**, we mean the someone's mouth or tongue making contact with your penis or anus, or your mouth or tongue making contact with someone else's genitals or anus. By **anal sex**, we mean putting a penis in your anus or rectum.

25. **Please read the following questions and select the responses that best fit your experiences?**
(Check *one for each row*)

Since you started attending NDSU, have you ever...	Yes	No
a. Been in a situation where someone obtained sexual acts with you such as anal or oral intercourse when you didn't want to by using threats or physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Had anyone use force or threat of harm to sexually penetrate you with a foreign object? By this, we mean for example, placing a bottle or finger in your anus.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Had anyone make or tried to make you have sexual intercourse or sexual contact when you did not want to by making promises of rewards, such as raising a grade, being hired or promoted, being given a ride or class notes, or getting help with coursework from a fellow student if you complied sexually?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Been in a situation where someone tried to have sexual intercourse with you when you didn't want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. Had sexual intercourse when you were unable to give your consent, because you were drunk or taking drugs at the time, or because you are a heavy sleeper, or because you were unconscious for any reason?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

- f. Had sexual intercourse with someone even though you didn't really want to because that person threatened to end your relationship otherwise? 1 2
-
- g. Been raped? 1 2

If you answered “yes” to any of the above questions 25a through 25g (even if you answered “yes” only once), please continue with the following questions. If you answered “no” to all of the above questions (25a through 25g), please skip to question 37 on p. 12 of the survey.

26. For the assault experience you remember the most, how well did you know the person at the time?

- 1 Not at all 2 Slightly 3 Moderately well
 4 Very well 5 Extremely well

27. What was your relationship to this person? (select the response that best fits with your experience)

- 1 Family member 2 Husband/Wife 3 Former Husband/Wife
 4 Boyfriend/girlfriend (living together) 5 Boyfriend/girlfriend (not living together)
 6 Former boyfriend/girlfriend 7 Date 8 Friend
 9 Acquaintance 10 Co-worker
 11 Employer 12 Teacher 13 Therapist
 14 Clergy 15 Stranger 15 Other _____

28. Did this experience happen on campus?

- 1 Yes 2 No

29. Did it happen in a fraternity or sorority house?

- 1 Yes 2 No

30. How long had you been at NDSU when this occurred?

- 1 Less than one semester 2 After one semester, but during first year here
 3 Second year 4 Third year 5 Fourth year
 6 Fifth year 7 after 5th year

31. Did the assault happen at a planned social event?

- ₁ Yes ₂ No

32. How would you describe the planned social event (e.g., party, date) surrounding this experience?

- ₁ Party ₂ Group date ₃ Individual date
₄ Spontaneous date (met at a bar, friend's house, dorm room, etc.)₅ Other _____

33. Was this person using any intoxicants (alcohol, drugs) on this occasion?

- ₁ Alcohol ₂ Drugs ₃ Both
₄ None ₅ Don't know/not sure

34. Were you using any intoxicants (alcohol, drugs) on this occasion?

- ₁ Alcohol ₂ Drugs ₃ Both
₄ None ₅ Don't know/not sure

35. Did you report this experience to any agency or anyone affiliated with an agency?

- ₁ Yes ₂ No

35a. If you answered "yes," to whom did you report this experience? (Check all that apply)

- ₁ NDSU Police ₂ Fargo Police ₃ Moorhead Police
₄ NDSU Office of Student Life ₅ Hospital ₆ Other police agency

35b. If you answered "no," why didn't you report this experience? (Check all that apply)

- ₁ Felt ashamed ₂ Did not want to go through court process
₃ Did not think anyone would believe me ₄ Wanted to keep it private
₅ thought the offenders' friends might harass/punish me
₆ Did not think offender would be held accountable
₇ Did not know how to report

- 8 Didn't identify it as rape 9 Didn't want my parents to find out
10 Didn't want offender to get into trouble 11 Thought I might get into trouble
12 Discouraged from reporting criminal offense 13 Other _____

36. Other than the report listed above, did you tell anyone about this experience?

- 1 Yes 2 No

36a. If you answered "yes," whom did you tell? (Check all that apply)

- 1 Friend 2 Family member 3 Medical worker
4 Resident Assistant 5 Faculty or staff member on campus
6 Counselor/therapist 7 Local rape crisis center 8 Other _____

Since you started attending NDSU, have you ever...		Yes	No
a.	Been in a situation where you used some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) to try to make a woman engage in kissing or petting when she didn't want to?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by overwhelming her with continual arguments and pressure?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) with a woman when she didn't want to by using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Attempted sexual intercourse with a woman (got on top of her, attempted to insert your penis) when she didn't want to by giving her alcohol or drugs, but intercourse <i>did not</i> occur?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Attempted sexual intercourse with a woman (got on top of her, attempted to insert penis) when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of force (such as twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.), but the intercourse <i>did not</i> occur?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Obtained sexual intercourse by saying things you didn't really mean?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by using your position of authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor)?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
h.	Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't really want to because she felt pressured by your continual arguments?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
i.	Engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by giving her alcohol or drugs?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
j.	Engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman who was heavily under the influence of alcohol or drugs (e.g., passed out, unaware of everything happening around her)?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>
k.	Engaged in sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>

Men: Thank you for your help. Please return survey to the box at the front of the room