

Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

Authors

David Cantor, Westat
Bonnie Fisher, University of Cincinnati
Susan Chibnall, Westat
Reanne Townsend, Westat

Hyunshik Lee, Westat
Carol Bruce, Westat
Gail Thomas, Westat



September 21, 2015

Prepared for:
The Association of American Universities

Prepared by:
Westat
An Employee-Owned Research Corporation[®]
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3129
(301) 251-1500

Acknowledgements

The Association of American Universities (AAU) Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct project was a major undertaking – and one of the first of its kind nationwide. It required an enormous amount of effort, expertise, dedication, and patience among all of the parties concerned.

Hunter Rawlings, AAU President, provided steadfast leadership of this endeavor. The AAU team – Mollie Benz Flounlacker, Barry Toiv, Melissa Luke, and other staff – provided clear guidance, encouragement, and support throughout the planning and implementation of this project. Their tireless commitment to it was critical to its success.

The project could not have moved forward without the support of the Presidents of the 27 participating institutions of higher education for their willingness to undertake this project. Their commitment to collect data on sexual assault and sexual misconduct was critical to the success of the project.

The design of the survey was a true collaboration with the members of the Survey Design Committee. They provided critical expertise in helping to develop and provide feedback on the survey and other products (e.g., reports; data files). In particular, we thank Russell Carey, Melissa Clark, and Lindsay Orchowski, Brown University; Debra Kalmuss, Columbia University; Stephen Minicucci, Consortium on Financing Higher Education; Marne K. Einarson, Cornell University; David Laibson, Harvard University; Jagruti Patel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Nancy Duetsch, Christina Morell, Sarah Schultz Robinson, University of Virginia; Nora Cate Schaeffer, University of Wisconsin, Madison; and Melanie Boyd, Stephanie S. Spangler and Lily Guillot Svensen, Yale University. A very special thanks to Sandy Martin, University of North Carolina, for her willingness to take on the challenging role of committee chair and for doing an excellent job in the process. Often working under great pressure, committee members approached their work in a collegial manner, continually respecting the opinions of their colleagues, even while sometimes disagreeing.

The university study coordinators worked closely with us throughout the project. Their diligent efforts to coordinate multiple tasks under an extremely tight timeline helped us to achieve many of our major milestones. Their motivation, always driven by their concern for the well-being and safety of the students on their campuses, was admirable.

Finally, we are truly indebted to our Westat colleagues, without whom this project would not have been possible. To our task leaders, Molly Hershey-Arista, Carol Bruce, Hyunshik Lee, Suzanne Kaasa, and Ed Mann, who provided expertise to the team; our site liaisons, June Crandall, Marnee Evans, Jaymie Lorthridge, and Gail Thomas who worked tirelessly with university study coordinators to manage the dozens of small and large tasks associated with this effort; to our lead programmers, Randy Herbison, Kristin Madden, and Katie Hubbell, who spent hundreds of hours running and rerunning data tables and files to make sure they were complete and accurate; and the scores of other analysts, programmers, research assistants, and administrative staff who devoted their time and energy to making this effort a success.

Most importantly, we'd like to thank the students who participated in the study, who were willing to share very personal information to help address this important issue at their school.

Executive Summary

Summary of Results

Members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) are working to combat sexual assault and misconduct on their campuses. As an association of research universities, AAU decided in 2014 that the best way to help its members address this issue was to develop and implement a scientific survey to better understand the attitudes and experiences of their students with respect to sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The survey's primary goal was to provide participating institutions of higher education (IHEs) with information to inform their policies to prevent and respond to sexual assault and misconduct. In addition, members hoped that the survey would provide useful information to policymakers as well as make a significant contribution to the body of academic research on this complex issue.

In the fall of 2014, AAU contracted with Westat, a research firm, to work with a university team of researchers and administrators to design and implement the survey, entitled the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct. The survey was administered at the end of the spring 2015 semester on the campuses of 27 IHEs, 26 of which are AAU member universities. This report provides a description of the survey methodology and key results.

The survey was designed to assess the incidence, prevalence, and characteristics of incidents of sexual assault and misconduct. It also assessed the overall campus climate with respect to perceptions of risk, knowledge of resources available to victims, and perceived reactions to an incident of sexual assault or misconduct. The report provides selected results for five questions:

- How extensive is nonconsensual sexual contact?
- How extensive is sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence?
- Who are the victims?
- To whom do students report or talk about the incidents?
- What is the campus climate around sexual assault and sexual misconduct?

This study is one of the first to provide an empirical assessment of these questions across a wide range of IHEs. Prior studies of campus sexual assault and misconduct have been implemented for a small number of IHEs or for a national sample of students with relatively small samples for any particular IHE. To date, comparisons across surveys have been problematic because of different methodologies and different definitions. The AAU study is one of the first to implement a uniform methodology across multiple IHEs and to produce statistically reliable estimates for each IHE. It was designed to provide separate estimates for incidents involving two types of sexual contact (penetration and sexual touching) and four tactics (physical force, drugs and alcohol, coercion, absence of affirmative consent), as well as behaviors such as sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence. Providing this level of detail allows campus administrators to tailor policies by these very different types of sexual assault and misconduct.

Highlights of the results include:

- The percentage of students who report nonconsensual sexual contact varies greatly by the type of sexual contact (penetration or sexual touching) and whether or not it involves physical force, alcohol or drugs, coercion, or absence of affirmative consent.
- The profiles of each IHE are quite different. There is wide variation across IHEs:
 - for most types of sexual assault and misconduct measured on this survey.
 - for various campus climate measures, such as opinions about how problematic it is at the school and how students and university officials might react to an incident.
- The average rates of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation across all 27 IHEs are as high or slightly higher than those revealed in prior surveys.
- Rates of sexual assault and misconduct are highest among undergraduate females and those identifying as transgender, genderqueer, non-conforming, questioning, and as something not listed on the survey (TGQN).
- The risk of the most serious types of nonconsensual sexual contact, due to physical force or incapacitation, decline from freshman to senior year. This decline is not as evident for other types of nonconsensual sexual contact
- Nonconsensual sexual contact involving drugs and alcohol constitute a significant percentage of the incidents.
- A relatively small percentage (e.g., 28% or less) of even the most serious incidents are reported to an organization or agency (e.g., Title IX office; law enforcement)
- More than 50 percent of the victims of even the most serious incidents (e.g., forced penetration) say they do not report the event because they do not consider it “serious enough.”
- A significant percentage of students say they did not report because they were “...embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult” or “...did not think anything would be done about it.”
- Significantly more than half of the victims of nonconsensual sexual contact who reported the incident to an agency or organization said their experience with the agency or organization was very good or excellent along several criteria.
- When asked what might happen when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or misconduct to a university official, about half say that it is very or extremely likely that the university will conduct a fair investigation. The percentage is lower for those groups that are most likely to report victimization (i.e., females and those identifying as TGQN). Similar percentages are evident for opinions about other types of reactions by

the university (e.g., officials would take the report seriously; protect the safety of the student; take action against the offender).

- A relatively small percentage of students believe it is very or extremely likely they will experience sexual assault or misconduct. A larger percentage of students believe that sexual assault and misconduct is very or extremely problematic for the IHE.
- A little less than half of the students have witnessed a drunk person heading for a sexual encounter. Among those who reported being a witness, most did not try to intervene.
- About a quarter of the students generally believe they are knowledgeable about the resources available related to sexual assault and misconduct.

As noted above, the study found a wide range of variation across the 27 IHEs in the rates of sexual assault and misconduct, as well as the climate measures. However, the analyses did not find a clear explanation for why there is such wide variation. Some university characteristics, such as size, were correlated with certain outcomes. But the correlation was not particularly strong.

An analysis of the possibility the estimates were affected by nonresponse bias found that certain types of estimates may be too high because non-victims may have been less likely to participate. This might have contributed to some of the differences observed between schools, although indications are that this was not a large effect.

The wide variation across IHEs puts in stark perspective prior discussions of single-IHE rates as representing a “standard” against which to compare results. For example, many news stories are focused on figures like “1 in 5” in reporting victimization. As the researchers who generated this number have repeatedly said, the 1 in 5 number is for a few IHEs and is not representative of anything outside of this frame. The wide variation of rates across IHEs in the present study emphasizes the significance of this caveat.

The remainder of this executive summary provides a more detailed description of the methodology and selected results.

What Types of Sexual Assault and Misconduct Are Covered on the Survey?

The survey defined sexual assault and misconduct with two types of victimization. One type focused on nonconsensual sexual contact involving two behaviors: sexual penetration and sexual touching. Respondents were asked whether one or more of these contacts occurred as a result of four tactics: (1) physical force or threat of physical force, (2) being incapacitated because of drugs, alcohol, or being unconscious, asleep, or passed out, (3) coercive threats of non-physical harm or promised rewards, and (4) failure to obtain affirmative consent. The first two tactics generally meet legal definitions of rape (penetration) and sexual battery (sexual touching). The other two tactics are violations of student codes of conduct. The second type of victimization focused on sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence (IPV). The definitions of these different tactics are provided below when data are presented on their prevalence.

Methodology

The survey was developed by a group of researchers, program administrators, and methodologists from the participating IHEs and the Westat Team. The Design Team started with the survey instrument developed by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault and adapted the design around the informational needs of the participating IHEs. When asking about sexual assault and sexual misconduct, the questions used descriptions of specific types of behaviors and tactics that constitute sexual assault and misconduct. Words such as “rape” and “assault” were specifically avoided so that respondents would use a set of uniform definitions when reporting on the types of events that were of interest.

Over the 4-month period between November 2014 and February 2015, the survey team met once a week, sometimes twice a week, to make decisions on the content and format of the questions. During this process, more than 700 comments from participating IHEs were reviewed, two rounds of cognitive interviews were conducted, and pilot administrations were conducted at four participating IHEs.

A copy of the questionnaire, with the sources of the questions, can be found in Appendix 5. For each section below, the wording and questionnaire items are provided to the reader. The full report provides a more detailed description of the rationale for the items on the survey.

All but one of the 27 schools launched the Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct over a 3-week period from April 1 to 17. One school launched on May 1. Most schools observed a 3-week field period, with three email requests sent out asking for student participation. For 26 of the 27 schools, all enrolled undergraduates, graduate, and professional students 18 years and older were asked to participate. The sample size was 779,170. To encourage participation, students were offered a variety of incentives. In 18 schools, students were either entered into a drawing or offered a \$5 incentive to complete the survey. Other schools, a variation on this basic design. Others offered an incentive to all students, while a few offered no incentive.

The survey had a response rate of 19.3 percent, with a total of 150,072 students participating. Graduate/professional students responded at a higher rate than undergraduates (23.2% for graduate/professional and 17.4% for undergraduates). Females (22.9%) responded at a higher rate than males (15.6%). To generate estimates for the student population, the data were weighted to adjust for this differential nonresponse. Response rates across the IHEs (Figure E-1) ranged from a low of 7 percent to a high of 53 percent.


The overall response rate of 19.3 percent is lower than several other surveys on sexual assault and misconduct. Other surveys that are cited in this report have rates that range from 30 percent to 86 percent. The response rate is only an indirect indicator of data quality.¹ A low response rate does not necessarily mean the survey estimates are biased in a particular direction. The report provides the results of three different assessments of nonresponse bias. Two of these three analyses provide

¹ Groves, R. M., and Peytcheva, E. (2008). The impact of nonresponse rates on nonresponse bias: A meta-analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(2), 167-189.

evidence that nonresponders tended to be less likely to report victimization. This implies that the survey estimates related to victimization and selected attitude items may be biased upward (i.e., somewhat too high).

Data are primarily reported by gender and enrollment status. To measure gender identification, respondents were asked to identify themselves into one of eight categories.² Using responses to this question, students were classified into one of four groups: (1) female, (2) male, (3) transgender, genderqueer or gender nonconforming, questioning, or not listed (TGQN), and (4) decline to state. Groups were collapsed into TGQN to maintain adequate sample size for generating estimates. Enrollment status was divided into two groups: (1) undergraduate and (2) graduate/professional.

Figure E-1. Distribution of response rate for the 27 IHEs participating on the AAU Survey



Prior surveys have shown that those identifying as TGQN experience higher risk of sexual assault and sexual misconduct. However, very few campus surveys have produced statistically reliable estimates for those who identify as TGQN because they constitute a very small percentage of the campus population. For the AAU Survey, approximately 1.5 percent of the students selected a non-male/non-female category. While this is a small percentage, the large number of responses to the AAU Survey permits estimating rates for this group with adequate statistical precision.

² These eight categories are: male, female, transgender male, transgender female, genderqueer or non-conforming gender, questioning, not listed, and “decline to state.”

How Extensive Is Nonconsensual Sexual Contact?

The four different types of nonconsensual sexual contact included in the AAU Survey reflect the different definitions that are used by IHEs, as well as what has been used in previous published studies on campus sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The AAU Survey was designed to estimate sexual assault and sexual misconduct using various definitions to allow shaping of IHE policy according to the type of behavior and tactic.

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Physical Force, Threats of Physical Force, or Incapacitation. Students were asked about nonconsensual sexual contact that was the result of physical force, threats of physical force, or incapacitation. This combination of tactics and behaviors generally meets legal definitions of rape (penetration) and sexual battery (sexual touching). The definitions provided to the respondent for the behaviors included (see items G1 through G5 on the survey):

- Penetration:
 - when one person puts a penis, finger, or object inside someone else’s vagina or anus
 - when someone’s mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else’s genitals
- Sexual touching:
 - kissing
 - touching someone’s breast, chest, crotch, groin, or buttocks
 - grabbing, groping, or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other’s clothes

Physical force was defined on the survey as incidents when someone was:

“... holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you, or using or threatening to use a weapon against you.”

Incapacitation was defined on the survey as a student being:

“...unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol”


Overall, 11.7 percent of students across the 27 universities reported experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching by force or incapacitation since enrolling at the IHE. This overall rate masks large differences by gender and enrollment status (Figure E-2). Females and students identifying as TGQN have significantly higher rates of this type of victimization than males and

those declining to provide a gender identity. Undergraduates also have much higher rates than graduate/professional students.

Acts involving penetration by force or incapacitation are considered the most serious types of sexual assault and misconduct. Those identifying as TGQN had the highest rates: undergraduates (12.4%), followed by undergraduate females (10.8%), and TGQN graduate/professional students (8.3%). The rates for males and other graduate/professional students are much lower. For example, 3.9 percent of graduate/professional females were victims of penetration from physical force or incapacitation.

One of the more important risk factors for nonconsensual sexual contact is the use of alcohol and drugs. Among undergraduate females, about as many individuals reported penetration by incapacitation (5.4%) as by physical force (5.7%). For sexual touching, a larger percentage of the undergraduate females reported being physically forced when compared to being incapacitated (12.8% vs. 6.6%). There are small percentages that report that both force and incapacitation occurred (e.g., 1.7% of undergraduate females).

Figure E-2. Percent reporting sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolling in the college



Another factor that might affect risk is the class year. Students who are relatively new to school may experience higher risk because they are not as familiar with situations that may lead to an incident of sexual assault or misconduct. Examination of the rates for the current academic year show this pattern holds for undergraduate females. Among freshmen, 16.9 percent of females reported sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation. This percentage steadily declines by year in school to a low of 11.1 percent for seniors.

Across the 27 IHEs (Figure E-3), the rates range from 13 percent to 30 percent. There are small but statistically significant differences between different types of IHEs. For undergraduates, for example, private universities had a higher rate (25.3%) when compared to public universities (22.8%). This pattern is not uniform for other types of students. For example, graduate/professional students in public universities have higher prevalence compared to private schools. Figure E-4 illustrates this for those identifying as TGQN. For TGQN undergraduates, private IHEs have higher rates; for graduate/professional students, public universities have a higher rate.

Figure E-3. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation since entering the IHE





Figure E-4. Percent identifying as TGQN* reporting sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the IHE by type of school and enrollment status



*TGQN = Transgender, Genderqueer or non-conforming, Questioning, Not Listed

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Coercion. Coercion is defined as involving threats of serious non-physical harm or promising rewards. This was defined for respondents on the survey as (see questionnaire items G6 and G7):

...threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that you felt you must comply? Examples include:

- threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work
- promising good grades or a promotion at work
- threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends, or authority figures
- threatening to post damaging information about you online

For the time period since students entered their respective IHEs, nonconsensual contact involving coercion was reported by less than 1 percent of the students. Females and males were about as likely to report this type of tactic (0.4% for females; 0.3% for males). Those identifying as TGQN were the most likely to report this type of tactic (1.6%). There are no significant differences between undergraduates and graduate/professional students.

These rates are lower than reported in other studies. One possible reason is the AAU Survey concentrated on threats of punishment or promise of rewards, where other surveys have included tactics such as verbal pressure that may not be considered threats (e.g., pestering or verbal pressure).

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Absence of Affirmative Consent. The survey captured emerging student codes of conduct which make it a violation if both partners in a sexual encounter do not explicitly consent. To develop the questions, affirmative consent policies from institutions in AAU and the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) were reviewed. To our knowledge, this is one of the first surveys to measure this type of tactic.

The question on absence of affirmative consent (AAC) was introduced with the following definition (see questionnaire items G8 and G9):


Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving penetration or oral sex without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement? Examples include someone:

- initiating sexual activity despite your refusal
- ignoring your cues to stop or slow down
- went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding
- otherwise failed to obtain your consent

Females and those identifying as TGQN were the most likely to be victimized by this type of tactic. For example, since enrolling at the IHE, 11.4 percent of undergraduate females and 14.8 percent of undergraduates who identify as TGQN were victimized by this tactic compared to 2.4 percent of males.

There is a wide range of rates across the 27 IHEs for this tactic. For undergraduate females, it ranges from a low of 5 percent to a high of 21 percent (Figure E-5). Smaller campuses have higher rates than larger campuses and private IHEs had a higher rate when compared to public IHEs.

Figure E-5. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



What Is the Total Experience with Nonconsensual Sexual Contact? To assess the overall risk of nonconsensual sexual contact, prevalence measures were estimated that combine the two behaviors that constitute sexual contact (penetration and sexual touching) and the four tactics discussed above (physical or threat of physical force, incapacitation, coercion, AAC).

With a few exceptions, the estimates provided to this point have been for all students for the time period since entering the IHE. This mixes students who have been at the university for different periods of time and, therefore, are at risk of campus sexual assault or misconduct for different periods of time. To largely standardize for the time period, and get an overall picture of the risk for a student's entire stay on the campus, estimates were made for seniors since entering the IHE. This provides the prevalence for the period while attending a 4-year college or university.

According to the AAU Survey, 16.5 percent of seniors experienced sexual contact involving penetration or sexual touching as a result of physical force or incapacitation. Senior females (26.1%) and those identifying as TGQN (29.5%) are, by far, the most likely to experience this type of victimization. Senior males are subject to much smaller risk (6.3%). Senior females and those identifying as TGQN reported being a victim of nonconsensual penetration involving physical force or incapacitation 11.3 percent and 12.6 percent, respectively, since first enrolling at the university or college.

The above estimates exclude attempted, but not completed, sexual contact. However, attempted acts are also part of the legal definition of rape and sexual battery. They also have been included in a number of different studies on victimization of college students (Koss, et al., 1987). The AAU

Survey measured attempts of forcible penetration. If these are also included, the estimates increase by approximately one percentage point (e.g., 27.2% for females and 30.8% for TGQN).

If all four tactics are included in an overall prevalence measure, the AAU Survey estimates that 21.2 percent of seniors were victims since first enrolling at the IHE. One-third (33.1%) of senior females and 39.1 percent of seniors identifying as TGQN report being a victim of nonconsensual sexual contact at least once. Approximately half of these were victims of nonconsensual penetration involving one of the four tactics (physical or threat of physical force, incapacitation, coercion, and AAC).

A second important summary measure is the prevalence during the 2014-2015 academic year. This is the most current measure of risk and might be seen as most relevant when developing policies. For the 2014-2015 year, 11 percent of undergraduates were victims of nonconsensual sexual contact involving any of the four tactics. Females and those identifying as TGQN, when compared to males, are most likely to be a victim. A large percentage of these victims experienced acts involving penetration (4.4% of all students; 6.9% of females and 9.0% of TGQN).

How Do the AAU Estimates Compare with Previous Surveys of College Students? To better understand the implications of the above results, it is useful to place them within the context of prior surveys on nonconsensual sexual contact. There are many differences in methodology among the different campus climate surveys, including the composition of the sample, the mode of survey administration, the response rate, the definitions of nonconsensual activity, and perhaps most importantly, the wording of the questions. Nonetheless, the detailed questions included on the AAU Survey allow selected comparisons.

The College Sexual Assault study (CSA) (Krebs et al., 2007) was conducted with undergraduate students attending two large public universities in 2005. Like the AAU Survey, it was a web survey, though it had a response rate considerably higher than the AAU Survey (42% vs. 19%). While the question wording between the two surveys are not identical, they are similar when asking about penetration and sexual touching behaviors and tactics, including physical force and incapacitation.³ The CSA study estimated rates using several different definitions that varied by the time period (current year, since enrolled in college) and whether attempted, but not completed, acts were included. Perhaps the most widely cited figure represents the experience of senior females since entering college. For completed nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation, this is 19.8 percent of female college seniors (“1 in 5”). This is lower than the estimate from the AAU Survey (26.1%). When comparing the estimates for penetration by force and incapacitation, the difference is in the opposite direction, with higher rates for CSA than for AAU (11.3% for AAU and 14.3% for CSA). Consequently, the main difference between the two estimates is for sexual touching, which makes up the remainder of the “1 in 5” figure.

In both cases, the CSA estimates are within the range of estimates across the 27 campuses included in the AAU Survey. For example, the range for nonconsensual sexual contact by force or incapacitation for female college seniors is 15 percent to 34 percent.

³ The AAU Survey was based, in part, on the CSA.

The National College Woman’s Sexual Violence Survey (NCWSV) (Fisher, et al., 2000) was a national telephone survey of college students, ages 18-24 years old conducted in 1997. The response rate was considerably higher than both the AAU and the CSA studies (86%). The behaviors included attempted acts as well as completed acts and did not screen for acts involving incapacitation. The most comparable estimate to the AAU Survey is completed and attempted forced penetration for the current school year. The NCWSV estimate was 2.8 percent. The rate for the AAU Survey, once excluding instances of penetration involving incapacitation, is 2.9 percent.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) conducted the Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault (CASA).⁴ This was a web survey with a 35 percent response rate that asked students to report about their experiences since entering the university. The question wording was considerably different from the above studies, using both “labeled experiences” specifically referencing rape and sexual assault, as well as behavior-specific descriptions of unwanted sexual contact. The behavior-specific questions include the same range of behaviors as AAU. Once asked about specific behaviors, respondents were then asked if any of the behaviors occurred as a result of several different tactics, including physical force or incapacitation. The estimate from the CASA study for the prevalence of sexual contact by force and incapacitation for undergraduate females was 17 percent. The comparable estimate from AAU is 23.1 percent, which is significantly higher. The rates for female graduate/professional students (5.0%) and male graduate/professional students (1%) are also lower than the comparable AAU estimates (8.8% for female graduate/professionals; 2.2% for male graduate/professionals). The rates for undergraduate males are approximately the same (5.0% vs. 5.4%). As with the comparison to the CSA, the MIT estimate also falls within the range of the AAU IHEs.

Overall, these comparisons illustrate that estimates such as “1 in 5” or “1 in 4” as a global rate, across all IHEs is at least oversimplistic, if not misleading. None of the studies that generate estimates for specific IHEs are nationally representative. The above results show that the rates vary greatly across institutions.

How Extensive Are Sexual Harassment, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence?

Students were asked about their experiences related to three other forms of sexual assault and sexual misconduct: (1) sexual harassment, (2) stalking and (3) intimate partner violence. These were included on the survey not only because they represent a serious form of victimization but also because they are the subject of federal investigations into civil rights violations across many of the IHEs participating in the survey.

Sexual Harassment. Sexual harassment was defined as a series of behaviors that interfered with the victim’s academic or professional performances, limited the victim’s ability to participate in an academic program, or created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive social, academic, or work environment. This definition is in line with campus policies, as well as those of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s definition regarding “hostile environment” and the U.S.

⁴ See two releases provided at <http://web.mit.edu/surveys/health/>

Department of Education. To provide this definition to respondents, each question on harassment was prefaced with the following text (see questionnaire items D1 through D5):

“These next questions ask about situations in which a student at [University], or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment”


The specific behaviors referenced were taken from several different scales measuring harassment:

- made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you?
- made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else’s body, appearance or sexual activities?
- said crude or gross sexual things to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters when you didn’t want to?
- emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos to you that you didn’t want?
- continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though you said, “No”?

Overall, 47.7 percent of students indicated that they have been the victims of sexual harassment since enrolled at the IHE. Students identifying as TGQN and females are most likely be victims of sexual harassment. For example, 75.2 percent of undergraduate and 69.4 percent of graduate/professional students who identify as TGQN reported being sexually harassed. Well more than half of female undergraduates (61.9%) report being sexually harassed. The most common behavior cited by the students was making inappropriate comments about their body, appearance, or sexual behavior (37.7%); followed by making sexual remarks, or insulting or offensive jokes or stories (29.5%).

For undergraduate females, the range of sexual harassment across the IHEs goes from a low of 49 percent to a high of 74 percent (Figure E-6). There are significant differences across several of the IHE characteristics. For enrollment size, the larger schools have the lowest rates of harassment. For example, among undergraduate females in the largest IHEs, 60.3 percent reported being a victim of harassment. This compares to 69.9 percent in the smallest schools.

Figure E-6. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting sexual harassment since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



The offender’s affiliation to the IHE was most often described as a student (91.6%). This was more common among undergraduate students (94.6% of female undergraduates, 93.8% of male undergraduates, 94.4% for TGQN) than among graduate/professional students (82.0% female graduate/professional students, 85.7% male graduate/professional students, 82.7% of TGQN). Graduate/professional students more often identified the offender as a faculty member (e.g., 22.4% of female graduate/professional students vs. 5.9% of female undergraduates).

The most common relationship of the offender to the victim is a friend or acquaintance (69.9%), followed by a stranger (43.1%). Graduate/professional students more frequently identified the relationship of the offender to the victim as teacher or advisor (e.g., 15.8% of female graduate/professional students vs. 4.9% of female undergraduates) or a co-worker, boss, or supervisor (17.7% of female graduate/professional students vs. 6.0% of female undergraduates).

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). The measure of IPV was intended to capture violence associated with relationships that would not be captured in the questions on nonconsensual sexual contact. These questions were administered to anyone who said they had been in any “partnered relationship” since enrolling in college. This was approximately 75 percent of the student population. A partner relationship included:

- casual relationship or hook-up
- steady or serious relationship
- marriage, civil union, domestic partnership, or cohabitation


To be classified as a victim, respondents had to say that a partner had done one of the following (see questions F1 through F3 on the survey):

- controlled or tried to control you? Examples could be when someone:
 - kept you from going to classes or pursuing your educational goals
 - did not allow you to see or talk with friends or family
 - made decisions for you such as, where you go or what you wear or eat
 - threatened to “out” you to others
- threatened to physically harm you, someone you love, or themselves
- used any kind of physical force against you? Examples could be when someone
 - bent your fingers or bit you
 - choked, slapped, punched or kicked you
 - hit you with something other than a fist
 - attacked you with a weapon, or otherwise physically hurt or injured you

Since enrolled in the college, 9.8 percent of the student population who had been in a partnered relationship reported experiencing IPV. This was reported most often by those identifying as TGQN (22.8% undergraduates; 17.8% graduate/professional), followed by female undergraduates (12.8%).

The range of IPV across the campuses goes from a low of 9 percent to a high of 16 percent (Figure E-7). There are some statistically significant, but relatively small, differences in the rate of IPV for characteristics such as the size of the school and public vs. private.

Figure E-7. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting intimate partner violence since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



Stalking. To measure stalking, students were asked whether someone (see survey items E1 through E4):

- made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- spied on, watched or followed you either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety

To be considered stalking, the respondent had to say that these behaviors, either singly or in combination, occurred more than once and were done by the same person.

Overall, 4.2 percent of students reported that they had been the victims of stalking since first enrolling at the college or university. As with almost all the different measures of assault and misconduct, those identifying as TGQN reported the highest rates (12.1% undergraduates; 8.4% graduate/professional). Female undergraduates reported being victims of stalking at the next highest rate (6.7%).

Most often, the offender's affiliation to the university was described as a student (63.9%), particularly among undergraduate students. A fairly large percentage (28.9%) did not know the person's association with the university.

In describing the relationship of the offender to the victim, students most often indicated that it was a friend or acquaintance (40.4%), followed by a stranger (28.7%), and someone they had dated or were intimate with (24.3%). Undergraduates were particularly likely to indicate that the offender was a friend or acquaintance.

The range across the 27 universities for stalking goes from 5 to 8 percent. University characteristics such as size or public/private are not strongly related to the percentage of students that report stalking.

Who Are the Victims?

In addition to collecting data on gender and enrollment status, students were asked about a number of other personal characteristics that might be related to rates of sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Generally speaking, the same groups had the highest rates of victimization across all types of sexual assault and misconduct. Non-heterosexual students report having been victimized more often than heterosexual students. For example, 60.4 percent of gays and lesbians report being sexually harassed compared to 45.9 percent of heterosexuals. Those who said they had a disability had higher rates of victimization. For example, 31.6% of female undergraduates with a disability reported nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation. This compares 18.4 percent of the undergraduate females without a disability. With respect to race, for most forms of victimization, Asians are less likely to report being a victim. For example, 37.9 percent of Asians reported being sexually harassed when compared to 51.3 percent for whites. There are not consistent differences among the other race groups. For graduate and professional students, married students are less likely to report all types of victimization. For example, 2.1 percent of married graduate/professional females reported AAC since entering the IHE compared to 6.3 percent who have never been married.

To Whom Do Students Talk About the Incident?

One important policy concern is whether victims of sexual assault and misconduct report it to either the appropriate university agency or another organization, such as law enforcement. To understand how often this happens, those students reporting a victimization were presented with a list of agencies that were tailored to specific campus resources. This list ranged from agencies concerned with prosecuting offenders (e.g., the Title IX office; campus or local police) to those concerned with assisting the victim with the consequences of the incident (e.g., health care providers; victim services). Students were asked if they reported the victimization to any of these places (hereafter referred to as "agencies"). These questions were asked for those students reporting sexual contact involving physical force and incapacitation for each behavior (penetration, sexual touching). It was also asked of those reporting sexual harassment, IPV, and stalking.


Overall, the rates of reporting were quite low. The highest was for stalking (28%) and physically forced penetration (25.5%). The rates are lowest for sexual touching involving both physical force (7%) and incapacitation (5%).

As with the rates of victimization, there was a wide range of reporting across the different IHEs. For example, the proportion that reported penetration by physical force to an agency across the 27 IHEs varied from a low of 17 percent to a high of 46 percent (Figure E-8).

When asked why the incident was not reported, the dominant reason was it was not considered serious enough. Even for penetration involving physical force, over half (58.6%) of students gave this reason. This reason is highest for harassment (78.6%) and sexual touching due to physical force or incapacitation (75.6%, 74.1%, respectively).

More than one-third (35.9%) of victims of forced penetration did not report the event because they were "...embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult." Almost as many said they "...did not think anything would be done about it."

Figure E-8. Distribution of the percent of students reporting a nonconsensual penetration by physical force to an agency since entering the college for the 27 IHEs



Most students (between 50% and 85%) reported telling someone else about the incident, although the percentages differ by the type of incident.

Those who reported to an agency during the current school year were asked to evaluate their experience. For those victims who reported at least one incident to an agency, 29.6 percent said it was somewhat useful, 37.7 percent said it was very useful, and 33.1 percent said it was extremely

useful. In contrast, 14.8 percent and 19 percent said it was not at all or a little useful. Students were asked if at any time they felt pressure from the program on whether or not to proceed with further reporting or adjudication. The vast majority of students said they were not pressured.

The students were asked to rate the program on a scale that went from “excellent” to “poor.” When asked to rate the program on showing respect to the student, 61.5 percent said excellent and 28.0% said very good. A smaller percentage said either fair (10.4%) or poor (6.4%). When asked to rate how well the agency helped to understand the victim’s options, 46.2% said excellent, and 32.6% said very good. Among those not as satisfied, 15.7% said fair and 11.9% said poor.

Campus Climate Around Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

The survey included a wide variety of measures of the climate with respect to sexual assault and sexual misconduct. This section of the report describes the results for four of these measures.


Response to a Report of Sexual Assault or Sexual Misconduct. Students were asked a series of questions about what would happen if an instance of sexual assault or sexual misconduct was reported. Overall, about half of the students generally said it was very or extremely likely that a positive result would happen as a result of reporting:

- 55.2 percent believe that it is very or extremely likely that the victim would be supported by other students in making a report.
- 63.3 percent believe it very or extremely likely that the report would be taken seriously by campus officials.
- 56.5 percent said it is very or extremely likely that the individual’s safety would be protected.
- 49.2 percent believe it is very or extremely likely that a fair investigation would occur.
- 44.3 percent of students thought it was very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action against the offender.
- 38.9 percent believe it is very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus.

For each of these items, those groups that have the highest rates of victimization (i.e., TGQN and females) are the least likely to provide a positive response.

There is wide variation across the IHEs participating in the survey on student perceptions about what is likely to happen when a victim reports an instance of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. For example, the percentage of students who think it is very or extremely likely the university will take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously varies from a low of 46 percent to a high of 77 percent (Figure E-9).

Figure E-9. Distribution of the percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously for the 27 IHEs



The range is larger for opinions on whether an official at the school would conduct a fair investigation (Figure E-10).


Bystander Intervention. Students were asked whether they have been a bystander to the occurrence of sexual assault or misconduct, and if so, the extent to which they intervened and the reason for their intervention decision.

Overall, 17.8 percent of respondents have suspected that a friend may have been sexually assaulted. Among those who reported they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted, 66.4 percent took some type of action, with most speaking to the friend or someone else to seek help (57.1%).

Overall, 44.4 percent of respondents reported they have witnessed a drunk person heading for a sexual encounter. Among those who reported being a witness, 77.0 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 23.5 percent saying they weren't sure what to do, and 53.5 percent saying they did nothing for another reason.

Overall, 19.6 percent of respondents indicated that they had witnessed someone acting in a sexually violent or harassing manner. Among those who witnessed this, 54.5 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 24.5 percent saying they weren't sure what to do, and 30.0 percent saying they did nothing for another reason.

Figure E-10. Distribution of the percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will conduct a fair investigation for the 27 IHEs in the AAU Survey since entering college




Opinions About Prevalence and Personal Risk. When asked how problematic sexual assault or sexual misconduct is at the IHE, 20.2 percent reported it is very or extremely problematic. In contrast, a relatively small percentage of students thought it was either very or extremely likely that they would experience sexual assault on campus or at a university affiliated event off campus (5.0% on campus; 5.3% campus affiliated event off campus).

There is quite a bit of variation in how problematic students view sexual assault and misconduct to be across the participating universities (Figure E-11). This ranges from a low of 2 percent to a high of 39 percent. Many (14) of the schools are at 20 percent or below.

Knowledge About University Sexual Assault Policies and Procedures. Students were asked a series of questions related to their knowledge of policies related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct:

- 24 percent of students reported they are very or extremely knowledgeable about how the university defines sexual assault and sexual misconduct.
- 29.5 percent said they were very or extremely knowledgeable about where to get help if they or a friend are victims of sexual assault or misconduct.
- 25.8 percent said they were very or extremely knowledgeable about where to make a report if a student or friend experienced a sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

Figure E-11. Distribution of the percent of students who perceive that sexual assault and sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic on campus for the 27 IHEs



The distribution across the 27 schools of student knowledge on where to get help at the school if the respondent or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct ranges from a low of 17 percent to a high of 44 percent.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Methodology	2
2	How Are Sexual Assault and Misconduct Defined?.....	11
3	How Extensive is Nonconsensual Sexual Contact?	11
4	How Extensive Are Sexual Harassment, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence?.....	28
5	Who Are the Victims?.....	34
6	Who Do Students Tell About the Incident?.....	35
7	Campus Climate Around Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct.....	37
8	Summary	49
	References.....	52
 <u>Appendixes</u>		
1	Survey Development.....	A1-1
	References for Appendix A-1	A1-14
2	Human Subjects Protections and Safeguards.....	A2-1
3	Results by Individual Status Code.....	A3-1
4	Nonresponse Bias Analysis	A4-1
5	Questionnaire	A5-1
6	Supplementary Tables	A6-1
 <u>Tables</u>		
1-1	Incentive plans offered at the 27 schools participating in the AAU Survey.....	4

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
1-2	Response rates by gender, enrollment status and public/private..... 6
1-3	Variables used in the raking procedure 8
1-4	Characteristics of respondents that completed the survey 54
3-1	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender 56
3-2	Percent of female undergraduate students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status..... 57
3-3	Percent of female graduate/professional students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status..... 58
3-4	Percent of male undergraduate students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status..... 59
3-5	Percent of male graduate/professional students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status..... 60
3-6	Percent of undergraduate students identifying as TGQN experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status 61
3-7	Percent of graduate/professional students identifying as TGQN experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status 62

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
3-8	Percent of undergraduate students declining to state gender experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status 63
3-9	Percent of graduate/professional students declining to state gender experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status 64
3-10	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college..... 65
3-11	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual penetration involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college..... 67
3-12	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college..... 69
3-13	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university..... 71
3-14	Percent of females experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status 73
3-15	Percent of males experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status 74
3-16	Percent of those identifying as TGQN experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status 75

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>	
3-17	Percent of students who declined to state their gender experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status.....	76
3-18	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college.....	77
3-19	Percent of students experiencing absence of affirmative consent by gender, enrollment status and university characteristics.....	79
3-20	Percent of seniors experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender	81
3-21	Percent of undergraduates experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender	82
3-22	percent of undergraduates experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender	83
4-1	Percent of students experiencing harassment by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of harassment	84
4-2	Percent of students experiencing harassment by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university	90
4-3	Percent of students who have been in partnered relationship experiencing intimate partner violence by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of intimate partner violence	92

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>	
4-4	Percent of students experiencing intimate partner violence by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university	94
4-5	Percent of students experiencing stalking by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of stalking.....	96
4-6	Percent of students experiencing stalking by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university.....	100
5-1	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender and victim characteristics	102
5-2	Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent by gender and victim characteristics	103
5-3	Percent of students experiencing harassment, intimate partner violence or stalking by type of incident, gender and enrollment status of victim.....	104
6-1	Percent of victims of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation that reported an incident to an agency or program, reasons why victim did not report and whether victim reported it to someone else.....	110
6-2	Percent of victims of harassment, intimate partner violence and stalking that reported an incident to an agency or program, reasons why victim did not report and whether victim reported it to someone else.....	112
6-3	Evaluation of contacts made with agencies within the current school year by victims of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation	114
7-1	Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender.....	115
7-2	Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender and enrollment status.....	118

<u>Tables</u>		<u>Page</u>
7-3	Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender	122
7-4	Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status	124
7-5	Perceptions related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status	128
7-6	Perceptions related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status	129
7-7	Knowledge and perceptions about resources related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status	131
A1-1	AAU Survey design team.....	A1-4
A3-1	Frequency of survey response status for the AAU Survey.....	A3-3
A3-2	Survey drop-out rate for the AAU Survey: Percent non-missing responses for initial item in each section for respondents that started the survey	A3-4
A4-1	Eleven key variables used in the nonresponse bias analysis.....	A4-2
A4-2	Comparison of early and later responders by gender and school enrollment for 11 key variables (estimates in percent).....	A4-6
A4-3	Direction of nonresponse bias according to analysis of early and late responders for 11 outcome measures by gender and enrollment status.....	A4-7
A4-4	Comparison of incentivized and non-incentivized groups by gender and school enrollment for 11 key variables (estimates in percent)	A4-11
A4-5	Direction of nonresponse bias according to analysis of incentive groups for 11 outcome measures by gender and enrollment status.....	A4-13
A4-6	Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females	A4-20

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
A4-7	Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual penetration by physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females A4-21
A4-8	Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females A4-22
A4-9	Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual contact by absence of affirmative consent for undergraduate females A4-23
A4-10	Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual contact for physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for undergraduate females A4-24
A4-11	Logistic regression predicting sexual harassment for undergraduate females A4-25
A4-12	Logistic regression predicting stalking for undergraduate females..... A4-26
A4-13	Logistic regression predicting intimate partner violence for undergraduate females A4-27
A4-14	Logistic regression predicting whether undergraduate females indicate that sexual assault and sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic for the IHE A4-28
A4-15	Logistic regression predicting whether undergraduate females indicate that university officials are very or extremely likely to take actions when a sexual assault is reported A4-29
A4-16	Logistic regression predicting whether undergraduate females indicate being very or extremely knowledgeable about on-campus resources for sexual assault and sexual misconduct A4-30
A4-17	Logistic regression predicting whether the student took action when they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted for undergraduate females A4-31
A6-1	Percent of graduate and professional students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender..... A6-2

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
A6-2 Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender	A6-3
A6-3 Percent of graduate and professional students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender.....	A6-4
A6-4 Percent of seniors experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender	A6-5
A6-5 Number of times female experienced nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by type of behavior and enrollment status	A6-6
A6-6 Number of times male experienced nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by type of behavior and enrollment status.....	A6-7
A6-7 Number of times those identifying as TGQN experienced nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by type of behavior and enrollment status	A6-8
 <u>Figures</u>	
1 Distribution of response rate for the 27 IHEs.....	7
2 Percent reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolling in the college	14
3 Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation since entering the school for the 27 IHEs	16
4 Percent identifying as TGQN reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the IHE by type of school and enrollment status	17

<u>Figures</u>	<u>Page</u>
5	Percent of females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the school by response rate for school and enrollment status 18
6	Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent since entering the school for the 27 IHEs 21
7	Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving force, incapacitation, coercion or absence of affirmative consent since entering the school for the 27 IHEs 24
8	Percent reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation during the 2014–2015 school year..... 25
9	Percent of senior females reporting completed nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the IHE for Campus Sexual Assault and the AAU Surveys by type of sexual contact..... 26
10	Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting sexual harassment since entering the school for the 27 IHEs 30
11	Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting intimate partner violence since entering the school for the 27 IHEs 33
12	Distribution of percent of students reporting nonconsensual penetration by physical force to an agency for the 27 IHEs..... 36
13	Percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously for the 27 IHEs in the AAU Survey since entering college..... 40
14	Percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will conduct a fair investigation for the 27 IHEs in the AAU Survey..... 41

<u>Figures</u>		<u>Page</u>
15	Distribution of the percent of students who perceive that sexual assault and sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic on campus for the 27 IHE	45
16	Distribution of percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely to experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus or at a campus affiliated event for the 27 IHEs	46
17	Distribution of percent of undergraduate females who perceive it is very or extremely likely to experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus or at a campus affiliated event for the 27 IHEs	46
18	Distribution of percent of students who believe they are very or extremely knowledgeable about where to get help at the school if the respondent or a friend experienced a school assault or sexual misconduct for the 27 IHEs	49

Members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) are working to combat sexual assault and misconduct on their campuses. As an association of research universities, AAU decided in 2014 that the best way to help its members address this issue was to develop and implement a survey to better understand the attitudes and experiences of their students with respect to sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The survey's primary goal was to provide participating institutions of higher education (IHEs) with information to inform their policies to prevent and respond to sexual assault and misconduct. In addition, members hoped that the survey would provide useful information to policymakers as well as make a significant contribution to the body of academic research on this complex issue.

In the fall of 2014, AAU contracted with Westat, a research firm, to work with a university team of researchers and administrators to design the survey and then to implement the survey, entitled the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct. The survey was administered at the end of the spring 2015 semester on the campuses of 27 IHEs, 26 of which are AAU member universities. This report provides a description of the survey methodology and key results.

The survey was designed to assess the incidence, prevalence, and characteristics of incidents of sexual assault and misconduct. It also assessed the overall campus climate with respect to perceptions of risk, knowledge of resources available to victims, and perceived reactions to an incident of sexual assault or misconduct. The report provides selected results for five questions:

- How extensive is nonconsensual sexual contact?
- How extensive are sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence?
- Who are the victims?
- To whom do students report or talk about the incidents?
- What is the campus climate around sexual assault and sexual misconduct?

This study is one of the first to provide an empirical assessment of these questions across a wide range of IHEs. Prior studies of campus sexual assault and misconduct have been implemented for a small number of IHEs or for a national sample of students with relatively small samples for any particular IHE. To date, comparisons across surveys have been problematic because of different methodologies and different definitions. The AAU study is one of the first to implement a uniform methodology across multiple IHEs and to produce statistically reliable estimates for each IHE. It was designed to provide separate estimates for incidents involving two types of sexual contact

(penetration and sexual touching) and four tactics (physical force, drugs and alcohol, coercion, absence of affirmative consent), as well as behaviors such as sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence. Providing this level of detail provides campus administrators with the ability to tailor policy by these very different types of sexual assault and misconduct.

1. Methodology

This section provides an overview of the survey development, the survey procedures, the response rates, and the methods used to weight the data. The Appendixes provide additional detail on various aspects of the methodology, including a more detailed description of the development of the survey (Appendix 1), human subject protections (Appendix 2), results by individual result codes (Appendix 3), an analysis of nonresponse (Appendix 4), the questionnaire (Appendix 5), and additional data tables (Appendix 6).

Survey Development. In early November 2014, the AAU Survey Design Team was formed and began the survey development process. (For a list of Design Team members, see Table A1-1 in Appendix 1.) The team met weekly, sometimes twice weekly, to review progress and discuss sections of the questionnaire. Throughout the survey design process, the team received more than 700 comments about the survey for consideration from study coordinators. Disagreements were resolved by discussion and then consensus. In addition, college students provided feedback on the instrument by participating in: (1) two rounds of cognitive testing conducted at Westat; and (2) pilot administration groups conducted at four participating IHEs. More details on the rationale for specific questions are provided in Appendix 1.

Survey Content. The survey structure is made up of 10 sections (A-J) and concludes with a final debriefing question about the survey experience. A core set of 53 questions was asked of every respondent, including Background (A), Perceptions of Risk (B), Resources (C), Harassment (D), Stalking (E), Sexual Violence (G), Sexual Misconduct Prevention Training (H), Perceptions of Responses to Reporting (I), and Bystander Behavior (J). Questions regarding Sexual Misconduct Prevention Training (H) were asked of students who had enrolled in the university in 2014 or 2015.

Respondents in a partnered relationship or who had been in a partnered relationship since enrolling at the university were asked questions about Intimate Partner Violence/Domestic Violence (F). Additional questions were administered if respondents reported being a victim of one of the types covered on the survey. For Harassment, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence/Domestic Violence (sections D, E and F), follow-up questions were asked for each type of misconduct. These follow-up

questions collected information across all reported incidents for each form of victimization. For example, if someone was a victim of intimate partner violence by two different partners, the follow-up questions asked for information about both partners. For Sexual Violence (section G), follow-up questions, including a Detailed Incident Form (DIF), were asked for the items covering sexual assault (G1-G5), coercion (G6, G7), and lack of affirmative consent (G8, G9). (For the complete instrument, with annotations, see Appendix 5.)

The Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct was administered as a web survey. The use of merge fields throughout the instrument allowed for frequent referencing of the respondent's university within questions and framing language, personalizing the survey experience for students. Further, response options for five questions included university-specific responses: school of enrollment (A5), student organizations (A16), living situation (A17), services and resources (C1), and resources related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct (D10, E8, F8, GA16). Each page of the web survey included links to general and school-specific frequently asked questions (FAQs) and resources. (For FAQs and resources, see Appendix 2.) All web survey pages also included the Help Desk number to assist students who needed either technical assistance or additional resources.

Sample and Incentives. With the exception of one institution, schools opened participation to all enrolled undergraduate, graduate, and professional students 18 years and older. The total sample size was 779,170. To encourage participation, schools offered students a variety of incentives. In 18 schools, students were either entered into a drawing or offered a \$5 incentive to complete the survey. A sample of 6,000 students was randomly selected to receive a \$5 Amazon gift card for submitting the survey. All remaining students were entered in a drawing for a \$500 cash prize if they clicked on the survey link embedded in their invitation or reminder email. Students were not required to complete the survey in order to be entered in the drawing.

Other schools offered some variation on this basic design. Four schools offered all students the \$5 gift card. Three schools offered a sample of 6,000 students the gift card and did not have a drawing for the others asked to participate. One school did not offer a \$5 card but did offer 10 prizes of \$100 in a prize drawing. Finally, one school offered the \$5 card to a sample of 6,000 students and held a drawing of 20 \$50 prizes for the balance of the students.

Students were notified of their eligibility for either the \$5 Amazon gift card or the drawing in the invitation and reminder emails.

Table 1-1. Incentive plans offered at the 27 schools participating in the AAU Survey

# Schools	Incentive plan	Alternative to incentive
18	Sample of 6,000 students eligible to receive \$5 Amazon gift card	Students not in the incentive sample eligible for \$500 cash drawing
4	All students eligible to receive \$5 Amazon gift card	No drawing
3	Sample of 6,000 students eligible to receive \$5 Amazon gift card	No drawing
1	No incentive plan	10 prizes of \$100 each
1	Sample of 6,000 students eligible to receive \$5 Amazon gift card	20 prizes of \$50 Amazon gift cards

Fielding the Survey. On April 1, 2015, the data collection on [the Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct](#) was opened for the first four schools. Data collection was staggered throughout a 6-week period, with nine schools following on April 2, another five schools opening on April 6, one school each opening on April 7 and 12, three schools on April 13, one on April 15, two on April 17, and the last school finally launching on May 1. Most schools observed a 21/22-day field period.

Email invitations to participate in the survey were sent to students’ university email addresses through a Westat email account on the first day of data collection. Each email included a unique link to the student’s online survey and was signed by a university representative, most commonly the university president or provost. Westat sent two reminder emails, signed by the same university representative or a second official, to prompt completion of the survey before the deadline.

Six weeks later, after data collection closed for the last of 27 participating schools, a total of 150,072 students had completed the survey.

Survey Procedures. Email invitations to participate in the survey were sent to students’ school email addresses through a Westat email account on the first day of data collection. Each email included a unique link to the student’s online survey and was signed by a ranking official at the university (e.g., President). Westat sent reminder emails, also signed by the official, to prompt completion of the survey before the deadline.

Response Rates. A completed survey was defined by two criteria:

1. For those with timing information, did it take the respondent at least 5 minutes to fill out the questionnaire?⁵
2. For everyone, did the respondent answer at least one question in each of the following sections: sexual harassment (D), stalking (E), and sexual assault/other misconduct (G)?

The first criterion excluded those students who went through the survey so quickly that they could not possibly read and answer the questions.⁶

The second criterion brings in those cases that did not press the “submit” button at the end of the survey but did provide responses to most of the questionnaire. We used the victimization sections to define “complete” because of the importance of these items to the survey’s goals.⁷

The final response rate was 19.3 percent (Table 1-2). This rate varied by gender (males 15.6%, females 22.9%) and enrollment status (17.4% undergraduates, 23.2% graduate/professional). The difference between the incentive and the non-incentive conditions was approximately 9 percentage points (25.8% vs. 16.5%). Private IHEs had a response rate of 34.2 percent and public IHEs had a response rate of 16.5 percent.

This overall response rate of 19.3 percent is lower than other surveys that are cited in this report. These other surveys have rates that range from 30 percent (NISVS)(Black et al., 2011) to 86 percent (NCSCW) (Fisher, et al., 2000). The range of response rates across the IHEs (Figure 1) is from a low of 7 percent to a high of 53 percent. The response rate is only an indirect indicator of data quality (Groves and Peytcheva, 2008). Nonresponse bias occurs when nonrespondents are different on a particular outcome than the respondents. For example, if nonrespondents are more likely to be victimized, then there will be a negative bias in the estimates (i.e., the estimated victimization rate will be too low). It is important to emphasize that nonresponse bias may affect the estimates of

⁵ Timing data was not available for anyone who did not get to the end of the survey and hit the “submit” button.

⁶ When testing the survey, we asked testers to go through the survey as quickly as possible (e.g., skimming the questions and not reading the introduction or instructions). Based on these findings, 5 minutes was chosen as a cutoff point, below which the survey was not counted as a complete.

⁷ This criterion could not be used for Intimate Partner Violence (section F) because of the skip pattern embedded in this section (i.e., student had to have been in a partnered relationship since a student at school).

certain outcomes (e.g., harassment) but not others (e.g., nonconsensual sexual activity by physical force). It all depends on how the mechanisms, or reasons, for nonresponse relate to the outcome.

There are very little data on the extent of nonresponse bias in estimates of sexual assault and misconduct. One hypothesis is that those who have been not been victimized will be the least likely to respond. If this is true, then a low response rate may provide estimates that are too high. An alternative hypothesis is that those who have been victimized will be the least likely to respond because they do not want to disclose their experiences on a survey. If this is true, then estimates will be too low if there is significant bias. Of course, it is likely that both of these hypotheses are true to some degree. The question is which one has the biggest impact on the estimates, if at all.

Appendix 4 provides three different analyses to assess the bias in the estimates presented in this report. The best evidence from these analyses suggests that survey estimates of selected types of victimization may be too high. It is difficult to estimate the magnitude of this possible bias because the survey does not have direct observations of the nonrespondents. The observed differences shown in Appendix 4 for the incentive group analysis are in the range of one-half to three percentage points. For example, for estimates of nonconsensual sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females, the observed difference between the incentive (high response rate) and non-incentive group (low response rate) is 0.9 percent, or about 5 percent of the survey estimate of around 18 percent.


Table 1-2. Response rates by gender, enrollment status and public/private

	Completes	Sample	Response Rate
Total	150,072	779,168	19.3%
Males	60,957	389,733	15.6%
Females	89,115	389,435	22.9%
Undergraduates	92,306	529,729	17.4%
Graduate and professional	57,766	249,439	23.2%
Male undergraduates	35,886	264,792	13.6%
Male graduate and professionals	25,071	124,941	20.1%
Female undergraduates	56,420	264,937	21.3%
Female graduate and professionals	32,695	124,498	26.3%
\$5 Amazon gift card*	34,088	132,000	25.8%
Prize drawing or nothing	91,517	555,275	16.5%
Private	41,043	119,977	34.2%
Public	109,029	659,191	16.5%

* Excludes schools that only provided an incentive or only had a prize drawing

Significant bias across institutions will complicate comparing rates across specific IHEs. Differences between institutions may not only be a function of experiences of the students but also the extent to which the estimates are subject to bias due to nonresponse.

Figure 1. Distribution of response rate for the 27 IHEs



Description of the Weighting Procedures. The results presented below use the university-specific weights. In this section, the procedure to create these weights for each university is described.

The initial step was to create a base-weight for each respondent. A census was conducted in all but one IHE and a base weight of one was assigned to each respondent. For the one IHE that did not have a census, the base weight was computed as the probability of selection. The base weight was adjusted to reflect nonresponse. This adjustment consisted of a raking procedure that adjusted the base weight to the demographic data available on the frame (Deming and Stephen, 1940). For all IHEs the variables used in the raking procedure are as shown in Table 1-3.

Table 1-3. Variables used in the raking procedure

Variable	Description	Variable Value
Gender	Two-category gender variable (Male/Female). The frame data only had two categories (male and female), whereas the survey data had 8 categories. To make the frame and the survey data compatible, the survey responses to a non-male/female category were imputed to a male or female category. Transgender males coded as males, transgender females are coded as female.	1: Male 2: Female
Age Group	Student's age was grouped into four categories, 18-20, 21-23, 24-26, and 27+.	1: 18-20 2: 21-23 3: 24-26 4: 27+
Year in School	This is a combined variable of student affiliation (Undergraduate/Graduate/Professional) and year of study or year in program. The questionnaire had separate questions on year of study for undergraduates (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) and graduate/professional students (1 st , 2 nd , ..., 6+).	1: Undergraduate freshman 2: Undergraduate sophomore 3: Undergraduate junior 4: Undergraduate senior 5: Graduate/Professional year 1 & 2 6: Graduate/Professional year 3 & 4 7: Graduate/Professional year 5 & 6+
Race/Ethnicity	This variable has 5 categories, Hispanic, White, Black, Other race, and Nonresident alien. The frame race/ethnicity categories are grouped this way, and the survey race/ethnicity variables were coded to conform to this categorization.	1: Hispanic 2: White 3: Black 4: Other race 5: Nonresident alien

For the 22 IHEs that had two incentive groups (e.g., Amazon card and a drawing; Amazon card and no drawing), incentive status was used as an additional raking variable.

Missing values in the demographic variables in the survey data were imputed using a hot-deck procedure that randomly allocated responses in the same proportion as those answered within each imputation class. On the average, 1.11 percent of survey respondents had to be imputed in this way.

The raking procedure adjusts the base weight so that the sum of adjusted weights of the survey respondents for a subgroup is equal to the frame total for that subgroup. Subgroups are defined by each variable used in the raking procedure. Algebraically, this can be expressed as

$$\sum_{k=1}^n I_{gk} w_k = N_g$$

where n is the respondent sample size, I_{gk} is an indicator variable having one if respondent k belongs to subgroup g , 0 otherwise, w_k is the adjusted weight for respondent k , and N_g is the frame count of subgroup g .

For example, the weighted total for all female respondent students from the survey is equal to the total female count in the frame. The same is true for subgroups defined by each variable listed in the above table.

The weights developed for each university are used when presenting the aggregate results below. This provides population estimates for all the students who attend the 27 universities. IHEs with larger student enrollments will contribute more to the aggregate estimates. Throughout the report, selected estimates are also presented by the size and other characteristics of the IHEs. For the convenience of the reader, the remaining tables have been placed in one place, after the reference list.

-----Table 1-4 about here----- (see tables after reference list)

Table 1-4 provides both the weighted and unweighted distribution of respondents in the study. The weighted estimates provide the totals for the student population attending the 27 IHEs that participated in the survey. Approximately 68 percent of the students are undergraduates. With respect to year in school, 10.9 percent are freshman, 15.4 percent are sophomores, 17.1 percent are juniors, and 24.8 percent are seniors.⁸ Approximately 31 percent of the students were first enrolled at the university in 2014 or 2015. With respect to demographic characteristics, the split was even between males and females, with almost 1 percent (0.9%) reporting some other gender. Approximately 10 percent of the sample is estimated to be non-heterosexual. The largest group among non-heterosexuals is made up of those who chose something other than gay/lesbian (6.2%).

Estimates of Statistical Reliability. To provide an estimate of statistical precision, each estimate is accompanied by a standard error. The standard errors were calculated using the jackknife replication. This accounts for the weighting procedures and a finite correction factor (Wolter, 2007).

⁸ The question on the survey on year in school instructed students to base their answer on the number of credits they have earned.

The standard errors can be used to construct a 95 percent confidence interval around the estimate by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Estimate} + 2 \times \text{standard error (high estimate)} \\ & \text{Estimate} - 2 \times \text{standard error (low estimate)} \end{aligned}$$

For example, it is estimated that 18.9 percent of female students were victims of nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation, including attempted penetration (Table 3.1). The standard error for this estimate is 0.1. Using the formula above, the 95 percent confidence interval for the estimate is 18.7 to 19.1 percent.

The standard error can also be used to determine if two independent estimates are statistically different. This can be done using the formula:

$$Z \text{ statistic} = [(\text{Estimate } 1) - (\text{Estimate } 2)] / \text{square root}(\text{Standard error}(1)^2 + \text{Standard error}(2)^2)$$

The “Z statistic” can be used to assess significance. If $Z > 1.96$, for example, then the difference is significant at the 5 percent level using a 2-tailed test. “Estimate 1” and “Estimate 2” are the two estimates being compared and “Standard error(1)” and “Standard error(2)” are the respective standard errors for each estimate.

For example, if one wanted to test if females are different from males on the item noted above, a Z statistic would be:

$$Z = (18.9 - 4.3) / \text{square root}(.1^2 + .1^2) = 14.6 / \text{square root}(.01 + .01) = 103.2$$

This is highly significant, since 103.2 is much larger than the critical value of 1.96.

Note that this only holds if the two estimates are independent. For example, different demographic or enrollment groups (e.g., males vs. females; undergraduates vs. graduate/professional) are independent because a respondent can only be in one of the two comparison groups. Estimates with overlapping groups are not independent. For example, two different victimization rates for females are not independent. The same female respondents contribute to both estimates.

The differences discussed in the report below are all statistically significant at the 5 percent level using a two-tailed significance test. The sample sizes for this study are very large. This leads to observed differences being statistically significant even though the difference is not meaningful. For

this reason, much of the discussion below focuses on the largest differences, rather than all of those that are statistically significant. Also, note that by aggregating over all of the IHEs, the results reported below may mask results for individual schools.

2. How Are Sexual Assault and Misconduct Defined?

The AAU Survey focused on nonconsensual sexual contact involving both sexual penetration and sexual touching. Respondents were asked whether one or more of these contacts occurred as a result of four tactics: (1) physical force or threat of physical force, (2) being incapacitated because of drugs, alcohol or being unconscious, asleep, or passed out, (3) coercive threats of non-physical harm or promised rewards, and (4) failure to obtain affirmative consent. The first two tactics generally meet legal definitions of rape (penetration) and sexual battery (sexual touching). The other two tactics generally are violations of student codes of conduct.

In addition, the survey collected measures of different types of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence (IPV). The definitions of these different forms of victimization are provided below.

3. How Extensive Is Nonconsensual Sexual Contact?

The four different types of nonconsensual sexual contact included in the AAU Survey reflect the different definitions that are used by colleges and universities, as well as what has been used in published studies on campus sexual assault. For example, the National College Women's Sexual Violence survey (NCWSV) (Fisher, et al., 2000) measured sexual contact by physical force and non-physical coercion. The Campus Sexual Assault survey (CSA) (Krebs, et al., 2007) measured both physical force and incapacitation. Some of the studies include instances of attempted assault/misconduct, while others only include completed acts. For example, the estimate of "1 in 5" undergraduate females being a victim of sexual assault does not count attempted acts (Krebs and Lundquist, 2014), while other estimates do include these (e.g., NCWSV; Fisher, et al., 2000). The AAU Survey was designed to provide estimates that apply different definitions of nonconsensual sexual contact.

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Physical Force or Incapacitation. Students were asked about sexual contact that was the result of physical force, threats of physical force or incapacitation. The behaviors included were:

- Penetration:
 - when one person puts a penis, finger, or object inside someone else’s vagina or anus
 - when someone’s mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else’s genitals
- Sexual touching:
 - kissing
 - touching someone’s breast, chest, crotch, groin, or buttocks
 - grabbing, groping, or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other’s clothes

Physical force was defined on the survey as incidents when someone was:

“... holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you, or using or threatening to use a weapon against you.”

Incapacitation was defined on the survey as a student being:

“...unable to consent to or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol.”

The following estimates include events that were completed, as well as uncompleted attempts to physically force the person to engage in acts involving penetration. Both the behaviors and tactics included in this definition generally violate criminal laws and would be considered either a rape (penetration) or sexual battery (sexual touching).⁹

If a respondent reported having experienced both penetration and sexual touching for the same incident, penetration was counted in the prevalence estimates described below. This follows FBI and Clery Act rules for reporting victimization rates.

⁹ This definition does not include some behaviors that would also be considered illegal, including attempts at penetration by incapacitation; attempts at sexual touching by force or incapacitation; or threats to engage in either behavior by force or incapacitation.

For gender, respondents were asked to identify themselves into one of eight categories.¹⁰ Using responses to this question, respondents were classified into one of four groups: (1) female, (2) male, (3) transgender, genderqueer or gender nonconforming, questioning, or not listed (TGQN), and 4) decline to state. Groups were collapsed into TGQN to maintain adequate sample size for generating estimates. Enrollment status was divided into two groups: (1) undergraduate and (2) graduate/professional.

Prior surveys have shown that females and those identifying as TGQN have significantly higher rates of victimization than males. However, very few campus surveys have produced statistically reliable estimates for those who identify as TGQN because they constitute a very small percentage of the campus population. For the AAU Survey, approximately 1.5 percent of the students selected a non-male/non-female category. While this is a small percentage, the large number of responses to the AAU Survey permits estimating rates for this group with adequate statistical precision.

Overall, 11.7 percent of students across the 27 universities reported experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching by force or incapacitation since they have been enrolled in their respective IHE (Table 3-1). However, this overall rate masks very large differences by gender and enrollment status. The focus of the remainder of this discussion will be on the rates that are specific to gender and enrollment status (Tables 3-2 to 3-9).


-----Tables 3-2 to 3-9 about here ----- (see tables after the reference list)

As shown in Figure 2, students identifying as TGQN and females have significantly higher rates of this type of victimization than males and those declining to provide a gender identity.

Undergraduates also have much higher rates than graduate/professional students. For example, the estimate for female undergraduates is almost five times higher than male undergraduates (23.1% vs. 5.4%).

¹⁰These eight categories are male, female, transgender male, transgender female, genderqueer or non-conforming gender, questioning, not listed, and “decline to state.”

Figure 2. Percent reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolling in the college



Similarly, female graduate/professional students had an estimated rate that is four times higher than male graduate/professional students (8.8% vs. 2.2%). Those identifying as TGQN have rates comparable, or in many cases slightly higher, than females, confirming prior research that has found these groups to be at high risk of sexual assault and misconduct. Statistically, the rates for female and TGQN undergraduates are the same (23.1% vs. 24.1%). However, there is a difference for graduate/professional students (8.8% females vs. 15.5% TGQN).

Comparing across enrollment status shows similarly large differences. Among females, undergraduates have estimated rates three times higher than graduate/professional students (23.1% vs. 8.8%), and among males, the estimated rates are more than twice as high (5.4% vs. 2.2%). The pattern by enrollment status for those identifying as TGQN is the same as for the other genders — undergraduates have higher rates than graduate/professional students. For example, for TGQN undergraduates, the rate is approximately 9 percentage points higher than for graduate/professional students (24.1% vs. 15.5%).

Acts involving penetration by force or incapacitation are considered the most serious types of sexual assault and misconduct. Undergraduates identifying as TGQN had the highest rates (12.4%), followed by undergraduate females (10.8%), and graduate TGQN students (8.3%). The rates for

males and other graduate/professional students are much lower. For example, 3.9 percent of graduate/professional females were victims of penetration from physical force or incapacitation. This is significantly lower than undergraduate females and those that identify as TGQN.

One of the more important risk factors for nonconsensual sexual contact is the use of alcohol and drugs. Among undergraduate females, about as many individuals reported penetration by incapacitation (5.4%) as by physical force (5.7%). For sexual touching, 6.6 percent of undergraduate females reported being incapacitated at the time of the incident. This compares to 12.8 percent for sexual touching by physical force. There are small percentages that report that both force and incapacitation occurred (e.g., 1.7% of undergraduate females).

Another factor that might affect risk is the class year. Those students who are relatively new to school may experience higher risk because they are not as familiar with situations that may lead to an incident of sexual assault or misconduct. Rates for the current academic year do decline by year in school for undergraduate females (Tables 3-10 to 3-12). Among freshmen, 16.9 percent of females reported sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation. This percentage steadily declines by year in school to a low of 11.1 percent for seniors. This pattern does not consistently hold for males. The results for those identifying as TGQN or those who declined to state their gender are volatile because of low statistical reliability (i.e., small sample sizes).

-----Tables 3-10 to 3-12 about here ----- see tables after reference list

The above discussion provides the average of rates across the 27 different universities. A unique feature of the AAU Survey is that the design supports generating statistically reliable estimates for each of the 27 colleges and universities. Prior studies have either sampled from a small number of universities (Krebs, et al., 2007) or drawn a national sample that could not reliably compare experiences across specific campuses (Koss, et al., 1987; Washington Post-Kaiser Family Foundation Survey, 2015; Fisher, et al., 2000). While the AAU Survey is not nationally representative, the sample of universities represents a wide range of sizes, both public and private institutions.

As noted in the methodology section, comparison of rates across particular institutions can be affected by differences in response rate and some caution should be used when comparing specific schools. In the discussion of the patterns below, we examine how university characteristics, including response rate, are correlated with nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation.

Figure 3. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation since entering the school for the 27 IHEs




Figure 3 provides the distribution of the school prevalence rates for nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females at the 27 IHEs. The rates range from 13 percent to 30 percent. To better understand how these rates vary by the type of IHE, rates of sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation were calculated by several IHE characteristics, including enrollment size, whether the school was public or private, the percentage of undergraduates at the university, the percentage of the student body that was female, and the response rate (Table 3-13). Similar analyses have been conducted for other national surveys on campus sexual assault. These prior studies did not find these institutional characteristics to be significantly related to victimization (Koss, et al., 1987; Washington Post-Kaiser Family Foundation Survey, 2015).


-----Table 3-13 about here ----- (see tables after reference list)

With respect to the IHE characteristics, these results show small but statistically significant differences between different types of schools. For undergraduate females, IHEs with a lower proportion of females had a rate of 21.9 percent compared to campuses with the highest proportion of females (23.8%). For undergraduate females, there were also small differences by the size of the enrollment, with smaller institutions having a rate of 24.4 percent compared to 22.5 percent for

larger institutions. Private universities had a higher rate of 25.3 percent compared to public universities at 22.8 percent. Universities with a low proportion of undergraduates had a higher rate than those with a higher proportion of undergraduates (25.7% vs. 21.6%).

For most of these characteristics, the opposite patterns occur for graduate/professional students. For example, graduate/professional students in public universities have higher prevalence compared to private schools. Figure 4 illustrates this for those identifying as TGQN. For TGQN undergraduates, private IHEs have higher rates, while for graduate/professional students public universities have a higher rate.

Figure 4. Percent identifying as TGQN* reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the IHE by type of school and enrollment status




* TGQN = Transgender, Genderqueer or non-conforming, Questioning, Not Listed

As noted in the methodology section, the response rates vary across the IHEs, which could affect the level of reporting for a particular school. Appendix 4 provides a full discussion of our assessment of the potential for nonresponse bias in the results. The data by response rate is presented here to provide information on how the rates vary across universities. As Appendix 4 discusses, however, it is not clear whether variation by response rate indicates issues with nonresponse bias or other factors that might be correlated with the response rate. As noted in the appendix, other evidence on nonresponse bias conflicts with the correlations noted below.

There is a significant relationship by response rate. This relationship is different for undergraduates and graduate/professional students. For undergraduates, those IHEs with the highest response rate have the highest prevalence rates. The strongest relationship is for undergraduate females. IHEs with the schools with the highest response rates have the highest prevalence rate (e.g., 26.1% for highest response rate vs. 19.5% for the lowest rate). There is a big jump in the prevalence rate between schools with a rate between 7 to 14 percent and the other categories. The patterns for graduate/professional students are opposite (Figure 5).

Figure 5. Percent of females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the school by response rate and enrollment status



While significant, the above considers only one characteristic at a time. For example, if the larger IHEs also tend to have more females, the correlation with size is difficult to interpret. Similarly, private schools had significantly higher response rates than public schools (see Methodology section).

To investigate this further, a second analysis was conducted that predicted nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females in a multivariate model (see Appendix 4 for a description). The results of this analysis found the response rate remained statistically significant in a positive direction. IHEs with higher response rates had higher rates of victimization. In addition, the percentage of females on campus remained significant and was

positively related to the victimization rate. The higher the proportion of undergraduate females enrolled on campus, the higher the rate of victimization for undergraduate females. The other institutional characteristics did not remain statistically significant.

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Coercion. A second type of nonconsensual contact that is of concern for campus administrators is coercion. This is defined as nonconsensual contact that involves threats of serious non-physical harm or promising rewards. This was defined for respondents on the survey as:

...threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that you felt you must comply? Examples include:

- threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work
- promising good grades or a promotion at work
- threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends or authority figures
- threatening to post damaging information about you online

Each time an instance of coercion was reported by a respondent, follow-up questions were administered that asked which year it occurred and whether this was part of another incident that had already been reported during the survey. If a respondent reported that an instance of coercion was part of a previously reported incident involving physical force or incapacitation, the event was not counted in the coercion prevalence rate since the incident had already been classified as another type of incident.

For the time period since students entered their respective IHEs, nonconsensual contact involving coercion was reported by less than 1 percent of the students (Tables 3-14 to 3-17). Females and males were about as likely to report this type of tactic (0.4% for females; 0.3% for males). Those identifying as TGQN were the most likely to report this type of tactic (1.6%). There are no significant differences between undergraduates and graduate/professional students.

---- Tables 3-14 to 3-17 about here ----- (see tables after reference list)

These rates are lower than reported in other studies. For example, the NCWSV (Fisher, et al., 2000) reported that 1.7 percent of female undergraduates reported completed penetration by coercion and 1.8 percent reported completed sexual touching by coercion. One possible reason the rates are lower

is the AAU Survey concentrated on threats of punishment or promise of rewards, where other surveys have included verbal pressure that may not be considered threats (e.g., pestering or verbal pressure) (Fisher, et al., 2000).

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Absence of Affirmative Consent. The survey included items asking about nonconsensual contact where there was an absence of affirmative consent (AAC). These items were developed to capture emerging student codes of conduct that make it a violation if both partners in a sexual encounter do not explicitly consent. To develop the questions, affirmative consent policies from institutions in AAU and the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) were reviewed. To our knowledge, this is one of the first surveys to measure this type of tactic.

The question on AAC was introduced with the following definition:

Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving penetration or oral sex without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement? Examples include someone:

- initiating sexual activity despite your refusal
- ignoring your cues to stop or slow down
- went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding
- otherwise failed to obtain your consent

Each time an instance of AAC was reported by a respondent, follow-up questions were administered that asked which year it occurred and whether this was part of another incident that had already been reported during the survey. If a respondent reported that an instance of AAC was part of a previously reported incident involving physical force, incapacitation, or coercion, the event was not counted in the AAC prevalence rate because it had already been counted in one of the other tactics.


The percentage of students reporting this type of tactic differed by gender and enrollment status (Tables 3-14 to 3-17). Females and those identifying as TGQN were the most likely to be victimized by this type of tactic. For example, among undergraduates, 11.4 percent of females and 14.8 percent of those identifying as TGQN were victimized by this tactic compared to 2.4 percent of males. For females, undergraduates were more likely to report this tactic than graduate/professional students (11.4% for undergraduates vs. 5.2% for graduate/professional students).

For undergraduate females, the rates of AAC dropped somewhat by year in school (Table 3-18). The rate for freshmen in the current year was 7.4 percent but 5.4 percent for seniors. However, this drop was not as large or as consistent as that observed for tactics involving physical force and incapacitation. There is also a decrease in the prevalence of AAC for graduate/professional females (2.7% first year vs. 1.3 sixth year or higher). However, there isn't a clear pattern for the other gender and enrollment groups.

-----Table 3-18 about here ----- see tables after reference list

There is a wide range of rates across the 27 colleges and universities for this tactic. For undergraduate females, it ranges from a low of 5 percent to a high of 21 percent (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



Smaller campuses have higher rates than larger campuses (Table 3-19). For example, for undergraduate females, IHEs that are between 2,000 to 13,000 have a rate of 16.3 percent compared to the largest schools with a rate of 10.5 percent. Private universities had a higher rate of 15.1 percent when compared to public universities (10.8%). Universities with a low proportion of undergraduates had a higher rate than those with a higher proportion (14.3% vs. 9.6%). Those IHEs with the lowest proportion of White students had the highest rate (14.9% vs. 10.7%). These

relationships hold for those that identify as TGQN but not for the other combinations of gender and enrollment status.

---Table 3-19 about here ----- see tables after reference list

The response rate is significantly related to the prevalence rate for all genders and enrollment status groups. Unlike the results for force and incapacitation, the direction of the relationship is positive across for all combinations of gender and enrollment status. The differences are largest for undergraduate females and undergraduates who identify as TGQN.

To further investigate these relationships, the same multivariate model described in the analysis of physical force and incapacitation was estimated, but this time predicting rates of AAC for undergraduate females (see Appendix 4). The response rate was the only IHE characteristic that was statistically significant.

What is the Total Experience with Nonconsensual Sexual Contact Measured by the AAU Survey? To assess the overall risk of nonconsensual sexual contact, prevalence measures were estimated that combine the two behaviors that constitute sexual contact (penetration and sexual touching) and the four tactics discussed above (physical or threat of physical force; incapacitation; coercion; AAC). Estimates are provided that combine these behaviors and tactics in different ways.

The first combination are rates of nonconsensual sexual contact for tactics that are generally considered criminal. This includes two of the four tactics (i.e., physical force and incapacitation) for behaviors that are widely used to legally define rape (penetration) and sexual battery (sexual touching). For example, Krebs, et al. (2007) use a similar reference when describing events with these two tactics. To narrow the definition further, estimates were made just for those events that were completed; this excludes attempts at forcible penetration that were not completed.

With a few exceptions, the estimates presented to this point have been for all students for the time period since entering the IHE. This mixes students who have been at the university for different periods of time and, therefore, are at risk of campus sexual assault or misconduct for different periods of time. To largely standardize for the time period, and get an overall picture of the risk for a student's entire stay on the campus, estimates were made for seniors since entering the IHE. This

provides the prevalence for the period while attending a 4-year college or university, which for many is a 4-year period.¹¹

According to the AAU Survey, 16.5 percent of seniors experienced sexual contact involving penetration or sexual touching as a result of physical force or incapacitation (Table 3-20). Senior females (26.1%) and those identifying as TGQN (29.5%) are, by far, the most likely to experience this type of victimization. Senior males are subject to much smaller risk (6.3%). Senior females and those identifying as TGQN reported being a victim of nonconsensual penetration involving physical force or incapacitation 11.3 percent and 12.6 percent, respectively, since first enrolling at the IHE.

---Table 3-20 about here ---- see tables after the reference list


The above estimates exclude attempted but not completed sexual contact. However, attempted acts are also part of the legal definition of rape and sexual battery. They also have been included in a number of different studies on victimization of college students (Koss, et al., 1987). The AAU Survey measured attempts of forcible penetration. If these are also included, the estimates increase by approximately 1 percentage point (e.g., 27.2% for females and 30.8% for TGQN).

The survey measured two additional tactics—coercion and AAC. If these are included in an overall prevalence measure, the estimate increases to 21.2 percent of seniors since first enrolling at the IHE. One-third (33.1%) of senior females and 39.1 percent of seniors identifying as TGQN report being a victim of nonconsensual sexual contact at least once. Approximately half of these were victims of nonconsensual penetration (17.1% of senior females and 23.2% of senior TGQN) involving one of the four tactics (physical force or threat of physical force; incapacitation; coercion; and AAC)

Another perspective is to characterize the experience of everyone who was enrolled at the institution at the time of the survey. This shifts the focus from seniors to all undergraduates. This provides the prevalence of victims of nonconsensual sexual contact currently attending the IHE. The rate ranges from a low of 17 percent to a high of 39 percent (Figure 7).

¹¹The exception are those that transferred to the college or university after their freshman year.

Figure 7. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving force, incapacitation, coercion or absence of affirmative consent since entering the school for the 27 IHEs




Another important summary measure is the prevalence during the 2014-2015 academic year. This is the most current measure of risk and might be seen as most relevant when developing policies. The prevalence for the 2014-2015 year for all undergraduates is 8.1 percent for completed acts of nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation (Table 3-21). Undergraduate females and those identifying as TGQN are at much higher risk than males (12.6% for females and 12.7% for TGQN vs. 3.1% for males) (Figure 8). Among females and TGQN, 3.9 percent and 5.2 percent, respectively, report being victims of completed penetration involving physical force or incapacitation. When adding in attempted but not completed acts of penetration using physical force, 4.9 percent and 6.5 percent of females and TGQN, respectively, report being victims of penetration.

----Table 3-21 about here ---- see tables after the reference list

Once including all types of nonconsensual sexual contact measured on the survey, 11.0 percent of undergraduates reported being a victim during the 2014–2015 academic year. Females and those identifying as TGQN, when compared to males, are most likely to be a victim at least once (17.0% for females; 19.0% for TGQN vs. 4.4% for males). A large percentage were victims of acts involving penetration (4.4% of all students; 6.9% of females and 9.0% of TGQN).

Figure 8. Percent reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation during the 2014 – 2015 school year




How do the AAU Estimates Compare with Surveys of College Students on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct? To better understand the implications of the above results, it is useful to place them within the context of prior surveys on nonconsensual sexual contact. There are many differences in methodology among the different campus climate surveys, including the composition of the sample, the mode of survey administration, the response rate, the definitions of nonconsensual activity, and perhaps most importantly is the wording of the questions (Fisher, 2009). Nonetheless, the detailed questions included on the AAU Survey allow making selected comparisons.

The College Sexual Assault (CSA) study (Krebs, et al., 2007) was conducted with undergraduate students attending two large public universities in 2005. Like the AAU Survey, it was a web survey, though it had a response rate considerably higher than the AAU Survey (42% vs. 19%). While the question wording between the two surveys are not identical, they are similar when asking about penetration and sexual touching behaviors and tactics, including physical force and incapacitation.¹² The CSA study estimated rates using several different definitions that varied by the time period

¹²The AAU Survey was based, in part, on the CSA.

(current year, since enrolled in college) and whether attempted, but not completed, acts were included. The most widely cited figure represents the experience of senior females since entering college. For completed nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation, this is 19.8 percent of female college seniors (“1 in 5”).¹³ This is lower than the estimate from the AAU Survey (26.1%).^{14,15} When comparing the estimates for penetration by force and incapacitation, the difference is in the opposite direction, with higher rates for CSA than for AAU (11.3% for AAU and 14.3% for CSA).¹⁶ Consequently the main difference between the two estimates is for sexual touching, which make up the remainder of the “1 in 5” figure (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Percent of senior females reporting completed nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the IHE for Campus Sexual Assault and the AAU Surveys by type of sexual contact



In both cases, the CSA estimates are within the range of estimates across the 27 campuses included in the AAU Survey. For example, the range for nonconsensual sexual contact by force or incapacitation for female college seniors is 15 percent to 34 percent (data not shown).

¹³The 95 percent confidence interval for this estimate is 17.7 percent to 21.9 percent (personal communication from Christopher Krebs).

¹⁴The 95 percent confidence interval for this estimate is 25.3 percent to 26.9 percent.

¹⁵Restricting the AAU sample to public universities results in a similar estimate (25.7%).

¹⁶The standard error for the Krebs estimate is approximately 1 percent.

The National College Woman’s Sexual Violence Survey (NCWSV) (Fisher, et al., 2000) was a national telephone survey of college students, ages 18-24 years old conducted in 1996. The response rate was considerably higher than both the AAU and the CSA studies (86%). The question wording was largely based on two studies (Kilpatrick, et al., 1992); Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000). The behaviors included attempted acts as well as completed acts and did not screen for acts involving incapacitation. The most comparable estimate to the AAU Survey is completed and attempted forced penetration for the current school year. The NCWSV estimate was 2.8 percent. The rate for the AAU Survey, once excluding instances of penetration involving incapacitation, is 2.9 percent (data not shown).

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) conducted the Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault (CASA).¹⁷ This was a web survey with a 35 percent response rate that asked students to report about their experiences since entering the university. The question wording was considerably different from the above studies, using both “labeled experiences” specifically referencing rape and sexual assault, as well as behavior-specific descriptions of unwanted sexual contact. The behavior specific questions include the same range of behaviors as AAU. Once asked about specific behaviors, respondents were then asked if any of the behaviors occurred as a result of several different tactics, including physical force or incapacitation. The estimate from the CASA study for the prevalence of sexual contact by force and incapacitation for undergraduate females was 17 percent. The comparable estimate from AAU is 23.1 percent (Table 3-22), which is significantly higher.¹⁸ The rates for female graduate/professional students (5.0%) and male graduate/professional students (1%) are also lower than the comparable AAU estimates (8.8% for female graduate/professionals; 2.2% for male graduate/professionals). The rates for undergraduate males are approximately the same (5.0% vs. 5.4%). As with the comparison to the CSA, the MIT estimate also falls within the range of the AAU IHEs.

-----Table 3-22 about here-----see tables after reference list

¹⁷See two releases provided at <http://web.mit.edu/surveys/health/>.

¹⁸MIT did not publish standard errors for these estimates. Assuming this was a simple random sample and that 914 female undergraduates responded,, the standard error for the MIT estimate is approximately 1.3 percent and has a 95 percent confidence interval from 14.4 percent to 19.6 percent. This estimate is statistically different from the AAU estimate of 23 percent.

Overall, these comparisons illustrate that estimates such as “1 in 5” or “1 in 4” as a global rate, across all IHEs is at least over simplistic, if not misleading. None of the studies that generate estimates for specific IHEs are nationally representative. The above results show that the rates vary greatly across campuses, and as seen from the discussion above, they vary by IHE characteristics. The two surveys with the most comparable definitions and questionnaire wording to the AAU are the CSA and NCWSV.¹⁹ The CSA estimate for both sexual touching and penetration involving force or incapacitation was lower than the AAU estimate (19.8% vs. 26.1%) but was within the range of estimates across the 27 campuses included in the survey. The NCWSV estimates, a nationally representative sample, of forced penetration were almost identical to the AAU estimate. The AAU estimate was consistently lower than the MIT survey by 1 to 5 percentage points depending on the gender and enrollment status of the student. But, again, it was within the range across the 27 IHEs.

4. How Extensive Are Sexual Harassment, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence?

Students were asked about their experiences related to three other forms of sexual misconduct: (1) sexual harassment, (2) stalking, and (3) intimate partner violence. This section reviews the prevalence, incidence, and characteristics associated with each of these behaviors. These were included on the survey not only because they represent serious forms of sexual misconduct but also because they are the subject of federal investigations into civil rights violations.

Sexual Harassment. Sexual harassment was defined as a series of behaviors that interfered with the victim’s academic or professional performances, limited the victim’s ability to participate in an academic program, or created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive social, academic, or work environment. This definition is in line with campus policies, as well as those of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s definition regarding “hostile environment” and the U.S. Department of Education.²⁰ To provide this definition to respondents, each question on harassment was prefaced with the following:

“These next questions ask about situations in which a student at [University], or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] said or did something that

¹⁹These surveys have very different response rates (19% AAU; 42% CSA; 85% NCWSV).

²⁰For the EEOC definition, see http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm. For the Department of Education definition, see http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/ocrshpam.html#_t1a.

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment”

The specific behaviors referenced were taken from several different scales measuring harassment:

- made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you?
- made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else’s body, appearance or sexual activities?
- said crude or gross sexual things to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters when you didn’t want to?
- emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos to you that you didn’t want?
- continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though you said, “No”?


The behaviors referenced were taken from several different scales measuring harassment (Leskinen and Cortina, 2014).

Overall, 47.7 percent of students indicated that they have been the victims of sexual harassment since enrolled at the college (Table 4-1). Students identifying as TGQN and females are most likely to be victims of sexual harassment. For example, 75.2 percent of undergraduate and 69.4 percent of graduate/professional students who identify as TGQN reported being sexually harassed. Well more than half of female undergraduates (61.9%) reported being sexually harassed. Female graduate/professional students and male undergraduates (44.1% and 42.9%, respectively) had the next highest rates, and male graduate/professional students had the lowest rates (29.6%). The most common behavior cited by the students was making inappropriate comments about their body, appearance, or sexual behavior (37.7%); followed by making sexual remarks, or insulting or offensive jokes or stories (29.5%). The pattern by gender and enrollment status is the same for each of the specific types of behaviors, although those who identify as TGQN have especially high rates of the inappropriate comments and making sexual remarks (66.2% and 61.2%, respectively).

-----Tables 4-1 and 4-2 about here ----- see tables after reference list

The range of sexual harassment experienced by undergraduate females across the IHEs goes from a low of 49 percent to a high of 74 percent (Figure 10). There are significant differences across several of the IHE characteristics (Table 4-2). For enrollment size, the larger schools have the lowest rates of harassment. For example, among undergraduate females in the largest IHEs 60.3 percent reported being a victim of harassment. This compares to 69.9 percent in the smallest schools. For whether a school is public or private, the direction of the differences varies by enrollment status. For undergraduates, prevalence is lower for those enrolled in public schools (e.g., 60.9% in public vs. 68.2% in private for undergraduate females). For graduate/professionals, private schools have a lower prevalence rate (e.g., 45.8% for public vs. 40.9% for private schools).

Figure 10. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting sexual harassment since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



There is a similar interaction between gender and enrollment status for the percentage of undergraduates enrolled. For undergraduates, schools with a smallest percentage of undergraduate enrollment have the highest rates of harassment (e.g., for undergraduate females 67.6% for IHEs with smallest percentage vs. 58.3% for the IHEs with the largest percentage). For male and female graduate/professional students, the opposite is the case. Those enrolled in the IHEs with the lowest percentage of undergraduate students have the lowest rates of harassment.

There is a positive correlation between the response rate and rates of harassment. This is most pronounced for undergraduate females and those identifying as TGQN, where the IHEs with the highest response rates also have the highest rates of harassment.

When estimating the multivariate model only the response rate remained significant. Characteristics such as size of enrollment and public vs. private were not significant.

Students who reported experiencing sexual harassment were asked several follow-up questions about the context of the incident(s) (Table 4-1). The offender's affiliation to the IHE was most often described as a student (91.6%). This was more common among undergraduate students (94.6% of female undergraduates, 93.8% of male undergraduates, 94.4% for TGQN,) than among graduate/professional students (82.0% female graduate/professional students, 85.7% male graduate/professional students, 82.7% of TGQN). Graduate/professional students more often identified the offender as a faculty member (e.g., 22.4% of female graduate/professional students vs. 5.9% of female undergraduates).

The most common relationship of the offender to the victim is a friend or acquaintance (69.9%), followed by a stranger (43.1%). Graduate/professional students more frequently identified the relationship of the offender to the victim as teacher or advisor (e.g., 15.8% of female graduate/professional students vs. 4.9% of female undergraduates) or a co-worker, boss, or supervisor (17.7% of female graduate/professional students vs. 6.0% of female undergraduates).

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). The measure of IPV was intended to capture violence associated with relationships that would not be captured in the questions on nonconsensual sexual contact. These questions were administered to anyone who said they had been in any “partnered relationship” since enrolling in college. This was approximately 75 percent of the student population. A partner relationship included:

- casual relationship or hook-up
- steady or serious relationship
- marriage, civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation

To be classified as a victim, respondents had to say that a partner had done one of the following:

- controlled or tried to control you? Examples could be when someone:

- kept you from going to classes or pursuing your educational goals
- did not allow you to see or talk with friends or family
- made decisions for you such as, where you go or what you wear or eat
- threatened to “out” you to others
- threatened to physically harm you, someone you love, or themselves
- used any kind of physical force against you? Examples could be when someone
 - bent your fingers or bit you
 - choked, slapped, punched or kicked you
 - hit you with something other than a fist
 - attacked you with a weapon, or otherwise physically hurt or injured you


Since enrolled in the college, 9.8 percent of the student population who had been in a partnered relationship had experienced IPV (Table 4-3). This was reported most often by those identifying as TGQN (22.8% undergraduates; 17.8% graduate/professional), followed by female undergraduates (12.8%), male undergraduates (9.3%, respectively), female graduate/professional students (7.0%) and lastly by male graduate/professional students (6.3%). The most common behavior was controlling or trying to control the victim (6.2%); followed by threatening to harm the victim, family or themselves (3.9%) and using physical force (3.9%).

-----Table 4-3 about here ---- see tables after reference list

The range of IPV among undergraduate females across the campuses goes from a low of 9 percent to a high of 16 percent (Figure 11). There are some statistically significant, but relatively small, differences in the rate of IPV by the IHE characteristics (Table 4-4). For example, for undergraduate females, larger schools (41,000 to 61,000) had a rate of 13.2 percent compared to 10.9 percent for smaller schools. Public schools had a higher rate than private schools for undergraduate females (13.0% to 11.3%). The differences between the high and low categories for the other characteristics are also relatively small (1 or 2 percentage points).

-----Table 4-4 about here ---- see tables after reference list

Figure 11. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting intimate partner violence since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



The response rate is negatively related to rates of IPV. The IHEs with the lowest response rates have the highest rates of IPV. For example for undergraduate females, the IHEs with response rates between 7 and 14 percent had a prevalence rate of 13.6 percent compared to 11 percent for those schools with the highest response rates.

Stalking. To measure stalking, students were asked whether someone:

- made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- spied on, watched or followed you either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety

To be considered stalking, the respondent had to say additionally that these behaviors, either singly or in combination, occurred more than once, and were done by the same person.

Overall, 4.2 percent of students reported that they had been the victims of stalking since first enrolling at the college or university (Table 4-5). As with almost all the different measures of sexual assault and misconduct, those identifying as TGQN reported the highest rates (12.1% undergraduates; 8.4% graduate/ professional). Female undergraduates reported being victims of stalking at the next highest rate (6.7%), followed by graduate/professional females at 5.2 percent, and male students (2.2% male undergraduates and 1.7% male graduate/professional).

-----Table 4-5 and 4-6 about here ----- see tables after reference list

Most often, the offender's affiliation to the university was described as a student (63.9%), particularly among undergraduate students (69.7% female undergraduates and 65.0% male undergraduates vs. 52.5% of graduate female students and 50.0% of male graduate/professional students). A fairly large percentage (28.9%) could not answer the question either because of not knowing how the person was affiliated or because of not knowing whether the person was affiliated at all.

In describing the relationship of the offender to the victim, students most often indicated that it was a friend or acquaintance (40.4%), followed by a stranger (28.7%), and someone they had dated or were intimate with (24.3%). Undergraduates were particularly likely to indicate that the offender was a friend or acquaintance (45.9% of female undergraduates and 34.8% of male undergraduates vs. 32.8% of female graduate/professional students and 28.2% of male graduate/professional students).

The range across the 27 universities for stalking goes from 5 to 8. As with IPV, the university characteristics are not strongly related to the percentage of students that report stalking (Table 4-6). For female undergraduates, for example, the rates are almost identical by size of school (e.g., 6.3% for 14,000 to 13,000 vs. 6.7% for 41,000 to 61,000).

The IHEs with the lowest response rates have the highest prevalence rates, although the differences are relatively small. The largest difference is for graduate/professional females for whom IHEs with response rates between 7 percent and 14 percent have a prevalence rate of 7.7 percent compared to 4.5 percent for IHEs with the highest response rate.

5. Who Are the Victims?

In addition to collecting data on gender and enrollment status, students were asked about a number of other personal characteristics that might be related to rates of sexual assault and sexual

misconduct. Generally speaking, the same groups had the highest rates of victimization across all types of sexual assault and misconduct (Tables 5-1 to Table 5-3). Students with sexual orientations other than heterosexual report having been victimized more often than heterosexual students. For example, 60.4 percent of gays and lesbians report being sexually harassed compared to 45.8 percent of heterosexuals (Table 5-3). The survey asked if the student had a disability registered with the university. Those who said they had a disability had higher rates of victimization. For example, 31.6 percent of female undergraduates with a disability reported nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation. This compares 18.4 percent of the undergraduate females without a disability (Table 5-1). With respect to race, for most forms of victimization, Asians are less likely to report being a victim. For example, 37.9 percent of Asians reported being sexually harassed when compared to 51.3 percent for Whites (Table 5-3). For graduate and professional students, married students are less likely to report all types of victimization. For example, 2.1 percent of married graduate/professional females reported AAC since entering the IHE compared to 6.3 percent who have never been married (Table 5-2).

-----Tables 5-1, 5-2 and 5-3 about here ----- see tables after reference list

6. Who Do Students Tell About the Incident?


One important policy concern is whether victims of sexual assault and misconduct report it to either the appropriate university agency or another organization, such as law enforcement (hereafter referred to as “agencies”). To understand how often this happens, those students reporting a victimization were presented with a list of agencies that were tailored to specific campus resources. This list ranged from agencies concerned with prosecuting offenders (e.g., the Title IX office; campus or local police) to those concerned with assisting the victim with the consequences of the incident (e.g., health care providers, victim services). Students were asked if they reported the victimization to any of these places. These questions were asked for those students reporting sexual contact involving physical force and incapacitation for each behavior (penetration, sexual touching). They were also asked of those reporting sexual harassment, IPV, and stalking.

Overall, the rates of reporting were quite low (Tables 6-1 and 6-2). This result has been found on other studies as well (e.g., Fisher, et al., 2003). The highest was for stalking (28.2%) and physically forced penetration (25.5%). The reporting rates for IPV and penetration involving incapacitation were a bit lower (15.0% and 13.3%, respectively). The reporting rates were lowest for sexual touching from both tactics (7.0% from physical force and 5.0% from incapacitation) and sexual harassment (7.7%).

-----see Table 6-1 and 6-2 about here ----- see tables after reference list

As with the rates of victimization, there was a wide range of reporting across the different IHEs. For example, the proportion of all victims of penetration by physical force reported to an agency across the 27 IHEs varied from a low of 17 percent to a high of 46 percent (Figure 12).

Figure 12. Distribution of percent of students reporting nonconsensual penetration by physical force to an agency for the 27 IHEs



When asked why the student did not report an incident, the dominant reason was it was not considered serious enough. This is also consistent with prior research (e.g., Fisher, et al., 2003). Even for penetration involving physical force, over half (58.6%) of students gave this reason. This reason is highest for those events that had the lowest overall rates of reporting to an agency (cited by 78.6% of those who experienced harassment, and by 75.6% and 74.1%, respectively, of students who experienced sexual touching due to physical force or incapacitation).

Fully one-third (35.9%) of victims of forced penetration did not report the event because they “embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult.” Twenty-nine percent said they did not report such an incident because they “...did not think anything would be done about it.”

Students were asked if they told someone else about the incident (e.g., friend, faculty). Most reported telling someone else, although the percentages differ by the type of incident. In all cases, the most common response was telling a friend. For acts involving sexual contact involving force or incapacitation, about 75 percent of the victims told a friend (78.2% for penetration by force; 76.1% for penetration by incapacitation, 75.5% sexual touching by force, and 74.1% for sexual touching by incapacitation). For harassment and IPV, the percentages that told a friend were somewhat lower (57.6% for harassment and 63.5% for IPV). The opposite is the case for stalking, where 83.5 percent of victims told a friend.

Those who reported an instance of sexual assault or misconduct to a program during the current school year were asked to evaluate their experience. Table 6-3 provides a summary of these evaluations for victims of nonconsensual sexual contact involving force and incapacitation. Overall, for those victims that reported at least one incident to a program, 29.6 percent said it was somewhat useful, 37.7 percent said it was very useful, and 33.1 percent said it was extremely useful. In contrast, 14.8 percent and 19 percent said it was not at all or a little useful. Students were asked if at any time they felt pressure from the program about whether or not to proceed with further reporting or adjudication. The vast majority of students (92.6%) said they were not pressured.

Students were asked to rate the program they contacted on a scale that went from “excellent” to “poor.” When asked to rate the program on showing respect to the student, 61.5 percent rated the program as “excellent” and 28.0 percent said “very good.” A smaller percentage rated the program as either “fair” (10.4%) or “poor” (6.4%). When asked to rate how well the agency helped them to understand their options, 46.2 percent rated the program as “excellent” and 32.6 percent said it was “very good.” Just 15.7 percent rated the program as said “fair” and 11.9 percent as “poor.”

7. Campus Climate Around Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

Students were asked about their expectations regarding the response from the university and peers if they were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct, whether they had ever witnessed an incident and whether they intervened, whether they perceive sexual assault or sexual misconduct as a problem on campus, and their perception of the likelihood that they would be sexually victimized.

Response to a Report of Sexual Assault or Sexual Misconduct. Students were asked to rate the likelihood of several different scenarios related to responding to sexual assault or sexual misconduct. These questions used a 5-point ordinal scale with the categories “not at all,” “a little,” “somewhat,” “very,” or “extremely.”

Students were asked what they thought might happen if someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at their university (Tables 7-1 and 7-2). Overall, just over half (55.2%) believe that it is very or extremely likely that the victim would be supported by other students in making a report (Table 7.1). However, members of those gender/enrollment groups least likely to be victimized (as noted in the prior section) are the most likely to believe other students would support the person making the report. Male students are more optimistic than females, with 60.5 percent of male undergraduate students and 59.6 percent of male graduate/professional students indicating that it is very or extremely likely that other students would support the victim in making a report (Table 7-2). This compares to 51.3 percent of female undergraduate students and 48.7 percent of female graduate/professional students. Those identifying as TQGN were the least likely to agree, with 33.2 percent of undergraduates and 36.1 percent of graduate/professional students saying it was very or extremely likely that a student who reported an incident would be supported by other students.

----Table 7-1 and Table 7-2 about here ----- see tables after reference list

Students were asked about the likelihood that the alleged perpetrator or associates would retaliate against the victim in response to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Overall, 22.2 percent thought it very or extremely likely that retaliation would occur (Table 7-1). Male students are less inclined to believe that a report would result in retaliation, with 17.7 percent of male undergraduate students and 17.7 percent of male graduate/professional students indicating that it is very likely or extremely likely that this would occur (Table 7-2). This compares to 27.5 percent of female undergraduate students and 24.0 percent of female graduate/professional students. Those identifying as TQGN were the most likely to say retaliation would occur with 42.1 percent of undergraduates and 37.6 percent of graduate/professional students believing it was very or extremely likely.

The survey contained several questions about how students thought campus officials would react to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Students were asked how likely it is that campus officials would take the report seriously. Overall, 63.3 percent believe it very or extremely likely that the report would be taken seriously by campus officials (Table 7-1). Female students are less optimistic than male students in this regard: 57.1 percent of female undergraduate students and 57.5 percent of female graduate/professional students believe that it is very or extremely likely, compared to 70.0 percent of male undergraduate students and 69.9 percent of male graduate/professional students (Table 7-2). As with the other attitudes, TQGN were least optimistic

by a large margin, with 41.5 percent of undergraduates and 38.6 percent of graduate/professional students thinking it was at least very likely the report would be taken seriously.

Students were asked if they believed campus officials would protect the safety of individuals making the report. Overall, 56.5 percent said it is very or extremely likely that the individual's safety would be protected (Table 7-1). Among undergraduate students, females are less optimistic, with 51.3 percent saying it is very or extremely likely that the individual's safety would be protected, compared to 63.3 percent of male undergraduate students (Table 7-2). A similar pattern can be observed when comparing female and male graduate/professional students (47.7% vs. 62.6%). Those identifying as TGQN were least likely to believe officials would protect the victim's safety (34.2% for undergraduates and 31.7% for graduate/professional students).

Students were asked if they believe campus officials would conduct a fair investigation in the event of a report. Overall, about half of the students (49.2%) believe it is very or extremely likely that this would occur (Table 7-1). Among undergraduates, females are less optimistic than males, with 45.7 percent of female undergraduate students saying that it is very or extremely likely that there would be a fair investigation, compared to 53.2 percent of male undergraduates (Table 7-2). A similar pattern is observed when comparing female and male graduate/professional students (47.3% vs. 53.9%). Among students who identify as TGQN, only 26.4 percent of undergraduate students and 25.7 percent of the graduate/professional students believe there would be a fair investigation.


Overall, 44.6 percent of students thought it was very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action against the offender (Table 7-1). Females were less likely than males to believe that campus officials would take action against the offender, with 37.4 percent of female undergraduate students and 33.6 percent of female graduate/professional students saying that it is very or extremely likely that this would occur (Table 7-2). This compares to 54.2 percent of male undergraduate and 51.4 percent of male graduate/professional students. Those who identify as TGQN were the least likely to believe action would be taken with 22.5 percent and 20 percent of undergraduate and graduate/professional students, respectively, saying it was very or extremely likely.

Lastly, 38.9 percent of students believe it is very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus. Female students are less inclined to believe this than males, with 36.0 percent of female undergraduate students and 32.3 percent of female graduate/professional students saying that it is very or extremely likely that this would happen. This compares to 43.9 percent of male

undergraduates and 42.4 percent of male graduate/professional students. The TGQN group was the least likely to believe action would be taken (17.0% of undergraduates; 18.2% of graduate/professional students).


There is wide variation across the IHEs participating in the survey for student perceptions about what is likely to happen when a victim reports an instance of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. For example, the percentage of students who think it is very or extremely likely the university will take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously varies from a low of 46 percent to a high of 77 percent (Figure 13). Most of the schools vary between 54 percent and 69 percent, but there are five schools below this range and five schools that are above it.

Figure 13. Percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously for the 27 IHEs in the AAU Survey since entering college



The range is larger for opinions on whether an official at the school would conduct a fair investigation (Figure 14). Most of the schools fell within the range of 38 percent to 57 percent of students that think is very or extremely likely that a fair investigation will occur. Six schools fell outside this range, with 3 IHEs with 26 percent to 37 percent of students and 3 IHEs with 58 percent to 67 percent.

Figure 14. Percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will conduct a fair investigation for the 27 IHEs in the AAU Survey



The multivariate model described in sections 3 and 4 was estimated to better understand the types of schools that have students that believe it is very or extremely likely the university will react in a positive way to a report of sexual assault or misconduct. The model predicted opinions among undergraduate females about how their peers and university officials would react to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct (Appendix 4). To simplify the analysis, a single outcome measure with two categories was created to summarize student opinions about the reactions of university officials to a report of sexual assault or misconduct. The new measure classified students into one category if they thought it was very or extremely likely for each of the following statements: (1) that university officials would take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously, (2) would conduct a fair investigation, and (3) would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct. If one or more of these measures was not answered as very or extremely likely, the student was classified into a second category.

Two university predictors were significant. Universities that were in the second highest enrollment category (26,000 to 40,000) had a smaller percentage of students saying very or extremely likely. The second significant variable was the percentage of female students at the IHE. The higher the percentage the fewer the undergraduate females that said very or extremely likely.

Bystander Intervention. Students were asked whether they have been a bystander to the occurrence of sexual assault or misconduct, and if so, the extent to which they intervened and the reason for their intervention decision (Tables 7-3 and 7-4).

----Table 7-3 and Table 7-4 about here----- see tables after reference list

Overall, 17.8 percent of respondents have suspected that a friend may have been sexually assaulted (Table 7-3). Those undergraduates identifying as TGQN are more likely to suspect a friend was a victim (42.6%) when compared to female (26.4%) and male (16.2%) undergraduates (Table 7-4). Undergraduates are more likely than graduate/professionals to suspect a friend was a victim of a sexual assault. For example, among the TGQN group, just 25.6 percent of graduate/professional students report suspecting a friend of being a victim compared to 42.6 percent of undergraduates. Similar patterns were noted for females and males.

Among those who reported they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted, 66.4 percent took some type of action, with most speaking to the friend or someone else to seek help (57.1%) (Table 7-3). While there are statistically significant differences across gender groups, the magnitude of these differences is not nearly as large as observed for other differences discussed above (Table 7-4). For example, 68.3 percent of undergraduate females said she took some action compared to 64.2 percent of undergraduate males. Similarly, the differences for the TGQN group, when compared to the other genders, are not as large and are not statistically significant.

Overall, 44.4 percent of respondents reported they have witnessed a drunk person heading for a sexual encounter (Table 7-3). For males and females there are large differences between undergraduate and graduate/professional students (Table 7-4). For example, 52 percent of undergraduate females witnessed a drunk person heading for a sexual encounter compared to 30.6 percent of female graduate\professional students. This pattern is not as pronounced for those who identify as TGQN, where the difference in proportions of undergraduates and graduate/professional students is smaller (42.3% vs. 38.6%).

Among those who reported having witnessed a drunk person heading to a sexual encounter, 77.0 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 23.5 percent saying they weren't sure what to do, and 53.5 percent saying they did nothing for another reason. With respect to taking actions, undergraduates were more likely to directly intervene. For example 11.5 percent of female undergraduates reported directly intervening compared to 7.5 percent of female graduate/professional students. Similarly, 7.4 percent of male undergraduates reported direct

intervention compared to 4.8 percent of graduate/professional students. There are also differences by gender. Females (11.5% for undergraduates; 7.5% for graduate/professional) and TGQN (14.1% and 9.7% for undergraduate and graduate/professional students) directly intervened in higher proportions than males (7.4% for male undergraduates and 4.8% for graduate/professional students).

A similar pattern is evident for those who spoke to someone else to seek help. Overall, 6.3 percent of students took this type of action. Undergraduates were more likely to take this action (e.g., female undergraduates 8.8% vs. 5.2% female graduate/professional students) and a higher proportion of females/TQGN when compared to males (e.g., 5.0% of male undergraduates vs. 8.8% of female undergraduates and 6.6% of TGQN undergraduates).

Overall, 19.6 percent of respondents indicated that they had witnessed someone acting in a sexually violent or harassing manner. Those identifying as TGQN reported this at much higher rates (42.6% for undergraduates, 35.1% for graduate/professional) than females (26.0% for undergraduates, 16.5% for graduate/professional) and males (18.4% for undergraduates, 10.7% for graduate/professional). There are similarly large differences by enrollment status. For example, the proportion of female undergraduates witnessing this behavior was 10 percentage points higher than female graduate/professional students (26.0% vs. 16.5%).

Among those who witnessed someone acting in a sexually violent or harassing manner, 54.5 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 24.5 percent saying they weren't sure what to do and 30.0 percent saying they did nothing for another reason. Even though there are statistically significant differences by gender and enrollment status, the magnitude of these differences is not large. For example, female undergraduates did nothing at a higher rate than male undergraduates (54.9% vs. 52.8%), but this difference is only around 2 percentage points.

With respect to taking actions to intervene, males and TGQN students were slightly more likely to intervene directly than females (16.6% female undergraduates vs. 22.0% male undergraduates and 24.1% TGQN). Females were more likely than males to speak to someone else (16.7% for undergraduate females vs. 11.4% of undergraduate males).

Opinions About Prevalence and Personal Risk. Students were asked several questions about the perceived risks of sexual assault or misconduct at their college or university (Table 7-5 and 7-6). When asked how problematic sexual assault or sexual misconduct is at their college or university, 20.2 percent reported it is very or extremely problematic (Table 7-5). In contrast, a relatively small


percentage of students thought it was either very or extremely likely that they would experience sexual assault on campus or at a university affiliated event off campus (5.0% on campus; 5.3% at a university-sponsored event off campus).

---Tables 7-5 and 7-6 about here ---- see tables after reference list

These overall rates vary by gender and enrollment status. With respect to gender, those identifying as TGQN are more likely to say the climate is problematic or more risky than females. Females are more likely to report problems or risks than males. For example, 43.6 percent of undergraduate students identifying as TGQN thought sexual assault or misconduct was very or extremely problematic on their campus. This compares to 27.1 percent of undergraduate females and 16.1 percent of undergraduate males. There are also differences between undergraduate and graduate/professional students. For example, 10.2 percent of undergraduate females reported it was very or extremely likely that they could experience sexual assault or misconduct on campus. This compares to 4.5 percent of graduate/professional females.

There is quite a bit of variation in how problematic students view sexual assault and misconduct to be across the participating universities (Figure 15). This ranges from a low of 2 percent to a high of 39 percent. Many (14) of the schools are at 20 percent or below.

Figure 15. Distribution of the percent of students who perceive that sexual assault and sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic on campus for the 27 IHE



As noted above, a relatively small percentage of students reported they thought they were very or extremely likely to experience a sexual assault or sexual misconduct incident. The variation across schools for this measure is relatively small. The survey included two questions on this topic: one question asked about risk when on campus; the other was for campus-affiliated events occurring off campus. To summarize these measures, we created a single index that counted the individual if the response to either of these was very likely or extremely likely (Figure 16). This ranges between 2 percent and 8 percent for the 27 schools. However, this masks larger variation for groups who report high levels of all types of sexual assault and misconduct. For example, the percentage of undergraduate females that said they were very or extremely likely to experience sexual assault or misconduct on campus (Figure 17) ranges from 6 percent to 24 percent.

A statistical model was estimated to test whether any university characteristics were related to how problematic undergraduate females think sexual assault or misconduct is at their school (Appendix 4). Several university characteristics were related to this measure. The higher the proportion of females and undergraduates at the IHE, the more female undergraduates believe sexual assault or misconduct to be problematic. In addition, the higher the response rate at the IHE, the more problematic sexual assault or misconduct was perceived at the school.

Figure 16. Distribution of percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely to experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus or at a campus affiliated event for the 27 IHEs





Figure 17. Distribution of percent of undergraduate females who perceive it is very or extremely likely to experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus or at a campus affiliated event for the 27 IHEs



Knowledge About University Sexual Assault Policies and Procedures. This section presents findings regarding the students' awareness of services and resources offered by the IHE for those affected by sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The students were asked questions about their knowledge of how the university defines sexual assault and sexual misconduct, how to get help if the student or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct, where to make a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, and what happens when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. For each question, the student was asked how likely certain actions would be taken using a 5-point response scale: not at all, a little, somewhat, very, and extremely likely. Students were also asked whether their initial orientation to the university included information about sexual assault and sexual misconduct on campus, and if so, how helpful it was.

Overall, 24.0 percent of students reported they are very or extremely knowledgeable about how the university defines sexual assault and sexual misconduct (Table 7-7). For males and females, undergraduate students tend to think they are more knowledgeable about the university's sexual assault policies and procedures than graduate/professional students. For example, for females, 25.4 percent of undergraduates believe they are very or extremely knowledgeable compared to 16.9 percent of female graduate/professional students. Similarly, for males the comparable percentages are 27.8 percent of undergraduates and 19.3 percent of graduate/professional students. There is also a difference by gender. Those identifying as TGQN have the highest percentage who believe they are knowledgeable (33.6% of undergraduates; 32.1% of graduate/professional students), males have the next highest (27.8% of undergraduates; 19.3% of graduate/professional students), and females have slightly lower percentages (25.4% of undergraduates; 16.9% of graduate/professional students).

---Table 7-7 about here --- see tables after reference list.

When asked if they know where to get help at the university if they or a friend are victims of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, 29.5 percent of students said they were very or extremely knowledgeable. The same gender and enrollment status patterns noted with regard to defining sexual assault are apparent on the item for where to get help. Those identifying as TGQN have the highest proportions who believe they are knowledgeable. Males and females have similar percentages. There is a large difference between undergraduates and graduate/professional students for males and females. There are no differences by enrollment status for those identifying as TGQN.

About one-quarter (25.8%) of all students said they were very or extremely knowledgeable about where to make a report if a student or friend experienced a sexual assault or sexual misconduct. For

males and females, undergraduates were more likely to say they are very or extremely knowledgeable when compared to graduate/professional students. For example, 25.6 percent of female undergraduates reported being very or extremely knowledgeable compared to 19.3 percent of female graduate/professional students. The differences by gender are relatively small, but males were more likely to say they are more knowledgeable than females. For example, 25.6 percent of undergraduate females said they are very or extremely knowledgeable compared to 30.2 percent of undergraduate males.

Compared to the above, students reported being much less knowledgeable about what happens when a student reports sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Overall, 11.4 percent of students said they are very or extremely knowledgeable about this. There was some variation by gender and enrollment status, although not as much as was observed for the other questions about knowledge of campus policies. Undergraduates think they are more knowledgeable than graduate/professional students. For example, 11.4 percent of female undergraduates said they are very or extremely knowledgeable compared to 8.6 percent of female graduate/professional students. Those identifying as TGQN are most knowledgeable when compared to the other genders. For example, 16.9 percent of TGQN graduate/professional students said they are very or extremely knowledgeable compared to 8.6 percent of female graduate/professionals.


Students were asked whether their initial orientation at the school contained information about sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Overall, 48.8 percent of the students said they attended the orientation and it did include information about sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Additionally, 13.3 percent said they attended and that the orientation did not include information about sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Another 8.2 percent did not attend the orientation, while 29.7 percent do not remember if they attended or what it included.

Compared to graduate/professional students, undergraduate students reported in higher proportions that the orientation did include information on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. For example, 54.1 percent female undergraduates said their orientation contained the material compared to 34.2 percent of female graduate/professional students. Graduate/professional students more often reported that the orientation did not include this information. For example, 23.2 percent of female graduate/professional students said it did not include this information compared to 11.2 percent of female undergraduates. Similarly, 24.7 percent of graduate/professional who identify as TGQN said the material was not presented in an orientation compared to 10.4 percent of undergraduates who identify as TGQN.

Among those who said the orientation included this material, 27.6 percent said that it was either very or extremely useful. While there were some differences by gender and enrollment status, these are generally small.

Figure 18 provides the distribution across the 27 schools of student knowledge on where to get help at the school if the respondent or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct. This ranges from a low of 17 percent to a high of 44 percent. To investigate how this is related to school characteristics, a statistical model predicting student opinions about their knowledge about where to get help was created for undergraduate females. The predictor variables and form of the model were the same as described for the other outcomes discussed above. The only significant predictor was the percentage of females at the university. The higher the percentage, the less likely female undergraduates felt very or extremely knowledgeable about where to get help.

Figure 18. Distribution of percent of students who believe they are very or extremely knowledgeable about where to get help at the school if the respondent or a friend experienced a school assault or sexual misconduct for the 27 IHEs



8. Summary

This study is one of the first to provide an empirical assessment of campus sexual assault and misconduct across a wide range of IHEs. Prior studies have been implemented for a small number of IHEs or for a national sample of students with relatively small samples for any particular IHE. To

date, comparisons across surveys has been problematic because of different methodologies and different definitions. The AAU study is one of the first to implement a uniform methodology across multiple IHEs and produce statistically reliable estimates for each IHE.

Highlights of the results include:

- The percentage of students who report nonconsensual sexual contact varies greatly by the type of sexual contact (penetration or sexual touching) and whether or not it involves physical force, alcohol or drugs, coercion, or absence of affirmative consent.
- The profiles of each IHE are quite different. There is wide variation across IHEs:
 - for most types of sexual assault and misconduct measured on this survey.
 - for various campus climate measures, such as opinions about how problematic it is at the school and how students and university officials might react to an incident.
- The average rates of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation across all 27 IHEs are as high or slightly higher than those revealed in prior surveys.
- Rates of sexual assault and misconduct are highest among undergraduate females and those identifying as transgender, genderqueer, non-conforming, questioning, and as something not listed on the survey (TGQN).
- The risk of the most serious types of nonconsensual sexual contact, due to physical force or incapacitation, decline from freshman to senior year. This decline is not as evident for other types of nonconsensual sexual contact.
- Nonconsensual sexual contact involving drugs and alcohol constitute a significant percentage of the incidents.
- A relatively small percentage (e.g., 25% or less) of even the most serious incidents are reported to an organization or agency (e.g., Title IX office; law enforcement).
- More than 50 percent of the victims of even the most serious incidents (e.g., forced penetration) say they do not report the event because they do not consider it “serious enough.”
- A significant percentage of students say they did not report because they were “...embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult” or “...did not think anything would be done about it.”
- Significantly more than half of the victims of nonconsensual sexual contact who reported the incident to an agency or organization said their experience with the agency or organization was very good or excellent along several criteria.

- When asked what might happen when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or misconduct to a university official, about half say that it is very or extremely likely that the university will conduct a fair investigation. The percentage is lower for those groups that are most likely to report victimization (i.e., females and those identifying as TGQN). Similar percentages are evident for opinions about other types of reactions by the university (e.g., officials would take the report seriously; protect the safety of the student; take action against the offender).
- A relatively small percentage of students believe it is very or extremely likely they will experience sexual assault or misconduct. A larger percentage of students believe that sexual assault and misconduct is very or extremely problematic for the IHE.
- A little less than half of the students have witnessed a drunk person heading for a sexual encounter. Among those who reported being a witness most did not try to intervene.
- About a quarter of the students generally believe they are knowledgeable about the resources available related to sexual assault and misconduct.

As noted above, the study found a wide range of variation across the 27 IHEs in the rates of sexual assault and misconduct, as well as the climate measures. However, the analyses did not find a clear explanation for why there is such wide variation. Some university characteristics, such as size, were correlated with certain outcomes. But the correlation was not particularly strong.

An analysis of the possibility the estimates were affected by nonresponse bias found that certain types of estimates may be too high because non-victims may have been less likely to participate. This might have contributed to some of the differences observed between schools, although indications are that this was not a large effect.

The wide variation across IHEs puts in stark perspective prior discussions of single-IHE rates as representing a “standard” against which to compare results. For example, many news stories are focused on figures like “1 in 5” in reporting victimization. As the researchers who generated this number have repeatedly said, the 1 in 5 number is for a few IHEs and is not representative of anything outside of this frame. The wide variation of rates across IHEs in the present study emphasizes the significance of this caveat. It also emphasizes the need for further research into why the rates might vary by campus.

References

- Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., and Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Kilpatrick, D.G., Edmunds, C.N., and Seymour, A. (1992). *Rape in America: A report to the nation*. Arlington, VA: National Victim Center.
- Deming, W.E., and Stephen, F.F. (1940). On a least squares adjustment of a sampled frequency table. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 14, 427-444.
- Fisher, B.S., Cullen, F.T., and Turner, M.G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Fisher, B., Daigle, L.E., Cullen, F.T., and 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. (2009). The effects of survey question wording on rape estimates: Evidence from a quasi-experimental design. *Violence Against Women*, 15(2), 133-147.
- Groves, R.M., and Peytcheva, E. (2008). The impact of nonresponse rates on nonresponse bias: A meta-analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(2), 167-189.
- Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., and 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 Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 55: 162-70.
- Krebs, C., and Lindquist, C. (2014) *Setting the record straight on "1 in 5"*. <http://time.com/3633903/campus-rape-1-in-5-sexual-assault-setting-record-straight/>.
- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., and Martin, S. (2007). *The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study*. Report of project awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Award 2004-WG-BX-0010. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>.

Leskinen, E.A., and Cortina, L.M. (2014). Dimensions of disrespect: Mapping and measuring gender harassment in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(1), 107-123.

Tjaden, P., and Thoennes, N. (2000). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey* (Report prepared for the National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Washington Post-Kaiser Family Foundation. (2015). *Washington Post-Kaiser Family Foundation Survey*.
http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/how-was-sexual-assault-measured/2015/06/11/db542664-08ab-11e5-a7ad-b430fc1d3f5c_story.html

Wolter, K.M. (2007). *Introduction to variance estimation*, 2nd Edition. New York: Springer.

Table 1-4. Characteristics of respondents that completed the survey

<i>Characteristic Category</i>	Weighted		Un-weighted	
	Number	%	Number	%
<i>Age</i>				
18	50,493	6.2	9,724	6.5
19	118,261	14.6	21,327	14.2
20	123,608	15.2	20,622	13.7
21	121,495	15.0	20,653	13.8
22	94,641	11.7	15,410	10.3
23	47,552	5.9	8,975	6.0
24	39,448	4.9	7,871	5.2
25 or older	216,292	26.6	45,490	30.3
<i>Student Affiliation</i>				
Undergraduate	553,136	68.1	92,306	61.5
Graduate or Professional	258,654	31.9	57,766	38.5
<i>Year in school/program</i>				
Freshman	88,356	10.9	18,113	12.1
Sophomore	125,002	15.4	21,547	14.4
Junior	138,458	17.1	24,156	16.1
Senior	201,320	24.8	28,490	19.0
Graduate or Professional 1st year	98,449	12.1	21,734	14.5
Graduate or Professional 2nd year	72,173	8.9	15,838	10.6
Graduate or Professional 3rd year	34,876	4.3	8,113	5.4
Graduate or Professional 4th year or higher	53,157	6.5	12,081	8.1
<i>Year first enrolled in the college or university</i>				
2010 or earlier	91,233	11.2	17,390	11.6
2011	127,318	15.7	21,697	14.5
2012	147,493	18.2	26,820	17.9
2013	193,856	23.9	35,479	23.6
2014 or 2015	251,890	31.0	48,686	32.4
<i>Hispanic or Latino?</i>				
Yes	77,905	9.6	11,884	7.9
No	733,885	90.4	138,188	92.1

Table 1-4. Characteristics of respondents that completed the survey (continued)

<i>Characteristic Category</i>	<i>Weighted</i>		<i>Un-weighted</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
<i>Race</i>				
White only	554,214	68.3	107,861	71.9
Black only	42,835	5.3	6,414	4.3
Asian only	162,706	20.0	27,590	18.4
Other or multi-racial	52,035	6.4	8,207	5.5
<i>Gender Identity</i>				
Female	400,357	49.3	87,737	58.5
Male	399,349	49.2	60,085	40.0
Transgender, Genderqueer or non-conforming Questioning or not listed	7,500	0.9	1,398	0.9
Decline to State	4,583	0.6	852	0.6
<i>Sexual Orientation</i>				
Heterosexual	717,870	88.4	132,149	88.1
Gay/Lesbian	30,259	3.7	5,468	3.6
Other	50,421	6.2	10,074	6.7
Decline to State/did not answer question	13,240	1.6	2,381	1.6
<i>Since enrolled in college or university, have you been in a partnered relationship?</i>				
Yes	606,068	74.7	115,203	76.8
No	204,787	25.2	34,705	23.1
Did not answer the question	935	0.1	164	0.1
<i>Have a disability registered with the university?</i>				
Yes	27,775	3.4	5,032	3.4
No	783,097	96.5	144,878	96.5
Did not answer the question	918	0.1	162	0.1

Table 3-1. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	11.2	0.1	18.1	0.2	4.2	0.1	21.0	1.3	10.4	0.9
Penetration	4.5	0.1	7.3	0.1	1.5	0.1	9.6	0.8	3.3	0.5
Sexual Touching	8.8	0.1	14.4	0.1	3.2	0.1	15.7	1.2	8.2	0.7
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	11.7	0.1	18.9	0.1	4.3	0.1	21.5	1.3	10.4	0.9
Penetration	5.3	0.1	8.8	0.1	1.7	0.1	11.2	0.8	3.7	0.6
Sexual Touching	8.8	0.1	14.4	0.1	3.2	0.1	15.7	1.2	8.2	0.7
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using physical force	11.8	0.1	19.0	0.2	4.5	0.1	22.0	1.3	10.4	0.9
Penetration	5.4	0.1	8.9	0.1	1.8	0.1	11.7	0.9	3.8	0.6
Sexual Touching	8.9	0.1	14.5	0.1	3.3	0.1	16.2	1.3	8.2	0.7
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using physical force	14.8	0.1	23.6	0.2	5.8	0.1	27.8	1.3	12.9	0.9
Penetration	7.0	0.1	11.4	0.1	2.3	0.1	16.0	1.1	5.3	0.7
Sexual Touching	11.5	0.1	18.4	0.1	4.4	0.1	21.2	1.3	10.3	0.8

¹ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-2. Percent of female undergraduate students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	37,179	13.2	0.2	65,152	23.1	0.2
Penetration	13,864	4.9	0.1	30,505	10.8	0.2
Physical force only	6,951	2.5	0.1	15,966	5.7	0.1
Completed	3,615	1.3	0.1	9,136	3.2	0.1
Attempted	4,109	1.5	0.1	10,561	3.7	0.1
Incapacitation only	6,783	2.4	0.1	15,344	5.4	0.1
Both physical force and incapacitation	1,877	0.7	0.0	4,754	1.7	0.1
Sexual Touching	29,460	10.5	0.1	49,945	17.7	0.2
Physical force only	21,044	7.5	0.1	35,958	12.8	0.2
Incapacitation only	10,113	3.6	0.1	18,501	6.6	0.1
Both physical force and incapacitation	2,160	0.8	0.0	3,649	1.3	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-3. Percent of female graduate/professional students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	4,047	3.4	0.1	10,417	8.8	0.2
Penetration	1,432	1.2	0.1	4,609	3.9	0.1
Physical force only	825	0.7	0.0	2,448	2.1	0.1
Completed	504	0.4	0.0	1,531	1.3	0.1
Attempted	416	0.4	0.0	1,415	1.2	0.1
Incapacitation only	593	0.5	0.0	2,159	1.8	0.1
Both physical force and incapacitation	133	0.1	0.0	597	0.5	0.0
Sexual Touching	3,094	2.6	0.1	7,573	6.4	0.2
Physical force only	2,339	2.0	0.1	5,578	4.7	0.1
Incapacitation only	855	0.7	0.0	2,343	2.0	0.1
Both physical force and incapacitation	155	0.1	0.0	409	0.3	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-4. Percent of male undergraduate students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	8,613	3.3	0.1	14,176	5.4	0.1
Penetration	3,106	1.2	0.1	5,706	2.2	0.1
Physical force only	1,551	0.6	0.0	2,498	0.9	0.1
Completed	982	0.4	0.0	1,514	0.6	0.0
Attempted	795	0.3	0.0	1,644	0.6	0.0
Incapacitation only	1,648	0.6	0.0	3,403	1.3	0.1
Both physical force and incapacitation	213	0.1	0.0	433	0.2	0.0
Sexual Touching	6,453	2.4	0.1	10,492	4.0	0.1
Physical force only	4,051	1.5	0.1	6,456	2.5	0.1
Incapacitation only	2,848	1.1	0.1	4,732	1.8	0.1
Both physical force and incapacitation	303	0.1	0.0	482	0.2	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-5. Percent of male graduate/professional students experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	1,483	1.1	0.1	3,017	2.2	0.1
Penetration	541	0.4	0.0	1,232	0.9	0.1
Physical force only	352	0.3	0.0	597	0.4	0.0
Completed	251	0.2	0.0	401	0.3	0.0
Attempted	162	0.1	0.0	376	0.3	0.0
Incapacitation only	225	0.2	0.0	702	0.5	0.1
Both physical force and incapacitation	61	0.0	0.0	85	0.1	0.0
Sexual Touching	1,109	0.8	0.1	2,228	1.6	0.1
Physical force only	786	0.6	0.0	1,460	1.1	0.1
Incapacitation only	344	0.3	0.0	837	0.6	0.0
Both physical force and incapacitation	51	0.0	0.0	93	0.1	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-6. Percent of undergraduate students identifying as TGQN experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	716	13.6	1.4	1,274	24.1	1.6
Penetration	344	6.5	0.7	654	12.4	0.9
Physical force only	227	4.3	0.7	420	7.9	0.9
Completed	161	3.0	0.6	286	5.4	0.7
Attempted	97	1.8	0.5	243	4.6	0.6
Incapacitation only	110	2.1	0.4	249	4.7	0.6
Both physical force and incapacitation	71	1.4	0.4	140	2.7	0.5
Sexual Touching	493	9.3	1.1	942	17.8	1.6
Physical force only	372	7.0	1.1	757	14.3	1.5
Incapacitation only	156	2.9	0.5	287	5.4	0.7
Both physical force and incapacitation	38	0.7	0.3	65	1.2	0.4

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-7. Percent of graduate/professional students identifying as TGQN experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	197	8.9	1.5	342	15.5	1.8
Penetration	99	4.5	1.1	183	8.3	1.2
Physical force only	58	2.6	0.8	107	4.8	1.0
Completed	50	2.3	0.8	94	4.2	1.0
Attempted	18	0.8	0.3	43	2.0	0.6
Incapacitation only	46	2.1	0.9	86	3.9	1.0
Both physical force and incapacitation	-	-	-	S	S	S
Sexual Touching	136	6.1	1.1	238	10.8	1.6
Physical force only	77	3.5	0.8	166	7.5	1.3
Incapacitation only	64	2.9	0.8	89	4.0	0.9
Both physical force and incapacitation	S	S	S	16	0.7	0.5

¹Per 100 students.

S = Cell suppressed

Table 3-8. Percent of undergraduate students declining to state gender experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	215	7.8	1.1	370	13.4	1.3
Penetration	78	2.8	0.6	134	4.8	0.8
Physical force only	32	1.2	0.4	51	1.8	0.5
Completed	19	0.7	0.3	32	1.2	0.4
Attempted	16	0.6	0.3	29	1.0	0.3
Incapacitation only	44	1.6	0.5	86	3.1	0.6
Both physical force and incapacitation	S	S	S	23	0.8	0.4
Sexual Touching	156	5.6	1.0	284	10.3	1.1
Physical force only	115	4.2	0.8	191	6.9	0.9
Incapacitation only	57	2.0	0.5	129	4.7	0.9
Both physical force and incapacitation	S	S	S	24	0.9	0.4

¹ Per 100 students.

S = Cell Suppressed

Table 3-9. Percent of graduate/professional students declining to state gender experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by tactic, current year vs. since entering college and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Current School Year			Since Entering College		
	Number	%	StdErr	Number	%	StdErr
<i>Total Involving physical force or incapacitation</i>	54	3.0	0.7	108	6.0	1.1
Penetration	15	0.8	0.4	37	2.1	0.5
Physical force only	11	0.6	0.3	25	1.4	0.4
Completed	S	S	S	15	0.8	0.3
Attempted	S	S	S	23	1.3	0.4
Incapacitation only	S	S	S	16	0.9	0.4
Both physical force and incapacitation	-	-	-	S	S	S
Sexual Touching	46	2.5	0.6	90	5.0	1.0
Physical force only	43	2.4	0.6	69	3.8	0.9
Incapacitation only	7	0.4	0.2	39	2.2	0.8
Both physical force and incapacitation	-	-	-	-	-	-

¹ Per 100 students.

S = Cell suppressed

Table 3-10. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3, 4}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Undergraduate</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
Freshman	10.5	0.2	16.9	0.3	3.5	0.3	14.4	2.9	17.3	6.5
Sophomore	9.4	0.2	14.8	0.3	3.5	0.2	11.3	2.2	8.9	3.1
Junior	8.1	0.2	12.4	0.3	3.2	0.2	16.0	2.6	5.9	1.8
Senior	7.2	0.1	11.1	0.2	3.0	0.1	13.0	2.7	6.7	1.6
<i>Since entering college</i>										
Freshman	10.7	0.2	17.1	0.3	3.6	0.3	14.4	2.9	17.3	6.5
Sophomore	13.2	0.2	20.8	0.3	4.7	0.2	17.4	2.7	16.4	3.7
Junior	14.8	0.3	23.4	0.4	5.3	0.2	25.0	3.0	11.4	2.3
Senior	17.1	0.2	27.2	0.4	6.5	0.2	30.8	2.8	12.7	2.1
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
1st year	2.6	0.1	4.0	0.2	1.3	0.1	7.7	2.1	3.1	1.3
2nd year	2.5	0.1	3.7	0.3	1.3	0.1	10.5	2.9	4.7	1.8
3rd year	2.0	0.1	3.2	0.3	0.9	0.2	2.1	1.4	2.5	1.1
4th year	1.4	0.1	2.2	0.2	0.8	0.2	13.9	5.5	2.7	1.8
5th year	1.3	0.2	2.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	9.0	6.0	-	-
6th year or higher	1.2	0.2	1.4	0.3	0.7	0.2	13.4	5.8	1.4	1.3

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation; (4) Sexual touching by physical force or threat of physical force; (5) Sexual touching by incapacitation.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-10. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3, 4} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Since entering college</i>										
1st year	4.4	0.2	6.9	0.3	1.9	0.2	11.0	2.3	5.8	2.3
2nd year	5.8	0.2	9.3	0.4	2.4	0.2	15.4	3.3	7.0	2.1
3rd year	6.0	0.3	10.0	0.5	2.3	0.2	10.1	3.5	5.5	2.9
4th year	5.8	0.3	10.5	0.6	2.1	0.3	22.4	6.0	9.9	4.3
5th year	6.4	0.3	11.0	0.7	2.7	0.4	23.9	8.7	-	-
6th year or higher	7.2	0.5	12.0	0.9	2.7	0.4	26.6	6.6	2.5	1.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation; (4) Sexual touching by physical force or threat of physical force; (5) Sexual touching by incapacitation.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-11. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual penetration involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3, 4}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Undergraduate</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
Freshman	4.0	0.1	6.6	0.2	1.0	0.1	10.9	2.6	S	S
Sophomore	3.5	0.1	5.5	0.2	1.3	0.1	4.4	1.3	3.6	1.7
Junior	3.0	0.1	4.7	0.2	1.1	0.1	7.8	2.0	1.6	0.7
Senior	2.6	0.1	3.9	0.2	1.2	0.1	5.5	1.3	2.7	1.0
<i>Since entering college</i>										
Freshman	4.1	0.1	6.7	0.2	1.2	0.2	10.9	2.6	S	S
Sophomore	5.7	0.1	9.2	0.2	1.9	0.1	8.2	1.8	6.3	2.2
Junior	6.9	0.2	11.3	0.3	2.0	0.1	12.9	2.4	3.7	1.4
Senior	8.3	0.2	13.5	0.3	2.9	0.2	15.2	2.1	4.8	1.3
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
1st year	0.9	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.4	0.1	3.8	1.7	S	S
2nd year	0.9	0.1	1.3	0.1	0.5	0.1	6.7	2.7	S	S
3rd year	0.7	0.1	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	S	S	-	-
4th year	0.6	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.1	8.3	4.4	S	S
5th year	0.5	0.1	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	S	S	-	-
6th year or higher	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	S	S	-	-

S = Cell Suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-11. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual penetration involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3, 4} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Since entering college</i>										
1st year	1.8	0.1	2.9	0.2	0.7	0.1	4.1	1.8	S	S
2nd year	2.6	0.1	4.2	0.3	1.1	0.1	8.3	2.7	3.1	1.4
3rd year	2.5	0.1	4.4	0.3	0.9	0.2	3.8	1.3	S	S
4th year	2.6	0.2	4.6	0.4	1.0	0.2	15.0	5.1	4.7	2.5
5th year	2.8	0.3	5.0	0.5	1.0	0.2	13.6	6.5	-	-
6th year or higher	3.5	0.3	6.1	0.6	1.0	0.2	19.0	6.2	-	-

S = Cell Suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-12. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Undergraduate</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
Freshman	8.4	0.2	13.5	0.3	2.8	0.2	10.9	2.6	11.2	4.4
Sophomore	7.4	0.2	11.8	0.3	2.6	0.2	7.2	1.7	6.1	2.1
Junior	6.3	0.2	9.7	0.3	2.5	0.2	10.1	1.5	4.3	1.7
Senior	5.6	0.1	8.8	0.2	2.1	0.1	9.7	2.6	5.3	1.5
<i>Since entering college</i>										
Freshman	8.6	0.2	13.7	0.3	2.9	0.2	12.6	2.9	11.2	4.4
Sophomore	10.1	0.2	16.2	0.3	3.5	0.2	11.7	2.1	11.4	3.0
Junior	11.3	0.2	17.8	0.4	4.1	0.2	19.4	2.6	9.3	2.1
Senior	12.8	0.2	20.6	0.3	4.6	0.2	22.2	3.1	10.3	2.0
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
1st year	2.0	0.1	3.0	0.2	1.0	0.1	4.8	1.6	2.2	1.1
2nd year	1.9	0.1	2.9	0.2	0.9	0.1	6.6	1.9	3.9	1.6
3rd year	1.4	0.1	2.3	0.2	0.7	0.1	2.1	1.4	2.5	1.1
4th year	1.1	0.1	1.6	0.2	0.6	0.1	12.6	5.5	2.7	1.8
5th year	1.0	0.2	1.8	0.3	0.3	0.1	6.1	5.4	-	-
6th year or higher	1.0	0.2	1.2	0.2	0.6	0.2	10.1	5.4	1.4	1.3

¹ Per 100 students.

² Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-12. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Since entering college</i>										
1st year	3.3	0.1	5.1	0.2	1.5	0.2	7.7	2.0	4.9	2.2
2nd year	4.2	0.2	6.7	0.4	1.7	0.1	11.0	2.7	5.0	1.7
3rd year	4.3	0.2	7.2	0.4	1.7	0.2	7.6	3.5	5.5	2.9
4th year	4.2	0.3	7.6	0.5	1.5	0.2	15.8	5.7	7.8	4.0
5th year	4.7	0.3	8.2	0.7	1.8	0.3	18.7	8.1	-	-
6th year or higher	5.0	0.4	8.2	0.7	2.1	0.3	15.4	5.9	2.5	1.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-13. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1, 2, 3}

Characteristic Category	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	24.4	0.5	8.1	0.3	6.7	0.3	2.3	0.2
14,000 to 25,000	24.3	0.5	8.2	0.2	6.1	0.3	2.0	0.2
26,000 to 40,000	23.5	0.2	10.5	0.4	5.2	0.2	2.5	0.2
41,000 to 61,000	22.5	0.3	8.4	0.3	5.1	0.2	2.2	0.2
Type								
Public	22.8	0.2	9.7	0.3	5.2	0.1	2.4	0.1
Private	25.3	0.4	7.0	0.2	6.4	0.2	1.9	0.1
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	21.9	0.4	8.8	0.3	5.2	0.2	2.5	0.2
48.79% to 51.55%	23.3	0.3	9.6	0.3	5.5	0.2	2.3	0.1
51.56% to 56.61%	23.8	0.3	8.1	0.3	5.5	0.2	2.0	0.2
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	25.7	0.4	6.9	0.2	6.5	0.2	1.8	0.1
64% to 72%	24.3	0.4	9.9	0.4	5.3	0.2	2.5	0.2
73% to 87%	21.6	0.2	10.2	0.4	5.1	0.2	2.3	0.2
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	26.1	0.5	6.7	0.2	6.0	0.3	1.9	0.1
57% to 67%	21.6	0.4	9.6	0.5	5.2	0.2	2.5	0.2
68% to 82%	23.8	0.3	9.7	0.3	5.2	0.2	2.6	0.2
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	19.5	0.4	9.8	0.6	5.2	0.2	1.9	0.3
15% to 18%	23.9	0.3	9.7	0.3	5.2	0.2	2.6	0.2
19% to 30%	25.8	0.4	7.6	0.2	5.7	0.2	2.0	0.1
31% to 53%	26.1	0.5	7.9	0.3	6.6	0.3	2.1	0.2

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-13. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Characteristic Category	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	31.5	3.8	9.2	3.2	21.7	6.1	12.3	3.8
14,000 to 25,000	22.3	2.8	11.4	2.0	14.6	3.9	5.7	2.3
26,000 to 40,000	25.5	3.1	15.0	3.0	11.6	2.4	6.4	2.1
41,000 to 61,000	22.3	2.4	19.0	3.7	13.3	2.0	4.4	1.8
Type								
Public	23.3	2.0	17.9	2.4	12.1	1.2	6.1	1.5
Private	27.8	2.7	9.6	1.9	20.7	4.3	5.8	1.7
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	21.6	2.8	20.9	4.3	5.1	1.8	8.5	3.0
48.79% to 51.55%	25.5	2.2	14.2	2.7	16.3	2.3	4.5	1.4
51.56% to 56.61%	24.6	3.3	13.3	2.7	16.6	3.0	5.4	1.6
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	29.1	3.1	11.5	1.9	21.1	4.4	6.1	1.6
64% to 72%	24.6	2.9	14.9	2.6	16.1	3.1	8.6	2.7
73% to 87%	22.0	2.3	20.5	4.1	9.8	1.5	3.6	1.3
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	24.4	2.8	9.5	1.9	18.4	4.7	3.1	1.2
57% to 67%	23.2	5.0	21.5	5.6	10.2	2.5	10.5	2.9
68% to 82%	23.9	2.3	15.8	3.5	11.4	1.8	5.9	2.0
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	21.3	3.3	25.3	5.7	7.5	2.3	4.3	1.8
15% to 18%	23.2	2.4	14.3	2.6	13.4	2.0	7.5	2.5
19% to 30%	30.2	3.0	11.8	2.3	20.6	3.5	5.2	1.7
31% to 53%	24.9	3.7	10.8	2.9	20.2	6.2	7.2	2.4

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-14. Percent of females experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Current school year						
<i>Coercion</i>	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
Penetration	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sexual Touching	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	5.2	0.1	6.4	0.1	2.3	0.1
Penetration	2.1	0.1	2.6	0.1	0.9	0.0
Sexual Touching	3.7	0.1	4.6	0.1	1.6	0.1
Since entering college						
<i>Coercion</i>	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.3	0.0
Penetration	0.3	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.0
Sexual Touching	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	9.6	0.1	11.4	0.1	5.2	0.1
Penetration	4.1	0.1	4.9	0.1	2.3	0.1
Sexual Touching	7.0	0.1	8.4	0.1	3.7	0.1

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-15. Percent of males experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Current school year						
<i>Coercion</i>	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0
Penetration	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
Sexual Touching	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	1.2	0.1	1.5	0.1	0.6	0.1
Penetration	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.0
Sexual Touching	0.9	0.1	1.1	0.1	0.4	0.0
Since entering college						
<i>Coercion</i>	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0
Penetration	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0
Sexual Touching	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	2.0	0.1	2.4	0.1	1.2	0.1
Penetration	0.7	0.0	0.8	0.1	0.5	0.0
Sexual Touching	1.6	0.1	1.9	0.1	1.0	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-16. Percent of those identifying as TGQN experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Total		Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Current school year						
<i>Coercion</i>	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.9	0.5
Penetration	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1	S	S
Sexual Touching	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	S	S
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	7.7	0.9	9.0	1.3	4.6	0.8
Penetration	3.0	0.4	3.1	0.6	2.7	0.8
Sexual Touching	5.7	0.9	6.6	1.3	3.3	0.7
Since entering college						
<i>Coercion</i>	1.6	0.3	1.1	0.3	2.7	0.9
Penetration	1.1	0.3	0.9	0.3	1.7	0.7
Sexual Touching	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.1	2.0	0.8
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	13.3	1.0	14.8	1.3	9.7	1.4
Penetration	6.6	0.8	7.0	1.1	5.7	1.3
Sexual Touching	9.9	1.0	11.3	1.3	6.5	1.0

S = Cell Suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-17. Percent of students who declined to state their gender experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving coercion or absence of affirmative consent by behavior, tactic, current year vs. since entering college, gender and enrollment status¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Current school year						
<i>Coercion</i>	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	S	S
Penetration	0.1	0.0	-	-	S	S
Sexual Touching	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	-	-
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	3.1	0.5	4.5	0.9	0.9	0.3
Penetration	1.2	0.4	1.8	0.7	S	S
Sexual Touching	2.4	0.4	3.4	0.7	0.9	0.3
Since entering college						
<i>Coercion</i>	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.3	S	S
Penetration	0.3	0.2	S	S	S	S
Sexual Touching	0.2	0.1	S	S	S	S
<i>Absence of affirmative consent</i>	5.5	0.7	7.9	1.1	1.8	0.5
Penetration	2.2	0.5	3.3	0.8	0.6	0.3
Sexual Touching	3.9	0.6	5.5	0.9	1.4	0.5

S = Cell Suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

Table 3-18. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3, 4}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Undergraduate</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
Freshman	4.6	0.1	7.4	0.2	1.5	0.2	6.8	2.0	7.8	2.9
Sophomore	4.5	0.1	7.4	0.2	1.3	0.1	8.2	2.0	4.8	2.1
Junior	3.9	0.1	6.1	0.2	1.5	0.2	7.3	1.6	2.4	1.1
Senior	3.6	0.1	5.4	0.2	1.6	0.2	11.6	2.9	5.4	1.9
<i>Since entering college</i>										
Freshman	4.7	0.1	7.6	0.2	1.6	0.2	6.8	2.0	7.8	2.9
Sophomore	6.4	0.1	10.4	0.2	1.8	0.1	11.3	2.0	6.6	2.3
Junior	7.4	0.2	11.8	0.3	2.5	0.2	13.3	1.8	3.5	1.2
Senior	8.5	0.2	13.5	0.3	3.1	0.2	20.7	3.0	11.8	2.5
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Current Year</i>										
1st year	1.6	0.1	2.7	0.1	0.6	0.1	5.7	1.7	0.6	0.5
2nd year	1.5	0.1	2.4	0.1	0.7	0.1	5.0	2.0	-	-
3rd year	1.4	0.1	2.4	0.2	0.6	0.1	3.9	1.8	0.7	0.6
4th year	1.0	0.1	1.3	0.2	0.7	0.2	7.2	2.9	2.0	1.8
5th year	1.0	0.2	2.0	0.4	0.3	0.1	-	-	-	-
6th year or higher	1.0	0.2	1.3	0.3	0.7	0.2	1.5	1.3	4.0	2.7

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation; (4) Sexual touching by physical force or threat of physical force; (5) Sexual touching by incapacitation.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-18. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent by gender, year in school and current year or since enrolled in college^{1, 2, 3, 4} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Graduate/Professional</i>										
<i>Since entering college</i>										
1st year	2.4	0.1	4.0	0.2	0.9	0.1	7.0	1.9	1.2	0.7
2nd year	3.2	0.1	5.3	0.3	1.2	0.1	9.7	2.5	0.9	0.8
3rd year	3.6	0.3	6.0	0.4	1.5	0.2	9.3	3.0	1.2	0.7
4th year	3.7	0.2	6.3	0.5	1.6	0.3	16.8	5.3	4.0	3.5
5th year	4.4	0.3	8.1	0.6	1.5	0.3	12.1	6.1	-	-
6th year or higher	4.5	0.4	7.2	0.6	2.0	0.4	12.6	5.5	4.0	2.7

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation; (4) Sexual touching by physical force or threat of physical force; (5) Sexual touching by incapacitation.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-19. Percent of students experiencing absence of affirmative consent by gender, enrollment status and university characteristics^{1, 2, 3}

Characteristic Category	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	16.3	0.5	5.5	0.3	3.6	0.2	1.2	0.2
14,000 to 25,000	13.4	0.3	5.8	0.2	2.9	0.2	1.5	0.1
26,000 to 40,000	11.2	0.2	5.3	0.2	2.1	0.2	1.2	0.1
41,000 to 61,000	10.5	0.2	4.8	0.2	2.4	0.1	1.2	0.1
Type								
Public	10.8	0.1	5.3	0.2	2.3	0.1	1.3	0.1
Private	15.1	0.3	5.0	0.2	3.4	0.2	1.2	0.1
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	10.8	0.3	5.7	0.2	2.2	0.1	1.3	0.1
48.79% to 51.55%	11.3	0.2	5.7	0.2	2.3	0.1	1.4	0.1
51.56% to 56.61%	11.9	0.2	4.5	0.2	2.8	0.2	1.1	0.1
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	14.3	0.3	4.8	0.2	3.5	0.2	1.2	0.1
64% to 72%	12.8	0.3	5.8	0.3	2.9	0.2	1.3	0.1
73% to 87%	9.6	0.2	5.1	0.2	1.9	0.1	1.2	0.1
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	14.9	0.3	4.7	0.2	3.3	0.2	1.2	0.1
57% to 67%	11.0	0.3	5.6	0.3	2.7	0.2	1.0	0.1
68% to 82%	10.7	0.2	5.0	0.2	2.1	0.1	1.4	0.1
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	8.8	0.3	4.9	0.3	1.8	0.1	1.2	0.2
15% to 18%	11.4	0.2	5.3	0.2	2.5	0.2	1.2	0.1
19% to 30%	13.6	0.3	4.8	0.2	2.7	0.2	1.2	0.1
31% to 53%	18.0	0.4	6.7	0.3	4.3	0.3	1.4	0.1

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed

Table 3-19. Percent of students experiencing absence of affirmative consent by gender, enrollment status and university characteristics^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Characteristic Category	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	21.1	2.7	15.4	4.3	16.6	5.6	4.8	2.5
14,000 to 25,000	12.4	2.2	10.3	2.5	12.6	3.5	1.5	0.9
26,000 to 40,000	12.2	2.0	6.2	2.4	7.1	2.2	1.1	0.7
41,000 to 61,000	16.4	2.6	10.6	2.2	6.3	1.6	1.6	0.8
Type								
Public	13.8	1.5	9.5	1.8	7.2	1.2	1.9	0.7
Private	19.6	2.3	10.4	2.0	12.0	3.1	1.5	0.8
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	10.9	1.7	10.1	2.6	4.8	1.6	0.3	0.3
48.79% to 51.55%	14.4	1.4	12.0	2.1	9.1	2.0	2.4	0.9
51.56% to 56.61%	17.6	2.7	7.4	2.1	9.0	2.0	2.3	1.2
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	20.1	2.5	8.4	1.8	17.5	3.4	2.0	0.9
64% to 72%	15.9	3.0	9.3	2.4	7.5	2.1	2.8	1.1
73% to 87%	12.1	1.5	11.8	2.6	5.4	1.6	0.7	0.6
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	18.5	2.4	9.0	2.1	10.4	3.0	1.7	0.9
57% to 67%	15.4	3.4	12.7	3.8	4.7	1.6	1.2	0.8
68% to 82%	14.5	1.9	10.0	2.7	7.3	1.9	2.7	1.3
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	10.3	2.1	10.4	3.8	4.8	1.9	-	-
15% to 18%	16.4	2.3	11.4	2.4	8.6	1.7	2.1	1.0
19% to 30%	15.9	2.2	6.8	1.8	11.3	2.5	2.5	1.1
31% to 53%	20.4	2.7	13.3	3.8	4.7	2.9	2.3	1.4

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-20. Percent of seniors experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=16,979)		Male (n=10,998)		TGQN (n=289)		Decline to State (n=156)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	16.5	0.2	26.1	0.4	6.3	0.2	29.5	2.8	12.7	2.1
Penetration	7.0	0.1	11.3	0.3	2.5	0.1	12.6	1.8	4.2	1.3
Sexual Touching	12.8	0.2	20.6	0.3	4.6	0.2	22.2	3.1	10.3	2.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	17.1	0.2	27.2	0.4	6.5	0.2	30.8	2.8	12.7	2.1
Penetration	8.3	0.2	13.5	0.3	2.9	0.2	15.2	2.1	4.8	1.3
Sexual Touching	12.8	0.2	20.6	0.3	4.6	0.2	22.2	3.1	10.3	2.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using physical force	17.3	0.2	27.4	0.4	6.7	0.2	31.3	2.8	12.7	2.1
Penetration	8.5	0.2	13.7	0.3	2.9	0.2	15.7	2.1	4.8	1.3
Sexual Touching	12.9	0.2	20.7	0.3	4.7	0.2	22.2	3.1	10.3	2.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using physical force	21.2	0.2	33.1	0.4	8.6	0.2	39.1	3.0	17.6	2.7
Penetration	10.6	0.2	17.1	0.3	3.6	0.2	23.2	2.7	8.2	2.0
Sexual Touching	16.4	0.2	25.8	0.4	6.4	0.2	30.5	3.1	14.9	2.4

¹ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-21. Percent of undergraduates experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=55,552)		Male (n=35,395)		TGQN (n=908)		Decline to State (n=451)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	8.1	0.1	12.6	0.2	3.1	0.1	12.7	1.2	7.8	1.1
Penetration	2.5	0.1	3.9	0.1	1.0	0.1	5.2	0.7	2.4	0.6
Sexual Touching	6.6	0.1	10.5	0.1	2.4	0.1	9.3	1.1	5.6	1.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	8.4	0.1	13.2	0.2	3.3	0.1	13.6	1.4	7.8	1.1
Penetration	3.1	0.1	4.9	0.1	1.2	0.1	6.5	0.7	2.8	0.6
Sexual Touching	6.6	0.1	10.5	0.1	2.4	0.1	9.3	1.1	5.6	1.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	8.5	0.1	13.3	0.2	3.4	0.1	13.6	1.4	7.8	1.1
Penetration	3.2	0.1	5.0	0.1	1.2	0.1	6.6	0.7	2.8	0.6
Sexual Touching	6.7	0.1	10.5	0.1	2.5	0.1	9.5	1.1	5.7	1.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	11.0	0.1	17.0	0.2	4.4	0.1	19.0	1.6	10.6	1.5
Penetration	4.4	0.1	6.9	0.1	1.6	0.1	9.0	0.8	4.4	0.9
Sexual Touching	8.6	0.1	13.4	0.2	3.4	0.1	13.6	1.3	8.3	1.2

¹ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 3-22. Percent of undergraduates experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=55,552)		Male (n=35,395)		TGQN (n=908)		Decline to State (n=451)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	14.1	0.1	22.2	0.2	5.2	0.1	23.4	1.6	13.4	1.3
Penetration	5.6	0.1	9.0	0.2	1.9	0.1	10.3	0.9	4.4	0.8
Sexual Touching	11.1	0.1	17.7	0.2	4.0	0.1	17.8	1.6	10.3	1.1
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	14.6	0.1	23.1	0.2	5.4	0.1	24.1	1.6	13.4	1.3
Penetration	6.7	0.1	10.8	0.2	2.2	0.1	12.4	0.9	4.8	0.8
Sexual Touching	11.1	0.1	17.7	0.2	4.0	0.1	17.8	1.6	10.3	1.1
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using physical force	14.8	0.1	23.3	0.2	5.5	0.1	24.3	1.6	13.4	1.3
Penetration	6.8	0.1	11.0	0.2	2.3	0.1	12.9	0.9	4.8	0.8
Sexual Touching	11.3	0.1	17.8	0.2	4.1	0.1	18.0	1.6	10.3	1.1
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using physical force	18.3	0.1	28.5	0.2	7.1	0.1	30.6	1.6	17.0	1.5
Penetration	8.6	0.1	13.9	0.2	2.8	0.1	17.7	1.4	7.1	1.0
Sexual Touching	14.3	0.1	22.4	0.2	5.4	0.1	23.9	1.7	13.5	1.3

¹ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-1. Percent of students experiencing harassment by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of harassment^{1, 2, 3}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Percent of Students Reporting Harassment	47.7	0.1	61.9	0.3	44.1	0.3	42.9	0.3	29.6	0.3
<i>University-associated individual:</i>										
made sexual remarks, or insulting/offensive jokes or stories	29.5	0.1	41.0	0.3	31.3	0.2	22.1	0.2	16.7	0.3
made inappropriate comments regarding body, appearance, or sexual activity	37.7	0.1	49.2	0.2	32.4	0.3	34.7	0.3	22.4	0.3
said crude or gross sexual things or tried to engage in sexual conversation	16.7	0.1	24.0	0.2	13.4	0.2	13.9	0.2	9.1	0.2
transmitted offensive sexual remarks, stories, jokes, pictures, videos	10.5	0.1	15.5	0.2	6.9	0.1	9.4	0.2	5.2	0.2
asked to go out, get dinner, drinks, or have sex, despite refusal	11.0	0.1	20.9	0.2	9.7	0.2	5.2	0.1	2.7	0.1
Percent of Victims of Harassment										
<i>Number of offenders</i>										
1 person	28.7	0.2	26.2	0.3	35.3	0.4	28.6	0.5	33.3	0.5
2 persons	27.2	0.2	29.4	0.2	30.0	0.4	23.5	0.3	25.4	0.5
3 or more persons	44.0	0.2	44.4	0.3	34.6	0.4	47.9	0.4	41.4	0.6

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-1. Percent of students experiencing harassment by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of harassment^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Number of incidents since beginning of 2014 term</i>										
0 times	19.4	0.2	16.0	0.2	30.0	0.5	17.2	0.3	27.8	0.6
1 time	20.7	0.2	20.4	0.3	21.8	0.3	20.4	0.3	22.4	0.5
2 times	21.4	0.1	23.7	0.2	20.2	0.4	19.7	0.3	17.9	0.4
3-5 times	26.4	0.2	28.5	0.3	21.0	0.3	26.8	0.3	22.4	0.6
6-9 times	5.9	0.1	6.6	0.1	3.9	0.2	6.4	0.2	3.9	0.3
10 or more times	6.2	0.1	4.9	0.2	3.1	0.1	9.4	0.3	5.6	0.3
<i>Association with university²</i>										
Student	91.6	0.1	94.6	0.1	82.0	0.3	93.8	0.2	85.7	0.4
Faculty	9.3	0.1	5.9	0.1	22.4	0.4	5.0	0.2	16.5	0.5
Coach, religious leader, or other non-academic advisor	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.8	0.1	0.7	0.2
Other staff or administrator	4.9	0.1	3.4	0.1	9.9	0.2	3.4	0.1	8.3	0.3
Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)	2.8	0.1	2.7	0.1	3.9	0.2	2.4	0.2	2.7	0.2
The person was not affiliated with [University]	9.3	0.1	10.2	0.2	8.4	0.2	7.6	0.3	9.6	0.4
Don't know association with [University]	9.7	0.1	11.7	0.2	6.6	0.2	9.3	0.3	6.5	0.3

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college. ² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-1. Percent of students experiencing harassment by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of harassment^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Relationship to victim²</i>										
At the time, it was someone I was dating or intimate with	6.0	0.1	8.6	0.1	3.7	0.1	4.3	0.2	2.8	0.2
Someone I had dated or was intimate with	7.1	0.1	10.0	0.2	4.9	0.2	5.2	0.2	2.7	0.2
Teacher or advisor	6.9	0.1	4.9	0.1	15.8	0.3	3.8	0.2	11.1	0.4
Co-worker, boss or supervisor	8.5	0.1	6.0	0.1	17.7	0.3	5.2	0.2	15.8	0.4
Friend or acquaintance	69.9	0.2	69.0	0.2	63.1	0.4	75.3	0.4	68.8	0.5
Stranger	43.1	0.2	54.2	0.3	30.3	0.5	37.2	0.4	26.1	0.6
Other	6.5	0.1	5.1	0.1	9.2	0.3	6.3	0.2	8.8	0.3
Don't Know	3.2	0.1	2.6	0.1	2.2	0.2	4.2	0.2	4.2	0.3

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-1. Percent of students experiencing harassment by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of harassment^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Percent of Students Reporting Harassment	75.2	1.4	69.4	2.8	55.9	2.2	41.9	2.2
<i>University-associated individual:</i>								
made sexual remarks, or insulting/offensive jokes or stories	61.2	1.8	55.7	2.5	41.9	2.5	32.2	2.3
made inappropriate comments regarding body, appearance, or sexual activity	66.2	1.5	57.4	2.6	42.6	2.1	34.0	2.4
said crude or gross sexual things or tried to engage in sexual conversation	31.9	1.6	29.3	2.3	21.8	1.9	19.1	2.2
transmitted offensive sexual remarks, stories, jokes, pictures, videos	13.9	1.1	11.8	1.5	12.9	1.6	9.6	1.7
asked to go out, get dinner, drinks, or have sex, despite refusal	19.0	1.4	10.9	1.4	10.1	1.3	6.2	1.1
Percent of Victims of Harassment								
<i>Number of offenders</i>								
1 person	13.0	1.6	20.7	2.2	25.5	2.8	32.2	3.7
2 persons	26.1	2.2	26.6	2.7	19.6	2.7	21.9	3.7
3 or more persons	60.9	2.2	52.6	2.9	54.9	3.4	45.8	3.8

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-1. Percent of students experiencing harassment by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of harassment^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Number of incidents since beginning of 2014 term</i>								
0 times	9.5	1.3	22.7	2.2	19.8	3.0	26.7	3.4
1 time	14.9	1.2	16.7	2.1	14.6	1.9	14.3	3.1
2 times	21.0	1.9	22.7	2.2	19.0	2.6	15.3	3.3
3-5 times	35.5	2.2	24.3	2.3	25.5	2.8	31.8	4.4
6-9 times	8.2	1.0	6.0	1.2	7.3	1.6	4.8	1.6
10 or more times	11.0	1.1	7.6	1.5	13.8	2.0	7.1	1.9
<i>Association with university²</i>								
Student	94.4	0.9	82.7	2.0	85.8	2.4	74.1	3.2
Faculty	14.6	1.1	33.0	2.9	14.3	2.2	36.3	3.6
Coach, religious leader, or other non-academic advisor	1.2	0.3	1.4	0.7	1.7	0.8	3.9	1.8
Other staff or administrator	7.1	1.1	12.5	1.9	5.7	1.3	16.8	2.6
Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)	5.3	0.7	4.3	0.9	7.8	1.7	8.8	2.1
The person was not affiliated with [University]	16.4	1.5	14.3	2.2	17.2	2.6	16.6	2.9
Don't know association with [University]	11.6	1.3	6.8	1.2	13.5	2.3	8.5	2.1

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-1. Percent of students experiencing harassment by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of harassment^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Relationship to victim²</i>								
At the time, it was someone I was dating or intimate with	7.2	1.1	3.3	1.0	5.2	1.3	2.1	1.0
Someone I had dated or was intimate with	7.6	0.9	2.8	0.9	6.0	1.3	2.5	1.1
Teacher or advisor	12.0	1.1	24.3	2.4	10.4	2.0	21.8	2.9
Co-worker, boss or supervisor	10.6	1.2	23.0	2.2	6.0	1.4	27.0	3.6
Friend or acquaintance	63.8	2.0	61.6	2.5	65.0	3.4	60.7	3.6
Stranger	67.9	2.0	33.7	3.1	53.8	3.6	34.5	3.7
Other	9.1	0.9	13.5	1.8	12.1	1.8	21.6	3.3
Don't Know	2.6	0.5	3.0	0.9	7.5	1.8	6.7	1.9

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-2. Percent of students experiencing harassment by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1, 2, 3}

Characteristic Category	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	69.9	0.7	46.4	0.7	51.7	0.7	31.7	0.6
14,000 to 25,000	64.6	0.4	46.4	0.5	46.8	0.6	31.2	0.4
26,000 to 40,000	61.8	0.4	46.3	0.5	41.6	0.5	30.5	0.6
41,000 to 61,000	60.3	0.4	41.2	0.4	41.7	0.4	27.8	0.5
Type								
Public	60.9	0.3	45.8	0.3	42.0	0.3	30.6	0.5
Private	68.2	0.4	40.9	0.4	48.4	0.6	27.4	0.3
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	59.8	0.5	48.0	0.5	41.1	0.4	31.8	0.5
48.79% to 51.55%	61.9	0.3	45.6	0.4	42.8	0.4	29.7	0.5
51.56% to 56.61%	63.3	0.5	40.5	0.4	44.6	0.5	27.8	0.5
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	67.6	0.4	40.2	0.4	48.9	0.6	28.0	0.4
64% to 72%	64.8	0.5	47.4	0.5	45.1	0.5	30.9	0.6
73% to 87%	58.3	0.3	46.1	0.5	40.1	0.4	30.0	0.7
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	67.9	0.5	40.2	0.4	47.7	0.6	27.2	0.3
57% to 67%	61.4	0.6	47.5	0.6	44.1	0.6	31.3	0.6
68% to 82%	60.7	0.3	45.2	0.5	40.8	0.5	30.1	0.6
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	56.2	0.4	46.3	0.8	40.0	0.6	29.2	0.9
15% to 18%	62.6	0.4	45.0	0.4	42.2	0.4	30.6	0.7
19% to 30%	65.6	0.4	40.4	0.4	46.6	0.5	27.1	0.4
31% to 53%	72.3	0.5	51.0	0.6	52.5	0.6	34.6	0.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-2. Percent of students experiencing harassment by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Characteristic Category	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	82.9	2.3	73.0	5.7	67.9	7.1	42.6	5.6
14,000 to 25,000	76.8	3.0	75.9	3.6	57.8	5.2	45.7	3.9
26,000 to 40,000	72.4	2.7	68.1	5.4	48.6	3.7	41.4	6.1
41,000 to 61,000	75.2	2.6	66.3	4.5	59.0	3.1	39.8	3.8
Type								
Public	74.2	1.7	69.7	3.5	53.7	2.5	43.1	3.0
Private	79.7	2.4	68.7	3.0	69.3	4.8	39.3	4.0
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	69.9	2.8	72.4	4.6	53.7	4.5	45.1	5.6
48.79% to 51.55%	78.0	1.8	74.4	3.0	59.1	2.9	41.0	3.6
51.56% to 56.61%	76.1	2.9	62.8	4.4	54.0	4.7	40.2	4.4
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	81.1	2.6	69.8	3.5	58.1	5.4	43.8	3.8
64% to 72%	74.8	2.8	68.7	4.1	56.3	4.5	43.7	4.2
73% to 87%	73.2	2.0	69.7	4.6	55.1	2.8	38.4	4.7
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	79.5	2.6	65.2	3.2	65.5	5.1	40.6	4.2
57% to 67%	72.8	3.9	62.1	7.4	57.6	6.1	43.4	5.5
68% to 82%	75.3	2.3	76.2	4.0	53.2	3.0	42.9	3.7
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	72.8	3.3	69.6	5.3	57.4	4.4	35.1	6.8
15% to 18%	74.0	2.4	69.7	4.3	54.1	3.4	45.3	4.3
19% to 30%	78.8	2.2	67.4	3.1	56.1	4.5	43.3	3.8
31% to 53%	83.7	2.7	75.6	4.6	68.4	6.7	40.6	5.0

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-3. Percent of students who have been in partnered relationship experiencing intimate partner violence by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of intimate partner violence^{1, 2, 3}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Percent of Students in Partnered Relationships Reporting Intimate Partner Violence	9.8	0.1	12.8	0.2	7.0	0.2	9.3	0.2	6.3	0.2
Partner controlled or tried to control	6.2	0.1	8.3	0.2	4.6	0.1	5.8	0.2	3.7	0.1
Partner threatened to harm student, family, or themselves	3.9	0.1	5.4	0.1	3.1	0.1	3.4	0.1	2.3	0.1
Partner used physical force	3.9	0.1	4.7	0.1	2.6	0.1	4.0	0.1	2.7	0.1
Percent of Victims of Intimate Partner Violence										
<i>Number of offenders</i>										
1 person	90.0	0.3	90.2	0.4	92.1	0.5	89.1	0.7	91.9	0.6
2 persons	8.1	0.3	8.6	0.4	6.6	0.4	8.1	0.5	6.1	0.5
3 or more persons	1.9	0.2	1.2	0.2	1.3	0.3	2.8	0.4	2.0	0.4
<i>Number of incidents since beginning of 2014 term</i>										
0 times	37.9	0.6	37.9	0.8	49.8	1.3	33.5	1.2	37.6	1.6
1 time	22.8	0.5	24.0	0.6	19.9	0.9	23.1	1.1	21.8	1.3
2 times	14.9	0.3	14.7	0.5	12.1	0.7	17.2	0.9	12.8	1.1
3-5 times	15.2	0.4	15.6	0.6	11.0	0.7	15.6	0.8	16.6	1.1
6-9 times	3.7	0.2	3.1	0.2	3.4	0.4	4.6	0.5	3.7	0.5
10 or more times	5.4	0.2	4.7	0.4	3.8	0.5	6.0	0.5	7.5	0.9

S=Cell Suppressed

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college. ²Percent of students who reported being in a partnered relationship since entering college (question A13 on questionnaire). ³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-3. Percent of students in partnered relationships experiencing intimate partner violence by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of intimate partner violence^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Percent of Students in Partnered Relationships Reporting Intimate Partner Violence	22.8	1.8	17.8	2.1	16.9	2.1	12.7	2.0
Partner controlled or tried to control	15.8	1.4	11.1	1.5	12.1	1.6	8.4	1.5
Partner threatened to harm student, family, or themselves	11.6	1.5	8.4	1.3	6.6	1.4	4.9	1.4
Partner used physical force	9.7	1.3	8.6	1.4	7.2	1.4	6.3	1.3
Percent of Victims of Intimate Partner Violence								
<i>Number of offenders</i>								
1 person	79.0	3.6	77.5	5.0	84.5	5.4	86.2	4.8
2 persons	15.2	3.2	18.1	5.0	8.6	3.0	8.0	3.8
3 or more persons	5.8	1.4	4.4	2.0	S	S	5.8	3.2
<i>Number of incidents since beginning of 2014 term</i>								
0 times	33.0	5.3	42.7	5.3	39.2	7.0	34.0	8.0
1 time	19.3	3.5	17.9	4.6	9.6	3.9	20.6	6.9
2 times	14.3	3.1	9.9	3.0	16.1	4.4	14.3	5.7
3-5 times	17.9	3.0	10.2	4.4	20.0	4.4	19.0	5.2
6-9 times	7.1	2.3	7.1	3.2	S	S	S	S
10 or more times	8.4	2.3	12.3	3.6	13.0	4.9	10.2	4.8

S=Cell Suppressed

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college. ²Percent of students who reported being in a partnered relationship since entering college (question A13 on questionnaire). ³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-4. Percent of students experiencing intimate partner violence gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1,2,3}

Characteristic Category	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	10.9	0.5	5.9	0.4	7.8	0.4	5.3	0.4
14,000 to 25,000	11.2	0.3	5.6	0.2	8.6	0.4	5.5	0.2
26,000 to 40,000	13.0	0.3	8.7	0.3	9.8	0.4	7.1	0.5
41,000 to 61,000	13.2	0.3	7.3	0.3	9.4	0.3	6.5	0.4
Type								
Public	13.0	0.2	7.8	0.2	9.6	0.2	6.8	0.2
Private	11.3	0.4	5.7	0.2	7.9	0.3	5.3	0.2
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	12.4	0.3	6.6	0.3	8.6	0.4	6.2	0.3
48.79% to 51.55%	12.7	0.3	7.5	0.3	9.5	0.3	6.3	0.3
51.56% to 56.61%	13.1	0.4	6.9	0.3	9.8	0.5	6.4	0.4
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	11.3	0.4	5.8	0.2	9.0	0.4	5.3	0.2
64% to 72%	12.0	0.4	7.0	0.3	9.0	0.3	6.9	0.5
73% to 87%	13.7	0.2	8.8	0.3	9.6	0.3	6.7	0.3
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	11.1	0.4	5.5	0.2	7.9	0.4	5.3	0.2
57% to 67%	13.1	0.5	6.8	0.4	9.1	0.5	6.7	0.4
68% to 82%	13.5	0.3	8.2	0.3	9.9	0.3	6.9	0.3
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	13.6	0.4	8.8	0.5	9.5	0.4	6.5	0.5
15% to 18%	13.2	0.3	7.8	0.3	9.8	0.3	7.2	0.4
19% to 30%	10.9	0.3	5.9	0.2	8.4	0.3	5.4	0.2
31% to 53%	11.0	0.4	5.7	0.3	7.4	0.4	5.6	0.3

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-4. Percent of students experiencing intimate partner violence gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1,2,3} (continued)

Characteristic Category	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	16.5	3.1	14.2	4.7	14.3	8.3	14.0	4.8
14,000 to 25,000	20.1	3.1	16.8	3.8	20.1	5.1	11.0	2.8
26,000 to 40,000	20.8	3.0	16.0	3.8	12.8	3.6	7.7	3.3
41,000 to 61,000	26.7	3.6	20.0	3.3	18.8	3.4	15.8	3.5
Type								
Public	23.5	2.1	18.5	2.4	15.8	2.2	13.5	2.5
Private	19.1	2.9	15.8	2.8	24.3	5.8	10.9	2.9
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	18.4	3.7	15.6	3.3	20.5	5.3	18.6	4.7
48.79% to 51.55%	22.2	2.1	20.7	4.0	12.8	2.6	7.1	2.8
51.56% to 56.61%	26.3	2.9	16.3	2.6	19.4	4.0	13.5	3.9
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	22.4	3.2	12.6	2.1	25.9	5.8	12.6	2.6
64% to 72%	23.9	4.1	17.1	3.8	14.1	3.9	13.9	3.4
73% to 87%	22.3	2.5	24.2	4.3	16.0	2.9	11.7	3.9
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	23.0	3.4	14.5	2.8	26.2	5.5	12.3	3.2
57% to 67%	23.3	4.7	19.0	5.1	22.1	5.7	14.3	4.9
68% to 82%	25.5	2.6	23.0	3.7	15.3	3.5	17.5	4.9
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	18.2	3.5	24.7	5.4	18.1	4.8	11.0	5.0
15% to 18%	27.0	3.2	19.2	3.1	15.8	3.4	16.9	4.0
19% to 30%	20.7	2.8	14.5	2.9	19.6	4.5	7.4	2.5
31% to 53%	20.9	3.7	7.2	2.9	7.0	4.8	18.6	4.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-5. Percent of students experiencing stalking by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of stalking^{1, 2, 3}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Percent of Students Reporting Stalking	4.2	0.1	6.7	0.1	5.2	0.1	2.2	0.1	1.7	0.1
Unwanted calls, emails, messages, pictures, video on social networking that caused fear for personal safety	2.3	0.0	3.5	0.1	2.9	0.1	1.2	0.1	1.0	0.1
Showed up somewhere or waited for student in manner that caused fear for personal safety	2.0	0.0	3.5	0.1	2.5	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.1
Spied on, watched, or followed in manner that caused fear for personal safety	1.2	0.0	1.8	0.1	1.5	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.1
Percent of Victims of Stalking										
<i>Number of incidents since beginning of 2014 term</i>										
0 times	27.9	0.5	26.7	0.8	38.0	1.2	20.3	1.6	29.8	2.2
1 time	13.7	0.4	14.2	0.6	12.0	0.7	14.9	1.5	12.2	1.4
2 times	21.3	0.5	22.4	0.7	17.2	0.8	23.9	1.8	18.9	2.2
3-5 times	23.5	0.6	24.3	0.6	20.8	1.0	22.3	2.1	26.7	2.8
6-9 times	6.2	0.4	6.7	0.4	5.3	0.6	6.3	1.1	2.8	0.9
10 or more times	7.5	0.4	5.7	0.5	6.7	0.6	12.2	1.5	9.7	1.4
<i>Association with university²</i>										
Student	63.9	0.7	69.7	0.9	52.5	1.5	65.0	2.4	50.1	2.7
Faculty	4.1	0.3	1.9	0.2	6.6	0.8	5.9	1.4	9.0	1.5
Coach, religious leader, or other non-academic advisor	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.4	1.8	0.7	1.3	0.6
Other staff or administrator	3.7	0.3	1.8	0.3	4.9	0.5	6.3	1.1	8.4	1.3
Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)	2.1	0.2	1.4	0.2	1.7	0.3	4.4	0.9	2.2	0.7

S = Cell Suppressed; ¹Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college. ² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100% ³TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-5. Percent of students experiencing stalking by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of stalking^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Percent of Victims of Stalking										
<i>Association with university²</i>										
The person was not affiliated with university	10.6	0.4	9.4	0.6	9.7	0.7	13.0	1.6	15.0	2.3
Don't know association with university	28.9	0.7	27.3	0.9	35.6	1.2	25.7	2.0	31.4	2.4
<i>Relationship to victim</i>										
At the time, it was someone I was dating or intimate with	9.4	0.4	9.0	0.6	8.6	0.8	12.7	1.5	7.6	1.3
Someone I had dated or was intimate with	24.3	0.6	25.7	0.8	25.9	1.1	20.9	1.8	18.4	1.8
Teacher or advisor	2.4	0.2	1.1	0.2	3.1	0.5	3.0	0.7	4.9	1.3
Co-worker, boss or supervisor	4.8	0.3	3.0	0.3	8.7	0.7	4.3	1.0	9.9	1.4
Friend or acquaintance	40.4	0.6	45.9	0.9	32.8	1.3	34.8	1.7	28.2	2.5
Stranger	28.7	0.6	28.4	0.7	27.0	1.4	29.8	2.0	32.9	2.6
Other	11.4	0.5	7.3	0.5	13.7	0.8	19.6	1.9	15.2	2.1
Don't Know	4.0	0.2	2.4	0.3	2.9	0.5	8.9	0.9	6.5	1.3

S = Cell Suppressed

¹Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

²Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-5. Percent of students experiencing stalking by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of stalking^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Percent of Students Reporting Stalking	12.1	1.0	8.4	1.1	8.8	1.3	5.2	1.0
Unwanted calls, emails, messages, pictures, video on social networking that caused fear for personal safety	6.8	0.8	3.2	0.7	4.9	1.0	3.4	0.8
Showed up somewhere or waited for student in manner that caused fear for personal safety	6.0	0.7	4.7	0.9	3.4	0.8	1.8	0.6
Spied on, watched, or followed in manner that caused fear for personal safety	3.2	0.6	3.4	0.8	1.8	0.6	2.5	0.7
Percent of Victims of Stalking								
<i>Number of incidents since beginning of 2014 term</i>								
0 times	27.2	4.3	17.8	5.8	30.0	7.4	36.2	10.2
1 time	7.6	2.8	27.4	6.9	9.2	4.0	S	S
2 times	13.6	3.1	8.9	4.1	31.9	7.0	20.8	7.8
3-5 times	27.6	4.2	27.0	8.0	14.2	4.9	17.1	10.0
6-9 times	9.5	3.1	9.5	3.3	6.5	3.6	S	S
10 or more times	14.6	2.9	9.4	5.1	8.2	3.1	16.2	7.8
<i>Association with university²</i>								
Student	59.5	5.1	50.3	8.9	54.8	8.5	45.2	12.2
Faculty	7.3	2.7	23.6	8.6	-	-	26.7	10.9
Coach, religious leader, or other non-academic advisor	-	-	S	S	-	-	S	S
Other staff or administrator	2.0	1.0	S	S	14.2	7.3	19.5	9.8
Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)	3.6	1.8	S	S	S	S	S	S
The person was not affiliated with university	10.1	2.5	14.4	8.0	24.2	8.0	20.3	10.5
Don't know association with university	31.6	5.1	36.1	6.9	15.3	5.2	29.8	9.5

S = Cell Suppressed ¹Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college. ² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%. ³TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-5. Percent of students experiencing stalking by type, gender, enrollment status and characteristics of stalking^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Relationship to victim²</i>								
At the time, it was someone I was dating or intimate with	6.3	1.9	14.2	5.9	S	S	S	S
Someone I had dated or was intimate with	26.5	4.3	10.2	4.5	16.7	5.5	31.8	10.5
Teacher or advisor	7.9	2.8	27.9	9.2	S	S	29.0	10.9
Co-worker, boss or supervisor	S	S	18.1	6.2	-	-	21.4	9.9
Friend or acquaintance	44.8	4.7	36.8	8.7	53.5	8.5	25.9	10.6
Stranger	28.9	3.8	25.4	8.4	31.0	8.1	26.7	9.5
Other	20.3	4.0	12.3	4.1	18.7	7.6	16.1	9.5
Don't Know	7.7	2.3	-	-	14.0	6.9	-	-

S = Cell Suppressed

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-6. Percent of students experiencing stalking by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1, 2, 3}

Characteristic Category	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	6.3	0.3	4.6	0.3	1.8	0.2	1.2	0.2
14,000 to 25,000	6.4	0.2	4.7	0.2	1.9	0.2	1.3	0.1
26,000 to 40,000	6.7	0.2	6.2	0.3	2.3	0.2	1.8	0.2
41,000 to 61,000	6.7	0.2	5.1	0.2	2.2	0.1	2.1	0.1
Type								
Public	6.7	0.1	5.7	0.2	2.2	0.1	2.0	0.1
Private	6.3	0.2	4.2	0.1	2.1	0.2	1.3	0.1
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	6.1	0.2	5.7	0.3	2.0	0.2	1.7	0.1
48.79% to 51.55%	7.1	0.2	5.7	0.2	2.0	0.1	1.9	0.1
51.56% to 56.61%	6.7	0.3	4.4	0.2	2.5	0.2	1.7	0.2
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	6.2	0.2	4.0	0.1	2.0	0.1	1.2	0.1
64% to 72%	6.4	0.3	5.4	0.3	2.2	0.2	1.9	0.2
73% to 87%	7.0	0.2	6.8	0.3	2.2	0.1	2.1	0.2
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	6.3	0.2	4.0	0.1	2.1	0.2	1.2	0.1
57% to 67%	6.1	0.3	5.6	0.3	2.4	0.2	1.7	0.2
68% to 82%	7.3	0.2	5.7	0.3	2.1	0.1	2.3	0.2
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	6.6	0.3	7.7	0.4	2.2	0.2	2.1	0.3
15% to 18%	7.0	0.2	5.0	0.2	2.2	0.1	2.1	0.2
19% to 30%	6.2	0.2	4.6	0.2	2.0	0.1	1.3	0.1
31% to 53%	5.7	0.3	4.5	0.2	1.9	0.2	1.2	0.1

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 4-6. Percent of students experiencing stalking by gender, enrollment status and characteristics of the university^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Characteristic Category	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Enrollment								
2,000 to 13,000	12.4	2.5	5.3	2.5	13.1	5.5	3.4	1.6
14,000 to 25,000	12.4	2.5	4.4	1.2	3.0	1.5	3.5	1.6
26,000 to 40,000	11.9	1.8	12.4	3.0	10.5	2.5	8.1	2.6
41,000 to 61,000	12.1	1.7	8.5	1.9	8.9	2.1	5.1	1.8
Type								
Public	11.5	1.2	9.8	1.4	8.9	1.5	5.9	1.3
Private	15.2	3.0	5.1	1.6	8.7	2.6	3.9	1.3
Percent of enrollment that is Female								
30.00% to 48.78%	12.8	2.0	7.7	2.0	6.3	2.9	2.3	0.9
48.79% to 51.55%	12.1	1.5	7.0	1.8	11.6	2.4	6.1	1.9
51.56% to 56.61%	11.6	1.8	10.2	2.2	7.7	2.1	6.6	1.9
Percent of enrollment that are Undergraduates								
31% to 63%	17.6	2.9	4.9	1.5	9.4	2.5	4.6	1.5
64% to 72%	9.7	1.7	9.1	1.9	9.0	2.4	7.9	2.0
73% to 87%	11.7	1.5	11.7	2.7	8.6	2.0	3.5	1.6
Percent of students that are White								
34% to 56%	14.3	3.3	5.7	1.7	4.5	1.9	3.0	1.3
57% to 67%	9.0	2.1	8.0	3.2	8.8	3.1	2.1	1.0
68% to 82%	13.5	1.8	13.3	3.1	7.2	2.0	8.3	3.0
Response Rate								
7% to 14%	9.4	2.1	10.5	3.4	8.8	3.1	-	-
15% to 18%	12.9	1.5	10.7	2.3	8.9	2.0	10.1	2.6
19% to 30%	14.6	2.3	5.1	1.5	9.7	2.2	4.0	1.5
31% to 53%	10.4	2.5	6.6	2.6	2.1	1.8	4.0	1.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-1. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation by gender and victim characteristics^{1,2,3,4}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female		Male		TGQN		Decline to State	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Sexual orientation										
Heterosexual	10.8	0.1	18.1	0.2	3.6	0.1	9.2	2.2	7.9	1.8
Gay or Lesbian	13.7	0.5	18.5	1.1	12.1	0.5	18.4	2.2	16.5	6.6
Bisexual	25.3	0.7	31.7	0.8	11.1	1.0	24.3	2.7	25.0	7.1
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	18.6	0.7	22.8	0.9	7.2	0.9	24.4	2.0	14.1	3.7
Decline to state	11.1	0.7	17.3	1.3	6.0	1.0	25.6	12.4	9.5	1.2
Ethnicity										
Hispanic	12.2	0.3	17.9	0.5	5.5	0.4	33.3	7.0	10.5	3.8
Not Hispanic	11.6	0.1	19.0	0.1	4.2	0.1	19.9	1.2	10.5	0.9
Race										
American Indian or Alaska Native	15.1	0.7	23.4	1.2	6.4	0.7	20.1	4.9	13.5	3.8
Asian	7.7	0.2	13.1	0.3	2.9	0.1	17.6	2.4	9.8	2.6
Black or African American	13.1	0.4	18.2	0.6	5.5	0.5	28.9	5.6	8.5	3.2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	12.2	0.9	21.2	1.7	3.8	1.0	22.6	7.8	6.7	3.1
White	13.0	0.1	21.0	0.2	4.7	0.1	21.6	1.3	11.2	1.1
Disability										
Yes	21.4	0.6	31.6	0.8	8.7	0.7	34.4	3.3	13.1	3.6
No	11.3	0.1	18.4	0.2	4.2	0.1	20.0	1.4	10.2	0.9
Marital status - Graduate and Professional										
Never married	6.3	0.1	10.3	0.3	2.7	0.1	16.2	2.3	6.1	1.7
Not married but living with a partner	6.2	0.4	8.7	0.4	3.3	0.5	12.8	2.9	4.5	2.1
Married	2.4	0.1	4.5	0.3	0.9	0.1	5.3	3.0	2.2	1.2
Divorced or separated	6.9	0.8	9.7	1.1	1.4	0.6	36.1	10.8	-	-
Other	6.8	0.7	9.7	1.2	1.9	0.7	27.2	9.4	20.1	7.9

¹ Per 100 students.

² Since enrolled in the college.

³ Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force, (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation, (4) Sexual touching by physical force or threat of physical force; (5) Sexual touching by incapacitation.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-2. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent by gender and victim characteristics^{1, 2, 3, 4}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Sexual orientation</i>										
Heterosexual	5.2	0.1	8.8	0.1	1.5	0.1	4.9	1.5	2.8	1.0
Gay or Lesbian	8.7	0.5	10.3	1.0	8.2	0.6	9.9	1.5	10.0	4.2
Bisexual	14.4	0.4	18.0	0.5	5.3	0.7	17.9	2.1	16.5	6.2
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	13.5	0.5	17.8	0.8	4.5	0.7	14.9	1.8	6.5	2.9
Decline to state	6.8	0.5	12.7	1.1	2.6	0.7	1.7	1.6	5.1	0.8
<i>Ethnicity</i>										
Hispanic	5.9	0.3	8.6	0.4	2.7	0.3	15.4	5.7	2.3	1.4
Not Hispanic	5.9	0.1	9.7	0.1	2.0	0.1	12.9	0.9	5.7	0.7
<i>Race</i>										
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.5	0.5	10.6	0.9	1.8	0.4	16.1	3.7	6.8	3.3
Asian	3.7	0.1	6.7	0.2	1.0	0.1	9.3	1.6	4.9	1.9
Black or African American	6.6	0.3	9.0	0.4	3.0	0.5	13.4	3.0	4.3	2.9
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6.8	0.9	10.8	1.6	2.1	0.8	20.1	10.0	6.9	4.8
White	6.7	0.1	10.7	0.1	2.4	0.1	14.7	1.3	6.0	0.9
<i>Disability</i>										
Yes	11.1	0.5	16.2	0.7	4.6	0.6	20.5	3.6	3.7	2.3
No	5.7	0.1	9.3	0.1	2.0	0.1	12.4	1.1	5.6	0.7
<i>Marital status - Graduate and Professional</i>										
Never married	3.8	0.1	6.3	0.2	1.6	0.1	11.9	2.2	1.7	0.8
Not married but living with a partner	3.6	0.2	5.2	0.4	1.5	0.3	10.5	2.8	3.0	1.8
Married	1.1	0.1	2.1	0.2	0.4	0.1	1.8	1.1	-	-
Divorced or separated	3.3	0.4	4.3	0.6	1.3	0.5	10.4	6.9	-	-
Other	3.7	0.5	5.3	0.8	1.8	0.8	8.2	4.4	4.2	2.8

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact involving: (1) penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (2) attempted, but not completed, penetration by physical force or threat of physical force; (3) penetration by incapacitation; (4) Sexual touching by physical force or threat of physical force; (5) Sexual touching by incapacitation.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

⁴ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-3. Percent of students experiencing harassment, intimate partner violence or stalking by type of incident, gender and enrollment status of victim^{1, 2, 3}

Survey Item Response			Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Total		Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Harassment										
<i>Sexual orientation</i>										
Heterosexual	45.8	0.1	60.5	0.3	42.4	0.3	40.9	0.3	27.7	0.3
Gay or Lesbian	60.4	0.7	72.9	1.5	58.3	1.9	64.7	1.4	48.2	1.2
Bisexual	69.1	0.7	77.2	0.8	63.3	1.2	61.2	1.9	50.9	2.4
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	64.0	0.9	73.2	1.1	56.3	2.1	51.7	2.5	34.1	2.8
Decline to state	49.1	1.1	62.6	2.2	49.1	2.2	48.6	2.4	29.2	2.6
<i>Ethnicity</i>										
Hispanic	47.8	0.5	57.6	0.7	43.6	1.0	44.1	1.1	31.7	1.3
Not Hispanic	47.7	0.1	62.4	0.3	44.1	0.3	42.7	0.3	29.4	0.3
<i>Disability</i>										
Yes	59.3	0.8	69.4	1.0	57.9	1.5	49.5	1.5	42.3	2.4
No	47.3	0.1	61.5	0.3	43.8	0.3	42.6	0.3	29.4	0.3
<i>Race</i>										
American Indian or Alaska Native	53.4	1.1	65.2	1.7	54.5	2.3	45.4	2.2	38.3	2.9
Asian	37.9	0.3	54.6	0.6	34.7	0.6	37.4	0.6	20.9	0.4
Black or African American	50.2	0.6	59.9	0.8	41.2	1.0	47.4	1.3	33.6	1.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	51.8	1.8	64.4	2.8	46.7	4.6	50.1	3.0	34.1	5.0
White	51.3	0.2	64.4	0.3	49.1	0.3	44.4	0.3	34.3	0.4

S = cell suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-3. Percent of students experiencing harassment, intimate partner violence or stalking by type of incident, gender and enrollment status of victim^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Intimate partner violence										
<i>Sexual orientation</i>										
Heterosexual	9.0	0.1	11.9	0.2	6.2	0.2	8.7	0.2	6.1	0.2
Gay or Lesbian	12.8	0.7	22.2	2.2	12.7	1.4	13.1	1.1	8.2	0.6
Bisexual	18.5	0.7	21.3	1.0	14.7	0.8	17.2	1.8	10.0	1.5
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	18.6	1.0	20.6	1.5	17.0	1.8	16.6	2.6	5.8	1.7
Decline to state	12.6	1.1	15.5	2.1	8.0	1.5	17.1	3.6	3.2	0.9
<i>Disability</i>										
Yes	18.3	0.6	20.0	0.8	16.2	1.4	15.6	1.3	16.0	1.8
No	9.5	0.1	12.5	0.2	6.8	0.2	9.1	0.2	6.1	0.2
<i>Ethnicity</i>										
Hispanic	10.9	0.4	13.5	0.7	8.8	0.7	10.4	0.6	6.2	0.7
Not Hispanic	9.7	0.1	12.7	0.2	6.9	0.2	9.2	0.2	6.3	0.2
<i>Race</i>										
American Indian or Alaska Native	15.4	1.0	19.0	1.8	12.3	1.7	11.7	1.9	13.8	1.9
Asian	8.1	0.2	11.5	0.4	5.7	0.3	8.6	0.5	5.1	0.3
Black or African American	11.0	0.4	14.8	0.8	6.9	0.7	10.3	1.1	6.1	0.8
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	10.1	1.0	15.4	2.3	5.4	1.7	6.2	1.8	6.6	2.6
White	10.1	0.1	12.8	0.2	7.4	0.2	9.4	0.2	6.8	0.2

S = cell suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-3. Percent of students experiencing harassment, intimate partner violence or stalking by type of incident, gender and enrollment status of victim^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
			Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Stalking										
<i>Sexual orientation</i>										
Heterosexual	3.7	0.1	6.1	0.1	4.8	0.1	1.8	0.1	1.5	0.1
Gay or Lesbian	5.9	0.3	10.3	1.5	6.0	1.0	5.5	0.5	4.3	0.5
Bisexual	9.9	0.4	13.1	0.6	8.6	0.7	5.1	0.8	4.8	1.1
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	9.5	0.6	11.4	1.0	11.2	1.2	5.9	1.1	2.2	0.8
Decline to state	6.5	0.5	9.0	1.3	8.5	2.0	4.1	1.2	2.7	0.8
<i>Disability</i>										
Yes	10.0	0.6	13.3	0.8	11.3	1.1	6.2	1.0	5.7	1.1
No	4.0	0.1	6.4	0.1	5.0	0.1	2.0	0.1	1.7	0.1
<i>Ethnicity</i>										
Hispanic	4.8	0.2	7.1	0.4	4.9	0.5	3.0	0.4	2.1	0.3
Not Hispanic	4.1	0.1	6.6	0.1	5.2	0.1	2.1	0.1	1.7	0.1
<i>Race</i>										
American Indian or Alaska Native	8.1	0.6	9.7	0.8	10.4	1.6	5.2	1.2	6.4	1.4
Asian	3.6	0.1	5.4	0.2	5.1	0.2	2.2	0.2	1.6	0.1
Black or African American	5.3	0.3	7.3	0.6	5.2	0.6	3.3	0.5	2.4	0.5
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6.6	0.9	7.0	1.5	11.6	4.1	4.9	1.6	0.9	0.8
White	4.3	0.1	6.9	0.1	5.3	0.2	2.0	0.1	1.7	0.1

S = cell suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-3. Percent of students experiencing harassment, intimate partner violence or stalking by type of incident, gender and enrollment status of victim^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Harassment								
<i>Sexual orientation</i>								
Heterosexual	63.2	6.1	53.9	10.4	45.4	6.0	28.6	4.6
Gay or Lesbian	77.5	3.6	70.1	4.3	74.4	12.6	23.2	9.3
Bisexual	77.9	2.6	73.9	6.0	80.9	9.9	67.4	10.0
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	76.3	2.4	73.8	2.9	72.7	7.4	58.1	13.1
Decline to state	48.7	20.5	S	S	54.9	2.8	44.1	2.9
<i>Ethnicity</i>								
Hispanic	70.3	4.9	60.8	7.7	52.1	9.4	55.5	8.5
Not Hispanic	75.6	1.6	70.5	2.8	56.0	2.3	41.1	2.5
<i>Disability</i>								
Yes	89.7	2.6	78.6	6.1	64.0	8.5	62.4	12.9
No	73.2	1.5	68.5	3.0	54.7	2.3	41.3	2.2
<i>Race</i>								
American Indian or Alaska Native	73.1	6.0	47.4	10.3	61.3	8.1	48.2	8.3
Asian	64.0	4.7	61.6	6.0	54.4	6.0	34.3	5.4
Black or African American	85.5	4.8	63.4	10.2	54.0	8.4	43.2	10.4
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	67.9	12.3	18.1	13.4	47.3	10.5	31.0	11.7
White	76.9	1.6	69.9	2.7	56.2	2.6	44.9	3.1

S = cell suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-3. Percent of students experiencing harassment, intimate partner violence or stalking by type of incident, gender and enrollment status of victim^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Intimate partner violence								
<i>Sexual orientation</i>								
Heterosexual	18.1	5.0	14.3	5.3	11.2	4.2	6.7	3.7
Gay or Lesbian	25.5	3.8	12.2	3.0	S	S	-	-
Bisexual	25.6	3.2	23.2	4.9	27.9	8.7	33.6	12.7
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	21.8	3.1	21.8	3.5	24.2	10.1	41.1	18.0
Decline to state	4.0	4.9	-	-	17.4	2.9	11.9	2.1
<i>Disability</i>								
Yes	37.4	4.5	19.1	6.4	33.6	10.6	S	S
No	20.8	2.0	17.6	2.3	14.7	2.0	12.7	2.0
<i>Ethnicity</i>								
Hispanic	33.3	7.9	15.5	6.6	23.5	12.0	24.9	10.7
Not Hispanic	21.4	1.7	18.0	2.3	16.5	2.2	11.9	2.0
<i>Race</i>								
American Indian or Alaska Native	22.4	6.4	12.8	6.2	26.8	9.2	46.2	10.7
Asian	14.4	2.9	11.1	3.8	19.0	6.4	14.8	5.1
Black or African American	25.0	6.1	12.3	5.6	20.5	10.6	13.9	7.7
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	17.6	7.9	S	S	29.2	13.8	S	S
White	23.5	1.9	18.8	2.2	16.4	2.1	11.8	2.3

S = cell suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 5-3. Percent of students experiencing harassment, intimate partner violence or stalking by type of incident, gender and enrollment status of victim^{1, 2, 3} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Stalking								
<i>Sexual orientation</i>								
Heterosexual	4.3	1.5	6.4	3.3	6.7	2.7	S	S
Gay or Lesbian	11.4	2.6	5.6	1.9	S	S	14.8	6.9
Bisexual	15.9	2.3	4.3	1.4	S	S	16.3	9.2
Asexual, Questioning, Not listed	11.8	1.5	14.4	2.6	S	S	-	-
Decline to state	12.8	10.0	-	-	10.1	1.6	4.6	1.1
<i>Disability</i>								
Yes	21.7	4.1	16.7	6.0	4.1	3.2	-	-
No	10.9	1.1	7.7	1.1	9.5	1.4	5.5	1.0
<i>Ethnicity</i>								
Hispanic	7.1	3.2	14.3	5.4	21.4	10.5	S	S
Not Hispanic	12.8	1.1	7.7	1.0	8.0	1.1	5.5	1.1
<i>Race</i>								
American Indian or Alaska Native	21.3	6.3	14.9	7.8	11.8	6.1	-	-
Asian	11.5	2.3	9.6	3.1	10.7	3.7	8.0	2.8
Black or African American	17.4	4.5	S	S	9.5	6.1	-	-
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	21.7	8.3	28.3	18.5	S	S	-	-
White	12.2	1.1	9.4	1.4	8.7	1.5	5.9	1.4

S = cell suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 6-1. Percent of victims of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation that reported an incident to an agency or program, reasons why victim did not report and whether victim reported it to someone else^{1, 2, 3, 4}

Survey Item Response	Penetration by Force		Penetration by Incapacitation		Sexual Touching by Force		Sexual Touching by Incapacitation	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Contacted at least one program in university list⁴</i>	25.5	0.7	13.3	0.6	7.0	0.3	5.0	0.4
Female	25.5	0.9	14.4	0.7	7.5	0.4	4.8	0.3
Male	22.9	2.3	8.2	1.3	3.9	0.5	4.5	1.1
TGQN	40.5	5.6	24.9	6.0	8.2	2.2	24.0	5.8
Decline to State	40.0	10.4	19.3	9.6	15.2	5.3	S	S
<i>Did not contact any programs⁴</i>								
Did not know where to go or who to tell	15.9	0.7	11.1	0.6	8.2	0.4	6.6	0.5
Felt embarrassed, ashamed, or that it would be too emotionally difficult	35.9	0.9	31.1	0.8	12.1	0.4	13.3	0.5
I did not think anyone would believe me	14.6	0.8	9.9	0.5	5.5	0.2	4.4	0.4
I did not think it was serious enough to report	58.6	0.9	62.1	0.9	74.1	0.5	75.6	0.9
I did not want the person to get into trouble	23.3	0.7	27.0	0.9	11.8	0.4	14.8	0.5
I feared negative social consequences	26.8	0.9	23.5	0.8	11.5	0.4	12.2	0.5
I did not think anything would be done	29.0	0.8	20.1	0.7	20.6	0.4	14.3	0.6
I feared it would not be kept confidential	19.8	0.8	13.7	0.7	6.7	0.3	6.7	0.4
Incident was not on campus or associated with the school	4.3	0.4	3.6	0.4	3.0	0.2	2.8	0.3
Incident did not occur while attending school	19.3	0.8	19.4	0.7	14.0	0.4	12.8	0.6
Other Reason	12.9	0.5	17.4	0.8	14.3	0.5	14.3	0.7

¹ Per 100 students.

² Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college. ³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed. ⁴ Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

Table 6-1. Percent of victims of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation that reported an incident to an agency or program, reasons why victim did not report and whether victim reported it to someone else^{1, 2, 3, 4} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Penetration by Force		Penetration by Incapacitation		Sexual Touching by Force		Sexual Touching by Incapacitation	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Who else did you tell?</i> ⁴								
Friend	78.2	0.5	76.1	0.7	75.5	0.6	74.1	0.8
Family member	21.9	0.6	13.2	0.6	12.9	0.4	8.3	0.5
Faculty	6.4	0.3	2.7	0.2	1.5	0.1	0.8	0.2
Someone else	10.5	0.5	5.7	0.4	5.2	0.3	3.2	0.4
I didn't tell anyone else	18.0	0.5	21.4	0.7	22.8	0.6	24.3	0.8

¹ Per 100 students.

² Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

⁴ Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

Table 6-2. Percent of victims of harassment, intimate partner violence and stalking that reported an incident to an agency or program, reasons why victim did not report and whether victim reported it to someone else^{1, 2, 3, 4}

Survey Item Response	Harassment		Intimate Partner Violence		Stalking	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Contacted at least one program in university list⁴</i>	7.7	0.1	15.0	0.4	28.2	0.6
Female	9.1	0.1	17.7	0.5	27.4	0.7
Male	5.2	0.2	10.6	0.5	30.6	1.5
TGQN	15.2	1.0	23.7	2.9	30.0	3.8
Decline to State	8.6	1.5	16.7	3.7	29.0	6.1
<i>Did not contact any programs⁴</i>						
Did not know where to go or who to tell	6.7	0.1	7.6	0.2	19.2	0.6
Felt embarrassed, ashamed, or that it would be too emotionally difficult	4.7	0.1	17.1	0.4	15.6	0.5
I did not think anyone would believe me	2.2	0.1	5.9	0.3	11.9	0.5
I did not think it was serious enough to report	78.6	0.2	61.1	0.6	56.7	0.9
I did not want the person to get into trouble	11.1	0.1	21.7	0.5	14.8	0.6
I feared negative social consequences	9.2	0.1	11.9	0.3	16.5	0.6
I did not think anything would be done	16.7	0.2	13.6	0.4	33.4	0.8
I feared it would not be kept confidential	6.0	0.1	8.3	0.3	13.1	0.5
Incident did not occur while attending school	11.0	0.1	29.4	0.5	22.3	0.8
Incident was not on campus or associated with the school	3.9	0.1	6.3	0.3	3.6	0.3
Other Reason	15.5	0.2	19.1	0.5	15.5	0.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college. ³TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed. ⁴ Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

Table 6-2. Percent of victims of harassment, intimate partner violence and stalking that reported an incident to an agency or program, reasons why victim did not report and whether victim reported it to someone else^{1, 2, 3, 4} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Harassment		Intimate Partner Violence		Stalking	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Who else did you tell?</i> ⁴						
Friend	57.6	0.2	63.5	0.5	83.5	0.5
Family member	13.6	0.1	27.3	0.5	43.0	0.7
Faculty	3.2	0.1	3.5	0.2	13.0	0.4
Someone else	6.7	0.1	8.8	0.3	17.4	0.6
I didn't tell anyone else	38.2	0.2	30.3	0.5	10.2	0.3

¹ Per 100 students.

² Unless otherwise indicated, estimates are for victimizations reported since entering college.

³ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

⁴ Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

Table 6-3. Evaluation of contacts made with agencies within the current school year by victims of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation^{1, 2}

<i>Survey Item Response</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>StdErr</i>
<i>Useful</i>		
Not at all	14.8	1.1
A little	19.0	1.1
Somewhat	29.6	1.4
Very	37.7	1.2
Extremely	33.1	1.1
<i>Pressure from university on whether to proceed</i>		
Yes	16.5	1.1
No	92.6	0.8
<i>Program showed respect towards victim</i>		
Excellent	61.5	1.4
Very good	28.0	1.4
Good	19.5	1.1
Fair	10.4	0.9
Poor	6.4	0.8
<i>Helped to understand options</i>		
Excellent	46.2	1.4
Very good	32.6	1.4
Good	23.7	1.2
Fair	15.7	1.1
Poor	11.9	1.1

¹ Percentages sum to more than 100% because respondents are evaluating each contact made within the last year.

² Mark all that apply survey item and percents can add up to more than 100%

Table 7-1. Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>If someone were to report sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official, how likely is it that...</i>										
<i>Students would support the person making the report.</i>										
Not at all	2.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	1.8	0.1	4.1	0.6	3.7	0.8
A little	9.3	0.1	11.2	0.1	7.3	0.1	18.1	1.2	14.0	1.2
Somewhat	33.5	0.1	36.3	0.2	30.7	0.2	43.7	1.4	31.7	1.6
Very	43.2	0.2	40.6	0.2	46.2	0.2	26.3	1.5	31.4	1.7
Extremely	12.0	0.1	9.9	0.1	14.1	0.2	7.7	0.8	19.3	1.2
<i>The alleged offender(s) or their associates would retaliate against the person making the report.</i>										
Not at all	8.2	0.1	6.1	0.1	10.2	0.1	4.4	0.6	15.9	1.3
A little	27.5	0.1	24.3	0.2	30.9	0.2	18.3	1.2	23.5	1.5
Somewhat	42.1	0.2	43.1	0.2	41.2	0.2	36.6	1.3	38.8	1.7
Very	17.8	0.1	21.3	0.2	14.2	0.2	28.6	1.2	14.3	1.2
Extremely	4.4	0.1	5.2	0.1	3.5	0.1	12.1	1.1	7.5	1.0
<i>Campus officials would take the report seriously.</i>										
Not at all	3.0	0.0	3.1	0.1	2.7	0.1	8.0	0.9	6.0	0.8
A little	8.8	0.1	10.9	0.1	6.5	0.1	17.8	1.0	14.0	1.2
Somewhat	24.9	0.1	28.8	0.2	20.8	0.2	33.5	1.3	26.9	1.5
Very	38.7	0.2	38.6	0.2	39.1	0.2	28.6	1.6	26.6	1.7
Extremely	24.6	0.1	18.5	0.2	30.8	0.2	12.1	1.0	26.5	1.5

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-1. Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Campus official would protect the safety of the person making the report.</i>										
Not at all	3.8	0.1	4.3	0.1	3.1	0.1	11.1	0.9	8.0	0.7
A little	10.5	0.1	13.0	0.1	7.8	0.1	20.8	1.0	14.9	1.4
Somewhat	29.3	0.1	32.5	0.2	26.0	0.2	34.7	1.4	30.3	1.6
Very	35.8	0.2	34.4	0.2	37.5	0.2	23.4	1.3	24.8	1.4
Extremely	20.7	0.1	15.9	0.1	25.6	0.2	10.1	1.1	22.0	1.2
<i>Campus officials would conduct a fair investigation.</i>										
Not at all	4.9	0.1	4.5	0.1	5.0	0.1	12.2	1.0	15.7	1.4
A little	11.5	0.1	13.0	0.1	9.7	0.1	22.7	1.2	17.9	1.3
Somewhat	34.4	0.1	36.9	0.2	31.8	0.2	38.8	1.0	33.2	2.0
Very	34.9	0.2	34.1	0.2	36.2	0.2	19.6	1.4	22.0	1.7
Extremely	14.3	0.1	11.5	0.1	17.2	0.2	6.6	0.9	11.2	1.0
<i>Campus officials would take action against the offender(s).</i>										
Not at all	5.2	0.1	6.4	0.1	3.7	0.1	14.5	1.1	9.9	1.0
A little	14.9	0.1	18.7	0.2	10.9	0.1	28.9	1.3	16.8	1.3
Somewhat	35.3	0.1	38.6	0.2	32.1	0.2	34.9	1.4	30.4	1.6
Very	30.6	0.2	26.8	0.2	34.6	0.2	14.9	1.3	23.4	1.6
Extremely	14.0	0.1	9.5	0.1	18.6	0.2	6.8	0.9	19.5	1.3

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-1. Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct.</i>										
Not at all	7.9	0.1	8.9	0.1	6.6	0.1	22.3	1.1	16.7	1.1
A little	17.2	0.1	19.5	0.2	14.7	0.2	28.8	1.4	18.0	1.4
Somewhat	35.9	0.2	36.7	0.2	35.3	0.2	31.5	1.5	29.4	1.5
Very	27.9	0.2	26.3	0.2	30.0	0.2	11.0	0.9	23.2	1.5
Extremely	11.0	0.1	8.6	0.1	13.4	0.1	6.3	1.0	12.7	1.1

¹ Per 100 students. ²TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed

Table 7-2. Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender and enrollment status^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>If someone were to report sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official, how likely is it that...</i>								
<i>Students would support the person making the report.</i>								
Not at all	2.1	0.1	1.9	0.1	1.9	0.1	1.8	0.1
A little	11.2	0.1	11.1	0.2	7.5	0.1	6.9	0.2
Somewhat	35.4	0.2	38.3	0.2	30.1	0.3	31.6	0.3
Very	40.7	0.2	40.3	0.3	46.0	0.3	46.4	0.3
Extremely	10.6	0.2	8.4	0.2	14.5	0.2	13.2	0.3
<i>The alleged offender(s) or their associates would retaliate against the person making the report.</i>								
Not at all	6.0	0.1	6.3	0.1	10.4	0.2	9.7	0.2
A little	24.1	0.2	24.7	0.3	31.5	0.3	29.8	0.3
Somewhat	42.3	0.3	45.0	0.3	40.4	0.3	42.7	0.2
Very	21.9	0.2	19.8	0.2	14.1	0.2	14.4	0.2
Extremely	5.6	0.1	4.2	0.1	3.6	0.1	3.3	0.1
<i>Campus officials would take the report seriously.</i>								
Not at all	3.3	0.1	2.8	0.1	2.8	0.1	2.5	0.1
A little	10.9	0.1	10.9	0.2	6.6	0.1	6.4	0.2
Somewhat	28.7	0.2	28.8	0.2	20.6	0.3	21.3	0.3
Very	37.8	0.3	40.7	0.3	37.9	0.3	41.6	0.3
Extremely	19.3	0.2	16.8	0.3	32.1	0.3	28.3	0.3
<i>Campus official would protect the safety of the person making the report.</i>								
Not at all	4.1	0.1	4.6	0.1	3.1	0.1	3.1	0.1
A little	12.8	0.2	13.5	0.2	7.8	0.1	7.8	0.2
Somewhat	31.8	0.2	34.2	0.3	25.7	0.3	26.6	0.3
Very	34.4	0.2	34.3	0.3	36.3	0.3	39.8	0.4
Extremely	16.9	0.2	13.4	0.2	27.0	0.2	22.8	0.3

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-2. Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Campus officials would conduct a fair investigation.</i>								
Not at all	4.6	0.1	4.3	0.1	5.4	0.1	4.4	0.1
A little	13.1	0.1	12.7	0.2	10.0	0.1	9.2	0.2
Somewhat	36.6	0.3	37.7	0.3	31.5	0.3	32.5	0.3
Very	33.6	0.3	35.2	0.3	35.2	0.3	38.1	0.3
Extremely	12.1	0.2	10.1	0.2	18.0	0.2	15.8	0.2
<i>Campus officials would take action against the offender(s).</i>								
Not at all	6.3	0.1	6.7	0.2	3.7	0.1	3.7	0.2
A little	18.5	0.2	18.9	0.3	10.6	0.2	11.6	0.3
Somewhat	37.7	0.3	40.7	0.3	31.5	0.3	33.3	0.3
Very	27.2	0.3	25.9	0.2	34.4	0.3	35.1	0.3
Extremely	10.2	0.2	7.7	0.2	19.8	0.2	16.3	0.3
<i>Campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct.</i>								
Not at all	8.4	0.1	9.9	0.2	6.5	0.2	6.8	0.2
A little	19.0	0.2	20.5	0.2	14.2	0.2	15.7	0.3
Somewhat	36.5	0.2	37.2	0.3	35.3	0.3	35.2	0.3
Very	26.8	0.2	25.0	0.2	29.8	0.2	30.3	0.3
Extremely	9.2	0.1	7.3	0.2	14.1	0.2	12.1	0.2

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-2. Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>If someone were to report sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official, how likely is it that...</i>								
<i>Students would support the person making the report.</i>								
Not at all	3.3	0.6	6.0	1.1	4.2	1.1	2.9	0.9
A little	18.6	1.5	17.0	1.9	13.9	1.4	14.0	2.1
Somewhat	44.9	1.7	40.8	2.4	32.3	2.3	30.6	2.2
Very	25.3	1.6	28.6	2.4	30.5	2.4	32.7	2.3
Extremely	7.9	1.0	7.5	1.2	19.0	1.6	19.7	1.6
<i>The alleged offender(s) or their associates would retaliate against the person making the report.</i>								
Not at all	3.0	0.6	7.8	1.4	17.2	1.9	13.9	1.7
A little	19.1	1.6	16.2	1.7	21.0	1.9	27.3	2.6
Somewhat	35.8	1.7	38.4	2.4	38.7	2.4	38.9	2.9
Very	29.5	1.4	26.6	2.1	13.4	1.6	15.7	1.6
Extremely	12.6	1.5	11.0	1.1	9.8	1.5	4.2	1.1
<i>Campus officials would take the report seriously.</i>								
Not at all	7.9	1.1	8.1	1.1	6.2	1.1	5.6	1.2
A little	17.7	1.4	18.2	1.6	12.5	1.4	16.2	1.9
Somewhat	32.9	1.7	35.1	2.0	27.3	2.3	26.3	1.9
Very	29.9	2.1	25.5	2.3	24.7	2.2	29.6	2.3
Extremely	11.6	1.3	13.1	1.5	29.3	2.0	22.3	2.1
<i>Campus official would protect the safety of the person making the report.</i>								
Not at all	11.3	1.1	10.4	1.7	8.1	1.2	7.9	1.2
A little	19.2	1.3	24.6	1.8	15.0	1.8	14.7	1.8
Somewhat	35.3	1.6	33.2	2.4	29.1	2.0	32.1	2.5
Very	23.4	1.5	23.4	2.3	25.2	1.9	24.2	2.4
Extremely	10.8	1.5	8.3	1.2	22.6	1.4	21.1	2.2

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-2. Perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Campus officials would conduct a fair investigation.</i>								
Not at all	12.7	1.4	11.1	1.4	17.3	2.0	13.4	1.6
A little	23.3	1.5	21.3	1.9	16.6	1.6	19.9	2.2
Somewhat	37.5	1.1	41.9	2.1	33.8	2.4	32.3	2.8
Very	20.0	1.9	18.7	1.7	20.4	1.9	24.3	2.5
Extremely	6.4	1.1	7.0	1.2	12.0	1.4	10.1	1.7
<i>Campus officials would take action against the offender(s).</i>								
Not at all	15.3	1.4	12.6	1.6	9.5	1.4	10.5	1.6
A little	28.5	1.4	29.7	2.1	17.5	1.6	15.7	2.3
Somewhat	33.8	1.8	37.7	2.7	28.9	1.9	32.7	2.9
Very	16.0	1.7	12.4	1.4	22.6	2.0	24.7	2.5
Extremely	6.5	1.0	7.6	1.2	21.6	1.6	16.4	1.8
<i>Campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct.</i>								
Not at all	22.2	1.4	22.5	1.9	15.0	1.7	19.2	1.9
A little	28.9	1.8	28.7	2.3	17.5	2.0	18.8	2.0
Somewhat	31.9	1.9	30.6	2.2	29.4	2.3	29.4	2.1
Very	10.9	1.1	11.2	1.3	24.8	2.1	20.8	2.3
Extremely	6.1	1.2	7.0	1.4	13.3	1.3	11.9	1.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-3. Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Have you been in any of the following situations? If so, what did you do?</i>										
<i>Suspected a friend was sexually assaulted</i>										
Yes	17.8	0.1	21.9	0.2	13.3	0.2	37.6	1.3	21.1	1.3
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	12.6	0.2	12.6	0.2	12.5	0.4	14.4	2.0	10.1	2.5
Did nothing for another reason	21.0	0.3	19.1	0.3	24.0	0.5	19.8	1.9	20.3	3.6
Spoke to my friend or someone else to seek help	57.1	0.3	60.5	0.4	51.6	0.6	56.4	2.4	56.1	3.8
Took action in another way	9.3	0.2	7.8	0.2	11.8	0.5	9.4	1.2	13.5	2.4
No	82.2	0.1	78.1	0.2	86.7	0.2	62.4	1.3	78.9	1.3
<i>Witnessed drunk person heading for sexual encounter</i>										
Yes	44.4	0.1	45.6	0.2	43.3	0.2	41.2	1.3	37.8	1.7
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	23.5	0.2	27.5	0.3	19.5	0.3	25.7	2.4	17.6	2.1
Did nothing for another reason	53.5	0.2	45.6	0.3	61.8	0.3	42.0	2.2	61.7	3.0
Directly intervened to stop it	8.8	0.1	10.7	0.2	6.7	0.2	12.9	1.4	7.1	1.4
Spoke to someone else to seek help	6.3	0.1	8.1	0.1	4.5	0.1	6.8	1.0	1.6	0.7
Took action in another way	7.9	0.1	8.1	0.2	7.5	0.2	12.6	1.5	12.0	1.9
No	55.6	0.1	54.4	0.2	56.7	0.2	58.8	1.3	62.2	1.7

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-3. Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Witnessed someone acting in sexually violent or harassing manner</i>										
Yes	19.6	0.1	23.1	0.2	15.7	0.2	40.3	1.5	21.3	1.4
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	24.5	0.3	27.1	0.4	21.0	0.4	21.4	2.2	19.5	3.4
Did nothing for another reason	30.0	0.3	28.0	0.3	32.9	0.4	27.2	2.2	30.5	3.6
Directly intervened to stop it	18.3	0.2	16.1	0.3	21.1	0.3	24.3	2.3	20.9	3.0
Spoke to someone else to seek help	14.2	0.2	16.4	0.3	11.1	0.4	13.4	2.0	13.4	3.9
Took action in another way	13.1	0.2	12.4	0.3	13.9	0.4	13.8	1.6	15.8	2.6
No	80.4	0.1	76.9	0.2	84.3	0.2	59.7	1.5	78.7	1.4

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-4. Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Have you been in any of the following situations? If so, what did you do?</i>								
<i>Suspected a friend was sexually assaulted</i>								
Yes	26.4	0.2	11.6	0.2	16.2	0.2	7.6	0.2
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	12.6	0.3	12.6	0.7	12.0	0.5	14.6	0.8
Did nothing for another reason	19.1	0.4	19.2	0.6	23.8	0.7	25.1	1.1
Spoke to my friend or someone else to seek help	60.6	0.5	60.1	0.9	52.2	0.7	49.3	1.4
Took action in another way	7.7	0.3	8.1	0.4	12.0	0.5	11.0	0.8
No	73.6	0.2	88.4	0.2	83.8	0.2	92.4	0.2
<i>Witnessed drunk person heading for sexual encounter</i>								
Yes	52.0	0.2	30.6	0.3	50.1	0.3	30.2	0.3
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	28.1	0.3	25.1	0.5	19.4	0.3	19.6	0.5
Did nothing for another reason	43.3	0.3	54.4	0.6	60.4	0.3	66.5	0.6
Directly intervened to stop it	11.5	0.2	7.5	0.3	7.4	0.2	4.8	0.3
Spoke to someone else to seek help	8.8	0.2	5.2	0.2	5.0	0.2	2.7	0.2
Took action in another way	8.2	0.2	7.8	0.2	7.9	0.2	6.5	0.3
No	48.0	0.2	69.4	0.3	49.9	0.3	69.8	0.3

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

S = cell suppressed because of small sample size

Table 7-4. Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Witnessed someone acting in sexually violent or harassing manner</i>								
Yes	26.0	0.2	16.5	0.2	18.4	0.2	10.7	0.2
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	27.7	0.4	24.8	0.7	20.8	0.5	21.6	0.9
Did nothing for another reason	27.2	0.4	31.0	0.7	32.0	0.5	35.8	1.0
Directly intervened to stop it	16.6	0.3	14.4	0.5	22.0	0.4	18.0	0.9
Spoke to someone else to seek help	16.7	0.3	15.3	0.6	11.4	0.4	10.0	0.6
Took action in another way	11.8	0.3	14.6	0.5	13.7	0.5	14.5	0.8
No	74.0	0.2	83.5	0.2	81.6	0.2	89.3	0.2

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

S = cell suppressed because of small sample size

Table 7-4. Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Have you been in any of the following situations? If so, what did you do?</i>								
<i>Suspected a friend was sexually assaulted</i>								
Yes	42.6	1.7	25.6	2.0	25.7	2.1	14.3	1.8
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	15.4	2.4	10.2	2.8	11.3	3.4	6.7	3.0
Did nothing for another reason	21.3	2.4	14.0	2.8	20.5	4.4	19.8	6.0
Spoke to my friend or someone else to seek help	54.9	2.8	62.3	4.6	52.4	4.9	66.1	6.5
Took action in another way	8.4	1.2	13.5	3.3	15.8	3.0	7.3	3.5
No	57.4	1.7	74.4	2.0	74.3	2.1	85.7	1.8
<i>Witnessed drunk person heading for sexual encounter</i>								
Yes	42.3	1.6	38.6	2.1	41.0	2.1	33.2	3.0
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	27.4	3.1	21.0	2.8	19.1	2.8	14.9	3.5
Did nothing for another reason	40.9	3.0	45.0	2.9	58.2	4.1	68.3	4.1
Directly intervened to stop it	14.1	1.8	9.7	1.9	8.0	1.8	5.4	1.8
Spoke to someone else to seek help	6.6	1.2	7.4	2.0	1.8	1.0	S	S
Took action in another way	11.0	1.7	16.9	2.4	12.9	2.5	10.2	2.9
No	57.7	1.6	61.4	2.1	59.0	2.1	66.8	3.0

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

S = cell suppressed because of small sample size

Table 7-4. Bystander intervention upon witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Witnessed someone acting in sexually violent or harassing manner</i>								
Yes	42.6	1.9	35.1	2.0	23.9	2.0	17.3	2.2
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do	23.5	2.5	15.4	3.1	21.7	4.2	14.9	4.7
Did nothing for another reason	27.5	2.5	26.1	2.8	24.2	4.4	43.6	7.3
Directly intervened to stop it	24.1	2.5	25.0	3.4	21.4	3.3	19.7	5.6
Spoke to someone else to seek help	13.0	2.1	14.5	3.9	15.2	5.1	9.7	4.7
Took action in another way	11.9	1.4	19.0	3.6	17.5	3.6	12.2	3.8
No	57.4	1.9	64.9	2.0	76.1	2.0	82.7	2.2

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

S = cell suppressed because of small sample size

Table 7-5. Perceptions related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Sexual assault or sexual misconduct a problem at university</i>										
Not at all	14.6	0.1	10.6	0.1	18.7	0.2	8.2	0.7	19.6	1.4
A little	28.2	0.1	24.4	0.1	32.3	0.3	16.3	1.2	25.1	1.8
Somewhat	37.0	0.1	40.3	0.2	33.9	0.2	33.5	1.3	25.6	1.4
Very	15.6	0.1	19.2	0.1	11.8	0.1	25.9	1.5	18.4	1.0
Extremely	4.6	0.1	5.5	0.1	3.3	0.1	16.1	1.2	11.4	1.1
<i>Likelihood of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus</i>										
Not at all	52.3	0.2	31.0	0.2	74.2	0.2	24.8	1.2	54.0	1.6
A little	29.6	0.1	39.3	0.2	19.9	0.2	31.5	1.1	23.4	1.4
Somewhat	13.1	0.1	21.2	0.1	4.6	0.1	27.0	1.4	13.9	1.2
Very	3.7	0.1	6.3	0.1	0.9	0.0	11.2	0.8	6.1	0.7
Extremely	1.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	5.5	0.6	2.6	0.6
<i>Likelihood of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct off campus at university-sponsored events</i>										
Not at all	46.8	0.1	27.0	0.2	67.0	0.2	25.6	1.4	49.6	1.8
A little	31.6	0.1	39.4	0.2	24.0	0.2	30.8	1.3	23.4	1.4
Somewhat	16.2	0.1	24.9	0.1	7.3	0.1	29.2	1.2	16.6	1.3
Very	4.3	0.1	7.1	0.1	1.3	0.1	9.9	0.7	6.1	0.9
Extremely	1.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	4.5	0.7	4.3	0.7

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-6. Perceptions related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Female (n=87,737)				Male (n=60,085)			
	Undergraduate (n=55,552)		Graduate or Professional (n=32,185)		Undergraduate (n=35,395)		Graduate or Professional (n=24,690)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Sexual assault or sexual misconduct a problem at university</i>								
Not at all	8.1	0.1	16.5	0.3	15.0	0.2	26.0	0.3
A little	23.6	0.2	26.2	0.2	33.1	0.3	30.6	0.3
Somewhat	41.1	0.2	38.4	0.3	35.8	0.3	30.2	0.3
Very	21.1	0.2	14.6	0.2	12.7	0.2	10.1	0.2
Extremely	6.0	0.1	4.3	0.1	3.4	0.1	3.1	0.1
<i>Likelihood of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus</i>								
Not at all	27.5	0.2	39.2	0.3	71.4	0.3	79.5	0.3
A little	38.6	0.2	41.1	0.3	21.5	0.3	16.8	0.3
Somewhat	23.8	0.2	15.1	0.2	5.6	0.1	2.8	0.1
Very	7.6	0.1	3.4	0.1	1.1	0.1	0.6	0.0
Extremely	2.6	0.1	1.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0
<i>Likelihood of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct off campus at university-sponsored events</i>								
Not at all	24.2	0.2	33.9	0.3	64.6	0.3	71.7	0.4
A little	38.5	0.2	41.5	0.2	25.0	0.2	22.1	0.3
Somewhat	27.1	0.2	19.5	0.2	8.4	0.2	5.1	0.1
Very	8.4	0.1	4.1	0.1	1.6	0.1	0.8	0.1
Extremely	1.9	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-6. Perceptions related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN (n=1,398)				Decline to State (n=852)			
	Undergraduate (n=908)		Graduate or Professional (n=490)		Undergraduate (n=451)		Graduate or Professional (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Sexual assault or sexual misconduct a problem at university</i>								
Not at all	7.5	0.9	9.9	1.4	18.4	2.0	21.3	1.7
A little	16.7	1.6	15.2	1.7	25.5	2.3	24.4	2.3
Somewhat	32.3	1.6	36.4	2.1	27.0	2.0	23.4	1.9
Very	26.8	2.0	23.9	2.0	16.7	1.5	21.1	1.6
Extremely	16.8	1.4	14.6	1.5	12.3	1.6	9.9	1.5
<i>Likelihood of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus</i>								
Not at all	21.9	1.4	31.7	2.4	51.1	2.2	58.3	2.0
A little	31.0	1.4	32.5	2.4	24.1	1.9	22.4	1.9
Somewhat	29.1	1.7	21.9	1.8	15.8	1.7	11.2	1.5
Very	12.2	1.2	8.7	1.0	7.0	1.1	4.7	1.1
Extremely	5.7	0.7	5.2	1.0	2.1	0.7	3.5	1.0
<i>Likelihood of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct off campus at university-sponsored events</i>								
Not at all	23.1	1.6	31.7	2.8	46.8	2.7	53.9	2.2
A little	30.4	1.6	31.6	2.2	21.7	1.9	26.1	2.4
Somewhat	30.8	1.5	25.2	2.1	20.5	1.8	10.8	1.4
Very	10.9	0.8	7.7	1.3	6.6	1.2	5.3	1.1
Extremely	4.8	0.8	3.8	0.8	4.5	1.1	3.9	0.9

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-7. Knowledge and perceptions about resources related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2}

Survey Item Response	Total		Female				Male			
			Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional		Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Knowledgeable about how sexual assault and sexual misconduct defined at university.</i>										
Not at all	15.7	0.1	14.3	0.2	23.0	0.3	12.1	0.2	19.0	0.3
A little bit	26.7	0.1	27.2	0.2	29.9	0.3	24.2	0.2	28.5	0.3
Somewhat	33.6	0.1	33.1	0.3	30.2	0.3	35.9	0.2	33.2	0.3
Very	18.4	0.1	19.1	0.1	13.5	0.2	21.3	0.2	15.7	0.2
Extremely	5.6	0.1	6.3	0.1	3.4	0.1	6.5	0.2	3.6	0.2
<i>Knowledgeable about where to get help at university if student or friend experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct.</i>										
Not at all	11.4	0.1	8.8	0.1	15.2	0.2	10.3	0.2	15.5	0.2
A little bit	24.4	0.1	22.8	0.2	28.8	0.3	22.4	0.2	28.3	0.3
Somewhat	34.7	0.1	34.0	0.3	33.7	0.3	35.8	0.3	35.2	0.4
Very	22.0	0.1	25.2	0.2	17.0	0.2	23.7	0.2	16.4	0.3
Extremely	7.5	0.1	9.3	0.1	5.3	0.1	7.8	0.2	4.6	0.1
<i>Knowledgeable about where to make a report if student or friend experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct at university.</i>										
Not at all	18.1	0.1	18.5	0.2	24.1	0.3	14.5	0.2	18.7	0.2
A little bit	24.8	0.1	24.9	0.2	27.1	0.3	22.9	0.2	26.5	0.3
Somewhat	31.4	0.2	31.0	0.2	29.4	0.2	32.4	0.3	31.9	0.3
Very	18.6	0.1	18.2	0.2	14.5	0.2	21.6	0.2	17.0	0.3
Extremely	7.2	0.1	7.4	0.1	4.8	0.1	8.6	0.2	5.9	0.2

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-7. Knowledge and perceptions about resources related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	Total		Female				Male			
			Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional		Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Knowledgeable about what happens when a student reports sexual assault or sexual misconduct at university.</i>										
Not at all	36.7	0.1	37.4	0.2	45.2	0.3	31.5	0.3	38.2	0.3
A little bit	27.3	0.1	27.2	0.2	25.7	0.2	28.1	0.3	27.7	0.3
Somewhat	24.5	0.1	24.0	0.2	20.5	0.2	27.4	0.3	23.6	0.3
Very	8.1	0.1	8.1	0.1	6.4	0.2	9.1	0.2	7.9	0.2
Extremely	3.3	0.1	3.3	0.1	2.2	0.1	4.1	0.1	2.6	0.1
<i>Initial university orientation included information about sexual assault or sexual misconduct.</i>										
Yes	48.8	0.2	54.1	0.3	34.2	0.5	56.8	0.5	39.5	0.5
Not at all	6.9	0.2	4.6	0.2	7.6	0.3	8.6	0.4	7.2	0.5
A little	21.8	0.3	22.2	0.4	27.6	0.6	19.9	0.6	20.6	0.6
Somewhat	43.7	0.3	43.9	0.5	41.8	0.8	44.1	0.6	44.2	0.8
Very	23.8	0.3	25.6	0.5	19.9	0.6	23.2	0.5	24.2	0.7
Extremely	3.8	0.1	3.7	0.2	3.1	0.3	4.1	0.3	4.0	0.3
No	13.3	0.2	11.2	0.2	23.2	0.4	8.4	0.3	16.3	0.4
I didn't attend orientation	8.2	0.1	5.1	0.2	14.1	0.4	5.2	0.2	13.1	0.4
I don't remember	29.7	0.2	29.6	0.4	28.5	0.5	29.6	0.5	31.0	0.5

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-7. Knowledge and perceptions about resources related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN				Decline to State			
	Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional		Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Knowledgeable about how sexual assault and sexual misconduct defined at university.</i>								
Not at all	13.7	1.1	15.1	1.5	18.9	2.0	21.9	2.3
A little bit	22.1	1.4	21.4	1.7	18.0	1.9	19.6	1.9
Somewhat	30.6	1.7	31.5	2.2	30.0	2.3	31.0	2.4
Very	22.0	1.6	22.0	2.4	21.4	1.8	17.1	1.7
Extremely	11.6	0.9	10.1	1.3	11.7	1.5	10.4	1.4
<i>Knowledgeable about where to get help at university if student or friend experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct.</i>								
Not at all	7.7	0.8	8.7	1.2	13.4	1.3	13.6	1.6
A little bit	17.1	1.3	22.6	1.9	17.6	1.8	21.9	2.0
Somewhat	33.3	1.7	31.4	2.3	31.5	2.0	30.0	2.1
Very	28.4	1.5	24.9	2.2	24.8	2.0	21.5	2.2
Extremely	13.5	1.1	12.4	1.5	12.6	1.6	13.1	1.6
<i>Knowledgeable about where to make a report if student or friend experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct at university.</i>								
Not at all	16.5	1.3	19.6	1.8	17.7	1.7	18.9	1.8
A little bit	22.4	1.6	18.5	1.7	20.0	1.9	18.8	1.7
Somewhat	32.4	1.6	29.0	2.2	29.7	2.3	25.0	2.1
Very	15.9	1.3	21.4	2.4	18.3	1.5	21.3	2.3
Extremely	12.8	1.7	11.5	1.5	14.2	1.6	16.0	2.1

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table 7-7. Knowledge and perceptions about resources related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct by gender and enrollment status^{1,2} (continued)

Survey Item Response	TGQN				Decline to State			
	Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional		Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
<i>Knowledgeable about what happens when a student reports sexual assault or sexual misconduct at university.</i>								
Not at all	35.9	1.7	35.0	2.4	34.2	2.2	38.8	2.6
A little bit	22.2	1.3	24.4	2.0	22.9	2.3	19.0	2.2
Somewhat	27.1	2.2	23.7	2.4	22.1	1.8	23.7	2.2
Very	8.7	0.9	10.4	1.9	10.8	1.7	10.5	1.6
Extremely	6.1	0.8	6.5	1.3	10.0	1.6	8.0	1.2
<i>Initial university orientation included information about sexual assault or sexual misconduct.</i>								
Yes	49.1	3.3	32.6	3.6	42.9	4.3	39.8	4.5
Not at all	7.7	2.1	15.9	4.7	21.9	5.1	18.0	5.8
A little	25.7	3.8	23.2	5.3	19.9	5.6	19.2	5.9
Somewhat	36.8	4.1	33.7	8.0	42.6	7.1	36.5	8.5
Very	28.2	4.8	19.8	5.7	12.4	3.9	18.8	5.7
Extremely	1.6	0.9	7.4	6.6	3.3	2.4	7.4	4.4
No	10.4	2.1	24.7	3.9	15.1	4.5	13.5	3.0
I didn't attend orientation	7.8	1.9	16.6	3.3	13.2	3.0	20.6	4.4
I don't remember	32.7	2.9	26.2	4.0	28.9	3.7	26.1	4.6

¹ Per 100 students.

² TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Appendix 1. Survey Development

A1.1 Survey Design Teams and Questionnaire Development

The survey development process was a collaboration between the Westat and AAU Survey Design Teams. The Westat Team was co-chaired by Co-Principal Investigators Dr. David Cantor, Senior Statistical Fellow at Westat and Research Professor at the Joint Program for Survey Methodology, and Dr. Bonnie Fisher, Professor, School of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati. The AAU Survey Design Team was chaired by Dr. Sandy Martin, Professor and Associate Chair for Research, Department of Maternal and Child Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. They were joined by a multidisciplinary group of university professors and administrators from participating IHEs with expertise in survey design and methodology and issues related to sexual assault and misconduct on campus. The members of the AAU Survey Design Team are presented in Table A1-1.

To start the survey design process, in October 2014, the Westat Team reviewed *Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*, which included recommendations on using campus climate surveys to document the problem of sexual assault on college campuses. The team also systematically reviewed decades of research literature on how to measure sexual misconduct and sexual victimization in a student population (e.g., Koss, et al., 1987; Koss, et al., 2007; Fisher and May, 2009; Kilpatrick, et al., 2007; Krebs, et al., 2009). In addition, the team reviewed procedures and surveys developed by other IHEs (e.g., Rutgers University, University of Oregon, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia University). The team drew on other victimization surveys such as National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), NCVS Supplemental Victimization Survey on Stalking (SVS), and the Campus Safety and Security Survey. Finally the team drew from scales that measured specific attitudes and behaviors, such as harassment and bystander intervention. The final survey provides the source material that was used for each of the major sections.

In early November 2014, the AAU Survey Design Team was formed and started working on the survey development process. The first meeting, conducted via conference call, set the stage for the frequent and ongoing meetings needed to develop the survey. During the initial instrument development phase, from November 2014 to January 2015, the team had weekly conference calls. In February 2015, when final revisions were being made to the survey, the team met every other week. Meetings lasted, on average, 2 hours. In between formal meetings, team members were in frequent, sometimes daily, contact to provide technical expertise on survey design, review survey drafts and provide feedback, and resolve issues raised during meetings.

During these meetings, the AAU Survey Design Team members discussed at length conceptual and methodological issues underlying the measurement of sexual misconduct, sexual victimization, and campus climate constructs. Team members made final decisions on how to define campus climate (e.g., nature and scope) and the types of victimization that would be covered, question wording, response set wording, and ordering of topics. All decisions were made with the goal of keeping the time to complete the survey to between 15 and 20 minutes.

Survey items and topics were submitted by both the Westat Team and the AAU Survey Design Team and considered as part of the multistep, iterative process to develop the final instrument.

The Design Team members provided information on the overall structure and constructs included in the survey, as well as the survey question, ordering of questions and sections, and other details. They also served as consultants at their respective universities who provided feedback to the entire group through their university liaisons; thus the survey was informed by a much wider group than the Design Team. In addition, some members of the Design Team assisted by pretesting aspects of the draft survey with students at their respective universities.

Throughout this process, the team received more than 700 comments about the survey for consideration. Each comment was reviewed individually and a decision was made about how best to handle each one with input from the AAU Survey Design Team. Disagreements were resolved by consensus.

A1.2 Student Input

The team received feedback from students in three ways. One was from cognitive interviews with students currently attending colleges or universities. This was completed in two different locations with approximately 35 students. Second, the instrument was administered to students at two different IHEs. After the instrument was administered, the students were asked for feedback on the items. Comments were received from approximately 60 students. Third, a focus group with 13 students was conducted at one IHE.

The feedback from these activities included a wide range of comments on both the content and wording of the questions. For example, the cognitive interviews pointed to questions where the definitions and instructions were not clear or not being read. The Design Team modified these questions to incorporate the definitions into the stem of the question to increase the likelihood they

Table A1-1. The AAU Survey Design Team

AAU Survey Design Team Members	
Melanie Boyd	Yale University Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and Director of Office of Gender and Campus Culture
Russell Carey	Brown University Executive Vice President for Planning and Policy
Melissa A. Clark	Brown University Professor of Epidemiology and Obstetrics and Gynecology; Associate Director, Center for Population and Health and Clinical Epidemiology
Nancy Deutsch	University of Virginia Associate Professor
Marne K. Einarson	Cornell University Assistant Director, Office Institutional Research & Planning
Lily Guillot Svensen	Yale University Research Analyst for the Office of Institutional Research; member of Yale’s Title IX Steering Committee
Debra Kalmuss	Columbia University Professor, Population and Family Health, Mailman School of Public Health
David Laibson	Harvard University Robert I. Goldman Professor of Economics
Sandra Martin, Chair	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill Department of Maternal and Child Health, Gillings School of Global Public Health
Stephen Minicucci	Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) Director of Research
Christina Morell	University of Virginia Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Lindsay Orchowski	Brown University Assistant Professor of Psychiatry and Human Behavior (Research)
Jagruiti “Jag” Patel	MIT Associate Director of Institutional Research
Nora Cate Schaeffer	University of Wisconsin-Madison Sewell Bascom Professor of Sociology Faculty Director, University of Wisconsin Survey Center
Sarah Schultz Robinson	University of Virginia Institutional Assessment Office
Stephanie S. Spangler	Yale University Deputy Provost for Health Affairs and Academic Integrity Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

would be seen by the respondent. Another example comes from feedback received by students who were administered the survey. They provided feedback on the wording of the question asking for the gender and sexual orientation of the students. The categories to these items were modified to account for a wider range of options.

A1.3 Survey Content and Sources

Topics used in the survey instrument cover domains outlined by the AAU in response to the requests of the Presidents/Chancellors. These topics were split into several basic categories – (1) direct personal experience with sexual assault and sexual misconduct, (2) campus climate, (3) school resources and (4) student characteristics. This section describes the development of these items, as well as those topics that were considered but not included on the survey instrument.

Personal Experience: Nonconsensual Sexual Contact

Priority was given to collecting nonconsensual sexual contact by four types of tactics: (1) physical force, (2) incapacitation, (3) coercion, and (4) absence of affirmative consent. The Design Team wanted to collect information to: (1) estimate the prevalence and incidence of sexual assault and sexual misconduct experienced by university students (undergraduate, graduate and professional) on each participating campus, and (2) identify characteristics of these experiences (e.g., location, offender characteristics). The term “incident” was used in the survey as it is defined in the White House Task Force Report – meaning the number of times a particular type of sexual assault or sexual misconduct occurred over a period of time.

These questions defined sexual contact as two behaviors—penetration and sexual touching. Penetration includes both sexual penetration of someone’s vagina or anus by a finger, penis, or object and oral sex by a mouth or tongue on someone’s genitals. Sexual touching includes kissing, touching someone’s breast, chest, crotch, groin or buttocks, or grabbing, groping or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other’s clothes.

To estimate the incidence and prevalence of nonconsensual sexual contact by each combination of behavior (penetration, sexual touching) and tactic (physical force, incapacitation, coercion, absence of affirmative consent), it was necessary to ask about each combination of behavior and tactics. The Design Committee felt it was important to distinguish between incidents that differed by the different types of tactics.

Tactics Involving Physical Force and Incapacitation. Five questionnaire items were developed that separated the different types of sexual contact for these two tactics. Physical force/attempted physical force includes someone being help down with his or her body weight, arms being pinned down, being hit or kicked, or a the use or threat of a weapon being used. Incapacitated refers to being unable to consent or stop what was happening due to being passed out, asleep, or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol.

These tactics were considered the most serious type of tactic and constitute the primary measures used on several other surveys (e.g., Krebs, et al., 2009). As noted above, the questions distinguished between different combinations of these tactics and the two types of sexual contact, including:

- Nonconsensual completed penetration that occurred as a result of physical force or attempted forced
- Nonconsensual attempts but not completed, penetration as a result of physical force or attempted force
- Nonconsensual completed penetration that occurred as a result of incapacitation
- Nonconsensual completed sexual touching that occurred as a result of physical force
- Nonconsensual completed sexual touching that occurred as a result of incapacitation

The Design Team examined different definitions and ways to operationalize these types of incidents, including looking at questions from scholarly sources. There are two approaches advocated by researchers using behavior-specific questions. The first approach developed by Koss and colleagues (2007), is structured so that for each of the behavior a series of follow-up statements describing specific tactics are asked. The second approach puts both type of behavior and tactic in the same question (Krebs, et al., 2007). There is no published empirical findings to make an evidence-informed choice about which of the two approaches produces a more valid and reliable measure. After discussions among members of the Design Team, the latter approach was selected to use because it takes up less questionnaire space and it has been successfully used in prior sexual victimization among college students research (e.g., Krebs, et al., 2007). As a result, the Design Team developed five screen questions. Each screen question provided both a definition and examples of the behavior and use of one of the two tactics.

Coercion and Absence of Affirmative Consent. Coercion was intended to capture non-consensual sexual contact involving threats of serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that the student felt s/he must comply. This tactic was intended to capture behaviors that were

violations of the student's personal or civil rights. It complemented the items asked in another section of the questionnaire on sexual harassment by focusing on nonconsensual sexual contact as opposed to verbal or other harassing behaviors.

Several members of the Design Team suggested including questions that captured the emerging school conduct codes related to the absence of affirmative consent as a fourth tactic. According to research conducted by the team members, seven out of the eight universities represented on the AAU Survey Design Team posted definitions of affirmative consent in their University's student conduct code, Title IX office materials, or other formal channels. All eight of the Ivy League, and the majority of the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) (29 out of 30), and AAU (49 out of 62) universities also have posted definitions consistent with this tactic. Therefore, inclusion of the absence of affirmative consent in the questionnaire seemed to be the best means to estimate the prevalence and incidence of nonconsensual penetration and sexual touching among students at the participating universities.

Collecting Details about the Incidents. There was a strong desire by members of the Design Team to collect both incidence (number of times) and prevalence measures. Prior studies have primarily concentrated on prevalence. In addition, the team wanted to generate estimates that covered two different time periods. One would be the time since the student was enrolled at the IHE. The second was over the current academic year.

To measure the timing and incidence of each type of nonconsensual sexual contact, a series of follow-up questions were developed to count the number of incidents and to place each incident with a particular year. This series followed up each yes response to the initial screening items asking about the occurrence of a specific combination of behavior and tactic. The follow-ups consisted of first asking how many times this type of incident occurred. For each incident the respondent was asked which year it occurred and whether the incident had already been reported in response to an earlier question. The latter was used to unduplicate events where the respondent reported more than one tactic. This structure allowed analysts to form prevalence and incidence rates for either the time period since enrolled, as well as the current academic year.

Once counting all incidents reported during the screening, more details were collected about each type of incident. The follow-up items differed depending on the type of nonconsensual sexual contact that was reported: (1) tactics involving physical force or incapacitation (DIF1), and (2) tactics involving coercion and AAC (DIF2).

The DIF1 was administered up to two times for four incident types with the following priority: (1) forcible and/or attempted nonconsensual penetration, (2) penetration due to incapacitation, (3) forcible sexual touching, and (4) sexual touching due to incapacitation. If, for example, a respondent reported incidents that fell into the types 1, 2 and 4, the DIF1 was administered for types 1 and 2. For DIF2, the priority was: (1) penetration and/or sexual touching by coercion, and (2) penetration and/or sexual touching without affirmative consent.

A range of information about an incident is asked in the follow-up questions to understand the context of sexual assault. Based on extensive discussions within the Design Team, the content of the follow-up questions used in DIF1 includes: time of occurrence (year and semester; during an academic break or recess); location of incident (on or off campus, specific location; perpetrator characteristics (number of offenders, gender of offender, type of nonconsensual or unwanted behavior, offender affiliation with school, relationship to victim), context prior to incident; respondent's voluntarily consumption of alcohol or drugs prior to incident, respondent's use of alcohol or drugs without their knowledge or consent prior to incident, offender's use of alcohol or drugs prior to incident, disclosure and reporting actions; reasons for not disclosing or reporting; use and assessment of campus or local services; and outcomes (e.g., physical injuries, pregnancy, and physical and psychosomatic symptoms).

Similar, but less detailed, information was collected for DIF2. The content of the follow-up questions used in the Sexual Misconduct DIF includes: perpetrator characteristics (number of offenders, gender of offender, type of nonconsensual or unwanted behavior, offender affiliation with school, relationship to victim).

Personal Experience: Sexual Harassment, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking

The other measures of sexual assault and sexual misconduct collected were sexual harassment, intimate partner violence (IPV), and stalking.

To meet the legal definition of harassment there are two criteria. First, as per the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)²¹ and Department of Education,²² the behavior has to create a “hostile or offensive work or academic environment.” To measure these behaviors, the

²¹http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm

²²http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/ocrshpam.html#_t1a

Design Team proposed using portions of the Leskinen and Cortina (2014) scale representing each of the major dimensions, with a few additional behaviors that are not covered by the scale. After discussions among the members of the Design Team, it was decided that questions on sexual harassment include the following behaviors: (1) made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to the victim; (2) made inappropriate or offensive comments about the victim or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities; (3) said crude or gross sexual things to the victim or tried to get the victim talk about sexual matters when she/he didn't want to; (4) emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures, or videos to the victim that she/he didn't want; and (5) continued to ask the victim to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though the victim said "no."

A second question is how to use these items when operationalizing the EEOC concept of "hostile work environment." According to legal definitions, to meet this standard, the behavior has to be either "frequent or severe." Most of the prior studies do this by asking whether a behavior occurring a specific number of times (e.g., 2014 MIT Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault Survey). Other campus climate surveys do not measure frequency and it is not clear how one can determine when something rises to a "hostile work environment." After multiple rounds of discussions with the Design Team, it was decided to provide an introduction at the beginning of the section, which defines sexual harassment as something that interfered with the victim's academic or professional performances, limited the victim's ability to participate in an academic program, or created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic, or work environment. This definition is more in line with campus life and policies as well as the EEOC's definition regarding "hostile environment" and the U.S. Department of Education.²³

The question wording for IPV is a combination of the University of New Hampshire 2012 survey as cited in the White House document and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) conducted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Black, et al., 2011). The Design Team decided that these questions should only be asked of individuals who are currently in, or have been in, a partnered relationship. To determine this, the team developed a definition of partnered relationship to capture various forms of relationships for college students, including casual

²³A Federal law, *Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX)*, prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, including sexual harassment, in education programs and activities. All public and private education institutions that receive any federal funds *must* comply with *Title IX*. *Title IX* protects students from harassment connected to any of the academic, educational, extracurricular, athletic, and other programs or activities of schools, regardless of the location. *Title IX* protects both male and female students from sexual harassment by any school employee, another student, or a non-employee third party.

relationships or hook-ups, steady or serious relationships and marriage, civil union, domestic partnerships or cohabitations. This question was asked in the demographic section. Only those that said they were in a relationship were asked the IPV questions.

Stalking was defined as repetitive behavior that caused fear in a reasonable person. Fear is the criterion that distinguishes sexual harassment from stalking (Catalano, 2012; Logan, 2010). The Design Team had discussions on what level of fear needed to be written into the question. The team eventually decided to use the criteria of fear for personal safety. Three repeated pursuit behaviors associated with stalking are used in the questionnaire, including (1) made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text, or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites; (2) showed up somewhere or waited for the victim when she/he didn't want that person to be there; and (3) having been spied on, watched or followed the victim, either in person or using devices or software. The use of new technologies for stalking is considered as the third tactic, for example, smartphone. This tactic is the third most frequently occurring stalking behavior in NISVS (39% for women and 31% for men) (Black, et al., 2011). It is also the third most frequently occurring behavior experienced by stalking victims in NCVS (34.4%; Catalano, 2012).

The same set of follow-up questions are asked for sexual harassment, IPV, and stalking. These questions include asking about: (1) the offender characteristics, including number of offenders, number of incidents, association with university, and relationship to the victim; (2) disclosure and to whom; and (3) use and assessment of campus-sponsored programs. The follow-up questions ask for the time period (e.g., Fall of 2013-Summer of 2014) of the most recent contact. For those who have not contacted any programs, the follow-up question asks for the reasons for not contacting the program.

Campus Climate Measures

At the beginning of questionnaire development, a list of topics and questions were drawn from five existing surveys that measured campus climate—the Rutgers Campus Climate Survey, the MIT Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault survey, the University of Oregon Sexual Violence and Institutional Behavior Campus Survey, the White House survey, and the Campus Sexual Assault Study—and circulated among members of the Design Team. The list includes topics on campus community attitudes toward each other, university efforts on informing students about sexual assault and sexual misconduct, perception of community safety, knowledge and use of police and resources, perceptions of leadership, policies and reporting, prevention training, and bystander intervention.

Each member of the Design Team reviewed the list and selected a number of topics to prioritize given that the length of the survey would be 15-20 minutes.

Further discussions within the Design Team narrowed down the number of topics on campus climate to the following five constructs: (1) perception regarding risk of sexual assault or sexual misconduct; (2) knowledge and perceptions about resources relating to sexual assault or sexual misconduct; (3) prevention trainings related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct for new students; (4) perceptions of responses to reporting sexual assault or sexual misconduct; and (5) bystander intervention upon suspecting or witnessing sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

Two types of questions on risk perceptions were administered. One asked about the likelihood of being a victim of sexual assault or misconduct either on campus or at a university-affiliated event off campus. The second asked students “how problematic” they thought sexual assault and misconduct was at the IHE.

Students were asked about their awareness of the services and resources offered by the university for those who are affected by sexual assault and sexual misconduct. These questions ask about knowledge of the definition of sexual assault and sexual misconduct at the IHE; where to get help at the university if the student or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct; where to make a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct at the university; and what happens when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or sexual misconduct at the university.

First-year undergraduate and graduate/professional students and transfer students were asked two questions about the training or sessions related to sexual assault and sexual misconducts during their orientations and the helpfulness of these.

Additionally, all students were asked about their perceptions of what might happen if someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Students’ were asked to assess the likelihood of seven different scenarios ranging from student supporting the person making the report to retaliation against the person making the report to different actions by university officials (e.g., taking report seriously, protecting safety of the person making the report, taking against action the offender(s), taking action to address factors that may have led to incident).

Two separate questions were proposed originally—one measured how the university responds to reporting and the other measured how students respond to reporting. Per comments from members

of the Design Team, the two constructs were combined using the questions from the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium HEDS Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey.

Members of the Design Team suggested questions measuring bystander behaviors and interventions that were adapted from Banyard, et al.'s (2005, 2014) work and the Rutgers' Campus Climate Survey. Respondents were asked if they had ever experienced three specific situations since being a student at the IHE (e.g., seen a drunk person heading off to what looked like a sexual encounter). If they had experienced the situation, they were asked what specific action, if any, they did. Actions ranged from did nothing to directly intervene to seek help.

School Resources

These items assessed student familiarity with university-specific and off-campus local resources and procedures related to sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Five university-specific questions were created to measure the following aspects: (1) school of enrollment (full name of schools or colleges within a particular university (e.g., Liberal Arts College, School of Engineering, School of Public Health); (2) participation in student organizations; (3) student living situation; and (4) awareness of on-and off-campus services resources related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct offered to students. Response options for these questions were customized to include the name of programs and services provided at each of the participating IHE. The same set of response options were used when asking students' knowledge of and assessment of usefulness of resources for and reporting behaviors of sexual harassment, stalking, IPV; these response also were used in the follow-ups for incidents of nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation (DIF1).

Student Characteristics

Questions asking about the students' demographics are posed at the beginning of the survey. Background information was collected on age, current student affiliation (undergraduate, graduate, professional), class year, race, Hispanic or Latino origin, resident status, gender identity, sexual orientation, relationship status and registered disability. Some of the information was used in weighting procedure, such as age and class year in school. Other demographic information was used to assess incidence and prevalence of sexual assault and sexual misconduct among students in a particular university for a particular demographic group (e.g., affiliation, gender identify, sexual orientation). A question asking about involvement in partnered relationships (casual or hookup, steady or serious, marriage, civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation) also was included; it

was used to screen students who have been in any partnered relationship since being a student at university into the IPV questions.

Design Team members had multiple rounds of discussions on how to ask for sexual orientation and gender identity questions. These two questions were tested with student feedback. Response options used in the questionnaire take into consideration of existing research on gender and sexual identity, suggestions from the Design Team, and findings from the pilot studies on student feedback.

Topics Discussed but Not Included in the Final Instrument

During the questionnaire development, some topics were discussed but dropped from the instrument due to concerns about the length of the survey. There were discussions on whether Rape Myth Acceptance questions (e.g., see the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale) should be included in measuring attitudes and views toward sexual assault and sexual misconduct on campus. Members of the Design Team expressed different opinions on this issue—some were in favor of rape myth questions, while others thought they are not very useful or valid. During the discussions, an alternative set of questions that measured students' perception related to risks was proposed. Members of the Design Team reviewed both sets of questions and most of them favored the alternative to the rape myth acceptance questions.

Two other topics were discussed but dropped from the instrument. Several researchers on the Design Team proposed adding questions on perpetration. A review of Krebs, et al. (2009) found that the frequency was so small that they were not analyzed. Similarly, the 2014 MIT Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault Survey, which had an extensive section on perpetration, found that only 1.9 percent of the respondents reported “unwanted sexual behavior” with 2.9 percent saying they were unsure. Given the limited space available to add questions to the survey instrument it was decided these were not high enough priority to include.

A second request was to ask questions on being pressured to have sexual contact, such as verbal or other types of nonphysical pressure. This came from some of the student feedback, as well as several Design Team members. The main argument to include this was to provide students a way to report behavior they see as problematic. The consensus was to not include this in the final instrument because they were seen as behaviors that could not be directly addressed by policymakers within the university. In addition, it was thought that the questions on the absence of affirmative consent overlapped with this type of tactic.

References for Appendix A-1

- Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A. C., and Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(1), 101.
- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., and Moynihan, M. M. (2005). *Rape prevention through bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention*. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Catalano, S. (2012). *Stalking victims in the United States – Revised*. US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics
- Fisher, B. S., and May, D. (2009). College students' crime-related fears on campus are fear-provoking cues gendered? *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 25(3), 300-321.
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Ruggiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., and McCauley, J. (2007). *Drug facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: A national study*. Charleston, SC: Medical University of South Carolina, National Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., and 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), 162-170.
- Koss, M.P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C. and White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(4), 357-370.
- Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., and Martin, S.L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol- or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(6), 639-647.
- Leskinen, E.A., and Cortina, L.M. (2014). Dimensions of disrespect: Mapping and measuring gender harassment in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(1), 107-123.
- Logan, T. (2010). *Research on partner stalking: Putting the pieces together*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky, Department of Behavioral Science and Center on Drug and Alcohol Research.

Appendix 2. Human Subjects Protections and Safeguards

A2.1 IRB Review Options and Process Overview

In January 2015, Westat submitted its Institutional Review Board (IRB) package (including the instrument and study protocols) to both the Westat IRB, for a full review, and the 27 participating IHEs, who used the materials to develop their own IRB packages. At this time, the study was given conditional approval by the Westat IRB. Full approval was obtained in February 2015. In March 2015, Westat tested and programmed the instrument for April 1, 2015, the first launch date.²⁴

Among participating IHEs, five universities elected to rely on Westat’s IRB as the IRB of record, 11 universities chose to use their own IRB, and four universities used both IRBs (their own and Westat’s). Seven universities determined their involvement in the study did not constitute human subjects research and, consequently, elected not to seek IRB approval or review. For these schools Westat was the only IRB involved in the study process and students were fully covered by Westat’s IRB protections.

When appropriate, an Institutional Review Board Authorization Agreement (IAA) was executed between the IHE and Westat to formalize which IRB would review the study.

A2.2 Respondent Emotional Protections

Given the sensitive nature of the survey topic, there was some risk of emotional distress for survey participants, as well as concerns about confidentiality and data security. Consequently, a number of human subject protections and security protocols were considered and put in place for survey participants.

A2.3 NIH Certificate of Confidentiality

The AAU Survey is protected by a Federal Certificate of Confidentiality (CoC) CC-AA-15-45. This certificate, issued by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, National Institutes of Health (NIH), allows “researchers to refuse to disclose identifiable research information in response to legal demands,”²⁵ such as court orders and subpoenas, for identifying information or identifying

²⁴To accommodate differences in IHEs’ academic calendars, IHEs chose the field period (generally 3 weeks) during which they wanted their survey to be open, with the earliest available launch date of April 1.

²⁵From *What is a Certificate of Confidentiality?* NIH Certificates of Confidentiality (CoC) Kiosk <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coc/index.htm>.

characteristics of a research participant. This is an important legal tool, and we are very pleased to have secured this protection for our study participants.

Following a multi-month application and review process, the certificate was issued April 8, 2015, and is retroactive to the start of data collection.

A2.4 Informed Consent

The first safeguard against participant distress was the process of informed consent. Functioning as a gateway to the survey, the consent form provided details about the survey, set expectations for the types of questions to be asked, and allowed students to make an informed decision whether participation was right for them. Students who felt they would become distressed taking such a survey could choose not to participate (and could not enter the survey), and students who consented to participate were prepared for the sensitive topics. The consent form emphasized that respondents could skip any question they did not want to answer, and that they could stop the interview at any time they felt uncomfortable or simply wished to stop. In addition, all consent forms concluded with contact information for a responsible IRB and research representative.

A2.5 Distress Protocols

Prior studies on sexual misconduct show that most individuals do not find participation in such research to be harmful and, in many cases, consider their participation beneficial.²⁶ However, data collection for the AAU Survey included several safeguards to minimize risk related to emotional distress.

A2.6 Campus-Specific Resources

Campus-specific resource lists with contact information on national, campus, and community-specific resources were offered to all students and accessible both inside and outside the survey. Examples of such resources include counseling and medical centers and 24-hour crisis phone lines. A link to these resources was available on each survey screen starting with the initial landing page. In addition, all respondents were offered the resource list again at the conclusion of the survey.

²⁶ Wager, N.M. (2012). Respondents' experiences of completing a retrospective, web-based sexual trauma survey: Does a history of victimization equate with a risk for harm? *Violence and Victims*, 27(6), 991-1004.

Although we anticipated that most participants would access these resources through the web survey, we also developed a protocol for Help Desk staff to use if they received distress calls or questions about sexual assault resources.

A2.7 Help Desk

To further encourage participants to complete the survey and minimize distress, Help Desk staff were available by phone and email throughout data collection to answer technical questions about the survey and how to complete it, and to provide resource lists to respondents who call and need additional support or referrals for services. Help Desk contact information was provided in all email communication and was available on all screens of the online survey, as well as on the survey landing page. Help Desk staff were trained in both project and customer service procedures, including distress protocols. While Help Desk staff did not provide counseling or other crisis intervention services, staff were prepared to offer respondents the same resource information included in the online survey for their specific campus. In the event that a caller expressed elevated distress or a threat to themselves or others, the staff were trained to directly connect these students with counseling services from the resource list. Data collection closed without the need to initiate the distress protocol.

In all cases, Help Desk staff were trained to be sensitive to callers and respond to them politely and thoughtfully, regardless of the circumstances of their call.



Campus Climate Survey
on Sexual Assault & Sexual Misconduct

FAQs Support Resources Help Desk (855) 497-4787

B2. How likely do you think it is that you will experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus?

- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- Very
- Extremely

As shown in this screenshot above, each page of the survey included links to general and school-specific frequently asked questions (FAQs) and resources. It also included the Help Desk number for easy access to those students who needed it for either technical assistance or additional resources.

A2.8 Data Security and Protecting Confidentiality

All survey data was collected via a secure web site hosted at Westat. The respondent's email address was encrypted and stored in the SqlServer database. Upon final submission of the survey, the respondent's email address and PIN number (used to create the unique survey link) was automatically deleted from the database, removing any linkage between the survey responses and the respondent. For any respondents who completed some of the survey but did not formally submit it, these variables were deleted manually at the end of the data collection period.

Roster file data was not included in the questionnaire data file so that if someone were to somehow obtain the survey data, they could not associate any data with a particular individual.

All necessary steps to mask the identity of survey respondents have been taken for the data analysis and reporting. The analysis included only quantitative components. Results are tabular, as well as more formal statistical models. Results were reviewed to ensure an acceptable risk of disclosure, including suppression of demographic characteristics and other potentially identifying information in situations in which cell sizes are small.

All data pertaining to this project has been stored in a secure manner in a physical and electronic form that can only be accessed by study personnel. All electronic data has been stored on network server directories. Access to the network project directory has been controlled through the use of directory and file access rights based upon user account ID and the associated user group definition. Paper data is stored in locked files cabinets.

Datasets will be provided to AAU and to participating universities. These project partners will own their respective datasets and the reports summarizing findings that will also be delivered by Westat. The individual data-sets have been reviewed for potential disclosure risks. Where appropriate, variables were altered (e.g., categories collapsed) to identify potential risks before delivering the final files.

Three years after completion of the study, all data and files related to this study will be permanently destroyed.

A2.9 Consent Form, FAQs, and Email Text

Informed Consent

[INSTITUTION NAME] is asking all students to answer a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The survey is sponsored by [INSTITUTION NAME] in collaboration with the American Association of Universities (AAU). The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe and nondiscriminatory environment at [INSTITUTION].

This survey includes sections that ask about your knowledge and beliefs about social situations, perceptions related to sexual misconduct at [INSTITUTION NAME] and your knowledge of resources available at [INSTITUTION NAME]. This survey also asks about your personal experience with sexual misconduct, such as harassment, sexual assault and other forms of violence. Some of the language used in this survey is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean. Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears on the bottom of each page and at the end of the survey.

This survey should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete. It may take up to 30 minutes for some individuals. You do NOT have to participate in this survey, and if you do choose to participate, you may skip any question you are not comfortable answering and may exit the survey at any time. There will be no consequences to you personally or your student status if you choose not to complete the survey.

[To thank you for your participation, every student who completes the survey will be offered a \$5 gift card to Amazon.com.]

We will protect the confidentiality of your answers [to the extent the law allows]*. When you complete the survey the link with your name, email and IP address will be broken so that no-one will be able to connect these with your survey answers. The results will be presented in summary form so no individual can be identified. However, if we learn about child abuse or you threaten to harm yourself or others, we are obligated to report it to the authorities.

[We have obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality (CoC) issued by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The CoC is issued to protect the investigators on this study from being forced to tell anyone about your participation in this study, even under a subpoena.

Even when a CoC is in place, you and your family members must still continue to actively protect your own privacy. If you voluntarily give your written consent for an insurer, employer, or lawyer to receive information about your participation in the research, then we may not use the CoC to withhold this information.]

If you have any questions about this study please call the Help Desk at XXX-XXX-XXXX.

If you have questions about your rights and welfare as a research participant, please call the Westat Human Subjects Protections office at 1-888-920-7631. Please leave a message with your full name, the name of the research study that you are calling about (ADD STUDY NAME HERE), and a phone number beginning with the area code. Someone will return your call as soon as possible.

*Text taken out once Certificate of Confidentiality was received.

FAQs

Frequently Asked Questions

Why me and what is this about?

We are asking all students at [University] to answer a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe, and nondiscriminatory environment on campus. Our goal is to make [University] as safe as possible by developing programs and services that prevent sexual assault and misconduct, as well as respond to these events when do they do occur. This survey is an important tool for us to assess current programs and to shape future policies.

Who is administering the survey?

The survey is sponsored by [University] in collaboration with the Association of American Universities (AAU). Westat, a private research organization, is administering the survey and will be assisting in the analysis of the data.

What will [University] do with the results?

The results will be used to better understand the climate at [university], the extent of sexual assault and misconduct among students, and the use of programs and services currently being offered. This information will be used to make recommendations for changes to the policies and procedures related to preventing and handling sexual assault and misconduct at [university].

Why are you asking about these sensitive topics?

Our goal is to foster a safe and supportive environment where students can flourish, both academically and personally. To understand the climate at [University], we need to ask direct questions about topics that some may find sensitive. It is only by directly collecting this information from you that we will be able to prevent negative experiences and effectively respond when they do happen.

What will I be asked to do?

You are invited to participate in a web survey. This survey includes sections that ask about your knowledge and beliefs about social situations, perceptions related to sexual misconduct at your college, and your knowledge of resources available at your college. This survey also asks about your personal experience with sexual misconduct, such as harassment, sexual assault, and other forms of violence.

Why is the language on the survey so explicit?

Some of the language used in this survey is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean. Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears on the bottom of each page and at the end of the survey.

Isn't this survey only for women?

No, this survey is for everyone, regardless of gender identity or experiences. The survey will be used to shape policies that affect everyone on campus, so it is very important that you provide your experiences and viewpoint.

I've never experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct, so why should I take part?

If only victims of sexual assault and sexual misconduct participate in the survey, we will have a very lopsided view of your campus. To get a complete picture of your college, we need to hear from as many students as possible. Please tell a friend!

How long will the survey take?

This survey should take most people approximately 20 minutes to complete. It may take up to 30 minutes for some individuals.

Am I required to participate?

You do NOT have to participate in this survey, and if you do participate, you may skip any question you are not comfortable answering and may exit the survey at any time. Most people will find the questions interesting.

Will my answers be confidential?

When you complete the survey, the link with your name, email, and IP address will be broken so that no one will be able to connect these with your survey answers. The results will be presented in summary form so no individual can be identified. However, if we learn about child abuse or about a threat of harm to yourself or others, we are obligated to report it to the authorities.

[We have obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality (CoC) issued by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The CoC is issued to protect the investigators on this study from being forced to tell anyone about your participation in this study, even under a subpoena.]

Even when a CoC is in place, you and your family members must still continue to actively protect your own privacy. If you voluntarily give your written consent for an insurer, employer, or lawyer to receive information about your participation in the research, then we may not use the CoC to withhold this information.]

What should I do if I become upset answering these questions?

On each page of the online survey, there is a link to on- and off-campus resources that you can contact if you become upset. In addition to local resources, there is information for several national services that provide information and counselors 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We have included a variety of resources so you can choose to contact the one(s) you think would be most helpful to you.

I still have questions.

If you have any questions about this study, please call the Help Desk at 1-855-497-4787.

If you have questions about your rights and welfare as a research participant, please call the Westat Human Subjects Protections Office at 1-888-920-7631. Please leave a message with your full name, the name of the research study that you are calling about (the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct), and a phone number beginning with the area code.

Someone will return your call as soon as possible.

Survey Invitation, Reminder Messages

1st Contact: Email Invitation

Condition 1: \$5 Amazon gift card

Subject: President [NAME OF PRESIDENT] asks you to take part in a climate survey for [INSTITUTION NAME]

Dear [Institution] Student,

I'm writing to ask you to respond to a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe and nondiscriminatory environment at [INSTITUTION]. It is important to hear from you, even if you believe these issues do not directly affect you.

I know your time is valuable, but I hope you can find a few minutes to respond before the survey closes on [DATE]. As a small token of appreciation, **you will receive a \$5 Amazon gift card** once you complete the survey.

Share your perspective by clicking on the link below:

www.xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Your individual responses will be treated as confidential. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and will not affect any aspect of your experience at [University]. However, your response is important to getting an accurate picture of the experiences and opinions of all students.

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an email to [EMAIL ADDRESS] or call XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Thank you,

[NAME OF PRESIDENT]

President

1st Contact: Email Invitation

Condition 1: \$500 lottery

Subject: President [NAME OF PRESIDENT] asks you to take part in a climate survey for [INSTITUTION NAME]

Dear [Institution] Student,

I'm writing to ask you to respond to a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe and nondiscriminatory environment at [INSTITUTION]. It is important to hear from you, even if you believe these issues do not directly affect you.

I know your time is valuable, but I hope you can find a few minutes to respond before the survey closes on [DATE]. **By going to the website** at the link below, **you will be entered into a lottery to win \$500**. We hope you will decide to complete the survey, but you are eligible for the lottery whether or not you complete the survey:

www.abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

Your individual responses will be treated as confidential. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and will not affect any aspect of your experience at [University]. However, your response is important to getting an accurate picture of the experiences and opinions of all students.

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an email to [EMAIL ADDRESS] or call XXX-XXX-XXXX.

Thank you,
[NAME OF PRESIDENT]
President

2nd and 3rd Contact: Email Reminder
Condition 1: \$5 Amazon gift card

Subject: Reminder from President [NAME] to fill out the climate survey

Dear [Institution] Student,

I recently sent you an individualized link to participate in a climate survey. If you have filled out the survey, thank you! This message has gone to all students on campus because no identifying information is linked with the survey and we are unable to identify whether you have completed the survey.

If you have not had a chance to take the survey yet, please do so as soon as possible by clicking on the link below. Your participation in the survey is voluntary, but the more people who participate, the better the information we will have to promote a healthier campus.

The closing date for the survey is [DATE], so it is important to hear from you as soon as possible. As a small token of appreciation, you will receive a **\$5 Amazon gift card when you complete the survey**.

www.abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an email to [EMAIL ADDRESS] or call xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Thank you,
[NAME OF PRESIDENT]
[TITLE]

2nd and 3rd Contact: Email Reminder

Condition 2: \$500 lottery

Subject: Reminder from President [NAME] to fill out the climate survey

Dear [Institution] Student,

I recently sent you an individualized link to participate in a climate survey. If you have filled out the survey, thank you! This message has gone to all students on campus because no identifying information is linked with the survey, and we are unable to identify whether you have completed the survey.

If you have not had a chance to take the survey yet, please do so as soon as possible by clicking on the link below. Your participation in the survey is voluntary, but the more people who participate, the better the information we will have to promote a healthier campus.

The closing date for the survey is [DATE], so it is important to hear from you as soon as possible. As a small token of our appreciation, **by going to the website at the link below, you will be entered into a lottery to win \$500.** You are eligible for the lottery whether or not you complete the survey.

Enter the Survey > >

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an email to [EMAIL ADDRESS] or call xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Thank you,
[NAME OF PRESIDENT]
[TITLE]

Appendix 3. Results by Individual Status Code

A3.1 Definition of Completed Survey

We define a completed survey with two criteria for all but one university: (1) the respondent answered at least one of the questions in each of the following victimization sections: sexual harassment (Section D), stalking (Section E), and sexual assault/other misconduct (Section G); and (2) the respondent took at least 5 minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

To status codes used to document the response rate are,

- **Status 1:** Respondents did not click on the link to access the web survey
- **Status 2:** Respondents who clicked on the link to access the web survey but did not start the survey
- **Status 3:** Respondents who started the survey but did not complete the victimization sections and did not submit the survey
- **Status 4:** Respondents who completed and submitted the survey in less than 5 minutes
- **Status 5:** Respondents who submitted the survey, completed the survey in 5 or more minutes or started/submitted the survey on different days but did not complete the victimization sections
- **Status 6:** Respondents who started the survey, completed the victimization sections, but did not submit the survey
- **Status 7:** Respondents who started the survey, completed the victimization sections, and submitted the survey

Based on the definition of a completed survey, cases of Status 6 and 7 are considered as completed, whereas cases of Status 1 to 5 are considered as not completed. Therefore, the response rate is calculated as,

$$\text{Response Rate} = \frac{n_1 + n_2}{N}$$

Where N is the total number of students that received the survey invitation. (For those schools that conducted a census, N represents the total number of registered undergraduate and graduate/professional students. For those few school that did not conduct a census, N represents the total number of registered undergraduate and graduate/professional students that were sampled); n_1 represents the number of students who started the survey, completed the victimization

sections, but did not submitted the survey; n_2 represents the number of students who started the survey, completed the victimization sections, and submitted the survey.)

Table A3-1. Frequency of survey response status for the AAU Survey

	Status Description	n	%
1	Did not click on link	582,186	74.7%
2	Clicked on link, but did not start	27,474	3.5%
3	Started, did not submit, did not have enough responses	17,921	2.3%
4	Submitted, completed in <5 minutes	652	.1%
5	Submitted, completed \geq 5 minutes or could not measure duration, did not did not have enough responses	151	.02%
6	Started, not submitted, completed minimum responses	11,009	1.4%
7	Started, submitted, completed minimum responses	139,777	17.9%
	Total	779,170	100.0%

A3.2 Drop-Out Rates

Students who consented to participate, then entered the survey but did not complete the victimization sections were not counted as a complete for the survey. Similarly, those that took less than 5 minutes to complete the survey were dropped.

About 11.4 percent of the individuals that started the survey did not complete using the rules described above ($[19,438 / 169,510] = 11.4\%$). Much of the dropout occurred after the background and harassment sections. Once starting section G (sexual assault), very few respondents were dropped from the analysis dataset. Of those that did not complete, 58 percent did not answer the first question in the Harassment section, and 93 percent did not answer the first question in the first sexual violence question.

Table A3-2. Survey drop-out rate for the AAU Survey: Percent non-missing responses for initial item in each section for respondents that started the survey^{1,2}

Section	Not Complete	Complete	Total
Section A – Background	97%	100%	100%
Section B – Perceptions of Risk	66%	99%	96%
Section C – Resources	54%	100%	95%
Section D – Harassment	42%	100%	93%
Section E - Stalking	19%	100%	91%
Section G – SV Screener	7%	100%	89%
Section I – Perceptions of Responses to Reporting	4%	96%	85%
Section J – Bystander Intervention	3%	94%	83%
Section K - Debriefing	3%	93%	83%
Submitted	4%	93%	82%
Total Started	19,438	150,072	169,510

¹ Initial questions used by section are: A2, B1, C2a, D1, E1, G1, I1, J1, K1. Sections F and H are not included because not all respondents were routed to these sections.

² See text for definition of a completed survey.

Appendix 4. Nonresponse Bias Analysis

To address nonresponse bias issue, for each IHE we adjusted the base weights using the raking procedure. To evaluate the effectiveness of the weighting procedure in removing nonresponse bias, we conducted several different analyses and reported the result for individual IHE. To examine the nonresponse bias issue in the aggregate estimates, we conducted three different analyses. One focused on a comparison of early and late responders. A second one compared outcomes among different incentive groups. The third correlated the IHE response rate and the IHE outcomes.

We used the following 11 key outcome variables for the analysis.

Table A4-1. Eleven key variables used in the nonresponse bias analysis

Variable Number	Variable Name	Variable Description
1	Penetration by Physical Force or Incapacitation	Indicates whether respondent experienced any rape incident since entering college
2	Sexual Touching by Physical Force or Incapacitation	Indicates whether respondent experienced any sexual battery incident since entering college
3	Penetration or Sexual Touching by Coercion	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of sex or sexual touching by coercion since entering college
4	Penetration or Sexual Touching by Absence of Affirmative Consent	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of sex or sexual touching without affirmative consent since entering college
5	Sexual Harassment	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of sexual harassment since entering college
6	Stalking	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of stalking since entering college
7	Intimate Partner Violence	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of intimate partner violence since entering college
8	Resources	Indicates whether respondent is “very” or “extremely” knowledgeable about campus resources for sexual assault and misconduct
9	Reporting Perception	Indicates whether respondent feels it is “very” or “extremely” likely that university officials will do all of the following in response to a report of sexual misconduct or assault: take the report seriously, conduct a fair investigation, and take action to address causes of the issue

Table A4-1. Eleven key variables used in the nonresponse bias analysis (continued)

Variable Number	Variable Name	Variable Description
10	Bystander Intervention	Indicates whether respondent took some sort of action when they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted
11	Perception of Problem	Indicates whether sexual assault or misconduct is seen as very or extremely problematic at the university

Discussion of Analysis Results

We conducted two different analyses for two different sets of universities to test whether bias due to nonresponse exists for the above 11 key measures (see Table A4-1). These include:

- Comparison of early and late responders: We compared key estimates between early and late responders. Early and late responders are identified by respondents' survey submission time. Early responders are those who responded before the first reminder email out of two or three for all universities but before the third for Yale out of four reminders; and the other respondents are the late responders. All universities are included in this comparison.
- Comparison by the incentive status: The incentivized sample has a higher response rate than the other group. We compared the key variable estimates of the incentivized sample of \$5 Amazon gift card with those of the other group of sweepstakes of a prize. This was the standard incentive program, which 19 universities used. To avoid mixing different effects of different incentive programs, we excluded from this comparison those universities, which used a non-standard incentive programs - the latter group includes California Institute of Technology, Columbia University, Cornell University, Dartmouth University, Harvard University, University of Arizona, University of Florida, and Washington University.

Comparison of Early and Late Responders

Assuming that those who responded later have more in common with the nonrespondents than those who responded early, we compared the late responders with early responders for the 11 key variables to examine potential nonresponse bias. While this is a standard method to evaluate

nonresponse bias, the assumption that those requiring more effort to gain cooperation resemble the nonrespondents does not always hold.²⁷

About 7 percent of respondents were missing the survey submission time and could not be included in this analysis.²⁸ The late responders account for 50 percent of the respondents with nonmissing survey submission time.

We compared weighted estimates of the 11 key survey variables at the total population and subgroup levels. The subgroups are defined by the categories of the auxiliary variables used in weighting (see Table A4-2). There are altogether 8 categories of subgroups (2 Incentive Statuses, 2 genders, and 4 Age-groups) - Year in School and Race/Ethnicity were not used because their categorizations are not consistent among the universities. Comparisons are also made at finer subgroups defined by crossing the gender and school enrollment (four subgroups: male undergraduate, male graduate/professional, female undergraduate, and female graduate/professional). There were 143 comparisons overall, which corresponds to the sum of 11 population-level comparisons, 88 (= 11 key variables × 8 categories) subgroup-level comparisons, and 44 (= 11 key variables × 4 finer subgroups) finer subgroup-level comparisons.

Subgroup-level comparisons for the same auxiliary variable were treated as multiple comparisons using Bonferroni corrected alpha values. For example, one *t*-test was performed to compare the estimate of Penetration by Force or Incapacitation for males for early vs. late responders. Another *t*-test was carried out for females in the same way. These two comparisons were made using the Bonferroni-corrected alpha-value of 0.025 (= 0.05/2). Population-level comparisons were made individually with a 0.05 alpha-value.

Ten (91%) out of 11 population-level comparisons are individually significant – the only insignificant case is Bystander Intervention. One issue with these comparisons is they do not fully control for differences that are adjusted in the survey weights (e.g., gender and enrollment status). While this analysis uses the weights, it does not control within early and late responder groups. For example, there may be more males who responded later, and comparing the early and late responder groups does not control for this difference. It is more instructive to examine the subgroup

²⁷Lin, I-F., and Schaeffer, N.C. (1995). Using survey participants to estimate the impact of nonparticipation. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59 (2), 236–58; Olson, K. (2006). Survey participation, nonresponse bias, measurement error bias and total bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70 (5), 737-758.

²⁸A time was not obtained for those that stopped completing the survey before they completed.

differences, which are specific to some of the characteristics that were used in the weighting. Sixty three (72%) out of 88 subgroup comparisons are significant, and 24 (55%) out of 44 finer subgroup comparisons are significant.

It is useful to concentrate on the subgroup estimates, as they are used throughout the report and they disaggregate by important variables used in the weighting. Table A4-3 provides the differences for each of these outcomes for the early vs. late responders for the four primary subgroups defined by gender and enrollment status. For example, for female undergraduates the rate for penetration involving physical force or incapacitation for late responders is 8.64 and for early responders 10.80. This difference is statistically significant at the 5 percent significance level for multiple comparisons with a *P*-value of <.01 percent, which is less than the Bonferroni alpha value of 1.25 percent (= 5%/4).

Table A4-2. Comparison of early and later responders by gender and school enrollment for 11 key variables (estimates in percent)^{1,2,3,4}

Outcome ¹	Gender	Enrollment Status ²	Late Responders	StdErr ³	Early Responders	StdErr ³	Difference	P-value ⁴
1	M	UnderGr	1.85	0.11	1.89	0.11	-0.04	80.06
1	M	Grad/Prof	0.65	0.07	1.05	0.12	-0.40	0.59*
1	F	UnderGr	8.64	0.18	10.80	0.23	-2.16	< 0.01*
1	F	Grad/Prof	3.03	0.17	4.05	0.19	-1.02	0.01*
2	M	UnderGr	3.44	0.14	3.89	0.16	-0.45	4.98
2	M	Grad/Prof	1.25	0.10	1.81	0.18	-0.56	1.36
2	F	UnderGr	14.67	0.23	17.43	0.28	-2.76	< 0.01*
2	F	Grad/Prof	5.29	0.19	6.60	0.31	-1.31	0.15*
3	M	UnderGr	0.21	0.04	0.28	0.04	-0.07	22.54
3	M	Grad/Prof	0.13	0.04	0.29	0.09	-0.16	9.54
3	F	UnderGr	0.37	0.03	0.46	0.06	-0.09	21.04
3	F	Grad/Prof	0.18	0.03	0.29	0.04	-0.11	5.25
4	M	UnderGr	1.99	0.12	2.92	0.18	-0.93	0.01*
4	M	Grad/Prof	1.05	0.08	1.50	0.09	-0.45	0.13*
4	F	UnderGr	10.02	0.19	11.96	0.22	-1.94	< 0.01*
4	F	Grad/Prof	4.25	0.13	6.00	0.22	-1.75	< 0.01*
5	M	UnderGr	40.77	0.39	45.26	0.43	-4.49	< 0.01*
5	M	Grad/Prof	27.82	0.45	32.35	0.36	-4.53	< 0.01*
5	F	UnderGr	58.09	0.37	64.63	0.35	-6.54	< 0.01*
5	F	Grad/Prof	40.96	0.44	47.74	0.39	-6.78	< 0.01*
6	M	UnderGr	1.97	0.13	2.15	0.17	-0.18	42.00
6	M	Grad/Prof	1.56	0.12	1.89	0.13	-0.33	5.68
6	F	UnderGr	6.10	0.15	7.11	0.21	-1.01	0.03*
6	F	Grad/Prof	5.01	0.17	5.23	0.20	-0.22	41.96
7	M	UnderGr	8.86	0.27	9.77	0.32	-0.91	3.51
7	M	Grad/Prof	5.87	0.24	6.95	0.34	-1.08	2.81
7	F	UnderGr	11.90	0.25	13.44	0.29	-1.54	0.02*
7	F	Grad/Prof	6.61	0.27	7.41	0.23	-0.80	4.00
8	M	UnderGr	30.66	0.35	33.04	0.45	-2.38	0.02*
8	M	Grad/Prof	20.30	0.39	22.53	0.38	-2.23	0.01*
8	F	UnderGr	33.96	0.31	35.90	0.26	-1.94	< 0.01*
8	F	Grad/Prof	21.68	0.30	23.80	0.35	-2.12	< 0.01*
9	M	UnderGr	34.56	0.41	33.58	0.31	0.98	6.88
9	M	Grad/Prof	36.28	0.39	32.29	0.46	3.99	< 0.01*
9	F	UnderGr	28.96	0.36	24.98	0.29	3.98	< 0.01*
9	F	Grad/Prof	27.95	0.39	23.22	0.34	4.73	< 0.01*
10	M	UnderGr	62.99	0.89	64.86	1.00	-1.87	17.84
10	M	Grad/Prof	59.39	1.55	61.73	1.52	-2.34	24.28
10	F	UnderGr	68.93	0.62	67.90	0.48	1.03	19.40
10	F	Grad/Prof	68.17	1.14	69.01	1.12	-0.84	60.58
11	M	UnderGr	16.59	0.26	16.09	0.34	0.50	25.47
11	M	Grad/Prof	12.83	0.38	14.17	0.34	-1.34	1.34
11	F	UnderGr	25.31	0.26	28.44	0.31	-3.13	< 0.01*
11	F	Grad/Prof	17.74	0.28	20.63	0.32	-2.89	< 0.01*

¹ See Table A4-1 for definitions of outcomes

² UnderGr = Undergraduate; Grad/Prof = Graduate or Professional Student

³ StdErr = Standard Error for the proportion

⁴ A significant result (P-value < 1.25%) is asterisked (*).

As noted above, 55 percent of the differences in Table A4-2 are statistically significant. These results indicate there is evidence of nonresponse bias, since the number of significant differences is much more than what was expected by chance. Table A4-3 summarizes the significance of each comparison by providing the direction of the bias (+ for positive bias and – for negative bias) when the difference was found to be statistically significant. These differences are described below after the table.

Table A4-3. Direction of nonresponse bias according to analysis of early and late responders for 11 outcome measures by gender and enrollment status

	Male		Female	
	U	G/P	U	GP
1. Penetration by physical force or incapacitation		+	+	+
2. Sexual Touching by physical force or incapacitation			+	+
3. Nonconsensual sexual contact by coercion				
4. Nonconsensual sexual contact by absence of affirmative consent	+	+	+	+
5. Sexual harassment	+	+	+	+
6. Stalking			+	
7. Intimate partner violence			+	
8. Student knowledge about campus resources	+	+	+	+
9. Opinions on what university officials would do when an incident is reported		-	-	-
10. Respondent took some action when they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted				
11. How problematic students feel sexual assault and misconduct is for the IHE			+	+

U = Undergraduate; G/P = Graduate or Professional

Of the measures of sexual assault and sexual misconduct,²⁹ 15 out of the 28 possible comparisons are significant. The measures that are significant as summarized below.

Penetration by physical force or incapacitation. There are three significant differences. The differences for graduate/professional males, undergraduate females and graduate professional females are negative, indicating the survey estimates are too high.

²⁹ Penetration by physical force or incapacitation; sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation; coercion, absence of affirmative consent, harassment, stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence.

Sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation. There are two significant differences. The differences for undergraduate females and graduate/professional females are negative, indicating the survey estimates are too high.

Nonconsensual sexual contact by absence of affirmative consent. There four significant differences. The differences are for all of the gender/enrollment status groups are negative, indicating the survey estimate are too high.

Sexual harassment. There four significant differences. The differences are for all of the gender/enrollment status groups are negative, indicating the survey estimate are too high.

Stalking. There is one significant difference. The difference for undergraduate females is negative, indicating the survey estimate is too high.

Intimate partner violence. There is one significant difference. The difference for undergraduate females is negative, indicating the survey estimate is too high.

Of the measures of campus climate, 9 out of the 16 are significant at the 5 percent level. The measures that are significant are summarized below.

Student knowledge about campus resources. There are four significant differences. The differences are for all of the gender/enrollment status groups are negative, indicating the survey estimate are too high.

Opinions on what university officials would do when an incident is reported. There are three significant differences. The differences for graduate/professional males, undergraduate females and graduate professional females are positive, indicating the survey estimates are too low.

How problematic students feel sexual assault and misconduct is for the IHE. There are two significant differences. The differences for undergraduate females and graduate/professional females are negative, indicating the survey estimates are too high.

Overall, this analysis indicates there is evidence for possible nonresponse bias in most of the above estimates, provided the assumption that late responders are similar to the nonrespondents for the variables used in comparisons. The estimates that are affected are for the following:

- Penetration by physical force or incapacitation
- Sexual Touching by physical force or incapacitation
- Nonconsensual sexual contact by absence of affirmative consent
- Sexual harassment
- Stalking
- Intimate partner violence
- Student knowledge about campus resources
- Opinions on what university officials would do when an incident is reported
- How problematic students feel sexual assault and misconduct is for the IHE

The direction of the possible bias is positive for the victimization measures. This means the survey estimates may be higher than the true value. For the climate measures, the direction of the bias depends on the particular measure. Survey estimates of student knowledge about campus resources and how problematic students feel sexual assault may be higher due to nonresponse. This analysis indicates that opinions about what university officials would do is biased downward – meaning the survey estimate may be lower because of nonresponse.

The number of significant differences can be misleading given that the sample size is so large that a small difference can easily be statistically significant. Another way to assess the magnitude of the bias is to examine the size of the differences. We computed an effect size by taking the percentage difference relative to the estimate for the early responders:

$$ES = |(Late - Early)/Early| \times 100$$

where ES is the effect size, Late is the estimate for the late responders, Early is the estimate for the early responders.

The effect size for the significant effects (differences) for the victimization measures ranges from 10 percent to 38 percent. For the measures of nonconsensual sexual contact, this represents differences

of between .5 to 3 percentage points. For example, 14.67 percent of early responders of undergraduate females reported sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation. This compares to 17.43 percent for the early responder group for a difference of 2.75 percentage points and an ES of 16 percent. The percentage differences are smaller for the other victimization measures (harassment, stalking, IPV) ranging from 10 percent to 14 percent. This represents differences between 1 and 7 percentage points.³⁰

Comparison by the Incentive Status

One limitation of the analysis of early/late responders is reliance on the assumption that late responders resemble the nonrespondents. As noted above, this assumption does not always hold and can vary by the outcome that is being examined. An alternative approach to examining nonresponse bias is to compare outcomes by the different incentive groups. The incentivized sample, which received a \$5 gift card for participating in the survey, was randomly selected and responded at a higher rate than those that were not offered an incentive (25.7% vs. 16.6%). If there is nonresponse bias, then there should be a difference in the outcomes between the incentivized and non-incentivized groups. For example, the incentive of \$5 gift card may have been more successful at convincing non-victims to participate. That is, the non-victims may have needed additional motivation to participate beyond the appeals made in the emails and advance publicity. If this is true, then the incentivized group should have a lower victimization rate than the non-incentivized group. Alternatively, the incentive of \$5 gift card may have been more successful at motivating victims who normally would not participate because of not being willing to share their personal experiences. If this is true, then the incentivized group should have a higher victimization rate than the non-incentivized group. If response propensity is not related to being a victim, then there shouldn't be any difference between the incentivized and non-incentivized groups in the victimization rates.

The total number of comparisons is 121, which is less than before because we cannot make subgroup-level comparisons defined by the incentive status. Significance tests were performed similarly as above. Overall weighted estimates of five key variables (Penetration by Physical Force or Incapacitation, Sexual Touching by Physical Force or Incapacitation, Stalking, Intimate Partner Violence, and Reporting Perception) are significantly different between the two incentive groups. Fifteen comparisons (23%) out of 66 subgroup comparisons are significant, and eight (18%) out of

³⁰Harassment has a 6.78 percentage point difference, but this is for proportions between 45 percent and 64 percent.

44 finer subgroup comparisons are significant (see Table A4-4). Many of these differences are concentrated in certain outcomes.

Those in the incentivized group with a higher response rate have a lower victimization rate than those in the non-incentivized group with a lower response rate.

Focusing on the subgroups estimates, Table A4-4 provides the differences for each of these outcomes for the four primary subgroups defined by gender and enrollment status. For example, for graduate/professional females the rate of Penetration by Physical Force or Incapacitation is 3.33 percent for the incentivized group and 3.98 percent for the non-incentivized group, and the difference is significant with a *P*-value of .91 percent, which is less than the Bonferroni alpha value of 1.25 percent (= 5%/4).

As noted above, 18 percent of the differences in Table A4-4 are statistically significant. These results indicate there is some evidence of nonresponse bias, since the number of significant differences is more than what was expected by chance.

Table A4-4. Comparison of incentivized and non-incentivized groups by gender and school enrollment for 11 key variables (estimates in percent) ^{1,2,3,4}

Outcome ¹	Gender	Enrollment Status ²	Incentive	StdErr ³	Non-Incentive	StdErr ³	Difference	P-value ⁴
1	M	UnderGr	1.81	0.16	2.28	0.09	-0.47	1.30
1	M	Grad/Prof	0.88	0.14	0.95	0.08	-0.07	64.87
1	F	UnderGr	10.44	0.23	11.02	0.17	-0.58	4.89
1	F	Grad/Prof	3.33	0.19	3.98	0.14	-0.65	0.91*
2	M	UnderGr	3.67	0.21	4.16	0.14	-0.49	6.05
2	M	Grad/Prof	1.63	0.22	1.66	0.08	-0.03	87.47
2	F	UnderGr	17.16	0.38	18.03	0.21	-0.87	5.33
2	F	Grad/Prof	5.65	0.21	6.52	0.19	-0.87	0.27*
3	M	UnderGr	0.20	0.04	0.28	0.03	-0.08	10.24
3	M	Grad/Prof	0.16	0.07	0.24	0.04	-0.08	31.67
3	F	UnderGr	0.49	0.06	0.49	0.04	0.00	95.33
3	F	Grad/Prof	0.27	0.06	0.29	0.04	-0.02	80.40
4	M	UnderGr	2.30	0.15	2.35	0.11	-0.05	76.86
4	M	Grad/Prof	1.09	0.16	1.34	0.09	-0.25	18.17
4	F	UnderGr	11.44	0.31	11.27	0.18	0.17	63.95
4	F	Grad/Prof	5.15	0.26	5.01	0.13	0.14	62.41
5	M	UnderGr	42.08	0.59	42.63	0.33	-0.55	43.65
5	M	Grad/Prof	30.14	0.93	29.61	0.43	0.53	60.75
5	F	UnderGr	62.00	0.39	61.24	0.29	0.76	11.58
5	F	Grad/Prof	42.98	0.53	43.24	0.31	-0.26	68.04
6	M	UnderGr	1.57	0.12	2.18	0.09	-0.61	0.02*
6	M	Grad/Prof	1.57	0.15	1.97	0.13	-0.40	4.30

Table A4-4. Comparison of incentivized and non-incentivized groups by gender and school enrollment for 11 key variables (estimates in percent) (continued) ^{1,2,3,4}

Outcome ¹	Gender	Enrollment Status ²	Incentive	StdErr ³	Non-Incentive	StdErr ³	Difference	P-value ⁴
6	F	UnderGr	6.76	0.14	6.73	0.14	0.03	88.94
6	F	Grad/Prof	4.57	0.22	5.51	0.19	-0.94	0.27*
7	M	UnderGr	9.15	0.36	9.46	0.23	-0.31	45.48
7	M	Grad/Prof	5.55	0.29	6.45	0.19	-0.90	1.27
7	F	UnderGr	12.21	0.36	12.84	0.19	-0.63	12.76
7	F	Grad/Prof	6.51	0.28	7.74	0.20	-1.23	0.07*
8	M	UnderGr	30.94	0.51	31.56	0.36	-0.62	33.60
8	M	Grad/Prof	22.39	0.72	21.29	0.40	1.10	20.48
8	F	UnderGr	34.73	0.36	34.37	0.22	0.36	41.33
8	F	Grad/Prof	23.01	0.52	22.75	0.27	0.26	66.09
9	M	UnderGr	32.95	0.47	34.88	0.32	-1.93	0.11*
9	M	Grad/Prof	34.57	0.63	34.78	0.40	-0.21	78.92
9	F	UnderGr	25.93	0.42	27.60	0.25	-1.67	0.20*
9	F	Grad/Prof	26.11	0.53	27.22	0.31	-1.11	6.23
10	M	UnderGr	62.54	1.51	63.86	0.95	-1.32	46.16
10	M	Grad/Prof	61.20	3.10	59.27	1.60	1.93	59.06
10	F	UnderGr	67.68	0.98	69.18	0.49	-1.50	18.53
10	F	Grad/Prof	71.57	1.88	69.23	1.05	2.34	29.24
11	M	UnderGr	16.83	0.37	16.44	0.24	0.39	38.28
11	M	Grad/Prof	13.48	0.51	14.38	0.31	-0.90	13.23
11	F	UnderGr	28.54	0.43	27.98	0.24	0.56	26.69
11	F	Grad/Prof	17.87	0.45	20.22	0.27	-2.35	< 0.01*

¹ See Table A4-1 for definitions of outcomes

² UnderGr = Undergraduate; Grad/Prof = Graduate or Professional Student

³ StdErr = Standard Error for the proportion

⁴ A significant result (P-value < 1.25%) is asterisked (*).

Table A4-5 summarizes the significance of each comparison by providing the direction of the bias when the difference was found to be statistically significant. These differences are described below after the table.

Table A4-5. Direction of nonresponse bias according to analysis of incentive groups for 11 outcome measures by gender and enrollment status

	Male		Female	
	U	G/P	U	GP
1. Penetration by physical force or incapacitation				+
2. Sexual Touching by physical force or incapacitation				+
3. Nonconsensual sexual contact by coercion				
4. Nonconsensual sexual contact by absence of affirmative consent				
5. Sexual harassment				
6. Stalking	+			+
7. Intimate partner violence				+
8. Student knowledge about campus resources				
9. Opinions on what university officials would do when an incident is reported	+		+	
10. Respondent took some action when they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted				
11. How problematic students feel sexual assault and misconduct is for the IHE				+

U = Undergraduate; G/P = Graduate or Professional

Of the measures of sexual assault and sexual misconduct,³¹ 5 out of the 28 possible comparisons are significant. The measures that are significant are as summarized below:

Penetration by physical force or incapacitation. There is one significant difference. The difference for graduate/professional females is negative, indicating the survey estimates is too high.

Sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation. There is one significant difference. The difference for graduate/professional females is negative, indicating the survey estimates is too high.

Stalking. There are two significant differences. The differences for undergraduate males and graduate/professional females are negative, indicating the survey estimates are too high.

Intimate partner violence. There is one significant difference. The difference for graduate/professional females is negative, indicating the survey estimate is too high.

³¹Penetration by physical force or incapacitation; sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation; coercion, absence of affirmative consent, harassment, stalking and intimate partner violence (IPV).

Of the measures of campus climate, 3 out of the 16 are significant at the 5 percent level. The measures that are significant are summarized below:

Opinions on what university officials would do when an incident is reported. There are two significant differences. The differences for undergraduate males and undergraduate females are negative, indicating the survey estimates are too high.

How problematic students feel sexual assault and misconduct is for the IHE. There is one significant difference. The difference for graduate/professional females is negative, indicating the survey estimate is too high.

Overall, this analysis indicates there is some evidence for nonresponse bias in selected estimates. The estimates that are affected are for

- Penetration by physical force or incapacitation
- Sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation
- Stalking
- Intimate partner violence
- Opinions on what university officials would do when an incident is reported
- How problematic students feel sexual assault and misconduct is for the IHE

The direction of the possible bias is positive for all of the above survey estimates for the specific gender by enrollment groups referenced above. This means the survey estimates may be higher than the true value.

To get some idea of the size of the differences that were found significant, the effect size was computed for the differences between the incentive groups. For the five victimization measures that were significant, ES ranges from 13 percent to 28 percent, four fall below 20 percent. This represents a difference of 0.6 to 1.2 percentage point for the rates. For example, for female graduate/professional students, the rate of sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation is 5.65 for the incentive group and 6.52 for the non-incentive group with an ES of 13 percent. For the three climate measures that are significant, the ES is between 6 percent and 12 percent, representing differences of between 1.7 to 2.4 percent.

Summary of Early/Late Responders and Incentive Groups

These two analyses provide different views of the severity of possible nonresponse bias. The early/late response analysis revealed many more significant differences (10 out of 11 outcomes, 66 subgroups out of 88, 24 out of 44 finer subgroups of the 11 outcomes analyzed crossing all of the gender/enrollment status groups). The incentive analysis revealed fewer differences (5 out of 10 outcomes, 15 out of 66 subgroups, and 8 out of 44 finer subgroups).

The commonality between the two is that they suggest a positive bias in most of the measures, in particular the victimization measures. This suggests that if there is nonresponse bias, it would tend to inflate the survey estimates. The significant observed differences for the victimization rates ranged between .5 to 7 percentage points, but this is only for the observed differences among those who responded to the survey. It does not directly speak to the magnitude of the bias if the 80 percent of the population that did not respond is included in the estimate.

The assumptions that underlie the two analyses are different. The early/late analysis relies on the assumption that the late responders resemble the nonresponders. As noted above, methodological research has found that this is not true in all cases. The incentive analysis does not make as strong an assumption as for the early vs. late responders analysis. Respondents were randomly assigned to the two incentive groups. The difference between the two incentive groups is the response rate. A key assumption is that receiving the incentive does not affect the measurement of the outcomes. For example, one hypothesis might be that those completing the survey because they are getting an incentive may not take the response task as seriously and may introduce measurement error into the estimates. However, there is very little, if any, empirical support for this effect of incentives. Given these different assumptions, our inclination is to put more weight on the incentive analysis than the early/late responder analysis.

Analysis of IHE Response Rates and Outcomes

Both of the above analyses have the shortcoming that they compare subsets of respondents and make inferences about those that never responded based on some uncertain assumptions. For an IHE with a 15 percent response rate, comparing the early/late responders does not speak directly to the 85 percent of students who did not cooperate. The incentive analysis more directly compares responders and nonresponders, but within a limited range of response rates. Comparison across IHEs with different response rates could address this to some extent. The range of response rates in the survey was between 7 percent and 53 percent. Correlating the response rate with the outcomes,

all else being equal, assesses the extent to which the two are related. The assumption is that IHEs do not differ except by their response rate. On its face, this not a realistic assumption. At the very least, IHEs differ by the types of students they admit, as well as the climate of the campus, both of which can have significant effects on the outcomes measured on the survey. Nonetheless, the wide range in response rate provides an opportunity to test how it is correlated with key outcomes. A negative correlation between response rate and outcomes would be indicative of a positive bias (i.e., higher response rates lead to lower victimization rates) and the opposite would hold for a positive correlation.

To pursue this, a series of multivariate hierarchical logistic regression models were estimated³² that predicted the key outcomes for undergraduate females. The first level of the models predicts the outcome of interest for each respondent in the sample. Included at this level are student characteristics as predictors used in the weighting, including age, race, ethnicity, year in school, and incentive status. The second level of the model predicts the intercept term of the level 1 equation using the response rate and university characteristics that might be correlated with response rate. These characteristics include enrollment size, percentage of undergraduates at the IHE, percentage of females at the IHE, percentage of White students, and whether the IHE is public or private. For purposes of this analysis, the natural log of the response rate was used.

Tables A4-6–A4-17 provide these results for the 11 outcomes discussed above for undergraduate females, with the addition of two summary measures. One summary measure is nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation (Table A4-6). This combines penetration and sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation. Nonconsensual sexual contact (Table A4-10) combines the two behaviors (penetration, sexual touching) and the four tactics (physical force, incapacitation, coercion, and absence of affirmative consent (AAC)).

For the victimization measures (Tables A4-6 to A4-10), there is a positive relationship between response rate and victimization. For example, for the tactics involving physical force and incapacitation, the logistic regression coefficient for the log response rate is .27, which is significant at the 3 percent level (odds ratio 1.31; 95% CI 1.01 to 1.69). The coefficients of the log response rate for the constituent components of this type of victimization are also significant (penetration - OR 1.23, 95% CI 1.00 to 1.52 see Table A4-7; sexual touching OR 1.44; 95% CI 1.10 to 1.87 see Table

³²Raudenbush, S., and A. Bryk. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

A4-8). There is also a positive relationship for the tactic of absence of affirmative consent (OR 1.48; 95% CI 1.07 to 2.03 see Table A4-9). A similar effect is apparent for the summary measure for all tactics (OR 1.487; 95% CI 1.13 to 1.97 see Table A4-10).

The effect of the log response rate is less consistent for the other types of victimization. It is significantly positive for harassment (OR 1.34; 95% CI 1.032 to 1.75 see Table A4-11), but it is not significant for intimate partner violence. The coefficient is negative for stalking, although not significant at the 5 percent level.

For the climate measures, the coefficient of the log response rate for the extent to which students believe sexual assault and misconduct is a very or extremely problematic is significantly positive (OR 2.38; 95% CI 1.00 to 5.67). The log response rate is not significantly related to the other three climate measures examined (knowledge of resources; opinions about reaction of university officials to a report of sexual assault; extent of bystander intervention).

The coefficient of the percentage female is significant for the nonconsensual sexual contact rates in a positive direction. The higher the percentage female at the IHE, the higher the victimization rate. This variable is also positively significant for predicting several of the climate measures. None of the other university characteristics are statistically significant predictors.

The individual-level coefficient for whether or not an incentive was received is significantly negative for the nonconsensual sexual contact measures involving physical force or incapacitation, as expected from the analysis above.³³ It is also significantly negative for the climate measure on opinions about how problematic sexual assault and misconduct are on campus and significantly positive for the bystander intervention measure.

The other individual-level variables (year in school, age, race/ethnicity) are all highly significant predictors.

One interpretation of the significant positive relationship between the IHE log response rate and victimization is that nonresponse bias is in a negative direction (i.e., nonresponse depresses the survey estimates). There are several reasons to question this conclusion. First, the participating IHEs

³³This logistic regression includes IHEs that did not randomly assign the incentive. This includes five IHEs that either provided the \$5 incentive to all respondents or did not provide it to anyone. The results do not significantly change when taking these IHEs out of the analysis.

were not randomly selected, and it is difficult to generalize the analysis result beyond this particular group. When plotting the response rate and victimization rate, one can see a number of outlying schools.³⁴ For example, 8 of the 27 schools fall outside the expected pattern. Some IHEs have high response rates but abnormally low or abnormally high victimization rates. There are similar examples of IHEs with low response rates. Without a larger, more representative sample of IHEs, it is difficult to assess whether these are true outliers or whether they are indicative of a different, perhaps more complex, relationship than discussed above.

Second, this conclusion depends on the assumption that the only difference between the IHEs is the response rate. While the above multivariate analysis does control for several broad characteristics (e.g., size, public vs. private), it is difficult to rule out the possibility that the positive relationship is spurious when assessing nonresponse bias. One example of a possible spurious relationship is that IHEs with higher victimization rates have a higher response rate because more people have been directly or indirectly affected by sexual assault or sexual misconduct. The proportion of students that said sexual assault and sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic is positively related to the response rate (see analysis above). This climate measure is also positively related to victimization. When including the campus- or student-level climate measure in the logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation the response rate is no longer significant (data not shown).

With the data at hand, it is difficult to empirically test that the relationship is spurious as discussed above. The causality may be in the opposite direction. The positive correlation between the victimization rate and the climate measure could reflect nonresponse bias. For those IHEs with a high response rate a higher proportion of victims at the school might have responded for other reasons, such as the outreach conducted prior to the survey launch. On the other hand, negative publicity might have discouraged victims to respond, resulting in a low response rate coupled with a low victimization rate.

There are two pieces of independent evidence that are counter to interpreting the results of the multivariate analysis as an indication of negative nonresponse bias. First, the conclusion from the analysis of early/late responders and the incentive analysis is that if any bias exists, it is inflating the survey estimates, rather than depressing them. These analyses attempt to directly measure the key outcomes for nonrespondents. The analysis of incentive groups is particularly compelling in this

³⁴Data not shown to preserve the confidentiality of individual IHEs.

regard because sample was randomly assigned to either the incentive or non-incentive group. Second the comparisons between the AAU estimates with other surveys are in the opposite direction from what would be expected from a negative bias. The comparable CSA estimate fell within the lower end of the range of the 27 IHEs on the AAU Survey. The CSA had a response rate that was significantly higher than the AAU Survey (42% vs. 19%). If there was a significant negative bias in the AAU estimates, one would have expected the AAU estimate to be lower than the CSA. A similar comparison to a less comparable survey (MIT) found a similar result. The MIT estimates were lower than AAU estimate, while the response rate was significantly higher.

Table A4-6. Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-3.569	2.000	0.000
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.270	0.129	0.035
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.050	0.161	0.757
Percent Female***			
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.055	0.156	0.724
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.119	0.191	0.532
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.051	0.179	0.774
Percent Undergraduate	-0.001	0.004	0.721
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.144	0.119	0.229
<i>68% to 82%</i>	-0.050	0.138	0.718
<i>Unknown</i>	-0.271	0.158	0.086
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition***			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.096	0.026	0.000
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	0.011	0.032	0.734
<i>24-26</i>	-0.531	0.085	<.0001
<i>27+</i>	-1.663	0.106	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.281	0.033	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.493	0.035	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.690	0.042	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.057	0.038	0.133
<i>Black only</i>	-0.277	0.061	<.0001
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.566	0.047	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.086	0.055	0.118

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-7. Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual penetration by physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-4.174	0.644	<.0001
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.210	0.105	0.046
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.030	0.132	0.821
Percent Female**	0.027	0.009	0.002
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.028	0.129	0.829
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.131	0.157	0.407
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.032	0.147	0.827
Percent Undergraduate	-0.004	0.003	0.176
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.092	0.099	0.351
<i>68% to 82%</i>	-0.044	0.115	0.702
<i>Unknown</i>	-0.251	0.129	0.052
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition***			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.135	0.035	0.000
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	0.058	0.042	0.163
<i>24-26</i>	-0.340	0.111	0.002
<i>27+</i>	-1.308	0.138	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.408	0.048	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.657	0.050	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.848	0.058	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.097	0.051	0.057
<i>Black only</i>	-0.254	0.085	0.003
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.608	0.066	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.069	0.075	0.354

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-8. Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual touching by physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-3.771	0.760	0.000
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.367	0.134	0.006
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.008	0.166	0.961
Percent Female**	0.019	0.010	0.052
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.082	0.161	0.610
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.230	0.199	0.247
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.180	0.186	0.333
Percent Undergraduate	0.000	0.004	0.987
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.144	0.123	0.243
<i>68% to 82%</i>	-0.132	0.144	0.358
<i>Unknown</i>	-0.304	0.164	0.063
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition**			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.086	0.029	0.003
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	-0.009	0.035	0.797
<i>24-26</i>	-0.592	0.097	<.0001
<i>27+</i>	-1.775	0.130	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.221	0.036	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.396	0.038	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.576	0.046	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.019	0.041	0.653
<i>Black only</i>	-0.300	0.068	<.0001
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.500	0.051	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.098	0.060	0.102

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-9. Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual contact by absence of affirmative consent for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-3.735	0.895	0.001
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.389	0.160	0.015
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.061	0.198	0.760
Percent Female	0.011	0.011	0.323
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	-0.059	0.193	0.761
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	-0.079	0.237	0.738
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	-0.116	0.222	0.601
Percent Undergraduate	-0.002	0.005	0.657
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.073	0.147	0.622
<i>68% to 82%</i>	-0.200	0.171	0.240
<i>Unknown</i>	-0.222	0.196	0.258
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.034	0.033	0.305
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	-0.034	0.033	0.305
<i>24-26</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>27+</i>	-0.034	0.033	0.305
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.375	0.044	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.600	0.047	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.784	0.055	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.146	0.049	0.003
<i>Black only</i>	-0.102	0.078	0.195
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.532	0.062	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.122	0.071	0.087

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-10. Logistic regression predicting nonconsensual sexual contact for physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-3.149	0.767	0.001
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.397	0.139	0.004
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.028	0.173	0.870
Percent Female**	0.019	0.010	0.047
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.011	0.168	0.946
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.097	0.206	0.639
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.057	0.193	0.767
Percent Undergraduate	-0.002	0.004	0.655
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.096	0.128	0.455
<i>68% to 82%</i>	-0.156	0.149	0.295
<i>Unknown</i>	-0.288	0.171	0.091
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition**			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.090	0.024	0.000
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	-0.027	0.030	0.372
<i>24-26</i>	-0.514	0.078	<.0001
<i>27+</i>	-1.767	0.097	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.308	0.031	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.540	0.033	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.753	0.039	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.117	0.036	0.001
<i>Black only</i>	-0.221	0.057	0.000
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.541	0.044	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.130	0.052	0.013

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-11. Logistic regression predicting sexual harassment for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-0.850	0.726	0.259
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.295	0.132	0.025
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.018	0.163	0.911
Percent Female	0.014	0.009	0.127
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	-0.129	0.158	0.415
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	-0.135	0.194	0.487
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	-0.216	0.182	0.234
Percent Undergraduate	-0.005	0.004	0.181
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.119	0.121	0.326
<i>68% to 82%</i>	-0.127	0.139	0.362
<i>Unknown</i>	-0.229	0.160	0.154
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition*			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.041	0.023	0.076
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	-0.196	0.030	<.0001
<i>24-26</i>	-0.940	0.069	<.0001
<i>27+</i>	-1.716	0.062	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.402	0.027	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.655	0.030	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.969	0.037	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.229	0.034	<.0001
<i>Black only</i>	-0.138	0.052	0.009
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.403	0.040	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.273	0.052	<.0001

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-12. Logistic regression predicting stalking for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-2.446	0.657	0.002
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate*	-0.200	0.108	0.063
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.006	0.137	0.965
Percent Female	0.007	0.009	0.427
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	-0.119	0.135	0.379
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	-0.225	0.160	0.161
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	-0.202	0.153	0.186
Percent Undergraduate	-0.004	0.003	0.278
Percent white**			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.076	0.105	0.467
<i>68% to 82%</i>	0.209	0.120	0.081
<i>Unknown</i>	0.072	0.131	0.582
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.024	0.044	0.578
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	0.140	0.053	0.009
<i>24-26</i>	0.122	0.123	0.322
<i>27+</i>	-0.591	0.138	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.326	0.065	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.616	0.066	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.772	0.075	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	-0.194	0.062	0.002
<i>Black only</i>	-0.171	0.101	0.089
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.387	0.078	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	-0.035	0.093	0.702

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-13. Logistic regression predicting intimate partner violence for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-2.403	0.501	0.000
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate	-0.100	0.081	0.219
Public vs. Private*			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.195	0.109	0.074
Percent Female	0.008	0.007	0.218
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.071	0.106	0.502
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.156	0.125	0.210
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.139	0.119	0.241
Percent Undergraduate	0.002	0.003	0.554
Percent white**			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	0.125	0.083	0.134
<i>68% to 82%</i>	0.208	0.094	0.027
<i>Unknown</i>	0.021	0.102	0.833
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.042	0.038	0.260
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	0.141	0.046	0.002
<i>24-26</i>	0.232	0.101	0.022
<i>27+</i>	-0.285	0.103	0.006
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.271	0.056	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.455	0.057	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.546	0.065	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	-0.148	0.054	0.007
<i>Black only</i>	-0.033	0.092	0.718
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.181	0.070	0.009
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.073	0.080	0.357

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-14. Logistic regression predicting whether undergraduate females indicate that sexual assault and sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic for the IHE

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-11.250	2.366	0.000
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.869	0.433	0.045
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.467	0.543	0.390
Percent Female***	0.135	0.030	<.0001
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.530	0.525	0.313
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.143	0.646	0.824
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.274	0.604	0.649
Percent Undergraduate	0.017	0.013	0.177
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	-0.135	0.401	0.736
<i>68% to 82%</i>	0.359	0.459	0.434
<i>Unknown</i>	-0.417	0.535	0.436
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition***			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	-0.112	0.025	<.0001
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	-0.055	0.031	0.074
<i>24-26</i>	-0.558	0.081	<.0001
<i>27+</i>	-1.060	0.079	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.429	0.032	<.0001
<i>Junior</i>	0.642	0.034	<.0001
<i>Senior</i>	0.799	0.041	<.0001
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	-0.100	0.037	0.006
<i>Black only</i>	0.112	0.056	0.044
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.374	0.044	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	-0.042	0.054	0.439

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-15. Logistic regression predicting whether undergraduate females indicate that university officials are very or extremely likely to take actions when a sexual assault is reported⁺

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	1.552	1.247	0.231
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate	-0.115	0.248	0.643
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	0.050	0.307	0.871
Percent Female**	-0.050	0.016	0.002
Enrollment Size*			
2,000 to 13,000 (<i>reference group</i>)	0.000	.	.
14,000 to 25,000	-0.476	0.343	0.165
26,000 to 40,000	-0.468	0.205	0.022
41,000 to 61,000	0.118	0.174	0.500
Percent Undergraduate	0.008	0.007	0.269
Percent white			
34% to 56% (<i>reference group</i>)	0.000	.	.
57% to 67%	0.310	0.229	0.175
68% to 82%	0.132	0.261	0.612
Unknown	0.258	0.304	0.396
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
\$5 Amazon gift card	-0.032	0.027	0.225
Age group***			
18-20 (<i>reference group</i>)	0.000	.	.
21-23	0.135	0.035	<.0001
24-26	0.602	0.079	<.0001
27+	0.925	0.065	<.0001
School year***			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
Sophomore	-0.441	0.031	<.0001
Junior	-0.661	0.035	<.0001
Senior	-0.947	0.043	<.0001
Race/ethnicity**			
Hispanic	0.000	.	.
White only	-0.039	0.040	0.332
Black only	-0.080	0.064	0.209
Asian only	-0.071	0.048	0.137
Other and Multi-race	-0.187	0.062	0.003

+ Model is predicting those who said it was very or extremely likely that university officials would take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously and would conduct a fair investigation and would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-16. Logistic regression predicting whether undergraduate females indicate being very or extremely knowledgeable about on-campus resources for sexual assault and sexual misconduct

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-1.333	1.115	0.249
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate**	0.448	0.223	0.045
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.274	0.279	0.326
Percent Female	-0.007	0.014	0.601
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.225	0.311	0.471
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.153	0.186	0.412
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.144	0.159	0.364
Percent Undergraduate	0.000	0.007	0.977
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	0.370	0.207	0.074
<i>68% to 82%</i>	0.379	0.236	0.109
<i>Unknown</i>	0.275	0.276	0.321
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition**			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	0.063	0.023	0.006
Age group***			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	-0.135	0.029	<.0001
<i>24-26</i>	-0.363	0.074	<.0001
<i>27+</i>	-0.297	0.062	<.0001
School year**			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	-0.040	0.027	0.150
<i>Junior</i>	-0.011	0.030	0.722
<i>Senior</i>	0.065	0.037	0.077
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.056	0.034	0.099
<i>Black only</i>	-0.006	0.053	0.908
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.566	0.041	<.0001
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	-0.063	0.050	0.209

* F test for variable is significant at p<.10

** F test for variable is significant at p<.05

*** F test for variable is significant at p<.01

Table A4-17. Logistic regression predicting whether the student took action when they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted for undergraduate females

Effect	Estimate	SE	Pr > t
Intercept	-0.266	0.617	0.671
School Level Variables			
Log of Response Rate	0.070	0.105	0.504
Public vs. Private			
<i>Public (reference group)</i>			
<i>Private</i>	-0.125	0.126	0.321
Percent Female	0.011	0.009	0.213
Enrollment Size			
<i>2,000 to 13,000 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>14,000 to 25,000</i>	0.042	0.142	0.766
<i>26,000 to 40,000</i>	0.040	0.088	0.650
<i>41,000 to 61,000</i>	0.075	0.072	0.298
Percent Undergraduate	0.002	0.003	0.455
Percent white			
<i>34% to 56% (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>57% to 67%</i>	0.121	0.094	0.200
<i>68% to 82%</i>	0.146	0.113	0.196
<i>Unknown</i>	0.011	0.126	0.932
Student Level Variables			
Incentive condition*			
<i>No incentive (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>\$5 Amazon gift card</i>	0.074	0.044	0.093
Age group			
<i>18-20 (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>21-23</i>	-0.034	0.056	0.541
<i>24-26</i>	-0.042	0.169	0.804
<i>27+</i>	0.408	0.229	0.074
School year			
<i>Freshman (reference group)</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>Sophomore</i>	0.076	0.063	0.231
<i>Junior</i>	0.045	0.066	0.498
<i>Senior</i>	0.092	0.078	0.236
Race/ethnicity***			
<i>Hispanic</i>	0.000	.	.
<i>White only</i>	0.200	0.065	0.002
<i>Black only</i>	-0.011	0.105	0.916
<i>Asian only</i>	-0.088	0.081	0.273
<i>Other and Multi-race</i>	0.063	0.096	0.510

* F test for variable is significant at $p < .10$

** F test for variable is significant at $p < .05$

*** F test for variable is significant at $p < .01$

Appendix 5. Questionnaire

SECTION A - BACKGROUND

First, we'd like to ask you a few questions about your background.

- A1. How old are you?**
[DROP DOWN LIST]
Under 18
18-29, by single year
30+
-

[IF AGE =Under 18]

"We are sorry but the survey can only be completed by students who are at least 18 years old. Thank you for your interest in our study. We appreciate your time."

[EXIT SURVEY]

- A2. Which of the following best describes your current student affiliation with [University]?**
Undergraduate [CONTINUE]
Graduate [GO TO A4]
Professional [GO TO A4]
[IF BLANK THEN GO TO A5]
-

- A3. What is your class year in school? Answer on the basis of the number of credits you have earned.**
Freshman [GO TO A5]
Sophomore [GO TO A5]
Junior [GO TO A5]
Senior [GO TO A5]
[IF BLANK THEN GO TO A5]
-

- A4. What year are you in your program? Answer on the basis of the number of years enrolled in the graduate or professional academic program.**
1st year
2nd year
3rd year
4th year
5th year
6th year or higher
-

A5. In which school at [University] are you enrolled? If you are enrolled in more than one choose the school that you consider your primary affiliation (ex. most credits, college of main advisor).

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

A6. In what year did you first enroll as a student at [University]?

[DROP DOWN LIST]

Prior to 1997

1997 – 2015 by single year

A7. Do you take all of your courses on-line?

Yes

No

A8. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

Yes

No

A9. Select one or more of the following races that best describes you: (Mark all that apply)

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian

Black or African American

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

White

A10. Are you a US citizen or permanent resident?

Yes

No

A11³⁵. Which best describes your gender identity?

Woman
Man
Transgender woman
Transgender man
Genderqueer or gender non-conforming
Questioning
Not listed
Decline to state

A12.³⁶ Do you consider yourself to be:

Heterosexual or straight
Gay or lesbian
Bisexual
Asexual
Questioning
Not listed
Decline to state

A13. Since you have been a student at [University], have you been in any partnered relationships? Partnered relationships include:

- casual relationship or hook-up
 - steady or serious relationship
 - marriage, civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation
- Yes
No
-

A14. Are you currently ...

Never married
Not married but living with a partner
Married
Divorced or separated
Other

³⁵Modified from The UO Sexual Violence and Institutional Behavior Campus Survey (2014).

³⁶Modified from Best Practices For Asking Questions About Sexual Orientation on Surveys. Williams Institute, 2009.

A15. Do you have a disability registered with [University]’s Disability Services or Office on Disabilities?

Yes

No

A16. Since you have been a student at [University], have you been a member of or participated in any of the following? (Mark all that apply):

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

A17. Which of the following best describes your living situation?

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

SECTION B – PERCEPTIONS OF RISK³⁷

“Sexual assault” and “sexual misconduct” refer to a range of behaviors that are nonconsensual or unwanted. These behaviors could include remarks about physical appearance or persistent sexual advances. They also could include threats of force to get someone to engage in sexual behavior such as nonconsensual or unwanted touching, sexual penetration, oral sex, anal sex or attempts to engage in these behaviors. These behaviors could be initiated by someone known or unknown, including someone you are in or have been in a relationship with.

These next questions ask about your perceptions related to the risks of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

B1. How problematic is sexual assault or sexual misconduct at [University]

- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- Very
- Extremely

B2. How likely do you think it is that you will experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus?

- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- Very
- Extremely

B3. How likely do you think it is that you will experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct during off-campus university sponsored events?

- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- Very
- Extremely

³⁷Adapted from Fisher, B. S., and Sloan III, J. J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the “shadow of sexual assault hypothesis” supported?. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(3), 633-659.

SECTION C - RESOURCES

The next questions ask about the services and resources offered by the university for those affected by sexual assault and sexual misconduct.

- C1.³⁸ Are you aware of the services provided by the following? (Mark all that apply)**
[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]
None of the Above
-

How knowledgeable are you about each of the following:

- C2a. How knowledgeable are you about how sexual assault and sexual misconduct are defined at [University]?**
Not at all
A little
Somewhat
Very
Extremely
-

- C2b.³⁹ How knowledgeable are you about where to get help at [University] if you or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct?**
Not at all
A little
Somewhat
Very
Extremely
-

- C2c.⁴⁰ How knowledgeable are you about where to make a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct at [University]?**
Not at all
A little
Somewhat
Very
Extremely
-

³⁸Modified from McMahon, S., Stepleton, K., and Cusano, J. (2014). Awareness of Campus Services Scale.

³⁹Modified from Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2008). Carleton College Climate Assessment Project: Carleton Final Report. Retrieved from: https://apps.carleton.edu/governance/diversity/campus_climate_survey/results/

⁴⁰Ibid.

C2d . How knowledgeable are you about what happens when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or sexual misconduct at [University]?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

SECTION D - HARASSMENT⁴¹⁴²

These next questions ask about situations in which a student at [University], or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D1. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you?

Yes

Never experienced

These questions ask about situations in which someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D2. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities?

Yes,

Never experienced

⁴¹Modified from Leskinen, E.A., and Cortina, L.M. (2014) Dimensions of disrespect: Mapping and measuring gender harassment in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(1), 107-123.

⁴²Modified from The UO Sexual Violence and Institutional Behavior Campus Survey (2014).

These questions ask about situations in which someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D3. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] said crude or gross sexual things to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters when you didn't want to?

- Yes
 - Never experienced
-

These questions ask about situations in which someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D4. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos to you that you didn't want?

- Yes
 - Never experienced
-

These questions ask about situations where someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D5. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though you said, "No"?

- Yes
 - Never experienced
-

BOX D1

IF YES TO ANY QUESTION D1 – D5, CONTINUE
ELSE GO TO E1

You said that the following happened to you since you've been a student at [University]:

- [IF D1 = YES] Someone made sexual remarks or jokes that were insulting or offensive
- [IF D2 = YES] Someone made inappropriate offensive comments about your or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities
- [IF D3 = YES] Someone said crude or gross sexual things to you or made unwelcomed attempts to get you to talk about sexual matters
- [IF D4 = YES] Someone emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos to you
- [IF D5 = YES] Someone continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though you said, "No"

D6. How many different people behaved this way?

- 1 person
- 2 persons
- 3 or more persons

D7. How (was the person/were the persons) who behaved (this way/these ways) associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

- Student
- Faculty or instructor
- Coach or trainer
- Other staff or administrator
- Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)
- The person was not affiliated with [University]
- Don't know association with [University]

D8. At the time of (this event/these events), what (was the person's/ were these persons') relationship to you? (Mark all that apply)

- At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with
- Someone I had been involved or was intimate with
- Teacher or advisor
- Co-worker, boss or supervisor
- Friend or acquaintance
- Stranger
- Other
- Don't know

D9. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term, how many times has someone behaved this way?

- 0 times
 - 1 time
 - 2 times
 - 3-5 times
 - 6-9 times
 - 10 or more times
-

D10. Since you have been a student at [University] have you contacted any of the following about (this experience/any of these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

None of the above **[GO TO D13]**

[IF NO PROGRAM MARKED GO TO D13]

BOX D2

IF D10= NONE OF THE ABOVE OR NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN GO TO D13
ELSE ADMINISTER ITEMS D11 AND D12 FOR EACH PROGRAM MARKED IN D10
(UP TO 10)

D11 [A-J]. When did you most recently contact [Program] about (this experience/these experiences)?

- Fall of 2014 – present
 - Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014
 - Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013
 - Prior to Fall of 2012
-

D12[A-J]. Thinking about the most recent time you contacted them, how useful was [Program] in helping you deal with (this experience/these experiences)?

- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very
 - Extremely
-

BOX D3

IF MORE PROGRAMS MARKED IN D10 THEN RETURN TO BOX D2
ELSE GO TO D14

D13. [IF NO PROGRAMS CONTACTED] Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]? (Mark all that apply)

- Did not know where to go or who to tell
 - Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult
 - I did not think anyone would believe me
 - I did not think it was serious enough to report
 - I did not want the person to get into trouble
 - I feared negative social consequences
 - I did not think anything would be done
 - I feared it would not be kept confidential
 - Incident was not on campus or associated with the school
 - Incident did not occur while attending school
 - Other
-

D14. Did you (also) tell any of the following persons about this? (Mark all that apply)

- Friend
 - Family member
 - Faculty or instructor
 - Someone else
 - I didn't tell anyone (else)
-

The next questions ask about instances where someone behaved in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety.

E1. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety?

Yes,

No [GO TO E2]

[IF BLANK GO TO E2]

E1a. Did the same person do this to you more than once since you have been a student at [University]?

Yes

No

Don't know

E2. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety?

Yes

No [GO TO E3]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO E3]

⁴³Modified from Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., and Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

⁴⁴Modified from Catalano, S. (2012). Stalking victims in the United States--revised. (NCJ 224527). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

⁴⁵ Modified from Tjaden, P., and Thoennes, N. (1998). Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. (NCJ 172837). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

E2a. Did the same person do this to you more than once since you have been a student at [University]?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

E3. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone spied on, watched or followed you, either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety?

- Yes,
- No [GO TO BOX E1]
- [IF BLANK THEN GO TO BOX E1]

E3a. Did the same person do this to you more than once since you have been a student at [University]?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

BOX E1

IF REPORTED "SAME PERSON DID THIS MORE THAN ONCE" TO ANY OF THE THREE TACTICS (E1a=yes or E2a=yes or E3a=yes), THEN GO TO E5

IF YES TO TWO OR MORE ITEMS E1-E3, AND NO TO ALL ITEMS E1a & E2a & E3a, THEN GO TO E4

IF "NO" TO ALL ITEMS E1-E3, OR
IF "YES" TO EXACTLY 1 ITEM E1-E3 AND "NO" OR BLANK TO ALL ITEMS E1a & E2a & E3a
THEN GO TO BOX F0

You said that the following happened to you since you've been a student at [University]:

- [IF E1 = YES] Someone made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- [IF E2 = YES] Someone showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- [IF E3 = YES] Someone spied on, watched or followed you either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety

E4. Did the same person do more than one of these to you since you have been a student at [University]?

Yes [GO TO E5]

No [GO TO F1]

Don't Know [GO TO F1]

You said that the following happened to you since you've been a student at [University]:

- [IF E1 = YES] Someone made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- [IF E2 = YES] Someone showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- [IF E3 = YES] Someone spied on, watched or followed you either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety

E5. How (is the person/are the persons) who did these things to you associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Student

Faculty or instructor

Coach or trainer

Other staff or administrator

Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)

The person was not affiliated with [University]

Don't know association with [University]

E6. At the time of these events, what (was the person's/were the persons') relationship to you? (Mark all that apply)

- At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with
 - Someone I had been involved or was intimate with
 - Teacher or advisor
 - Co-worker, boss or supervisor
 - Friend or acquaintance
 - Stranger
 - Other
 - Don't know
-

E7. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term, how many times have you had any of these experiences?

- 0 times
 - 1 time
 - 2 times
 - 3-5 times
 - 6-9 times
 - 10 or more times
-

E8. Since you have been a student at [UNIVERSITY], have you contacted any of the following about any of these experiences? (Mark all that apply)

- [UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]
 - None of the above **[GO TO E11]**
 - [IF NO PROGRAM MARKED GO TO E11]**
-

BOX E2

IF E8= NONE OF THE ABOVE OR NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN GO TO E11
ELSE ADMINISTER ITEMS E9 AND E10 FOR EACH PROGRAM MARKED IN E8 (UP TO 10)

E9[A-J]. When did you most recently contact [Program] about these experiences?

- Fall of 2014 – present
 - Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014
 - Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013
 - Prior to Fall of 2012
-

E10[A-J.] Thinking about the most recent time you contacted them, how useful was [Program] in helping you deal with these experiences?

- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very
 - Extremely
-

BOX E3

IF MORE PROGRAMS MARKED THEN RETURN TO BOX E2
ELSE SKIP TO E12

**E11. Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]?
(Mark all that apply)**

- Did not know where to go or who to tell
 - Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult
 - I did not think anyone would believe me
 - I did not think it was serious enough to report
 - I did not want the person to get into trouble
 - I feared negative social consequences
 - I did not think anything would be done
 - I feared it would not be kept confidential
 - Incident was not on campus or associated with the school
 - Incident did not occur while attending school
 - Other
-

E12. Did you (also) tell any of the following persons about this? (Mark all that apply)

- Friend
 - Family member
 - Faculty or instructor
 - Someone else
 - I didn't tell anyone (else)
-

SECTION F – IPV/DV⁴⁶

BOX F0

IF A13 = YES (PRIOR RELATIONSHIP) GO TO F1
ELSE SKIP TO G1

Earlier in the survey you indicated that you have been in a partnered relationship at least part of the time since you have been a student at [University]. People treat their partner in many different ways. The next section asks you questions about your relationship with your partner(s). Recall that partnered relationships include:

- casual relationship or hook-up
- steady or serious relationship
- marriage, civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation

F1. Since you have been a student at [University], has a partner controlled or tried to control you? Examples could be when someone:

- kept you from going to classes or pursuing your educational goals
- did not allow you to see or talk with friends or family
- made decisions for you such as, where you go or what you wear or eat
- threatened to “out” you to others

Yes

No

F2. Since you have been a student at [University], has a partner threatened to physically harm you, someone you love, or themselves?

Yes

No

⁴⁶Modified from Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., and Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

F3. Since you have been a student at [University], has a partner used any kind of physical force against you? Examples could be when someone

- bent your fingers or bit you
- choked, slapped, punched or kicked you
- hit you with something other than a fist
- attacked you with a weapon, or otherwise physically hurt or injured you

Yes

No

BOX F1

IF F1=YES OR F2=YES OR F3=YES, THEN GO TO F4
ELSE GO TO G1

You said that the following happened to you since you've been a student at [University]:

- [IF F1 = YES] A partner controlled or tried to control you
- [IF F2 = YES] A partner threatened to physically harm you or someone you love
- [IF F3 = YES] A partner used physical force against you

F4. How many different partners treated you this way?

1 partner

2 partners

3 or more partners

F5. Were you physically injured as a result of (this incident/any of these incidents)?

Yes

No [GO TO F7]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO F7]

F6. Did you ever seek medical attention as a result of (this incident/any of these incidents)?

Yes

No

F7. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term, how many times have you (had this experience/had any of these experiences)?

- 0 times
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3-5 times
- 6-9 times
- 10 or more times

F8. Since you have been a student at [University], have you contacted any of the following about (this experience/any of these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

None of the above [GO TO F11]

[IF NO PROGRAM MARKED GO TO F11]

BOX F2

IF F8= NONE OF THE ABOVE OR NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN GO TO F11

ELSE ADMINISTER ITEMS F9 AND F10 FOR EACH PROGRAM MARKED IN F8 (UP TO 10)

F9[A-J]. When did you most recently contact [Program] about (this experience/these experiences)?

- Fall of 2014 – present
- Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014
- Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013
- Prior to Fall of 2012

F10[A-J]. Thinking about the most recent time you contacted them, how useful was [Program] in helping you deal with (this experience/these experiences)?

- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- Very
- Extremely

BOX F3

IF F8= NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN CONTINUE TO F11
ELSE SKIP TO F12

F11. [IF NO PROGRAMS CONTACTED] Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]? (Mark all that apply)

- Did not know where to go or who to tell
 - Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult
 - I did not think anyone would believe me
 - I did not think it was serious enough to report
 - I did not want the person to get into trouble
 - I feared negative social consequences
 - I did not think anything would be done
 - I feared it would not be kept confidential
 - Incident was not on campus or associated with the school
 - Incident did not occur while attending school
 - Other
-

F12. Did you (also) tell any of the following persons about this? (Mark all that apply)

- Friend
 - Family member
 - Faculty or instructor
 - Someone else
 - I didn't tell anyone (else)
-

This next section asks about nonconsensual or unwanted sexual contact you may have experienced while attending [University]. The person with whom you had the nonconsensual or unwanted contact could have been someone you know, such as someone you are currently or were in a relationship with, a co-worker, a professor, or a family member. Or it could be someone you do not know.

The following questions separately ask about contact that occurred because of physical force, incapacitation due to alcohol or drugs, and other types of pressure.

The first few questions ask about incidents that involved force or threats of force against you. Force could include someone holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you, or using or threatening to use a weapon against you.

- **G1. Since you have been attending [University], has someone used physical force or threats of physical force to do the following with you:**
 - **Sexual penetration. When one person puts a penis, fingers, or object inside someone else’s vagina or anus, or**
 - **Oral sex. When someone’s mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else’s genitals**
 - Yes [GO TO Attachment 1]
 - No

⁴⁷Modified from Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., and Martin, S.L. (2007). The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study Final Report. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>

⁴⁸Modified from Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., and White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(4), 357-370.

G2. Since you have been attending [University], has someone used physical force or threats of physical force in an unsuccessful attempt to do any of the following with you:

- **Sexual penetration. When one person puts a penis, finger, or object inside someone else's vagina or anus**
- **Oral sex. When someone's mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals**
 - Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)
 - No

G3. Since you have been attending [University], has someone used physical force or threats of physical force to do any of the following with you:

- kissing
- touching someone's breast, chest, crotch, groin or buttocks
- grabbing, groping or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other's clothes
- Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)
- No

• The next questions ask about incidents when you were unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep, or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol. Please include incidents even if you are not sure what happened.

G4. Since you have been attending [University], has any of the following happened to you while you were unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol:

- **Sexual penetration. When one person puts a penis, finger, or object inside someone else's vagina or anus**
- **Oral sex. When someone's mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals**
- Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)
- No

G5. Since you have been attending [University], has any of the following happened to you while you were unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol:

- kissing
- touching someone's breast, chest, crotch, groin, or buttocks
- grabbing, groping or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other's clothes

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

The next questions ask about incidents when someone coerced you by threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards.

G6. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving penetration or oral sex by threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that you felt you must comply? Examples include:

- Threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work
- Promising good grades or a promotion at work
- Threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends or authority figures
- Threatening to post damaging information about you online

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

G7. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving kissing or other sexual touching by threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that you felt you must comply? Examples include:

- Threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work
- Promise good grades or a promotion at work
- Threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends or authority figures
- Threatening to post damaging information about you online

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

The next questions ask about incidents that occurred without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement.

G8.⁴⁹ Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving penetration or oral sex without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement? Examples include someone:

- initiating sexual activity despite your refusal
- ignoring your cues to stop or slow down
- went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding
- otherwise failed to obtain your consent

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

⁴⁹Incorporate affirmative consent as a tactic from the AAU and COFHE schools affirmative consent policies.

G9.⁵⁰ Since you have been a student at [University], has someone kissed or sexually touched you without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement? Examples include:

- initiating sexual activity despite your refusal
- ignoring your cues to stop or slow down
- went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding
- otherwise failed to obtain your consent

Yes [GO TO Attachment 1]

No

BOX G1

ONCE THE ENTIRE G SECTION (G1-G9) HAS BEEN ANSWERED THEN DO

IF ANY OF G1-G9 = YES THEN GO TO ATTACHMENT 2

ELSE GO TO BOX H0

⁵⁰Ibid.

SECTION H – SEXUAL MISCONDUCT PREVENTION TRAINING⁵¹

BOX H0

ADMINISTER SECTION H ONLY IF A6=2014 or 2015

ELSE SKIP TO I1.

H1. Think back to the orientation when you first came to [University]. Did that orientation include a training or information session about sexual assault or sexual misconduct?

Yes

No **[GO TO I1]**

I didn't attend orientation **[GO TO I1]**

I don't remember **[GO TO I1]**

[IF BLANK THEN [IF BLANK THEN GO TO I1]

H2. Overall, how useful was this session?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

⁵¹Modified from White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault. (2014). Not Alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from sexual assault. Retrieved from <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/ovw-climate-survey.pdf>.

SECTION I – PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONSES TO REPORTING⁵²⁵³

The following are statements about what might happen if someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University]. Please use the scale provided to indicate how likely you think each scenario is.

- 11. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that students would support the person making the report?**

Not at all
A little
Somewhat
Very
Extremely

- 12. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that the alleged offender(s) or their associates would retaliate against the person making the report?**

Not at all
A little
Somewhat
Very
Extremely

- 13. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would take the report seriously?**

Not at all
A little
Somewhat
Very
Extremely

⁵²ibid.

⁵³Modified from McMahon, S. (2014). #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey. New Brunswick, NJ: Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Retrieved from http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/Libraries/VAWC/new_doc_to_upload_for_ispeak.sflb.ashx.

14. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would protect the safety of the person making the report?

- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very
 - Extremely
-

15. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would conduct a fair investigation?

- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very
 - Extremely
-

16. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would take action against the offender(s)?

- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very
 - Extremely
-

17. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct?

- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very
 - Extremely
-

SECTION J - BYSTANDER BEHAVIOR⁵⁴⁵⁵

The next questions are about situations you may have seen or been in since you have been a student at [University]

J1. Since you have been a student at [University] have you suspected that a friend had been sexually assaulted.

Yes [CONTINUE]

No [GO TO J3]

[IF BLANK GO TO J3]

J2. Thinking about the last time this happened, what did you do?

Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do

Did nothing for another reason

Spoke to my friend or someone else to seek help

Took action in another way

J3 Since you have been a student at [University] have you seen a drunk person heading off for what looked like a sexual encounter?

Yes [CONTINUE]

No [GO TO J5]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO J5]

J4. Thinking about the last time this happened, what did you do?

Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do

Did nothing for another reason

Directly intervened to stop it

Spoke to someone else to seek help

Took action in another way

⁵⁴Modified from Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A.C., and Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works?: Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence, 4*(1), 101-115.

⁵⁵McMahon, S. (2014). #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey. New Brunswick, NJ: Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Retrieved from http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/Libraries/VAWC/new_doc_to_upload_for_ispeak.sflb.ashx

- J5. Since you have been a student at [University] have you seen or heard someone was acting in a sexually violent or harassing way?**
Yes [CONTINUE]
No [GO TO K1]
[IF BLANK THEN GO TO K1]
-

- J6. Thinking about the last time this happened, what did you do?**
Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do
Did nothing for another reason
Directly intervened to stop it
Spoke to someone else to seek help
Took action in another way
-

SECTION K - DEBRIEFING ITEM

The next question asks for your opinion about this survey.

K1. How difficult were the questions to understand?

- Not at all
 - A little
 - Somewhat
 - Very
 - Extremely
-

ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION G1: IMMEDIATE FOLLOWUPS

BOX G1_1

IF G[X]=Yes THEN CONTINUE TO G[X]a

ELSE SKIP TO NEXT ITEM IN SECTION G

G[X]a⁵⁶. Since you have been a student at [University], how many times has this happened?

1. 1 time
2. 2 times
3. 3 times
4. 4 or more times

BOX G1_2

ADMINISTER G1B AND G1C FOR EACH INCIDENT REPORTED IN G1A, UP TO 4 TIMES
IF G1A IS BLANK THEN ADMINISTER G1B AND G1C ONCE

You said that the following occurred (1/2/3/4 or more) time(s):

- [INCIDENT SUMMARY]

G[X]b. When did (this/the (second/third/fourth) most recent) incident (of this type) occur?

1. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term [GO TO NEXT BOX]
2. Prior to the fall 2014 term [GO TO G1c]
[IF BLANK GO TO BOX G1_2]

G[X]c. [IF G1b = 2] In what school year did it occur?

1. Fall 2013 to Summer 2014
2. Fall 2012 to Summer 2013
3. Fall 2011 to Summer 2012
4. Prior to Fall of 2011
5. It occurred before I was a student at [University][GO TO BOX G1_2]
[IF BLANK GO TO BOX G1_2]

⁵⁶Modified from Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., and White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(4), 357-370.

BOX G1_3

IF TIME PERIOD REPORTED IN G[X]B AND G[X]C IS THE SAME AS TIME PERIOD REPORTED IN PREVIOUS G ITEM FOLLOW-UP, THEN GO TO G[X]D

ELSE RETURN TO G[X]B FOR NEXT INCIDENT REPORTED IN G[X]A

IF NO MORE INCIDENTS THEN GO TO NEXT G ITEM

G[X]d. Was this part of (the other incident/any of the other incidents) you reported as occurring (during the) (Time period) (school year)?

1. Yes [GO TO G2e]
 2. No [GO TO NEXT BOX]
[IF BLANK THEN GO TO NEXT BOX]
-

**G[X]e. [IF G[X]d = Yes] Was it part of any of the following incidents you reported earlier?
[LIST PRIOR ANSWERS THAT OCCURRED DURING SAME TIME PERIOD]**

1. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G1 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex involving physical force or threats of physical force
 2. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G2 TIME PERIOD] Attempted but not successful penetration or oral sex involving physical force or threats of physical force
 3. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G3 TIME PERIOD] Sexual touching involving physical force or threats of physical force
 4. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G4 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex when you were unable to consent or unable to stop what was happening
 5. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G5 TIME PERIOD] Sexual touching when you were unable to consent or unable to stop what was happening
 6. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G6 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex when you were coerced by threats of serious non-physical harm or promised rewards
 7. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G7 TIME PERIOD] Sexual touching when you were coerced by threats of serious non-physical harm or promised rewards
 8. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G8 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex without your active ongoing consent

 9. None of the above
-

BOX G1_4

IF G[X]A = "4 or more times" AND ALL G[X]C="since fall 2014" THEN CONTINUE TO G[X]F

ELSE RETURN TO G[X]B FOR NEXT INCIDENT REPORTED IN G[X]A

IF NO MORE INCIDENTS THEN GO TO NEXT G ITEM

G2f. You said that this happened other times as well. Did any of these other incidents also occur since the beginning for the fall 2014 term?

Yes

No

Section GA – Detailed Incident Form (DIF) for G1-G5

BOX GA0

IF ALL ITEMS G1 – G5 = “NO” THEN SKIP TO BOX GC0
ELSE CONTINUE TO BOX GA1

BOX GA1

Section GA administered UP TO 2 TIMES based on incidents reported in items G1-G5

The FIRST DIF will reference the MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The SECOND DIF will reference the SECOND MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The following are the 4 INCIDENT TYPES reported in G1-G5, (listed from most serious to least serious):

GA Type 1: G1 and/or G2 (Forcible rape and/or Attempted forcible rape)

GA Type 2: G4 (Rape by incapacitation)

GA Type 3: G3 (Forcible sexual touching)

GA Type 4: G5 (Sexual touching by incapacitation)

You said that the following happened to you since you have been a student at [University]:

- [SUMMARY OF REFERENCE INCIDENT(S)]

The next questions ask about what happened (when/during any of the times) this happened to you since you have been a student at [University].

GA1. (In total, across all of these incidents) (How/how) many people did this to you?

1 person [GO TO GA2a]

2 persons [SKIP TO GA2b]

3 or more persons [SKIP TO GA2b]

[IF BLANK SKIP TO GA2b]

⁵⁷Modified from Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., and Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

⁵⁸Modified from the 2012-2013 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)

GA2a. [IF 1 PERSON] Was the person that did this to you ...

Male

Female

Other gender identity

Don't know

[FOR ANY RESPONSE OR IF BLANK SKIP TO GA3]

GA2b⁵⁹. [IF >1 PERSON] Were any of the people that did this to you...

Male

Yes

No

Don't Know

Female

Yes

No

Don't Know

Other gender identity

Yes

No

Don't Know

GA2c. What type of nonconsensual or unwanted behavior occurred during (this incident/any of these incidents)? (Mark all that apply)

Penis, fingers or objects inside someone's vagina or anus

Mouth or tongue makes contact with another's genitals

Kissed

• Touched breast, chest, crotch, groin or buttocks

Grabbed, groped or rubbed in a sexual way

Other

GA3. How (is the person/ are the persons) who did this to you associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Student

Faculty or instructor

Coach or trainer

Other staff or administrator

Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)

The person was not affiliated with [University]

Don't know association with [University]

⁵⁹Modified from Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., and White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(4), 357-370.

GA4. At the time of (this event/ these events), what (was the person's /were these persons') relationship to you? (Mark all that apply)

- At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with
Someone I had been involved or was intimate with
Teacher or advisor
Co-worker, boss or supervisor
Friend or acquaintance
Stranger
Other
Don't know
-

GA5. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents), (was/were) (the person/any of the persons) who did this to you drinking alcohol?

- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
-

GA6. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents), (was/were) (the person/any of the persons) who did this to you using drugs?

- Yes
 - No
 - Don't know
-

GA7. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents) were you drinking alcohol? Keep in mind that you are in no way responsible for what occurred, even if you had been drinking?

- Yes
- No

GA8. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents) did you voluntarily take any drugs? Keep in mind that you are in no way responsible for what occurred, even if you had been on drugs.

- Yes
 - No
-

GA9. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents), had you been given alcohol or another drug without your knowledge or consent?

- Yes, I am certain
 - I suspect, but I am not certain
 - No
 - Don't know
-

BOX GA2

IF GA7="YES" or GA8="YES" or GA9 = "YES" or "I SUSPECT", THEN CONTINUE TO GA10.
OTHERWISE SKIP TO BOX GA3

GA10. Were you passed out for all or parts of (this incident/any of these incidents)?

- Yes
 - No
 - Not sure
-

BOX GA3

IF MORE THAN ONE INCIDENT IN G[X]A OR IF DK NUMBER OF TIMES
THEN SKIP TO GA11b
OTHERWISE CONTINUE TO GA11a

GA11a. [IF G[X]A=1 TIME] Did this incident occur during an academic break or recess?

- Yes
 - No
-

GA11b. [IF G[X]A>1 TIME] How many of these incidents occurred during an academic break or recess?

- None
 - Some
 - All
-

GA12. Did (this incident/any of these incidents) occur on campus or on university affiliated off-campus property?

Yes [CONTINUE TO GA13a]

No [SKIP TO GA13b]

[IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GA13b]

GA13a. [IF GA12=Yes] Where did (this incident/these incidents) occur? (Mark all that apply)

- University residence hall/dorm
- Fraternity or Sorority house
- Other space used by a single-sex student social organization
- Other residential housing
- Non-residential building
- Other property (ex. outdoors)

[FOR ANY RESPONSE OR IF BLANK SKIP TO GA14]

GA13b. [IF GA12=No] Where did this (incident/these incidents) occur? (Mark all that apply)

- Private residence
 - Fraternity or Sorority house
 - Other space used by a single-sex student social organization
 - Restaurant, bar or club
 - Other social venue
 - Outdoor or recreational space
 - Some other place
-

GA14. Did any of the following happen to you from (this experience/any of these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

Physically injured, [CONTINUE TO GA14a]

Contracted a sexually transmitted disease [SKIP TO GA15]

Became pregnant [SKIP TO GA15]

None of the above [SKIP TO GA15]

[IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GA15]

GA14a. What sort of injury or injuries did you sustain (Mark all that apply)

- Bruises, black-eye, cuts, scratches or swelling
 - Chipped or knocked out teeth
 - Broken bones
 - Internal injury from the sexual contact (ex., vaginal or anal tearing)
 - Other injuries
-

GA15. Did you experience any of the following as a result of (the incident/any of the incidents)? (Mark all that apply)

- Difficulty concentrating on studies, assignments or exams
 - Fearfulness or being concerned about safety
 - Loss of interest in daily activities, or feelings of helplessness and hopelessness
 - Nightmares or trouble sleeping
 - Feeling numb or detached
 - Headaches or stomach aches
 - Eating problems or disorders
 - Increased drug or alcohol use
 - None of the above
-

GA16. Have you ever contacted any of the following about (this experience/these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

- [UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]
 - None of the above [\[GO TO GA17\]](#)
 - [\[IF NO PROGRAMS MARKED GO TO GA17\]](#)
-

BOX GA4

IF NO PROGRAM MARKED, GO TO GA17
ELSE ASK GA16a-GA16f FOR THE FIRST 4 PROGRAMS SELECTED IN GA16

GA16a. When did you most recently contact [Program] about this experience?

Fall of 2014 – present [CONTINUE TO GA16b]

Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014 [SKIP TO BOX GA4B]

Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013 [SKIP TO BOX GA4B]

Prior to Fall 2012 [SKIP TO BOX GA4B]

[IF BLANK THEN CONTINUE TO GA16b]

GA16b. How useful was [Program] in helping you?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

GA16c. At any time did you feel pressure from [Program] on whether or not to proceed with further reporting or adjudication?

Yes

No [SKIP TO GA16e]

[IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GA16e]

GA16d. [IF GA16C=Yes] What type of pressure?

To proceed with further reporting or adjudication

To not proceed with further reporting or adjudication

How would you rate [Program] on the following criteria?

GA16e. Respecting you

Excellent

Very good

Good

Fair

Poor

GA16f. Helping you understand your options going forward

- Excellent
 - Very good
 - Good
 - Fair
 - Poor
-

BOX GA5

IF GA16 = NO PROGRAMS MARKED, THEN CONTINUE
IF MORE PROGRAMS MARKED THEN RETURN TO BOX GA4
ELSE SKIP TO GA18

GA17. [IF NO PROGRAMS CONTACTED] Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]? (Mark all that apply)

- Did not know where to go or who to tell
 - Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult
 - I did not think anyone would believe me
 - I did not think it was serious enough to report
 - I did not want the person to get into trouble
 - I feared negative social consequences
 - I did not think anything would be done
 - I feared it would not be kept confidential
 - Incident was not on campus or associated with the school
 - Incident did not occur while attending school
 - Other
-

GA18. Which of the following persons, if any, did you (also) tell about this? (Mark all that apply)

- Friend
 - Family member
 - Faculty or instructor
 - Someone else
 - I didn't tell anyone (else)
-

BOX GA6

IF THIS IS THE FIRST DIF FOR SECTION GA AND THERE IS ANOTHER INCIDENT THEN
RETURN TO BOX GA1

ELSE GO TO BOX GC0

Section GC – Detailed Incident Form (DIF) for G6-G9

BOX GC0

IF ALL ITEMS G6 – G9 = “NO” THEN SKIP TO BOX H1
ELSE CONTINUE TO BOX GC1

BOX GC1

Section GC is administered UP TO 2 TIMES based on incidents reported in items G6-G9

The FIRST DIF will reference the MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The SECOND DIF will reference the SECOND MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The following are the 2 INCIDENT TYPES reported in G6-G9, (listed from most serious to least serious):

GC Type 1: G6 and/or G7 (Sex and/or Sexual touching by Coercion)

GC Type 2: G8 and/or G9 (Sex and/or Sexual touching without Affirmative Consent)

You said that the following happened to you since you have been a student at [University]

- [SUMMARY OF REFERENCE INCIDENT(S)]

The next questions ask about what happened (when/during any of the times) this happened to you since you have been a student at [University].

GC1. (In total, across all of these incidents) (H/h)ow many people did this to you?

1 person [GO TO GC2a]

2 persons [GO TO GC2b]

3 or more persons [GO TO GC2b]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO GC2b]

GC2a. [IF 1 PERSON] Was the person that did this to you ...

Male

Female

Other gender identity

Don't know

[FOR ANY RESPONSE OR IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GC2c]

GC2b. [If >1 PERSON] Were any of the people that did this to you...

Male	Yes No	Don't Know
Female	Yes No	Don't Know
Other gender identity	Yes No	Don't Know

GC2c. What type of nonconsensual or unwanted behavior occurred during (this incident/any of these incidents)? (Mark all that apply)

- Penis, fingers or objects inside someone's vagina or anus
 - Mouth or tongue makes contact with another's genitals
 - Kissed
 - Touched breast/chest, crotch/groin or buttocks,
 - Grabbed, groped or rubbed in a sexual way
 - Other
-

GC3. How (is the person/ are the persons) who did this to you associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

- Student
 - Faculty or instructor
 - Coach or trainer
 - Other staff or administrator
 - Other person affiliated with a university program (ex., internship, study abroad)
 - The person was not affiliated with [University]
 - Don't know association with [University]
-

GC4. At the time of (this event/ these events), what (was the person's/were these persons') relationship to you? (Mark all that apply)

- At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with
 - Someone I had been involved or was intimate with
 - Teacher or advisor
 - Co-worker, boss, or supervisor
 - Friend or acquaintance
 - Stranger
 - Other
 - Don't know
-

BOX GC2

IF REFERENCE INCIDENT FOR THIS DIF IS G8 OR G9, THEN GO TO G5

IF THIS IS THE FIRST DIF FOR SECTION GC AND THERE IS ANOTHER INCIDENT THEN RETURN TO BOX GC1

ELSE GO TO BOX H0

GC5. Did the person(s) do any of the following during (this incident/any of these incidents)?

(Mark all that apply)

Initiated sexual activity without checking in with you first or while you were still deciding

Initiated sexual activity despite your refusal

During consensual activity, ignored your verbal cues to stop or slow down

During consensual activity, ignored your nonverbal cues to stop or slow down

Otherwise failed to obtain your active ongoing voluntary agreement

None of the above

Appendix 6. Supplementary Tables

Table A6-1. Percent of graduate and professional students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent since enrolling at university by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=32,185)		Male (n=24,690)		TGQN (n=490)		Decline to State (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	5.1	0.1	8.3	0.2	2.1	0.1	15.3	1.8	6.0	1.1
Penetration	2.0	0.1	3.2	0.1	0.8	0.1	7.8	1.2	1.5	0.5
Sexual Touching	3.9	0.1	6.4	0.2	1.6	0.1	10.8	1.6	5.0	1.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	5.4	0.1	8.8	0.2	2.2	0.1	15.5	1.8	6.0	1.1
Penetration	2.3	0.1	3.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	8.3	1.2	2.1	0.5
Sexual Touching	3.9	0.1	6.4	0.2	1.6	0.1	10.8	1.6	5.0	1.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using physical force	5.5	0.1	8.9	0.2	2.3	0.1	16.6	1.9	6.0	1.1
Penetration	2.4	0.1	4.0	0.1	1.0	0.1	8.8	1.3	2.2	0.5
Sexual Touching	4.0	0.1	6.5	0.2	1.7	0.1	11.9	1.7	5.0	1.0
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using physical force	7.4	0.1	11.9	0.2	3.2	0.1	21.0	2.0	6.6	1.1
Penetration	3.4	0.1	5.5	0.2	1.4	0.1	12.0	1.6	2.4	0.6
Sexual Touching	5.5	0.1	8.9	0.2	2.4	0.1	14.8	1.7	5.4	1.1

¹ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table A6-2. Percent of students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=87,737)		Male (n=60,085)		TGQN (n=1,398)		Decline to State (n=852)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	6.2	0.1	9.8	0.1	2.4	0.1	11.6	1.0	5.9	0.7
Penetration	1.9	0.0	3.0	0.1	0.8	0.0	4.9	0.6	1.7	0.4
Sexual Touching	5.0	0.1	8.1	0.1	1.9	0.1	8.4	0.9	4.4	0.6
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	6.5	0.1	10.3	0.1	2.5	0.1	12.2	1.2	5.9	0.7
Penetration	2.4	0.0	3.8	0.1	0.9	0.0	5.9	0.7	2.0	0.4
Sexual Touching	5.0	0.1	8.1	0.1	1.9	0.1	8.4	0.9	4.4	0.6
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	6.6	0.1	10.4	0.1	2.6	0.1	12.4	1.2	5.9	0.7
Penetration	2.5	0.0	3.9	0.1	1.0	0.0	6.1	0.7	2.1	0.4
Sexual Touching	5.1	0.1	8.2	0.1	2.0	0.1	8.7	0.9	4.5	0.6
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	8.6	0.1	13.5	0.1	3.5	0.1	16.9	1.3	7.7	0.9
Penetration	3.4	0.1	5.4	0.1	1.3	0.1	8.4	0.8	3.1	0.6
Sexual Touching	6.6	0.1	10.6	0.1	2.6	0.1	12.0	1.0	6.1	0.8

¹ TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table A6-3. Percent of graduate and professional students experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=32,185)		Male (n=24,690)		TGQN (n=490)		Decline to State (n=401)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	2.1	0.1	3.2	0.1	1.0	0.1	8.9	1.5	3.0	0.7
Penetration	0.7	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	4.2	1.1	0.7	0.3
Sexual Touching	1.7	0.1	2.6	0.1	0.8	0.1	6.1	1.1	2.5	0.6
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	2.2	0.1	3.4	0.1	1.1	0.1	8.9	1.5	3.0	0.7
Penetration	0.8	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.4	0.0	4.5	1.1	0.8	0.4
Sexual Touching	1.7	0.1	2.6	0.1	0.8	0.1	6.1	1.1	2.5	0.6
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	2.3	0.1	3.5	0.1	1.2	0.1	9.6	1.6	3.0	0.7
Penetration	0.9	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.5	0.1	4.9	1.2	1.0	0.4
Sexual Touching	1.7	0.1	2.6	0.1	0.9	0.1	6.6	1.2	2.5	0.6
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	3.4	0.1	5.2	0.1	1.6	0.1	12.1	1.8	3.2	0.7
Penetration	1.3	0.0	2.0	0.1	0.7	0.1	6.7	1.3	1.0	0.4
Sexual Touching	2.5	0.1	3.9	0.1	1.2	0.1	8.2	1.2	2.8	0.6

¹TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table A6-4. Percent of seniors experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force, incapacitation, coercion and absence of affirmative consent for current year by tactic and gender¹

Survey Item Response	Total		Female (n=16,979)		Male (n=10,998)		TGQN (n=289)		Decline to State (n=156)	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation	6.8	0.1	10.5	0.2	2.8	0.1	12.2	2.7	6.7	1.6
Penetration	2.1	0.1	3.1	0.1	1.0	0.1	4.1	1.0	2.1	0.9
Sexual Touching	5.6	0.1	8.8	0.2	2.1	0.1	9.7	2.6	5.3	1.5
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	7.2	0.1	11.1	0.2	3.0	0.1	13.0	2.7	6.7	1.6
Penetration	2.6	0.1	3.9	0.2	1.2	0.1	5.5	1.3	2.7	1.0
Sexual Touching	5.6	0.1	8.8	0.2	2.1	0.1	9.7	2.6	5.3	1.5
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	7.2	0.1	11.1	0.2	3.1	0.1	13.0	2.7	6.7	1.6
Penetration	2.7	0.1	4.0	0.2	1.3	0.1	5.5	1.3	2.7	1.0
Sexual Touching	5.6	0.1	8.8	0.2	2.2	0.1	9.7	2.6	5.3	1.5
Completed using Physical Force or Incapacitation or Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent; Attempted Penetration using Physical Force	9.6	0.2	14.5	0.3	4.3	0.2	20.2	2.9	10.1	2.3
Penetration	3.9	0.1	5.8	0.2	1.7	0.1	8.5	1.6	5.3	1.8
Sexual Touching	7.3	0.2	11.2	0.3	3.1	0.2	14.4	2.8	7.9	2.1

¹TGQN = Transgender woman, Transgender man, Genderqueer, gender non-conforming, questioning, not listed.

Table A6-5. Number of times female experienced nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by type of behavior and enrollment status^{1,2,3}

Survey Item Response	Total		Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Current School Year - Penetration or Sexual Touching						
Number of times						
0 times	81.1	0.1	76.9	0.2	91.2	0.2
1 time	7.2	0.1	8.4	0.1	4.2	0.1
2 times	4.5	0.1	5.6	0.1	2.0	0.1
3 times	2.6	0.1	3.2	0.1	1.0	0.1
4 or more times	4.6	0.1	5.9	0.1	1.6	0.1
Current School Year - Penetration						
Number of times						
0 times	91.2	0.1	89.2	0.2	96.1	0.1
1 time	5.0	0.1	6.1	0.1	2.5	0.1
2 times	2.0	0.1	2.5	0.1	0.7	0.1
3 times	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.3	0.0
4 or more times	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.4	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact that was: a) completed by physical force or threat of physical force; b) attempted but not completed by physical force or threat of physical force or c) by incapacitation.

³ Estimates for since entering college.

Table A6-6. Number of times male experienced nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by type of behavior and enrollment status^{1,2,3}

Survey Item Response	Total		Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Current School Year - Penetration or Sexual Touching						
Number of times						
0 times	95.7	0.1	94.6	0.1	97.8	0.1
1 time	2.0	0.1	2.5	0.1	1.0	0.1
2 times	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.1	0.5	0.0
3 times	0.5	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.1
4 or more times	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.5	0.1
Current School Year - Penetration						
Number of times						
0 times	98.3	0.1	97.8	0.1	99.1	0.1
1 time	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.1	0.5	0.1
2 times	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.0
3 times	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0
4 or more times	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact that was: a) completed by physical force or threat of physical force; b) attempted but not completed by physical force or threat of physical force or c) by incapacitation.

³ Estimates for since entering college.

Table A6-7. Number of times those identifying as TGQN experienced nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation by type of behavior and enrollment status^{1,2,3}

Survey Item Response	Total		Undergraduate		Graduate or Professional	
	%	StdErr	%	StdErr	%	StdErr
Current School Year - Penetration or Sexual Touching						
Number of times						
0 times	78.5	1.3	75.9	1.6	84.5	1.8
1 time	7.1	0.6	7.8	0.9	5.3	0.9
2 times	5.1	0.7	5.8	0.8	3.4	1.0
3 times	2.9	0.3	3.8	0.5	S	S
4 or more times	6.5	0.9	6.8	1.1	5.7	1.2
Current School Year - Penetration						
Number of times						
0 times	88.8	0.8	87.6	0.9	91.7	1.2
1 time	5.2	0.5	5.7	0.7	3.8	0.7
2 times	2.2	0.5	2.6	0.5	1.2	0.7
3 times	1.7	0.3	1.9	0.4	S	S
4 or more times	2.1	0.3	2.1	0.4	2.2	0.8

S = Cell Suppressed

¹ Per 100 students.

² Includes contact that was: a) completed by physical force or threat of physical force; b) attempted but not completed by physical force or threat of physical force or c) by incapacitation.

³ Estimates for since entering college.