University of Louisville

ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

12-2018

Sexual violence and the institutional integration of first year college students.

Ann Katherine James
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Part of the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

James, Ann Katherine, "Sexual violence and the institutional integration of first year college students."
(2018). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 3079.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/3079>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION OF FIRST YEAR COLLEGE
STUDENTS

By

Ann Katherine James
B.A., Appalachian State University, 1996
M.Ed., Appalachian State University, 2000

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
College of Education and Human Development
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in Counseling and Personnel Services

Department of Counseling and Human Development
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky

December 2018

Copyright 2018 by Ann James

All rights reserved

SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION OF FIRST YEAR COLLEGE
STUDENTS

By

Ann Katherine James
B.A., Appalachian State University, 1996
M.Ed., Appalachian State University, 2000

A Dissertation Approved on

November 27, 2018

by the following Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Amy Hirschy, Chair

Dr. Jacob Gross

Dr. Susan Longerbeam

Dr. Jeff Valentine

DEDICATION

I had the privilege of being raised by two women who valued education and self-sufficiency. My grandmother, Ann Tipton Martin (known as Dodi to me and my sister), helped raise me while my mom, Kitty Martin Pitini, finished her B.A. and M.A. degrees after my parents' divorce. The nights spent at Dodi's house while my mom drove back and forth from Bristol, TN to Radford, VA are ones I will always remember, both because I got to spend time with my grandmother and also because I knew that my mom was doing all of this hard work for her children. I vividly remember my mom's M.A. graduation ceremony- how happy she was and how proud my grandmother was of her. My sister and I were proud too, but I think our pride has grown as we've gotten older and become parents of our own. This dissertation is dedicated to my mom and my Dodi. I love you both more than you know.

It took me seven years to complete my PhD. During that seven years, I was newly married to my husband, Jonathan, and we had our son, Owen. Without the support of both of them, I would not have finished. There were times when I was gone writing for entire weekends and most evenings after work and my husband held everything down on his own, making sure Owen did fun things so maybe he wouldn't

notice my absence quite as much. I love you with my whole heart, Jonathan and Owen.

This dissertation is also dedicated to you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor and dissertation committee chair, Dr. Amy Hirschy, for the countless hours she spent reading various drafts, sending me feedback, and talking me down from a panicked state. Her perfect balance of kindness and honesty was just what I needed to get me through this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Jeff Valentine for his time and patience with me as I grappled with research methods and statistics. Dr. Susan Longerbeam and Dr. Jacob Gross were also incredibly generous with their time and knowledge. Without all of their input and help, I would certainly not have finished this undertaking.

I was incredibly fortunate to be surrounded by women who had already earned or were also earning their terminal degrees and supported me by providing expertise and care. Dr. Brandelyn Tosolt not only helped me flush out my thoughts- she also normalized my anxiety and showed me so much compassion. Sara Kelley, J.D., demonstrated her complete and total mastery of active voice and Microsoft Word. She spent more than her fair share of time helping me with grammar and formatting and was patient the entire time. Dr. Jessica Kratzer listened and advised me at my most frustrated times and helped me out of the mommy-guilt abyss. Meg Cowherd, fellow doctoral student, and I spent many an hour sharing our high and low moments as we worked to be good parents, spouses, students and employees all at once.

Without the compassion and flexibility of my supervisors during this process, Arnie Slaughter and Dr. Kimberly Moore, I would have gotten much less sleep and would not have maintained the balance I was able to find. I also found support in Matt Gregory who spent many, many hours helping me understand the various statistical tests I was considering and editing my early, very drafty work. I would also like to thank Dr. Erik Sorenson for his kindness and generosity in helping a new colleague as I worked to finish this dissertation while starting a new job.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. My sister, Ashley, listened tirelessly as I expressed my anxiety and always offered to help with my son/her nephew. Marissa and Brett, my dearest friends, provided motivation by phone when I didn't have any left. My dad consistently asked for updates and always offered love, encouragement and support. My Aunt Lisa and Uncle Steve always tell me how proud they are of me- a huge motivation when wanted to just stop writing. My parents- and sister-in law, Owen, Karen and Jodi, provided support from across the sea through frequent check-ins and cheerleading. I love you all dearly and am so grateful.

ABSTRACT

SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND THE INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRATION OF FIRST YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Ann James

November 27, 2018

This purpose of this study is to explore the relationships among identity, sexual violence, reporting choices, perception of campus climate and institutional integration. Student affairs professionals and other educators are particularly concerned about the effects of sexual violence on college students because of the deleterious effects that such violence has on factors critical to student success. Research indicates that 1 in 5 students will experience actual or attempted sexual assault while in college (Fisher, 2000). Students with greater levels of social and academic integration have a greater commitment to their college or university and thus graduate at higher rates (Tinto, 1975). While much is known about how sexual violence is related to the college experience of those who are victimized during their first semester, little research has focused on how such an experience is associated with institutional integration. This study drew from two theories: Tinto's theory of student departure (1975; 1993) and Abes et al.'s reconceptualized model of multiple dimensions of identity (2007). Specifically, this study examined how identity, sexual violence, campus climate, and reporting choices relate to institutional integration as measured by the Institutional

Integration Scale (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1975, 1993, 1997). This study found a significant positive relationship between perception of campus climate and institutional integration. The study concludes with recommendations for educators who work with students who have experienced sexual violence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Overview	1
Purpose and Significance of the Study	5
Definition of Terms	6
Research Questions	7
Conceptual Model	8
Summary of Chapter I	10
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Overview	11
Conceptual Framework	11
Tinto's Theory of Student Departure	12
Reconceptualized Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity	19
Literature on Student Background Characteristics and Institutional Integration	21
Sexual Violence and College Students	24
Frequency and Scope	24
Race and Sexual Assault of College Students	27
Sexual Identity and Sexual Assault of College Students	29
Impact	30
College Students and Reporting Sexual Violence	34
Sexual Violence and Campus Climate	38
Institutional Integration and Trauma	39
Institutional Integration Scale	40
Need for Further Research	42
Summary of Chapter II	42

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	43
Introduction	43
Research Design	43
Population	43
Setting.....	44
Data Sources and Collection Procedures.....	44
Instruments Used in Data Collection	45
Haven Survey	45
Institutional Integration Scale.....	47
Research Questions, Hypotheses, Variables and Analyses	48
Limitations	52
CHAPTER IV RESULTS	55
Introduction.....	55
Data Collection	55
Data Analysis	56
Results	58
General characteristics of the sample	58
Research question 1.....	61
Research question 2.....	64
Research question 3.....	66
Research question 4.....	68
Research question 5.....	69
Summary.....	71
CHAPTER V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	72
Discussion of study findings	72
Implications for research.....	75
Recommendations for practice	78
Conclusion	84
REFERENCES.....	86
Appendix A.....	98
Appendix B	115
Appendix C	116
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	121

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Variables and Statistical Analyses Used	56
2. Frequency of Racial Identities	58
3. Frequency of Sexual Identities	59
4. Frequency of Gender Identities	60
5. Frequency of Sexual Violence Based on Sexual Identity	61
6. Frequency of Sexual Violence Based on Racial Identity	62
7. Frequency of Sexual Violence Based on Gender Identity	62
8. Frequency of Students Experiencing Sexual Violence in first 6-10 weeks	64
9. Mean Scores for Interactions with Faculty Subscale	64
10. Mean Scores for Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale	64
11. Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale Means by Gender Identity	66
12. Interactions with Faculty Subscale Means by Gender Identity	67
13. Correlation between Campus Climate and Interactions with Faculty Subscale	68
14. Correlation between Campus Climate and Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale	69

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
<i>Figure 1.</i> Conceptual framework	9
<i>Figure 2.</i> Tinto's model of student departure (1993)	17
<i>Figure 3.</i> Reconceptualized Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity (Abes et al., 2007)	20

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Sexual violence among college students in the United States is a topic visible over the past decade in the media and in new and pending federal and state legislation. Partly as a result, researchers examine the frequency and effects of such violence. The Campus Sexual Assault Study (CSA) reports that 13.7% of undergraduate female college students experienced at least one sexual assault since entering college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007). Additionally, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (2010) found that 81% of women experiencing sexual violence indicated significant short or long-term effects, such as post-traumatic stress syndrome and injury (Black et al., 2011).

Addressing the issue of sexual violence in college is made more complex and difficult due to several factors. Voluntary alcohol consumption on the part of one or both individuals leads to more incidents of sexual violence among college students than use of force (Krebs et al., 2007). Someone the survivor knows perpetrates the majority of sexual assault involving college students and the perpetrator uses alcohol and drugs to facilitate the assault in most incidents (Fisher et al., 2003).

The survivors described by Fisher et al. report the incident to police or another campus authority less of the time than survivors who did not know their perpetrator or experienced a forcible assault (2003). In addition, survivors label their experience as rape less frequently when the assault involves an intimate partner, or if impaired by the use of alcohol or drugs, both of which occur more frequently in this population of survivors (Kahn, Jackson, Kully, Badger, & Halvorsen, 2003).

The issue of non-reporting leads to additional challenges for both survivors and those working on campuses to support them. Federal government and external stakeholders increasingly scrutinize college and universities leaders on how they address the issue of sexual violence on campuses across the United States (DOE OCR, 2011). The Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights investigates hundreds of institutions involving complaints by students and others who feel their civil rights related to gender under Title IX were violated (DOE OCR, 2016). As such, sexual violence remains an issue on campuses across the country despite the efforts of administrators to comply with Title IX and other federal mandates (Carroll, Dahlgren, Grab, Hasbun, Hayes, & Muntis, 2013).

The media's portrayal of Title IX compliance can be different from the experience of many student affairs professionals working in the areas of compliance and survivor advocacy. A 2003 study found that 66.2% of respondents told a friend or family member that they had been raped while only 3.2% disclosed the same information to a campus administrator (Fisher et al.). Survivors felt the following were barriers to reporting incidents of sexual violence: that the incident would be seen as their fault, felt

ashamed, did not want anyone else to know about the incident, and did not want the police to be involved (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Krebs et al., 2007; Krebs, Lindquist, Berzofsky, Shook-Sa, Peterson, Planty, Langton, & Stroop, 2016). College women additionally indicate greater disability, more psychological symptoms, and impaired ability to cope when they experience sexual assault and do not acknowledge the victimization or tell anyone about it (Clements & Ogle, 2009).

Many US institutions implement campus climate surveys to get a better sense for how their students view their experiences on campus. Little research exists about how students who experience sexual violence see campus climate compared to those who have not. A study examining the intersection of sexual assault and campus climate found that across all of the institutions and most all of the climate scales included in their survey, more students who responded that they had experienced sexual assault gave lower climate ratings than those who did not respond that they had experienced sexual assault (Krebs et al., 2016).

Research consistently demonstrates the negative effects of sexual violence on college students. Studies show such effects as lower GPA, higher rates of anxiety and depression, increased high-risk drinking and risking sexual behavior, as well as decreased class attendance and higher rates of attrition (Campbell, Dworkin, & Cabral, 2009; Black et al., 2011; Amar & Gennaro, 2005). However, unexplored areas related to the effects of sexual violence still exist and should be addressed so that faculty and administrators can better serve students.

One such area is how sexual violence may be related to a college student's level of institutional integration. Tinto's model (1975; 1993) indicates that a student's academic and social integration into an institution is correlated with their decision to remain in school and persist towards graduation. Academic integration is described as a student's identification with the norms of the academic systems of the college while social integration consists primarily of the degree of congruency between a student and their social surroundings (Tinto, 1975). Tinto also attributes persistence to individual characteristics, such as family background, previous academic performance, and goal commitment (1975). A student's multiple identities, as well as the intersection of those identities, are also key individual characteristics that should be considered in order to fully understand a student's perspective that may be related to persistence (Abes, Jones, & McEwen, 2007; Jones & McEwen, 2000). A student who experiences sexual violence may encounter deleterious effects on their overall wellness that could interfere with their goal commitment and institutional integration (Campbell et al., 2009; Black et al., 2011; Amar & Gennaro, 2005). If that is the case, it is possible that those factors may lessen the likelihood that those students will persist in college.

In the only known study to examine questions about sexual assault and persistence, Jordan, Combs and Smith point out the critical omission of the exploration of sexual assault as a predictor of attrition (2014). Their study found that college women who were sexually assaulted during their first semester of enrollment earned lower GPAs than women who did not have that experience (Jordan et al., 2014). The researchers in this study recommend further exploration of the relationship between

sexual assault and persistence, particularly as it relates to academic performance. These implications are related to Tinto's concept of academic integration which he linked directly to student attrition.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

This study seeks to explore the relationships among sexual violence, whether or not a student reports that experience, perception of campus climate and institutional integration. As noted, institutional integration is positively related to a student's likelihood to persist in college. If, for example, students who experience sexual violence and report it are more socially and academically integrated into the campus community than those who do not report it, efforts to educate students about resources should be expanded in order to increase reporting rates. Additionally, a student's multiple social identities (in Tinto's model termed pre-college characteristics) and how the intersection of those identities correlate to a student's decision to persist has been underexplored. Important implications could also be made regarding a student's perception of campus climate and their level of institutional integration. Findings from this research could inform student affairs professionals regarding the type of education students should receive regarding support services available on campus.

The relationships among the variables of social identity, experiencing sexual violence, reporting, and perception of campus climate with institutional integration is not fully understood. The results of this study could provide additional research that may assist educators in better supporting students who experience sexual violence.

Definition of Terms

The following section defines the major terms used in this research study.

First-year college student. A person who enrolls, either part-time or full-time, in undergraduate coursework for the first time at an institution of higher education. Some students included in the study may be classified as sophomores by class status because they obtained college course credit while still in high school.

Institutional integration. Individual student's normative and structural congruence with the academic and social systems of the college or university they attend (Tinto, 1975).

Survivor. A student who indicated experiencing unwanted sexual contact before attending college, since they enrolled in college, or both. This term is inclusive of how a student may choose to identify their experience: a victim, a survivor, or both.

Reporting. A survivor deciding to share information about unwanted sexual contact with any of the following (Everfi, 2016):

- Friends, family members, or roommate
- Crisis center/helpline/hospital/healthcare center at their current school
- Crisis center/helpline/hospital/healthcare center not at their current school
- Campus police/security
- Local police (county, city, state)
- Administrators, faculty, or other officials or staff at their current school
- Minister or pastoral counselor

Unwanted sexual contact. Physical interaction that one did not consent to and did not want to happen (perpetrated by physical force or threats of physical harm; manipulation through lies, threats, or pressure; or taking advantage of a person significantly impaired or incapacitated by drugs or alcohol). Examples of sexual contact could include one (or more) of the following (Everfi, 2016):

- Touching of a sexual nature
- Oral stimulation
- Sexual intercourse
- Anal penetration
- Sexual penetration with a finger or object

Research Questions

This study addresses the relationship among sexual violence, reporting, and perception of campus climate and levels of institutional integration among college students.

Specifically, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. When considering gender, sexual identity, and racial identity, what is the frequency of incidents of sexual violence during the first 6-10 weeks of the first semester of college?
2. Do students who have never experienced sexual violence and students who have experienced sexual violence since entering college have a significantly different level of institutional integration?
3. Among students who have experienced sexual violence since entering college, is the combination of non-dominant demographic identities and sexual violence

correlated with significantly lower levels of institutional integration than the combination of dominant demographic identities and sexual violence?

4. Among students who experienced sexual violence since entering college, is there a difference in the levels of institutional integration between students who report and do not report their incident?
5. Among all students, is there a relationship between perception of campus climate regarding sexual violence and level of institutional integration?

Conceptual Model

The following conceptual model displays the variables examined in this study using the framework of Vincent Tinto's model of student departure (1975) and informed by Abes, Jones and McEwan's Reconceptualized Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity (2007).

Figure 1. Conceptual framework

Summary of Chapter I

The issue of sexual violence on college campuses is one that captures the attention of student affairs professionals, faculty, students, their families, the government, as well as the media. Of particular concern to student affairs professionals are the effects of sexual violence on college students because of the deleterious effects that such violence has on factors critical to student success. There is a gap in the research regarding the effect of sexual violence on institutional integration.

The following chapter examines the literature on several aspects of sexual assault and college students: frequency, pre-entry characteristics of gender, sexual identity, and race, and reporting behaviors among college students. In addition, the chapter reviews research related to perception of campus climate and the impact of sexual trauma on institutional integration.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

This dissertation examines the factors centering on the experience of sexual violence in first-year college students and their degree of institutional integration. This chapter reviews the conceptual framework of the study as well as the literature of five main factors related to sexual violence and college students.

Conceptual Framework

This study draws from two theories: Tinto's theory of student departure (1975; 1993) and Abes et al.'s reconceptualized model of multiple dimensions of identity (2007). Specifically, this study examines how identity, sexual violence, campus climate, and reporting choices relate to institutional integration as measured by the Institutional Integration Scale (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1975, 1993, 1997). Tinto considers both pre-entry characteristics and experiences in college to create a predictive model for student attrition. This study utilizes Tinto's model to explore pre-entry demographic traits related to sexual violence and campus climate to determine relationships with institutional integration. The work of Abes, Jones and McEwan (2007) adds important nuance to what Tinto termed "pre-entry characteristics" through their work to explore how a student's multiple identities are related to their ability to make meaning of their college experience. Their work is critical in order to fully understand

the identities that a student brings to college with them and how those identities shape their perspectives, including their decision regarding persistence in the face of trauma. This goal of this study is to determine the relationships that exist between the outcomes of sexual violence that have been identified in the research thus far, student identities, and institutional integration.

Tinto's theory of student departure. Vincent Tinto (1975) proposed a model of student departure defined by a process that students go through to integrate academically and socially into the college environment. He made the case that a student's integration into the social and academic systems of the institution is directly related to persistence. Tinto's criticism of previous theories of student persistence centered on their focus on describing attrition behaviors without explaining why those behaviors occur (1993). Additionally, he noted that previous theories focused on individual student deficiencies and not the interaction between those students and the institutions in which they were enrolled (Tinto, 1995). In order to address the shortcomings that Tinto believed existed in prior theories, he developed an interactionalist theory that took into account how the student and the institution together influenced persistence (Tinto, 1995). Tinto's theory did not attempt to explain student attrition from a systemic level but rather specifically at an institutional one, outlining strategies for institutions to improve their rates of student persistence (1975). Tinto's model is shown in Figure 2.

Tinto built upon an existing theory of departure of a different sort- that of suicide. Emile Durkheim's Theory of Suicide correlates a lack of integration into societal

communities with suicide (1961). Durkheim's research indicated that higher rates of suicide are often found within those communities where it is more difficult to feel a part of, or integrated into, social and intellectual life (1961). Tinto extended Durkheim's theory to apply to college student attrition by comparing a person's isolation from societal communities to a student's isolation from the academic and social systems of a college (1993). He called upon institutional leaders to ask whether or not they have created easily accessible ways for all students to become integrated into the faculty, staff, and student communities (Tinto, 1993). Tinto also pointed out that Durkheim's theory illuminates the powerful influence that the communities within a college have on a student's decision to persist or not, just as societal communities have such influence on a person's decision to commit suicide (1993).

William Spady (1970) also built on Durkheim's research, and laid the foundation for Tinto, in his research that aimed to synthesize the many variables that contribute to a student's decision to drop out of college. He criticized those who had examined dropout prior to his work by saying that others had looked at such variables, like academic success and social connection, in isolation rather than taking a comprehensive, interdisciplinary approach (1970). Spady developed a model that integrates a student's family and cultural background with the rewards a student receives, or does not receive, through the academic and social systems of the college (1970). Importantly, Spady introduced the concept of normative congruence, or how much a student's attitudes and interests are in line with those of the institution, within

his model (1970). Tinto integrates normative congruence significantly into his later work (1975).

In building his theory of student departure, Tinto moved from the foundation laid by Durkheim and Spady into defining what institutional integration, both social and academic, looks like on a campus. A quote from his 1975 article published in the *Review of Educational Research* succinctly sums up his theory:

Assuming unchanging external conditions, dropout is taken to be the result of the individual's experiences in the academic and social systems of the college. These experiences lead to varying levels of normative and structural integration in those collegiate systems and to the reevaluation and modification, if need be, of commitments to the goal of college completion and to the institution (p. 103).

Tinto describes academic integration as the formal educational aspect of the college experience, defined largely by a student's congruence with the academic systems of the institution (1975). A lack of academic integration can be linked to a decrease in what Tinto frames as goal commitment, or one's expectations of themselves to complete their college degree (1975). The lower or less intense one's expectations of themselves to persist through graduation, the less likely they will be to be academically integrated into the institution. Social integration is characterized by a high level of congruence between a student and their social environment, as defined by informal peer group associations, co-curricular activities, and interaction with faculty and staff within the institution (Tinto, 1975). Tinto linked social integration closely with the concept of

institutional commitment, or the expectation that one has of themselves to persist at that specific institution (Tinto, 1975). Lower rates of institutional commitment can lead to a student transferring to another institution whereas lower rates of goal commitment can lead to a student dropping out of the pursuit of a college degree completely (Tinto, 1975).

Increased levels of both academic and social integration, or institutional integration, lead to higher levels of both goal and institutional commitment and, therefore, higher levels of persistence (Tinto, 1975). Because a student is experiencing varying degrees of integration throughout their college years, they are constantly evaluating both their goal and institutional commitment by engaging in a cost/benefit analysis (Tinto, 1975). According to Tinto (1975), "This is so because these commitments, which reflect the person's integration into the academic and social domains of the institution, are themselves the result of the person's perception of the benefits and the costs of his attendance at college" (p. 98). Social and academic rewards play in to the evaluation of costs and benefits and, therefore, contribute to one's modification of their institutional commitment (Tinto, 1975).

With regard to attrition, Tinto differentiates between a student voluntarily withdrawing from an institution and the academic dismissal of a student. Academic dismissal due to poor grade performance can be related to a student being unable to meet the academic demands of the institution to pre-college characteristics or other factors (Tinto, 1975). An incongruence between a student and the climate and/or social system at the institution often influences voluntary withdrawal (Tinto, 1975). While it is

clear that institutions have as a goal the retention of their students, Tinto points out that attrition is not always a negative outcome. There are times when a student's goals and those of the institution are not in sync; in those cases, a student's departure may be the most beneficial path forward (Tinto, 1982). Tinto notes that students do attach meaning to their decision to leave an institution, but that meaning does not always have to be negative (1982).

Tinto's theory also takes into consideration pre-entry characteristics that students have before attending college as well as external factors that exist outside the institution but that influence persistence. Pre-entry characteristics include family background, skills, attributes, financial resources, dispositions, and educational experiences (Tinto, 1993). Tinto identifies external factors such as familial and community support for higher education as well as work commitments as things that may also impact a student's integration into the college (1993). These characteristics are significant in that they are influential to the goal and institutional commitments that a student has when they enter college and as they persist. The higher those commitments are when a student begins, the more likely that student is to persist through graduation (Tinto, 1993).

This study utilizes questions from the Institutional Integration Scale that are from the "interactions with faculty" and "institutional and goal commitment" subscales (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1975, 1993, 1997). These subscales were selected because they focus on areas not asked about elsewhere in the Haven survey, and their reliability and validity have been established in the literature (Pascarella & Terenzini,

1980).

Figure 2. Tinto's model of student departure (1993)

Pascarella and Terenzini conducted further research that supported the predictive validity of Tinto's theory of institutional integration with the strongest impact seen in student-faculty relationships (1980). Student-faculty interaction outside of the classroom is as important to persistence, if not more so, than their interaction in the classroom. Pascarella and Terenzini confirmed Tinto's finding that the greater a student's integration into the campus, the more likely they are to persist, noting that "Whenever and wherever students can be more fully involved in the life of an institution, the likelihood of their remaining will be enhanced" (1980, p. 15).

According to Tinto, an important factor in a student's integration into the college community is that of normative congruence, or the similarity between the student's beliefs and values and those of the institution (Braxton, Hirschy, & McClendon, 2004). Additionally, Braxton noted that oftentimes students drop out because they do not perceive that they have normative congruence with the institution and/or they feel isolated from the campus community (2000). This concept of normative congruence is important when considering a student's perception of their community after an incident of sexual violence has occurred. It is possible that a student's view of the campus climate may shift depending on how they perceive the institution will respond to sexual violence, and that their institutional commitment may decrease. A student's decision to report an incident of sexual violence may also be related to their perception of campus climate and, therefore, their level of institutional commitment. If a student does not believe that their college will be supportive of them should they decide to report, it is unlikely that they would take that step. Further, if students do not report incidents of sexual violence, they may be without needed support and resources which may further decrease their commitment and consequently their decision to persist.

A critique of Tinto's work is that students from minoritized identity groups based on, for example, race, gender and sexual orientation did not make up a significant number of the participants in his research (Tierney, 1999). While this is certainly a limitation in this study, the IIS was selected because its validity and reliability has been consistently tested with more diverse populations and does show value in measuring institutional integration. This study adds to the body of work that continues to

determine whether or not the IIS is appropriate for use in diverse populations or if another instrument should be developed.

Reconceptualized model of multiple dimensions of identity. Jones and McEwan's (2000) model of multiple dimensions of identity postulates that no one aspect of a person's identity can be considered in isolation. Rather, each identity dimension, such as race, sexual orientation and gender, must be considered in the context of one another in order for each to be fully understood (Jones & McEwan, 2000). Additionally, the researchers indicate that the core sense of self is developed in the context of the intersection of all aspects of one's identity. Abes, Jones, and McEwan (2007) reconceptualized this model to incorporate meaning-making ability in order to gain a more holistic perspective on a student's development.

The reconceptualized model of multiple dimensions of identity (Abes et al., 2007) addressed an important issue in student development theory by exploring meaning-making related to the intersectionality of identities. The model stems from a 2004 study conducted by Abes and Jones that suggests a student's capacity for meaning-making acts as a filter that is instrumental in processing contextual factors that determine one's perception of their intersecting identities.

The identity construction process is made up of three parts: context, meaning-making, and identity perceptions. The model is shown in Figure 3. Meaning-making is illustrated as a filter that context moves through to yield self-perception of identity. The more complex the meaning-making filter, the smaller the holes are in that filter and the more context one is able to discard and the more likely one is to generate their

perception of identity internally rather than externally (Abes et al., 2007). The less complex the filter, the more influenced one is by environmental factors and therefore their perception of identity is heavily determined by external factors (Abes et al., 2007).

The authors designate three types of meaning-making moving from less to more complex. The least complex is categorized as formulaic meaning-making and is comprised of minimal filtering that results in infrequent identification of relationships between one's multiple identities. Transitional meaning-making occurs when a student is moving out of the formulaic phase and experiences tension and conflict among and within their multiple identities. Foundational meaning-making is the most complex and is characterized by the ability to, regardless of environment, present themselves consistently and inclusive of their multiple identities (Abes et al., 2007).

Figure 3. Reconceptualized Model of Multiple Dimensions of Identity (Abes et al., 2007)

One key difference between this reconceptualized model and prior models is that it allows for multiple identities to be included in one's "core self" as described by Jones and McEwan (2000). The outcome of this integration can be that a student sees their social identities as fully incorporated into their internally-defined self rather than pieces of their identity that are moved from front to back of their presentation depending on the context (Abes et al., 2007).

The authors advise student affairs professionals to focus on understanding the contextual influences on their campuses so that they can better understand their students' experiences (Abes et al., 2007). They recommend that educators become aware of the campus climate and how that climate might influence how students choose to represent themselves in the community. A student who does not feel that they can live their intersecting identities authentically on campus may not be integrated into the campus. If that same student experiences sexual violence, their persistence may be at risk due to their lack of connectedness to the campus community.

Literature on Student Background Characteristics and Institutional Integration

Student pre-entry characteristics, such as family background, skills, attributes, financial resources, dispositions, familial and community support and educational experiences, were noted by Tinto as important variables that are related to student persistence (1993). Sexual orientation, gender and other aspects of a student's identity were not included in Tinto's original research but are ones that have been considered by researchers more recently.

With regard to race, Reid (2013) found that Black male college students with higher GPAs reported higher levels of social integration and more faculty relationships. These findings were moderated by students' racial identity, with students who indicated resolved and stable feelings about their racial identity tending to have more positive outcomes in college than those who did not indicate those same feelings. Academic achievement of Black male college students in this study related positively to quality of interaction with faculty members but no relationship was found between academic achievement and social integration. Langin (2001) also concluded that Black college student racial identity attitudes were related to institutional integration. Additionally, students in this study who reported high initial commitments to graduation and the institution reported subsequent high levels of commitment to both graduation and the institution as well. Only one study was found regarding multiracial college students that reported a positive relationship between multiracial identity and levels of social integration (Spicer-Runnels, 2013).

Personal relationships have been shown to be impactful to the institutional integration of both Native American and international college students (McSorely, 2017; Oxendine, 2015). With regard to Native American students in particular, higher levels of integration, specifically peer group interactions and social support, were shown to be related to a stronger sense of belonging on campus (Oxendine, 2015). Davidson and Wilson (2013-2014) concluded that, regardless of a student's racial or ethnic identity, relationships with people on campus matter most when identifying factors that are related to persistence. Similarly, Strayhorn (2008) found that, among Black college

students, supportive relationships on campus are positively related to student satisfaction with their college experience.

Students who do not identify with the majority culture or norms on their campus could be expected to diminish some aspects of their identity in order to become integrated into the college environment (Wolf-Wendel, Ward, & Kinzie, 2009). Those students who either choose not to diminish aspects of their identity or are not successful at doing so could be at risk for dropout due to lack of integration and connectedness. Tierney (1992) concluded that it is the responsibility of the institution to provide opportunities for all students to connect to the campus community rather than to expect students from minoritized identities to determine how to change in order to becoming integrated.

With regard to this study, the independent variables of pre-college identity, experiencing sexual violence, perception of campus climate, and the decision to report sexual violence are all potential factors that play into a student's institutional and goal commitment and therefore may influence their decision to persist. A student's commitments result from their perception of the costs and benefits of attendance, and that perception can be heavily influenced by one's experiences on campus. This review of literature outlines the potential effects of sexual violence on students, specifically as it relates to campus climate and overall health and wellness. The purpose of this study is to explore the potential outcomes that the effects of sexual violence have on institutional integration.

The dependent variable in this research study is Institutional integration. Given the research that indicates that social and academic integration into college are related to persistence in college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1975, 1993, 1997; Braxton et al., 2004) and also that unwanted sexual contact happens so frequently among college students, it is critical to examine how those variables are related to one another (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Krebs et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2016).

Sexual Violence and College Students

This chapter highlights four main areas of the literature within the larger topic of sexual violence and college students: frequency and scope, race and sexual assault of college students, sexual identity and sexual assault of college students, and impact.

Frequency and Scope. Perhaps one of the most frequently cited studies on sexual violence, the National College Women Sexual Victimization (NCWSV) study, was funded by the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, both part of the Office of Justice Programs (Fisher et al., 2000). Created in 1984, the Office of Justice Programs is part of the United States Department of Justice and is focused on prevention of crime through grants and assistance directed towards state, local, and tribal criminal justice agencies (<https://ojp.gov>). Using a two-stage process to collect data, Fisher, Cullen, and Turner first asked “behaviorally specific” questions about their experiences to respondents and then asked questions more specifically about the incident(s) they experienced.

The results of the NCWSV study produced the often-cited statistic that 1 in 4 undergraduate women will be the survivor of completed or attempted rape during their

college career. This statistic is drawn from the finding that 2.8% of the respondents of the survey experienced completed or attempted rape during a six-month period. If that percentage is expanded out to a full year, then the researchers concluded that the data suggest that nearly 5% of undergraduate women would experience a completed or attempted rape during a 12-month period. If that estimate is then further extrapolated to the typical five-year college career of most students, the rate of completed or attempted rape that undergraduate women experience could be between 20% and 25%. The data indicated that 9 out of 10 of the respondents who experienced attempted or completed rape knew their perpetrator (Fisher et al., 2000).

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) funded an additional study several years later, the Campus Sexual Assault Study (CSA), to examine the “prevalence, nature, and reporting of various types of sexual assault” that students at US colleges and universities have experienced (Krebs et al., 2007, p. vii). The primary outcome was to determine effective prevention and intervention strategies to address the occurrence of sexual violence on campus.

The CSA study was conducted at two large public universities in the winter of 2005-2006, and 5,466 female and 1,375 male undergraduate students participated. Nearly sixteen percent of undergraduate women indicated experiencing attempted or completed sexual assault before entering college while 19.0% of undergraduate women indicated experiencing attempted or completed sexual assault since entering college. Eleven point one percent of undergraduate women who responded to the survey indicated that they were incapacitated and unable to provide consent during their

assault and 4.7% indicated that the assault that they experienced was perpetrated using physical force. Six point one percent of male undergraduate respondents indicated that they had experienced an attempted or completed sexual assault since entering college, with a majority of those students reporting that they were incapacitated and unable to provide consent during the assault rather than physical force being used (Krebs et al., 2007).

Most recently, the Campus Climate Survey Validation Study Final Technical Report was published further supporting data reported in previous similar research (Krebs et al., 2016). Krebs and his colleagues found that 25.1% of undergraduate females indicated experiencing unwanted/nonconsensual sexual contact while in college. Of the students who indicated experiencing sexual assault in one academic year, 85.4% stated that the tactic used was someone touching/grabbing their sexual body parts, 24.9% stated that they were incapacitated and unable to provide consent or stop what was occurring, 23.7% stated that physical force was used, and the remaining respondents stated they were threatened or some other reason.

Krebs and his colleagues found evidence for the phenomenon known as the “red zone” that postulates that first-year college students are more at-risk for sexual violence during their first semester of college. The highest rates of sexual assault were stated to have happened in September of the first year of college (Krebs et al., 2016). An additional study including 22 colleges and universities in the United States found further evidence for the “red zone” with much higher percentage of first-year students

experiencing sexual violence in all measured categories: forced, drug-facilitated, coerced, and attempted assault (Cranney, 2014).

These three studies demonstrate consistent findings regarding the frequency of sexual violence among college students. However, it is worth noting that there are conflicting results regarding assaults resulting from physical force being used (4.7% in the 2007 study vs. 23.7% in the 2016 study) but consistent results regarding survivors being incapacitated and unable to provide consent. The research conducted from 2000 to 2016 were made more inclusive of various aspects of sexual assault, with the 2016 study including such details as when most assaults occur during the academic year and what specific tactics were used by the perpetrator during the assault.

Race and Sexual Assault of College Students. Very little research exists on the experience of students of color with sexual violence. Researchers in a 2011 study reported that theirs is the first study of which they are aware that explores sexual violence among women enrolled at HBCUs (Krebs, Barrick, Lindquist, Crosby, Boyd, & Bogan, 2011). Previous studies regarding sexual assault on college campuses have included large sample sizes, but the number of student respondents who identify as racial and/or ethnic minorities have been relatively small. This study specifically looked at rates of attempted and completed rape and sexual battery perpetrated against women enrolled at HBCUs and whether or not the assault was perpetrated using physical force or incapacitation.

Krebs and his colleagues compared the experiences of 3,951 undergraduate female students at HBCUs with those of 5,446 undergraduate female students at non-

HBCUs (2011). The results indicated that 9.7% of female undergraduates at HBCU's indicate experiencing a completed sexual assault since entering college while 13.7% of female undergraduates at non-HBCUs indicate a similar incident. A significant difference existed in the circumstances involved in the perpetration of the assaults in this study. 6.4% of women enrolled at an HBCU indicate that their assault occurred while they were incapacitated while 11.1% of women enrolled at non-HBCUs state the same (Krebs et al., 2011). Women enrolled at an HBCU were as likely to experience an assault perpetrated by physical force as a woman enrolled at a non-HBCU at 4.7% (Krebs et al., 2011). Researchers concluded that one factor that may be different between these two populations is the use of alcohol with women at HBCUs stating that they use alcohol less frequently. If women at HBCUs use alcohol less frequently, there may be less risk of those students becoming incapacitated and therefore unable to provide consent (Krebs et al., 2011).

However, a 2006 study found that African-American women experienced higher rates of sexual violence than White women (Gross, Winslett, Roberts, & Gohm, 2006). Additionally, these researchers found that African-American women indicated that the person who assaulted them was more likely to use physical force or emotional pressure and also that they perceived their partner as "too aroused" to stop the sexual activity (Gross et al., 2006, p. 295). The results of this study are consistent with that of Krebs et al. (2011) with regard to differences in alcohol-facilitated assault, however. Gross et al. found that alcohol use was reported at significantly lower rates among African-American women as compared to White women (2006).

With regard to students who identify as male, research has shown that men who have minoritized identities experience sexual violence at higher rates than White male students (Black et al., 2011). Specifically, 33% of men who identified as multiracial and 22.6% of Black male students responded that they had experienced sexual violence in their lifetime (Black et al., 2011).

Sexual Identity and Sexual Assault of College Students

There is a small but growing body of research on the experience of sexual-minority college students and sexual victimization. Edwards and his colleagues studied a sample of college students and compared rates of sexual victimization of sexual minority students with that of non-sexual minority students (Edwards, Sylaska, Barry, Moynihan, Banyard, Cohn, Walsh, & Ward, 2015). They found that during a six-month period, sexual minority students respond that they experience significantly higher rates of physical domestic violence, sexual assault, and unwanted pursuit victimization (Edwards et al., 2015). In addition, female sexual minority students in that same study indicated significantly higher rates of domestic violence than non-sexual minority female students.

A 2015 study by the Association of American Universities surveyed students at 27 colleges and universities in the United States (Cantor et al., 2015). Students who identified as transgender, genderqueer, questioning their gender identity, or gender nonconforming responded that they experienced non-consensual sexual penetration at higher rates, 12.4%, than any other gender identity group, including cisgender women

(Cantor et al., 2015). Additionally, these same students reported experiencing some kind of unwanted sexual contact at the rate of 29.5% (Cantor et al., 2015).

The 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that respondents with non-dominant sexual identities, such as lesbian, gay or bisexual, experienced significantly higher rates of sexual violence than those who identify with the gender binary as female or male (Black et al., 2011). Further, the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs reported that men who identify as gay, bisexual or queer were three times more likely to experience sexual violence than men who identify as heterosexual (2011). These studies indicate a much higher rate of victimization among sexual minorities than students with dominant sexual identities and a need to further understand the risk factors involved with these students.

Impact. The long-term impact of rape on survivors is demonstrated through the research to include PTSD, depression, fear, anxiety, and suicidality (Campbell et al., 2009). Both female and male survivors of sexual violence respond that they experience health effects such as frequent headaches, chronic pain, sleep difficulty, and poor physical and mental health at higher rates than those who had not experienced sexual violence in their lifetime (Black et al., 2011). Turchik and Hassija (2014), in their study of female college students who had experience sexual victimization, found that those students report higher rates of drug use, risky drinking behaviors, risky sexual behavior, and sexual dysfunction.

In a study of women ages 18-25, researchers found that survivors are more likely to report increases in sexual activity and alcohol consumption post-assault (Deliramich

& Gray, 2008). This lead to the prediction that those respondents were more likely to engage in alcohol use as a coping strategy that may also lead to an increase in risky sexual behavior (Deliramich & Gray, 2008). Additionally, negative social reactions experienced by survivors post-assault from such groups as family and peers have been shown to be significant predictors of PTSD (Ullman, Filipas, Townsend, & Starzynski, 2006).

As noted, alcohol and drug-related assault is more common than forcible assault among college students (Krebs et al., 2007). Forcible assault is consistently linked to survivor's poor health outcomes, such as PTSD symptoms and injury (Zinzow, Resnick, McCauley, Amstadter, Ruggiero, & Kilpatrick, 2010). However, incapacitated assault also has associated negative outcomes even though it is sometimes not labeled as assault by either the survivors or the those to whom they disclose. Alcohol and drug-facilitated assault has been shown to be associated with a two to four times greater risk of PTSD and major depressive episode (MDE) in those who experience such incident when compared to those who have not (Zinzow et al., 2010).

With regard to college students, it has been found that the possible effects of sexual violence can include a decrease in class attendance and an increased likelihood of academic failure and attrition (Amar & Gennaro, 2005). Demonstrating further evidence of college student survivors being at risk, it is reported that college students who experience mental health distress have higher rates of institutional drop out than those who do not (Smith, White, & Holland, 2003).

One study of risk factors and consequences of unwanted sexual experiences among college students specifically looked at the “hook up” phenomenon and the outcomes associated with those types of situations (Flack et al., 2007). Results indicate that students who state that they have had unwanted sexual intercourse most frequently attribute that experience to their impaired judgement due to the use of alcohol (Flack et al., 2007). The negative experiences reported by these students included unwanted memories, avoidance and numbing responses, and hyperarousal responses (Flack et al., 2007).

Research shows that female undergraduate students who experienced sexual violence during their first semester of college had lower GPAs after their first semester than those who did not (Jordan et al., 2014). Female undergraduate students who characterize experiencing their sexual assault as rape had lower GPAs after their first semester than those who indicate experiencing other forms of assault classified as “less severe” (Jordan et al., 2014). That correlation indicates that more severe the victimization a woman in college experiences, the greater the negative impact on her academic success.

Many college students have experienced some type of sexual trauma prior to their enrollment in college (Kaltman, Krupnick, Stockton, Hooper, & Green, 2005). College women who have experienced adolescent sexual victimization or who have been sexually victimized more than once are at the greatest risk of struggling with social adjustment in college, risky sexual behaviors and psychopathology (Kaltman et al., 2005).

While unwanted sexual experiences are certainly among the most negatively impactful experiences a student can have in college, students experience many other life-changing situations such as the death of a family member or other major life change. A 2008 study examined nineteen negative social experiences and found that sexual assault had the highest level of negative impact on college students, including impact on academic performance (Tremblay et al.). An additional study conducted in 2009 examined the impact of various types of trauma on college students and found that sexual assault was the traumatic event associated most closely with PTSD symptoms and prevalence rates (Frazier et al.).

The majority of studies about sexual violence and college students have been conducted at predominately White institutions (PWIs). The studies that have been done at HBCUs are important in that they provide insight as to how sexual violence impacts students who attend those institutions perhaps in different and critical ways. A 2013 study of women attending four HBCUs found that those students who respond that they experienced sexual violence also indicate more symptoms of depression and are also more likely to screen positive for PTSD-related symptoms than those students who do not (Lindquist et al., 2013). The women in this study also report that their assaults most likely occurred late at night on weekends at off-campus events/parties involving alcohol and that the assault was perpetrated by someone that the survivor knew well (Lindquist et al., 2013).

Across ethnic groups, women who experience sexual assault report higher rates of anxiety and depression than those who do not experience sexual violence (Littleton,

Grills-Taquechel, Buck, Rosman, & Dodd, 2012). Additionally, respondents who indicate being victimized indicate that they engage in more high-risk drinking and risky sexual behavior than those who have not experienced sexual violence in order to mediate the effects of their assault. European American women were the group most at risk for high-risk drinking after their assault (Littleton et al., 2012).

It has been noted that men who experience sexual violence report at even lower rates than women (Turchik, 2012). This is especially problematic given that the negative outcomes associated with sexual assault apply to men as survivors as well. Turchik found that male survivors indicate increased alcohol and tobacco use, higher rates of sexual risk-taking behavior and sexual functioning difficulties (2012).

College Students and Reporting Sexual Violence

Research has consistently demonstrated that college students who experience unwanted sexual contact or sexual assault rarely report the incident to anyone, but when they do they most often tell a friend, roommate, or family member (Fisher et al., 2000; Krebs et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2016). Further, it has been shown that students rarely, if ever, report an incident of sexual assault or unwanted sexual contact to law enforcement (Fisher et al., 2000; Krebs et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2016). Reporting is less likely when the survivor had been drinking at the time of the assault, which is shown to be the case in the majority of incidents of sexual assault on college campuses (Fisher et al., 2003; Lindquist, Barrick, Krebs, Crosby, Lockard, & Sanders-Phillips, 2013). It is more likely for a survivor to reach out for assistance or to report the incident to law enforcement when the assault involved physical force and less likely when the assault

was the result of incapacitation due to alcohol or drug use (Fisher et al., 2003; Lindquist et al., 2013). Victims are also more likely to report the incident to the police if the person who assaulted them is of a different race than their own (Fisher et al., 2003).

The reasons given most often by students for not reporting the incident to anyone was that the student did not need assistance, did not think the incident was serious enough to report, did not think they would be believed, feared retaliation, or did not want any action taken (Fisher et al., 2000; Krebs et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2016). An additional study conducted in 2007 found other reasons why students may not report their assault, such as being in denial about what happened, not wanting to be labeled as a victim, and not wanting the incident to become public (Guerette & Caron).

Beyond not reporting the incident to an authority either on or off campus, many students also do not reach out to get support through counseling or advocacy services. Even though those services are almost always confidential, students in one study cited their reasons for not seeking help as not having the energy to deal with it, not wanting anyone else to know about the assault, not wanting the perpetrator to hurt them or their friends, and wanting their life to go back to the way it was before the assault took place (Guerette & Caron, 2007).

The principal issue regarding lack of reporting of sexual assault by college students is that those students who do not report do not receive support and assistance. Research has indicated that women who have experienced sexual assault but did not acknowledge their experience as an assault indicated higher levels of

psychological distress, impaired coping and disability than those who did (Clements & Ogle, 2009).

Some survivors decide to share their stories but then quickly retreat because of the response they receive during that initial disclosure. Researchers in a 2007 study found that of the female college students who disclosed their assault to a family member or friend and got a negative reaction began to engage in self-blame, doubt their own memory, and wonder if they were doing the right thing by sharing what happened (Guerette & Caron). Survivors who blame themselves for the assault have been found to negative and/or risky coping strategies following the incident, therefore increasing the likelihood of negative outcomes (Littleton & Breitkopf, 2006). In either situation, either not sharing at all or sharing and getting a negative reaction, students are likely not getting the support they need to be successful.

Few studies regarding sexual violence and college students have focused on men's experiences. Those studies that have focused on men have indicated that male survivors are even less likely to report the incident than female survivors are (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017; Turchik, 2012). One example of this finding in the research is included in a 2007 study that reported male survivors of unwanted sexual contact were more likely to tell no one (33%) than female survivors (15%) (Banyard et al., 2007). This may be related to the finding that female students were more likely to know about support services for those who experience sexual violence as well as prevention programs on campus (Banyard et al., 2007).

A 2017 study reported that over 50% of male respondents who indicated that they had experienced unwanted sexual contact told no one about the incident (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017). 26.0% told a friend, 19.0% told a roommate and 7.7% told an intimate partner about the unwanted sexual contact. None of the participants in this study reported the incident to police, counselors, or a university employee.

When asked about reasons why they did not tell anyone about the incident, the men in this study most commonly said it was because they didn't think what happened was serious enough to disclose (19%), they wanted to forget what happened (15%), they wanted to handle it on their own (15%), they didn't think anyone would take them seriously (11%), and that they didn't have time to deal with it (11%) (Navarro & Clevenger, 2017).

Even fewer studies focus on the reporting of sexual victimization by sexual minority students. The research that has been published on this topic indicates that reporting rates among sexual minority students are similar to non-sexual minority students, but that the reasons for non-reporting are different (Sylaska & Edwards, 2015). Sexual minority students who indicated experiences with intimate partner violence cited reasons for not disclosing the incident to anyone as it not being a big enough deal to report, that their experiences with interpersonal violence were private, as well as that they were concerned about others reactions to their disclosure (Sylaska & Edwards, 2015). Within the group of students who cited privacy as their reason for non-disclosure, indicators of minority stress, such as identity concealment and internalized homonegativity, were higher (Sylaska & Edwards, 2015).

Sexual Violence and Campus Climate

One of the only studies that has examined the relationship between unwanted sexual contact and perception of campus climate was the 2016 Campus Climate Survey Validation Study (Krebs et al., 2016). The study was designed to establish an instrument that colleges and universities could use to assess campus climate related to sexual victimization and was funded through the Office of Violence Against Women and conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, both of which are part of the US Department of Justice. 14,989 undergraduate female and 8,034 undergraduate male students from nine colleges and universities in the United States completed the pilot survey.

For three of the campus climate scales (perceptions of institutional leadership climate for sexual misconduct prevention and response, perception of school leadership climate for treatment of sexual assault survivors, and general perceptions of leadership staff), institutions with very low climate ratings also had a higher number of responses indicating incidents of sexual assault and sexual harassment. Additionally, climate ratings for the perceptions of student norms related to sexual misconduct by female undergraduate students were highly correlated with rates of sexual assault and harassment. Across all of the institutions and most all of the climate scales included in the survey, more students who indicated experiencing sexual assault gave lower climate ratings than those who did not indicate experiencing sexual assault (Krebs et al., 2016).

Campus climate with regard to sexual violence is used as a variable in this study. A student's perception of how a college campus supports survivors of sexual violence

and how committed the campus is to addressing the issue could be influenced by many factors. It is important to explore what those factors could be and how one's perception of campus climate is related to institutional integration.

Institutional Integration and Trauma

While an extensive body of research exists regarding outcomes of sexual assault and college students, no research has been located that specifically addresses sexual assault and institutional integration. Jordan et al., point out the critical omission of the exploration of sexual assault as a predictor of attrition (2014). Students' experiences with sexual assault and other trauma may be included in other studies on student retention, but it has not been called out as overtly in the research as it should be. It has potentially been cloaked under students' reported experiences with depression and other mental health issues but has not been identified specifically as a possible predictor of college student attrition (Jordan et al., 2014).

Additionally, few data are available to understand what possible effects rape and other sexual assault types have on a student's ability to manage the transition to college and the stress that comes along with that transition (Jordan et al., 2014). This is especially important as the research, especially that of Braxton, Hirschy, and McClendon related to the impact of the potential of a student finding community on campus, has shown that social integration and connections with others is related to student attrition (2004). Little is known about how sexual violence is related to a student's ability to make those connections.

Further research has found that, among sexual minority students, negative reported psychological and experiential climate is related to lower rates of academic and social integration to campus (Woodford & Kulick, 2015). Woodford and Kulick cite Tinto's model of institutional departure when discussing their finding that students who reported engagement with social and academic aspects of the institution also reported higher rates of social and academic integration (2015). The results of Woodford and Kulick's study indicate that sexual minority students' perceptions of campus climate is related to their institutional integration.

The results of this 2015 study are important because they link perceived negative psychological and experiential climate with decreased levels of institutional integration. Students who experience sexual assault and indicate they experience an unwelcoming climate on campus may also experience lower rates of institutional integration. More research is needed in this area to explore that possibility and address its effects (Woodford & Kulick, 2015).

Institutional Integration Scale

Scholars have widely implemented the Institutional Integration Scale (IIS) to measure academic and social integration among college students (Berger & Milem, 1999; Mallette & Cabrera, 1991; Mannan, 2001; Terenzini et al., 1981). Of particular interest to this study is how researchers have used the IIS to measure integration as it applies to students who may be part of a marginalized group or a group that has experienced trauma. The use of the IIS among such groups is limited. With regard to minoritized racial and ethnic groups, Reid (2013) employed the IIS to examine Black

male academic achievement and racial identity attitudes related to institutional integration at large research universities. Institutional integration of multiracial college students was also examined and found a significant relationship between multiracial identity and social integration into the college environment (Spicer-Runnels, 2013).

Several other studies examined institutional integration and student populations marginalized due to socioeconomic status (SES), first-generation status, or academic under-preparedness. In a study examining persistence rates, students labeled “at risk” who participated in a summer bridge program were compared using institutional integration scores with those “at risk” students who did not participate in the summer bridge program (Arena, 2013). A 1994 study of “underprepared” college students examined the relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy and institutional integration (Peterson). In Pilotte’s 2012 study, the pre-entry characteristics of first-generation status, SES, sex, motivation, and best friend attachment were examined to determine their relationship to institutional integration levels.

Questions have been raised about the ability of the IIS to accurately measure integration across gender (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980). Baker, Caison, and Meade conducted a study to examine differential functioning, a lack of measurement equivalent or invariance, within the IIS (2007). They found that the instrument was as predictive of attrition with female students as it was with male students, successfully addressing the concern raised by Pascarella and Terenzini in 1980 (Baker et al., 2007).

Need for Further Research

While much is known about some ways in which sexual assault and other forms of unwanted sexual contact can affect college students, little is known about how that experience relates to institutional integration. Jordan and her colleagues who studied the relationship of sexual violence to academic performance specifically recommend that future research involving sexual violence and college students also look at how that experiences impacts persistence (2014). The pre-entry characteristics of race, gender and sexual identity considered alongside the college experiences of sexual assault, reporting and perception of campus climate have not been explored to this point. Given the breadth of research on how impactful social and academic integration into campus is to persistence, it is important to know how a phenomenon such as college sexual assault effects those factors. This study begins to provide needed insight in the research related to this topic.

Summary of Chapter II

Chapter II provided an overview of institutional integration and Tinto's theory of student departure as well as the literature related to college students and sexual violence. Specifically, the literature regarding the scope of sexual violence on college campuses, reporting of sexual violence among college students, the impact of sexual violence on college students, the impact of trauma on institutional integration, and perception of campus climate and sexual violence were reviewed in this chapter.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The chapter that follows outlines the methodological approach for this research study. The research design, population and sample, setting, data collection procedures, instruments used, as well as the research questions and analyses are discussed in detail. Finally, limitations of the study are discussed to conclude the chapter.

Research Design

The research design employed in this study is a longitudinal cohort study of first-year students at a mid-sized regional public university in the southeastern United States. The data were collected from the same population at the beginning of the students' first semester of college and then again beginning six weeks after the fall semester had begun.

Population

The population for this study includes all first-year students for the fall of 2017 who were 24 years old or younger at the start of the fall semester. That population is comprised of 2,665 students. Students were given an incentive to complete the survey by the stated deadline and were also told that completion of both parts one and two was required by the institution.

Setting

This study was conducted at a mid-sized, regional, public institution in the southeastern United States. Most undergraduate students are between 18-24 years of age (71%) and are from cities and counties adjacent or near to the campus (69%). Fifty-six percent of enrolled students identify as female and 83% identify as White. Seven percent identify as Black or African American, 3% identify as Hispanic or Latino, and 7% identify as another racial or ethnic group. Two percent of enrolled students are international.

Data Sources and Collection Procedures

Created by Everfi, Haven is a two-part online module that is used by over 650 institutions in the United States to address the topics of sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking among college students (everfi.com). In addition to information on these topics, the module includes survey and assessment questions to measure student learning, experiences, and attitudes. Four weeks prior to the start of the fall semester, the Haven module was emailed to all incoming first-year and transfer students via their university email account. This study only uses data reported by incoming first-year students and excludes data reported by transfer students. The message that the students received indicated that completion of the module was required of all incoming students and a due date for part one was included in the body of the email. Part two of the module was emailed to students 45 days after their completion of part one. The message that students received with part two also indicated that completion of the module was required by the institution. All students

were told that they would be entered into a drawing for incentives if they met the deadlines for both parts one and two. Students who had not completed either part one or part two, or both, received email reminders weekly for three weeks following the deadlines.

Students were informed at several points in both part one and two that they could opt out of the survey at any time with no penalty. The language used within the survey (included in Appendix A) informed students that any question can be left unanswered with no penalty if the student is uncomfortable and are also encouraged to seek support from the resources that are included in the survey itself. Additionally, there was both a “safety exit” button and a “chat with an advocate” button at the top right corner of the browser window whenever a student is logged in to the instrument. This allowed a student to either exit the instrument immediately and see a Google search screen or to be connected to an advocate from a national sexual violence support hotline.

The data set in this study contained no identifying information. The survey protected the anonymity of the respondents by not linking any responses to individual students. Responses from students who were not at least 18 years of age at the time of part one of the survey were excluded from the study.

Instruments Used in Data Collection

Haven survey. The data used in this study were collected using the survey portion of the Haven module that is included in part two. The survey is designed to measure student attitudes towards sexual violence, bystander intervention related to

social norms, self-efficacy related to assisting someone who has reported sexual violence, student attitudes related to campus climate, and a student's experiences with sexual violence and stalking (both before college and since the beginning of the fall semester). Part one takes approximately 30 minutes to complete and can be done from any computer with an internet connection. Students can stop and start the module as many times as they would like. Part two is automatically sent to that same population of students 45 days after they complete part one and takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. The entire Haven survey can be found in Appendix A of this dissertation.

The face validity of the Haven survey, as a whole, is supported by the content and design of the instrument being based on "what the literature has identified as the most effective pedagogical strategies and theoretical approaches for reaching, teaching, and engaging students about sexual assault prevention" (Haven Partner Guide, 2015, p. 32). The primary foundations for the Haven survey are found in public health and education theory as well as in research regarding social norms (Crusto, Davino, Kumpfer, Morrissey-Kane, Nation, Seybolt, & Wandersman, 2003; Banyard, Berkowitz, Gidycz, Katz, Koss, Lonsway, Schewe, & Ullman, 2009).

The survey questions from the Haven module used in this study relate to student personal experiences, campus climate, and whether or not the student reported any sexual violence they may have experienced. Using an analysis of 373,267 cases in the 2016 survey, the developers of the Haven survey found that the campus climate scale used in part two has a Cronbach's alpha score of .95 (Everfi, 2016). The questions used to measure student personal experiences on the Haven survey were taken from the

Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) (Koss, et al. 2007). The SES was developed to assess victimization of unwanted sexual experiences by participants. The instrument has been widely used since its development and its reliability and validity have been consistently demonstrated. A 2004 study reported the instrument as having a Cronbach's alpha of .73, which is virtually the same as has been indicated in prior research (e.g., Abbey et al., 1996; Koss et al., 1987) (Testa, et al., 2004). The scale's validity was supported in a 1985 study which indicates a significant correlation between experiences disclosed on the SES and incidents shared with an interviewer (Koss & Gidycz).

Institutional integration scale. The Haven module allows for the addition of up to 10 campus-specific questions. Ten questions regarding institutional integration were added to the module on the campus where these data were collected. The 10 questions used were taken from the Institutional Integration Scale (IIS) developed by Tinto (1975, 1993, 1997) and Pascarella and Terenzini (1980). Pascarella and Terenzini's 1980 study examined academic and social integration of students enrolled at four-year institutions and the reliability and validity of the instrument has been widely established (e.g., Knight, 2002; Chapman & Pascarella, 1983; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1982). The IIS has been used many times by researchers to measure both academic and social integration among college students (Berger & Milem, 1999; Mallette & Cabrera, 1991; Mannan, 2001; Terenzini et al., 1981).

The IIS is a 34-item instrument designed to measure five aspects of institutional integration: Peer Group Interactions, Interactions with Faculty, Faculty Concern for Student Development, Academic and Intellectual Development, and Institutional and

Goal Commitment (Baker et. al., 2007). The predictive validity of the instrument was established in 1980 by Pascarella and Terenzini particularly with regard to the Interactions with Faculty subscale. The questions used in this study are taken from two subscales: questions one through five are from the Interactions with Faculty subscale and questions six through ten are from the Institutional and Goal Commitment subscale (French & Oakes, 2004).

These two subscales are being used independently from the larger Institutional Integration Scale due to their levels of internal consistency, as measured by their Cronbach's alpha scores. The interactions with faculty subscale has a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.89 and the institutional and goal commitment subscale has a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.76 (French & Oakes, 2004). The questions from the Institutional Integration Scale used in this study can be found in Appendix B of this dissertation.

Research Questions, Hypotheses, Variables and Analyses

This study addresses the relationship between sexual violence, reporting and perception of campus climate, and levels of institutional integration among college students. Specifically, this study addresses four research questions.

1. When considering gender, sexual identity, and racial identity, what is the frequency of incidents of sexual violence during the first six to ten weeks of the first semester of college?

Analysis: Descriptive statistics regarding sexual violence experiences are reported for each of the three demographic variables. The survey responses for part two of Haven are filtered by completion date in order to control for the

broad time period during which students may receive an invitation to complete it. Only those part two surveys completed between weeks six and ten of the fall semester are considered in this analysis.

2. Do students who have never experienced sexual violence and students who have experienced sexual violence since entering college have a significantly different level of institutional integration?

Hypothesis 2 (H2): The level of institutional integration for students who have experienced sexual violence will be significantly lower than the level of institutional integration for those students who have not.

- i. IV: Sexual violence measured “yes” (since entering college) or “no”
- ii. DV: There are two dependent variables, Interactions with Faculty and Institutional and Goal Commitment. These dependent variables are subscales of the Institutional Integration Scale. Each subscale is measured by five questions and has a score range of 5-25.

Analysis: Controlling for pre-entry characteristics, separate *t*-tests were conducted on each of the two DVs to determine if there is a significant difference in the mean DV scores of the two groups of the IV. In order to ensure the assumption of homogeneity of variance for the two independent *t*-tests, an F-test of equality of variance was also conducted.

3. Among students who have experienced sexual violence since entering college, is the combination of non-dominant demographic identities and sexual violence

correlated with significantly lower levels of institutional integration than the combination of dominant demographic identities and sexual violence?

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Students who have experienced sexual violence since entering college and hold non-dominant demographic identities will have lower levels of institutional integration than students who have experienced sexual violence and hold dominant demographic identities.

- i. IV: Demographic identity status: dominant or non-dominant in three categories (responses of “not listed” or that are left blank were excluded)
 - a. Gender: 0) Dominant- female, male 1) Non-dominant- transgender female, transgender male, genderqueer, gender-nonconforming
 - b. Sexual identity: 0) Dominant- Heterosexual/Straight 1) Non-dominant- Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Queer, Questioning
 - c. Racial identity: 0) Dominant- White 1) Non-dominant- Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino/a, Multiracial, and all other races
- ii. DV: There are two dependent variables, Interactions with Faculty and Institutional and Goal Commitment. These dependent variables are subscales of the Institutional Integration Scale. Each subscale is measured by five questions and has a score range of 5-25.

Analysis: Multiple linear regression was conducted separately on each DV. The goal of this analysis was to determine if a significant relationship exists between each DV and the three categories of demographic identity status that make up the IV. Forced entry of the variables, or entering the three categories of IV into

the model at the same time, was used as the method of regression in this analysis.

4. Among students who experienced sexual violence since entering college, is there a difference in the levels of institutional integration between students who report and do not report their incident?

Hypothesis 4 (H4): Among students who experience sexual violence in their first semester, those who do not report their incident will have a lower level of institutional integration than students who do report their experience with sexual violence.

- i. IV: Reported sexual violence measured “yes” (told any of the entities listed as options on the Haven survey) or “no”
- ii. DV: There are two dependent variables, Interactions with Faculty and Institutional and Goal Commitment. These dependent variables are subscales of the Institutional Integration Scale. Each subscale is measured by five questions and has a score range of 5-25.

Analysis: Separate *t*-tests were conducted on each DV to determine if there is a significant difference in the mean DV scores of the two groups of the IV. In order to ensure the assumption of homogeneity of variance for the two independent *t*-tests, an F-test of equality of variance was conducted.

5. Among all students, is there a relationship between perception of campus climate regarding sexual violence and level of institutional integration?

Hypothesis 5 (H5): Students who have more positive perceptions of campus climate will have higher levels of institutional integration.

- i. IV: Perception of campus climate measured by five Likert Scale questions scored 1-7 on the Haven survey (score range 7-35)
- ii. DV: There are two dependent variables, Interactions with Faculty and Institutional and Goal Commitment. These dependent variables are subscales of the Institutional Integration Scale. Each subscale is measured by five questions and has a score range of 5-25.

Analysis: The Pearson Correlation was used with each DV to evaluate the relationship between the two continuous variables in this research question- perception of campus climate and Interactions with Faculty and Institutional and Goal Commitment. This method has been chosen because the data are continuous and not ordinal in nature (Field, 2009).

Limitations

Additionally, the reliability and validity of the Haven survey has not been demonstrated thoroughly. While the questions used in the instrument have been widely used and shown to have sufficient reliability and validity, the instrument itself has been in use for only three years.

Because the Haven survey was sent to all incoming first-year students, it is possible that some of the respondents may be sophomores by classification. Some incoming students included in the sample may be new to the institution but may have enough credit hours to be considered sophomores by class status.

Due to the timing of students receiving part one of Haven prior to the start of the fall semester, rates of disclosure of unwanted sexual activity may be lower than what actually occurred. This could be due to students not being on campus yet and not having a level of comfort or trust with the institution. It could also be due to the well-documented pattern that survivors of sexual violence rarely report the incident to anyone. However, it is important to establish a baseline for unwanted sexual activity to begin to measure what students' experiences are during their first semester of college attendance. Additionally, there is a range of time, from six to twelve weeks into the first semester, that a student can receive an invitation to complete part two of the Haven survey.

The limitation of using a longitudinal cohort study is loss of participants from the time of one survey to the time of another (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). Because all first-year students received the survey at both times, the survey sample size should be large enough to sustain the statistical impact of losing a small percentage of participants from part one to part two.

The small number of students who responded to the survey in weeks six through ten ($n=213$) limits the analysis that can be conducted in this study. The responses were limited to this timeframe in an attempt to capture incidents that occurred during the "red zone"; a phenomenon in which the highest rates of sexual assault are stated to occur in September of the first year of college (Krebs et al., 2016).

Additionally, the students who did indicate that they had experienced sexual violence since entering college did not respond to the question about their reporting

choices. For example, a student who indicated on the survey that they did experience sexual violence since entering college then chose not to respond to the questions regarding whether or not they told anyone about the violence and who they may have told. This further limits any conclusions that could be drawn related to these students' experiences.

Another limitation is the homogeneity of the sample with regard to racial identity. 87.9% of the respondents identified themselves as White. The experiences of students with minoritized racial, gender, and sexual identities need more attention in the research and the high percentage of student respondents in this study with a dominant racial identity did not lend itself to that.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of this research study as well as the statistical analyses completed to obtain those results. Study participants are students enrolled in their first semester of college during the fall of 2016. Data collection, data analysis, and the results for each of the five research questions are addressed. Chapter V further discusses the implications of these results.

Data Collection

Study data was collected from an existing data set gathered during the fall 2016 semester by a mid-sized public university in the Midwest using the Haven Survey. The institution provided the raw data file to the researcher, which did not include participants' identifying information.

The study's data set variables include: student demographic information; self-disclosed experiences with sexual violence; self-disclosed information regarding whether or not the student reported the sexual violence; and student perceptions of campus climate and their own institutional integration. Questions from the Institutional Integration Scale measured the institutional integration variable as a supplement to the Haven Survey.

Data Analysis

Utilizing Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 to conduct data analysis for this study, the original planned statistical procedures were a series of independent sample *t*-tests, multiple linear regression, and Pearson's correlation test. Because the number of students indicating on the survey that they experienced sexual violence is low, all of the categories within research questions one through four are necessarily even lower. The planned independent sample *t*-tests were not conducted as it would be inappropriate to infer information from the small sample size. To avoid extremely wide confidence intervals, descriptive statistics are reported for those questions where the sample was too small. However, a correlation analysis was conducted as planned for research question five because of the large number of survey responses.

Table 1 summarizes the variables included in this study as well as the statistical tests used in each of five research questions. Appendix C provides a table summarizing the study variables.

Table 1

Variables and Statistical Analyses

Research Question	Statistical Test	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Variable(s)
1 Frequency of sexual violence by identity	Descriptive	N/A	N/A
2 Difference in institutional integration based on sexual violence experience	Independent samples <i>t</i> -tests	Sexual violence (yes or no)	Institutional integration Measured with 2 of the 5 IIS subscales: Interactions with faculty Institutional and goal commitment
3 Difference in institutional integration based on sexual violence and dominant or non-dominant identity	Multiple regression	Sexual identity Gender identity Racial identity (Identity variables coded as dominant or non-dominant)	Institutional integration Measured with 2 of the 5 IIS subscales: Interactions with faculty Institutional and goal commitment
4 Difference in institutional integration based on reporting choices of sexual violence	Independent samples <i>t</i> -tests	Reported sexual violence (yes or no)	Institutional integration Measured with 2 of the 5 IIS subscales: Interactions with faculty Institutional and goal commitment
5 Correlation between student perception of campus climate and level of institutional integration	Pearson's correlation	Perception of campus climate	Institutional integration Measured with 2 of the 5 IIS subscales: Interactions with faculty Institutional and goal commitment

Results

General characteristics of the sample and comparison to the population. The overall sample consists of 1736 first-year students in their first semester of college. As shown in Table 2 below, the vast majority of student participants identify as White (87.9%) and the next largest group identify as Black or African-American (8.1%). All other racial identity groups comprised 4.1% of the sample. Participants were able to select more than one race. Therefore, it is likely that some did so, given that there was not an option for “multiracial”. Students on the overall campus also identify primarily as White (82.6%) with the next largest group being African-American students (6.8%). Nearly eleven percent of the population identifies as a member of another racial or ethnic group. Students who identify as a race other than White or African-American made up 4.1% of the sample but nearly 11% of the campus population as a whole.

Table 2

Frequency of Racial Identities

	N	Percent
American Indian or Alaska Native	6	.4
Asian	20	1.2
Black or African American	130	8.1
Hispanic	32	2.0
Hawaiian Native or Pacific Islander	1	.1
White	1411	87.9
Not listed	5	.3
Prefer not to answer	1	.1
Total	1606	100.0
Missing	0	130
Total	1736	

Table 3 below shows the frequency of sexual identities with the majority of students identifying as heterosexual or straight (78.6%). One hundred and thirty students (7.5%) report their sexual identity as asexual and 80 students (4.6%) identifying as bisexual. 19.1%, or 323 students, report their identity as something other than heterosexual or straight. Comparison data for reported sexual identities of the campus population are not available.

Table 3

Frequency of Sexual Identities

	N	Percent
Asexual	130	7.5
Bisexual	80	4.6
Gay	31	1.8
Hetero/straight	1365	78.6
Lesbian	17	1.0
Queer	4	.2
Questioning	25	1.4
Not listed	36	2.1
Total	1688	97.2
Missing System	48	2.8
Total	1736	100.0

Regarding gender identity, most students surveyed identify in a manner consistent with the gender binary, 60.5% as female and 35.6% as male (see Table 4). However, a subset of 20 students identified as trans*, genderqueer or gender nonconforming (1.2%), with 20 students reporting that their gender identity was not listed as an option (1.2%). The institutional research website for the institution where this study was conducted does not report the gender identity of students beyond the gender binary of male and female. The students enrolled during the fall of 2016 reported that they were 57.7% female and 42.3% male.

Table 4

Frequency of Gender Identities

		N	Percent
	Female	1051	60.5
	Male	618	35.6
	Transfemale	3	.2
	Transmale	2	.1
	Genderqueer	8	.5
	Nonconforming	7	.4
	Not listed	20	1.2
	Total	1709	98.4
Missing	System	27	1.6
Total		1736	100.0

Research question 1. When considering gender, sexual identity, and racial identity, what is the frequency of incidents of sexual violence during the first six to ten weeks of the first semester of college?

Descriptive statistics based on gender, sexual and racial identity, and experiences of sexual violence are reported to address this research question. It is noteworthy that of the 1736 students who responded to the survey during the fall semester, only 213 students (12%) responded during the first six to ten weeks and are considered for questions one through four of this research study. Of those 213, eight responded that they experienced sexual violence since entering college, therefore the number of students within each category is either very small or zero.

Tables 5 through 7 show the demographic characteristics of student respondents within the first six to ten weeks of the fall semester. Table 5 displays the frequency of sexual violence among respondents based on sexual identity. Eight students indicated that they had experienced sexual violence since entering college with most of those students (n=6) identifying at heterosexual or straight. Due to the very small sample size, the planned analysis was not conducted. Information related to this question is reported in Tables 6 and 7 below.

Table 5

Frequency of Sexual Violence Based on Sexual Identity

		Sexual Identity							Total
		Asexual	Bisexual	Gay	Hetero/ straight	Lesbian	Questioning	Not listed	
Experienced	No	11	12	8	163	1	4	5	204
sexual violence since entering college	Since entering college	1	0	0	6	0	0	1	8
Total		12	12	8	169	1	4	6	212

Table 6

Frequency of Sexual Violence Based on Racial Identity

		Racial Identity					
		American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Black or African American	Hispanic	White	Total
Experienced sexual violence since entering college	No	1	1	25	4	160	191
	Since entering college	0	0	0	0	8	8
Total		1	1	25	4	168	199

Table 7

Frequency of Sexual Violence Based on Gender Identity

		Gender Identity							
		female	male	trans female	trans male	gender queer	non conform	not listed	Total
Experienced sexual violence since entering college	No	126	68	1	2	3	4	1	205
	Since entering college	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Total		132	70	1	2	3	4	1	213

Research question 2. Do students who have never experienced sexual violence and students who experienced sexual violence during the first six to ten weeks of the first semester of college have a significantly different levels of institutional integration?

Hypothesis 2 (H2). The level of institutional integration for students who have experienced sexual violence will be significantly lower than the level of institutional integration for those students who have not.

Given the small number of students who indicated on the survey that they had experienced sexual violence during their first six to ten weeks of college, it is not appropriate to conduct the planned analysis using inferential statistical tests. The confidence intervals resulting from such analyses would be so wide that any inferences made would likely be inaccurate. Table 8 indicates that eight of the 213 respondents responded that they had experienced sexual violence during that timeframe.

In lieu of inferential tests, the mean scores for institutional integration were calculated to describe the responses by the students who participated in the survey. Descriptive statistics found in Tables 9 and 10 indicate that students who experienced sexual violence since entering college report a virtually identical rate of institutional integration as those who did not. To further illustrate this, the effect size was calculated for both dependent variables. The effect size for interactions with faculty is $d = .04$ and the effect size for institutional and goal commitment is $d = .03$. A small effect size is defined as .10, therefore these effect sizes are too small to explain any of the total variance in the means for these variables (Field, 2009).

Table 8

Frequency of Students Experiencing Sexual Violence in first 6-10 weeks

	N	Percent
No	205	96.2
Since entering college	8	3.8
Total	213	100

Table 9

Mean Scores for Interactions with Faculty Subscale

Experienced sexual violence since entering college	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
No	2.17	204	.681
Since entering college	2.20	8	.875
Total	2.17	212	.686

Table 10

Mean Scores for Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale

Experienced sexual violence since entering college	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
No	2.51	203	.512
Since entering college	2.53	8	.692
Total	2.51	211	.518

Research question 3. Among students who have experienced sexual violence during the first six to ten weeks of the first semester of college, is the combination of non-dominant demographic identities and sexual violence correlated with significantly lower levels of institutional integration than the combination of dominant demographic identities and sexual violence?

Hypothesis 3 (H3). Students who have experienced sexual violence since entering college and hold non-dominant demographic identities will have lower levels of institutional integration than students who have experienced sexual violence and hold dominant demographic identities.

Again, due to the small number of students who indicated that they experienced sexual violence during the first six to ten weeks of college, it is not appropriate to conduct the planned inferential tests. The mean institutional integration scores based on the respondents who indicated that their gender identity is female or male are provided in Tables 11 and 12. No students from other gender identity groups indicated that they experienced sexual violence, therefore no statistics could be reported from those groups. The results do not demonstrate a consistent pattern regarding whether or not institutional integration levels are higher or lower based on identity group. The effect size for institutional and goal commitment is $d = .63$ and is $d = .36$ for interactions with faculty. While the effect size for institutional and goal commitment is considered moderate, the very small number of students within this group ($n = 8$) limits the ability to conduct inferential statistical tests.

Table 11

Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale Means by Gender Identity

Experienced sexual violence since entering college	Gender identity	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
No	Female	2.54	124	.531
	Male	2.45	68	.468
	All other gender identities	2.51	11	.568
	Total	2.51	203	.512
Since entering college	Female	2.43	6	.784
	Male	2.80	2	.283
	Total	2.53	8	.692
Total	Female	2.53	130	.542
	Male	2.46	70	.466
	All other gender identities	2.51	11	.568
	Total	2.51	211	.518

Table 12

Interactions with Faculty Subscale Means by Gender Identity

Experienced sexual violence since entering college	Gender identity	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
No	Female	2.16	125	.717
	Male	2.20	68	.647
	All other gender identities	2.19	11	.461
	Total	2.17	204	.681
Since entering college	Female	2.13	6	1.017
	Male	2.40	2	.283
	Total	2.20	8	.875
Total	Female	2.16	131	.728
	Male	2.21	70	.639
	All other gender identities	2.19	11	.461
	Total	2.17	212	.686

Research question 4. Among students who experienced sexual violence during the first six to ten weeks of the first semester of college, is there a difference in the levels of institutional integration between students who report and do not report their incident?

Hypothesis 4 (H4). Among students who experience sexual violence in their first semester, those who do not report their incident will have a lower level of institutional integration than students who do report their experience with sexual violence.

Within the data set, no students responded to the questions regarding whether or not they shared their experience with anyone and if so, to whom, therefore no tables

are displayed regarding this research question. For context, the Annual Security Report for the institution where this study took place indicates that three incidents of rape occurred during the entire year of 2016. That report only includes those incidents reported to campus administration or law enforcement, not to campus advocates or counselors, therefore it is likely not inclusive of all incidents of sexual misconduct that occurred on the campus during that time period. Chapter V provides a discussion regarding why students may choose not to respond to such questions.

Research question 5. Among all students, is there a relationship between perception of campus climate regarding sexual violence and level of institutional integration?

Hypothesis 5 (H5). Students who have more positive perceptions of campus climate will have higher levels of institutional integration.

Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated to address this research question. The independent variable of student perception of campus climate was measured using a 1-7 Likert Scale with 1 indicating strongly disagree and 7 indicating strongly agree. The dependent variables are both subscales of the Institutional Integration Scale: Interactions with Faculty and Institutional and Goal Commitment. The dependent variables were measured using a 1-5 Likert Scale with 1 indicating strongly agree and 5 indicating strongly disagree. The scales of the independent and dependent variables are inversely related, therefore a positive correlation between the variables will be shown as a negative value in the analysis. For example, a student who responded with a high number on the campus climate scale is indicating a positive

feeling while a high number on the Institutional Integration scale indicates a negative perception. The result of the correlation analysis is shown in Tables 13 and 14.

Table 13

Correlation between Campus Climate and Interactions with Faculty Subscale

		Campus Climate Score	Interactions with Faculty Subscale
Campus Climate Score	Pearson Correlation	1	-.362**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	679	677
Interactions with Faculty Subscale	Pearson Correlation	-.362**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	677	686

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 14

Correlation between Campus Climate and Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale

		Campus Climate Score	Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale
Campus Climate Score	Pearson Correlation	1	-.164**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	679	676
Institutional and Goal Commitment Subscale	Pearson Correlation	-.164**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	676	684

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A significant positive correlation exists between Interactions with Faculty and the perception of campus climate. Stated more directly, a student with a positive experience in their interactions with faculty is likely to have a positive perception of campus climate. Again, despite the direction of the coefficient itself, the correlation is positive because the scales of the two variables are scaled inversely. The correlation coefficient represents a medium effect ($r = -.362$).

Table 14 presents data showing the dependent variable, Institutional and Goal Commitment, is also significantly positively correlated with the independent variable of perception of campus climate. The correlation is relatively weak, however, at $r = -.164$.

Summary

This chapter presents the results of the analyses of the five research questions in this study, as well as the methods for each question, and corresponding results, as available. Descriptive statistics best answer research question one regarding frequency of sexual violence based on identity group. Descriptive statistics also answer research questions two and three by providing a general picture of the data. Descriptive statistics are necessary to answer these research questions because the study sample is not sufficiently large to run meaningful inferential statistics for questions two, three, and four. A large enough sample does exist to complete the correlation analysis for research question five; therefore, the Pearson's correlation coefficient is reported for each dependent variable and a significant relationship is found for both.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research study is to examine the relationships between the variables of student identity, experiences of sexual violence, reporting such violence, perception of campus climate, and levels of institutional integration. The Haven survey and supplemental questions from the Institutional Integration Scale were used to collect the data for this study during the fall semester of 2016. This chapter discusses the study findings, implications for research and practice, and areas for future research.

Discussion of Study Findings

Participants in this study reported incidents of sexual violence since entering college at a rate of 3.8%. The often-cited statistic from the 2000 study by Fisher et al. is that 2.8% of college students responded that they experienced sexual violence in a six-month period at any time during their enrollment in college. The percentage of students participating in this study who responded that they had experienced sexual violence during their first ten weeks of their first semester is one percentage point higher than the 2000 study participants reported during a six-month period (Fisher et al.).

The reason for this higher rate of sexual violence in this population is not immediately apparent to this researcher. It is note-worthy that the campus on which this study was conducted is largely commuter with less than 15% of students living on

campus. The participants in the study conducted by Fisher et al. indicated that most of their assaults took place off campus in a residential setting. Because the students who participated in this research study attend a largely commuter campus, one possible explanation for this higher rate of assault could be that more of them live in off campus housing. The 2000 study indicates that off campus housing is one of the most frequent locations that students cited as the location of their assault (Fisher et al.).

No students who participated in this study chose to respond to the questions related to whether or not they reported incidents of sexual violence or, if they did report, to whom. Prior research using large national samples has established that rates of reporting incidents of sexual violence are low; however, no studies were found that indicated that students were hesitant to disclose reporting choices on an anonymous survey (Fisher et al., 2000; Krebs et al., 2016). It is unclear why students in this study chose not to disclose whether or not they reported and to whom.

Among the students who participated in this study, perception of campus climate related to sexual violence was found to be positively correlated with levels of institutional integration, supporting hypothesis five. Institutional integration was measured using subscales from the Institutional Integration Scale: interactions with faculty and institutional and goal commitment. Campus climate was significantly correlated with interactions with faculty ($r = -.362, p = .01$) and also with institutional and goal commitment ($r = -.164, p = .01$). The negative coefficient values are due to the scales used to measure the variables being inversely related.

A conclusion suggested from this finding is that the more positively a student views the climate on their campus related to sexual misconduct, the higher their levels of institutional integration. Further, students who experience sexual violence may be less likely to persist due to lower levels of institutional integration. Research related to institutional integration indicates that students with higher levels of institutional integration are more likely to persist in college (Tinto, 1975; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980). More recent research confirms those findings in studies involving students from non-dominant racial, gender, and sexual identity groups (Reid, 2013; Spicer-Runnels, 2013; Arena, 2013; and Baker et al., 2007). Therefore, and not surprisingly, it is likely important for educators to focus on creating a campus climate around sexual violence that is positive for students in the campus community if they want to create environments that are ones in which students persist. Specific suggestions for educators on how to work towards accomplishing that are discussed later in this chapter.

While no previous studies regarding the specific relationship of perception of campus climate related to sexual violence and institutional integration were found, some findings of prior research are important to note. Jordan et al. specifically point out the gap in research regarding how sexual assault is related to persistence (2014). Additionally, Krebs and his colleagues found that students who indicated experiencing sexual assault reported more negative perceptions of campus climate related to sexual violence compared with those who did not indicate experiencing sexual assault (2016).

These two studies support a recommendation made later in this chapter regarding future research.

Implications for Research

No studies that examine the relationship between perception of campus climate related to sexual violence and institutional integration were found during the literature review for this dissertation. A student's perception of how a college campus supports survivors of sexual violence and how committed the campus is to addressing the issue could be influenced by many factors such as; support services offered, visibility of such support services, and experiences of students who seek assistance from the institution (Everfi, 2015). This research provides a starting point for additional research to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between the variables of campus climate and institutional integration.

Krebs and his colleagues explored the relationship between experiencing sexual violence and perception of campus climate related to sexual violence (2016). Future studies can expand on their findings by further examining how students' perceptions of campus climate around sexual violence may relate to student persistence.

Additionally, little research is available regarding how sexual violence may impact a student's ability to manage the transition to college and the stress that comes along with that transition (Jordan et al., 2014). Tinto's research indicates that social integration and connection to the campus community is related to persistence on residential campuses (1982). More should be known about how the experience of sexual violence may be related to a student's ability to make those connections.

Despite the small sample size that limited the analysis that could be completed as part of this study, there are still conclusions that can be drawn with regard to future research. First, much could be learned from conducting this same study with a larger sample and to look at incidents of sexual violence during the first semester or academic year in their entirety. Some of the research related to sexual violence and college students with the most informative results have been done on a national scale (Fisher et al., 2000; Krebs et al., 2016). Replicating this study on a scale such as that could be useful to gaining a greater understanding of how sexual violence is related to institutional integration.

A potentially effective way to learn more about student experiences regarding sexual violence, campus climate, and institutional integration would be to add questions to existing widely-used national surveys. Many institutions who use such surveys are trying to learn more about their student populations in order to increase retention rates. If further research confirms what this study found with regard to perception of campus climate being positively related to institutional integration, it could be in an institution's best interest to learn more about the variables considered in this study by adding such questions to a pre-existing survey.

Because students' experiences with sexual violence vary widely based on institution type, location, and other factors, it is critical that such national data be able to be filtered easily based on such characteristics. For example, a small, liberal-arts institution in a rural community should be able to identify data related to similar institutions to their own in order to better understand their own students' experiences.

The lack of response from students regarding their reporting choice warrants further examination. Students chose to answer the questions about their experiences with sexual violence but then decided not to answer the questions about their reporting choices. Some reasons for that could be that those students were emotionally drained from answering the previous questions about their experiences with sexual violence or that the survey was too long and they simply grew tired of participating. A suggestion for future research regarding this lack of response would be to conduct qualitative studies to hear student voices around their choices around reporting and participating in research around this topic.

One of the main areas of focus for this study was to center the experiences of students with non-dominant identities who have been sexually assaulted. Unfortunately, the limitations related to the number of respondents to this survey did not allow for conclusions to be drawn about those students' experiences, specifically. While the literature review for this dissertation identified some research addressing minoritized students experiences with sexual violence, it is clear that more research needs to be done in order for educators to best support these students. The lack of diversity related to gender, sexual and racial identity among the survey respondents provided significant challenges in this study. It is critical that more be known about the experiences of students with marginalized identities in order to improve campus climate.

In their 2017 book *Intersections of Identity and Sexual Violence on Campus: Centering Minoritized Students' Experiences*, editors Harris and Linder present extensive

information about this need for further research. Harris and Linder write that much of the literature focuses on the experiences of students with dominant identities. That focus creates a “narrow story” that makes invisible three factors in particular- identity, history and “acknowledgment of power and interlocking systems of domination” (Harris & Linder, 2017, p. 9). Educators need to have a full and inclusive picture of the experiences of all students who experience sexual violence, not just those with dominant identities.

Peer influence could be an effective way to encourage students, especially minoritized students, to participate in research about sexual violence and college students. Students who are leaders within student organizations, such as LGBTQ and others that include marginalized students, should encourage members of their groups and communities to participate in such research since it will help contribute to creating more a more positive climate on campus.

Recommendations for Practice

One way for educators to gain a more inclusive picture of students’ experiences is for student affairs practitioners and researchers to work together more frequently. Jessica Harris points out in the final chapter of *Intersections of Identity and Sexual Violence on Campus: Centering Minoritized Students’ Experiences* that the benefits of such collaboration could prevent practitioners from continuing practices that are not based on students’ experiences and also could help guide researchers in their work (2017). Harris states that she while she believes in the importance of theorizing about sexual violence, faculty should work to help integrate that theorizing into the practice

that impacts students (2017). Such a partnership would likely benefit both parties, and in turn provide services to students that are centered around their individual identities.

Faculty and student affairs professionals have opportunities to partner to better understand student experiences. Practitioners can inform the research agenda of faculty by sharing the challenges that they encounter in their daily work so that research can focus on addressing those challenges. Faculty who spend time in shared environments with students gain insight into not only the daily work of practitioners, but also the perspectives of students who seek support. Feminist research methods, such as ethnography and in-depth interviews, could provide the depth necessary for researchers to understand the individual student experiences in a personal and necessarily complex way and are therefore recommended methods for future research on this topic.

Campus administrators should conduct surveys specifically related to perception of campus climate regarding sexual violence every two to four years. The more frequently administrators conduct such surveys, the more insight they will have into the perception of campus climate by students on their campus. The results of the surveys must be analyzed, interpreted, and communicated to all students, faculty, and staff. Practitioners who are responsible for education, prevention and response services related to sexual violence; such as staff in LGBTQ centers, multicultural centers, and violence prevention and response areas, must use the results to make changes in response to student perceptions and needs.

In addition to gaining insight from students, another reason to launch a campus climate survey effort on campus may be to simply raise awareness about the topic of

sexual violence. If students see that campus administrators are using resources to educate students about resources and ask their opinions about the perceptions of campus climate, that alone may create a protective effect that promotes a climate of care. Students, especially survivors of sexual violence, who perceive that their campus community cares about them, they may be more likely to persist at the institution.

Whatever the reasons that an institution has for deciding to implement a survey to learn about students' experiences with sexual violence, administrators at those institutions have a duty to use the information they learn to improve the campus climate. Students who participate in such research could be retraumatized by simply answering a question about their experience. It is critical that administrators honor those students' courage by using the data to make positive change.

The current body of literature provides information to student affairs professionals and others working to shape prevention and response efforts on campuses that only reveals part of the picture. Harris and Linder also propose that this limited picture leads educators to develop policy that only takes into account the needs of students with dominant identities (2017). The editors sum this observation up well when they write: "An identity-neutral, power-evasive, ahistoric perspective informs higher education research and practice, resulting in a narrow view and surface-level approach to addressing sexual violence on college campuses" (Harris & Linder, 2017, p. 10).

At a minimum, an annual assessment, based in research and best practice, should be conducted by those administrators who implement the programs and services

offered to student survivors of sexual violence. The results of such assessment should be used by those responsible for programs and services for student survivors to make changes based on student needs and perspectives. Student affairs practitioners may cite reasons such as a lack of time, money and other resources that place these educators in a mode in which they are forced to operate day-to-day and simply respond to student needs as they arise. It is critical that educators break this cycle of operation without assessment in order to fully understand the student populations who they serve.

Further, if additional research supports the finding that perception of campus climate is positively related to institutional integration, educators should focus on creating a positive campus climate related to sexual violence in order to support persistence. One way that can be accomplished is to ask minoritized students about their experiences with sexual violence and what needs they have surrounding that experience. Listening and understanding would likely contribute not only to a greater understanding of student needs, but also to creating a climate in which students feel comfortable sharing their experiences with administrators. It is critical that Title IX coordinators, sexual misconduct investigators, campus advocates, student conduct administrators, and others who work directly with student survivors be among the people listening to the needs of marginalized students. Students must see that those who work with them most directly are invested in learning about their experiences and perspectives.

Given the positive correlation between perception of campus climate and institutional integration found in this study, it is also critical for educators to promote a positive campus climate related to sexual violence among majority student communities. Survivors cite barriers to reporting such as believing that the incident would be seen as their fault, feeling ashamed and not wanting anyone else to know what happened (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Krebs et al., 2007; Krebs, Lindquist, Berzofsky, Shook-Sa, Peterson, Planty, Langton, & Stroop, 2016). Additionally, survivors state that they experience greater disability, more psychological symptoms, and impaired ability to cope when they experience sexual assault and choose not to share their experience with anyone (Clements & Ogle, 2009). Creating space in which survivors feel safe reporting is critical to promoting a positive climate on campus related to sexual violence. Institutions should demonstrate their commitment to creating such a climate as soon as students arrive on campus for their orientation experience. Possible ways to demonstrate that commitment early in a student's academic career are through mandatory education programs for incoming students, conversations about the campus approach to sexual violence with student leaders such as orientation leaders and resident assistants, and resources and support services that are visible to the campus community.

With regard to students who are not new to the campus, administrators should demonstrate a sustained effort to promote a positive climate related to sexual violence. Providing students with pathways to improve campus climate themselves could be an effective strategy in promoting such a climate. Connecting students to prevention and

response efforts through bystander intervention education has been shown to be an effective strategy for creating positive outcomes related to bystander effectiveness, abilities, and intentionality (Banyard et al., 2007). If students perceive that their peers are concerned about their safety and well-being, positive perception of campus climate related to sexual violence could be an outcome that results.

Student conduct professionals and staff in Title IX offices on campus can be in a particularly critical place to impact student perception of climate around sexual violence support. Survivors who do decide to report an incident to the institution can often start at one of those two offices on campus. If a survivor has a negative experience while making a report, they may share that experience with others and decrease the likelihood that others will come forward.

Another area of focus for both faculty and practitioners should be working to increase response rates to climate surveys and other research methods done on campus to better understand students' experiences. Campus climate surveys about sexual violence ask students to share very sensitive information that may make students reluctant to participate in such research. It is important to help students understand the purpose of the survey and that message must come from those who students trust. Leveraging peer influence by partnering with student organizations, such as those focused on prevention and response related to sexual violence, may be an effective strategy to increase campus climate survey participation. Additionally, working with campus partners who have frequent contact with students, such as academic advisors

and faculty in first-year seminar courses, to ask for their assistance in increasing student participation could increase response rates as well.

Conclusion

It was the goal of this study to contribute to an important conversation related to student experiences with sexual violence and the institutional integration of first-year college students. Research overwhelmingly points to a student's social and academic integration as being important predictive factors to persistence (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1980; Tinto, 1975, 1993, 1997; Braxton et al., 2004). Given that, it is critical for educators to understand how experiences of sexual violence and other types of trauma might be related to a student's integration to campus. Specifically, educators need to know more about the experiences of students with non-dominant gender, sexual and racial identities. Those students may have a more difficult time feeling a congruence with the campus community and, according to Tinto, may therefore be particularly vulnerable to stopping out of college (1982).

While the small number of respondents limited the analysis that could be conducted within this study, the information gathered about a positive correlation between campus climate and institutional integration is valuable to educators as they look to create new or adapt existing programs and services on their campuses. Any way in which student survivors interact with services at the institution that are designed to support them should be grounded in research and best-practice. Those services should also be inclusive of all students regardless of their identity. Additional research should be conducted involving the variables of identity, experience with sexual violence,

campus climate and institutional integration in order to shed light on minoritized student experiences.

REFERENCES

- Abes, E. S., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Meaning-making capacity and the dynamics of lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*, 612-632.
- Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the model of multiple dimensions of identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*, 1-22.
- Arena, M. L. (2013). *Summer bridge programs: A quantitative study of the relationship between participation and institutional integration using Tinto's student integration model at a mid-sized, public university in Massachusetts* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (ERIC No. ED561788).
- Abes, E. S., & Jones, S. R. (2004). Meaning-making capacity and the dynamics of lesbian college students' multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 45*, 612-632.
- Baker, B. A., Caison, A. L., & Meade, A. W. (2007). Assessing gender-related differential Item functioning and predictive validity with the institutional integration scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 67*(3), 545-559.

- Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(4), 463-481.
- Banyard, V. L., Eckstein, R. P., & Moynihan, M. M. (2010). Sexual violence prevention: The role of stages of change. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(1), 111-135.
- Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (1999). The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in a causal model of student persistence. *Research in Higher Education, 40*(6), 641-664.
- Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Braxton, J. M. (2000). *Reworking the student departure puzzle* (1st ed. ed., Vanderbilt issues in higher education). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Braxton, J. M., Hirschy, A. S., & McClendon, S. (2004). *Understanding and reducing college student departure* (ASHE-ERIC higher education report, v. 30, no. 3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributor).

- Carroll, C. M., Dahlgren, M. G., Grab, K. L., Hasbus, M. E., Hayes, M. A., & Muntis, S. E. (2013). Implementing the dear colleague letter: A title IX case study for university compliance. *Journal of the Student Personnel Association at Indiana University, 2013*, 45-63.
- Chapman, D. W., & Pascarella, E. T. (1983). Predictors of academic and social integration of college students. *Research in Higher Education, 19*(3), 295-322.
- Clements, C. M., & Ogle, R. L. (2009). Does acknowledgment as an assault victim impact post assault psychological symptoms and coping? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(10), 1595-1614.
- Cranney, S. (2015). The relationship between sexual victimization and year in school in U.S. colleges: Investigating the parameters of the “red zone”. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(17), 3133-3145.
- Davidson, C., & Wilson, K. (2013). Reassessing Tinto’s concepts of social and academic integration in student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 15*(3), 329-346.
- Deliramich, A. N., & Gray, M. J. (2008). Changes in women’s sexual behavior following sexual assault. *Behavior Modification, 32*(5), 611-621.
- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Suicide*. (J. Spaulding & G. Simpson, trans). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Edwards, K. M., Sylaska, K. M., Barry, J. E., Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Cohn, E. S., Walsh, W. A., & Ward, S. K. (2015). Physical dating violence, sexual violence, and unwanted pursuit victimization: A comparison of incidence rates among sexual-

- minority and heterosexual college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(4), 580-600.
- Everfi, Inc. (2017). *Haven: Understanding sexual assault* [Online module]. Retrieved from everfi.com.
- Everfi, Inc. (2015). *Haven partner guide*. Retrieved from <https://platform.everfi.net/hepc/resource>.
- Flack, W. F., Daubman, K. A., Caron, M. L., Asadorian, J. A., D'Aureli, N. R., Gigliotti, S. N., Hall, A. T., Kiser, S., & Stine, E. R. (2007). Risk factors and consequences of unwanted sex among university students: Hooking up, alcohol, and stress response. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(2), 139-157.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage Publications. Ltd.
- Fisher, B. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (Research report). Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2003). Reporting sexual victimization to the police and others: Results from a national-level study of college women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(1), 6-38.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Frazier, P., Anders, S., Perera, S., Tomich, P., Tennen, H., Park, C., & Tashiro, T. (2009). Traumatic events among undergraduate students: Prevalence and associated symptoms. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56(3), 450-460.

- French, B. F., & Oakes, W. (2004). Reliability and validity evidence for the Institutional Integration Scale. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 64*(1), 88-98.
- Gross, A., Winslett, A., Roberts, M., & Gohm, C. (2006). An examination of sexual violence against college women. *Violence against Women, 12*(3), 288-300.
- Guerette, S. M., & Caron, S. L. (2007). Assessing the impact of acquaintance rape: Interviews with women who are victims/survivors of sexual assault while in college. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 22*(2), 31-50.
- Harris, J. C. (2017). Centering women of color in the discourse on sexual violence on college campuses. In J. C. Harris & C. Linder (Eds.), *Intersections of identity and sexual violence on campus* (pp. 42-59). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Harris, J. C., & Linder, C. (2017). *Intersections of identity and sexual violence on campus*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 405-414.
- Jordan, C. E., Combs, J. L., & Smith, G. T. (2014). An exploration of sexual victimization and academic performance among college women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15*(3), 191-200.
- Kaltman, S., Krupnick, J., Stockton, P., Hooper, L., & Green, B. (2005). Psychological impact of types of sexual trauma on college women. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 18*(5), 547-555.
- Kahn, A. S., Jackson, J., Kully, C., Badger, K., & Halvorsen, J. (2003). Calling it rape: Differences in experiences of women who do or do not label their sexual assault as rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*(3), 233-242.

- Knight, W. E. (2002). *Toward a comprehensive model of influences upon time to bachelor's degree attainment* (AIR Professional File No. 85). Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research.
- Koss, M., & Gidycz, C. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*(3), 422-423.
- Koss, M., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*(4), 357-370.
- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., Langton, L., & Stroop, J. (2016). *Campus Climate Survey validation study- Final technical report. Bureau of Justice Statistics Research and Development Series*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.
- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Warner, T., Fisher, B., & Martin, S. (2007). *The campus sexual assault study (CSA) final report: Performance period: January 2005 through December 2007*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.
- Krebs, C. P., Barrick, K., Lindquist, C. H., Crosby, C. M., Boyd, C. & Bogan, Y. (2011). The sexual assault of undergraduate women at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(18), 3640-3666.
- Langin-Ealey, B. (2001). *A study of racial Identity, institutional integration, and attrition among*

- African -American freshmen attending the University of Mississippi* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 3010952).
- Littleton, H. L., Grills-Tauechel, A. E., Buck, K. S., Rosman, L., & Dodd, J. C. (2012). Health risk behavior and sexual assault among ethnically diverse women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(1), 7-21.
- Littleton, H., & Breitkopf, C. R. (2006). Coping with the experience of rape. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30, 106-116.
- Lindquist, C. H., Barrick, K., Krebs, C., Crosby, C. M., Lockard, A. J., & Sanders-Phillips, K. (2013). The context and consequences of sexual assault among undergraduate women at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(12), 2437-2461.
- Lonsway, K., Banyard, V., Berkowitz, A., Gidycz, C., Katz, J., Koss, M., Schewe, P., & Ullman, S. (2009). *Rape prevention and risk reduction: Review of the research literature for practitioners*. Retrieved from vawnet.org.
- McCann, C. R., & Kim, S. (2002). *Feminist theory reader: Local and global perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McSorely, L. D. (2017). *The impact of social support on institutional integration among international students in the Midwest* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (ED577543).
- Mallette, B. I., & Cabrera, A. F. (1991). Determinants of withdrawal behavior: An exploratory study. *Research in Higher Education*, 32(2), 179-194.

- Mannan, M. A. (2007). Student attrition and academic and social integration: Application of Tinto's model at the University of Papua New Guinea. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 53(2), 147-165.
- Mertes, S. J. (2015). Social integration in a community college environment. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(11), 1052-1064.
- Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist*, 58(6/7), 449-456.
- National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (2011). *Hate violence against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and HIV-affected communities in the United States in 2010*. Retrieved from http://avp.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/04/2011_NCAVP_HV_Reports.pdf.
- Oxendine, S. (2015). *Examining the impact of institutional integration and cultural integrity on sense of belonging to predict intention to persist for Native American students at non-native colleges and universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI no. 3708162).
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1980). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions from a theoretical model. *Journal of Higher Education*, 51(1), 60-75.

- Payne, D., Lonsway, K., & Fitzgerald, L. (1999). Rape myth acceptance: Exploration of its structure and its measurement using the Illinois rape myth acceptance scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33*(1), 27-68.
- Peterson, S. L. (1993). Career decision-making self-efficacy and institutional integration of underprepared college students. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(6), 659-685.
- Pilotte, C. (2012). *Family and individual predictors of first-generation and low family income first-year undergraduates' integration at a Midwestern university* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (ERIC No. ED552727)
- Reid, K. W. (2013). Understanding the relationships among racial identity, self-efficacy, institutional integration and academic achievement of Black males attending research universities. *Journal of Negro Education, 82*(1), 75-93.
- Seidman, A. (2005). *College student retention: Formula for student success* (ACE/Praeger series on higher education). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Spady, W. G. (1970). Dropout from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. *Interchange, 1*(1), 64-85.
- Spicer-Runnels, A. D. (2013). *An examination of the influence of social and academic integration on multiracial college student persistence* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (ERIC No. ED553671).

- Sylaska, K. M., & Edwards, K. M. (2015). Disclosure experiences of sexual minority college student victims of intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 55*, 326-335.
- Terenzini, P. T., Lorang, W. G., & Pascarella, E. T. (1981). Predicting freshman persistence and voluntary dropout decisions: A replication. *Research in Higher Education, 15*(2), 109-127.
- 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*(3), 256-265.
- Tierney, W. G. (1992). An anthropological analysis of student participation in college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 63*(6), 603-618.
- Tierney, W. G. (1999). Models of minority college-going and retention: Cultural integrity versus cultural suicide. *The Journal of Negro Education, 68*(1), 80-91.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*, 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1982). Defining dropout: A matter of perspective. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 1982*, 3-15.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed. ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (1997). Classrooms as communities: Exploring the educational character of student persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*(6), 599-623.

- Tremblay, P. F., Harris, R., Berman, H., MacQuarrie, B., Hutchinson, G. E., Smith, M. A., Braley, S., Jelley, J., & Dearlove, K. (2008). Negative social experiences of university and college students. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 38*(3), 57-75.
- Turchik, J. A. (2011). Sexual victimization among male college students: Assault severity, sexual functioning, and health risk behaviors. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 13*(3), 243-255.
- Turchik, J. A., & Hassija, C. M. (2014). Female sexual victimization among college students: Assault severity, health risk behaviors, and sexual functioning. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(13), 2439-2457.
- Ullman, S. E., Filipas, H. H. Townsend, S. M., & Starzynski, L. L. (2006). The role of victim-offender relationship in women's sexual assault experiences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(6), 798-819.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. (April 4, 2011). "Dear colleague" letter guidance, supplementing the OCR's revised sexual harassment guidance (2001). Retrieved from:
<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201104.html>
- U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. (2016). *Securing equal educational opportunity: Report to the President and Secretary of Education under section 203(b)(1) of the Department of Education Organization Act, FY 2016*, Washington, DC. Retrieved from:

<https://www2.ed.gov/about/reports/annual/ocr/report-to-president-and-secretary-of-education-2016.pdf>

Wolf-Wendel, L., Ward, K., & Kinzie, J. (2009). A tangled web of terms: The overlap and unique contribution of involvement, engagement, and interaction to understanding college student success. *Journal of College Student Development*, 34, 321-326.

Woodford, M. R., & Kulick, A. (2015). Academic and social integration on campus among sexual minority students: The impacts of psychological and experiential campus climate. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 55(1-2), 13-24.

Zinzow, H. M., Resnick, H. S., McCauley, J. L., Amstadter, A. B., Ruggiero, K. J., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2010). The role of rape tactics in risk for posttraumatic stress disorder and major depression: Results from a national sample of college women. *Depression and Anxiety*, 27, 708-715.

Appendix A

Haven Instrument

HAVEN SURVEY

2016-17

NOTE: The order you see the questions presented in this document is not the exact order students will receive the questions. The order of questions and sections within this document is to make it easier for you to see the complete picture of the content that is covered in the survey.

- The demographics and personal experiences questions will come at the end of the survey.
- Demographics will only be asked in the Pre-survey.
- All of the Likert-scale questions will be presented in a randomized order.
- The only difference between the Haven and HavenPlus survey is the age options in the demographics (HavenPlus age options are: 17 or younger, 18, 19, 20, 21-24, 25-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51 or older)

Pre-Survey (before Part 1 of Haven)

Introduction

Demographics

Personal Experiences

Bystander Intervention (attitudes, intentions, and behaviors)

Social Norms (self vs. others)

Additional Awareness, Attitudes, and Behaviors

Post-Survey (in Part 2, after intersession)

Introduction

Bystander Intervention (attitudes, intentions, and behaviors)

Social Norms (self vs. others)

Additional Awareness, Attitudes, and Behaviors

Personal Experiences

Campus Climate

Course Impact

Course Perceptions

Pre-Survey (before Part 1 of Haven)

Introduction

This survey asks about your current beliefs, attitudes, and experiences. Remember that this survey is **anonymous**. None of the information you provide will be linked to you in any way. Your individual response to any question you're asked in this course will never be identified with you or reported.

If there are questions that you would prefer not to answer, you can choose to leave them blank, but we hope that you'll answer all questions as completely as you can. The information that you provide will help evaluate the effectiveness of the course and can be used to help create a safe, supportive community at your school.

Demographics

1. **What is your current gender identity?**
 - a. Female
 - b. Male
 - c. Transgender Female
 - d. Transgender Male
 - e. Genderqueer
 - f. Gender-nonconforming
 - g. Not listed (please specify) _____
2. **Select one or more of the following options that best describes your race:**
 - ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native
 - ☐ Asian
 - ☐ Black or African American
 - ☐ Hispanic or Latino/a
 - ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - ☐ White
 - ☐ Not listed (please specify) _____

3. Do you consider yourself to be:

- a. Asexual
- b. Bisexual
- c. Gay
- d. Heterosexual/Straight
- e. Lesbian
- f. Queer
- g. Questioning
- h. Not listed (please specify) _____

4. How old are you?

- a. 16 or younger
- b. 17
- c. 18
- d. 19
- e. 20
- f. 21
- g. 22
- h. 23
- i. 24 or older

5. In what year of school are you currently enrolled?

- a. College freshman (First-year)
- b. College sophomore (Second-year)
- c. College junior (Third-year)
- d. College senior (Fourth/Fifth/Sixth-year)
- e. Graduate or professional school student
- f. High school student
- g. Not a student
- h. Other (please specify) _____

6. Which best describes your current living arrangements this academic year?

- a. College residence hall
- b. Substance-free residence hall
- c. Fraternity or sorority house
- d. On-campus apartment or house
- e. Off-campus apartment or house
- f. Other (please specify) _____

7. Are you currently a member of any of the following? *Please select all that apply.* (Note: Not all of these options may be available at your school)

- ☐ Fraternity or sorority
- ☐ Volunteer/community service organization
- ☐ Student religious group
- ☐ College athletic team
- ☐ Intramural or club athletic team
- ☐ Peer education group
- ☐ Media organization (e.g., newspaper, radio, magazine)
- ☐ Minority or ethnic organization
- ☐ Political or social action group
- ☐ Music or other performing arts group
- ☐ Professional organization
- ☐ Not applicable

8. Do you intend to be a member of any of the following while at college? *Please select all that apply.* (Note: Not all of these options may be available at your school)

- ☐ Fraternity or sorority
- ☐ Volunteer/community service organization
- ☐ Student religious group
- ☐ College athletic team
- ☐ Intramural or club athletic team
- ☐ Peer education group
- ☐ Media organization (e.g., newspaper, radio, magazine)
- ☐ Minority or ethnic organization
- ☐ Political or social action group
- ☐ Music or other performing arts group
- ☐ Professional organization
- ☐ Not applicable

9. Did you transfer, or are you transferring, to this school this term?

- a. Yes
- b. No

10. Please indicate your current affiliation with U.S. military, if any. (Select all that apply)

- ☐ I have no affiliation with the U.S. military.
- ☐ I am a veteran.
- ☐ I am currently on active duty.
- ☐ I am a military spouse.
- ☐ I am a legal dependent of a person who is currently on active duty.
- ☐ I am a legal dependent of a veteran.

11. Have you ever received training on any of the following topics? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Alcohol and drugs
- ☐ Intervening as a bystander
- ☐ Consent
- ☐ Dating/domestic violence
- ☐ Healthy relationships
- ☐ Helping someone who experienced sexual/relationship violence
- ☐ How to report sexual/relationship violence
- ☐ Personal safety
- ☐ Sexual assault
- ☐ Sexual harassment
- ☐ Sexual health
- ☐ Stalking
- ☐ None of the above

If response to 11 is anything other than "None of the above" branch to 11a.

11a. How many total hours of training did you receive on these topics.

- a. Less than 1 hour
- b. 1-2 hours
- c. 3-5 hours
- d. 6-10 hours
- e. 10-20 hours
- f. More than 20 hours

Personal Experiences

The following questions ask about experiences of nonconsensual or unwanted sexual contact, as well as behaviors that may have occurred in a current or previous relationship. This information can be used to help create a safe, supportive community at your school.

In these questions, unwanted sexual contact is sexual contact that you did not consent to and that you did not want to happen. For the purpose of this survey, sexual contact means one (or more) of the following:

- touching of a sexual nature
- oral stimulation
- sexual intercourse
- anal penetration
- sexual penetration with a finger or object

If any of these questions are difficult or uncomfortable for you to answer, you are welcome to leave them blank. In the event that you do find them difficult to answer, we encourage you to consider seeking out support resources if needed (which are provided in this program).

NOTE: Information collected in this survey is for evaluation purposes only, and your responses are anonymous and will not be linked to you in any way. Your individual responses, including disclosures that may violate school policy or applicable laws, are not considered notice to the school or law enforcement for the purpose of triggering an individual investigation. Please refer to the resources provided in this program or contact an administrator at your school if you want to learn more about reporting or support options.

1. Has anyone ever told you that they experienced unwanted sexual contact?

- a. No
- b. Yes, before I arrived at my school as a student
- c. Yes, after I arrived at my school as a student
- d. Yes, both before and after I arrived at my school as a student
- e. Not sure
- f. Prefer not to answer

2. Has someone ever had unwanted sexual contact with you? (e.g., used physical force or threatened to physically harm you; manipulated you through lies, threats, or pressure; took sexual advantage of you when you were significantly impaired or incapacitated by drugs/alcohol, etc.)

- a. No
- b. Yes, before I arrived at my school as a student
- c. Yes, after I arrived at my school as a student
- d. Yes, both before and after I arrived at my school as a student
- e. Not sure
- f. Prefer not to answer

If Q2 = a,b,e,f, then go to Q3.

If Q1 = c,d, then go to Q2a and Q2b.

The following questions pertain to unwanted sexual contact you may have experienced after arriving at your current school as a student.

2a. Did you seek help from anyone about this unwanted sexual contact? (select all that apply)

- ☐ No
- ☐ Friends, family members, or roommate
- ☐ Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center at my current school
- ☐ Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center not at my current school
- ☐ Campus police/security
- ☐ Local police (county, city, state)
- ☐ Administrators, faculty, or other officials or staff at my current school
- ☐ Minister or pastoral counselor

2b. Did you report this unwanted sexual contact to anyone? (select all that apply)

- ☐ No
- ☐ Friends, family members, or roommate
- ☐ Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center at my current school
- ☐ Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center not at my current school
- ☐ Campus police/security
- ☐ Local police (county, city, state)
- ☐ Administrators, faculty, or other officials or staff at my current school
- ☐ Minister or pastoral counselor

3. **Have you ever had sexual contact with another person that they did not consent to or did not want? (e.g., used physical force or threatened to physically harm them; manipulated them through lies, threats, or pressure; took sexual advantage of them when they were significantly impaired or incapacitated by drugs/alcohol, etc.)**
- a. No
 - b. Yes, before I arrived at my school as a student
 - c. Yes, after I arrived at my school as a student
 - d. Yes, both before and after I arrived at my school as a student
 - e. Not sure
 - f. Prefer not to answer
4. **Has a current or former partner ever abused or threatened to abuse you? (e.g., verbally, physically, sexually, emotionally, financially)**
- a. No
 - b. Yes, before I arrived at my school as a student
 - c. Yes, after I arrived at my school as a student
 - d. Yes, both before and after I arrived at my school as a student
 - e. Not sure
 - f. Prefer not to answer
5. **Have you ever experienced repeated and unwanted attention, harassment, or other form of contact from another person that has made you feel afraid?**
- a. No
 - b. Yes, before I arrived at my school as a student
 - c. Yes, after I arrived at my school as a student
 - d. Yes, both before and after I arrived at my school as a student
 - e. Not sure
 - f. Prefer not to answer

Bystander Intervention (attitudes, intentions, and behaviors)

Have you engaged in any of the following behaviors in the last 30 days? If you have not been in the situation described, please select "I did not have an opportunity to engage in this behavior."

1. I spoke up when I heard someone saying something I found offensive or demeaning.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I did not have an opportunity to engage in this behavior
2. I expressed concern when I saw a person exhibiting abusive behavior toward their partner.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I did not have an opportunity to engage in this behavior
3. I helped someone get support or find resources when they told me about an unwanted sexual experience.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I did not have an opportunity to engage in this behavior
4. I intervened when I saw someone trying to take advantage of someone else sexually.
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. I did not have an opportunity to engage in this behavior

Please rate your agreement with the following statements (1-Strongly Disagree to 7-Strongly Agree)

NOTE: For the next set of questions, any reference to "my school" should be interpreted as the college or university you are currently attending or about to attend. For the purpose of this survey, "sexual assault" is defined as any type of sexual contact or behavior that is unwanted or occurs without the permission of the recipient.

5. It is not my responsibility to prevent sexual assault at my school.
6. I am confident in my ability to intervene effectively in a potential sexual assault situation.

7. I would respect a person who took action to prevent a sexual assault.

8. I would reach out to offer support to a friend who I suspect is in an abusive relationship.

9. If you observe a situation that you believe is, or could lead to, a sexual assault, which of the following behaviors would you be confident engaging in (select all that apply):

- ☐ Stepping in and separating the people involved in the situation.
- ☐ Asking the person who you're concerned about if they need help.
- ☐ Confronting the person who appears to be causing the situation.
- ☐ Creating a distraction to cause one or more of the people to disengage from the situation.
- ☐ Finding the friends of those involved and asking them for help.
- ☐ Asking others to step in as a group to diffuse the situation.
- ☐ Telling someone in a position of authority about the situation.
- ☐ Following up later to check in with the person who you were concerned about.
- ☐ Talking to others about your concern.
- ☐ I would not be confident taking any action in this situation.

Social Norms (self vs. others)

Please rate your agreement with the following statements (1-Strongly Disagree to 7-Strongly Agree)

NOTE: For the next set of questions, any reference to “my school” should be interpreted as the college or university you are currently attending or about to attend. We understand that some students may not have developed an informed opinion about their peers yet, but we are simply looking for your current opinion or perception of the students at your school.

1. In a sexual situation, I would make sure to communicate with the other person about what they want.
2. In a sexual situation, most students at my school would make sure to communicate with the other person about what they want.
3. I would take action in a situation in which someone was trying to take advantage of another person sexually.
4. Most students at my school would take action in a situation in which someone was trying to take advantage of another person sexually.
5. I would never place blame on a person who told me that someone had sexually assaulted them.
6. Most students at my school would never place blame on a person who told them someone else had sexually assaulted them.
7. I would not engage in sexual activity with someone if the other person was incapacitated from alcohol or drugs.
8. Most students at my school would not engage in sexual activity with someone if the other person was incapacitated from alcohol or drugs.
9. I would express concern if I saw a person exhibiting abusive behavior toward their partner.

10. Most students at my school would express concern if they saw a person exhibiting abusive behavior toward their partner.

DO NOT DISTRIBUTE

Additional Awareness, Attitudes, and Behaviors

Please rate your agreement with the following statements (1-Strongly Disagree to 7-Strongly Agree)

1. I can identify concerning behaviors related to abuse in relationships.
2. I am aware of support resources related to sexual assault and relationship violence at my school.
3. I know how to report a sexual assault at my school.
4. I would respect someone who made sure they asked for and received consent in a sexual situation.
5. Clear, verbal, and sober permission is the best way to make sure a person is okay with sexual activity.
6. A person who has been drinking and is sexually assaulted is never at fault for what happened to them.
7. Which of the following best matches your current situation:
 - a. I don't think sexual assault is a problem at my school.
 - b. I would like to learn more about sexual assault at my school.
 - c. I can play a role in preventing sexual assault at my school.
 - d. I am planning to get more involved in sexual assault prevention at my school.
 - e. I am currently involved in preventing sexual assault at my school.

Post-Survey (in Part 2, after intersession)

Introduction

Same as Pre-Survey

Bystander Intervention (attitudes, intentions, and behaviors)

Same as Pre-Survey

Social Norms (self vs. others)

Same as Pre-Survey

Additional Awareness, Attitudes, and Behaviors

Same as Pre-Survey

Personal Experiences

Same as Pre-Survey

Also add Campus Climate, Course Impact, and Course Perceptions (see below)

Campus Climate

Please rate your agreement with the following statements (1-Strongly Disagree to 7-Strongly Agree)

1. Officials at my school take reports of sexual assault seriously.
2. My school is committed to preventing sexual assault.
3. I feel part of a caring community that looks out for one another at my school.
4. There are good support resources at my school for students who are going through difficult times.
5. My school does a good job protecting the safety of students.

Course Impact

Please rate your agreement with the following statements about the impact of this course (1-Not at all to 7-Completely)

1. The course helped me identify characteristics of healthy and unhealthy relationships.
2. The course taught me where to find resources for sexual assault and abusive relationships at my school.
3. The course made me more confident in my ability to intervene when I see concerning behavior.
4. The course provided me with skills to better support someone who has experienced sexual assault.
5. The course increased my understanding of school policies related to the issues of consent, sexual assault, relationship violence, sexual harassment, and stalking.
6. The course gave me information about sexual consent that I plan to use if I choose to be sexually active.

Course Perceptions

Please provide your responses to the following questions to help us continue improving this program.

1. What do you think was the most valuable part of the course? (open ended)
2. What do you think would improve the course experience? (open ended)

Appendix B

Supplemental Questions from Institutional Integration Scale

Questions 1-5 are from the “interactions with faculty” subscale.

Questions 6-10 are from the “institutional goals and commitments” subscale.

1. My non-classroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my personal growth, values, and attitudes.
2. My non-classroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.
3. My non-classroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my career goals and aspirations.
4. Since coming to this university, I have developed a close, personal relationship with at least one faculty member.
5. I am satisfied with the opportunities to meet and interact informally with faculty members.
6. It is important for me to graduate from college.
7. I am confident that I made the right decision in choosing to attend this university.
8. It is likely that I will register at this university next fall.
9. It is not important for me to graduate from this university.
10. Getting good grades is not important to me

Appendix C

Table of Variables

Description of Variables				
Type of Variable	Variable	Level of Measurement	Definition/Codes	Recode
Independent Variables	Gender Identity	Categorical 2 levels	Haven Survey- Part 1 1= Female 2= Male 3= Transgender Female 4= Transgender Male 5= Genderqueer 6= Gender-nonconforming 7= Not listed (please specify)	0= Female 0= Male 1= Transgender Female, Transgender Male, Genderqueer, Gender-nonconforming, or specified written categories Discard= Not listed or blank
	Racial Identity	Categorical 2 levels	Haven Survey- Part 1 1= American Indian or Alaska Native 2= Asian 3= Black or African American 4= Hispanic or Latino/a 5= Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander 6= White 7= Not listed (please specify)	1= Black or African American 1= Hispanic or Latino/a 0= White 1= Multiracial 1= All other races Discard= Not listed or blank

Sexual Minority Status	Categoric al 2 levels	Haven Survey- Part 1 1= Asexual 2= Bisexual 3= Gay 4= Heterosexual/Straight 5= Lesbian 6= Queer 7= Questioning 8= Not listed (please specify)	0= Heterosexual/Straight 1= Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Heterosexual/Straight, Lesbian, Queer, Questioning, or specified written categories Discard= Not listed or blank
Sexual Violence	Categoric al 4 levels	Haven Survey- Part 2 Has someone ever had unwanted sexual contact with you? Has a current or former partner ever abused or threatened to abuse you? Have you ever experienced repeated and unwanted attention, harassment, or other form of contact from another person that has made you feel afraid? 1= No 2= Yes, before I arrived at my school as a student 3= Yes, after I arrived at my school as a student 4= Yes, both before and after I arrived at my school as a student 5= Not sure 6= Prefer not to answer	As an answer to any or all of the three questions: 1= No 2= Yes, before I arrived at my school as a student 3= Yes, after I arrived at my school as a student 4= Yes, both before and after I arrived at my school as a student
Campus Climate	Ordinal	Haven Survey- Part 2 1. Officials at my school take reports	

		of sexual assault seriously.	
		2. My school is committed to preventing sexual assault.	
		3. I feel part of a caring community that looks out for one another at my school.	
		4. There are good support resources at my school for students who are going through difficult times.	
		5. My school does a good job protecting the safety of students.	
		Likert scale 1 (strongly agree)-7 (strongly disagree)	
Reported	Categorical 2 levels	Haven Survey- Part 2	1= No 2= Friends, family members, or roommate, Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center at my current school, Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center not at my current school, Minister or pastoral counselor Campus police/security, Local police (county, city, state) Administrators, faculty, or other officials or staff at my current school
		Did you seek help from anyone about this unwanted sexual contact?	
		Did you report this unwanted sexual contact to anyone?	
		1= No	
		2= Friends, family members, or roommate	
		3= Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center at my current school	
		4= Crisis center/helpline/hospital/health care center not at my current school	
		5= Campus police/security	

			6= Local police (county, city, state) 7= Administrators, faculty, or other officials or staff at my current school 8= Minister or pastoral counselor
Dependent Variable	Institutional Integration	Ordinal	Institutional Integration Scale
			<p>My non-classroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my personal growth, values and attitudes.</p> <p>My non-classroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my intellectual growth and interest in ideas.</p> <p>My non-classroom interactions with faculty have had a positive influence on my career goals and aspirations.</p> <p>Since coming to this university, I have developed a close, personal relationship with at least one faculty member.</p> <p>I am satisfied with the opportunities to meet and interact informally with faculty members.</p> <p>It is important for me to graduate from college.</p> <p>I am confident that I made the right decision in choosing to attend this university.</p> <p>It is likely that I will register at this university next fall.</p>

It is not important for me to
graduate from this
university.
Getting good grades is not
important to me.
Likert scale 1 (strongly
disagree)-5 (strongly agree)

CURRICULUM VITAE

Ann K. James

EDUCATION

PhD candidate, College Student Personnel, anticipated December 2018
University of Louisville, Louisville, KY
Dissertation topic: Sexual Violence and the Institutional Integration of First-Year College Students

MBA Essentials Certificate, Spring 2010
Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, KY

Master of Arts, Student Development, May 2000
Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

Bachelor of Arts, Political Science and Economics, May 1996
Appalachian State University, Boone, NC

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

WGS 150; Introduction to Contemporary Gender Issues, Northern Kentucky University, Spring 2016-Spring 2018

- Undergraduate course that uses gender as a lens to analyze the social, political, economic, cultural and personal conditions of people in multi-ethnic societies as well as the interaction of gender, race, sexuality and class on the diversity of peoples' experiences

UNV 101; Introduction to College, Northern Kentucky University, Fall 2008-2011

- Freshman seminar course for three credit hours teaching basic skills of adjustment to college life

GT 1000; The Freshman Seminar, Georgia Institute of Technology, Fall 2001-Fall 2007

- Course for incoming students for one credit hour teaching basic skills of adjustment to college life

Residence Life Student Staff Training Course, Georgia Institute of Technology, Fall 2006, 2007

- Credit-bearing course taken by all newly-hired student staff, focusing on community development and job functions

University 101, American InterContinental University, May 2000-June 2001

- Freshman seminar course focusing on first year success topics for academically at-risk students

Life and Career Planning, Appalachian State University, Fall 1999

- For-credit course that focused on self-assessment, lifelong career development and goal-setting

Grants and Publications

- James, A. (2013). Intersecting identities of doctoral student, administrator, and woman struggling with infertility: reflections on personal control. *Developments*, 11(3).
- Co-writer on continuation application for \$300,000 Department of Justice Office of Violence Against Women grant, Spring 2017
- Co-Principal Investigator with Social Work faculty member on \$300,000 Department of Justice Office of Violence Against Women grant, Fall 2013

PRESENTATIONS

James, A. (2017). *Effective strategies for part time hearing officers*. Presentation at the ASCA annual conference, Jacksonville, FL.

James, A. (2016). *Title IX Investigator Training*. Thomas More College Title IX staff training, Crestview Hills, KY.

James, A. (2014). *Title IX Investigator Training*. Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and Universities Title IX investigator training, Highland Heights, KY.

James, A., & Stimpson, R. (2014). *Title IX and Pregnant and Parenting Students*. Presentation at the ASCA annual conference, St. Pete Beach, FL.

James, A. (2014). *Campus SaVE Act Compliance*. Presentation at the NASPA Regional Drive-In Conference, Crestview Hills, KY.

Stimpson, R., & James, A. (2012). *Title IX Legislation: Historical and Future Perspectives*. Three concurrent presentations at the ACPA annual convention, Louisville, KY.

James, A. (2011). *On the Job: RA Evaluations and Direct Assessment of Learning*. Presentation at the ACPA annual convention, Baltimore, MD.

James, A. (2009). *Intentional Professional Development; Finding ways to advance those you supervise*. Presentation at the annual KAHO conference, Lexington, KY.

James, A., & Woods, K. (2009). *Our recycled residence hall; A sustainable solution*. Presentation at the annual SEAHO conference, Mobile, AL.

James, A., & Woods, K. (2009). *The development of the residential education model at NKU*. Presentation at the annual SEAHO Conference, Mobile, AL.

James, A. (2009). *Blasting your team off to new heights; Creating an effective staff development program*. Presentation at the annual SEAHO Conference, Mobile, AL.

James, A. (2008). *Intentional supervision of mid-level professionals in student affairs*. Presentation at the annual ACPA convention, Atlanta, GA.

James, A. (2007). *Teaching student staff how to foster millennial student success*. Presentation at the annual SEAHO Conference, Chattanooga, TN.

Becking, A., & James, A. (2007). *Campus and community response to a suicide in a residence hall*, Presentation at the annual SEAHO Conference, Chattanooga, TN.

James, A. (2004). *Finding professional balance*. Presentation at the annual Georgia Housing Officers Conference, Atlanta, GA.

James, A., & Becking, A. (2004). *Georgia Tech community standards class*. Presentation at the annual ACPA national convention, Philadelphia, PA.

James, A. (2000). *Assessment in student affairs: strategies for practitioners*. Presentation at the ACPA national convention, Washington, DC.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Miami University, Oxford, OH

- *Director, Office of Community Standards*, July 2018-present

Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, KY

- *Senior Associate Dean of Students and Director of Student Conduct, Rights and Advocacy*, June 2015-July 2018
- *Deputy Title IX Coordinator*, September 2011-July 2018
- *Associate Dean of Students*, April 2012-May 2015
- *Associate Director of Housing and Director of Residence Life*, May 2008-April 2012

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta GA

- *Area Manager, Freshman Experience Program*, June 2004-May 2008
- *Interim Assistant Director, Freshman Experience Program*, March-September, 2007
- *Residence Life Coordinator, Freshman Experience Program*, June 2001-June 2004

American InterContinental University, Atlanta, GA

- *Coordinator of Student Activities and Leadership*, May 2000-June 2001

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Northern Kentucky University

- Member, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Affairs search committee, Fall 2017
- SACSCOC Reaccreditation team member, Spring 2017-present
- Drug Free Schools Committee member, Spring 2017-present
- Member, University Council for Student Success, Spring 2016 to present
- Steering committee member, NCAA Institutional Performance Program Self-Study, Fall 2014-Spring 2015
- Member, campus climate assessment committee, Spring 2015 to present
- Member, task force to evaluate and revise campus-wide sexual misconduct policies, Fall 2014-Fall 2015
- Member, Director of International Students and Scholars search committee, Fall 2014
- Presenter, Norse Leadership Society Retreat, NKU, 2011, 2014
- Co-chair compliance and enforcement sub-committee, campus tobacco-free task force, 2013-2014
- Member, University strategic planning mission, vision and values sub-committee, 2012-2014
- Member, Staff, Administrators and Faculty for Equality committee, 2009-present
- Member, Vice President for Student Affairs search committee, Fall 2012-Spring 2013
- Chair, committee to write the sexual misconduct policy for the NKU Student Code of Conduct, 2009

- Committee co-chair, Foundations of Excellence task force to increase first-year student success, 2010-2011
- Chair, Housing Assessment Committee, 2008-2010
- Member, Chief of Police search committee, Fall 2010

Georgia Institute of Technology

- Co-chair, Staff Selection Committee for Residence Life, 2007-2008
- Program development and facilitator for the GT Safe Space Program, 2006-2008
- Member, Assistant Director of Residence Life search committee, Fall 2007
- Facilitator, Three-part diversity dialogue series for Department of Residence Life at Georgia Tech, 2007-2008
- Presenter, Advising 201- Advanced Leadership for Student Organizations, GT Residence Life Professional Development, 2007
- Presenter, Evaluating Student Staff, GT Residence Life Summer Institute, 2007
- Chair, Safety and Security Committee for Residence Life, 2005-2007
- Member, Search committee for the Asst. Director of Orientation Programs, 2004
- Member, Georgia Tech Sexual Assault Task Force Advocacy Subcommittee, 2002-2004, 2007-2008
- Member, Campus Life Advisors and Mentors, 2002-2008
- Member, GT Smart Late Night Programming committee, 2002-2003
- Member, Freshman Experience evaluation process committee, 2001-2002

PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

- Association of Student Conduct Administration (ASCA), member, 2008-present
- College Student Educators International (ACPA), member 1999-present
- ACPA Commission on Student Conduct and Legal Issues Directorate member, March 2016-present
- Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and Universities, 2011-present
- ACPA annual convention planning team, 2013-2016
- Green Dot Bystander Intervention Program facilitator training, Summer 2014
- ACPA Standing Committee for Women Directorate member, 2010-2014
- Association of College and University Housing International (ACUHO-I), member 2001-2010
- Southeast Association of Housing Officers (SEAHO), member 2001-2010
- Kentucky Association of Housing Officers, member, 2008-2012
- Georgia Housing Officers (GHO), member 2001-2008
- ASCA Kentucky State Coordinator, 2010-2012
- Kentucky State Representative to SEAHO, 2010-2012
- ATIXA Title IX Coordinator Certification Training course, Fall 2011

- Behavioral Analysis of Sexual Assault Advanced Training, Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault, Fall 2007
- ACPA's Beyond the Typical Tools for Social Justice Conference, Kansas City, MO, Fall 2007
- National Housing Training Institute, The University of Maryland, Summer 2005
- Received 10 hour training on sexual assault response and advocacy, 2005
- State Report Editor for the Georgia Housing Officers, 2004-2008
- Conference Evaluation Focus Group, American College Personnel Association Conference, 2003, 2004
- Planning committee member, Georgia New Professionals Conference, Fall 2002

RECOGNITION AND AWARDS

- Leon E. Boothe Diversity Award, NKU Division of Student Affairs, 2011
- Burdell's Best Award for Outstanding Campus Advisor, Georgia Tech, 2005-2006
- SEAHO Service Award, February 2005
- Freshman Partner of the Year, Georgia Tech, 2005, 2006
- "Georgia Gee Whiz Award" for advising Freshman Activities Board, October 2003

RELATED EXPERIENCE

Chapter Advisor

Phi Sigma Sigma National Sorority, 2010-Present

Northern Kentucky University

Sigma Kappa National Sorority, August 1998-May 2007

Appalachian State University and the University of Georgia

- Advised officers regarding programming needs, reviewed required paperwork and enforced risk management policies
- Attended advisory board meetings, member meetings and sorority programs in advising capacity

Group Leader, Oxford Study Abroad Program, Georgia Institute of Technology, Summer 2006

- Advised fifty Georgia Tech students as they studied Music and Architecture courses throughout Europe
- Assisted students in emergency situations and dealt with day-to-day issues in foreign countries
- Collaborated with faculty regarding the co-curricular educational experience of the study abroad program