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The UO 2015 Sexual Violence Survey

- Designed to assess student experiences of sexual assault, sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence, as well as student attitudes, and well-being
- Based in part on our 2014 UO campus survey and the national 2015 ARC3 survey
- Funds for participant pay and graduate assistant provided by the UO President’s Office
- Data collection occurred online during 26 May to 5 June 2015
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1. Recent Background
The 2014 UO Sexual Violence Survey

- Assessing sexual assault, sexual harassment, perpetration, attitudes, institutional response, student health, and educational engagement
- Primary Collaborators: Marina N. Rosenthal and Carly Parnitzke Smith
- [http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/campus/](http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/campus/)

Pictured: C. Smith, J. Freyd, M. Rosenthal
The 2014 Survey

• Assesses
  – sexual assault and harassment victimization
  – student attitudes and perceptions of institutional behaviors
  – educational engagement and student well-being

• Data collection
  – August and September of 2014, on-line, $20 gift card compensation

• Funding for participant compensation: CSWS grant and private donation

• Sample
  – 982 completed surveys
The 2014 Survey Instrument

• Primarily used or modified existing instruments; some new items were created specifically for this study
• Civil rights versus criminal foundation
  – Victimization items based on Title IX understanding
• Victimization assessed with behavioral descriptions of events (labels like *sexual assault* or *rape* avoided)
• Web presentation; Qualtrics software
  – Qualitrics "Display Logic" was used such that questions presented to participants often depended upon their answers to prior questions.
Some Key Findings from the 2014 UO Survey

• 10% of female participants were subjected to completed anal or vaginal penetration
• 19% of female participants were subjected to attempted or completed anal or vaginal penetration
• 35% of female and 11% of male participants indicated at least one sexual experience without consent during college
2014 Findings Continued

• The perpetrators were mostly men (frequently other students) known to the victims.
• The overwhelming majority of students who were assaulted (90%) or raped (86%) did not report to a university source.
• 41% of those victimized also indicated at least one sort of institutional betrayal
2014 Survey Open Source
http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/campus/

A list of measures, an electronic print-out of the UO online survey, and additional results can be found at: http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/campus/
The 2015 ARC3 Survey

- ARC3 = The Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative
- Created in February 2015 at the Madison Summit on Campus Climate and Sexual Misconduct
- ARC3 included or incorporated many of our 2014 UO survey measures
- UO one of 4 pilot schools, spring 2015
# ARC3 Collaborators

Madison Summit for Campus Climate and Sexual Misconduct collaborators who collectively designed the survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonia Abbey</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noël Busch-Armendariz</td>
<td>Professor of Social Work and Director, Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquelyn Campbell</td>
<td>Professor of Nursing</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Carter</td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Clum</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Public Health</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Cook</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology and Associate Dean, Honors College</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalia Corby-Edwards</td>
<td>Senior Legislative and Federal Affairs Officer</td>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilia Cortina</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Psychology and Women’s Studies</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karol Dean</td>
<td>Dean, School of Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Mercy College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Douse</td>
<td>Special Assistant to Vice President of Student Life at The Ohio State University</td>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Emerita Professor of Psychology and Gender &amp; Women’s Studies</td>
<td>University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Flack</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>Bucknell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Freyd</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaray Gillespie</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hedgepeth</td>
<td>Government Relations Manager</td>
<td>American Association of University Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Holland</td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate in Psychology and Women’s Studies</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Hyde</td>
<td>Professor of Psychology and Gender &amp; Women’s Studies</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Koss</td>
<td>Regents’ Professor of Public Health</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia McGinty</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs</td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Smith</td>
<td>Lead Title IX Investigator &amp; Deputy Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Stover</td>
<td>Educational Programmer</td>
<td>Title IX Compliance Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Swartout</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacquelyn White</td>
<td>Emerita Professor of Psychology</td>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UO 2015 Sexual Violence Survey

- Spring 2015
- Two lab members joined research team: doctoral students Alec Smidt and Jennifer M. Gómez
- We also created an advisory group
- Goals: contribute to UO, nation, research
- Start with the ARC3 survey pilot; modify lightly; add additional measures
How the 2015 survey compares to the 2014 survey

• Overall similar: random selection of UO students invited; on-line survey; amazon.com certificate compensation; similar measures (behavioral descriptions, guided by civil rights/Title IX)

• Numerous small differences in measures and some changes in measures (e.g. stalking, dating violence added this time)
  – Institutional support measured along with betrayal

• Both undergraduate and graduate student participants included this time

• Assessment in late spring 2015 rather than late summer 2014
2. The 2015 Survey Methods
The UO 2015 Sexual Violence Survey

• Designed to assess student experiences of sexual assault, sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence, as well as student attitudes, and well-being

• Based in part on our 2014 UO campus survey and the national 2015 ARC3 survey

• We also added a number of additional measures to test hypotheses about mechanisms

• Funds provided by the UO President’s Office

• Data collection occurred online during 26 May to 5 June 2015
2015 Survey Procedure

• Goal was to survey 1500 students; a 25% response rate was expected.
• 4,000 undergrad and 2,000 graduate student emails were randomly selected by the UO Registrar
• Compensation: $15 Amazon.com gift certificate
• Due to our strong response we had to cut the survey off – so we really cannot give a precise response rate, except to say *at least 25%.*
2015 Data Integrity -- Attention Check

• 5 attention-check items designed to ensure that participants were attending to the content of their responses

• placed at various points throughout the survey, often as part of a list of responses in a matrix table, and directed participants to select a specific response if they were paying attention
  – *I will select ‘agree’ if I am paying attention*
  – *The response to this item will be ‘neutral’ to indicate attention.*

• Only participants who got at least 4 of these items correct were included in the data analysis
2015 Survey Participants

• 1,334 finished the survey and passed attention checks
  – 795 Undergraduate Students
  – 539 Graduate Students
2015 Survey Participants Continued

• Racial Demographics
  – 82% White or Caucasian
  – 11% Asian or Asian American
  – 8% Hispanic or Latino
  – 3% Black or African American
  – 2% Native American or Alaska Native
  – 1% Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
  – 3% Other
2015 Survey Participants Continued

• Gender
  – Undergraduate Students
    • 501 Women
    • 278 Men
    • 16 Genderqueer or Trans
  – Graduate Students
    • 323 Women
    • 199 Men
    • 11 Genderqueer or Trans

• Sexual Orientation
  – Undergraduate Students
    • 86% heterosexual
    • 14% lesbian, gay, bisexual, or other
  – Graduate Students
    • 83% heterosexual
    • 16% lesbian, gay, bisexual, or other
What did we measure in 2015?

• Demographics
• Academic satisfaction and engagement
• Life satisfaction, mental health, and well being
• Alcohol use
• Peer norms
• Perceptions of campus climate regarding sexual misconduct
• Sexual harassment victimization by students
• Sexual harassment victimization by faculty/staff
• Stalking victimization and perpetration
• Dating violence victimization and perpetration
• Sexual violence victimization and perpetration

• Institutional responses to sexual misconduct
• Attitudes toward and knowledge of consent
• Experiences with bystander intervention
• Perception of safety on campus
• Trauma symptoms
• Entitlement
• Narcissism, Machiavellianism, Psychopathy
• Male Role Norms
Note: All Victimization Questions Tied to UO

• Participants were informed that:
  – The next several sections will ask about a variety of experiences you have had since enrolling at the University of Oregon.

• For every section about victimization the instructions started with a reminder. E.g.:
  – Since you enrolled at the University of Oregon, have you been in a situation in which a. . .
3. Some Survey Findings

a. Participant Reactions to Survey
b. Victimization Rates
c. Graduate Student Victimization Patterns
d. Student Awareness and Attitudes about Institution
a. Participant Reactions to Survey
Participant Response to 2015 Survey

How distressing were these questions, compared to everyday life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Much Less Distressing)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Much More Distressing)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant Response to 2015 Survey

How important is it to ask these questions?

How important is it to ask these questions?

- [Definitely Not Important]
- [Definitely Important]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>1 (Definitely Not Important)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 (Definitely Important)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Men: 27

Women: 23
Findings

b. Victimization Rates
Rates of sexual experiences without consent

(modified Sexual Experiences Survey, Koss et al., 2007)
Percentage of undergraduate students indicating sexual experiences without consent

- Completed vaginal or anal rape:
  - Male: 1
  - Female: 13

- Attempted or completed vaginal, oral, or anal:
  - Male: 3
  - Female: 20

- Any victimization:
  - Male: 7
  - Female: 27
Graduate student rates of sexual experiences without consent (new to 2015)
Percentage of **graduate students** indicating **sexual experiences without consent**
Dating Violence (battering) and Stalking
Percentage of students who experienced dating or partner violence (battering) at UO

• 6 items (ARC3)
  – 1. Not including horseplay or joking around, the person threatened to hurt me and I thought I might really get hurt.
  – 2. Not including horseplay or joking around, the person pushed, grabbed, or shook me.
  – 3. Not including horseplay or joking around, the person hit me.
  – 4. Not including horseplay or joking around, the person beat me up.
  – 5. Not including horseplay or joking around, the person stole or destroyed my property
  – 6. Not including horseplay or joking around, the person can scare me without laying a hand on me.
Percentage who experienced dating or partner violence (battering)
What percent of students were stalked at UO?

• 10 items (ARC3)
• E.g.:
  1. Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS [global positioning system]?
  2. Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn’t want them to be there?
  3. Left strange or potentially threatening items for you to find?
Percentage of students indicating at least one type of stalking
What percent of students experienced sexual or gender-based events that are potentially harassing?
Events That are Potentially Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment

• Measured separately for events enacted by students and events enacted by faculty/staff
• In each case the same 19 items from ARC3. E.g.:
  – Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?
  – Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?
• For the combined analyses we dropped one item as too unclearly potentially harassing (Treated you “differently” because of your sex?) from analyses, leaving 18 items.
Potentially Harassing Experiences:
Undergraduates
Potentially Harassing Experience: Undergraduates

By a student
- Men: 46
- Women: 68

By faculty/staff
- Men: 21
- Women: 28
Potentially Harassing Experiences: Graduate Students
Potentially Harassing Experience: Graduate Students

- **Men** by a student: 39%
- **Women** by a student: 58%
- **Men** by faculty/staff: 23%
- **Women** by faculty/staff: 38%
Findings

c. Graduate Student Victimization Patterns
Different pattern of victimization for undergrads versus graduate students?
## Rates of Victimization for Female Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Type</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed penetration without consent</td>
<td>13%***</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted and completed vaginal, oral, or anal contact without consent</td>
<td>20%***</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any attempted or completed sexual contact without consent</td>
<td>27%***</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating violence (battering)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual or gender-based harassment-related event – by other student</td>
<td>68%**</td>
<td>58%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual or gender-based Harassment-related event – by faculty/staff</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high rates of harassment related experiences reported by graduate students also prompted us to take a closer look: does graduate degree program matter?
Potentially harassing experiences for graduate students by degree program
Percentage of Graduate Students Indicating Any Harassment from Fellow Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentage of Graduate Students Indicating Any Harassment from Faculty or Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What about other victimization types – do JD students report more or less than other grad students?
### Victimization Experiences of Female Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Type</th>
<th>JD students</th>
<th>Other graduate students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempted or completed sexual contact without consent</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted and completed vaginal, oral, or anal contact without consent</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed penetration without consent</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating violence</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment – by other students</td>
<td>86%**</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment – by faculty/staff</td>
<td>63%*</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is going on with JD students?

- We added some measures at the end (after the ARC3 pilot) designed to test various hypotheses about mechanisms including
  - Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986)
  - Dark Triad (Jonason & Webster, 2010)
- We can look at the male grad students in our sample; this is indirect but gives us some hints about climate
  - JD men reported significantly higher adherence to **traditional masculine role norms** \( (t(203) = 2.09, p = .04) \) in comparison to other male graduate students
  - JD men also demonstrated significantly higher endorsement of the "**Dark Triad**" personality traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy) in comparison to other male graduate students \( (t(203) = 2.42, p = .03) \)
- More research is needed
Findings

d. Student Awareness and Attitudes about Institution
Student Awareness and Attitudes about Institution

– unawareness of services
– perception of institutional response
– institutional support and betrayal
– perceptions of safety
Student Unawareness of Services
Undergraduate unawareness of services (percentage indicating “not at all aware” to the following resources)
Graduate student unawareness of services (percentage of students indicating “not at all aware” of the following resources)
Student Perception of Institutional Response
Undergraduate perceptions of positive institutional reactions to sexual violence (percentage endorsing “very likely” or “likely”)

- The institution would take the report seriously. (60%)
- The institution would maintain the privacy of the person making the report. (60%)
- The institution would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case. (49%)
- The institution would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report. (54%)
- The institution would support the person making the report. (45%)
- The institution would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g., academic, housing, safety). (36%)
- The institution would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct. (42%)
- The institution would handle the report fairly. (45%)

Percentage of Undergraduates
Undergraduate perceptions of negative institutional reactions to sexual violence (percentage endorsing “very likely” or “likely”)

- The institution would label the person making the report a troublemaker: 17%
- The institution would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report: 26%
- The institution would punish the person who made the report: 11%
Graduate student perceptions of positive institutional reactions to sexual violence (percentage endorsing “very likely” or “likely”)

- The institution would take the report seriously: 46%
- The institution would maintain the privacy of the person making the report: 41%
- The institution would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case: 29%
- The institution would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report: 35%
- The institution would support the person making the report: 26%
- The institution would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g., academic, housing, safety): 20%
- The institution would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct: 24%
- The institution would handle the report fairly: 29%
Graduate student perceptions of perceptions of negative institutional reactions to sexual violence (percentage endorsing “very likely” or “likely”)

- The institution would label the person making the report a troublemaker: 29%
- The institution would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report: 44%
- The institution would punish the person who made the report: 20%
Experiences of Institutional Support and Experiences of Institutional Betrayal
Institutional Support and Institutional Betrayal

• Of those victimized

  – 29% reported at least one form of institutional support or repair. (New to 2015)

  – 44% of students reported at least one type of institutional betrayal. (Similar to 2014)
Student Perceptions of Safety
Undergraduates indicating “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to the following statements:

- On or around this campus, I feel safe from sexual harassment: 83 (Men) 42 (Women)
- On or around this campus, I feel safe from dating violence: 89 (Men) 67 (Women)
- On or around this campus, I feel safe from sexual violence: 87 (Men) 48 (Women)
- On or around this campus, I feel safe from stalking: 80 (Men) 53 (Women)
On or around this campus, I feel safe from sexual harassment. 89% of Graduate Students indicate "Agree" or "Strongly Agree".

On or around this campus, I feel safe from dating violence. 92% of Graduate Students indicate "Agree" or "Strongly Agree".

On or around this campus, I feel safe from sexual violence. 92% of Graduate Students indicate "Agree" or "Strongly Agree".

On or around this campus, I feel safe from stalking. 84% of Men and 48% of Women indicate "Agree" or "Strongly Agree".
4. Summary of Key Findings, Limitations, Future Directions
2015 Survey Key Findings: Participant Reactions

- Participants indicated they did not find the survey distressing compared to everyday life
- Participants indicated the questions were important for researchers to ask
2015 Survey Key Findings: Victimization

- The 2015 Survey largely replicated the 2014 Survey for sexual assault and rape – about 20% of female undergraduates are victims of completed or attempted rape at the UO.
- The 2015 Survey also reveals high rates of sexual and gender-based harassment-related events, stalking, and dating violence (battering) for female students.
- Graduate students and undergraduate students show different patterns of victimization...
## Rates of Victimization for Female Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Type</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed penetration without consent</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong>*</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted and completed vaginal, oral, or anal contact without consent</td>
<td><strong>20%</strong>*</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any attempted or completed sexual contact without consent</td>
<td><strong>27%</strong>*</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating violence (battering)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual or gender-based harassment-related event – by other student</td>
<td><strong>68%</strong></td>
<td>58%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual or gender-based Harassment-related event – by faculty/staff</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Survey Key Findings Continued: Female JD students at high risk

- JD students appear at especially high risk of harassment-related events from both students and faculty/staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimization Type</th>
<th>JD students</th>
<th>Other graduate students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempted or completed sexual contact without consent</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted and completed vaginal, oral, or anal contact without consent</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed penetration without consent</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating violence</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment – by other students</td>
<td>86%**</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment – by faculty/staff</td>
<td>63%*</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 Findings: Student Awareness and Attitudes about Institution

- Students are unaware of some support services
- Students have limited confidence in good institutional response if they report
- The 2015 Survey largely replicated the 2014 Survey for perceptions of institutional betrayal – about 44% of victimized students experienced at least one type of institutional betrayal
- Female students do not feel safe
Limitations

• Self-report
  – Memory issues
  – Tendency to deny experiences
  – However, well-tested behavioral items

• Self-selection
  – However, monetary incentive structure
  – Also, comparison to other samples

• Missing Information
  – Very end of spring term which has high party frequency
  – Students who dropped out due to victimization not included
Future Directions

• Research
  – Continued analysis of this survey data set
    • Calculating risk as a function of minority status
    • Many measures left to analyze
    • Hypotheses to test regarding associated variables
  – For future, consider surveying during the same period and using same items to allow comparison year to year – in theory we could this way track effectiveness of prevention efforts
  – Compare across campuses and research basis of differences
  – Continue to search for underlying mechanisms and test interventions

• Addressing the Problem on Campus
  – How to truly end sexual violence?
  – Understanding and addressing hot spots
  – Meaningful education of students and faculty/staff