College Students' Sexual Assault Experiences at SUNY Geneseo: Results from an Anonymous, Campus-Wide Survey and Implications for Change

July 2010

This report was prepared by Jennifer Katz, Department of Psychology. The support of the SUNY Geneseo administration is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks are due to Robert Bonfiglio, Vice President for Student and Campus Life, Melinda DuBois, Administrative Director of Counseling, Julie Rao, Director of Institutional Research, Leonard Sancillio, Dean of Students, Joan Zook, Chair of the Institutional Review Board, and recent graduates Christy Allen, Clare Campbell, Renae Pepe, and Erika van der Kloet for their invaluable assistance.

Foreword

Acknowledging sexual assault at SUNY Geneseo exemplifies our deep commitment to community and integrity. That is, we embrace the interests of all our students, and we promote the ethical development of our citizens, our policies, and our procedures. By addressing campus sexual assault, we are embarking on a proactive process of self-assessment and critical self-evaluation. This process will allow Geneseo to bring data and theory on campus sexual assault into meaningful practice. As New York State's premiere public liberal arts college, we seek to address sexual assault in the most creative, innovative, and proactive ways possible. This difficult work reinforces our distinctive role in developing cutting-edge solutions to problems in higher education. In doing so, Geneseo can provide national leadership on this topic consonant with its own mission and values. This report is only a first step.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 4
Introduction 6
Method
Participants 8
Measures 9
Procedure 10
Results
Overall Prevalence 11
Common Types of Campus Sexual Assault at Geneseo 12
Behaviorally-Specific versus General Reports of Sexual Assault 13
Rates of Reporting Sexual Assault to SUNY Geneseo Staff 13
Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault to SUNY Geneseo Staff 14
Discussion 14
References 19
Table 1: Sample Characteristics 21
Table 2: Overall Prevalence and Sex Differences in Any and Each Type of Sexual Assault. . . 22
Table 3: Overall Prevalence and Sex Differences in Each Specific Sexual Assault 23
Table 4: Sex Differences in Rates of Same-Sex Perpetration 24
Table 5: Demographic Characteristics Associated with Severe Sexual Assault 25
Table 6: Students Who Self-Identified as Sexually Assaulted 26
Table 7: Level of Correspondence Between Students' Most Severe Sexual Assault and Self-Identified Sexual Assault 27
Table 8: Rates of Disclosure to Campus Personnel 28
Table 9: Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault to Campus Personnel 29
Appendix A: The Sexual Experiences Survey 30
Appendix B: Students' Self-Reported Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault at Geneseo 31

Executive Summary

Sexual assault involves sexual activity that is nonconsensual and unwanted (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2007). Sexual assault is common on college campuses across the nation. According to a report commissioned by the National Institutes of Justice (NIJ), 19% of women reported experiencing attempted or completed rape specifically since starting college (Krebs et al., 2007). Similarly, the American College Health Association (ACHA) projected that 20-25% of women will experience attempted or completed rape in college; rates are even higher when including non-penetrative sexual contact (Carr, 2005). Men are also sexually assaulted; in the NIJ study, 6% of men reported attempted or completed rape since starting college (Krebs et al.)

Sexual assaults violate individual *sexual autonomy*, which includes the right to refuse sexual activity with any person, at any time, for any or no reason (Schulhofer, 1998). Sexual autonomy is not protected in either state law (McGregor, 2005) or in college codes of conduct (e.g., Shapiro, 2010). The absence of this protection both reflects and corroborates widespread societal tendencies to minimize sexual assault and to blame victims.

According to the Center for Public Integrity (Lombardi, 2010), campus sexual assault across the nation is common, yet widely minimized by institutions of higher learning. In contrast, SUNY Geneseo is proactively addressing these issues in our own community. To begin, an anonymous campus wide survey was conducted to a) estimate the prevalence of sexual assault at Geneseo, b) identify the most common types of sexual assault on campus and risk for sexual assault, c) learn which experiences, if any, were identified by students as reflecting "sexual assault", d) identify rates of reporting sexual assault to Geneseo personnel and specific offices most likely to receive these reports, and e) identify barriers to student reporting to personnel.

Currently enrolled students (N = 1701, 72.4% female) responded to a 20 item online survey of "College Students' Sexual Experiences." The average age was 20.11. Freshman (25.8%), sophomores (23.6%), juniors (25.7%), seniors (23.5%), and graduate students (1.4%) participated. To assess time on campus, students were asked "this is my ____year enrolled at Geneseo" (possible responses were first (1), second (2), etc.). The sample average was 2.28.

Students completed a validated behaviorally-specific measure of sexual assault experiences. They also indicated the sex of the perpetrator(s), who they told about these experiences, barriers to telling Geneseo personnel, and if they identified as having been sexually assaulted. All survey items were preceded with these instructions: "Please include only incidents that occurred at Geneseo. That is, include experiences either on or off campus or involving others affiliated with the Geneseo community."

About 25% of the overall sample experienced some kind of behaviorally-specific sexual assault at Geneseo. Rates among women (30%) are consistent with projections from the ACHA (Carr, 2005). Although the most common type of sexual assault at Geneseo involved nonconsensual contact, 13.2% experienced more than one type of sexual assault (i.e., sexual contact, sexual coercion, attempted rape, or rape), and 18.3% had multiple experiences.

About 15% of women and 8% of men in our Geneseo sample were severely sexual assaulted (i.e., attempted or completed rape), which is similar to rates reported by the NIJ (Krebs et al., 2007). In our research, as well as in theirs, severe sexual assault may be underestimated for at least two reasons. First, sexual assault was most commonly reported by those in their fourth year on campus, but about a third of our sample was on campus for less than one year. Second, some students described offenses not captured by behaviorally-specific items. Nevertheless, sexual assault occurs at Geneseo and elsewhere (Carr, 2005; Karjane et al., 2006; Krebs et al.).

The perpetrator tactics most commonly used in sexual assaults at Geneseo, in descending order, were overwhelming verbal pressure, victim incapacitation due to substances, physical force, and abuse of authority. Most of these tactics are clearly problematic. At the same time, we might be encouraged that many sexual assaults involved psychological pressure, which is often treated by the law as persuasion (Schulhofer, 1998). And it is certainly possible that some nonconsensual events involving verbal pressure leading to touching, fondling, or kissing were brief and (to quote many students), "no big deal." At the same time, sexual contact can involve a wide range of invasive non-penetration experiences. In addition, as a result of overwhelming verbal pressure, 11% of women and 4% of men were compelled into unwanted sexual penetration. Although different from attempted or completed rape, this type of sexual coercion is a problem both because it violates individual sexual autonomy and because it often occurs within violent intimate relationships on our campus (e.g., Katz, Moore, & May, 2008) and elsewhere (e.g., White & Smith, 2009).

Consistent with past research (e.g., Banyard et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2997), women at Geneseo were significantly more likely than men to be sexually assaulted. To our knowledge, no nationwide studies have investigated rates of same-sex perpetration. At Geneseo, most sexual victimization occurred in a heterosexual context, although men who were sexual assaulted were significantly more likely than women to experience same-sex perpetration. On our campus, sexual assault among women, among men, and in the LGBT community should be addressed.

Most Geneseo students who had behaviorally-specific sexual assault experiences did not identify having been "sexually assaulted." Likewise, the most common barriers to reporting sexual assault to Geneseo were minimization of the event, self-blame, and stigma. These results are consistent with larger sociocultural tendencies to minimize violations of sexual autonomy. Many students define terms like "sexual assault" in a narrow, stereotypical way (e.g., Anderson, 2007) and are reluctant to apply these terms to their own experiences, in part, because victims are routinely devalued (e.g., Valenti, 2010).

Few students reported their sexual assault experiences to Geneseo. Even among those who identified as sexually assaulted, about 18% told any personnel. Those who did, in fact, report sexual assaults to personnel were most likely to tell on campus health services or residence hall staff. Low rates of reporting converge with low rates nationwide documented by the ACHA (Carr, 2005). Common barriers to reporting specific to Geneseo policy or procedures involved a lack of proof or worry about being believed, the perceived ineffectiveness of reporting, and discomfort reporting to unfamiliar people. Geneseo policy-related barriers were somewhat more frequently endorsed by students who identified as having been sexually assaulted. Even when victims do not minimize their experiences, they do not expect to be supported.

These survey results suggest the need for campus-wide educational programs aimed at reducing collective tendencies to minimize sexual assault and blame victims. Underreporting also suggests the need for Geneseo to evaluate our institutional policies and practices. The messages that we send about sexual assault can powerfully shape, for better or for worse, students' own understandings of sexual assault. ACHA and NIJ reports show that institutional policies and practices across the nation reflect the larger sociocultural context in which sexual assault is minimized. Our campus may also, albeit unintentionally, perpetuate these ideas. We should carefully consider our policies and procedures related to sexual assault. Regardless of the specific changes we make, one thing is certain. At Geneseo, we can do better.

Introduction

Sexual assault involves sexual contact or penetration that is nonconsensual and unwanted (Peterson & Muehlenhard, 2007). There are many forms of sexual assault, and perpetrators use many different tactics to compel nonconsensual contact (i.e., sexual battery or attempted rape) or sexual penetration (i.e., sexual coercion or rape). Sexual assault commonly occurs on college campuses across the United States. A national report commissioned by the National Institutes of Justice (NIJ) found that 19% of women and 6% of men experienced attempted or completed rape since they began college (Krebs et al., 2007). Similarly, a report by the American College Health Association (ACHA) projected that 20-25% of women experience some type of sexual assault in college; rates are even higher when including sexual contact (Carr, 2005).

All sexual assaults, including those committed on campuses, violate individual *sexual autonomy.* As defined by Schulhofer (1998), sexual autonomy includes the right to refuse sexual activity with any person, at any time, for any or no reason. Sexual autonomy is not a legally protected right. In contrast, property laws protect us from threats of slander (extortion), stealth (larceny), or false persuasion (fraud). Of course, there are important differences between rights to property ownership and rights to sexual autonomy. Nevertheless, sexual autonomy is not protected in either state law (McGregor, 2005) or in college codes of conduct (see, for example, Shapiro, 2010, *College Justice Falls Short for Victim*). The absence of this protection both reflects and corroborates collective societal tendencies to minimize sexual assault and to blame its victims for perpetrator behaviors.

Pervasive sociocultural beliefs about gender, sex, and sexual assault help explain why people routinely minimize sexual assault. For example, such events are often minimized due to pervasive cultural beliefs about men's insatiable sexual drives and women's obligation to provide sex in relationships (Gavey, 2005). According to Weiss (2009), "boys will be boys" is a common way in which victims justify male perpetrator behavior. In addition, sexual assault is often minimized because it is seen as "just sex"; that is, events that resemble consensual interactions that could involve sexual desire or pleasure (Anderson & Doherty, 2008). Likewise, widespread permissive attitudes about sex as relatively insignificant promote the minimization of sexual assault (Gavey, 2005). That is, to the degree that sex is "no big deal", being compelled into nonconsensual sexual activity is similarly trivialized. In addition, sexual assault victims are consistently devalued and stigmatized (Xenos & Smith, 2001; Valenti, 2010). By extension, to the degree that only 'sluts' or 'fags' are assaulted, victims may be motivated to minimize their own experiences. Furthermore, because most people believe that a typical rape involves forcible stranger perpetration (Anderson, 2007), other types of sexual assaults may be overlooked.

In addition to minimization, victims of sexual assault tend to be blamed for perpetrator behaviors. In turn, victims often blame themselves. This blaming, in part, occurs because sexual consent among college-aged students is presumed unless there is sufficient evidence to the contrary (McGregor, 2005; Schulhofer, 1998). Moreover, sexual assault victims often are seen as undeserving of sympathy. These perceptions of unworthiness are especially common when victims suffer no observable physical injury or are judged as contemptible based on their behavior, appearance, or other factors. Indeed, victim behaviors or characteristics are common grounds for dismissing charges of sexual assault in the state legal system as well as on college campuses (Shapiro, 2010, *College Justice Falls Short for Victim*); in contrast, other types of victims are permitted to engage in potentially inadvisable behaviors. For example, if a drunkenly incapacitated student is unable to prevent someone from taking her wallet, she isn't seen as

having "consented." Likewise, subsequent claims by the perpetrator that the wallet was a gift, a loan, or was freely given would not seem credible. Finally, even in the absence of presumed consent, perpetrators are often viewed as lacking self-control over their own sexual desires -- ironically enough, this perception shifts responsibility to the person whose behavior was unconstrained by apparently overwhelming sexual 'passion': the victim (Anderson & Doherty, 2008).

It is perhaps not surprising, then, that many college students do not acknowledge their experiences of sexual assault when asked general questions such as "have you been sexually assaulted?" (e.g., Hamby & Koss, 2003). In part, this is predictable how frequently people, including victims themselves, minimize sexual assault and the perpetrator's role. In addition, however, identifying oneself as assaulted is related to one's relationship to the perpetrator, the specific tactics of assault used, and the specific type of penetration. In one study, women who endorsed behaviorally-specific experiences of sexual assault were especially unlikely to label themselves as such if the perpetrator was a boyfriend, if they were incapacitated due to alcohol, or if they forced to engage in oral sex or penetration by objects other than a penis (Kahn, 2004). Because the victim and perpetrator know each other in 80%-90% of campus sexual assaults (Karjane et al., 2005), and because alcohol is often involved in campus assaults (e.g., Krebs et al., 2007; Shapiro, 2010), behaviorally-specific measures (such as those used by Carr, 2005 and Karjane et al.) are necessary to accurately estimate campus sexual assault prevalence.

Serious efforts to understand campus sexual assault and to respond to victims at both the individual and institutional level must acknowledge that sexual assault is routinely minimized and victims blamed. Given this larger sociocultural context, victims often trivialize their own experiences, blame themselves, or both. Furthermore, this larger sociocultural context of minimization and blame challenges institutions in developing and enacting effective, responsive policies and procedures to address sexual assault. These challenges were recently documented by nationwide investigations conducted by the Center for Public Integrity (CPI; Lombardi, 2009; 2010) and National Public Radio (NPR; Shapiro, 2010).

Underreporting is one challenge faced by institutions of higher education. Despite the high prevalence of campus sexual assault, most students do not report their experiences to campus officials. One NIJ report concluded that less than five percent of attempted or completed rapes are reported to any campus authority or police (Karjane et al., 2005). The ACHA report by Carr (2005) found that 22% of rapes and 18% of other sexual assaults were reported to any authority (potentially including local police). Underreporting is partly explained by common individual-level factors. For example, victims are commonly embarrassed, worried about their privacy, and afraid that they will be punished for underage drinking (Karjane et al.).

At the same time, institutional policies and procedures both shape and are shaped by such individual-level concerns. For example, according to an NIJ report, only about 4 in 10 schools offer any sexual assault training, and only about half of these train staff in how to respond to sexual assaults (Karjane et al, 2005). Untrained staff members who are uninformed about sexual assault are unlikely to effectively respond to students who report sexual assaults. When interviewed by the Center for Public Integrity about barriers to reporting sexual assault, students described campus procedures as "intimidating, unsympathetic, or unlikely to result in punishment for the accused students" (Lombardi, 2009, *Barriers Curb Reporting on Campus Sexual Assault*).

Even when campus assaults are reported to campus personnel, perpetrators are rarely held accountable (Shapiro, 2010, *College Justice Falls Short for Rape Victim*). At SUNY New Paltz,

for example, between 1988 and 2009, only 6 students reported a sexual assault to the disciplinary office; of these, 3 led to an actual hearing. One student was punished for perpetrating sexual assault in 2002 (Lombardi, 2009, *Barriers Curb Reporting on Campus Sexual Assault*). Based on the prevalence rates for campus sexual assault, however, a projected 1700+ students had been sexually assaulted during that period.

Likewise, even when campus assaults are reported to campus personnel, these assaults may not be documented as required by the Clery Act. The Center for Public Integrity investigation found that in 2006, 77% of schools reported *zero* sexual offenses. (Lombardi, 2009, *Campus Sexual Assault Statistics Don't Add Up*). Even after taking into consideration student underreporting, this percentage is clearly inaccurate. In contrast, campuses that make a concerted effort to improve their responses to rape victims, like Harvard, show a concomitant decrease in underreporting (Lombardi, 2009, *Barriers Curb Reporting on Campus Sexual Assault*). In short, student reluctance to report sexual assault to campus personnel can be meaningfully affected by campus policy and procedure.

On a national level, college students' experiences of sexual assault are common and yet widely minimized by students generally, by victims themselves, and by institutions of higher learning. In contrast, as New York State's premier liberal arts college, SUNY Geneseo is proactively addressing sexual assault in our community. In the spring 2010, SUNY Geneseo administration recognized the need to learn about sexual assault specifically as it occurs on our own campus, to educate our campus, and to consider revising campus policies and procedures. In so doing, Geneseo can provide national leadership in the area of sexual assault consonant with its own mission, values, and initiatives involving transformational learning, innovation, and wide-ranging excellence.

As a first step in this process, an anonymous campus wide study was conducted to understand how these widespread problems manifest in our local community. This report describes an anonymous campus-wide survey of SUNY Geneseo students' sexual assault experiences in our community. The survey aims were to a) estimate the prevalence of sexual assault at Geneseo, b) identify the most common types of sexual assault on campus and risk for severe sexual assault, c) learn which experiences, if any, were identified by students as reflecting "sexual assault", d) identify rates of reporting to Geneseo personnel and specific offices most likely to receive these reports, and e) identify barriers to student reporting to personnel.

Method

Participants

Participants (N = 1734) were recruited from the SUNY Geneseo campus for a study of "College Students' Sexual Experiences." Seventeen people did not respond to any of the questions, one person submitted the same data twice, and one person indicated that he had not yet attended Geneseo. In addition, fourteen people did not indicate their current class. Data from these 33 respondents were discarded to ensure that the sample reflected the actual experiences of currently enrolled students. This left a final sample size of 1701.

The average student age was 20.11 (SD = 1.64, range 16 to 29+). As shown in Table 1, most students identified as female (72.4%; n = 1228) and 26.8% (n = 455) identified as male. Fewer than one percent either identified as trans (0.2%; n = 4) or did not disclose their sex (0.8%; n = 14). All class years were represented with the sample consisting of approximately equivalent proportions of freshman (25.8%; n = 439), sophomores (23.6%; n = 401), juniors (25.7%; n = 437), and seniors (23.5%; n = 400). Some graduate students also participated (1.4%;

n = 24). To assess time on campus, students were asked, "This is my _____year enrolled at Geneseo" (possible responses were first (1), second (2), third (3), etc.). The sample average was 2.28 (*SD* = 1.17, range 1 to 7).

Measures

All survey items were preceded with the following instructions: "Please include only incidents that occurred at Geneseo. That is, include experiences either on or off campus or involving others affiliated with the Geneseo community. Please do NOT include other incidents, e.g., those at home or at another college."

An option of "prefer not to answer" was provided for every question except for three demographic items asking age, class year, and the number of years enrolled at Geneseo.

The first 11 survey items were drawn from the 2004 updated version of the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss & Oros, 1982; Testa et al., 2004). The SES is the most widely used measure of sexual assault. It is a reliable and valid self-report measure with extensive psychometric support. Behaviorally-specific items assess non-consensual, unwanted sexual contact (3 items), sexual coercion (2 items), attempted rape (2 items), and rape (4 items). Students were asked to indicate the number of times they have experienced each item based on experiences since enrolling at Geneseo; possible responses ranged from 0 to 9+. Items referring to "sexual intercourse" (from the sexual coercion, attempted rape, and rape subscales) were preceded by a definition:"Note: sexual intercourse is defined here as any penetration of a vagina, mouth, or anus, no matter how slight, regardless of whether ejaculation occurred."

In the present survey, questions were slightly modified from the Testa et al. (2004) version of the SES in three ways: a) each item began with the stem "Since starting college, at Geneseo," b) gender-neutral language ensured items would pertain to both men and women students and c) experiences were described both as unwanted and nonconsensual. These questions are listed in Appendix A. As can be seen, all questions converge with the SUNY Geneseo Code of Conduct description of "nonconsensual sexual activity" under the subsection "Information Regarding Sex Offenses" (p. 48).

Following the 11-item SES, respondents were asked to indicate whether any of the experiences had happened to them at Geneseo (possible responses were "yes", "no", "unsure", or "prefer not to answer"). This question set up the following two items. First, students were asked, "What was the sex of the person(s) who did this to you?" There were five possible options: n/a, "female only", "male only", "both female and male", and "prefer not to answer." This item allowed us to estimate rates of heterosexual versus same-sex perpetration. Second, students were asked, "If any of these experiences happened, who did you tell about what happened? If more than one experience happened, please mark all the people you told about any of them. Please mark all that apply." This latter item was adapted from Banyard et al. (2007) to allow respondents to indicate who, if anyone, they told about their unwanted, nonconsensual experiences at Geneseo. Possible responses included "not applicable/none of these experiences happened to me", "no one", "roommate", "close friend other than roommate", "romantic partner", "parent or guardian", "other family member", "residence hall staff", "dean of students/judicial affairs", "on campus health center", "off campus health or medical professional", "faculty member", "campus police", "other Geneseo staff member", "other police", "rape crisis advocate", or "other". Responses to this question were coded to indicate whether or not the student reported being sexually assaulted to any Geneseo personnel, and if so, which specific offices were informed.

An open-ended question invited students to report barriers to making official reports (i.e., "If you did not tell campus personnel about these experiences, what prevented you from doing so?). A single item next assessed each student's perception of whether s/he has been sexually assaulted ("Have you ever been sexually assaulted on campus or in the Geneseo community?") Students then responded to basic demographic questions (sex, age, year in school, number of years at Geneseo). Finally, students were provided with the option of providing any additional comments ("please feel free to leave whatever comments you wish about the survey or topic here").

Procedure

Most recruitment occurred via the internet to advertise to the widest possible number of students. Specifically, on 4/21/10, a message announcing the study including the link to the survey was sent to student Geneseo email accounts from *campusnews-l*. In addition, the same message was posted to the MyGeneseo page and sent to *What's Up*. Flyers also were posted around campus in academic buildings and in the health center; flyers were "fringed" at the bottom so that interested persons could tear off slips of paper on which the survey link was printed. The message is reprinted here:

QUICK SURVEY -- CASH PRIZES
Please fill out this brief survey on college students' sexual experiences by clicking on the link below. The survey will only take a few minutes. By participating you will be eligible for a chance to win one of six $100.00 cash prizes! Questions or concerns can be directed to Dr. Katz, katz@geneeso.edu. We greatly appreciate your participation.
http://survey.geneseo.edu:8080/survey/entry.jsp?id=1269561543457

There was an immediate initial response; 629 people had responded by the end of 4/21/2010, and 909 had responded by the end of the day on 4/25/2010. On 4/26/2010, the message was re-sent to *What's Up* and was sent for the first time to the RAs on campus with a request to advertise via email to their residents. Later that evening, a slightly modified message was sent to all of the available student email list-serves on campus. Because it was anticipated that some students at this point may have received multiple email announcements about the study, the underlined statement, "You can only participate/be considered for the raffle once" was added to the above message. Otherwise, however, this second set of messages was identical to the first. There was a corresponding increase in respondents after the messages sent on 4/26/2010; as of 4/29/2010, there were 1596 respondents. The survey closed on 5/15/10 with 1734 total entries.

After submitting the survey, the exit screen presented respondents with a chance to participate in a lottery for one of six $100.00 prizes. Individuals interested in entering the lottery were asked to use their Geneseo email account to email *geneseoresearch@yahoo.com* with their name, phone number, and an identification code to prove their participation. Respondents were assured that their survey responses would not be linked to their identities if they participated in the lottery. By requiring students to use their Geneseo email accounts, they could only be considered for the raffle once. Six lottery winners were randomly selected on 5/17/10 and contacted that week.

Precautions were taken to ensure respondent welfare. Survey instructions were discussed with several students and staff members, including members of the Institutional Review Board

and the Director of Institutional Research. At the top of the survey webpage, respondents were advised to find a private place where they could complete the survey. The response option of "prefer not to answer" emphasized that participants were free not to volunteer personal information if they did not wish to do so. At the bottom of the survey webpage, phone numbers to free, 24-hour rape crisis hotlines and the website for Rape Crisis Services were listed. In addition, the principal investigator extended a written offer to talk with students on a one-time basis to provide support and help them find formal services. No one contacted her with any such request.

Results

Overall Prevalence

About 5.0% (n = 85) of the sample identified themselves as having been "sexually assaulted on campus or in the Geneseo community." An additional 2.3% (n = 39) were "unsure". In contrast, in response to the behaviorally-specific questions on the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES), 25.5% (n = 433) reported one or more events. The most common sexual assaults involved sexual contact (20.9%; n = 356), followed by completed rape (9.5%; n = 162), sexual coercion (9.3%; n = 159), and attempted rape (6.9%; n = 118).

The sample mean for number of SES events was 1.31 (SD = 4.92, range 0 to 58). About 18.3% (n = 311) of the sample experienced multiple sexual assaults. Because 13.2% (n = 225) of respondents reported more than one type of SES event (e.g., sexual coercion *and* attempted rape), each student was categorized according to only on the most severe experience reported following guidelines suggested by Testa et al. (2004). In descending level of severity, almost 10% (n = 162) of the sample reported completed rape, 3.6% (n = 62) reported attempted rape, 3.5% (n = 59) reported sexual coercion, and 8.8% (n = 150) reported sexual contact.

Some students in our sample indicated that they experienced other forms of sexual victimization that were not captured by the SES behaviorally-specific items. In the optional comments part of the survey, for example, one student wrote, *"On one occasion, a man come up to me and touched my genital area at a party and then walked away. I didn't feel any of the questions fit this situation. Also, at one point, a man put a pill in my drink before he handed it to me. I was sober, saw the pill, and left immediately. I went to the Village Police and reported the incident. I didn't feel like there was a question that fit this situation either."* A few other students described experiences that may be classified as sexual harassment because there was abuse of authority or sexual intimidation without corresponding physical contact (e.g., *"Maybe add in questions of sexually explicit talk. Supervisors say really sexual things and it was uncomfortable and creepy"* and *"there have been times when i felt sexually harassed--either by men whistling or saying inappropriate things. My friend was walking back by herself and two guys turned around and one asked another if they should follow her...luckily another friend was walking behind her and yelled at the guys."* However, this report focuses only on the behaviorally-specific SES sexual assault questions, all of which involve nonconsensual sexual contact or penetration.

The percentages of students who endorsed at least one of each behaviorally-specific type of sexual assault are listed in Table 2. Rates experienced by women and men are also included. These numbers are slightly different from those in the preceding paragraphs because they did not include either the 14 students who did not indicate their sex or the 4 trans-identified students, none of whom endorsed any items on the SES. As can be seen, rates of nonconsensual sexual

contact, sexual coercion, and attempted rape but not completed rape were significantly higher among women students than men.

Common Types of Campus Sexual Assault at Geneseo

Perpetrator Tactics. Table 3 shows the percentages of students who endorsed each specific SES item across the entire sample and separately for women and men. Results indicated that perpetrators most frequently used overwhelming verbal pressure, followed by victim incapacitation due to alcohol or drugs. The next most common tactics involved physical force, and the least frequently used tactics involved abuse of authority.

The two most commonly endorsed SES items both involved perpetrator use of continual arguments and pressure; such pressure led to either sexual contact (19.8% overall) or sexual penetration (9.1% overall). Women had both experiences at higher rates than men. Almost 24% of women and 10% of men experienced nonconsensual contact, whereas 11% of women and about 4% of men experienced nonconsensual penetration due to continual arguments and pressure.

The third most commonly endorsed SES item involved sexual penetration that occurred because the respondent was incapacitated by drugs or alcohol. Overall, about 8% of the sample experienced incapacitated rape; almost 9% of women and 6% of men had these experiences. In contrast, it was less common for students to indicate that a perpetrator had given them substances without their knowledge. With regard to attempted rape, overall, 4% of students were given drugs or alcohol without their knowledge or consent. This form of attempted rape was significantly more common among women (5%) than men (2%). In contrast, completed rape after unknowingly ingesting substances was relatively rare; about 2% of students overall indicated this occurred, and rates were similarly low across the sexes.

SES items involving physical force were somewhat less commonly endorsed than items involving incapacitated sexual assault. About 6% of the sample experienced physically forced sexual contact, with rates significantly higher among women (7.3%) than men (1.6%). About 4% of the overall sample experienced physical force as part of an attempted rape, with rates significantly higher among women (5.3%) than men (1.3%). In contrast, less than 2% of the sample was forcibly raped, and rates were similarly low for women and men.

Finally, students indicated that perpetrators only rarely used a position of authority to obtain nonconsensual sexual access. The two least commonly endorsed forms of nonconsensual experiences both involved perpetrator abuse of authority. These abuses of authority led to either nonconsensual sexual contact (1.3%) or penetration (0.5%), with no significant sex differences.

Rates of Same-Sex Perpetration. Rates of same-sex versus heterosexual perpetration were examined within the subsample of students who endorsed some type of sexual assault on the SES *and* who had provided data about their own sex and the sex of their perpetrator(s) (n = 358). The majority of assaults occurred in a heterosexual context (91.9%, n = 329), although 8.1% (n = 29) of the sample experienced perpetration either only by a member of the same sex or perpetration by both male(s) and female(s) (which includes both same-sex perpetration). Men were significantly more likely than women to experience same-sex perpetration, $X^2(1) = 45.97$, $p < .001$. About 33% of men with complete data indicated same-sex perpetration, as compared to 4.2% of women. Men also were significantly more likely than women not to respond to the item about perpetrator sex, $X^2(1) = 4.79$, $p < .05$. About 26% of men and 14% of women did not indicate the sex of their perpetrator(s).

Table 4 lists the rates of same-sex perpetration by women and men students grouped only by their most severe SES experience. As can be seen, greater proportions of men than women indicated experiencing same-sex perpetration within each grouping. Over 60% of men whose most severe experience involved either sexual coercion or attempted rape experienced same-sex perpetration. Among the sexually assaulted men whose most severe experience involved sexual contact, just more than one third experienced same-sex perpetration, and among men who experienced rape, just less than one quarter experienced same-sex perpetration. In contrast, less than five percent of women in any of these groups experienced same-sex perpetration. These data show that same-sex perpetration occurs in a sizeable minority of sexual assaults against men at Geneseo.

Risk for Attempted or Completed Rape at Geneseo. Severe sexual assault was defined here in terms of attempted or completed rape. A total of 224 students endorsed at least one attempted or completed rape item on the SES. As shown in Table 5, attempted or completed rape was significantly more common among women students than men, $X^2(1) = 12.23$, $p < .001$. Of those who reported attempted or completed rape, 82.7% were women and 17.3% were men. Put another way, about 15% of the women and about 8% of the men in the overall sample experienced attempted or completed rape. Of note, however, four students endorsed severe sexual assault but did not identify their sex and so could not be classified into male and female subgroups. Although there were no significant differences in average age, attempted or completed rape at Geneseo was more significantly common among students in their fourth year on campus, $X^2(4) = 22.99$, $p < .001$.

Behaviorally-Specific versus General Reports of Sexual Assault

Frequency analyses were calculated to determine how many students who endorsed behaviorally-specific items on the SES also self-identified as having been sexually assaulted. Students were classified according to their most severe SES experience. Those who did not respond to the general question about having been sexually assaulted ($n = 22$) could not be included in this analysis. Results are listed in Table 6. As can be seen, although all of these students endorsed behaviorally-specific assault experiences, most did not identify as sexually assaulted.

Table 7 lists the percentages of students who reported being sexually assaulted based on individual responses to each SES item. Students were grouped only in terms of their most severe SES experience (i.e., sexual contact, sexual coercion, attempted rape, or rape) before calculating the percentages of students who identified themselves as having been sexually assaulted based on each individual item endorsed. The specific item that was most frequently endorsed by students who self-identified as having been sexually assaulted involved completed penetration due to physical force. Still, only 30% of those physically forced into sexual penetration identified as sexually assaulted. Furthermore, fewer than half of the students who reported other forms of severe sexual assault identified themselves as sexually assaulted.

Rates of Reporting Sexual Assault to SUNY Geneseo

Rates of reporting to Geneseo staff were calculated within three groups of students: a) those who reported any sexual assault on the SES, b) those who reported any severe sexual assault on the SES and c) those who self-identified as sexually assaulted at Geneseo. About 16%, 5%, and 7% of each group, respectively, did not respond to this question. Accordingly, subsequent analyses were based on a reduced sample size. At the same time, the wording of the

question maximized the chances of detecting student responding to staff; specifically, students were asked to mark "all that apply" across all nonconsensual sexual experiences at Geneseo.

Very few students reported sexual assault experiences to any Geneseo personnel. As shown in Table 8, of those who reported any sexual assault, only 8% told at least one Geneseo staff member about their experience. Of those who reported severe sexual assault, about 13% told at least one Geneseo staff member. And of those who self-identified as sexually assaulted, about 18% told at least one Geneseo staff member. Some students reported to multiple offices on campus. The specific offices informed in descending order of frequency, were the on-campus health center, residence life, the office of the dean/judicial affairs, UP/campus police and other Geneseo staff. Because 82% of students who identified as having been sexually assaulted did not tell any Geneseo personnel about their experiences, these data unequivocally show that campus sexual assault at Geneseo is underreported to the college.

Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault to SUNY Geneseo

Just over 200 students responded to the following question: *"If you did not tell campus personnel about these experiences, what prevented you from doing so***?"** After reviewing all the barriers listed by these students, responses were grouped thematically by the principal investigator and under two major categories – those related to how sexual assault is handled at Geneseo and those that seem non-specific to Geneseo policy or personnel. Each response was classified only once. Responses such as "prefer not to answer" or "n/a" were not included in the total number of students and were not coded. Verbatim (unedited) student comments are listed in Appendix B.

Table 9 lists barriers identified within subgroups of students who reported any sexual assault, who reported any severe sexual assault, and who identified as having been sexually assaulted. The most common barriers reported for all three groups were the perception that the event was not a big deal, the event was the students' own fault (i.e., due to drinking, level of resistance, or other factors), and feelings of shame/fear/embarrassment.

Overall, few of the barriers reported by students specifically implicated Geneseo policy or procedures. Geneseo policy-related barriers were somewhat more frequently endorsed by those who identified as having been sexually assaulted. For students who reported any sexual assault, the three most common concerns about how sexual assault is handled that interfere with reporting involve being believed/having proof, feeling uncomfortable about telling personnel, and believing that reporting will be ineffective. Among those who identified as having been sexually assaulted, concerns about getting the perpetrator in trouble or getting into trouble oneself were more often reported than feeling uncomfortable.

Discussion

About 25% of the overall Geneseo sample (30% of women, 15% of men) experienced some kind of behaviorally-specific sexual assault. Rates of sexual assault among women at Geneseo are largely consistent with projections from the ACHA (Carr, 2005). The most common type of sexual assault at Geneseo involved nonconsensual sexual contact. About 13% of the sample experienced more than one type of sexual assault (i.e., sexual contact, sexual coercion, attempted rape, or rape) at Geneseo based on responses to the behaviorally-specific SES, and 18% were sexually assaulted multiple times.

When defined more narrowly, in terms of attempted or completed rape, about 15% of women and 8% of men at Geneseo reported severe sexual assault. These rates converge with

rates of severe sexual assault in the Krebs et al. (2007) National Institute of Justice report; 19% of women and 6% of men sampled experienced attempted or completed rape since starting college. It is encouraging that the prevalence of severe sexual assault against women at Geneseo is slightly lower than in the NIJ report, although prevalence in our study may be attenuated. More specifically, Krebs et al found that sophomores reported the highest rates of severe sexual assault, whereas the highest rates of sexual assault among Geneseo students were found among those who had been on campus for four years. Because only about 16% of the Geneseo sample had been on campus for four years, it is possible that some students here will experience campus sexual assault but they have not yet. In addition, some Geneseo students described offenses not specifically captured by our behaviorally-specific survey items. Nevertheless, the survey data show that sexual assaults, including severe assaults, occur at Geneseo. This is troubling, but perhaps expected given that sexual assault is a pervasive problem across institutions of higher education (Carr, 2005; Karjane et al., 2006; Krebs et al., 2007).

The perpetrator tactics most commonly used in sexual assaults at Geneseo, in descending order, were overwhelming verbal pressure, victim incapacitation due to substances, physical force, and abuse of authority. We might be encouraged that that the most common sexual assaults involved psychological pressure. Overwhelming verbal pressure is often treated by the law as persuasion rather than sexual assault (Schulhofer, 1998). And it is certainly possible that some nonconsensual events involving touching or kissing were brief and (in the words of many students; see Appendix B), "no big deal". At the same time, sexual contact can apply to a wide range of potentially invasive non-penetration experiences. In addition, overwhelming psychological pressure was used to compel 11% of women and 4% of the men in our sample into nonconsensual sexual penetration. Two earlier, independent research studies of verbal sexual coercion by male dating partners at Geneseo found that such coercion frequently co-occurs with more general psychological and physical abuse (Katz, Moore, & May, 2008; Katz & Myhr, 2008), which is corroborated by data collected elsewhere (e.g., White & Smith, 2009). Although it may take a different form than attempted or completed rape, verbal sexual coercion is a problem both because it violates individual sexual autonomy and because often occurs within violent intimate relationships. It is also a problem because it violates core Geneseo values.

Based on these rates of verbal sexual coercion, at a minimum, Geneseo students would benefit from education about "socially acceptable" forms of sexual assault (Muehlenhard & Peterson, 2004), including those that are common within intimate relationships. Educational efforts might also challenge widespread beliefs gender stereotypes that support coercion. For example, students within established sexual relationships may benefit to the degree that they falsely believe prior sexual consent somehow legitimizes a partner's use of pressure and delegitimizes future sexual refusals (i.e., saying yes once means yes always). Students who falsely believe that women are obligated to provide sex in relationships (Gavey, 2005) would benefit from considering mutual obligation to respect each other's (dis)interests. Likewise, students who falsely believe that "real men" are perpetually eager for sex could learn that masculinity is not inextricably tied to sex and thus validate men's rights to refuse unwanted sex.

Overall, women students at Geneseo were significantly more likely than men to report some type of sexual assault. Furthermore, most sexual assault occurred in a heterosexual context. This is consistent with past research (e.g., Banyard et al., 2007) as well as widespread societal beliefs about both normative (hetero)sex and men's insatiable desires (Gavey, 2005). To our knowledge, no nationwide studies of campus sexual assault have investigated men's victimization or rates of same-sex perpetration. At Geneseo, however, men who reported sexual

assault on the SES were more likely than women to report experiencing same-sex perpetration. The sexual assault of women students by men should be a clear priority for our campus. At the same time, sexual assault among men also should be addressed. Male Geneseo students would benefit from specific educational programming about perpetration by women as well as men. Furthermore, sexual assault among sexual minorities on campus should not be ignored.

Consistent with past research conducted elsewhere (e.g., Hamby & Koss, 2003; Kahn, 2004), most of the behaviorally-specific nonconsensual experiences that Geneseo students endorsed on the SES were not identified as sexual assault. Similarly, the three most common barriers to reporting to Geneseo staff were minimization of the event, self-blame, and negative emotions (e.g., fear, embarrassment). These results are consistent with larger sociocultural tendencies to minimize violations of sexual autonomy. Many students define terms like "sexual assault" in a narrow, stereotypical way (Anderson, 2007) and are reluctant to apply these terms to their own experiences, in part, because of the routine devaluation of victims (e.g., Xenos & Smith, 2007; Valenti, 2010).

Few students reported their sexual assault experiences to any Geneseo staff on campus. Even among those who self-identified as having been sexually assaulted, fewer than 20% of students disclosed this experience to personnel. These low rates of reporting converge with low rates documented by the ACHA (Carr et al., 2005). Barriers to reporting specific to Geneseo commonly centered around a lack of proof or worry about being believed, the perceived ineffectiveness of reporting assault, and discomfort with reporting to unfamiliar people. Among those who self-identified as having been sexually assaulted, some students worried about getting the perpetrator and oneself into trouble. Geneseo policy-related barriers were somewhat more frequently endorsed by those who identified themselves as having been sexually assaulted. Accordingly, even students who do not minimize or blame themselves may still avoid reporting sexual assaults because they are concerned about how our institution will respond to them. This is troubling.

Students who report their experiences to Geneseo staff were most likely to tell on campus health services or a member of the residence hall staff. Although residence hall staff members are mandated reporters, health services staff are not, and so these cases would not be "counted" in official campus estimates of sexual assault. In other words, official numbers that could be reported as required by the Clery Act would be underestimated. Anecdotal student comments suggest that victims of sexual assault at Geneseo understandably feel isolated and invalidated when they encounter our official campus crime statistics. These reported statistics may falsely communicate to our students that sexual assault here is anomalous.

At the same time, it is unclear whether our students benefit from mandated reporting at Geneseo. The ACHA suggested that "Any policy or procedure that compromises, or worse, eliminates the students' ability to make his or her own informed choices about proceeding through the reporting and adjudication process – such as mandatory reporting requirements that do not include an anonymous reporting option or require the victim to participate in the adjudication process if the report is filed – not only reduces reporting rapes but may be counter-productive to the victim's healing process" (Carr, 2005, p. 5). The ACHA report strongly recommends that an option to remain anonymous be available to students; the NIJ report further recommends that anonymous reporting could allow experiences to be "counted" without requiring additional undue burdens for victims (Karjane et al., 2005). Given that 82% of students *who identified themselves as sexually assaulted* did not report to any Geneseo staff, perhaps we should consider this option.

Possible limitations of this survey should be acknowledged. Not all students at Geneseo participated. With a sample size of 1701, however, if we consider that Geneseo enrolls roughly 5000 full-time students, about one third of the student body responded. Not all students may have been represented. About 75% of the sample was female. Although we have more female than male students on campus, this is a bigger gender gap than would be expected based on enrollments alone. Of note, similar patterns have been observed both in studies on other campuses (e.g., Krebs et al., 2007) and on our own campus (e.g., in the fall 2009 campus-wide survey of student scheduling preferences at Geneseo; see Muller, 2010). Compared to men, women students at Geneseo are more likely to complete surveys. We did not assess race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, or other demographic variables that could be helpful in identifying students at risk for sexual assault. This would be useful information;, including these questions, however, would increase the length of the survey (and thus decrease responses rates). These questions also could compromise actual and perceived student anonymity (e.g., we have very few black lesbian women students on campus).

Estimates of sexual assault on our campus may have been subject to error. Sexually active students may have been more likely than other students to participate in our study of "College Students' Sexual Experiences." However, this description would not otherwise appear to disproportionately attract sexual assault victims. It was possible for students to participate more than one time. The data were examined carefully for repeated responses and in fact, one person was omitted on this basis. However, students could only be considered for the lottery once, which would seem to be the primary reason students might consider responding multiple times. Even if a student did participate multiple times, s/he would have to submit responses at least 20 different times to make even a slightly perceptible impact on the rates of sexual assault obtained. The high level of convergence between our findings and those from national reports (e.g., Carr, 2005; Krebs et al., 2007) also is encouraging.

In addition, as discussed earlier, this survey may underestimate sexual assault on our campus to some degree because one third of the sample was only in their first year on campus and several students described experiences not captured by our behaviorally-specific items. In addition, it is possible that some individuals who did experience sexual assault were unsettled by the questions and so did not complete the survey, submit their responses, or both. Students who left 50% or more of the survey blank were not included in the sample. In addition, students who marked *prefer not to answer* were not included in estimated rates of sexual assault, although it is likely that at least some of those students were, in fact, sexually assaulted. Furthermore, some people who reported sexual assault experiences on the SES were not included in the final sample because they didn't indicate their class, and it was imperative to ensure all participants were currently enrolled students.

Despite these limitations, sexual assault occurs on our campus. Student underreporting of sexual assault reflects a need for education on campus to reduce widespread tendencies to minimize sexual assault and blame its victims. At the same time, student underreporting also reflects the need for Geneseo to critically evaluate our institutional policies and practices. As an institution of higher education, the messages that we send about sexual assault can powerfully shape, for better or for worse, students' own understandings of assault. Reports by the ACHA and NIJ show that institutional policies and practices across the nation reflect the larger sociocultural context in which sexual assault is minimized and victims are blamed. It is possible that our campus may also, albeit unintentionally, perpetuate these ideas. As a campus, we should carefully consider, for example, the messages about sexual assault conveyed to students based on

a) The types and number of educational and skills-based prevention programs offered
b) How well we balance a focus on victim responsibility with a focus on perpetrators
c) The time and emotional costs expected of victims who report to judicial affairs, and
d) The accessibility as well as clarity of our sexual assault policy in terms of tone, definitions of acts that "count," mandated reporting, and student options, including specific judicial procedures that are followed if students proceed with a campus wide complaint.

Perhaps, as recommended by Schulhofer (1998) and McGregor (2005), we should consider affirming individuals' rights to sexual autonomy in our code of conduct. If consent was no longer presumed, victims would no longer be required to provide evidence of non-consent. Rather, the accused would need to provide reasonable evidence for *actual* consent. This would mean treating violations of sexual autonomy like other kinds of violations. The presumption of sexual consent is "without analogy in law" (McGregor, 2005, p. 104). Consider, for example, medical consent. Barring life-threatening crisis situations, if a physician does not receive explicit permission from patients or their families to medically intervene, the physician may not. This is true even when physicians judge that such procedures would be in a patient's best interests. Laws requiring medical consent exist because we value the right to decide for ourselves what happens to our own bodies. The general default position that reflects our right to self-determination, then, is one of non-consent. In contrast, however, sexual consent is conceptualized differently, which at least partly explains why people widely minimize sexual violations.

There are many arguments against protecting sexual autonomy in our campus policy. For example, an objection might be that victims, namely women, would make false accusations. Ironically, the belief in women's basic untrustworthiness is a common rape myth (e.g., Gerger, Klay, Bohner, & Siebler, 2007), and the belief that women lie (i.e., "no means yes") predicts rape acceptance (Osman, 2003). Still, removing the presumption of consent would not interfere with due process, because the accused would remain innocent until proven guilty. Reasonable doubt might still exist if the accused provides a credible account of why specifically why s/he believed the accuser actually consented. At the same time, common justifications currently sufficient to create reasonable doubt due to *presumed* but not *actual* consent (i.e., "s/he stopped didn't push me, said no but didn't mean it, eventually stopped saying no, was silent, didn't push me away, stopped saying no, we've had sex before, she was drunk") would not be sufficient. Another argument against protecting sexual autonomy is that it may be unfair to those, especially men, who have been socialized to behave as if no means "keep trying" (e.g., Holland, Ramazanoglu, Sharpe, & Thompson, 2004). This same argument, however, could be used to justify the need to protect sexual autonomy. Without this protection, those who initiate sexual activity may be more focused on seeing what they can get away with than ensuring their partner's consent. A changed policy, however, could foster motivation to consider both one's own and one's partner's wishes. And more broadly, requiring evidence for actual consent could send a powerful message challenging the students' collective tendencies to minimize acts of sexual assault, both on our campus and beyond.

There are other options to consider as well. For example, the ACHA has published guidelines for campuses that we should critically examine and consider applying locally. Informed, careful developments in campus programming and policy have the potential to communicate unequivocally to students that sexual assault violates individual rights and that victims at Geneseo will be supported. Regardless of what specific changes we make, one thing is certain. At Geneseo, we can do better.

References

Anderson, I. (2007). What is a typical rape? Effects of victim and participant gender in female and male rape perception. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46,* 225-245.

Anderson, I., & Doherty, K. (2008). Rape supportive culture and the rape victim. (pp. 1-24). *Accounting for rape: Psychology, feminism, and discourse analysis in the study of sexual violence.* Routledge.

Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L., & Sweeney, B. (2006). Sexual assault on campus: A multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Social Problems, 53,* 483-499.

Banyard, B. L., Ward, S., Cohn, E.S., Plante, E. G., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. *Violence and Victims, 22,* 52-72.

Carr, J. L. (2005, February). *American College Health Association campus violence white paper.* Baltimore, MD: American College Health Association.

Gavey, N. (2005). Heterosexuality under the microscope. (pp. 102-135). *Just sex: The cultural scaffolding of rape. Routledge.*

Gerger, H., Klay, H., Bohner, G., & Siebler, F. (2007). The acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression scale: Development and validation in German and English samples. *Aggressive Behavior, 33,* 422-440.

Hamby, S., & Koss, M. (2003). Shades of gray: A qualitative study of terms used in the measurement of sexual victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27,* 243-255.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S., & Thompson, R. (2004). *The male in the head: Young people, heterosexuality, and power.* London: Tufnell Press.

Kahn, A. S. (2004). What college women do and do not perceive as rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28, 9-15*

Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B. S., & Cullen, F. T. (2005). Sexual assault on campus: What colleges and universities are doing about it. *Report commissioned by the National Institutes for Justice.*

Katz, J., Moore, J.A., & May, P. (2008). Physical and sexual covictimization from dating partners: A distinct type of interpersonal abuse? *Violence Against Women, 14,* 961-980.

Katz, J., & Myhr, L. (2008). Perceived conflict patterns and relationship quality associated with verbal sexual coercion by male dating partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23,* 798-814

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The campus sexual assault survey. *Report commissioned by the National Institutes for Justice.*

Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 30,* 455-457.

Lombardi, K. (2009, December). Barriers curb reporting on campus sexual assault. http://www.publicintegrity.org/investigations/campus_assault/

Lombardi, K. (2009, December). Campus sexual assault statistics don't add up. http://www.publicintegrity.org/investigations/campus_assault/

Lombardi, K. (2010, February). Sexual assault on campuses: A frustrating search for justice. http://www.publicintegrity.org/investigations/campus_assault/

McGregor, J. (2005). *Is it rape? On acquaintance rape and taking women's consent seriously.* Ashgate.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Peterson, Z. D. (2004). Conceptualizing sexual violence: Socially acceptable coercion and other controversies. In A.G. Miller (Ed.), *The social psychology of good and evil* (pp. 240-268). New York: Guilford Press.

Muller, K. (2010 April 10). *Psychology club studies schedule habits.* The Lamron.

Osman, S. (2003). Predicting men's rape perceptions based on the belief that 'No' really means 'Yes'. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 33*, 683-692.

Peterson, Z.D., & Muehlenhard, C. L. (2007). Conceptualizing the "wantedness" of women's consensual and nonconsensual sexual experiences: Implications for how women label their experiences with rape. *Journal of Sex Research, 44,* 72-88.

Schulhofer, S. J. (1998). Taking sexual autonomy seriously. (pp. 274-282). *Unwanted sex: The culture of intimidation and the failure of law.* Harvard University Press.

Shapiro, J. (2010). Myths that make it hard to stop campus rape. *Seeking Justice for Campus Rapes: An NPR News Investigation* /www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=124272157

Shapiro, J. (2010). College justice falls short for rape victim. S*eeking Justice for Campus Rapes: An NPR News Investigation* /www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=124111931&ps=rs

Testa, M., VanZile-Tamsen, C., Livingston, J.A., & Koss, M. P. (2004). Assessing women's experiences of sexual aggression using the sexual experiences survey: Evidence for validity and implications for research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28,* 256-265.

Valenti, J. (2010). Public punishments. (pp. 145-165). *The purity myth: How America's obsession with virginity is hurting young women.* Seal Press.

Weiss, K. G. (2009). "Boys will be boys" and other gendered accounts: An exploration of victims' excuses and justifications for unwanted sexual contact and coercion. *Violence Against Women, 15*, 810-834.

White, J. W., & Smith, P. H. (2009). Covariation in the use of physical and sexual intimate partner aggression among adolescent and college-age men. *Violence Against Women, 15,* 24-43.

Xenos, S., & Smith, D. (2001). Perceptions of rape and sexual assault among Australian adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16,* 1103-1119.

Table 1

Sample Characteristics (*N* = 1701)

	%	*n*
Sex		
Female	72.2	1228
Male	26.7	455
Trans	0.2	4
Prefer not to answer/left blank	0.8	14
Class		
Freshman	25.8	439
Sophomore	23.6	401
Junior	25.7	437
Senior	23.5	400
Graduate Student	1.4	24
Year at Geneseo		
First	33.9	576
Second	25.7	437
Third	21.1	359
Fourth	16.4	279
Fifth	2.3	39
Sixth	<.01	2
Seventh	<.01	1
Left blank	<.01	8

Table 2

Overall Prevalence and Sex Differences in Any and Each Type of Sexual Assault

	Overall (N = 1683[a])	Women (n = 1228)	Men (n = 455)	p
Any SES experiences (% yes, n)	25.5 (429)	29.6 (363)	14.5 (66)	.001
Any Sexual Contact (fondled, kissed, or sexually touched without consent)	20.9 (352)	25.0 (307)	9.9 (45)	.001
Any Sexual Coercion (nonconsensual oral, anal, or vaginal penetration)	9.2 (155)	11.0 (135)	4.4 (20)	.001
Any Attempted Rape (attempted penetration -- but it did not occur)	6.8 (114)	8.4 (103)	2.4 (11)	.001
Any Rape (nonconsensual oral, anal, or vaginal penetration)	9.4 (158)	10.0 (123)	7.7 (35)	.15

Notes: [a] Excludes students who didn't indicate their sex (n = 14) and trans-identified students (n = 4); no trans students reported any sexual assault experiences; 13.2% of the sample reported more than one type of sexual assault on the SES; comparisons with p values of less than .05 reflect significant differences in rates between women and men students

Table 3

Overall Prevalence and Sex Differences in Each Specific Sexual Assault

	Overall (N = 1683 [a])	Women (n = 1228)	Men (n = 455)	p
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)	
Any Sexual Contact				
(fondled, kissed, or touched sexually without consent)				
o overwhelmed by continual arguments and pressure	19.8 (333)	23.6 (289)	9.7 (44)	.001
o used a position of authority to make you	1.3 (22)	1.4 (17)	1.1 (5)	.65
o threatened or used some degree of physical force	5.7 (96)	7.3 (89)	1.6 (7)	.001
Any Sexual Coercion				
(nonconsensual oral, anal or vaginal penetration)				
o overwhelmed by continual arguments and pressure	9.1 (153)	11.0 (134)	4.2 (19)	.001
o used a position of authority to make you	0.5 (8)	0.3 (4)	0.9 (4)	.14
Any Attempted Rape				
(attempted penetration -- but it did not occur)				
o was threatening or using some degree of force	4.2 (70)	5.3 (64)	1.3 (6)	.001
o gave you alcohol or drugs without your knowledge	4.0 (68)	4.8 (58)	2.2 (10)	.02
Any Rape				
(nonconsensual oral, anal, or vaginal penetration)				
o gave you alcohol or drugs without your knowledge	2.0 (33)	1.8 (22)	2.5 (11)	.39
o incapacitated by alcohol or drugs/not able to prevent it	7.8 (132)	8.6 (105)	6.0 (27)	.08
o threatened or used some kind of physical force	1.8 (31)	2.0 (24)	1.5 (7)	.55
o sex acts because threatened or used physical force	1.3 (22)	1.3 (16)	1.3 (6)	.98

Notes: [a] Excludes students who didn't indicate their sex (n = 14) and trans-identified students (n = 4); ; 13.2% of the sample (n = 225) reported more than one type of nonconsensual sexual experience; comparisons with p values of less than .05 reflect significant differences in rates between women and men students

Table 4

Sex Differences in Rates of Same-Sex Perpetration

	Most Severe SES Event Reported			
	Sexual Contact (n = 99)	Sexual Coercion (n = 56)	Attempted Rape (n = 59)	Rape (n = 144)
Women	4.7	3.9	3.9	4.3
Men	35.7	60.0	67.0	22.0
X^2	13.95^{***}	17.62^{***}	17.94^{***}	10.02^{**}

Notes: Table entries reflect percentages of students who report same-sex perpetration whose most severe SES experience corresponds to the column heading. Sample sizes are reduced after excluding students who reported SES experiences but did not respond to questions about either perpetrator sex (n = 72) or own sex (n = 4). Chi-squared values reflect that same-sex perpetration was more commonly reported by men than women respondents within each subgroup; $^{**}p < .01$, $^{***}p < .001$.

Table 5

Demographic Characteristics Associated with Severe Sexual Assault

		Severe Sexual Assault at Geneseo		
	Entire Sample (N = 1697 [a])	Yes (n = 224)	No (n = 1473)	*p*
Sex (%) [b]				.001
Women	73.0	14.8	85.2	
Men	27.0	8.4	91.6	
Year on campus (%)				.001
First	34.2	8.9	91.1	
Second	25.7	13.0	87.0	
Third	21.2	13.8	86.2	
Fourth	15.5	20.7	79.3	
Fifth or more	2.4	14.6	85.4	
Age (*M, SD*)	20.11 (1.64)	20.30 (1.32)	20.08 (1.68)	*ns*

Notes: [a] Trans-identified students (n = 4) were not included; [b] Four additional students who reported attempted or completed rape did not indicate their sex.

Table 6

Students Who Self-Identified as Sexually Assaulted

	Have you ever been sexually assaulted on campus or in the Geneseo community?		
	Yes	Unsure	No
Subgroups based on SES Severity			
Sexual contact (*n* = 146)	5.5	4.1	90.4
Sexual coercion (*n* = 59)	10.2	3.4	86.4
Attempted rape (*n* = 60)	28.3	11.7	60.0
Rape (*n* = 158)	30.4	10.8	58.9

Notes: Percentages in each row are based on the proportion of students classified in terms of their most severe sexual assault experience. Subsample sizes are included because 22 students who did not respond to the question about being sexually assaulted on campus or in the Geneseo community and therefore could not be included in this analysis. Less than one third of students who reported any type of sexual assault on the SES identified themselves as having been sexually assaulted.

Table 7

Level of Correspondence Between Students' Most Severe Sexual Assault and Self-Identified Sexual Assault

	Have you ever been sexually assaulted on campus or in the Geneseo community?		
	Yes % (*n*)	Unsure % (*n*)	No % (*n*)
Sexual Contact (*n* = 146)			
o overwhelmed by continual arguments and pressure	5.2 (7)	3.7 (5)	91.1 (123)
o used a position of authority to make you			100 (5)
o threatened or used some degree of physical force	14.3 (16)	9.5 (2)	76.2 (16)
Sexual Coercion (*n* = 59)			
o overwhelmed by continual arguments and pressure	3.4 (2)	10.2 (6)	86.4 (51)
o used a position of authority to make you		50.0 (1)	50.0 (1)
Attempted Rape (*n* = 59)			
o was threatening or using some degree of force	33.3 (12)	8.3 (3)	58.3 (21)
o gave you alcohol or drugs without your knowledge	16.7 (5)	23.3 (7)	60.0 (18)
Rape (*n* = 156) (nonconsensual oral, anal, or vaginal penetration)			
o gave you alcohol or drugs without your knowledge	30.6 (11)	19.4 (7)	50.0 (18)
o incapacitated by alcohol or drugs and not able to prevent it	27.6 (37)	9.0 (12)	63.4 (65)
o threatened or used some kind of physical force	57.6 (19)	12.1 (4)	30.3 (10)
o sex acts because threatened or used physical force	46.2 (12)	15.4 (4)	38.5 (10)

Note: Row percentages represent responses to the sexual assault question within subgroups of students based on their most severe SES experience (i.e., contact, sexual coercion, attempted rape or rape). Subsample sizes vary due to varying prevalence rates and occasional missing values on specific SES items and because 22 students did not respond to the question about being sexually assaulted.

Table 8

Rates of Disclosure to Campus Personnel

	Any Assault (n = 366) % (n)	Severe Assault (n = 213) % (n)	Sexually Assaulted (n = 79) % (n)
Tell any Geneseo personnel?	8.2 (30)	12.7 (27)	17.7 (14)
Tell more than one office?	2.5 (9)	3.8 (8)	11.4 (9)
Specific offices told			
On campus health center	4.7 (17)	7.5 (16)	12.7 (10)
Residence hall staff	4.1 (15)	6.1 (13)	10.1 (8)
Dean of students/judicial affairs	2.2 (8)	3.8 (8)	10.1 (8)
UP/campus police	1.4 (5)	1.9 (4)	5.1 (4)
Geneseo faculty member	0	0	0
Other Geneseo staff	<.01 (1)	.01 (1)	0

Note: Sample sizes within each column vary based on prevalence rates and how many students responded to the question "*If any of these experiences happened, who did you tell about what happened? Please mark all that apply*."

Table 9

Barriers to Reporting Sexual Assault to Campus Personnel

	Any Assault (n = 204)	Severe Assault (n = 115)	Sexually Assaulted (n = 51)
Barriers nonspecific to Geneseo policy or personnel			
It wasn't a big deal	38.7	24.3	17.6
It was my own fault	13.7	16.5	15.7
I felt shame/fear/embarrassment/unsupported	10.3	15.7	13.7
I handled it myself/it's a private matter	3.4	1.7	3.9
I didn't know it was something to tell	3.4	1.8	5.9
It happened with someone I know	7.8	7.8	2.0
I didn't want to	0.7	2.6	3.9
Barriers related to how sexual assault is handled at Geneseo			
I don't have proof/may not be believed	5.4	7.8	9.8
Reporting is ineffective	3.4	6.1	7.8
Reporting is uncomfortable	2.9	3.5	3.9
Location/timing made reporting hard	2.5	2.6	2.0
I'd get the person into trouble	2.5	1.8	7.8
I'd get myself into trouble	2.0	1.3	5.9
Reporting is burdensome	1.5	1.7	0
My experience doesn't "count"	1.0	0	0

Notes: Each student's response was coded into only one category; sample sizes reflect prevalence rates and responses to the open-ended question, *"If you did not tell campus personnel about these experiences, what prevented you from doing so?"* Student comments are listed in Appendix B.

Appendix A

Sexual Experiences Survey

1. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you been fondled, kissed, or touched sexually when you didn't consent to it because you were overwhelmed by another person's continual arguments and pressure?

2. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you been fondled, kissed, or touched sexually when you didn't consent to it because as person used a position of authority (your boss, teacher, counselor, supervisor) to make you?

3. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you been fondled, kissed, or touched sexually when you didn't consent to it because a person threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?

4. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you given into sexual intercourse although you didn't consent to it because you were overwhelmed by a person's *continual arguments and pressure*?

5. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a person used a position of *authority* (as your boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make you?

6. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times has a person *attempted* sexual intercourse (but intercourse did not occur) when you didn't consent to it and the person was threatening or using some degree of force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?

8. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you *had* sexual intercourse when you didn't consent to it because a person gave you alcohol or drugs without your knowledge or consent?

9. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you been in a situation with a person in which you were incapacitated due to alcohol or drugs (that is, passed out or unaware of what was happening) and were not able to prevent unwanted sexual intercourse from taking place?

10. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't consent to it because a person threatened or used some kind of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?

11. Since starting college, at Geneseo, how many times have you had *sex acts* (e.g., penetration by objects) when you didn't want to because a person threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?

Note: items reflect sexual contact (1-3), sexual coercion (4-5), attempted rape (6-7), and rape (8-11)

Appendix B

Students' Verbatim Self-Reported Responses to *"If you did not tell campus personnel about these experiences, what prevented you from doing so?"*

Note: The language of the underlined headings used to categorize student comments is my own. Each student's comments are listed only once. Although most responses were straightforward, some comments were multidimensional and reflected multiple themes simultaneously. In such cases, I tried to select the predominant or most important theme for categorization; another reader may not classify these in the same way.

<u>It wasn't a big deal</u>

It wasn't a real big deal.
was not emotionally or physically traumatizing for me
Wasn't that big of a deal.
Unimportant, not that traumatic.
it seemed silly to make a big deal out of it
It didn't seem like a big deal.
I didn't think it was that big of a deal
I didn't see it as a big deal.
I thought it was only a minor problem.
it always seemed insignificant.
Wasn't serious enough
Wasn't a big deal.
I thought that it was not important enough to say something about.
I did not think it was worth reporting
Didn't find it necessary cuz it wasn't too serious more of annoyance
Was not serious
It was not serious enough-- I did not feel like I was in danger, but it was unwelcome contact.
Not a big deal
It didn't leave a lasting negative impression on me.
These experiences I had in Geneseo were not that serious, so I didn't feel necessary to report them.
Did not feel that it was necessary. Did not feel unsafe beyond that moment.
Not that big of a deal
I love sex
Not upset with it
When I found out I didn't mind
It was more of a joke thing - a male friend held me down and gave me a hickey while I mock protested and strained against his hands pinning me down. My friends looked on amusedly and he definitely knew he was pushing but not going beyond my boundaries. He would have stopped instantly if I had seriously told him to.
It wasn't that big of a deal in my case
It wasnt a problem
Mine was not anything serious.
I didn't think it was a huge deal

Did not feel like it was a serious enough offense.

Didn't think it was a big deal...

I didn't want to make it a big deal.

Didn't think it was a big enough deal to tell campus personnel.

I didn’t believe that it was a huge deal

They weren’t very serious. The argument took place because she had a boyfriend and I didn’t want to be part of that but eventually I regretfully consented

Doesn’t really matter

not a big deal

It wasn't a big deal,

I never felt threatened by the situation

None of the traumatic experiences happened to me. None of my experiences involved someone forcing themselves on me or drugging me

it wasn't that big of a deal

I didn't feel that it was necessary.

I didn't think it was serious enough.

I didn't think of it as a big deal.

it was not that serious

Nothing happened, and I stopped talking with the person who was doing it.

It wasn't a big deal, she just drunkenly kissed me. I told her to stop, she did.

My experiences were not that seriously and i confronted the person about their actions.

Not a serious event, I was able to take care of it myself immediately

people came up and got me before anything sserious happened.

It happened once, we talked about it, and it will never happen again.

I didn't think it was a big deal, both times i was kissed/touched without permission I just walked away, i have no problems standing up for myself, it wasn't that serious of a situation

It was a misunderstanding and although he was much larger than me, I was able to say "No, I'm sorry but I don't want this" and he stopped.

I wasn't too freaked out about someone kissing me and grabbing my boobs because I ended up quitting contact with them. I handled it myself and they didn't try to go any further.

It wasn't a big deal at all. I didn't feel violated or offended, I just had to make my point clear to the person when they were sober that I wasn't interested and all contact stopped.

I did not think it was that serious. They stopped after I forcefully said no.

It was never a big issue. My experiences have only been with drunk guys being too forward at the bar, and trying to make-out with me or grind with me, mashing their nasty penises into my leg and dancing really terribly. I took care of it with a well-articulated, 'get the fuck away from me' and that was that.

It wasn't a big deal, I told him off and then he left me alone.

I didn't think it was a big deal that he was being pushy and after he did it for a minute I left. I would not let him go any farther and I was in control of the situation before it got worse.

It wasn't serious. She was drunk and I was sober. She gave me a smooch on the lips was all.

Didn't think it was a big enough deal...nothing I couldn't handle by myself or with help from friends, feel like most of what happened was partially my own fault.

didn't think it was serious enough. learn from mistakes.

It wasn't rape, it was a personal choice, which i viewed as a mistake.

It wasn't a big deal-it wasn't sex, just fondling.

It did not lead to unwanted sexual acts or intercourse because I was able to leave by my own will.

It was only a kiss. I didn't think it was a big deal.

Nothing actually happened so I didn't want to.

I think it is somewhat a waste of time to report that some guy grabbed my ass in bar, or tried to kiss me.

They did not seem serious enough-simple grabbing at the bar, doesn't entirely measure up to the experiences I know some of my friends have had here.

It was only once and only kissing.

it was just a kiss but it was forceful and unwanted

Nothing happened, it was just a bad experience.

I wasn't raped and even though I didn't consent I told him off and after a little he stopped trying.

It was just an over touching and kissing incident that I was able to get myself out of.

<u>It was my own fault</u>

The second time the person didn't do it on purpose, he was just drunk and I just shouldn't have agreed even though I didn't want it.

I felt that as I had consumed a large quantity of alcohol, my drunk state consented to things I wouldn't have sober, and thus my male partners could not have known where my sober self would have drawn the line.

Felt it was more my own fault for having been so incapacitated

As long as I'm clean and it doesn't become a habit I can live with it.

In another instance, I was under the influence of alcohol and felt partially responsible.

i was drunk and not 21, and was not really sure what to do--- so i just let it go

I was not physically forced to take part in the experience and was under the influence of alcohol by my own choice. I realized that I should not have gotten so drunk and slightly wanted it to happen but realized when I began sobering up that this was not I wanted to be happening.

I was drunk and did/do not suffer any after-effects. I accepted the situation and know that I won't let something like that happen again.

It was my fault for getting so drunk in the first place.

It was an ex-boyfriend and I was drunk

I was blackout and had sex with someone I considered a good friend. I just had no idea that it had happened the next day. I felt violated but knew that I had to have some part in its occurrence because he never would have hurt me purposefully.

I didn't feel like it was approporiate, I had been drinking, and I knew the person.

I was drunk and knew it was going to happen, even know I didn't want it to happen. In a way it was my fault for calling him to talk about things.

I was inebriated,and had had previous relations with said male.

I chose to go to a party and drink alcohol. I knew the person who took advantage of me. I did not want the acts to be made public, I just wanted to forget about them.

Try not to make it a big deal and according to him he was really drunk too.

because it was all in good nature and both parties were intoxicated.

Both parties were inebriated. The actions were stopped by someone else. Situation was dealt with personally

I feel like I was in the wrong for getting that intoxicated. He was just as drunk and unaware of his actions.

I figured it was not that big a deal because we were both drunk

I assumed it was due to lack of communication. I was reluctant but not emphatic about my resistance.

I felt like it was my fault for not being clear enough in saying no.

I was not sure if had conveyed consent or not.

It's such a grey area, when you just give in as opposed to being physically coerced or drugged. Also, I'm a guy, and so I assumed any mention of rape wouldn't have been taken seriously and I was afraid of possible homophobia.

I was persuaded, rather than forced, when I did not want to. I felt alerting authorities was unnecessary.

It was not a big enough deal and I could handle the situation on my own. Basically, what happened was I just made out with this person a few times because he kept bugging me and i got tired of it and annoyed so i finally gave in. I didn't feel it was necessary to get campus personnel involved.

I was pressured because he kept asking me to sleep with him. He kept insisting and I kept saying no. Eventually I was tired of saying no, so i told him fine. I don't think I should report it, because I consented.

I was embarrassed about the whole thing because I thought I could have made my displeasure more clear or have made it more firm and besides it was someone I trusted and he was intoxicated. Not quite in the right mind, I think.

I did not think it was necessary because it was my own problem.

I didn't think it was anyone's fault but my own.

Thought it was my fault.

I made a poor choice. I don't feel she had done anything wrong.

In the case where he pinned me and forceably touched my breast I threatened that if it happened again I would tell someone in authority. Feelings of pressure leading to activity were my choice.

I was asking for it. no really i did.

<u>I felt shame/fear/embarrassment/unsupported</u>

embarrassment, no real sign of further endangerment.

i was scared

stigma

nervous

I was ashamed of my own actions.

Embarrassment

Fear

embarrassment

shame

embarrassed

I was uncomfortable because it seemed to be something I SHOULD be consenting to.

None of my friends believed me that I didn't want it, so why should I tell more unsupportive people?

i was embaressed that it happened, it wasnt actually that big a deal.

embarrassed and ashamed
embarrassed
embarrassed
I was embarrassed and scared.
Embarrassment
Fear
fear, embarrassment/shame
fear
Saying it means it happened, I am a Catholic and am ashamed that I allowed someone else to control me in such a way, I prefer to not think/talk about this.
Fear
Embarassment

<u>I handled it myself/it's a private matter</u>

I was able to remove myself from the situation without having been raped or hurt (other than him forcefully grabbing my arm). I didn't know his last name or where he lived. I knew he was a friend of Geneseo students, but didn't know who his friends were. This incident did occur in Geneseo, while he was visiting friends. The other incident was similar in nature- a random guy at the bar. In that experience I was dancing with a guy who tried to touch me in places I was uncomfortable with in the middle of the dance floor- you might be surprised at how often this occurs at the IB. He threatened that "I would regret it" if I screamed or tried to get away. Luckily, I go to the bar with several friends who saw what happened and rushed to my support. I was able to remove myself from this situation without harm as well.
i felt as though i had handled it myself
it's a personal matter that didn't require any outside involvement.
I resolved the issue with the person after the fact.
It was stopped immediately and the situation was somewhat under control.
unnecessary, person stopped after second time request to stop.

<u>I didn't know it was something to tell</u>

I didn't realize what had happened until the summer
Didn't think of it
It took me awhile to realize that it was sexual assault. I trusted him and didn't want to admit that he would do that to me.
trying to figure out myself first
I didn't think it mattered because I was a guy and I didn't think it mattered to anyone.
At the time I didn't think it was that big of a deal
*I didn't recognize until very recently that I was probably date raped because I was always told that "rape" meant forced penetration. My negative sexual experience falls under a "grey zone" because I wanted to have sex, but my partner used my drunken state to force me to have *unprotected* sex against my will.*

<u>It happened with someone I know</u>

I started dating him soon after.
It was someone whose father worked with mine. Didn't want to cause trouble.
It was my boyfriend

I didn't want this person to stop being my friend. He was always there for me whenever I needed him. He liked me in a way that I didn't feel about him.

I was not actually raped and I didn't consider the guy to be particularly dangerous because we had been casually dating when he pressured me to be in a more physical relationship.

He was my boyfriend and it didn't seem like it was a big deal. He just begged all the time for it so I gave in even though I didn't really want it.

Was a friend of mine, and I was able to handle the situation on my own.

I was friends with the other person involved

Incidents happened with boyfriend, not a big deal.

I was seeing the person who did the act to me at the time.

It was my freshman year and with a boyfriend at the time. Things were broken off that year and I just decided not to mention anything, I didn't find it that serious and moved on.

the person who was involved was (is) my boyfriend

The individual was my girlfriend.

because, he was kind of my friend.

It was my boyfriend at the time and I did not realize I was being emotionally abused. I was never physically forced in any way and so at the time never considered it an issue. Now I respect my right to leave the incident in the past.

I wasn't ever "raped" per say, and he was my boyfriend of over a year. He pressured me and told me how important sex in our relationship was to him and it made me feel guilty for not wanting to always have sex with him, so I would have intercourse even if I didn't want to. I didn't tell authorities because I never said no and usually, at some point during the intercourse, enjoyed it.

<u>I didn’t want to</u>

Did not feel it was necessary.

Wanting to just get over it and move on and knowing that I could with my strength and the support of my friends here at Geneseo.

Didn't want to talk about it

Barriers to reporting related to how sexual assault is handled at Geneseo

<u>I don’t have proof/may not be believed</u>

Did not think I would be taken seriously because alcohol/drugs were involved.

There was no proof and I didn't think they could do anything about it.

I have no evidence of it occurring, and am unable to identify who did it. I would not be able to help in terms of any kind of investigation, and I'm afraid nobody will believe me.

I wasn't completely sure of the situation and felt uncomfortable providing information when I wasn't 100% sure of the facts.

Costs outweigh the benefits, It would undoubtedly turn into a long "he-said, she-said" ordeal, which I did not want to deal with. I also don't think it would change how I feel about the situation, so it would have been unnecessary stress.

I was really drunk and hit my head and blacked out, so I didn't remember enough detail about after that to give a good description. I also didn't know the name of the person. Other than

the sexual experience that one time, the other times I think were not as significant so I didn't think I need to tell anyone.

No sexual contact resulted & I did not know the person's name.

The stigma that because most situations happened in terms of alcohol and/or I was pressured into it, feeling unvalidated

I felt that it wasn't a big deal. That whomever I told would say it wasn't sexual harassment or that I was making a bigger deal out of it than it really was.

I didn't know the name of person who did it. Didn't want to deal with it.

I didn't think they would believe me, and I figured that since there was alcohol and drugs involved I pretty much had it coming.

Reporting is ineffective

I don't believe there is anything they can or would do about it.

I've known other girls who have reported their assault on campus and with the Geneseo police. Their cases were not handled in an appropriate manner, everyone on campus found out, and the girls were treated as social parriahs and sluts.

The person who I believe drugged me was not a student at Geneseo. I have experienced a lack of confidentiality at the health center and with campus personnel.

Didn't think they would be able to do anything about it, and slightly blamed myself for ending up in that situation.

Do not seem as if they would be much help, very little to no resources on campus to aid people emotionally. Our campus is pathetic in this regard.

They would not care and there is nothing that they can do

Reporting is uncomfortable

I would have only felt comfortable talking to an RA my own age rather than just my friends.

I didn't feel close enough with any personnel and I felt stupid/felt bad about what I had done to put myself in that situation.

too much paperwork -- to tell police or campus personnel means telling A LOT of people.

I don't feel comfortable describing such incidents to people who I don't know.

It wasn't something I wanted to share with campus personnel, I didn't think it needed that kind of attention

just did not want to, felt uncomfortable

The location/timing made reporting hard

It was off campus and during the summer.

Incident occurred off-campus

Most of my negative sexual experiences occurred over the summer so I did not have access to Geneseo services.

it was off campus

Happened over winter break. Also, was living off campus at the time. This is in addition to the fact that most people are embarrassed by the events and that the person that has done these horrible things was a friend, so there was a huge cloud of confusion over emotions and such.

I'd get the person into trouble

Getting the person in trouble

embarrassed, didn't want to get the other person in trouble, thought that after going through the experience once, I could prevent it from happening again

I didn't want the other person to know I reported it. I wanted it to be over.

I was nervous i'd be judged or the person would get in a lot of trouble.

I'd get myself into trouble

Fear of legal retaliation/ on-campus consequences against me for drinking

they are unhelpful

I was drinking underage when it happened and had been told how unhelpful they were in these matters

I was drinking underage, and I didn't consider it sexual assault at the time. I thought we were both just really drunk, and he didn't mean for any of it to happen.

Reporting is burdensome

I didn't want to go through with everything/ too busy with school work

I didn't think it was worth the trouble.

Too lazy

My experience doesn't "count"

*Well, it was on the less extreme end of the scale - "a guy who got me to have sex with him because of continual arguments or pressure." Still bad, but I did not necessarily feel like that was something I could take action against in a legal way (or even just, like, an RA) or even necessarily *should* take action against in a *legal* way.*

Although intercourse is defined in this survey as "any penetration of a vagina, mouth, or anus, no matter how slight, regardless of whether ejaculation occurred," I felt that others would not define it the same way and attribute less importance to such experiences