

**CAMPUS SAFETY SURVEY 2009
STUDENT RESULTS**

KEY FINDINGS

- This sample (n= 539) of students responding to the survey was on average in their 30s', mostly Caucasian. There was a greater percentage of students identifying themselves as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or queer. Seventy percent of student respondents were enrolled on a full time basis and 30% indicated they were part-time.
- Between 14% to 27% of the responding female students indicated ever experiencing physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse.
- On average, men indicated higher agreement with adversarial sexual beliefs as measured by the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB) (Burt, 1980). The Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB) measures the expectation that sexual relationships are fundamentally exploitative and each party is manipulative and not to be trusted.
- Men indicated more endorsement of rape myths as measured by the Rape Myths Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980).
- Five percent of physical acts of violence as measured by the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) (Gelles & Straus, 1979; Straus, 1979) and twelve percent of acts sexual aggression and sexual victimization as measured by Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) (Koss & Oros, 1982) occurred on campus as indicated by female students.
- Nearly six (5.7%) percent of physical acts of violence as measured by the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) (Gelles & Straus, 1979; Straus, 1979) and eight percent of acts sexual aggression and sexual victimization as measured by Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) (Koss & Oros, 1982) occurred on campus as indicated by male students.
- More female than male students are aware of the PEACC program. There is a trend towards female students more likely to have heard one or more PEACC educational presentation than male students. Male and female students were equally likely to be aware of the Men of PEACC group on campus.
- These findings are similar to results of the 2000-2001 study.

CAMPUS SAFETY SURVEY 2009 STUDENT RESULTS

Introduction

Back in 2000-2001, The PEACC Project established a multi-faceted approach to prevention and intervention regarding incidents of violence of all types against women on campus. An important component of the PEACC Project was an awareness campaign that began Fall, 2000. In order to establish baseline data faculty, staff, and students were invited to complete a survey during Fall 2000 and Spring 2001 semesters that measured:

- § perceptions of safety on campus,
- § knowledge about crime prevention and related services that are already in place on campus,
- § any previous contacts with the University's Department of Public Safety and evaluation of those contacts,
- § attitudes toward the range of types violence against women,
- § incidents of violence on campus whether or not officially reported previously,
- § suggestions for improving safety and related services on campus.

The content of the survey was the same for faculty/staff (Full Version) and students. These two surveys differ only in the types of demographic information requested and questions about classes. An additional Short Version for faculty/staff was used in the Fall semester in order to encourage response. This short form was not used in the Spring since response rates were virtually the same for the long and short versions.

A follow-up survey was administered to faculty, staff, and students in 2010-2011 at the University of Louisville. The same survey instrument was administered in the follow-up survey. However, a major difference between the original and follow-up survey is that student participants for the original survey were randomly selected and this present survey was distributed online to all students. Thus, the results of the follow-up survey are not generalizable to the larger student population at University of Louisville.

This report summarizes the results of the follow-up campus safety survey of students conducted in 2010 and 2011 at the University of Louisville.

Survey Content

The student version of the survey (results of which are reported here) consisted of the following:
Demographic Information

Experience (ever) of physical, sexual, or emotional abuse

Adversial Sexual Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1980)

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980)

Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) (Gelles & Straus, 1979; Straus, 1979)

Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) (Koss & Oros, 1982)

Participation in PEACC program activities

RESULTS

Participants

Students were sent an online link asking them to complete the survey. Participants were 539 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at the University of Louisville. See Table 1 below for a summary of the demographics of the resultant sample of students responding to the survey. Compared to the original survey, this sample of students responding to the survey consisted of a greater percentage of women, was on average older, but similar to the original respondents was mostly Caucasian. There was a greater percentage of students identifying themselves as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or queer. Seventy percent of students completing the survey were enrolled on a full-time basis and 30% indicated they were part-time.

Table 1. Summary of Student Sample Demographics

Characteristic	N (%)
Sex	
Female	366 (70.4)
Male	154 (29.6)
Other	3 (0.6) Excluded from analysis – due to small number & not sure what this means. Transgendered?
Age	
	Mean = 30.14 SD = 10.52 Mode = 26.0 Median = 26.0 Range 18 – 84 (4 being 70 or older)
	N (%)
Ethnicity	
White	438 (81.7)
Black/African American	46 (8.6)
Non-resident alien	20 (3.7)
Hispanic/Latino	12 (2.2)
Asian	11 (2.1)
American Indian / Alaskan Native	6 (0.9)
Unknown	4 (0.7)
Sexual orientation	
Heterosexual	472 (90.6)
Lesbian/Gay	21 (4.0)
Bisexual	21 (4.0)
Queer/Questioning	7 (1.3)
Full or Part-time	
Full	375 (70.0)
Part-time	161 (30.0)

Class	
Freshman	40 (7.5)
Sophomore	46 (8.6)
Junior	71 (13.2)
Senior	100 (18.7)
Note: Undergraduates are (N = 257) 47.7 % of sample but were 70.9% of the student body. See Table 2 below.	
Post-Baccalaureate	35 (6.5)
Undergraduate Non-degree	4 (0.7)
Graduate / Professional	233 (43.5)
Note: Graduate students are (N = 257) 43.5 % of sample but were 29.1% of the student body. See Table 2 below.	
Graduate / Professional Non-degree Seeking	7 (1.3)
Any disabilities?	
Yes	27 (5.1)
Which Campus do you spend most time?	
Belknap	428 (81.1)
Health Science	97 (18.0)
Shelby	2 (0.4)
UPS Classrooms	1 (0.2)
When usually on campus?	
8 am – 5 pm weekdays	423 (80.1)
After 5 pm weekdays	86 (16.3)
8 am - 5 pm weekends	16 (3.0)
After 5 pm weekends	3 (0.6)

Compared to original PEACC Campus Survey....

Table 1a. Summary of Student Sample Demographics

	Fall 2000 (n = 619)	Spring 2001 (n = 691)
Sex	54.8% female 45.2% male	57.5% female 42.5% male
Age	Mean = 25.5 Range 17 -58	Mean = 24.4 Range = 17 - 80
Ethnicity	82.3% white	83.8% white
	9.3% African-American	7.2% African-American
	2% Asian-American	3.1% Asian-American
	1.4% Hispanic	0.7% Hispanic
Sexual orientation	1.6% gay or lesbian	1.7% gay or lesbian
	1.6% bisexual	1.0% bisexual

Respondents by classification	15.1% freshmen	14.6% freshmen
	11.2% sophomores	14.8% sophomores
	16.3% juniors	23.8% juniors
	18.4% seniors	25.0% seniors
	21.1% Arts & Sciences graduate students	13.6% Arts & Sciences graduate students
	2.2% medical students	0.2% medical students
	3.4% dental students	1.0% dental students
	12.2% post grad students	4.7% post grad students
Any disabilities?	3.9% responded "yes"	2.0% responded "yes"
Live on campus?	13.5%, mostly Belknap Campus	12.6%, mostly Belknap Campus

The total enrollment at the University in Fall 2009 was 22,031, with 74.3% enrolled on a full time basis. It is important to note that the current sample is not representative of students on campus, specific to the university enrollment figures (see Table 2, Table 2a, and Table 2b).

Table 2.

Fall 2009 Enrollment	Undergraduate N (%)	Graduate N (%)	First-Professional	Total
	15,619 (70.9)	6,412 (29.1)	*	22,031

Based on Office of Institutional Research and Planning's 2009-10 Fact Book (<http://louisville.edu/institutionalresearch/institutional-research-planning/Factbook%202009-10%203-16-11.pdf>)

*Note: Starting in 2008-09 First-Professional students are included in the Doctoral category.

Table 2a.

Fall 2009 Enrollment	Full-time N (%)	Part-time N (%)	Total N	FTE N
	16,377 (74.3)	5,654 (25.7)	22,031	17,540

Based on Office of Institutional Research and Planning's 2009-10 Fact Book (<http://louisville.edu/institutionalresearch/institutional-research-planning/Factbook%202009-10%203-16-11.pdf>)

Table 2b.

Enrollment by School, Student Level and Race Fall 2009								
	African American	American Indian or Alaskan Native	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic	White	Nonresident Alien	Unknown	Total
Undergraduate	1,951	53	470	330	12,206	363	246	15,619
Graduate	387	12	114	58	2,999	636	205	4,411
First-Professional	114	8	168	37	1,553	74	47	2,001
Total	2,452	73	752	425	16,758	1073	498	22,031
Percent of Total	11.1%	0.3%	3.4%	1.9%	76.1%	4.9%	2.3%	100%

Based on Office of Institutional Research and Planning's 2009-10 Fact Book (<http://louisville.edu/institutionalresearch/institutional-research-planning/Factbook%202009-10%203-16-11.pdf>)

Ever Experienced Physical, Sexual, or Emotional abuse

Students were asked if they had ever experienced any physical, sexual, or emotional abuse. Next, they were asked to indicate whether or not any of these incidents occurred during the time they were a student at the University regardless of where the incident(s) took place. The table below indicates the results.

Ever Experienced Physical, Sexual, or Emotional Abuse		
	Male N (%)	Female N (%)
Physical violence or abuse	10 (6.4)	53 (14.4)
Sexual violence or abuse	5 (3.2)	58 (15.8)
Emotional abuse	14 (8.9)	98 (26.6)

Since you have been attending UofL, have you ever reported any incident to the campus police?	
Male N (%)	Female N (%)
27 (17.2)	46 (12.5)

Female students' reports of experienced violence is slightly higher than reported in the original 2000-2001 survey. Of the 209 female students who responded to the survey, 14.4% (n=53) indicated that they had ever experienced physical abuse, 15.8% (n=58) had experienced sexual abuse, and 26.6% (n=98) had experienced emotional abuse. ***These percentages are greater than what was reported in 2000-2001 by female students during the Fall and Spring semesters.*** Female students' reports of experienced violence (Fall, 2000). Of the 318 female students who responded to the Fall 2000 survey, 11.3% (n=36) indicated that they had ever experienced physical abuse, 12.89% (n=41) had experienced sexual abuse, and 20.75% (n= 66) had experienced emotional abuse. Female students' reports of experienced violence (Spring). Of the 347 female students who responded to the Spring survey, 10.1% (n=35) indicated that they had ever experienced physical abuse, 8.0% (n=28) had experienced sexual abuse, and 19.0% (n= 66) had experienced emotional abuse.

Attitudinal Measures

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1980). The Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB) consists of nine items developed by Burt to measure the expectation that sexual relationships are fundamentally exploitative and each party is manipulative and not to be trusted. Burt suggested that to a person who strongly endorses this point of view, rape might seem more like the extreme on an exploitative continuum than the unexpected act of violence it is. In that case, rape might not be seen as an event that generates much sympathy or support for the victim. Burt developed the nine item ASB scale from a large item pool that was pretested and used item analyses to help determine which items would be retained in the final version of the scale. During scale development, a random sample of 598 adults (60% women) were interviewed with the scale and the resulting Cronbach's alpha was .802 (Burt, 1980). It is expected that scores on this scale will vary directly with scores on the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980).

The following five items based on the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale were used as part of the campus survey: 1) *A man's got to show the woman who's boss right from the start.* 2) *Women are usually sweet until they've caught a man, but then they let their true self show.* 3) *In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.* 4) *Men are out for only one thing.* 5) *A lot of women seem to get pleasure from putting a man down.* Students were asked to respond to each item on a 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*) scale.

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale	All Students		Male Students		Female Students	
	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)
A man's got to show the woman who's boss right from the start.	530	1.25 (0.55)	153	1.48 (0.70)	364	1.14 (0.43)
Women are usually sweet until they've caught a man, but then they let their true self show.	527	1.64 (0.88)	151	2.01 (1.04)	364	1.48 (0.76)

In a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.	527	1.36 (0.65)	151	1.68 (0.79)	364	1.22 (0.52)
Men are out for only one thing.	527	1.98 (0.94)	151	2.01 (0.94)	364	1.98 (0.95)
A lot of women seem to get pleasure from putting a man down.	527	1.74 (0.88)	151	1.99 (1.02)	364	1.63 (0.80)

Due to very unequal numbers of women and men, nonparametric analysis had to be applied. Specifically a Mann-Whitney test was conducted on gender by item. On average, men indicated higher agreement on all items, indicating a higher degree of adversarial beliefs. The resulting Z tests were significant at $p \leq 0.0001$ (2-tailed) for four of the five times. The responses were not statistically significantly different for 'Men are out for only one thing.'

These results are similar to the results of the 2000-2001 survey. In the 2000-2001 survey, a Gender by Item (2 X 5) MANOVA was conducted in order to compare responses by men and women students overall and on individual items of the scale. The overall MANOVA (Pillai's Trace $F_{(5, 1161)} = 31.98, p < .001$) was significant. On average, men ($N = 512$, Mean = 10.68) endorsed adversarial beliefs more than women ($N = 655$, Mean = 8.87). Differences in rates of endorsement were significantly different on all items except "A man's got to show the woman who's boss right from the start" with men indicating more agreement on all other items than women.

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980). Rape myths are defined as prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists and contribute to creating a hostile climate for rape victims (Burt, 1980). Burt's scale has been widely used in the past and is a reliable scale with predictive value. A number of previous studies have found that men who committed sexual assault had higher scores on the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale as well as the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale as compared to men who had not committed sexual assault (Demare, Lips, & Briere, 1993; Koss, Leonard, Beezley, & Oros, 1985; Malamuth, 1986; Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991; Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Rapaport & Burkhart, 1984).

The Rape Myth Acceptance scale was developed in a similar manner as the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale described above and had a Cronbach's alpha of .875.

The following five items were based on Burt's Rape Myth Acceptance scale: 1) *A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.* 2) *Any female can get raped.* 3) *Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.* 4) *Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.* 5) *If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she's just met there, she should be considered "fair game" to other males at the party who also want to have sex with her whether she wants to or not.*

Students were asked to respond to each item on a 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*) scale. On all items except ‘*Any female can get raped*’ more agreement indicated more endorsement of rape myths. Thus, this item was reverse coded before analysis.

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale	All Students		Male Students		Female Students	
	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)	N	Mean (SD)
A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex.	526	1.75 (0.90)	150	1.84 (0.86)	364	1.70 (0.70)
Any female can get raped	527	1.72 (1.04)	151	1.99 (1.07)	364	1.59 (0.98)
Any healthy woman can successfully resist a rapist if she really wants to.	525	1.68 (0.92)	150	1.97 (1.05)	363	1.56 (0.84)
Many women have an unconscious wish to be raped, and may then unconsciously set up a situation in which they are likely to be attacked.	525	1.25 (0.62)	150	1.38 (0.63)	363	1.17 (0.54)
If a woman gets drunk at a party and has intercourse with a man she’s just met there, she should be considered “fair game” to other males at the party who also want to have sex with her whether she wants to or not.	527	1.18 (0.55)	151	1.25 (0.48)	364	1.14 (0.63)

NOTE: The following two Rape Myth Scale items were not included in the 2009 survey.

- *What percentage of women who report a rape would you say are lying because they are angry and want to get back at the man they accuse?*
- *What percentage of reported rapes would you guess were merely invented by women who discovered they were pregnant and wanted to protect their own reputation?*

Due to very unequal numbers of women and men, nonparametric analysis had to be applied. Specifically a Mann-Whitney test was conducted on gender by item. Men indicated more endorsement of rape myths on all items. The resulting Z tests were significant at $p \leq 0.0001$ (2-tailed) for four of the five times. The results for one item (*A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex*) were statistically significant at $p \leq 0.05$ (2-tailed).

These results are similar to results reported from the data gathered in the 2000-2001 survey. Back then, a Gender by Item (2 X 5) MANOVA was conducted comparing men's and women's endorsement of rape myths as measured by this scale. The overall MANOVA (Pillai's Trace $F_{(5, 1152)} = 11.14, p < .001$) was significant. On average, men ($N = 511, Mean = 9.23$) endorsed rape myths more than women ($N = 647, Mean = 8.53$). There was no significant difference in men and women's acceptance of "A woman who goes to the home or apartment of a man on their first date implies that she is willing to have sex" with a mean response of 1.77 for both men and women, indicating little acceptance of this belief. Also, there was no significant difference in responses by gender to "Any female can get raped" with both means (men, Mean = 2.86 and women, Mean = 2.90) being very close to the midpoint of the scale indicating that both somewhat agree with the statement. Differences in rates of endorsement were significantly different on the remaining three items with men indicating more agreement than women. However, none of these means reached the midpoint of the scale.

Relationship of Adversarial Beliefs and Acceptance of Rape Myths. As expected there was a strong positive correlation between the total scores on both scales ($r_{(521)} = 0.54, p \leq 0.01, 2$ -tailed). This finding is consistent with past reports (Burt, 1980) and supports the concurrent validity of the scales. *These results are similar to those of the 2000-2001 survey*, where there was a strong positive correlation between the total scores on both scales ($r_{(1231)} = .49, p < .01, 2$ -tailed).

Behavior Measures (Self-Report)

Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Gelles & Straus, 1979; Straus, 1979). Even though the CTS has been criticized for not taking the context of the violence and severity of injuries to women into account, ten items adapted from the CTS were included in the campus survey. See Brush, (1993); Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, and Daly, (1992) for examples of criticisms of CTS. DeKeseredy and Schwarz (chapter 3, 1998) provide a particularly clear discussion of the issues involved. Also, Straus (1990) has provided an extensive review of criticisms of the CTS and his responses to them.

The CTS continues to be one of, if not the most widely used, measures of relationship violence and it was felt that for comparison reasons it was important to include as one indicator. Approximately 400 studies have been published using data collected with the CTS (see Straus, 1995). Reported alpha coefficient reliabilities for physical aggression items range from .82 to .88 (Straus, 1990).

Conflict theory, which assumes that conflict is inevitable in all relationships but violence as a tactic is not, is the theoretical basis of the CTS (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). The CTS attempts to measure specific tactics, not attitudes about conflict or violence or causes and consequences of violence. In fact, one of the criticisms of the CTS is that it focuses only on conflict-instigated violence and does not include control-instigated violence which is believed to be used far more often by men than women (DeKeseredy & Schwarz, 1998). The CTS (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) can be used to measure the extent to

which relationship partners engage in psychological as well as physical attacks on each other and their use of reasoning to deal with conflict. However, the CTS has been most frequently used to measure only physical assaults and that is the manner in which it was used as part of the campus survey. Consistent with the original version of the CTS, the items described below were presented in hierarchical order of social desirability, with the least acceptable behaviors listed last. The scale authors' reasoning on this approach was that it would encourage self-disclosure of violence acts by allowing the respondent to first show that they had tried everything else.

The following ten items adapted from the Conflict Tactics Scale were presented with these response options: "Ever experienced?" (*Yes or No*) and "Did it happen on or off UofL campus?" (*On or Off*): 1) *accused you of having affairs or flirting with others*; 2) *threatened to hit you or throw something at you*; 3) *threw, smashed, or kicked something*; 4) *threw something at you*; 5) *pushed, grabbed, or shoved you*; 6) *kicked, bit, or hit you with a fist*; 7) *beat you up*; 8) *choked you*; 9) *threatened you with a gun or knife*; 10) *used a gun or knife on you*. All items were presented in two formats one with victim wording, i.e., "Has anyone accused you of having affairs or flirting with others?" and the other version with perpetrator wording, i.e., "Have you ever accused a partner of having affairs or flirting with others?"

Conflict Tactics Scale - Victimization Ever Experienced

Female Students

<u>Conflict Tactics Scale</u>	<u>Ever Experienced?</u> N (%)	<u>On Campus?</u> N (%)
Accused you of having affairs of flirting with others	130 (38.01)	14 (3.8)
Threatened to hit you or throw something at you	81 (23.75)	4 (4.9)
Threw, smashed, or kicked something	127 (37.13)	3 (2.4)
Threw something at you	62 (18.13)	3 (4.6)
Pushed, grabbed, shoved you	114 (33.24)	7 (6.2)
Kicked, bit, or hit you with a fist	38 (11.1)	1 (2.4)
Beat you up	13 (3.79)	0
Choked you	25 (7.29)	0
Threatened you w/ a gun or knife	24 (7.00)	1 (3.1)
Used a gun or knife on you	6 (1.75)	0

Conflict Tactics Scale – Ever Committed

Male Students

<u>Conflict Tactics Scale</u>	<u>Ever Experienced?</u> N (%)	<u>On Campus?</u> N (%)
Accused you of having affairs of flirting with others	126 (35.2)	8 (7.0)
Threatened to hit you or throw something at you	44 (12.3)	2 (5.1)
Threw, smashed, or kicked something	65 (18.2)	3 (5.6)
Threw something at you	43 (12.0)	3 (8.1)
Pushed, grabbed, shoved you	54 (15.2)	3 (6.0)
Kicked, bit, or hit you with a fist	27 (7.6)	2 (7.4)
Beat you up	1 (0.3)	0
Choked you	3 (0.8)	0
Threatened you w/ a gun or knife	3 (0.8)	0
Used a gun or knife on you	1 (0.3)	0

NOTE: It appears that the question “*Gender of partner(s)?*” (*Male, Female, Both*) was not presented with each item on the CTS, and therefore is not useable and results not reported here.

Female students reported a total of 620 incidents on the CTS. Thirty-three (5%) of these incidents took place on campus. Male students reported a total of 367 incidents, 21 of which took place on campus (5.7%). ***These results are similar to data collected in the previous survey. In the 2000-2001 survey, female students reported 1,377 incidents (Fall and Spring Semesters combined) and 5.66% (n=78) of these were stated to have occurred on campus. Male students reported a total of 387 incidents (Fall and Spring Semesters combined) and 5.68% (n=22) of these were stated to have occurred on campus.***

Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss & Oros, 1982). Koss and Oros developed the SES in order to detect unreported cases of rape and in an effort to document a dimensional view of sexual aggression and sexual victimization. The original version consisted of male and female parallel versions. It was 12 items long for men and included one additional question, “Have you ever been raped?” for women. A *Yes* or *No* response format was used. In a study in which a representative sample of 3, 862 university students completed the survey, Koss and Oros (1982) found that the instrument consisted of one factor that accounted for 67.3% of the variance. Seventy-five percent of the women and 81% of the men responding indicated they had experienced consensual sexual intercourse; 6% of the women indicated they had been raped.

Koss and Gidycz (1985) reported similar results when men made self-reports of their aggression on the SES as compared to levels of aggression reported to an interviewer ($r = .61$, $p < .001$). The SES also has good test-retest reliability for men (93%) as reported by Koss and Gidycz (1985).

For the campus survey, eight items were adapted from the SES and presented in gender neutral terms (i.e., “Have you had sexual intercourse with *your partner* even though you didn’t really want to because *your partner* threatened to end your relationship otherwise?”). All items except “*Ever had someone misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?*” and “*Have you ever been raped?*” were presented with wording for both victimization and perpetration of the acts involved.

The following eight items were adapted from the SES for use in the survey:

1) *Ever had someone misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?*

Have you been in a situation where.....

2) *your partner used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn’t want to?* 3) *your partner tried to have sexual intercourse with you when you didn’t want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn’t cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?* 4) *your partner used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to get you to have sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?*

Have you had sexual intercourse with your partner.....

5) *even though you didn’t really want to because your partner threatened to end your relationship otherwise?* 6) *when you didn’t want to because your partner threatened to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn’t cooperate?* 7) *when you didn’t want to because your partner used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?* 8) *Have you ever been raped?*

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had ever experienced each of the eight items above (*Yes or No*) and whether it happened on campus or not (*Yes or No*).

<u>Sexual Experiences Survey Female Students</u>	Ever Experienced? N (%)	On campus? N (%)
Had someone misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?	190 (51.8)	23 (12.1)
<i>Have you been in a situation where.....</i>		
your partner used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to make you engage in kissing or petting when you didn’t want to?	38 (10.5)	3 (8.3)
your partner tried to have sexual intercourse with you when you didn’t want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn’t	19 (5.2)	2 (11.1)

cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?		
your partner used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to get you to have sexual intercourse when you didn't want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?	20 (5.6)	2 (9.5)
<i>Have you had sexual intercourse with your partner.....</i>		
even though you didn't really want to because your partner threatened to end your relationship otherwise?	21 (5.8)	0
when you didn't want to because your partner threatened to use physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) if you didn't cooperate?	4 (1.1)	1 (20.0)
when you didn't want to because your partner used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?	19 (5.3)	2 (12.5)
Have you ever been raped?	54 (14.8)	4 (7.5)

<u>Sexual Experiences Survey Male Students</u>	Ever Experienced? N (%)	On campus? N (%)
Had someone misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?	42 (26.8)	4 (9.5)
<i>Have you been in a situation where.....</i>		
used some degree of physical force (twisting arm, holding down, etc.) to try to make your partner engage in kissing or petting when partner didn't want to?	2 (1.3)	0
tried to have sexual intercourse with your partner when partner didn't want to by threatening to use physical force (twisting arm, holding down, etc.) if partner didn't cooperate, but for various reasons <i>sexual intercourse did not occur</i> ?	1 (0.7)	0
you used some degree of physical force (twisting arm, holding down, etc.) to try to get partner to have sexual intercourse when partner didn't want to, but for various reasons <i>sexual intercourse did not occur</i> ?	1 (0.7)	0
<i>Have you had sexual intercourse with your partner.....</i>		
even though partner didn't really want to because you threatened to end relationship otherwise?	1 (0.7)	0
when partner didn't want to because you threatened to use physical force (twisting arm, holding down, etc.) if partner didn't cooperate?	0	0
when partner didn't want to because you used some degree of physical force (twisting arm, holding down, etc.)?	1 (0.7)	0

Female students reported experiencing a total of 311 incidents on the SES. Thirty-seven (11.9%) of these incidents took place on campus. Male students reported committing a total of 48 incidents, 4 of which took place on campus (8.3%). Contrary to the majority of previously reported findings, a higher percentage of female students responded that they had been raped when given the behavioral description of rape as part of the SES (i.e., having sexual intercourse as the result of threat or actual use of physical force) than when simply asked, "Have you ever been raped?"

PEACC PROGRAMMING: AWARENESS & PARTICIPATION

Only 32% of all the students (n=539) reported being aware of the mission of the PEACC program. More female (129) than male (45) students are aware of the PEACC program.

Are you aware of the mission of the UofL PEACC Program?*			
	YES	NO	Missing/NO RESPONSE
All Students (N=539)	177 (32.8%)	227 (42.1%)	135 (25.1%)
Male (N=157)	45 (28.7%)	80 (51%)	32 (20.4%)
Female (N=368)	129 (35.1%)	146 (39.7%)	93 (25.3%)

**Note: Chi Square = 4.161, df = 1, p = .041. Females were more likely to be aware of the mission of the UofL PEACC program.*

Sixty-six students reported attending a PEACC event at least once. More female versus male students have attended a PEACC public awareness event. *The 2000-2001 survey results indicated that 37 students had attended 1 or more a PEACC event held on campus.*

How many times have you attended a PEACC public awareness event?*						
	Never	Once	Twice	3x	> 3x	Missing/No response
All Students (N=539)	409 (75.9%)	66 (12.2%)	23 (4.3%)	6 (1.1%)	19 (3.5%)	16 (3.0%)
Male (N=157)	128 (81.5%)	18 (11.5%)	5 (3.2%)	1 (.6%)	4 (2.5%)	1 (.6%)
Female (N=368)	276 (75%)	48 (13%)	18 (4.9%)	4 (1.1%)	15 (4.1%)	7 (1.9%)

**Note: Chi Square = 1.998, df = 1, p = .158. Females were no more likely to have attended one or more PEACC public awareness event than males.*

Seventy-seven students reported hearing a PEACC presentation at least once. There is a trend towards female students more likely to have heard one or more PEACC educational presentation than male students. *A total of 364 students had heard a PEACC presentation either in the Fall or Spring semester according to the 2000-2001 survey data.*

How many times have you heard of a PEACC educational presentation?*						
	Never	Once	Twice	3x	> 3x	Missing/ No response
All Students (N=539)	388 (72%)	77 (14.3%)	24 (4.5%)	11 (2%)	19 (3.5%)	20 (3.7%)
Male (N=157)	122 (77.7%)	20 (12.7%)	5 (3.2%)	1 (.6%)	4 (2.5%)	5 (3.2%)
Female (N=368)	263 (71.5%)	55 (14.9%)	19 (5.2%)	9 (2.4%)	15 (4.1%)	7 (1.9%)

**Note: Chi Square = 3.136, df =1, p =.077. There is a trend towards females being more likely to have heard one or more PEACC educational presentations.*

Male and female students were equally likely to be aware of the Men of PEACC group.

Are you aware of the Men of PEACC group?*			
	YES	NO	Missing/NO RESPONSE
All Students (N=539)	143 (26.5%)	350 (64.9%)	46 (8.5%)
Male (N=157)	37 (23.6%)	113 (51%)	7 (4.5%)
Female (N=368)	104 (28.3%)	234 (63.6%)	30 (8.2%)

**Note: Chi Square = 1.883, df =1, p =.170. Males were no more likely to be aware of the Men of PEACC group than females.*

References & Resources

- Abbey, A., McAuslan, P. & Ross, L.T. (1998). Sexual Assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17(2), 167-195.
- Brush, L. D. (1993). 17 Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. In Pauline B. Bart & Eileen Geil Moran (Eds.) Violence against women: The bloody Footprints. United States: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, 217 - 230.
- Demare, E., Lips, H. M., & Briere, J. (1993). Sexually violent pornography, anti-women attitudes, and sexual aggression: A structural equation model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 27, 285-300.
- Dobash, R. E. & Dobash, R. P. (1983). Do we need new methods for studying wife abuse? : The context-specific approach. Chapter 15 in *The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research*. Edited by D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, and M. A. Straus. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, Martin. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, 39, 71-91.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (December, 2000). The sexual victimization of college women. Research report NCJ 182369, Washington; DC: U. S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Foubert, J.D., & McEwen, M. K. (1998). An all-male rape prevention peer education program: Decreasing fraternity men's behavioral intent to rape. Journal of College Student Development, 39(6), 548-556.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1979). Determinants of violence in the family: Toward a theoretical integration. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), *Contemporary theories about the family* (Vol. 1, pp. 549-581). New York: Free Press.
- Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual experiences survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 422-423.

- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. R. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of students in higher education. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.
- Koss, M. P., Leonard, K. E., Beezley, D. A., & Oros, C. J. (1985). Nonstranger sexual aggression: A discriminant analysis of the psychological characteristics of undetected offenders. *Sex Roles, 12*, 981 - 992.
- Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50* (3), 455-457.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 953-962.
- Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 353-369.
- Malamuth, N. M., Sockloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 670-681.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34*, 186-196.
- Rapaport, K. R., & Burkhart, B. R. (1984). Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 93*, 216-221.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A. (1990). The Conflict Tactics Scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M. A. Straus and R. J. Gelles. *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8, 145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ. Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M. A. (1995). *Manual for the Conflict Tactic Scales*. Durham N. H.: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*, 283-316.