Theses and Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2015

Sexual Assault Among College Students: An Examination of Demographic, Contextual, and Behavioral Factors

Sarah A. Rogers

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td

Sexual assault among college students: an examination of demographic, contextual, and

behavioral factors

By

Sarah A. Rogers

A Document Type.
Submitted to the Faculty of
Mississippi State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Science
in Sociology
in the Department of Sociology

Mississippi State, Mississippi

December 2015

Sexual assault among college students: an examination of demographic, contextual, and

behavioral factors

By

Sarah A. Rogers

Approved:

_____
Nicole E. Rader
(Major Professor)

_____
Stacy H. Haynes
(Committee Member/Graduate Coordinator)

_____
Kimberly C. Kelly
(Committee Member)

_____
R. Gregory Dunaway
Dean
College of Arts & Sciences

Name: Sarah A. Rogers

Date of Degree: December 11, 2015

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Sociology

Select Appropriate Title: Nicole E. Rader

Title of Study: Sexual assault among college students: an examination of demographic, contextual, and behavioral factors

Pages in Study 91

Candidate for Degree of Master of Science

Although studies examining sexual assault among college students are vast, the literature is somewhat lacking in discussions of contextualized sexual assault predictors and their relationship with sexual assault prevention. The purpose of this study is to examine whether demographic factors, contextual factors, and behavioral factors effect sexual victimization on college campuses. In this examination, I hope to show that the presence of these factors may be related to sexual victimization; however their existence does not necessitate the use of victim blame. By reviewing sexual assault prevention programming on college and university campuses across the United States, I provide alternate explanations and possible solutions to the sexual victimization of students in higher education. This study used data from the American College Health Association Fall 2011 survey. In addition, a comparison is made to these data from an Executive Summary for Mississippi State University from the Spring 2013 ACHA survey period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Sexual assault is a serious social problem in society today and this is especially the case for women. According to the National Sex Offender Public Registry, about 20 million women (about 18 percent) in the United States will be raped during their lifetime, and approximately 91% of sexual assault victims are women (Bureau of Justice Statistics 2013). Therefore, women make up a sizable portion of sexual assault victims. In addition to the amount of women who are victimized, research has established that women are often blamed for their victimization because of society's reliance on rape myths (Bohner et al. 2009; Burt 1980; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). Rape myths were first defined by Burt (1980) as "prejudicial, stereotyped or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists" (217). Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) later revised this definition by saying "attitudes and beliefs that are generally false, yet widely held, and that serve to justify male sexual violence against women" (134). Sexual assault is most common among young adults (BJS 1995), and approximately one-quarter of this age group is currently attending a college or university (U.S. Census Bureau 1996). According to the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the estimated percentage of completed or attempted rape victimization among women in higher educational institutions may be between 20% and 25% over the course of a college career, or that one out of every four college women will be raped (Koss, et al. 1987).

1

For these reasons, existing feminist literature examines the relationship between rape myths, victim blame, and the sexual victimization of college women, as well as how this relationship affects sexual assault prevention programming on the college campus (Choate 2003; Davis and Liddell 2002; Foubert 2000). This literature suggests that rape myths and victim blame are tied to traditional gender roles, sexual aggression, and a rape culture that is often supported by university policies that protect groups on campus who generate money and prestige (i.e., male athletic teams and fraternities; Giroux and Giroux 2002; Neimark 1993). Gender scholars in criminology have argued that rather than focusing on women's accountability concerning their victimization, both the role of men (as offenders and bystanders) as well as the inequality of women in society should be considered when trying to understand sexual victimization.

In general, feminist criminology directly contrasts more traditional criminological literature that has exclusively focused on what women do that may lead to sexual assault victimization (i.e., drinking, taking drugs, being alone, and examining victim's sexual history). This more traditional literature tends to emphasize what women could have done differently to prevent victimization or what future victims can do to prevent future victimization. The sexual victimization research, then, is often bifurcated, with researchers focusing either on more "traditional risk factors" (women's behavior that may lead to sexual victimization) or on society's role in sexual victimization (often targeting programming or policies or lack thereof for women and/or developing programming for men on sexual assault prevention). In this study, I hope to examine all elements of this debate by analyzing various factors that predict sexual victimization on college campuses and couching these findings in a gendered framework.

In this thesis, then, I use the American College Health Association (ACHA) data set (a sample of 27,774 students from 44 colleges or universities across the country). This is an ideal data set for this thesis because of its use of a college sample (a population in which sexual victimization occurs more often) and because this survey asks several questions about sexual behaviors, alcohol and drug use, violence prevention programming, and school demographics. I answer several research questions in this thesis, do "traditional risk factors" actually predict sexual victimization among college or university students? And if so, are they greater predictors of victimization than demographic or contextual factors? Finally, do these predictors differ for male and female sexual assault victims?

Using data from the ACHA data set I first examine several sets of factors including demographic factors (i.e., gender, race, marital status, sexual identity, age, year in school, relationship status) and behavioral factors (i.e., several traditional risk factors in addition to variables that could be categorized as such), which include alcohol use, marijuana use, other drug use, number of sexual partners, Greek membership, GPA, and varsity athlete status). Doing so allows me to consider the more "traditional risk factors" of sexual assault in order to determine if these are significant in this data set. However, I also examine some factors that are not found as often in the typical literature—contextual factors—to see if these factors provide a better explanation of sexual victimization. The contextual factors presented in this thesis include the following: campus size, community size, campus vs. off-campus residence, region, school type—public or private; the perception of alcohol use by the typical student, the perception of marijuana use by the typical student, and perception of other drug use by the typical student, if the respondent

3

received information regarding alcohol and drug use and abuse, received information regarding sexual assault prevention, or received information regarding violence prevention; and finally, respondents who would like to receive information regarding alcohol/drug use, sexual assault prevention, and violence prevention are considered as a contextual factor.

Because the ideas of social change and progress are ingrained in feminist scholarship, this thesis not only considers if traditional factors, contextual factors, or behavioral factors predict sexual assault but also uses a feminist lens to make sense of these findings. It does so by framing the argument of the occurrence of sexual assault from a structural perspective, one that often blames women in society for sexual assault victimization. This thesis also takes a serious look at the role of policies and programming in sexual assault prevention efforts. Most prevention programming provided at college and universities are targeted toward women who should avoid "traditional risk factors" in order to prevent their own sexual victimization. However, there are successful programs directed toward men athletes and members of sororities and fraternities that have been implemented in various regions of the U.S. I suggest that the latter programs be practiced across the country, especially in the South where college sports (especially football) and membership in the Greek system are widespread (as well as a culture of violence (Cohen and Nisbett 1994; DeBard and Sacks 2010). To illustrate these claims, I include an executive summary of ACHA data that includes only findings from Mississippi State University (a large, public university in the Southern region of the United States, who also has a top 25 football program and a large Greek membership) and I tie my discussion back to both policy and gendered theory.

4

I answer my research questions by testing several hypotheses using logistic regression models. Doing so will allow me to use all factors (demographic, contextual, and behavioral) that predict sexual victimization for both men and women to discuss appropriate policy and programming strategies on the college campus. With these things in mind, I will use logistic regression to test the following hypotheses:

(1) Because students who live on campus are more likely to be sexually assaulted and because campus size and community size surrounding campuses are related to violence on college and university campuses in the U.S. (Banyard 2011; Fisher, Daigle, and Cullen 2010; Wechsler and Nelson 2008; Jennings, Gover, and Pudrzynska 2008), *contextual factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization than *behavioral factors*.

(2) Because younger, single women in college are more likely to be sexually assaulted than any other group in college (Fisher, et al. 2010), *demographic factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization than *behavioral factors*.

(3) Because women are held more accountable for their victimization by society, *behavioral factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization for women than for men.

(4) Because men are held less accountable for their victimization than women are by society, *contextual factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization for men than for women.

This thesis will proceed in the following ways. I will first review the literature in three primary sections. First, I will discuss sexual assault among college or university

5

students, paying particular attention to the rape culture and "traditional risk factors." Second, I will review the theoretical literature that will help guide my project, namely the gender literature in criminology and the social construction literature. Third, because of my emphasis on appropriate programming based on factors that predict sexual victimization, I will review both traditional and feminist oriented sexual victimization policies on college campuses. Next, I will provide information on my methodology, the data set I am using, my variables of interest, my hypotheses, and the limitations of this data set. I then proceed to findings, where I discuss my logistic regression models, my hypotheses, and my key findings. I will then conclude with my discussion and policy implications.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sexual Assault among College and University Students

Background on Sexual Assault in Society

According to the National Sex Offender Public Registry, about 20 million women (about 18 percent) in the United States will be raped during their lifetime. Although sexual assault occurs throughout the lifespan, it is most common in late adolescence and early adulthood (BJS 1995); approximately one-quarter of this age group is currently attending a college or university (U.S. Census Bureau 1996). Other demographic characteristics are also important. As stated above, women are much more likely than men to be victims of sexual assault (BJS 2013). In addition, women who have never been married or who are divorced or separated have higher rates of victimization than married women do; Black women have a higher rate of victimization than White women or Hispanic/Latina women; and as age increases, the rate of victimization decreases (BJS 2013). Further, in terms of location of victimization, from 2005-10, 12 percent of rape or sexual assault victimizations against females occurred while the victim was working, and 7 percent occurred while the victim was attending school. Another 29 percent of sexual violence occurred while the victim went to or from work or school, was out shopping, or was engaged in leisure activities away from the home (bjs.gov 2013). Therefore, it is not

only women who are likely to be victims of sexual assault but certain groups of women under certain circumstances.

Sexual Assault among College Students

Researchers have assessed the nature, frequency, and prevalence of sexual assault on college campuses (Bohmer 1993; Fisher, Cullen, and Turner 2000; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, and Martin 2007). In 2006 alone, 300,000 college women (about 5.2 percent) were raped. Of those rapes, about 12 percent were reported to law enforcement. In a study conducted by Fisher, Cullen, and Turner in 2000 in conjunction with the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, it was estimated that the percentage of completed or attempted rape victimization among women in higher educational institutions may be between 20% and 25% over the course of a college career, or that one out of every four college women will be raped. There are several other known factors concerning sexual assault victims on college campuses. For example, research has shown that 9 in 10 sexual assault victims on college campuses knew their offender (Fisher et al. 2000). In addition, students living in a sorority house (three times more at risk) or on-campus dormitories (1.4 times more at risk) were more likely to be sexually assaulted than students living off-campus (Fisher et al. 2000). All of these studies suggest that students in college are at an increased risk of sexual victimization perpetrated on campus by assailants they know.

Finally, the Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) study funded by the National Institute of Justice found that freshmen and sophomores are at greater risk for victimization than juniors and seniors (which reflects findings showing a decrease in victimization with an increase in age); eighteen percent experienced an attempted (13%) and/or completed

8

(13%) sexual assault since entering college; and among the total sample, 5% experienced a completed physically forced sexual assault, but a much higher percentage (11%) experienced a completed incapacitated sexual assault (Krebs et al. 2007).

Because statistics are not widely available on sexual assault offenders in college, I discuss general statistics of sexual assault offenders in order to suggest successful violence prevention programming aimed at potential offenders among college or university students. More than one in five men report "becoming so sexually aroused that they could not stop themselves from having sex, even though the woman did not consent." An alarming statistic showing that 35 percent of men report at least some degree of likelihood of raping if they could be assured they would not be caught or punished, illustrating the need for sexual assault prevention programming on college campuses targeted toward men in hopes of reducing rape-supportive beliefs. In addition to the above statistic, first-year students in college tend to believe more rape myths than seniors, which is why mandatory programming upon entering college could be a helpful programming strategy. Lastly, eight percent of men admit committing acts that meet the legal definition of rape or attempted rape—of these men who committed rape, 84% said that what they did was "definitely not rape" (oneinfourusa.org 2014).

The Rape Culture

Research indicates that universities may knowingly or unknowingly support a rape culture. A rape culture is a set of values and beliefs that provide an environment conducive to rape and sexual assault (Boswell and Spade 1996; Burt 1980; Herman 1989). These values and beliefs can be learned through primary socialization or secondary socialization (e.g., peer group in college). Given the prevailing cultural myths

in regards to women—alcohol and sexuality—men may use drinking as an excuse for various misbehaviors (Johnson and Stahl 2004). Research shows that men are overwhelmingly more likely to be perpetrators of rape and sexual assault than women and educating men on what constitutes rape and the ramifications of rape for victims may decrease the amount of men who participate in the rape culture (Bannon, Brosi, and Foubert 2013; Banyard, Plante, and Moynihan 2004; Boswell and Spade 1996). This is especially important because researchers have found that certain male groups encourage and project stereotypical masculine images (e.g., aggressive, competitive, experienced, strong, sexually forceful, and rebellious) which may condone if not encourage sexual assault, and that sexual hostility is perhaps learned in destructive environments such as fraternities (Boswell and Spade 1996; Boeringer, Shehan, and Akers 1991).

On college campuses, organizations such as fraternities and athletics have been found to demonstrate a rape culture. In fact, several studies have shown that sexual victimization is more likely to occur at a fraternity house or a function sponsored by a fraternity than elsewhere on campus; male offenders are more likely to be a member of the Greek system and/or a member of an athletic team on campus (Boswell and Spade 1996; Katz 1995; Kalof and Cargill 1991; Martin and Hummer 1989). Within these outlets, men are able to exert their dominance over women through sexual assaults. An increased display of rigid, stereotypical masculinity can lead to an overwhelming need among fraternity members to convince their fellow brothers of their masculinity (Martin and Hummer 1989; Harris 2010). For example, recently there was a letter sent out by a fraternity member at Georgia Tech University to his fraternity brothers about how to have sex with women they meet at parties. It is signed, "In luring rape bait." This letter

instructs fraternity members how to dance with women (i.e., "grab them on the hips with your 2 hands and then let them grind against your [male genitalia]," or "always use your hands or arms to guide their dancing in order to maximize your pleasure"), always give girls drinks…"if anything ever fails, go get more alcohol," and calls any member or pledge of the fraternity who isn't "succeed[ing] at parties," "chods" (WSB-TV, 2013). In an environment where young, male college students are shamed for not engaging in misogynistic, sexist behavior, it is not unbelievable that sexual assaults are occurring so often among college and university students.

Other Elements that Increase Sexual Victimization on Campus

There are several factors that could lead to the increase of sexual victimization among college and university students. The first of these is peer pressure. Peer pressure is an important part of a college rape culture (Choate 2003, Melnick 1992; Jackson, Gilliland, and Veneziano 2006). Members of peer groups are influenced by each other. According to Akers, sexual aggression is more likely when individuals are engaged with others that portray similar behavior or anticipate that the individual's group of peers will support their deviant behavior. Almost everyone can recall a story they have heard about different hazing rituals men go through in order to pledge a fraternity. In these stories, it is common to hear of men engaging in sexually aggressive behaviors towards women (e.g. having sex with a certain number of women the same weekend and providing proof of the acts). Hazing involving heavy drinking in short periods is among the most common of the rituals (MacLachlan 1999; Owen, Burke, and Vichesky 2008). When looking from the standpoint of offender's guilt (instead of the notion of a victim's blame), it is found

11

that "fraternity men who drink are three times as likely as non-fraternity men who drink to commit assault" (Mustaine & Tewksbury 2002).

The second element is social status and expectations. Being a member of a fraternity or an athlete on a college campus provides a sense of social status and expectations (Sher, Bartholow, and Nanda 2001; Jackson et al. 2006). As Jackson and colleagues point out, if consensual sex is not given to fraternity members and/or athletes, they feel as if they are allowed to take what they perceive is due to them. This ill-conceived notion that women are objects of acquisition and prizes for their merit comes from the embeddedness of a rape-supportive culture in which rape myths are abundant. Being a member of a fraternity or an athlete on a college campus typically means that those men hold an elevated status among the student body. This status, according to Jackson and colleagues creates the idea that they are entitled to and expect sex from women. If consensual sex is not given to them, they feel as if they are allowed to take it. Another way social status is elevated is the notion that coaches "train athletes to be violent or build the perception that the only way to be successful is to be aggressive both on and off the field. Athletes will internalize this idea and exhibit it through their social interaction outside of the arena" (Jackson et al. 2006).

Another important and key element in sexual assault victimization on college campuses is alcohol (Abbey 2002; Berkowitz 1992; Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, and Koss 2004; Ullman, Karabatsos, and Koss 1999). For example, Jackson et al. (2006) found that alcohol and drugs were involved in over half of the sexual assaults on college campuses. This statistic is not surprising considering drinking alcohol is very common among college students. However, one common thread throughout the literature regarding

12

alcohol and sexual victimization on college campuses is the percentage of victims who were drinking alcohol and the percentage of offenders who were also drinking prior to the attack. The statistic showed half of the college campus sexual assaults included both the victim and offender drinking (Abbey 2002; Abbey and McAuslen 2004; Ullman et al. 1999). This is an important example of how academia perpetuates rape myths and victim blame by focusing on behavioral elements of victims.

A final element of sexual victimization on campus can be university support (either knowingly or not) of a rape culture. Some authors have argued that the victimization of women on college campuses is somehow structured by the nature of university policies (Knapp, Rasmussen, and Barnhart 2001; Otto 2009). While university policies will be discussed below, it is important to note that the widely held belief that fraternity members and college athletes are likely to avoid punishment for crimes committed on college campuses "can in essence be viewed as an attempt to hold the university entirely responsible for individual student behavior" (Jackson et al. 2006: 458). In other words, according to Jackson and colleagues (2006), the university is partially at fault for the victimization of women on its campus by being an ineffective guardian and by creating more opportunities for potential offenders.

Traditional Risk Factors and their Consequences

Because of the prevalence of sexual assault among college and university students and the rape-supportive culture that exists in which socially constructed rape myths have become reality, many "traditional risk factors" are often cited as precursors to sexual assault. There is no set list of these risk factors, but they often involve victims' use of alcohol and drugs, sexual promiscuity by victims, and victims' involvement in deviant

13

activities (Burt 1980; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). Most traditional factors are embedded in rape myths. There are many rape myths in society including she asked for it, it wasn't really rape, he didn't mean to, she wanted to, she lied, rape is a trivial event, and rape is a deviant event (Burt 1980). Studies have shown that these factors rarely prevent rape from occurring (Bohner, Eyssel, Pina, Siebler, and Viki 2009; Burt 1980; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). The advice to essentially stay inside "not only asks women to remove themselves voluntarily from the mainstream of public life, it also ignores the fact that none of these measures will be effective for rape by intimates, [which are] the overwhelming majority of rapes committed on college campuses" (Schwartz et al. 2006: 632).

In large part because of the prevalence and acceptance of rape myths, many rape and sexual assault victims believe that they must have done something to deserve their victimization. In one study, over twenty percent of forcible rape victims reported that they were "completely to blame for the event" (i.e., their victimization; Schwartz et al., 2006:630). Put another way, this indicates that 1 in 5 women of forcible rape believe that their victimization was in no part the fault of their attacker. Not only do victims believe they are to blame for their victimization but others in society do as well. Studies have found that people engage in victim blame because it makes them feel better about their own life and chances of victimization (i.e., the Just World Hypothesis). According to Lerner's (1970) hypothesis, "good" people will have positive life experiences and "bad" people with get their "just desserts" (Furnham and Boston 1996; Hammock and Richardson 1993; Haynes and Olson 2006). As Haynes and Olson (2006) note, "Holding

14

this belief gives people a sense of security that they themselves will be exempt from suffering undeserved misfortunes" (665).

The impact of victim blame has several negative consequences; victims are less likely to report victimization, are more likely to have psychological issues because of their victimization, and do not use help seeking avenues like counseling or social support systems (Campbell 2005; Fehler-Cabral, Campbell, and Patterson 2011; Ullman and Filipas 2001). Reporting to police is low for many crimes but sexual assault is a highly underreported crime (Du Mont, Miller, and Myhr 2003; Rennison 2002). Approximately 38 percent of sexual assault victims report their victimization to police and only 5 to 13 percent of college women report their sexual victimization to the police (Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner 2003; Orchowski and Gidycz 2012; Tjaden & Thoennes 2006).

Reporting is particularly unique on college campuses because many universities have a mandatory reporting policy, meaning that if a victim reveals her assault to a university employee, that university employee is required to relay that information to deans of colleges and other figures of power. Unfortunately, that power comes with a responsibility to protect the image of the university. Because of the Clery Act, which states that all colleges and universities are required to disclose information about crime on their campus, victims of sexual assault are sometimes asked not to press charges against their attacker (*New York Times*, April 18, 2013; NBC News.com, 2013).

In one case, a victim of sexual assault in college was asked not to press charges, and told not to see her ex-boyfriend (the offender) or she would be arrested (Huffington Post, February 3, 2014). This type of action from a university is what Bohmer and Parrot (1993) call a "Victim Blamers" approach. Some institutions in this category might say to

15

the victim, 'If you insist upon filing these charges against this man, we will investigate them, but we will also bring *you* up on charges for violating the alcohol policy on campus' (134). This type of statement applies to victims who were drinking at the time of their assault, or just accused of drinking by their assailant or the college or university administration.

In addition to the expected negative response from medical and police personnel, the impact of victim blame also extends to informal support networks, such as friends and family. Victims may find it difficult to talk to friends or family because they may worry about negative reactions if they disclose their victimization to others, perhaps due to victim blame (Ullman and Filipas 2001). Even with this difficulty, though, researchers have found that victims are more likely to report sexual victimization to a friend or family member than to official sources such as police agencies (Orchowski and Gidycz 2012). Therefore, the underlying potential of victim blame may prevent sexual assault victims from reporting victimization to police as well as getting the medical (both physical and mental) attention that they need.

Alcohol Use

Many "traditional risk factors" involve drinking behavior: alcohol use and its availability, binge drinking, playing drinking games, drinking at bars alone, and drinking at fraternity parties. In this section, I will discuss many of these behaviors in relation to sexual assault, specifically how they are cited in the current literature.

Alcohol consumption is commonplace on and around college campuses. Several studies have examined the relationship between alcohol use and sexual assault, but they have produced mixed results in terms of whether women's alcohol use actually predicts

sexual victimization (Basile and Smith 2011). In the existing literature regarding sexual assault among college students and risk factors (specifically alcohol use), most researchers "have not tried to determine if the personality traits of men who commit alcohol-involved sexual assault differ from men who commit sexual assaults that do not involve alcohol" (Abbey et al. 2004); therefore, personality traits, rather than alcohol use, could be the bigger predictor of sexual assault.

Several researchers have revamped Cohen and Felson's (1979) Routine Activities Theory to explain the sexual victimization of women, especially among college students. Cohen and Felson (1979) defined routine activities and lifestyles as recurring formalized activities, which are necessary for individual needs. Daily routines are products of lifestyles that guide individuals through formal settings, interactions, and institutions (Mustaine & Tewksbury 2002). Cohen and Felson argue that the structure of routine activities in everyday life influence criminal opportunity. They believe victimization is more likely when three factors exist together: the presence of likely offenders, the absence of capable guardians, and the availability of suitable targets (Cohen and Felson 1979; Schwartz and Pitts 1995). Several authors have called college campuses "hot spots" where the three criteria of Routine Activities exist for increased victimization converges. Potential/motivated offenders, suitable targets, and lack of capable guardians all coexist on college campuses.

To test how routine activities plays a role in the relationship between alcohol and the victimization of women, one study analyzed the effect of drinking alcohol at bars, attendance at parties, attendance at drink promotions, and participation in drinking games. Although this study by Pino and Johnson-Johns does not address more serious

17

forms of sexual assault (i.e. rape), it does examine unwanted sexual advances, which the authors say can be degrading and psychologically harmful. They, like authors previously mentioned, identify college campuses as settings in which increased opportunities exist for potential offenders.

Pino and Johnson-Johns frame the routine activities approach in a slightly less traditional way indicating that "the strength of the routine activities approach in the instance of sexual coercion is that it emphasizes that motivated male sexual aggressors are searching for situations where they have an advantage or the ability to take the upper hand in victimization" (254). While this may be true, others have argued it is quite a leap to assume that victims of rape and sexual assault have somehow created this advantage for the offenders (Bachman, Paternoster, and Ward 1992; Beauregard and Leclerc 2007). As I will discuss below, many have argued that the patriarchal society in which we live creates an environment that legitimizes the victimization of women. This is especially true in all-male peer groups, such as fraternities.

Other factors involving alcohol have been considered by the literature. Some have found that victimization increases in communities with high levels of alcohol availability. If a college campus is considered a small community, then researchers can posit that high levels of alcohol availability could be accounting for sexual victimization (Mustaine and Tewksbury 2009).

Others have focused on the importance of binge drinking as a predictor of sexual assault victimization. Binge drinking, "commonly defined as consuming five or more drinks at one sitting at least once a week" (Borsari 2004:37-38) , is cited as a major public health problem that *could* contribute to 1400 deaths, 70,000 sexual assaults or

rapes, and 500,000 injuries on college campuses (Capece and Lanza-Kaduce 2013). Not only is five drinks a narrowly constructed parameter of binge drinking, it is unknown how many of the 70,000 sexual assaults occurred after the offender or the victim was binge drinking. Many studies that focus on binge drinking frame binge drinking as the problem of the potential victim of sexual assault, not as precursory measure of the potential offender's behavior.

Additionally, there are several possible explanations as to why there is a potential relationship between binge drinking and sexual assault. First, those who drink heavily probably do so in many situations in which sexual assault is common (i.e., parties and bars; Abbey et al. 2004). Pino and Johnson-Johns (2009) and Abbey et al. (2004) found that men interpret platonic female behaviors as sexual interest after drinking alcohol. Because of their diminished capacity, men can interpret women's actions as seeking consensual sexual activity. Pino and Johnson-Johns (2009) acknowledged that "potential perpetrators are equally likely to target women who drink and those who abstain, and even though women often go to parties in groups to provide guardianship for each other, men use group strategies of their own to disrupt the informal social control of the female protective buddy system" (255). Second, personality traits may be the underlying cause of binge drinking, causing repressed symptoms to be present. Third, serial offenders may use alcohol to facilitate an excuse if confronted.

Another aspect of drinking and its connection to sexual victimization that has been examined by the literature involves drinking games. Drinking games, according to Borsari (2004) involves various games of skill and/or luck. Essentially, drinking games are designed to get the players intoxicated faster. Some argue that drinking games are

19

especially popular at fraternity parties, and playing drinking games is solely for the purpose of getting someone drunk in order to have sex with them (Johnson and Stahl 2004).

Borsari (2004) interviewed college students and found four common reasons students play drinking games: getting intoxicated, getting others intoxicated, meeting new people, and competition. Although one of the common reasons for playing, according to Borsari, is getting others intoxicated, it is unclear through his study as to why this might be the case. He suggests one reason might be that a player "committed an infraction against another player." Another reason for getting others drunk while playing drinking games posits Borsari is newcomers to the party are usually more sober than existing members of the party, therefore needing to be caught up to a certain intoxication level. Borsari's final suggestion as to why players intentionally try to get others drunk is one of a sinister nature, citing achieving a sexual advantage over women. Borsari uses existing literature (Abbey 2002; Johnson 2002; Kanin 1985) to show the link between alcohol use and sexual assault among college students, and intentionally intoxicating a female target during a drinking game as a common occurrence by sexual assault offenders on campus.

Drug Use

Existing literature addressing drug use as a predictor of sexual assault, almost always discusses drug use in conjunction with alcohol use or the use of drugs as a facilitator of rape and sexual assault (i.e., the perpetrator drugged his unknowing victim; McCauley, Amstadter, Danielson, Ruggiero, Kilpatrick, and Resnick 2009). However, there are some articles that reference voluntary drug use by the victim, particularly pertaining to prescription drug use without a prescription (which is relevant to my data

20

set, which asks questions about recreational prescription drug use in the last twelve months; ACHA-NCHA, fall 2011).

Several studies have shown that prescription drug use without a prescription is more prevalent in White individuals between the ages of 18 and 25 (McCabe, Cranford, and Boyd 2006; McCauley, Amstadter, Danielson, Ruggiero, Kilpatrick, and Resnick 2009). Because the majority of college students are White and between the ages of 18 and 25, a college sample is an ideal one in which to study prescription drug use without a prescription (United States Census Bureau 2012).

Because taking prescription drugs without a prescription is illegal, it is easier to place the onus of victimization on the victim, rather than the offender. Some studies show that victims of incapacitated rape (rape of a victim who was incapacitated due to self-intoxication) and drug or alcohol facilitated rape (rape of a victim who was incapacitated through the perpetrators deliberate intoxication or drugging of the victim) report substance abuse more often than victims of "forcible rape" (rape that used physical force or threat of force; Kaysen, Neighbors, Martell, Fossos, and Larimer 2006; McCauley, Amstadter, Danielson, Ruggiero, Kilpatrick, and Resnick 2009).

In general, traditional risk factors researchers maintain the idea that it is no one's fault if they are raped or sexually assaulted, but if you do not put yourself in "risky" situations, such as using drugs or alcohol, then the likelihood of victimization would be much lower (Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss, and Wechsler 2004; Berkowitz 1992; McCauley et al. 2009).

Multiple Sexual Partners

Not only do many medical, police, and legal personnel interrogate victims regarding their previous sexual history, researchers also cite prior consensual sexual behavior between victim and assailant and increased numbers of sexual partners as risk factors for sexual victimization (Abbey et al. 1996; Walker, Messman-Moore, and Ward 2011). According to Abbey et al. (1996), not only does the number of sexual partners and frequency of sexual activity become a risk factor, but reputation does as well.

In their study examining risk factors of sexual assault, Abbey and colleagues (1996) found that men who admitted committing "date rape" are "more likely to feel that 'certain types of women' such as a 'bar pick-up,' a 'woman with a loose reputation,' or a 'known tease' [are] fair targets for sexual aggression" (148). These findings illustrate how a "bad reputation" can be a risk factor of sexual victimization. Abbey and McAuslan (2004) also found that men often regret raping women after the victimization occurred, and never again commit the offense. Abbey and McAuslan argue that this finding (i.e., no pattern of victimization after first offense because of feelings of guilt and remorse) shows that at least some sexual aggressors are influenced by "social and cultural factors" (Littleton 2014: 1). Littleton (2014) argues that one of these social factors might be the presence of the sexual double standard prevalent in the United States, in which men are praised for sexual conquests and women suffer a negative outcome regarding their reputation. The sexual double standard and negative stereotypes regarding women (e.g., women who drink, wear "provocative clothing, and who have sex outside of committed relationships) lead to "bad reputations." In turn, their reputation can lead to sexual victimization and increased difficulties in reporting and prosecuting offenders.

22

After a woman has been labeled with a bad reputation, the burden of proof of sexual victimization lay with her, even more so than women of "moral character." Studies show that legal decisions are not only based on case facts, but are also influenced by victim characteristics and "behavior preceding the assault and her reputation and moral character" (Beichner and Spohn 2012: 3). Women who hold "moral character" are seen as credible and have a better chance to prosecute and win their case than women who lack this virtue via stereotyping. "Although operationalization of moral character issues/reputation may vary, this typically includes evidence indicating any of the following: the victim's prior sexual contact with someone other than the suspect, out-of-wedlock pregnancies or births," and alcohol or drug use (Beichner and Spohn 2012: 7).

It is clear from the above discussion of risk factors that many of these factors are behavioral in nature (e.g., drinking, drugs, and sexual history of the victim). In addition, it is also clear that many traditional risk factors focus on sexual assault victims instead of offenders. Finally, it is important to note that these traditional risk factors and rape myths have a lot of overlap. Knowing that rape myths often lead to victim blame, the focus on "traditional risk factors" in the literature may in turn play into commonly established rape myths and contribute to victim blame. Rape victims may believe that because they were raped when they were drunk, for example, that they are to blame for their victimization. It is important, then, that researchers not only consider "traditional risk factors" but also put these factors in a structural context, focusing on both victims and offenders, and also focusing on other types of factors (e.g., contextual factors) that may influence sexual victimization on college campuses. Furthermore, using a theoretical orientation that can make sense of traditional risk factors from a structural perspective is important.

23

Therefore, in this thesis, I rely on the social construction perspective and feminist theories and scholarship that consistently find that "traditional gender arrangements, beliefs, and behaviors reinforce women's sexual subordination to men" (Hlavka 2014: 3). I also rely on feminist theories to assist in understanding how "traditional risk factors" tie into rape myths and victim blame.

A Feminist Approach to Explaining Victimization

"The prime paradox of gender is that in order to dismantle

the institution you must first make it visible" (Lorber 1994,

quoted in Martin 2004:1261)

The definition of a social institution is highly contested; however, most definitions include the following characteristics: constraining, persistent, embodied, and interdependent structures (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Connell 1987; Lorber 1996, 1999; Martin 2004). Martin (2004) argues for redefining social institutions. She gives several guidelines for the *new* definition of social institution including: social institutions that persist across extensive time and space, social practices that are repeated over time by group members, that constrain and facilitate behavior by societal/group members contradictory, and that are organized in accord with and permeated by power. When looking at this new definition of social institutions, gender as a social institution meets all of the guidelines.

According to feminist scholarship, gender is a social structure that changes over time, both within an individual and within a given culture. Gender "establishes expectations for individuals" (Lorber 1994: 1), thus establishing a way for us to be held

24

accountable for our gender and hold others accountable for their gender display (Connell 1987, 2009; West and Zimmerman 1987).

Through the criteria of social institutions as outlined by Martin (2004), gender should also be considered a social institution for the basis of the definition as well as the benefits of framing gender as an institution. According to Martin, "framing gender in terms of its collective, institutional, and historical properties depicts it more accurately and renders it more accessible to sociological analysis" (1259).

In addition, gender has been discussed as producing, reproducing, and sustaining inequality. Doing gender, according to West and Zimmerman (1987) is "the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (127). As just one example, we hold female victims and offenders to expected roles. Gender roles help to explain how women are in subordinate roles and can be coerced and victimized by men. If "doing gender" means conforming to rigid ideals of masculinity, then it is no surprise that sexual assault among college and university students is amplified.

While some scholars publish articles that take the stance that women who place themselves in risky situations are somewhat responsible for their victimization, feminist researchers argue that this scholarship perpetuates the use and belief of rape myths and victim blame. Much of this work illustrates the attitudes of sexual assault that are fostered through the perpetuation of rape-supportive ideals produced in a patriarchal society. Feminist scholarship is also rooted in the ideas of change; their work has political implications that should be thoughtfully considered. Because of the commitment to better

25

society through theory and policy, the feminist lens is one in which that supports my arguments throughout my thesis.

Rape myth acceptance and victim blame are by-products of gender inequality and expected gender roles. These two factors produce ineffective sexual assault prevention programming and campus policies that deter victims from reporting their assault. By discussing institutions, I attempt to show how gender is embedded both *in* the institution of higher education, and *as* an institution *within* higher education. Doing so, should shed light upon the importance of addressing gender issues (e.g. traditional gender expectations) on the college campus. In this thesis, I rely on feminist theory to assist in understanding how "traditional risk factors" tie into rape myths and victim blame. Although I do use several behavioral factors that are considered by existing literature as traditional risk factors, I regard them in a structural way--meaning if findings show significance of behavioral factors, it may not be that women or men who are sexually assaulted did something that provoked the victimization, but that some structural forces are at play. Because of this perspective utilized in my thesis, several contextual factors pertaining to the structural nature of the college or university are included in analyses.

Social Construction of Gender

The definition of knowledge according to Berger and Luckmann (1966) is "the certainty that phenomena are real and that they possess specific characteristics" (1). They define reality as "a quality appertaining to phenomena that we recognize as being independent of our own volition," we cannot "wish them away" (Berger and Luckmann 1966: 77). According to these definitions, knowledge is made in the social world by how

people relate to things or situations. Human contact and thought (regardless of validity or lack thereof) and *social contexts* dictate our social construction of reality.

Many feminist scholars argue that the representation of women in news media is designed to legitimate or uphold a patriarchal system in which women are dominated by men and are usually framed as victims who hold some responsibility for their victimization. For example, "when violence against women is framed in terms of the perpetrator's obsession with the victim, the victim herself becomes the cause of the violence" (Anastasio and Costa 2004: 536). Others argue that the economic and political elite (typically white, affluent men) who generate these messages make it so that the public believes these images and stories to be normal, which helps shape our social construction of reality and gender (Graziano, Schuck, and Martin 2010; Daly and Chesney-Lind 1988; Humphries 2009). The framing of these messages shape our discourse and keep the attention of the public (Graziano et al. 2010; Schneider 1985).

Because of the patriarchal society in which we live, we do not question rape myths but instead, accept these socially constructed messages as true. Unfortunately, the public is rarely educated from official sources about sexual victimization and most individuals learn about victimization from television, from word of mouth, or from other forms of entertainment (Humphries 2009). Such media images have heightened levels of victim blame and rape myths, thus teaching individuals that victimization experiences are parallel to victim culpability (Suarez and Gadalla 2010). This socially constructed reality makes it easier for the public to come to believe that victims, under certain circumstances, are at least somewhat or totally responsible for their victimization.

27

I will utilize a feminist approach and the social construction approach in my thesis by showing why the relationship between "traditional risk factors" and the sexual victimization of college students exists. Despite what many scholars claim, I attempt to show that rape myths, victim blame, and the sexual assault prevention programming that stems from such ideas, are a better predictor of sexual assault than are "traditional risk factors" alone.

Sexual Assault Prevention Programming

Both traditional risk factor researchers and feminist criminology researchers alike focus not only on what causes sexual assault but also on sexual assault prevention programs. Programming for each group has been quite different and are reviewed here.

Programs Targeting Traditional Risk Factors

> *"Although rape-supportive attitudes create a climate in which date rape can exist, it is the passivity and lack of assertiveness of many individuals (i.e., women) that often allows date rape to manifest itself" (quoted in Lonsway 1996:231)*

Historically, universities that do require sexual assault prevention workshops (rather than a one hour mandatory freshman orientation that covers sexual assault awareness), have been directed solely toward strategies women can perform in which to protect herself from potential sexual offenders. The prevention program for college women usually includes a list of tips often consisting of the following: don't give mixed messages (in the context of date or acquaintance rape), avoid secluded places, don't walk

28

alone at night, don't drink alcohol or drink responsibly, stay with a group of friends, don't stay out late, don't go to fraternity parties, don't go to bars alone, and/or practice self-defense. All of the previously listed tips explicitly make the prevention of sexual assault the victim or potential victim's responsibility. In addition, these deterrence strategies are aimed at individual women, who if unsuccessful in thwarting an attack, have only allowed the rapist/potential rapist to move on to a more "vulnerable" individual; these strategies do nothing to protect women as a group or permanently stop a potential rapist (Lonsway 1996).

Slowly, a shift is occurring from protection strategies for women to prevention strategies for men and women. However, some still argue for a self-defense training approach to better prevent sexual assault than prevention programs designed to reduce rape-supportive attitudes in men (Norrell and Bradford 2011; Hollander 2009; Ullman 2007). Ullman (2007) takes somewhat of a middle-ground approach by arguing that "certain resistance strategies can be used by women to avoid rapes, implying that prevention programs should focus on teaching women effective resistance methods to protect themselves. Concurrent prevention efforts must focus on men who are the primary perpetrators of rapes and on stopping rape from ever occurring" (Ullman 2007: 412-413). If prevention programs that focus on men college students are being implemented, then there should be no need for programming focused on women college students need to physically protect herself in a sexual attack. Lonsway (1996) argues that self-defense strategies have some value, but sexual assault prevention must target the main cause of rape and sexual assault—men's motivation to rape.

29

Programming Aimed at Men

> *"Although it is important to address the question of how*
> *women can protect themselves, it is also of vital importance*
> *to develop interventions that target the rapist or potential*
> *rapist" (Lee 1987: 100).*

The importance of sexual assault prevention programming specifically designed for men is important for several reasons. First, research shows that men are overwhelmingly more likely to be perpetrators of rape and sexual assault than women and educating men on sexual assault and the ramifications of such acts for victims may decrease the amount of men who participate in the rape culture (Bannon, Brosi, and Foubert 2013; Banyard, Plante, and Moynihan 2004; Boswell and Spade 1996). This is especially important because researchers have found that certain male groups encourage and project stereotypical masculine images (aggressive, competitive, experienced, strong, sexually forceful, and rebellious) which may condone if not encourage sexual assault. For these reasons, preventative prevention programming that target men have become more popular since the late 1980s (Berkowitz 1994; Davis and Liddell 2002; Foubert and McEwen 1998; Katz 1995; Lee 1987).

There are few programs that target men nationwide. Programs that target men focus on addressing rape myths, legal definitions of rape, and peer support/intervention (Choate 2003; Hattery-Freetly and Kane 1995). As an example of an effective sexual assault prevention programming that targets men, in Columbia, Missouri in the mid-1980s, the Mid-Missouri Men's Resource Group started a project to help address the issue of sexual assault in their community—the Rape Prevention Education Project

(RPEP), designed for teenage and adult men, but was implemented on the college campus. The program was divided into four sections all led by trained men volunteers (usually graduate students): (1) reviewing rape myths and facts, (2) empathy exercise through role play narrative, (3) empathy exercise through guided role play, and (4) discussion of participant responses (Lee 1987). There are many groups that have since been created under the same name—RPEP. These programs now exist through schools and community groups whose aim is to end violence against women. Another example is the Men Against Violence model that illustrates the need to separate violence and traditional male gender expectations and delegitimizes stereotypical displays of masculinity (e.g., violence against women; Chaote 2003). This program involves student organizations in universities across the country.

Sexual Assault Prevention Programming for Men Athletes

Although sexual assault prevention programming for men athletes is more common than the same type of programming directed toward the general men student-body population of colleges and universities, prevention programming for male athletes is still scarce. One program that seems to be effective is one that was developed by Jackson Katz and fellow researchers at Northeastern University in Boston. To date, his program, Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) has been implemented in several college athletic programs (specifically football, baseball, and hockey), professional teams (including the New England Patriots and the Boston Red Sox), and other notable organizations such as the United States Marine Corps. In an effort to reduce the defensiveness of participants, Katz and his colleagues focus on men as bystanders rather than men as offenders (Katz 1995). This program, as will be discussed in the following section, which is designed to

address the "social construction of masculinity that equates strength in men with dominance over women" (Katz 1995: 166) which is pervasive among men athletes and fraternity members. The MVP model is comprised of three sections or meetings over the course of three months.

The problem of sexual assault on college campuses is structural in nature. Athletics, more so than fraternities, bring money to universities. This is why athletes are not often appropriately sanctioned for violence committed toward women (or any crime for that matter). Because of this lack of accountability, men feel as if they can seize the opportunity to commit sexual assault with minimal punishment. Because of the rape-supportive culture that is entrenched in universities, sexual assault may become even more common on college campuses (Jackson, Gilliland, and Veneziano 2006).

Sexual Assault Prevention Programming for Members of the Greek System

In light of this research and the prevalence of violence against women on college campuses, one university developed a new program specifically targeted at fraternities and sororities. The new program is led by undergraduate representatives who participated in a leadership course offered for credit through their university. The prevention program had three sections preceded by a pre-test to gauge and misogynistic beliefs that contribute to sexual assault (Schwartz, et al 2006): (1) leaders read five vignettes, then discussed counter behaviors, (2) mock talk shows focused on self-esteem and warning signs and preventive measures, and (3) question and answer session, which was followed by a posttest using the same questions as the pretest. Through the results and feedback from the workshop, the university that developed this program found it to be a success, though they recognize the need for follow-up educational programs to counteract the

pervasiveness of stereotypical gender expectations, particularly in the Greek system (Schwartz, et al. 2006). Martin and Hummer (1989) suggest that fraternities are in desperate need to restructure their organizations or college women will continue to be victimized by fraternity members.

The Role of Regional Differences

Several studies have found that the southern United States is more violent than the northern United States. Several scholars argue that this is due to the subculture of violence (a theory developed by Wolfgang and Ferracuti in 1967) in the South that justifies "violence for self-protection and for maintaining 'honor,' or a reputation for toughness" (Cohen and Nisbett 1994: 551). Other authors argue that poverty and inequality, two characteristics of "disorganized condition" contribute to this culture of violence (Gastil 1971; Erlanger 1976). If an individual in these subcultures does not perform the expectations valued in such environments, sanctions are enforced (West and Zimmerman 1987; Erlanger 1976). "Under such circumstances violence is important to the subculture, and we would be more likely than those who do not to be like, respected, and accorded high status in the group" (Erlanger 1976: 487). Because of these theories, I suggest that students at colleges and universities in the southern United States (represented in the ACHA data set and the Mississippi State University executive summary) will have a higher risk of sexual victimization than those on campuses in other regions of the country. For these reasons, I suggest sexual assault prevention programming differ by region in which the college or university is located.

In this review of the literature, then, I have demonstrated that most literature focuses on traditional risk factors as a *predictor* of sexual victimization, especially on

33

college campuses. However, a small but growing body of literature reviewed extensively in this thesis has used gender scholarship to examine the structural reasons why traditional factors might predict victimization. What is not as vast in this literature is a more complex consideration of various risk factors; namely not only examining behavioral factors but also examining other types of factors (i.e., demographic, contextual). By having a structural foundation for what predicts sexual assault victimization among college students, appropriately designed programs can target not only potential victims and offenders, but also the structural conditions that make sexual assault victimization more likely. In this thesis, I use a secondary dataset of college students American College Health Association (ACHA) to determine what demographic, contextual, and behavioral factors best predict sexual assault victimization.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT STUDY

Methods and Data

Data

I use data from the Fall 2011 survey of the American College Health

Association/National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA), which includes

27,774 students from 44 colleges or universities across the country. These data were

chosen for analysis due to the large number of respondents, relevance of questions, and

most importantly, respondents are college students—a population in which sexual

victimization occurs more often. The Fall 2011 data were selected based on their

availability of access and their inclusion of all the variables I was looking for (unlike

other semesters) with a large enough sample size to make inferences. These data are

better than several data sets to answer my research questions because of the availability

of prevention programming questions, in addition to several contextual factors that are

not usually addressed in data. Secondary data for this thesis is beneficial to my study due

to the vast amount of questions and large sample size that would have been beyond the

scope of possibilities for this thesis.

ACHA-NCHA was developed by a team of college health professionals and

systematically evaluated with reliability and validity analyses comparing common survey

items with national studies such as the National College Health Risk Behavior Survey

35

conducted by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The first test was administered in the Spring of 2000 and participation has tripled in size since its inception. The survey is confidential and only students in randomly selected classrooms from self-selected universities nationwide participate. Surveys are standardized, and institutions can elect to use either a paper or web-based format or both.

Dependent Variable[1]

There is one dependent variable used in all models included in this thesis. *Sexual Victimization* is measured using four questions: (1) *Within the last 12 months were you sexually touched without your consent?* (2) *Within the last 12 months was sexual penetration attempted (vaginal, anal, oral) without your consent?* (3) *Within the last 12 months were you sexually penetrated (vaginal, anal, oral) without your consent?* (4) *Within the last 12 months, has someone had sex with you without your consent when you were drinking alcohol?[2]* I ran a factor analysis of all five variables in the data that pertain to sexual victimization (the four listed above plus another variable). Although they all factored together, the sexually abusive relationship variable had the lowest extraction (.305). After removing this variable, the other four range from .418-.743. Reliability

---

[1]I originally wanted to run models concerning sexual assault victimization for both victims and offenders. However, there are only 112 respondents, who responded affirmatively that they had sexually penetrated someone without their consent. Not only are there only 112 respondents making modeling difficult, when looking at the sex breakdown of those that answered "yes, to this one question" 63% of the respondents were female. This is highly unusual and suspect (since sexual assault offenders are almost exclusively male). Finally, nothing in the models is statistically significant, except for age. Thus, the lack of respondents, strange sex break down, and lack of significance has given us pause regarding the offender models. For these reasons, I have focused exclusively on the victim models.

[2] There were originally five variables that comprised the dependent variable. However, I ran a factor analysis and reliability analysis in order to determine the best grouping of the variables in the dataset pertaining to sexual assault. After evaluating the alphas, I decided to drop one variable—*In the last 12 months have you been in a sexually abusive relationship*—leaving only four variables left to create the dependent variable.

36

analyses showed that dependent variable has an alpha of .723. Responses to these questions were summed and collapsed into a single dummy variable named *Sexual Victimization* (0=no, 1=yes). If a respondent answered yes to any of the questions, they were coded as a 1. The vast majority of the respondents did not report being sexually victimized within the last twelve months (roughly 93%, compared to 7% who did experience some form of sexual victimization within the last twelve months).

Independent Variables

There are several independent variable measures used that consider demographic, contextual, and behavioral factors.

Demographic Variables

Demographic variables included in the models are comprised of *race* (0=non-white, 1=white), *gender (*0=female, 1=male)*, marital status* (0=unmarried, 1=married), *sexual identity* (0=non-heterosexual, 1=heterosexual), *age* (continuous variable), *year in school* (1=first year undergraduate, 2=second year undergraduate, 3=third year undergraduate, 4=fourth year undergraduate, 5=fifth year or more undergraduate, 6=graduate or professional student), and *relationship status*. Relationship status was originally coded as 1=not in a relationship, 2=in a relationship, but not living together, and 3=in a relationship and living together. This is recoded to a dummy variable where 0=not in a relationship and 1=in a relationship—the combination of "in a relationship, but not living together" and "in a relationship and living together".

37

Contextual Factors

Contextual factors included in the models are *campus size* (1=less than 2,500, 2=2,500-4,999, 3=5,000-9,999, 4=10,000-19,999, 5=20,000 or more), *community size* (1=<2,500, 2=2,500-9,999, 3=10,000-49,999, 4=50,000-249,000, 5=250,000-499,999, 6=>500,000), campus vs. off-campus residence is measured using the question: *Where do you currently live?* (Original response categories were 1= campus residence hall, 2=fraternity or sorority house, 3=other college/university housing, 4=parent/guardian's home, 5=other off-campus housing, 6=other). Responses to these questions were collapsed into a dummy variable, *campus residence* (0=off campus residence—parent/guardian's home and other off-campus housing, 1=on campus residence—campus residence hall, fraternity or sorority house, and other college/university housing; the original response, "other" is coded as system-missing). R*egion* is not a question asked on the ACHA survey, rather it is information filled in by the American College Health Association. *Region* is originally coded as a nominal variable (1=Northeast, 2=Midwest, 3=South, 4=West, 5=Outside U.S.), but is now coded as a dummy variable (0=non-Southern region, 1=South). Public versus private colleges and universities, like region, is information filled in by the American College Health Association. This variable was originally coded as 1=public, 2=private, but is now named *public school* and coded as a true dummy variable (0=private, 1=public).

In addition to the basic contextual factors listed above, I also include variables pertaining to the awareness of contextual factors derived from questions in the original data regarding the respondent's perception of typical student behavior. A*lcohol perception* is measured using the question, *Within the last 30 days, how often do your*

38

think the typical student at your school used alcohol? (Response categories are 1= never used, 2=have used, but not in the last 30 days, 3=1-2 days, 4=3-5 days, 5=6-9 days, 6=10-19 days, 7=20-29 days, 8=used daily). *Marijuana perception* is measured using the question, *Within the last 30 days, how often do your think the typical student at your school used marijuana?* (Response categories are 1= never used, 2=have used, but not in the last 30 days, 3=1-2 days, 4=3-5 days, 5=6-9 days, 6=10-19 days, 7=20-29 days, 8=used daily). O*ther drugs perception* is measured using the following questions, *Within the last 30 days, how often do your think the typical student at your school used: cocaine, methamphetamine, other amphetamines, sedatives, hallucinogens, anabolic steroids, opiates, inhalants, MDMA, other club drugs, other illegal drugs?* (Original response categories were 1= never used, 2=have used, but not in the last 30 days, 3=1-2 days, 4=3-5 days, 5=6-9 days, 6=10-19 days, 7=20-29 days, 8=used daily). Responses to these questions were summed and collapsed into a single variable, *other drugs perception.* This variable ranges from 11-88 (11=never used any of the eleven drugs, 88=yes, used all of the listed eleven drugs).

Finally, I include victimization prevention programming variables (also listed under contextual factors) that address the need for better prevention programming and distribution of helpful information regarding the prevention of violence and alcohol/drug abuse, the following questions are included in my analyses. The first set of questions illustrates information that was received by students; the second set of questions reflects the students who want to receive that information. The first set is measured using the question, *Have you received information on: alcohol and other drug use, sexual assault/relationship violence prevention, violence prevention from your college or*

39

university? (Original responses were recoded from 1=no, 2=yes to 0=no, 1=yes). Somewhat surprisingly, the majority of respondents reported receiving information regarding alcohol and other drug use, and sexual assault prevention (71% alcohol/drugs, 63% sexual assault). However, only 39% of respondents reported receiving information regarding violence prevention.

The second set is measured using the question, *Are you interested in receiving information on: alcohol and other drug use, sexual assault/relationship violence prevention, violence prevention from your college or university?* (Original responses were recoded from 1=no, 2=yes to 0=no, 1=yes). Not surprisingly, only a small percentage of students reported wanting to receive information regarding alcohol and other drug use (26%); 39% of respondents reported wanting to receive information on sexual assault/relationship violence prevention; and 32% of respondents reported wanting to receive information regarding violence prevention.

Behavioral Factors

Behavioral factors include *alcohol use, marijuana use, other drug use, number of sexual partners, Greek membership,* and *school-sponsored athlete. Alcohol use* is measured using the question: *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use alcohol?* Original response categories (1= never used, 2=have used, but not in the last 30 days, 3=1-2 days, 4=3-5 days, 5=6-9 days, 6=10-19 days, 7=20-29 days, 8=used daily) are collapsed into a single dummy variable (0=never used, 1=used). *Marijuana use* is measured using the question: *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use marijuana?* Original response categories (1= never used, 2=have used, but not in the last 30 days, 3=1-2 days, 4=3-5 days, 5=6-9 days, 6=10-19 days, 7=20-29 days, 8=used daily)

40

are collapsed into a single dummy variable (0=never used, 1=used). Other Drug Use (drugs other than marijuana)--The measure for *other drug use* was created using eleven questions: (1) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use cocaine?* (2) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use methamphetamines?* (3) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use other amphetamines?* (4) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use sedatives?* (5) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use hallucinogens?* (6) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use steroids?* (7) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use opiates?* (8) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use inhalants?* (9) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use MDMA?* (10) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use other club drugs?* (11) *Within the last 30 days, on how many days did you use other illegal drugs?* (Original response categories were 1= never used, 2=have used, but not in the last 30 days, 3=1-2 days, 4=3-5 days, 5=6-9 days, 6=10-19 days, 7=20-29 days, 8=used daily). Responses to these questions were summed and collapsed into a single dummy variable, *other drug use* (0=never used any of the eleven drugs, 1=yes, used of at least one of the listed eleven drugs). The majority of the respondents have never used any of the eleven drugs listed above (85%; compared to 15% who reported using at least one of the eleven drugs).

Greek membership and *athlete* are both dummy variables (0=no, 1=yes), *number of sexual partners* is a continuous variable, and *GPA* is an ordinal variable (originally coded 1=A, 2=B, 3=C, 4=D/F), which I reverse coded (1=D/F, 2=C, 3=B, 4=A) to show the corresponding increases when analyzing using logistical regression.

41

Analyses

The analyses in this thesis, conducted in SPSS, proceeds in three steps. First, descriptive statistics and binary correlation matrixes are provided for all variables: demographics, contextual variables, and behavioral factors. Second, estimates from logistic regression models predicting sexual victimization are presented for all variables. Because the sexual victimization variable was dichotomous, binary logistic regression was used to determine the predictors of sexual assault among college and university students. The dependent variable selected from the ACHA dataset is predominately found in the academic literature regarding sexual victimization for men and women, specifically men and women who attend college. The third step in my analyses is to explore gender differences in predicting sexual assault among college and university students. The sample is split by gender and presented in different logistic regression models.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Descriptives

As seen in Table 1, most of the respondents are White (76%) and female (67%). The age of respondents varied from 18 all the way to 98 (indicating there are outliers in the sample). Therefore, I limited the sample to ages 18 to 34 (accounting for 93% of the original sample), which is more representative of college populations. This mean age, shown in table 4.1, is roughly 21 years of age (21.13). The average year in school for those sampled is around the third year of undergraduate (2.91, where two equals the second year of undergraduate and three equals the third year of undergraduate). Only 11% of respondents are married, but approximately half of the respondents are in a relationship (49%). Finally, 92% of respondents identify as heterosexual.

For contextual factors, the average campus size of the colleges or universities represented in this study is somewhere in between five and 20 thousand (3.57, where 3=5,000-9,999 and 4=10,000-19,999), and the average size of the community surrounding the campus is between 50,000 and 249,000 (4.13). A little less than half of the respondents live on campus (43%). Regarding region and type of school, 40% of the schools represented in this sample are in the South and 60% are public schools. Finally, regarding perceptions of "typical" student behavior, respondents believed that "typical" students drank alcohol between six and nine days in the previous month (5.48, where

43

5=6-9 days). Respondents perceived marijuana use by the "typical" student to have occurred between three and five days in the previous month (4.38, where 4=3-5 days) and other drug use by the "typical" student is perceived to have occurred between one and two days.[3] Regarding programming and information availability, the majority of respondents reported receiving information about alcohol and other drug use (71%) and about sexual assault prevention (63%). However, only 39% of respondents reported receiving information regarding violence prevention. Only a small percentage of students reported wanting to receive information regarding alcohol and other drug use (26%); 37% of respondents reported wanting to receive information on sexual assault/relationship violence prevention and 32% of respondents reported wanting to receive information regarding violence prevention.

For behavioral factors, most respondents are drinkers (76%) and about one third have smoked marijuana (33%). Only 15% have used drugs other than marijuana. The range of sexual partners reported is 0 to 96, meaning there are significant outliers. Given that 99.3% of the sample reported between zero and ten partners in a 12-month period, I limited the sample to represent this range. After doing so, the average number of sexual partners within the past 12 months is about one for the respondents (1.22). Of the respondents, only 11% are Greek members (i.e., in a fraternity or sorority) and only 8% are school-sponsored athletes. To conclude, the average GPA is about a B (3.31).

---

[3] Because this is a computed variable ranging from 11-88, I had to transform the mean reported (23.24) to a meaningful number. 23.24 divided by 88 equals 26.41. This number falls between two categories of responses—2=have used, but not in the last 30 days, and 3=1-2 days in the past 30 days. After rounding up, the mean falls into the latter category, therefore, students perceive typical students to have used other drugs one to two days in the past 30 days.

Table 4.1   Description of the Sample

	Mean	Median	SD	Range
Demographics				
White	0.76	1.00	0.43	0.00 - 1.00
Male	0.33	0.00	0.47	0.00 - 1.00
Married	0.11	0.00	0.32	0.00 - 1.00
Heterosexual	0.92	1.00	0.27	0.00 - 1.00
Age	21.13	20.00	3.42	18.00-34.00
Year School	2.91	3.00	1.67	1.00 - 6.00
In Relationship	0.49	0.00	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Contextual Factors				
Campus Size	3.57	4.00	1.28	1.00 - 5.00
Community Size	4.13	4.00	1.27	1.00 - 6.00
Campus Residence	0.43	0.00	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
South	0.40	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Public School	0.60	1.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Alcohol Perception	5.48	6.00	1.72	1.00 - 8.00
Marijuana Perception	4.38	4.00	2.05	1.00 - 8.00
Other Drug Perception	23.24	18.00	14.56	11.00-88.00
Got: Alcohol info	0.71	1.00	0.45	0.00 - 1.00
Got: Sexual Assault info	0.63	1.00	0.48	0.00 - 1.00
Got: Violence info	0.39	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Alcohol info	0.26	0.00	0.44	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Sexual Assault info	0.37	0.00	0.48	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Violence info	0.32	0.00	0.47	0.00 - 1.00
Behavioral Factors				
Alcohol use	0.76	1.00	0.43	0.00 - 1.00
Marijuana use	0.33	0.00	0.47	0.00 - 1.00
Other Drug use	0.15	0.00	0.36	0.00 - 1.00
# Sex Partners	1.22	1.00	1.51	0.00 - 10.00
Greek	0.11	0.00	0.31	0.00 - 1.00
GPA	3.31	3.00	0.67	1.00 - 4.00
Athlete	0.08	0.00	0.28	0.00 - 1.00
Dependent Variable				
Sexually Victimized	0.07	0.00	0.25	0.00 - 1.00

N=27,774

In the correlation matrixes, several variables are moderately correlated. First,

regarding demographic factors, marriage and age are correlated (.490); age is also

correlated to year in school (.434) and campus residence (-.409); and year in school is

45

also correlated with campus residence (-.468). Second, there are several moderate correlations (including one strong positive correlation) involving contextual factors. Campus size is positively correlated with community size (.417) and school type (public school; .581). Next, the perception of alcohol use by typical students is positively correlated with the perception of marijuana use by typical students (.584), and the perception of marijuana use by typical students is positively correlated with the perception of other drug use by typical students (.454).

Regarding prevention programming and information questions, receiving alcohol/drug abuse information is positively correlated with receiving sexual assault information (.494); receiving sexual assault prevention information is correlated with receiving violence prevention information (.472). In addition, interested in receiving information regarding drug and alcohol abuse is correlated with interested in receiving information regarding sexual assault prevention (.546) and violence prevention (.561). Being interested in receiving information on sexual assault prevention is strongly, positively correlated with wanting to receive information on violence prevention (.728). Finally, marijuana use is moderately, positively correlated with other drug use (.466)— the only behavioral factor that has a relationship with any other variables.

Table 4.2   Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. White	1												
2. Male	-.014*	1											
3. Married	0.01	0.007	1										
4. Heterosexual	.023**	-.015*	.023**	1									
5. Age	-.003*	.019**	.490**	-0.005	1								
6. Year School	-.006**	.018**	.222**	-.013*	.434**	1							
7. In Relationship	-.054**	-.084**	.350**	.019**	.226**	.178**	1						
8. Campus Size	-.095**	.037**	.022**	0.011	.053**	.211**	0.002	1					
9. Community Size	-.163**	0	.012*	-.021**	.021**	.035**	-.030**	.417**	1				
10. Campus Residence	0.012	-0.008	-.263**	-0.005	-.409**	-.468**	-.216**	-.222**	-.082**	1			
11. South	-.125**	-0.008	0.006	0.008	-0.003	.181**	-0.009	.383**	.264**	-.028**	1		
12. Public School	.019**	.020**	.103**	.032**	.166**	.082**	.093**	.581**	-.104**	-.339**	.106**	1	
13. Alcohol Perception	.128**	-.038**	-.028**	-0.004	-.041**	.028**	.018**	.021**	-0.005	-0.004	-.013*	.021**	1
14. Marijuana Perception	.134**	-.043**	-.047**	-.018**	-.062**	0.011	.022**	.064**	.025**	-.014*	-.036**	.061**	.584**
15. Other Drugs Perception	0.005	-.096**	0.007	-0.006	.015*	.026**	.031**	.070**	.016**	-.067**	0.004	.106**	.304**
16. Got: Alcohol info	.023**	.041**	-.239**	-.013*	-.329**	-.237**	-.145**	-.036**	-0.002	.310**	-.017**	-.137**	.062**
17. Got: Sexual Assault info	-0.002	-.013*	-.165**	-0.006	-.234**	-.161**	-.091**	-0.005	.036**	.238**	-.041**	-.132**	.053**
18. Got: Violence info	-.044**	.029**	-.086**	0.004	-.121**	-.127**	-.057**	-.040**	.032**	.122**	-.025**	-.073**	-0.004
19. Want: Alcohol info	-.090**	0	-.074**	-.027**	-.085**	-.032**	-.027**	-.041**	0.004	.068**	0.006	-.050**	-0.005
20. Want: Sexual Assault info	-.085**	-.132**	-.082**	-.067**	-.093**	-.013*	-.013*	-.040**	0.006	.074**	.014*	-.078**	.017**
21. Want: Violence info	-.101**	-.063**	-.058**	-.068**	-.061**	-0.009	-.020**	-.042**	0.001	.058**	.016**	-.062**	0.008
22. Alcohol use	.135**	-.014*	.012*	-.040**	.085**	.215**	.089**	.040**	-0.007	-.137**	-.023**	.035**	.228**
23. Marijuana use	.109**	.052**	-.052**	-.083**	-0.006	.053**	.015*	.031**	-0.003	-.069**	-.023**	.027**	.114**
24. Other Drug use	.063**	.050**	0.006	-.080**	.075**	.059**	.030**	.020**	-0.003	-.105**	0.006	.054**	.057**
25. # Sexual Partners	.036**	.064**	-.034**	-.089**	.015*	.025**	0.002	-0.007	-.028**	-.023**	-.014*	.015*	.026**
26. Greek	.043**	0	-.059**	.032**	-.070**	-.017**	-.042**	.091**	.053**	.088**	.042**	-.018**	.021**
27. GPA	.094**	-.035**	.041**	.021**	.024**	.104**	.023**	.027**	.086**	.045**	.074**	-.119**	.024**
28. Athlete	.059**	.034**	-.086**	.033**	-.122**	-.119**	-.039**	-.176**	-.043**	.150**	-.082**	-.158**	-0.008

*p<.01. **p<.001.

47

Table 4.2 (continued)

	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1. White															
2. Male															
3. Married															
4. Heterosexual															
5. Age															
6. Year School															
7. In Relationship															
8. Campus Size															
9. Community Size															
10. Campus Residence															
11. South															
12. Public School															
13. Alcohol Perception															
14. Marijuana Perception	1														
15. Other Drugs Perception	.454**	1													
16. Got: Alcohol info	.077**	0.012	1												
17. Got: Sexual Assault info	.067**	.013*	.494**	1											
18. Got: Violence info	0.001	0.008	.343**	.472**	1										
19. Want: Alcohol info	0.006	.020**	.175**	.154**	.143**	1									
20. Want: Sexual Assault info	.018**	.047**	.173**	.214**	.144**	.546**	1								
21. Want: Violence info	.012*	.040**	.158**	.186**	.179***	.561***	.728**	1							
22. Alcohol use	.223**	.063**	.018**	0.007	-.028**	.040**	.026**	0.002	1						
23. Marijuana use	.180**	.083**	.051**	.019**	-.021**	.028**	.014*	0.005	.379**	1					
24. Other Drug use	.093**	.130**	-0.011	-.033*	.035**	0.005	0.003	0	.211**	.466**	1				
25. # Sexual Partners	.054**	.040**	.017**	-0.005	0.002	.018**	0.009	0.004	.163**	.215**	.170**	1			
26. Greek	.033**	.014*	.093**	.065**	.029**	.025**	0.008	-0.009	.083**	.066**	.020**	.063**	1		
27. GPA	-0.002	-.043**	0.006	.037**	0.007	.018**	0.002	0.006	-.042**	.075**	.072**	.077**	-0.003	1	
28. Athlete	0.003	-.022**	.097**	.064**	.051**	.027**	0.002	0.002	0.006	-.020**	.043**	.042**	-0.005	-0.011	1

*p<.01. **p<.001.

48

Models Representing Full Sample

While there are sex specific models below, the first set of models includes both males and females. In model 1, demographic variables are included (i.e., race, gender, marital status, sexual identity, age, year in school, and relationship status). In addition to the demographic variables, contextual factors are examined in the second model (i.e., campus size, community size, place of residence, region, type of school, perception of alcohol use by typical students, perception of marijuana use by typical students, perception of other drug use by typical students, and six variables pertaining to the availability of prevention programming and information). In the third model, demographic variables and behavioral factors are examined (i.e., alcohol use, marijuana use, other drug use, number of sexual partners, Greek membership, GPA, and varsity athlete status). Finally, in the fourth and final model, all variables are analyzed (demographic variables, contextual variables, and behavioral factors).

In the first model all demographic variables are significant at the $p<.001$ level except *year in school*, which is not significant at all. Those who are white are 24% more likely to have experienced sexual victimization (the only positive relationship in this model). Men respondents (56%), married respondents (51%), heterosexual respondents (53%), and respondents in a relationship (26%) are all less likely to report experiencing sexual victimization. In addition, for every one year increase in age, the odds of experiencing sexual victimization decrease by 7%. In the second model, the demographic variables remain significant and have roughly the same effect sizes. However, only four of the fourteen contextual factors are significant. The respondents who perceived that "typical" students at their school used marijuana were 12% more likely to have

experienced sexual assault. Respondents who received information regarding alcohol and drug abuse are 26% more likely to have experienced sexual assault ($p<.01$). Respondents who are interested in receiving information regarding sexual assault prevention are also more likely to have reported experiencing sexual victimization (67%; $p<.001$). This finding could mean that students who want to receive information or programming about sexual assault have already been exposed to victimization (e.g., they or someone they know have been sexually assaulted). Interestingly, those who received violence prevention information were significantly less likely to have experienced sexual victimization (14%; $p<.01$).

In the third model, *race* is no longer significant, but the other demographic factors maintain their same direction and significance levels. In model 3, all behavioral factors (i.e., alcohol use, marijuana use, drug use other than marijuana, number of sexual partners, fraternity/sorority membership, GPA) are significant except athlete status. Students in this sample who report alcohol use are more than twice as likely to have experienced sexual victimization (2.05). Those who use marijuana or other drugs are more likely to experience sexual assault (30% and 39%, respectively). Respondents with higher numbers of sexual partners and those who are members of the Greek system are also more likely to have experienced sexual assault (28% and 20%, respectively). Unlike the behavioral factors just mentioned, GPA has a negative relationship with sexual assault; as GPA increases, respondents are 8% less likely to have experienced sexual victimization.

In the fourth and final model, all demographic variables are significant except race and year in school. The odds of experiencing sexual victimization are lower for men

respondents (60%), married respondents (47%), heterosexual respondents (38%), and respondents in a relationship (28%). In addition, for every one year increase in age, the odds of experiencing sexual victimization decrease by 7%. In this model, only three contextual factors are significant—perception of drug use other than marijuana by the typical student ($p<.05$), receiving violence prevention information, and wanting to receive information about sexual assault prevention ($p<.001$). Those who received violence prevention information were 15% less likely to have experienced sexual victimization and those who are interested in receiving sexual assault prevention information are 58% more likely to have experienced previous sexual assault. Of the behavioral factors that are significant, all have a positive relationship (i.e., students who drink alcohol, use marijuana, use drugs other than marijuana, have more sexual partners, and are in a fraternity or sorority are more likely to have experienced sexually assault). In addition, these variables are all statistically significant at the $p<.001$ level (other than membership in a fraternity or sorority, which is significant at the $p<.01$ level).

Summary of the Full Sample Models

Overall, respondents who are younger, unmarried, women, not in a relationship, and identify as non-heterosexual are significantly more likely to experience sexual victimization. Respondents who perceive "typical" students as drug users are also more likely to experience sexual assault. Respondents who have used alcohol, marijuana, and other drugs are more likely to experience sexual victimization. Finally, respondents who are in a sorority or fraternity and who have had multiple sexual partners also are more likely to experience sexual victimization than are their counterparts.

51

The pseudo R^2 (represented in each model as Nagelkerke R^2) is a goodness-of-fit measure that indicates how well each regression model fits the data. By comparing the R^2 in model 1 (.046) and model 2 (.069), we can see that the addition of the contextual factors improved the fit of the model. When comparing the R^2 in model 1 (.046) and model 3 (.129), we see the addition of the behavioral factors improved the fit of the model. Therefore, hypothesis one—*contextual factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization than *behavioral factors*—is not true due to the much larger odds ratios in the behavioral model than the contextual model. Hypothesis two—*demographic factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization than *behavioral factors* is also not indicative of the results; *behavioral factors* matter more than *contextual* and *behavioral factors* in the final model.

52

Table 4.3   Logistic Regression Models Predicting Sexual Victimization

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)
Demographics												
White	0.21	0.06	1.238***	0.29	0.07	1.340***	0.00	0.07	1.00	0.09	0.08	1.09
Male	-0.83	0.07	.438***	-0.72	0.07	.486***	-1.01	0.07	.364***	-0.91	0.08	.402***
Married	-0.72	0.16	.486***	-0.63	0.17	.534***	-0.69	0.19	.500***	-0.64	0.20	.528***
Heterosexual	-0.76	0.08	.469***	-0.71	0.08	.491***	-0.51	0.09	.599***	-0.48	0.09	.618***
Age	-0.08	0.02	.925***	-0.05	0.02	.949***	-0.10	0.02	.907***	-0.07	0.02	.932***
Year School	0.04	0.02	1.038	0.02	0.03	1.023	-0.01	0.03	0.99	-0.02	0.03	0.98
In Relationship	-0.30	0.05	.741***	-0.32	0.06	.724***	-0.27	0.06	.762***	-0.26	0.06	.772***
Contextual Factors												
Campus Size				0.04	0.04	1.04				0.03	0.04	1.03
Community Size				-0.01	0.03	0.99				0.02	0.03	1.02
Campus Residence				0.01	0.07	1.01				0.12	0.08	1.13
South				-0.03	0.06	0.97				-0.02	0.07	0.98
Public School				-0.02	0.09	0.98				-0.02	0.10	0.98
Alcohol Perception				-0.02	0.02	0.98				0.02	0.03	1.02
Marijuana Perception				0.11	0.02	1.116***				0.01	0.02	1.01
Other Drugs Perception				0.00	0.00	1.00				0.01	0.00	1.005*
Got: Alcohol info				0.23	0.08	1.258**				0.10	0.09	1.11
Got: Sexual Assault info				0.07	0.07	1.08				0.09	0.08	1.10
Got: Violence info				-0.15	0.06	.858**				-0.16	0.07	.851**
Want: Alcohol info				0.07	0.07	1.08				0.06	0.08	1.06
Want: Sexual Assault info				0.51	0.08	1.671***				0.46	0.09	1.584***
Want: Violence info				0.03	0.08	1.03				0.08	0.09	1.09
Behavioral Factors												
Alcohol use							0.72	0.10	2.047***	0.68	0.11	1.973***
Marijuana use							0.26	0.07	1.298***	0.27	0.07	1.313***
Other Drug use							0.33	0.07	1.391***	0.32	0.08	1.377***
# Sexual Partners							0.24	0.01	1.276***	0.24	0.02	1.275***
Greek							0.18	0.08	1.201*	0.20	0.08	1.223**
GPA							-0.08	0.04	.923*	-0.08	0.05	0.93
Athlete							0.04	0.10	1.04	0.06	0.10	1.06
Constant	-0.23	0.28	0.79	-1.77	0.37	.171***	-0.69	0.35	.501*	-2.13	0.44	.119***
Nagelkerke R²			.046			.069			.129			.143

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001. N=21,973

Split by Gender: Female Only Models

The results presented in Table 4.5 show a positive relationship between race and sexual victimization. Women on the college campus who are white are 37% more likely to have experienced sexual assault. Women who are married and heterosexual are significantly less likely to have experienced sexual victimization (60% and 50%,

53

respectively); women who are in a relationship are also less likely to have experienced sexual assault (28%). In addition, for each year that a student ages, they are 9% less likely to report having experienced sexual assault.

Surprisingly, in the second model, only a few contextual factors were significant in the female model, but the demographic factors retained their significance and roughly the same effect size. Female respondents who perceive "typical students" at their college or university as marijuana and other drug users are more likely to have experienced sexual assault (13% and 33%, respectively). Women in this sample who received information from their school regarding violence prevention were 16% less likely to have experienced sexual victimization, and women who are interested in receiving information regarding sexual assault prevention are 77% more likely to have experienced sexual victimization. This finding could mean that students who want to receive information or programming about sexual assault prevention may have been exposed to victimization and/or are more likely to report victimization if they know how to do so.

In the third model, race is no longer significant, but the other demographic variables remain significant, with only moderate changes in effect sizes. In model 3, all behavioral variables are significant except being an athlete. Women in this sample who report alcohol use are more than twice as likely to have experienced sexual victimization (2.10). Those who use marijuana or other drugs are more likely to report previous sexual assault (32% and 34%, respectively) and respondents with higher numbers of sexual partners and those who are members of the Greek system are more likely to have experienced sexual assault (31% and 22%, respectively). Unlike the behavioral factors

just mentioned, GPA has a negative relationship with sexual assault; as GPA increases, respondents are 9% less likely to have reported experiencing sexual victimization.

In model 4 four demographic variables are significant—women who are married (57%), heterosexual (35%), older (7%), and in a relationship (26%) are all less likely to have experienced sexual victimization. Women in this sample who received violence prevention information were 17% less likely to have experienced sexual victimization, while women who were interested in receiving information regarding sexual assault prevention were 64% more likely to have experienced sexual victimization. Finally, all of the behavioral factors in the full model of females in the sample are significant, except being a school-sponsored athlete and GPA. Women who have consumed alcohol in the last 12 months are more than twice as likely (2.03) to have experienced sexual assault. Women in this sample who have used marijuana or other drugs in the last 12 months are more likely to report previous sexual assault (33% and 31%, respectively) and respondents with higher numbers of sexual partners and those who are members of the Greek system are more likely to have experienced sexual assault (31% and 22%, respectively).

Summary of the Female Models

Overall, younger, unmarried women, who are also not in a relationship, are more likely to have experienced sexual victimization than are their counterparts. Additionally, women who identify as non-heterosexual are more likely to have experienced assault Finally, women who have used alcohol, marijuana, other drugs, women who are in a sorority, and who have had multiple sexual partners are also more likely to have experienced sexual assault than their counterparts.

55

Table 4.4   Logistic Regression Models Predicting Sexual Victimization, Split by Gender: Female

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)
Demographics												
White	0.31	0.07	1.365***	0.37	0.08	1.453***	0.08	0.08	1.09	0.16	0.09	1.17
Married	-0.93	0.20	.396***	-0.78	0.21	.458***	-0.92	0.24	.397***	-0.84	0.25	.430***
Heterosexual	-0.70	0.09	.496***	-0.64	0.09	.528***	-0.47	0.10	.627***	-0.43	0.11	.653***
Age	-0.09	0.02	.911***	-0.06	0.02	.941***	-0.11	0.02	.900***	-0.07	0.02	.928***
Year School	0.04	0.03	1.036	0.01	0.03	1.006	-0.02	0.03	0.98	-0.05	0.04	0.96
In Relationship	-0.33	0.06	.720***	-0.34	0.06	.713***	-0.32	0.07	.728***	-0.30	0.07	.743***
Contextual Factors												
Campus Size				0.07	0.04	1.07				0.06	0.04	1.06
Community Size				-0.02	0.03	0.98				-0.01	0.03	0.99
Campus Residence				-0.01	0.08	0.99				0.08	0.09	1.08
South				-0.03	0.07	0.98				0.00	0.08	1.00
Public School				-0.11	0.10	0.90				-0.13	0.11	0.88
Alcohol Perception				-0.02	0.03	0.98				0.03	0.03	1.03
Marijuana Perception				0.12	0.02	1.131***				0.02	0.03	1.02
Other Drugs Perception				0.00	0.00	1.00				0.00	0.00	1.00
Got: Alcohol info				0.27	0.09	1.328***				0.16	0.10	1.17
Got: Sexual Assault info				0.08	0.08	1.08				0.11	0.09	1.12
Got: Violence info				-0.18	0.07	.835**				-0.18	0.08	.833**
Want: Alcohol info				0.06	0.08	1.06				0.02	0.08	1.02
Want: Sexual Assault info				0.57	0.09	1.767***				0.49	0.09	1.638***
Want: Violence info				0.00	0.09	1.00				0.07	0.10	1.07
Behavioral Factors												
Alcohol use							0.74	0.11	2.103***	0.71	0.12	2.028***
Marijuana use							0.27	0.07	1.315***	0.29	0.08	1.330***
Other Drug use							0.29	0.08	1.342***	0.27	0.09	1.309**
# Sexual Partners							0.27	0.02	1.312***	0.27	0.02	1.308***
Greek							0.20	0.09	1.216*	0.20	0.09	1.221*
GPA							-0.09	0.05	.911*	-0.08	0.05	0.92
Athlete							0.10	0.11	1.11	0.10	0.11	1.11
Constant	-0.03	0.34	0.98	-1.72	0.43	.179***	-0.62	0.41	0.54	-2.12	0.51	.120***
Nagelkerke R²			.035			.062			.130			.145

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001. N=14,851

Split by Gender: Male Only Models

In these models (table 4.6), only one demographic variable—sexual identity—was significant. Men in this sample who identify as heterosexual are significantly less likely (62% less likely, according to model 1) to report experiencing sexual victimization.

56

In the second model, contextual factors (i.e., campus size, community size, campus residence, the school being in the Southern region, school type, perception of typical student behavior variables, and programming information variables) are analyzed along with demographic factors. For men in this sample, only the perception of drug use other than marijuana by "typical students" is significant. Respondents who perceived students on their campus to be drug users were 2% more likely to have experienced sexual assault (a low effect size, but is significant at the $p<.001$ level). In addition to heterosexual identity, which is still significant (with the exact same effect size), year in school is now important. For every year increase in school classification (e.g. sophomore to junior year), men in this sample are 88% less likely to have experienced sexual victimization.

In the third model, behavioral factors (i.e., alcohol use, marijuana use, other drug use, number of sexual partners, Greek membership, GPA, and athlete status) are examined along with demographic factors. Men who report alcohol use (76%), other drug use (67%), and more sexual partners (19%) are significantly more likely to have experienced sexual victimization. In this model, race and age are now significant, but year in school is no longer important. White men in this model are 28% less likely to have experienced sexual assault, heterosexual men are 51% less likely, and older men are 8% less likely to have experienced assault.

In the full model (model 4), several factors from each model remained significant. Being heterosexual significantly lessened the odds of experienced sexual assault. Men who identify as heterosexual are 51% less likely to report previous sexual victimization. Men who attend a public college or university within this sample are significantly more

57

likely to have experienced sexual assault (69%). Finally, men who use alcohol, drugs other than marijuana, and have a higher number of sexual partners are significantly more likely to report previous sexual victimization. Men who drink alcohol (78%) and men who use drugs other than marijuana (76%) are more likely to have experienced prior sexual assault; and men who have higher numbers of sexual partners are 20% more likely to report having previous sexual victimization.

Summary of the Male Models

Overall, men who identify as non-heterosexual and attend public colleges or universities are more likely to have experienced sexual victimization. In addition, men in this sample who perceive "typical students" as drug users are more likely to report previous victimization. Finally, men who drink alcohol, have used drugs other than marijuana, and who report higher numbers of sexual partners are all significantly more likely to have experienced sexual victimization.

Table 4.5 Logistic Regression Models Predicting Sexual Victimization, Split by Gender: Male

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)	b	SE	exp(b)
Demographics												
White	-0.14	0.13	0.87	0.03	0.15	1.03	-0.33	0.15	.716*	-0.16	0.17	0.85
Married	-0.22	0.29	0.81	-0.30	0.31	0.75	-0.08	0.34	0.92	-0.17	0.35	0.84
Heterosexual	-0.97	0.15	.378***	-0.98	0.16	.376***	-0.75	0.18	.493***	-0.72	0.19	.487***
Age	-0.05	0.03	0.95	-0.05	0.03	0.96	-0.08	0.03	.920**	-0.08	0.03	.926*
Year School	0.07	0.05	1.069	0.11	0.06	1.117*	0.06	0.06	1.06	0.09	0.06	1.10
In Relationship	-0.15	0.13	0.86	-0.21	0.14	0.81	-0.04	0.14	0.96	-0.05	0.15	0.95
Contextual Factors												
Campus Size				-0.14	0.09	0.87				-0.15	0.10	0.86
Community Size				0.03	0.06	1.03				0.12	0.07	1.13
Campus Residence				0.06	0.15	1.07				0.26	0.18	1.29
South				-0.02	0.14	0.98				-0.08	0.16	0.93
Public School				0.37	0.20	1.44				0.53	0.24	1.693*
Alcohol Perception				-0.04	0.05	0.96				0.00	0.06	1.00
Marijuana Perception				0.05	0.04	1.05				-0.04	0.05	0.96
Other Drugs Perception				0.02	0.00	1.018***				0.02	0.01	1.016**
Got: Alcohol info				-0.03	0.17	0.97				-0.13	0.20	0.88
Got: Sexual Assault info				0.10	0.16	1.11				0.07	0.18	1.07
Got: Violence info				-0.03	0.14	0.97				-0.08	0.16	0.92
Want: Alcohol info				0.17	0.17	1.18				0.19	0.18	1.21
Want: Sexual Assault info				0.11	0.21	1.12				0.22	0.22	1.25
Want: Violence info				0.27	0.20	1.31				0.20	0.22	1.23
Behavioral Factors												
Alcohol use							0.56	0.22	1.758**	0.57	0.23	1.775**
Marijuana use							0.18	0.16	1.19	0.17	0.18	1.18
Other Drug use							0.51	0.17	1.671***	0.56	0.18	1.758***
# Sexual Partners							0.18	0.03	1.192***	0.18	0.03	1.200***
Greek							0.12	0.19	1.12	0.20	0.20	1.23
GPA							-0.04	0.09	0.96	-0.05	0.10	0.95
Athlete							-0.15	0.22	0.86	-0.06	0.24	0.94
Constant	-1.40	0.52	.247**	-2.20	0.71	.111***	-1.59	0.70	.204*	-2.68	0.89	.069**
Nagelkerke R²			.021			.046			.072			.092

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001. N=7,122.

Summary of the Gender Models

In the models split by gender there are significant and substantive differences. First, being married significantly decreases the odds of experiencing sexual victimization for women, but has no significant effect for men. Second, as age increases, women's odds of experiencing sexual assault decreases, but age is not significant for men in this sample.

Third, being in a relationship, just as it does with marriage, significantly decreases the odds of sexual victimization for women, but has no significant effect for men. Fourth, the use of marijuana significantly increases the odds of sexual victimization for women, but has no significant effect for men in this sample. Fifth, being a member of a sorority significantly increases the odds of sexual victimization for women, but has no significant effect for men in fraternities. Sixth, year in school significantly decreases the odds of sexual victimization for men, but has no effect among the women in this sample. Finally, men who attend public colleges or universities are significantly more likely to have experienced sexual assault, while this has no effect in women. In summary, then, using marijuana, being a member of the Greek system, and having a lower GPA increases women's chance of victimization, while attending a smaller public school increases men's chance of victimization.

For women, the demographic model (model 1) explains almost 4% of the variation (compared to 2% for men); the contextual model (model 2) explains 6% of the variation (compared to almost 5% for the male model); the behavioral model (model 3) explains 13% of the change (compared to 7% in men), as does the model 4 (14.5% compared to 9% in men). Taken together, these variables fit the female models better than the male models.

Because of the amount of variation explained by the behavioral factors in the male and female models, hypothesis three—because women are held more accountable for their victimization by society, *behavioral factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization for women than for men—is shown to be true. *Behavioral factors* are far more important in explaining the risk of sexual victimization for women

60

who attend a college or university in this sample than men. However, hypothesis four—because men are held less accountable for their victimization than women are by society, *contextual factors* will have a greater effect on the likelihood of victimization for men than for women—is not substantiated with the findings.

Summary

The results show that behavioral factors predict sexual victimization better than either demographic or contextual factors for both men and women. However, some contextual factors do show significance, including variables that are not generally discussed in the literature (i.e., perception of typical student behaviors and dissemination of violence prevention programming and information). A factor that is often discussed in the literature is relationship status. However, scholars typically examine the significance of this variable in relation to intimate partner violence. What I found in these data is that respondents who are in a relationship are significantly less likely to experience sexual victimization--very different than findings pertaining to violence in relationships. Demographic factors also significantly predict sexual victimization. These findings are consistent with the current literature, but add value when looking at both age and year in school (it is usually just one of the two), and both marital status and relationship status. Overall, the best predictors of sexual victimization in women are not always similar to the predictors in men. Some demographic factors, contextual factors, and several behavioral factors all vary in significance.

In the next chapter, I will discuss these findings in more detail, comparing them to previous research discussed in the literature review. In addition, I will discuss the

limitations of my study and future research endeavors needed in the body of research

pertaining to sexual assault among college or university students.

CHAPTER V

SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES

Mississippi State University is a participating institution involved in the survey

collection of ACHA-NCHA data. Through my work on campus with advocates for sexual

assault victims, I have been given access to the executive summary of survey results from

the Spring 2013 ACHA survey including only results from Mississippi State University.

Although I do not have raw data from Mississippi State to analyze, I can contextualize

and discuss how these findings relate to the results from the logistic regression models I

have run for this thesis. Mississippi State's findings are an excellent case study in what

ACHA data has found across the country, giving my findings more legitimacy, especially

in relation to college students in the South and at large, public institutions.

According to the school's website, enrollment for the academic year 2012-2013

(when this survey was administered), was 20,365 students. By comparing the ACHA

executive summary results to the Fall 2011 national sample results generated from the

survey analyzed in my thesis, I can illustrate the similarities and differences between the

two samples. First, the average age for Mississippi State students is about two years

younger than the national sample from 2011 (20.5 years and 21.13 years, respectively). In

addition, the national sample has more females (67% versus 59% at MSU) and more

individuals who self-classify as white (76% versus 69% at MSU). A few demographics

had subtle differences: there are 43% of respondents that live on campus in the national

63

sample, compared to 40% at Mississippi State; both samples show 8% of respondents as varsity athletes; and 51% of the national sample were not in a relationship, compared to 50% who are not in a relationship in the Mississippi State sample.

There are a few characteristics that are more prevalent in the Mississippi State University sample in 2013. First, 97% of MSU students identify as heterosexual, compared to 92% in the 2011 national sample. Second, 94% of the MSU respondents are unmarried at the time of the survey, compared to 89% of the respondents in the national survey. Mississippi State men and women report a higher number of sexual partners than the national sample (men: 3.12 vs. 1.98, respectively; women: 2.51 vs. 1.72, respectively).[4] Finally, 43% of the Mississippi State sample is a member of either a sorority or a fraternity. This is three times higher than the national sample in 2011 (11%). Because of this huge difference in Greek membership, I argue that colleges and universities similar to Mississippi State University (i.e., public schools located in the Southern region of the United States with higher participation in Greek life) could potentially have a more supportive rape culture than other schools.

Regarding perception of alcohol and marijuana use by the typical student, women at Mississippi State perceived "typical students" use of alcohol and marijuana at lower rates than women in the 2011 national sample examined in this thesis. Men at MSU perceived alcohol and marijuana use by "typical students" at higher rates than men in the national sample. Actual alcohol and marijuana use for women at MSU is lower than women in the national sample (alcohol: 74% vs. 76.5%, respectively; marijuana: 22.8%

---

[4] Students reporting 0 sexual partners within the last 12 months were excluded from the MSU Executive summary. Therefore, students reporting 0 sexual partners within the last 12 months in the 2011 national sample are excluded for comparison purposes.

vs. 31.7%, respectively). For men at Mississippi State University, alcohol use is higher (78.5% vs. 75.2%) than men in the national sample, but marijuana use is lower than the national sample (32% vs. 36.9%).

Concerning sexual victimization, women on the campus of Mississippi State University have comparable to lower numbers than the 2011 national sample analyzed in this thesis. About 4% of women at MSU experience sexual touching without consent, compared to almost 7% in the national sample. Roughly 2.5% of MSU women report attempted sexual penetration without consent, compared to 3.2% in the national sample. One percent of women at Mississippi State report having been in a sexually abusive relationship, compared to 2.1% of women in the national sample. The rape measure (sexually penetrated without consent) is roughly the same between the MSU sample and the national sample (1.7% vs. 1.8%, respectively). Finally, 1.4% of women at Mississippi State University report rape while drinking during the last 12 months, compared to 1.3% nationally.

Interestingly, men at Mississippi State report more sexual victimization than men in the 2011 national sample. About 4% of men at MSU experienced sexual touching without consent, compared to 3% of men in the national sample. Attempted sexual penetration occurred at roughly the same rate between samples (.9% at MSU and 1% nationally). Roughly one percent (1.2%) of men at MSU report having been in a sexually abusive relationship, compared to .9% nationally. Over one percent (1.3%) of men at Mississippi State report sexual penetration without consent, compared to .6% of men nationally. Shockingly, 4.2% of men at MSU have been raped while drinking during the last 12 months, compared to 1.3% nationally. While I cannot make statistical

65

comparisons between these results and the national data, comparing the findings of these

two groups is an interesting extension of this literature.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this thesis was to answer the research questions, do "traditional risk factors" (also referred to as behavioral factors) actually predict sexual victimization among college or university students? And if so, are they greater predictors of victimization than demographic or contextual factors? Finally, do these predictors differ for male and female sexual assault victims? The results of this study show several similarities among men and women in regards to predicting sexual victimization. When examining the models not split by gender, there are several findings in need of discussion. While some are not surprising, such as the finding that women are more likely to be the victim of sexual assault than men, there are others that are not as likely to appear in the literature.

For example, sexual identity, especially for women in college or at a university, and the risk of sexual assault is not addressed heavily in the literature. Women who identify as heterosexual are almost 62% less likely to experience sexual victimization than women who identify as non-heterosexual. This finding may relate to men trying to exert their masculinity over women who are seen as rejecting male dominance by having sex with other genders (or possibly in addition to). By sexually assaulting these women, men may feel as if they have taken back control of the needs of men. Also not widely discussed in the literature is the importance of relationship status of women on campus.

67

Women who are in relationships (either cohabitating or not) are 77% less likely to experience sexual assault than women who are not in a relationship. Although relationship status is discussed in the fear of crime and victimization literature, it mostly pertains to women who live with their significant other, and do not discuss women in college or at a university.

Models not Split by Gender

In the models representing both men and women, five of the seven demographic characteristics are of interest, which include gender, marital status, sexual identity, age, and relationship status. Interestingly, in models 1 and 2, race was significant, with moderate effect sizes (24% and 34%, respectively). It was only in the behavioral model (model 3) that it lost significance and stayed non-significant it in the full model (model 4). There were also some contextual variables that are important to discuss. First, as discussed above, contextual variables were not as good at predicting sexual assault as one might expect. For example, due to the culture of violence documented in the South, I expected to find that respondents at schools located in this region would be at a higher risk of victimization. This, however, is not the finding in this data set.

Two interesting variables that were significant that do not often appear in the literature involved perceptions of typical students at their school and their drug and alcohol use. In model 2, the perception of marijuana use is significant; and in model 4, the perception of other drug use is significant. If students perceive typical students at their school to be drug users, this might mean there is a "party school" atmosphere that could be contributing to a rape culture on campus. In addition, if students want to receive information or programming regarding sexual assault, then respondents of this survey

68

may have already experienced sexual victimization or had friends who have experienced sexual assault. While this study cannot test for a "party school" atmosphere or "rape culture," how respondents perceive the amount of drinking and drug use serves as a proxy for this measure here. This is lacking in the previous literature and based on these findings, should be considered in future research.

To address the effect of sexual assault prevention programming (along with alcohol/drug abuse prevention and violence prevention), I examined six questions pertaining to these issues. In model 2, respondents who received alcohol and drug abuse information were significantly more likely to have experienced sexual assault (26%); and violence information were significantly less likely to have experienced sexual assault (14%)—this is also significant in the fourth model (15%). Finally, students who were interested in receiving sexual assault information from their college or university were significantly more likely to have experienced sexual assault (67% in model 2, and 58% in model 4). These findings could be because these students who want this information may have already been exposed to sexual victimization (whether they or someone they know was victimized).

Additionally, research has shown that students living in sorority houses and on-campus dormitories are more likely to be sexually assaulted than students living off-campus (Fisher et al. 2000). Also, research has shown that 9 out of 10 sexual assault victims on college campuses knew their offender. Because of the existing literature regarding date/acquaintance rape on campuses, I expected to find that students who live on campus would be significantly more at risk of sexual assault. However, campus residence holds no significance when predicting sexual victimization. Finally, all

69

behavioral factors except athlete status are significant in the behavioral model (model 3) and five out of seven are significant in the full model—model 4 (only GPA and Athlete status are not significant). These findings are not surprising considering the vast amount of literature that consider most of these variables as "traditional risk factors" (i.e., alcohol use, marijuana and other drug use, number of sexual partners, and membership in a fraternity or sorority). These findings, or lack of findings, are also found in the female only models.

The absence of significance of most contextual factors means that campus demographics (i.e., campus size, size of community surrounding the campus, campus residence, campuses located in the South, type of school—public or private) do not play as big of a role in predicting sexual victimization as is previously cited in the literature. These findings can inform our understanding of policy making in the future by focusing on the population of students who are at a higher risk of sexual victimization--men students in smaller, public schools (a finding that will be addressed in the section discussing the male only models).

Overall, men and women in this sample who identify as non-heterosexual are at a much higher risk for sexual victimization. Women and men who are older are at a much lower risk of sexual victimization. Both women and men who have the perception that "typical" students at their school use drugs other than marijuana are more likely to have been the victim of sexual assault. This may be because these students were victimized by someone who was using drugs or were victimized at a party where drugs were available. What is especially pertinent to this study is the significance of alcohol use, other drug use, and number of sexual partners in both men and women. Because these factors are

70

significant for both men and women, prevention programming needs to address the risks of these behaviors and what sober bystanders can do to help prevent a potential sexual victimization.

Female Models

In the female only models, most demographic characteristics are of interest, which include race, marital status, sexual identity, and relationship status. As with the models representing both genders, year in school is not significant. Similar to the models not split by gender, perception of marijuana use by typical students, receiving alcohol and violence prevention information, and interested in receiving sexual assault information are the only four contextual factors that are significant in the contextual model (model 3). However, only receiving violence prevention information (respondents were 17% less likely to have experienced sexual assault) and wanting to receive sexual assault prevention information (respondents were 64% more likely to have experienced sexual assault) is significant in the full model (model 4).

Finally, all behavioral factors except athlete status are significant in the behavioral model (model 3) and five out of seven are significant in the full model—model 4 (only GPA and Athlete status are not significant). Again, these findings were expected and not at all surprising. Considerations of sexual identity, relationship status, and perception of alcohol and drug use by "typical" students are all worthy of discussion and can contribute to the existing literature regarding the sexual assault of college students. These issues will be addressed further in the future research section below.

71

Male Models

In the male only models, the demographic characteristics of interest differ by each model. In the first and final models, only sexual identity is significant. For these respondents, identifying as heterosexual significantly decreases the likelihood of sexual assault (38% in model 1, and 49% in model 4). In the second model, year in school is also significant. For every increase in year in school, the odds of experiencing sexual assault increases 12%. Interestingly, in model 3—the contextual model—race is significant. White men in this sample are 28% less likely to have experienced sexual assault. Also in this model, age is significant. For every year older a respondent is in this sample, the odds of experiencing sexual assault decrease by 8%. Sexual identity is also still significant in this model, and remains the only significant variable in the full model (model 4).

Unlike the other models representing men and women, and the women only sample previously discussed, type of school is significant in the full model. For men who attend a public college or university in this sample, the odds of experiencing sexual victimization are 69% more than men at a private school. I believe future research is needed regarding this area due to the lack of literature found in my review.

Because membership in fraternities is so heavily tied to victimization in the existing literature, I expected to find significance with this variable. However, this behavioral factor, along with marijuana use, GPA, and athlete status, is not significant. I thought that men athletes' risk of sexual victimization would increase because of their association with other men who hold aggressive tendencies to exert their masculinity over others--this idea is not found in these data. Because GPA is significant in the female only

72

models, I expected GPA would hold the same significance in the male only models. This, however, is not the case. This is an attention-grabbing finding that is not heavily explored in the literature.

Finally, the behavioral factors that are significant include alcohol use, drug use other than marijuana, and number of sexual partners are significant in the behavioral model (model 3) and the final model (model 4).

Summary of Model Differences

First, marital status and relationship status are not significant for men, but are for women. The risk of sexual victimization for women in this sample who are married or in a relationship is significantly less than women who are not married or not in a relationship. When looking through a social constructionist lens, it is easy to see that the gender norms expected of women and men play a part in these findings. Men are seen as the protector of his partner, therefore warding off any potential sexual offenders. Second, year in school is not significant for men in this sample, but is for women.

When comparing the significance of behavioral factors I find that marijuana use, Greek membership, and GPA all differ between men and women. These three factors are not significant at all for men, but are significant for women. When using a feminist perspective to explain the non-significance for Greek membership for men, I argue that because men who are fraternity members have already shown their masculinity through pledging rituals and survival, they are less susceptible to the risk of sexual victimization. Women who are in a sorority, on the other hand, are more exposed to this male dominance through attendance of fraternity parties. Because marijuana use is more

expected among men, it is not surprising that it is not significant in predicting sexual victimization in that group.

Findings Explained through a Gendered Framework

As outlined in the introduction, gender theories help make sense of these findings. Because of the prevalence of male dominance and masculinity in our society, women are more at risk of sexual victimization than men (men's odds of experiencing sexual assault are 66% lower than women in the models representing both men and women—table 4.4). As discussed in the literature, rape myths and victim blame are tied to traditional gender expectations and a rape culture that is often supported by university policies that protect groups on campus who generate money and prestige (i.e., male athletic teams and fraternities; Giroux and Giroux 2002; Neimark 1993). Although I am unable to specifically comment on rape culture, I did create proxy measures (the perception of alcohol, marijuana, and other drugs of "typical students) to speak to the pervasiveness of this dynamic on the college or university campus.

Gender has been discussed as producing, reproducing, and sustaining inequality. Doing gender, according to West and Zimmerman (1987) is "the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one's sex category" (127). Gender expectations help to explain how women are in subordinate roles and can be coerced and victimized by men. If "doing gender" means conforming to rigid ideals of masculinity, then it is no surprise that sexual assault among college students is amplified. To illustrate this point, my findings show that the odds of experiencing sexual assault are 22% higher for women involved in the Greek system than women who are non-Greek. Because of their membership in a sorority, women are

74

exposed more to men in fraternities who uphold rigid ideals of masculinity, which means these women are more likely to be subjected to aggressive behavior of men.

As stated in the literature review chapter, a small but growing body of literature (reviewed extensively in this thesis) has used gender scholarship to examine the structural reasons why traditional factors might predict victimization. I have shown how my findings in this thesis are aligned with the previous gender scholarship by discussing the importance of "traditional risk factors" (i.e., alcohol and drug use as well as sexual history) in way that does not blame the victim for their victimization. Because women are exposed to men who have not received prevention programming or sexual assault information from their college or university and who exhibit negative characteristics of gender expectations (e.g. aggression, entitlement, etc.), women are at a higher risk of sexual victimization. This idea uses a feminist approach to explain how their assault is not their fault, but is a shortcoming of colleges and universities for not providing sexual assault prevention information or programming. It is an easy argument to make that offenders hold the blame for assaulting victims. While this may be true, several contextual factors could decrease the risk of victimization (and offending) if only schools would implement change.

Limitations

There are several benefits of the American College Health Association/National College Health Assessment (ACHA-NCHA) data set used in this thesis, including several variables that address sexual victimization among a college sample. However, because universities are solicited to participate, rather than being randomly selected, the sample may not be representative of the overall student population. In addition, the lack of

75

information regarding distribution of sexual assault prevention material and/or sexual assault prevention program attendance, excludes the possibility to quantitatively test effectiveness of existing programs' effect on sexual victimization in this sample. In addition, because I am using cross-sectional data, a limitation of this thesis is that I cannot determine the time ordering of variables (drinking, drug use, and sexual assault for example). This thesis is also limited because I did not create my own survey. Had creating and distributing my own survey been possible with a large sample as was provided by ACHA, I would have been able to address specific questions regarding rape culture, as opposed to using proxy measures. In addition, I was limited by the fact that I used a survey—interesting and more substantive results could have been produced had I been able to conduct interviews. I am also limited in my analyses because I do not know specific characteristics about each school. If these details were available, I could have looked more specifically at a party school culture or sexual assault statistics (via US News and World Report statistics, for example).

Finally, there are two limitations that I consider most important in this thesis. First, these data do not describe where the assaults occurred. Therefore, it is impossible to know if the respondents in this dataset who were sexually victimized were assaulted on the college or university campus (in open space, a dormitory, or in a fraternity or sorority house) or off-campus. In addition, these data do not reveal if the offender is also a student and/or someone the victim knows. This information could be very helpful in appropriate campus responses. Second, I was unable to include analyses of offenders due to the lack of affirmative responses and questionable rough descriptive analyses. I originally wanted to run models concerning sexual assault victimization for both victims and

76

offenders. However, there are only 112 respondents, who responded affirmatively that they had sexually penetrated someone without their consent. Not only are there only 112 respondents making modeling difficult, when looking at the sex breakdown of those that answered "yes, to this one question" 63% of the respondents were female. This is highly unusual and suspect (since sexual assault offenders are almost exclusively male). Finally, nothing in the models is statistically significant, except for age. Thus, the lack of respondents, strange sex break down, and lack of significance has given us pause regarding the offender models. For these reasons, I have focused exclusively on the victim models. Offender information is an important aspect of sexual assault prevention programming for college students. Understanding what factors and characteristics are more prevalent in offenders could inform the development and implementation of violence and sexual assault prevention programs.

Future Research

Because there are many findings from these data that are not found in my review of the literature, there are several avenues of future research needed. First, the odds of experiencing sexual victimization are lower for white men (28% in model 3), but the odds of experiencing sexual victimization are higher for white women (37% in model 1, 45% in model 2). Future research is needed to address the significance of race differing by gender. This could be addressed by looking at offender type, which is out of the scope of possibilities related to this dataset.

Second, GPA is not significant in predicting sexual victimization for men, but is significant for women (in the behavioral model, 9%). This could be because women who have a higher GPA are spending more time at home, less time at campus events, or less

77

time at social functions (e.g. fraternity or sorority parties) are exposed less to men who have not received prevention programming or sexual assault information from their college or university. This idea is somewhat based on routine activities theory, however, it uses a feminist approach, flipping the original version on its head. Instead of putting the blame on women for drinking or attending parties, the onerous is on men who are assaulting women and colleges and universities for not providing sexual assault prevention information or programming.

Third, the odds of experiencing sexual victimization for men who are students at a public college or university are 69% higher than those who attend a private school; this is not significant for women. It may be this statistic is related to more men athletes and fraternity members in larger public schools than in smaller public schools or private schools. The more athletes and Greek members, according to the literature previously cited in this thesis, the higher the probability for a supportive rape culture to exist. Fourth, the odds of experiencing sexual victimization are 35% lower for women who identify as heterosexual, and 51% lower for men who identify the same. This is an interesting avenue for future research, which can inform prevention programming on the college or university campus. Finally, addressing the relationship status of women on campus (either cohabitating or not) and risk of victimization is a gap in the literature than needs to be addressed.

Because the five avenues of future research discussed are important to my areas of interest and research goals, I plan on addressing these gaps in the literature. To do so, I plan on using the ACHA data set represented in this thesis (it is also possible to get more recent years of these data) as well as continuing to use Mississippi State University

78

ACHA data (hopefully with access to raw data, rather than executive summaries). In addition to performing quantitative analyses, I would like to interview individuals who develop and train others on successful prevention programs throughout the country. Because of my work on campus with advocates for sexual assault victims, I am aware of a potential sexual assault prevention campaign to be starting in the Fall of 2015 at MSU. By discussing the need for variation in design of sexual assault and violence prevention programming based on variation of race, gender, age, and sexual identity (based off findings in this thesis and possible findings in future research) with advocates at Mississippi State is a jumping-off point in spreading the change needed in programming in colleges and universities across the country.

This thesis addresses the need of violence and sexual assault information and programming in colleges and universities in the United States. Although sexual assault on campus is not a new topic discussed in the literature or the media, it is still an important issue to discuss. Because rates of sexual assault of college students have not decreased, and because of the increased media attention of this epidemic (due to Title IX violations), my thesis and future research are especially important for change to occur.

REFERENCES

Abbey, Antonia, Lisa Thomsson Ross, Donna McDuffie, and Pam McAuslan (1996).
"Alcohol and Dating Risk Factors for Sexual Assault Among College Women."
Psychology of Women Quarterly 20(1): 147-169.

Abbey, Antonia, Tina Zawacki, Philip O. Buck, A. Monique Clinton, and Pam McAuslan
(2004). "Sexual Assault and Alcohol Consumption: What Do We Know About
Their Relationship and What Types of Research are Still Needed?" *Aggression
and Violent Behavior* 9(3): 271-303.

Abbey, Antonia and Pam McAuslan. (2004). "A Longitudinal Examination of Male
College Students' Perpetration of Sexual Assault." *Journal of Consulting and
Clinical Psychology* 72(1): 747-756.

Abbey, Antonia. (2002). "Alcohol-Related Sexual Assault: A Common Problem Among
College Students." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* Supplement 14: 118-
128.

Anastasio, Phyllis A. and Diana M. Costa. (2004). "Twice Hurt: How Newspaper
Coverage May Reduce Empathy and Engender Blame for Female Victims of
Crime." *Sex Roles* 51(9-10): 535-542.

Bachman, Ronet, Raymond Paternoster, and Sally Ward. (1992). "The Rationality of
Sexual Offending: Testing a Deterrence/Rational Choice Conception of Sexual
Assault." *Law and Society Review* 26(2): 343-372.

Bannon, R. Sean, Matthew W. Brosi, and John D. Foubert. (2013). "Sorority Women's
and Fraternity Men's Rape Myth Acceptance and Bystander Intervention
Attitudes*." Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 50(1): 72-87.

Banyard, Victoria L. (2011). "Who Will Help Prevent Sexual Violence: Creating an
Ecological Model of Bystander Intervention." *Psychology of Violence* 1(3): 216-
229.

Banyard, Victoria L., Elizabethe G. Plante, and Mary M. Moynihan. (2004). "Bringing a
Broader Community Perspective to Sexual Violence Prevention." J*ournal of
Community Psychology* 32(1): 61-79.

Basile, Kathleen C. and Sharon G. Smith. (2011). "Sexual violence Victimization of Women: Prevalence, Characteristics, and the Role of Public Health and Prevention." *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine* 5: 407-417.

Beauregard, Eric and Benoit Leclerc. (2007). "An Application of the Rational Choice Approach to the Offending Process of Sex Offenders: A Closer Look at the Decision-making." *Sex Abuse* 19(2): 115-133.

Beichner, Dawn and Cassia Spohn. (2012). "Modeling the Effects of Victim Behavior and Moral Character on Prosecutors' Charging Decisions in Sexual Assault Cases." *Violence and Victims* 27(1): 3-24.

Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Berkowitz, Alan. (1992). "College Men as Perpetrators of Acquaintance Rape and Sexual Assault: A Review of Recent Research. *Journal of American College Health* 40(4): 175-181.

Berkowitz, Alan. D. (1994). "A Model Acquaintance Rape Prevention Program for Men." *New directions for Student Services* 65: 35-42.

Boeringer, Scot B., Constance L. Shehan, and Ronald L. Akers (1991). "Social Contexts and Social Learning in Sexual Coercion and Aggression: Assessing the Contribution of Fraternity Membership." *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies* 40(1): 58-64.

Bohmer, Carol. (1993). *Sexual Assault on Campus: The Problem and the Solution*. New York, Lexington Books.

Bohner, Gerd, Friederike Eyssel, Afroditi Pina, Frank Siebler, and G. Tendayi Viki. (2009). "Rape Myth Acceptance: Cognitive, Affective and Behavioural Effects of Beliefs that Blame the Victim and Exonerate the Perpetrator." *Rape: Challenging Contemporary Thinking*. M. H. a. J. Brown. UK, Willan Publishing: 17-45.

Boswell, A. Ayres and Joan Z. Spade. (1996). "Fraternities and Collegiate Rape Culture: Why are Some Fraternities More Dangerous Places for Women? *Gender and Society* 10(2): 133-147.

Burt, Martha. R. (1980). "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38(2): 217-230.

Campbell, Rebecca. (2005). "What Really Happened? A Validation Study of Rape Survivors' Help-Seeking Experiences with the Legal and Medical Systems." *Violence and Victims* 20(1): 55-68.

81

Capece, Michael and Lonn Lanza-Kaduce. (2013). "Binge Drinking Among College Students: A Partial Test of Akers' Social Structure-Social Learning Theory." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 38: 503-519.

Choate, Laura Hensley. (2003). "Sexual Assault Prevention Programs for College Men: An Exploratory Evaluation of the Men against Violence Model." *Journal of College Counseling* 6(2): 166-176.

Cohen, Dov and Richard E. Nisbett. (1994). "Self-Protection and the Culture of Honor: Explaining Southern Violence." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 20(5): 551-567.

Cohen, Lawrence E. and Marcus Felson (1979). "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44(4): 588-608.

Connell, R. (2009). *Gender: Short Introductions.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. CA, Stanford University Press.

Daly, Kathleen and Meda Chesney-Lind (1988) "Feminism and criminology." *Justice Quarterly* 5(4) 497-538.

Davis, Tracy L. and Debora L. Liddell. (2002). "Getting Inside the House: The Effectiveness of a Rape Prevention Program for College Fraternity Men." *Journal of College Student Development* 43(1): 35-50.

DeBard, Robert and Casey Sacks. (2010). "Fraternity/Sorority Membership: Good News about First-Year Impact." *The Research Journal of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors* 5(1): 12-23.

Du Mont, Janice, Karen-Lee Miller, and Terri L. Myhr. "The role of 'real rape' and 'real victim' stereotypes in the police reporting practices of sexually assaulted Women." *Violence Against Women* 9, no. 4 (2003): 466-486.

Erlanger, Howard S. (1976). "Is there a 'Subculture of Violence' in the South?" *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 66(4): 483-490

Fehler-Cabral, Giannina, Rebecca Campbell, and Debra Patterson (2011). "Adult Sexual Assault Survivors' Experiences with Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners (SANEs)." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 26(18): 3618-3639.

Fisher, Bonnie S., Francis T. Cullen, and Michael G. Turner (2000). The Sexual Victimization of College Women. O. o. J. P. National Institute of Justice, and Department of Justice: 33.

Fisher, Bonnie S., Leah E. Daigle, Francis T. Cullen, and Michael G. Turner. (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.

Foubert, John D. (2000). "The Longitudinal Effects of a Rape-Prevention Program on Fraternity Men's Attitudes, Behavioral Intent, and Behavior." *Journal of American College Health* 48: 158-163.

Foubert, John D. and Marylu K. McEwen. (1998). "An All-male Rape-Prevention Peer Education Program: Decreasing Fraternity Men's Behavioral Intent to Rape." *Journal of College Student Development* 39(6): 548-556.

Freetly, Angela J. Hattery and Emily W. Kane. (1995). "Men's and Women's Perceptions of Non-Consensual Sexual Intercourse." *Sex Roles* 33(11-12): 785-802.

Furnham, Adrian and Natalie Boston. (1996). "Theories of Rape and the Just World." *Psychology, Crime and Law* 2(3): 211-229.

Gastil, Raymond D. (1971). "Homicide and a Regional Culture of Violence." *American Sociological Review* 36(1): 412-427.

Giroux, Henry A., and Susan Searls Giroux. (2012). "Universities Gone Wild Big Money, Big Sports, and Scandalous Abuse at Penn State." *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies* 12 (4): 267-273.

Hammock, Georgina S. and Deborah R. Richardson. (1993). "Blaming Drunk Victims: Is it Just World or Sex Role Violation." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 23(19): 1574-1586.

Harris, Frank. (2010). "College men's conceptualizations of masculinities and contextual influences: Toward a conceptual model." *Journal of College Student Development* 51(3): 297-318.

Haynes, Graeme A. and James M. Olson. (2006). "Coping with Threats to Just-World Beliefs: Derogate, Blame, or Help?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 36(3): 664-682.

Herman, Dianne F. (1989). The Rape Culture. *Women: A Feminist Perspective*. Mountain View, CA, Mayfield Publishing Company.

Hlavka, Heather R. (2014). Normalizing Sexual Violence: Young Women Account for Harassment and Abuse." *Gender & Society* 28(3): 1-22.

Hollander, Jocelyn A. (2009). "The Roots of Resistance to Women's Self-Defense." *Violence Against Women* 15(5): 574-594.

Humphries, D. (2009). *Women, Violence, and the Media: Readings in Feminist Criminology.* Lebanon, NH: Northeastern University Press.

Jackson, Arrick, Katherine Gilliland and Louis Veneziano. (2006). "Routine Activity Theory and Sexual Deviance among Male College Students*." Journal of Family Violence* 21 (1):449-460.

Jennings, Wesley, Angela R. Gover, and Dagmar Pudrzynska. (2007). "Are Institutions of Higher Learning Safe? A Descriptive Study of Campus Safety Issues and Self-Reported Campus Victimization among Male and Female College Students." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 18(2): 191-208.

Johnson, Thomas J. (2002). "College Students' Self-Reported Reasons for Why Drinking Games End." *Addictive Behaviors* 27(1): 145-153.

Johnson, Thomas J. and Courtney Stahl. (2004). "Sexual Experiences Associated with Participation in Drinking Games." *The Journal of General Psychology* 131(3): 304-320.

Kalof, Linda and Timothy Cargill. (1991). "Fraternity and Sorority Membership and Gender Dominance Attitudes." *Sex Roles* 25(7-8): 417-423.

Kanin, Eugene J. (1985). "Date Rapists: Differential sexual Socialization and Relative Deprivation." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 14(3): 219-231.

Katz, Jackson. (1995). "Reconstructing Masculinity in the Locker Room: The Mentors in Violence Prevention Project." *Harvard Educational Review* 65(2): 163-174.

Kaysen, Debra, Clayton Neighbors, Joel Martell, Nicole Fossos, and Mary E. Larimer (2006). "Incapacitated Rape and Alcohol Use: A Prospective Analysis." *Addictive Behaviors* 31(10): 1820-1832.

Knapp, Terry J., Charles Rasmussen, and Roger K. Barnhart (2001). "What College Students Say about Intercollegiate Athletics: A Survey of Attitudes and Beliefs." *College Student Journal* 35(1).

Koss, Mary P., Christine A. Gidycz, and Nadine Wisniewski. (1987). "The Scope of Rape: Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Higher Education Students." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 55(2): 162-170.

Krebs, Christopher P., Christine H. Lindquist, Tara D. Warner, Bonnie S. Fisher, and Sandra L. Martin. (2009). "The Differential Risk Factors of Physically Forced and Alcohol-or Other Drug-Enabled Sexual Assault Among University Women." *Violence and Victims* 24(3): 302-321.

Lee, Lucienne. A. (1987). "Rape Prevention: Experiential Training for Men." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 66(2): 100-101.

Littleton, Heather. (2014). "Interpersonal Violence on College Campuses: Understanding Risk Factors and Working to Find Solutions." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 15(4): 297-303

Lonsway, Kimberly A. and Louise F. Fitzgerald. (1994). "Rape Myths: In Review." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18(2): 133-164.

Lonsway, Kimberly A. and Louise F. Fitzgerald. (1995). "Attitudinal Antecedents of Rape Myth Acceptance: A Theoretical and Empirical Reexamination." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 68(4): 704-711.

Lonsway, Kimberly. A. (1996). "Preventing Acquaintance Rape Through Education." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 20(2): 229-265.

Lorber, Judith. (1994). *Paradoxes of Gender*, Yale University Press.

Lorber, Judith. (1996). "Beyond the Binaries: Depolarizing the Categories of Sex, Sexuality, and Gender." *Sociological Inquiry* 66(2): 143-160.

MacLachlan, Jenna. (1999). "Dangerous traditions: Hazing rituals on campus and university liability." *Journal of College and University Law* 26: 511.

Martin, Patricia Yancey and Robert A. Hummer. (1989). "Fraternities and Rape on Campus." *Gender and Society* 3(4): 457-473.

Martin, Patricia Yancey. (2004). "Gender as Social Institution." *Social Forces* 82(4): 1249-1273.

McCauley, Jenna L., Ananda B. Amstadter, Carla Kmett Danielson, Kenneth J. Ruggiero, Dean G. Kilpatrick, and Heidi S. Resnick. (2009). "Mental health and Rape History in Relation to Non-medical Use of Prescription Drugs in a National Sample of Women." *Addictive Behaviors* 34(8): 641-648.

Melnick, Merrill. (1992). "Male Athletes and Sexual Assault." *Journal of Physical Education* 63(5): 32-36.

Mohler-Kuo, Meichun, George W. Dowdell, Mary P. Koss, and Henry Wechsler. (2004). "Correlates of Rape While Intoxicated in a National Sample of College Women." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* 65(1).

Mustaine, Elizabeth Ehrhardt and Richard Tewksbury. (2002). "Sexual Assault of College Women: A Feminist Interpretation of a Routine Activities Analysis." *Criminal Justice Review* 27 (1):89-123.

Mustaine, Elizabeth Ehrhardt and Richard Tewksbury. (2009). "Transforming Potential Offenders into Motivated Ones: Are Sex Offenders Tempted by Alcohol and Pornography?" *Deviant Behavior* 30 (1):561-588.

Neimark, Jill. (1993). "Out of bounds: The truth about athletes and rape." *Sport in contemporary society: An anthology*: 130-137.

Norrell, Phillip M. and Shelley Bradford. (2013). "Finding the Beast in the Beauty: Resistance as a Rape Prevention Strategy." *National Social Science Journal* 40(2): 74-87.

Orchowski, Lindsay M., and Christine A. Gidycz. (2012). "To whom do college women confide following sexual assault? A prospective study of predictors of sexual assault disclosure and social reactions." *Violence against women* 18(3): 264-288.

Otto, Kadence A. (2009). "Criminal Athletes: An Analysis for Charges, Reduced Charges and Sentences." *Journal of Legal Aspects Sport* 19: 67.

Owen, Stephen S., Tod W. Burke, and David Vichesky. (2008). "Hazing in student organizations: Prevalence, attitudes and solutions." *Oracle: the research journal of the association of fraternity advisors* 3(1): 40-58.

Pino, Nathan W. and Abby M. Johnson-Johns. (2009). "College Women and the Occurrence of Unwanted Sexual Advances in Public Drinking Settings." *Social Science Journal* 46 (1):252-267.

Rennison, Callie Marie. (2002). *Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992-2000*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Schneider, Joseph W. (1985). "Social Problems Theory: The Constructionist View." *Annual Review of Sociology* 11(1): 209-229.

Schwartz, Jonathan P., Linda D. Griffin, Melani M. Russell, and Sarannette Frontaura-Duck. (2006). "Prevention of Dating Violence on College Campuses: An Innovative Program." *Journal of College Counseling* 9(1): 90-96.

Schwartz, Martin D. and Victoria L. Pitts. (1995). "Exploring a Feminist Routine Activities Approach to Explaining Sexual Assault." *Justice Quarterly* 12 (1):9-29.

Sher, Kenneth J., Bruce D. Bartholow, and Shivani Nanda (2001). "Short-and Long-Term Effects of Fraternity and Sorority Membership on Heavy Drinking: A Social Norms Perspective." *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 15(1).

Suarez, E. and Gadalla, T.M. (2010). "Stop Blaming the Victim: A Meta-Analysis on Rape Myths. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25: 2010-2035.

Tjaden, Patricia G. and Nancy Thoennes (2006). "Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Rape Victimization: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." National Institute of Justice. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.

Ullman, Sarah E. (2007). "A 10-Year Update of "Review and Critique of Empirical Studies of Rape Avoidance"." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 34(3): 411-429.

Ullman, Sarah E. and Henrietta H. Filipas. (2001). "Predictors of PTSD Symptom Severity and Social Reactions in Sexual Assault Victims." *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 14(2): 369-389.

Ullman, Sarah E., George Karabatsos, and Mary P. Koss. (1999). "Alcohol and Sexual Assault in a National Sample of College Women." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14(6): 603-625.

Walker, Dave P., Terri L. Messman-Moore, and Rose Marie Ward. (2011). "Number of Sexual Partners and Sexual Assertiveness Predict Sexual Victimization: Do More Partners Equal More Risk?" *Violence and Victims* 26(6): 774-787.

Wechsler, Henry and Toben F. Nelson. (2008). "What We Have Learned from the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study: Focusing Attention on College Student Alcohol Consumption and the Environmental Conditions that Promote it." Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs 69(4): 481-490.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1: 125-151.

WSB-TV: Atlanta. 2013. "Controversial Ga. Tech Letter from Fraternity." Retrieved Nov. 21, 2013(http://www.wsbtv.com/news/news/local/controversial-ga-tech-letter-fraternity/nbJjY/).

APPENDIX A

FREQUENCIES OF VARIABLES

Table A.1   Number of Sexual Victimizations

	Frequency	%
Sexually touched without consent	1558	5.60
Attempted penetration without consent	696	2.50
Penetration without consent	399	1.40
Penetration without consent while drinking	351	1.30
Number of Sexual Victimizations	3,004	10.90

N=27,774

Table A.2   Number of People Sexually Victimized

# of victimizations per respondent	Frequency	%
0	25534	93.40
1	1181	4.30
2	265	1.00
3	235	0.90
4	137	0.50
Number of People Victimized	1,818	6.70

Number of victimizations per respondent refers to the four variables used to create the Dependent Variable, Sexual Victimization: sexually touched without consent, attempted penetration without consent, penetration without consent, and penetration without consent when drinking. N=27,774.

Table A.3   Description of the Female Only Sample

	Mean	Median	SD	Range
Demographics				
White	0.77	1.00	0.42	0.00 - 1.00
Married	0.11	0.00	0.31	0.00 - 1.00
Heterosexual	0.93	1.00	0.26	0.00 - 1.00
Age	21.00	20.00	3.31	18.00-34.00
Year School	2.89	3.00	1.65	1.00 - 6.00
In Relationship	0.52	1.00	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Contextual Factors				
Campus Size	3.54	4.00	1.30	1.00 - 5.00
Community Size	4.13	4.00	1.25	1.00 - 6.00
Campus Residence	0.43	0.00	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
South	0.41	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Public School	0.60	1.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Alcohol Perception	5.57	6.00	1.69	1.00 - 8.00
Marijuana Perception	4.49	5.00	2.04	1.00 - 8.00
Other Drug Perception	23.96	19.00	14.66	11.00-88.00
Got: Alcohol info	0.70	1.00	0.46	0.00 - 1.00
Got: Sexual Assault info	0.63	0.00	0.48	0.00 - 1.00
Got: Violence info	0.38	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Alcohol info	0.26	0.00	0.44	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Sexual Assault info	0.41	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Violence info	0.35	0.00	0.48	0.00 - 1.00
Behavioral Factors				
Alcohol use	0.76	1.00	0.42	0.00 - 1.00
Marijuana use	0.32	0.00	0.47	0.00 - 1.00
Other Drug use	0.14	0.00	0.35	0.00 - 1.00
# Sex Partners	1.17	1.00	1.41	0.00 - 10.00
Greek	0.11	0.00	0.31	0.00 - 1.00
GPA	3.33	3.00	0.66	1.00 - 4.00
Athlete	0.08	0.00	0.27	0.00 - 1.00
Dependent Variable				
Sexually Victimized (N=1,445)	0.08		0.27	0.00 - 1.00
N=18,370				

90

Table A.4   Description of the Male Only Sample

	Mean	Median	SD	Range
Demographics				
White	0.75	1.00	0.43	0.00 - 1.00
Married	0.11	0.00	0.32	0.00 - 1.00
Heterosexual	0.92	1.00	0.28	0.00 - 1.00
Age	21.40	20.00	3.61	18.00-34.00
Year School	2.96	3.00	1.72	1.00 - 6.00
In Relationship	0.43	0.00	0.50	0.00 - 1.00
Contextual Factors				
Campus Size	3.64	4.00	1.23	1.00 - 5.00
Community Size	4.13	4.00	1.29	1.00 - 6.00
Campus Residence	0.43	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
South	0.40	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Public School	0.62	1.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Alcohol Perception	5.30	5.00	1.76	1.00 - 8.00
Marijuana Perception	4.15	4.00	2.04	1.00 - 8.00
Other Drug Perception	21.69	16.00	14.14	11.00-88.00
Got: Alcohol info	0.74	1.00	0.44	0.00 - 1.00
Got: Sexual Assault info	0.62	1.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Got: Violence info	0.41	0.00	0.49	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Alcohol info	0.26	0.00	0.44	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Sexual Assault info	0.28	0.00	0.45	0.00 - 1.00
Want: Violence info	0.28	0.00	0.45	0.00 - 1.00
Behavioral Factors				
Alcohol use	0.75	1.00	0.43	0.00 - 1.00
Marijuana use	0.37	0.00	0.48	0.00 - 1.00
Other Drug use	0.18	0.00	0.38	0.00 - 1.00
# Sex Partners	1.31	1.00	1.69	0.00 - 10.00
Greek	0.11	0.00	0.31	0.00 - 1.00
GPA	3.28	3.00	0.69	1.00 - 4.00
Athlete	0.10	0.00	0.30	0.00 - 1.00
Dependent Variable				
Sexually Victimized (N=335)	0.04		0.19	0.00 - 1.00

N=8,989

91