Do College Women Facilitate the Sexual Assault of Their Same-Gender Peers?

Allyson Hopper

Bucknell University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses

Part of the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Hopper, Allyson, "Do College Women Facilitate the Sexual Assault of Their Same-Gender Peers?" (2011). Honors Theses. 52.
https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses/52
Do College Women Facilitate the Sexual Assault of their Female Peers?
Do College Women Facilitate the Sexual Assault of Their Same-Gender Peers?

By

Allyson B. Hopper

A Thesis Submitted to the Honors Council

For Honors in Psychology

May 11, 2011

Approved by:

[Signature]

Adviser: William F. Flack, Jr.
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Flack for all that he has taught me over the past year. He has taught me invaluable knowledge about psychology, the research process, and the importance of better understanding the many factors that play a part in the negative aspects of campus culture. I would also like to thank the Bucknell Sexual Assault Research Team for all of their help and support throughout the process of writing my thesis. Without their input and encouragement, this project would have been a much more difficult task.
Do College Women Facilitate the Sexual Assault of their Female Peers?

Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.</td>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.</td>
<td>Prevalence rates and frequencies of reported sexual assault victimization</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.</td>
<td>Female Facilitation measure</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do College Women Facilitate the Sexual Assault of their Female Peers?

Abstract

National studies indicate that approximately 25 percent of women have been sexually assaulted by the time they finish college. Although male peers are often the perpetrators, women also engage in behaviors with their female peers that may increase the risk of sexual assault. In the present study, we sought to determine how often college women engaged in these behaviors (i.e. “female facilitation”). Participants were 373 female students (sophomore through senior; Greek and independent) who completed an online survey containing measures of sexual assault, alcohol consumption, and female facilitation. The female facilitation measure indexed both “facilitator” behaviors (those directed toward others that likely increase the risk of sexual assault victimization) and “facilitatee” behaviors (those that may increase risk of sexual assault victimization), and the two sets of items were counterbalanced across participants. Descriptive statistics showed an overall prevalence rate for any type of sexual assault was 44.2%. Scores on the facilitator and facilitatee versions of the female facilitation measure were highly correlated. Facilitation was highly correlated with alcohol consumption, and being a facilitatee was moderately correlated with sexual assault. Results were consistent with some of our expectations regarding the relationships among facilitation, alcohol consumption, sexual assault, and demographic variables. Limitations of the methods and the implications of the findings for understanding campus sexual assault will be discussed.
Introduction

Sexual assault is a common problem among women of all walks of life. Koss and colleagues (1987) reported that 53.7 percent of women experience some sort of sexual victimization, ranging in severity from unwanted sexual touching to rape. The most serious form of victimization was sexual contact for 14.4 percent of women, sexual coercion for 11.9 percent of women, attempted rape for 12.1 percent of women, and completed rape for 15.4 percent of women. During the four years spent on a college campus, research has demonstrated that between 15.5 and 25 percent of women will experience sexual victimization (Fisher et al., 2000, Flack & Daubman, 2007, Finley & Corty, 1993). For every 1,000 women that attend a college, there are likely to be 35 incidents of rape in a single academic year (Fisher et al., 2000). Abbey and colleagues (1996) found that 95% of assaults of college women were committed by someone the women knew, and over half of the assaults involved alcohol consumption by the man, the woman, or both.

Fisher and colleagues (2000) found that many women do not characterize their sexual assault as a crime for a number of reasons including embarrassment, not understanding the legal definition of rape, or because they blame themselves for their sexual assault. Less than 5% of rapes and attempted rapes were reported to police. Of the 86 incidents categorized as completed rape by the Sexual Experience Survey given, only 46.5% of women considered the incident to be rape. Because many women do not categorize their experience as rape and do not report it, the incident rate of sexual assault both nationally and on campus is likely to be even higher than reports suggest.

The majority of the time, the research about campus sexual assault focuses on the male perpetrators and general risk factors associated with sexual assault situations, while
concentrating less on the role of female peers and their role in enabling a culture of sexual assault among their peers.

**Alcohol Consumption**

Alcohol has been shown to be a contributing factor to the risk of sexual assault victimization. In their 2006 study, Kaysen and colleagues followed a randomly selected sample of students from three campuses over the course of three years. *It was* found that heavier alcohol consumption is positively associated with the likelihood of experiencing a rape while drunk, and participants in their study who had never experienced rape *while intoxicated* and who were not assaulted during the time frame of the study drank less, on average, than women who had been assaulted.

Mohler-Kuo and colleagues (2004) utilized data from 119 schools participating in three separate Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol surveys. They found that one in twenty college women had experienced rape since the beginning of the school year. Of these victims, 72 percent experienced the rape while intoxicated. Demographics that put women more at risk of rape while intoxicated included women who were under 21 years old, white, lived in sorority houses, used illicit drugs, drank heavily in high school, and attended colleges with high rates of heavy drinking. Attending a school in a rural environment also increased one’s odds of being raped while intoxicated by 1.3. Palmer and colleagues (2006), in their survey of 370 undergraduate students including measures of sexual experiences, expectancies, alcohol use, use of protective strategies while drinking, and negative consequences found that victims of unwanted sexual contact reported higher alcohol consumption, used fewer protective strategies when drinking, and experienced more negative
consequences in general due to alcohol usage. They also had higher expectancies for liquid courage and sex when drinking.

Benson, Gohm, and Gross (2007) similarly found that women who reported attempted rape and rape consumed higher amounts of alcohol. In their study in which 350 undergraduate women completed measures of sexual behaviors, sexual victimization experience, sex related alcohol expectancies, and drinking habits they also found an interaction between alcohol consumption and expectancy of vulnerability to sexual coercion. Women who consumed higher levels of alcohol indicated higher vulnerability to sexual coercion and experience more severe victimization. However, while there was a correlation between alcohol consumption and rape there was no significant relationship between level of alcohol consumption and history of unwanted sexual contact. Those who had experienced unwanted sexual contact had significantly stronger alcohol expectancies for vulnerability to sexual coercion than did those who had not experienced unwanted sexual contact. Women who experienced rape or attempted rape drank more alcohol on average than those who had not experienced attempted rape. They also had more consensual sex partners and had stronger alcohol expectancies for aggression and vulnerability to sexual coercion. Overall, higher levels of alcohol consumption were associated with beliefs that alcohol enhances sex drive and vulnerability to sexual coercion. This study suggests the important role that alcohol plays in different levels of sexual assault by suggesting that those who drink more alcohol are endorsing beliefs and behaviors that put them more at risk for being sexually assaulted.
Hooking Up

In recent years, researchers have done studies that look at the relationship between hooking up and sexual victimization. “Hooking up” was defined by Flack and Daubman (2007) as “single, casual encounters…sometimes involving sexual intercourse but with no expectation of future commitment” has shown to be a serious risk factor for sexual assault. In their study of 178 undergraduate students, Flack and Daubman found that 23 percent of women reported one or more experience of unwanted intercourse, of these 78 percent took place while hooking up, and impaired judgment due to alcohol was found to be the biggest reason for unwanted sex.

Lambert, Kahn, and Apple (2003) found that there is pluralistic ignorance associated with hooking up. In their study of 136 female and 128 male college students, both male and female participants rated their peers as being more comfortable with hooking up than they rated themselves, and both men and women overestimated the other gender’s comfort with hooking up. With these beliefs, students assumed that hooking up attitudes by their peers were more homogeneous than they actually were, which may result in many engaging in behaviors that they do not feel comfortable with for fear of breaking the norm.

Franklin (2010) found that a higher number of consensual sex partners significantly increased one’s odds of sexual assault that involves alcohol. In her sample of 185 college women, survey responses demonstrated that an increased number of sex partners and Greek affiliation both significantly increased one’s odds of experiencing completed rape. More sexual partners and delays in responding to dangers in sexual situations significantly increased one’s odds of experiencing sexual assault due to verbal coercion. Benson and colleagues (2007) had similar results, finding that those who had unwanted sexual contact
had a higher number of consensual sex partners throughout their lifetime and also reported having consensual sex at a younger age than those who did not have unwanted sexual contact.

**Greek Life**

Research suggests that members of Greek life are more likely to be both perpetrators and victims of sexual assault. Minnow and Einolf (2009) had a sample of 779 undergraduate women, 56 percent of whom were sorority members. They found that overall, 20.5 percent of their sample experienced completed rape while in college, however when broken down into Greek affiliation it was found that 33 percent of sorority women had experienced completed rape while significantly less Independent women experienced completed rape (only 8 percent). Attempted rape was experienced less frequently, 11 percent of the sample had experienced attempted rape. Broken down into Greek affiliation it was found that 14 percent of sorority women and only 6 percent of Independent women had experienced attempted rape. Interestingly, the overall differences in unwanted sexual contact were not significant between Greek and Independent women, as there was an overall unwanted sexual contact rate of 34 percent, and Greek women experienced unwanted sexual contact at a rate of 35 percent and Independent women experienced unwanted sexual contact at a rate of 33 percent. Within the sample, alcohol consumption predicted rape by physical force and rape where the victim was too intoxicated to defend herself. The difference in sexual assault prevalence between sorority members and non-sorority members remained even when alcohol consumption and attendance at Greek parties were controlled for. However, among sorority women, participation in social events with no alcohol – sisterhood events, coed Greek events with no alcohol - was negatively correlated with sexual assault. Among
sorority members, the relationship between attendance at Greek events where alcohol was served and sexual assault became non-significant when alcohol consumption by the sorority member is controlled.

Kalof (1993) also found that sorority women were significantly more likely than independent women to have nonconsensual sex. Kalof’s survey of 21 sorority and 195 nonsorority women asked questions concerning gender roles and experience with sexual coercion. She found that 47.6 percent of sorority women versus 21 percent of non sorority women experienced sex without consent while under the influence of alcohol. 29 percent of sorority women and 11 percent of nonsorority women experienced physical coercion, and 22 percent of sorority women and 26 percent of nonsorority women experienced social coercion. A higher percentage of sorority women had been raped at 19 percent compared to 7 percent of nonsorority women, but this difference was not significant. Kalof also found an association between sorority membership and attitudes that support traditional rape and sex myths.

Handler (1995) described some of the dynamics of sorority life, suggesting that “joining a sorority involves entering an implicit social contract that demands forgoing competition with other sisters for male attention” but as a larger group, the sorority works to attract men. Handler suggests that men are a focal point of life in a sorority, with weekly social events open exclusively to the sorority and a fraternity as avenues of access to alcohol and fraternity members. Anderson and Danis (2007) also looked at the dynamics of sororities by conducting interviews with 35 sorority women at one university in regards to dating violence helping strategies. They found that preventing violence is largely missing from the formal agendas of sororities, as many have no formal policy or guidelines in regards
to how to help a sorority member who is in a violent relationship. There was an overall lack of awareness among sorority women that relationship violence occurred to other members of their own sorority. The lack of awareness, prevention and helping techniques does not necessarily breed an environment that encourages inter-gender violence, but it also does not lend to an environment that supports women who are in need of help from their peers. In Wuthrich’s (2009) study of 180 reflection papers from women in two sororities, it was found that sorority women were not likely to intervene in the behavior of their peers and did not normally act in unsafe situations involving other members or friends. Wuthrich also found that older sorority women were not empathetic to younger ones who got in trouble with alcohol, as they saw it as a rite of passage. There was little concern among sorority sisters for the safety and health of other members of their sorority.

One risky behavior that Greek life does encourage is alcohol consumption. Hutching, Lac, and Labrie (2007) found that binge drinking behaviors were very common among sorority women, with 35.2 percent of their sample of 247 sorority women classified as binge drinkers. A general sample of college women found that only 23.2 percent qualified as binge drinkers. Through measures assessing attitudes towards drinking, subjective norms of others’ attitudes towards drinking, perceived behavioral control, drinking intentions, and drinking behavior, Hutching and colleagues found that intention to drink mediated the relationship between attitudes and subjective norms about drinking behavior. For sorority women, norms were a stronger prediction of intention to drink than personal attitudes, suggesting an important role of peer influence among sorority members.

Copenhaver and Grauerholz (1991) found that 46% of their sample of 140 sorority women experienced at least one type of unwanted sexual contact, 24% experienced
attempted rape, and 17% experienced completed rape. Of the rapes and attempted rapes, 41% occurred at fraternity houses and 57% of unwanted sexual experiences occurred in fraternity houses. Those women who were most active in sorority functions were more likely to experience attempted or completed rape during a fraternity function or by a fraternity member than were those women who were less active in sorority functions. In the vast majority of cases, either the victim or perpetrator had been either drinking or taking drugs.

*Other Assault Risk-Related Behaviors*

Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1997) provided research on male peer support groups and their relationship with sexual assault, which could prove to be similar to female facilitation. Their study demonstrated that male peer groups directly and indirectly support attitudes of a male-dominant sexual culture, and sexually aggressive college men seek out male friends to support and sustain male dominant, sexually exploitative behavior. The development of the female facilitation construct used in this study is, in part, based upon similar thinking to the male peer support model, and how similar behaviors may be occurring among female peers.

Horstman (2003) interviewed 16 undergraduate women to explore rivalry among college women. It was found that rivalry exists in many female relationships, and those that initiate it do so because of insecurities and desires to achieve affirmation. The nature of these relationships is that women do not place a high priority on their female friendships, and thus when situations of sexual assault occur, other women tend to minimize the experience of the victim.

Schwartz and Pitts (1996) found that a female’s peer group does influence her risk of sexual assault victimization, but focused on the men in their peer group. They found that women who have more male friends who have gotten a woman intoxicated in order to have
sex with her are more likely to be victimized themselves. This leads to the idea that who a woman associates with may put her more at risk of victimization, and can be expanded to their female peer group as well as their male peer group. If women acquaint themselves with men who are engaging in behaviors that put other women at risk, it is likely that they are also acquainting themselves with women who have a lack of understanding for the risky situations they are putting themselves and their female friends in.

**Current Study**

The purpose of the current study is to expand upon the notion of female peers’ role in sexual assault on college campuses. The goal was to look beyond the dynamics of sorority women in particular and look at how all women engage with their peers in encouraging behaviors that put them at risk of sexual assault, including encouraging drinking behaviors, attending alcoholic events, and hooking up. While by no means taking the blame away from the male perpetrators, this study instead focuses on how female college students enable a campus culture which breeds sexual assault at such high rates. In order to test these hypotheses, a new “Female Facilitation” measure was created which included two parts. In one half, behaviors in which one encouraged female peers to engage in behaviors that put them at risk for sexual assault were measured (“facilitator”), and in the other half, behaviors in which one had been encouraged by their female peers to engage in risky behaviors were measured (“facilitatee).

**Hypotheses**

1. Senior women will have experienced higher rates of sexual assault than sophomore women
2. Both measures of facilitation will be positively related to sexual assault victimization and alcohol consumption.

3. Greek women will obtain significantly higher scores on the facilitator and facilitatee versions of the facilitation measure than independent women.
Methods

Participants

Table 1 indicates the demographics of the sample of women who participated in the current study. Overall, the sample is a good representation of undergraduate women at Bucknell during the Fall 2010 semester. 85.55% of sophomore, junior, and senior women at Bucknell are Caucasian, which is extremely close to the percentage of the sample that is Caucasian. Similarly, 2.08% of women are African American, 2.47% are Asian/Asian-American, 2.94% are Hispanic, and 6.96% are “other.” These numbers are all relatively close to the sample population. The sample has a smaller percentage of Greek affiliated students than the overall population, as 71.35% of eligible students are Greek, and in this study all women were eligible to rush given their class years. 20.06% of the student body is varsity athletes, which is very close to the percentage of our sample who is student athletes.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n ) 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% sophomore 34.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% junior 32.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% senior 32.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n ) 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 18 .80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 19 30.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 20 33.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 21 30.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% 22 4.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n ) 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes 61.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% no 38.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Athlete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n ) 373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes 19.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% no 80.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Parental Income
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-149,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-199,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-249,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian/Asian-American</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% African-American</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Heterosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homosexual</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% no</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Social Group

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
 n & 373 \\
\% \text{ Greek} & 65.15 \\
\% \text{ Independent} & 21.18 \\
\% \text{ Varsity Athlete} & 13.67 \\
\end{array}
\]

Measures

Demographic items asked for participants’ age, class year, sorority membership, varsity athletic team membership, race/ethnic group identification, sexual orientation, combined parental income, religiosity, and primary social group.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1989) is a ten item scale in which participants answer questions on a 1-4 scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree) in regards to their self-esteem. It has demonstrated good face validity and convergent validity with measures of depression, feelings of unhappiness and discouragement, and symptoms of anxiety (Rosenberg, 1989). In the present study the RSE demonstrated an internal consistency of \( \alpha = 0.89 \).

Social Desirability Scale (SDS-10; Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) is a 10-item, true/false questionnaire which measures participant’s tendency to respond in a socially acceptable manner. This is a short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. Scores can range from 0 to 10, with a higher score indicating a greater tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner. This measure is the most commonly used instrument to identify whether responses to other measures are associated with socially desirable responding, and has
demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties (Loo & Thorpe, 2000). In the present study the SDS-10 demonstrated an internal consistency of $\alpha = 0.60$.

*Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT; Babor et al., 2001)* measures alcohol consumption and related behaviors and is used to determine risky drinking behaviors. Questions ask about past drinking behaviors and consequences, for example “how often during the last year have you failed to do what was normally expected from you because of drinking?” Response options include “never,” “less than monthly,” “monthly,” “weekly,” and “daily or almost daily.” Previous research has demonstrated strong reliability and validity of the measure, with high correlations between AUDIT scores and other measures of drinking consequences, attitudes towards drinking, vulnerability to alcohol dependence, reasons for drinking and negative mood states after drinking (Babor et al., 2001) and is the most commonly used measure of alcohol consumption (Reinert & Allen, 2002). In the present study the AUDIT demonstrated an internal consistency of $= 0.81$.

*Female Facilitation Survey (FFS)* is a measure developed for the purpose of this study containing 46 questions about facilitation and facilitatee behaviors, 23 questions on facilitation and 23 questions on facilitatee measures. Both measures contained questions about the same behaviors - hazing; encouraging females to “hook up,” consume alcohol and dress provocatively – but differed in that the facilitator questions involved the person doing these behaviors to someone else and the facilitatee questions involved the person having the behaviors done to them. Each question was answered on a 0-4 scale ranging from “never” to “more than once a week” with a possible range of scores per subscale from 0-92. Half of the participants received the facilitator questionnaire first and half received the facilitatee questionnaire first. The overall internal consistency of this measure is $\alpha = 0.96$, the internal
consistency for the facilitator measures is $\alpha = 0.93$, and the internal consistency for the facilitatee measures is $\alpha = 0.93$. The validity of the measure appears to be strong, as it has convergent validity with related measures as is discussed further in the results section.

*Sexual Experience Survey – Short Form Victimization* (SES-SFV; Koss et al., 2007) contains questions regarding sexual assault victimization. Questions are asked about non-consensual sexual contact, oral/anal/vaginal attempted rape and oral/anal/vaginal completed rape. Participants were asked to indicate the frequency (0, 1, 2, 3+) of each type of assault they have experienced as well as the main reason for its occurrence (verbal pressure, expressed anger, victim too drunk, threatening physical harm or using force). The SES is commonly considered to be the most valid and reliable measure of sexual assault victimization (e.g. Kolivas & Gross, 2007, Koss et al., 2006). In the present study the SES demonstrated an internal consistency of $\alpha = 0.84$.

*Procedures*

The procedures were approved by Bucknell’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) in October 2010. The email address, class year, and Greek/Independent affiliation of 900 sophomore, junior, and senior women at Bucknell were randomly selected through the registrar’s office to participate in this survey. Of these 900 women, 373 responded, yielding a 41.4% response rate. Emails were sent to these women inviting them to participate in the web-based survey, told them the approximate time taken to complete the survey, and their chances of winning a cash prize. This email was sent out to the female students at the beginning of four consecutive weeks in the fall semester, with a reminder email being sent out once a week to those who had not yet completed the survey. In the email, participants were assured that their identity would remain anonymous. If the participant decided to
participate in the study, she followed a link included in the body of the email which led to the survey, beginning with an informed consent page. The last page of the survey contained a debriefing page, which included a space for participants to enter their username into the drawing for prizes. Survey data and usernames were sent to separate files to ensure the anonymity of the participants. The entire survey given to participants is contained in Appendix A.

The measures were given in the order presented in the previous section on measures. Approximately half of participants received the facilitator and facilitatee questions in one order and the other half of participants received them in the other order to see if the order in which they were presented affected responses.
Results

Social Desirability

The SDS-SVF has negative, significant correlations with AUDIT scores $r(371) = - .18$, $p < .01$; facilitator scores $r(371) = - .25$, $p < .01$; facilitator scores $r(371) = - .24$, $p < .01$; unwanted sexual contact rates $r(371) = - .15$, $p < .01$; and overall sexual assault $r(371) = - .12$, $p < .05$. This indicates that those who answered positively to the above measures were less likely to respond in a socially desirable manner on the SDS-SVF. The RSE had a positive, significant correlation with the SDS-SVF $r(371) = .21$, $p < .01$, indicating those who had a tendency to indicate a greater degree of self esteem also had a tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner on the SDS-SVF.

Sexual Assault Victimization

The overall sexual assault prevalence among the entire sample was 44.2% ($n = 165$), which was the percent of the sample that indicated any level of sexual assault including sexual touching, rape and attempted rape. Unwanted sexual contact was the most prevalent type of sexual assault and rape and attempted rape were the least common (Table 2).
Table 2

Prevalence rates and frequencies of reported sexual assault victimization (N=373)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assault Type</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assault Rate</td>
<td>44.24</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive Assault</td>
<td>33.24</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Rape</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaginal Rape</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anal Rape</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Rape</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Oral Rape</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Vaginal Rape</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Anal Rape</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was hypothesized that senior women would have experienced higher rates of overall sexual assault than sophomore women given the longer time period in which they have been in college; however this was not shown to be significantly true. Senior women
had reported, on average, more sexual assault than sophomore women but the difference was not significant (t(245) = -1.27, p = .21).

A chi-square analysis of assault prevalence and Greek status indicated that overall assault prevalence did not differ by Greek status, c2(1, N=370) = 1.31, p = 0.25 nor did unwanted sexual contact c2(1, N=370) = 0.69, p = 0.41. This was also the case with attempted rape, c2(1, N=370) = 0.33, p = 0.57 and rape c2 (1, N=369) = 0.19, p = 0.66.

There was a difference, although not significant but indicating a strong trend, in overall assault prevalence rate between varsity athletes and non-athletes, with varsity athletes being less likely to experience sexual assault, c2 (1, N=370) = 3.35, p = 0.07. This was also the case with unwanted sexual contact, c2 (1, N=370) = 3.07, p = 0.08. There was no difference in reports of rape by varsity athletes and non-athletes c2(1, N=369) = 1.29, p = 0.26. Attempted rape showed the same, c2(1, N=370) = 0.76, p = 0.39.

There was no difference in combined parental income in assault prevalence, t(359) = 0.28, p = 0.78. There was also no difference in assault prevalence among those who considered themselves religious and those who do not, c2(1, N= 367) = 0.00, p = 0.95.

There was a difference in AUDIT sum and prevalence in unwanted sexual contact, with those who indicated higher scores on the AUDIT also indicating higher rates of unwanted sexual contact, t(368) = -6.51, p = 0.00. The same was found for facilitator scores and unwanted sexual contact t(357) = -6.54, p = 0.00 and facilitatee scores, t(362) = -7.52, p = 0.00. Similarly, for attempted rape, those with higher AUDIT scores were more likely to indicate an experience of attempted rape t(368) = -6.12, p = 0.00. Those with higher facilitator scores were also more likely to report attempted rape t(357) = -7.04, p = 0.00 and those with higher facilitatee scores were more likely to report attempted rape t(362) = -6.96,
p = 0.00. Rape was also more likely to be indicated by those with higher AUDIT scores, t(367) = -3.80, p = 0.00 and higher facilitator scores t(356) = -3.95, p = 0.00 and higher facilitatee scores t(361) = -4.82, p = 0.00.

Female Facilitation Measure

The order in which the two subscales of the facilitation measure were given had a significant effect on the responses. In the version of the survey that had the facilitator measure first, the mean scores were significantly higher than when the facilitator measure came after the facilitatee measure. The mean score for facilitator behaviors in the facilitator-first version was 22.00 compared to 13.73 in the facilitatee-first version which is a statistically significant difference in order t(354) = 5.54, p = 0.00. The same was not true for the facilitatee subscale, as the mean score in the facilitator-first version was 22.79 compared to 21.16 in the facilitatee-first version. There was not a significant difference in facilitatee scores on the two versions of the survey t(354) = 1.10, p = 0.27.

There was a statistically significant difference in scores on the two subscales, with higher mean scores on the facilitatee subscale than the facilitator subscale, t(326) = 24.00, p = 0.00 (Table 3).
Table 3

*Female Facilitation Measure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Obtained Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Subscale</td>
<td>17.52 (13.08)</td>
<td>0-63</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitatee Subscale</td>
<td>21.96 (14.05)</td>
<td>0-63</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Possible range of 0-92 per subscale

The reliability of the facilitation measure is strong, as demonstrated in Table 3, with high Cronbach’s alphas for each of the two subscales. The overall Cronbach’s alpha was 0.96, demonstrating very good inter-item reliability.

*Factor Analyses.* Twenty-three questions related to being a facilitator were factor analyzed using a rotated component matrix. The analysis yielded five factors explaining a total of 65.03% of the variance for the entire set of the variables. Factor 1 was labeled facilitation of drinking and hooking up and explained 39.97% of the variance. Items loading on factor 1 were:

1. Item5: When socializing with fellow female students, how often have you ever encouraged a member of that group to become intoxicated?
2. Item 7: How often have you ever encouraged female peers to “pre-game” (consume alcohol in preparation for a social event)?
3. Item 8: How often have you ever encouraged your female peers’ participation in drinking games?
4. Item 9: How often have you ever pressured a female peer in your primary social group to “go out” (attend a party, bar, etc. where alcohol is available for her use”)?
5. Item 10: How often have you ever pressured a female peer in your primary social group to attend events where alcohol is not available for her use?
6. Item 11: How often has your opinion of a certain male organization or group ever influenced your female peers’ likelihood to go to a hosted event at that group?
7. Item 12: How often has your opinion of a certain male organization or group ever influenced your female peers’ likelihood to “hook-up” with a member of that group?
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("Hook-up" is defined as: sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.)

8. Item 20: How often have you ever encouraged female peers to participate in themed parties?

Factor 2 was labeled facilitation by hazing and explained 9.89% of the variance. Items loading for factor 2 were:

1. Item 1: How often have you ever hazed a female peer?
2. Item 2: How often have you ever told female peers that hazing is normal/to be expected?
3. Item 3: How often have you ever hazed because hazing is normal/to be expected?
4. Item 4: How often have you ever hazed females within your primary social group?

Factor 3 was labeled facilitation of hooking up and explained 5.46% of the variance. Items loading for factor 3 were:

1. Item 6: How often have you ever encouraged female peers to participate in “hook-up” bets or dares?
2. Item 14: How often have you ever encouraged a female peer to kiss you or another female student in the presence of males?
3. Item 17: How often have you ever rewarded, tangibly or intangibly, a female peer for drinking to excess?
4. Item 18: How often have you ever rewarded, tangibly or intangibly, a female peer for “hooking-up” with male peers?
5. Item 19: How often have you ever encouraged female peers to wear more revealing outfits?

Factor 4 was labeled facilitation by minimizing the gravity of events, explaining 5% of the variance. Items loading for factor 4 were:

1. Item 13: How often have you ever called your female peers a derogatory slur (e.g. “bitch”, “slut”, or “whore”) in a playful or joking manner?
2. Item 15: How often have you ever negatively judged a female peer when recalling an evening’s events in which she was intoxicated?
3. Item 16: How often have you ever minimized the gravity of events from a female peer’s previous night (by joking or laughing about it) despite her possible feelings of personal shame?

Factor 5 was labeled facilitation by encouraging risky behaviors in male rooms explaining 4.7% of the variance. Items loading for factor 5 were:
1. Item 21: How often have you ever escorted a female peer to a male’s room?
2. Item 22: How often have you ever encouraged a female peer to drink alcohol in a male’s room?
3. Item 23: How often have you ever encouraged a female peer to use marijuana (e.g. smoke, bong, brownie, vaporizer)?

Twenty-three questions related to being a facilitatee were factor analyzed using a rotated component matrix. The analysis yielded four factors explaining a total of 60.24% of the variance for the entire set of variables. Factor 1 was labeled experiencing facilitation of hooking up and rewarding risky behaviors and explained 40.16% of the variance. Items loading for factor 1 were:

1. Item 29: How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to participate in “hook-up” bets or dares?
2. Item 35: How often have your female peers’ opinions of a certain male organization or group influenced your likelihood to go to a hosted event at that group?
3. Item 36: How often have you ever been called a derogatory slur (such as “bitch,” “slut,” or “whore) by your female peers in a playful or joking manner?
4. Item 37: How often have you ever been encouraged by a female peer to kiss her or another female student in the presence of males?
5. Item 38: How often have you ever been negatively judged by a peer when recalling an evening’s events in which you were intoxicated?
6. Item 39: How often has a female peer ever minimized the gravity of events from your previous night (by joking or laughing about it) despite your possible feelings of personal shame?
7. Item 40: How often have you ever been rewarded, tangibly or intangibly, by a female peer for drinking to excess?
8. Item 41: How often have you ever been reward, tangibly or intangibly, by a female peer for “hooking-up” with male peers?
9. Item 42: How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to wear more revealing outfits?

Factor 2 was labeled experiencing facilitation of alcohol consumption and accounted for 8.59% of the variance. Items loading for factor 2 were:

1. Item 28: When socializing with fellow female students, how often have you ever been encouraged by a member of that group to become intoxicated?
2. Item 30: How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to “pre-game” (consume alcohol in preparation for a social event)?
3. Item 31: How often have you ever been encouraged by your female peers’ to participate in drinking games?
4. Item 32: How often have you ever been pressured by female peers to “go out” (attend a party, bar, etc. where alcohol is available for your use)?
5. Item 33: How often have you ever been pressured by female peers in your primary social group to attend events where alcohol is not available for your use?
6. Item 34: How often have your female peers’ opinions of a certain male organization or group ever influenced your likelihood to go to a hosted event at that group?
7. Item 43: How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to participate in themed parties?

Factor 3 was labeled experiencing facilitation by hazing and accounted for 6.09% of the variance. Items loading for factor 3 were:

1. Item 24: How often have you ever been hazed by a female peer?
2. Item 25: How often have you ever been told by female peers that hazing is normal/to be expected?
3. Item 26: How often have you ever been hazed by female peers because hazing is normal/to be expected?
4. Item 27: How often have you ever been hazed by females within your primary social group?

Factor 4 was labeled experiencing facilitation by being encouraged to participate in risky behaviors in male rooms, explaining 5.39% of the variance. Items loading for factor 4 were:

1. Item 44: How often have you ever been escorted by a female peer to a male’s room?
2. Item 45: How often have you ever been encouraged by a female peer to drink alcohol in a male’s room?
3. Item 46: How often have you ever been encouraged by a female peer to use marijuana (e.g. smoke, bong, brownie, vaporizer) in a male’s room?

The mean inter-item correlation for the facilitator subscale was 0.36, with a minimum of 0.06 and a maximum of 0.84. This range suggests further strength in the measure, as it means that not all of the questions are asking the same thing but they are still reliable as a whole. Similarly, for the facilitatee subscale the mean inter-item correlation was 0.36, with a minimum of .007 and maximum of 0.85.
Tests of Convergent Validity. The Female Facilitation measure is a new measure created by the Bucknell Sexual Assault Research Team, and thus had to be measured against other items in order to determine validity. It was expected that the measure would be negatively correlated to self esteem, as those with lower self esteem would be more likely to engage in both facilitator and facilitatee behaviors. However, we found no correlation, r(371) = 0.04 and 0.00 respectively. There was a significant correlation between facilitator status and social desirability, r(371) = -0.24, p<0.01, with those receiving lower social desirability scores reporting more facilitator behaviors. There was also a significant correlation between facilitatee status and social desirability, r(371) = -0.24, p<0.01, with those receiving lower social desirability score reporting more facilitatee behaviors.

The results indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between facilitation status for Greek and independent women (t(359) = -4.71, p = 0.00). There is also a statistically significant difference between facilitatee status for Greek and Independent women (t(362) = -5.41, p =0.00). A statistically significant difference was found in alcohol consumption for Greek and Independent women (t(371) = -6.30, p = 0.00). However, there was no significant difference in assault prevalence of any type between Greek and Independent women (t(368) = -0.14, p = 0.25).

An independent-samples T-test indicated there was a significant effect between AUDIT scores and facilitator sum, t(357) = 1.33, p = 0.00. The same was found for AUDIT scores and facilitatee sums, t(362) = 0.02, p = 0.00.
Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to test the following ideas in the hope of evaluating the potential role that women play in sexual assault on campus. It was hypothesized that senior women will have experienced higher rates of sexual assault than sophomore women, both measures of facilitation will be positively and significantly related to sexual assault victimization and alcohol consumption and that Greek women will obtain significantly higher scores on the facilitator and facilitatee versions of the facilitation measure than independent women. It is important to note that the purpose was not to take blame away from the male perpetrators, but rather to further analyze the contributing factors to a culture that manifests sexual assault victimization at such high rates. Further, this study was meant to analyze the rates at which female peers encourage behaviors previously found to be risky that may put their same-gender peers at higher risk of sexual assault victimization. By understanding the role that women may play in contributing to a culture of risk it is likely that other researchers will be able to use this information to increase the effectiveness of prevention programs geared towards women.

Sexual Assault Victimization Rates

The sexual assault victimization rates in this study were consistent with past findings on sexual assault victimization collected on Bucknell’s campus by Flack and colleagues, with 44.2% of participants indicating that they had experienced some type of sexual assault during their time at Bucknell University. In the 2009 study, 59.1% of participants indicated that they had experienced some type of sexual assault while at Bucknell, and in 2008 43.7% of female participants indicated that they had experienced some type of sexual assault while at Bucknell.
According to the current study, sexual assault rates at Bucknell are comparable to national rates. Using the 10-item Sexual Experience Survey, Koss and colleagues (1987) found that 53.7% of college women had experienced some sort of sexual victimization since the age of 14. The amount that experienced assault during their time at college is less clear, so direct comparisons between the samples are difficult. Fisher and colleagues (2000) found that 15.5% of their national sample had experienced sexual victimization during the past academic year – including sexual contact with and without force, sexual coercion, completed rape and attempted rape. The rate of sexual assault victimization in the current study is higher than the rate in Fisher’s study, and a potential reason for this is that Fisher’s study only asked for incidents that occurred during the most recent academic year – a time frame of 7 months. The current study asked participants to recall incidents during their entire time at Bucknell, which could range from one to three years. There are a number of other reasons that could account for the difference in prevalence rates, including the high population of Greek life on campus and the rural location (Mohler-Kuo et al., 2004).

**Female Facilitation Measure**

The Female Facilitation construct used in this study was a new metric designed to measure behaviors that we believed women may engage in which increase their own or others risk of being sexually assaulted. The analysis done between female facilitation and sexual assault was strictly correlational and thus cannot be seen as a cause of sexual assault victimization, but the statistically significant correlations between both the facilitation and facilitatee measures and experiencing sexual assault demonstrates that there is a connection between the two.
The factor analysis done on the measures indicated five factors for the facilitator subscale; facilitation of drinking and hooking up, facilitation by hazing, facilitation of hooking up, facilitation by minimizing the gravity of events, and facilitation by encouraging risky behaviors. There were four factors indicated on the facilitatee subscale – experiencing facilitation of hooking up and rewarding risky behaviors, experiencing facilitation of alcohol consumption, experiencing facilitation by hazing, and experiencing facilitation by being encouraged to participate in risky behaviors in the presence of males. The factors indicated on both measures correspond to the risky behaviors that the research intended to measure based on past research of risk factors of sexual assault victimization.

There are also significant, positive correlations between both female facilitation measures and AUDIT scores, suggesting that the more facilitator/facilitatee behaviors one partakes in, the more risk one takes in drinking. Alcohol consumption has proved to be a significant risk factor for sexual assault victimization, and thus this connection between the AUDIT scores and female facilitation is not a surprise. In addition, one of the factors of the facilitation measure involved questions related to drinking and encouraging peers to drink, thus women who answered affirmatively to those questions were likely to be high in AUDIT scores themselves. Further research might be done to look into if this encouragement of alcohol consumption is causal of the high AUDIT scores.

In opposition to initial hypotheses of convergent measures, female facilitation scores had no correlation to self-esteem. When coming up with convergent measures, it was hypothesized that those with lower self esteem would be higher in both subscales of the female facilitation measure, as we thought that those who were able to be encouraged by their peers to engage in risky behaviors would do so because they had low self esteem. To a
similar account, it was thought that those who would encourage those behaviors in others would do so in part because they had low self-esteem. However, in the current study it was found that there was no correlation in either direction. Further explanation of the self esteem – female facilitation relationship is not warranted given the lack of correlation between the measures. In future research with the female facilitation measure, it is important that one looks into more personality measures that may provide convergent validity for the female facilitation measure.

**Female Facilitation**

The mean score on the facilitatee subscale was 21.96 out of a possible 92 with a standard deviation of 14.05, and a 17.52 out of a possible 92 with a standard deviation of 13.08 on the facilitator subscale. For both of the measures, the range of scores was from 0-63, with no one obtaining the highest possible score on either measure. In both cases, the mean score was about one-quarter of the possible total score. There are a number of reasons that this could be the case which should be explored in future studies of the female facilitation measure. These scores might indicate a frequency issue, which is that they responded positively to a majority of items but at a low frequency of the behaviors. It could also be that some of the items received higher scores while others received were not indicated as occurring.

Facilitator and facilitatee scores were positively and significantly correlated, suggesting that one who participates in facilitatee behaviors also likely participates in facilitator behaviors. This might suggest that it is common in a peer group for an individual to be encouraged by others and then find that it is the norm, and thus engage in those
behaviors as well. This relationship must be further looked into in order to better understand why it is that the correlation is so strong.

Independent sample t-test results indicate that there is a statistically significant difference between Greek and independent women for both facilitator and facilitatee subscales, suggesting that being a member of a sorority makes one increasingly likely to participate in these behaviors. Being a varsity athlete, however, was negatively and significantly correlated with both facilitation subscales, suggesting that being a member of a varsity sports team makes one less likely to engage in these behaviors.

There seems to be some inconsistency in the causal nature of facilitation and sexual assault due to the results that Greek women have significantly higher scores on both facilitation measures, yet there is no significant difference in the assault rates between Greek and independent women. The reasons for this must be further explored in future research. One hypothesis is that on a campus such as Bucknell’s, where Greek life is so prevalent, the independent women engage in similar behaviors that they see their Greek peers engaging in. In a sorority setting, there are other women in one’s social group that encourage risky behaviors in others. However, for independent women, it is possible that they engage in these same behaviors without the encouragement of others as a means of emulating the social scene that much of the campus is a part of. It must be further explored if independent women are, indeed, engaging in these behaviors without their female peers facilitating them.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations in this study and the findings related to it require subsequent validation. Since the female facilitation measure was constructed for the purpose of this study, care must be taken when reporting and analyzing findings. Preliminary results
are promising with respect to the reliability and convergent validity with most other measures in this study; however the research must be replicated in a future study in order to be able to affirmatively state the validity of the measure.

A second limitation is that the data reflects a single university campus. Bucknell University is a unique institution in regards to the campus culture. A high population of eligible students are member of Greek Life (71.41%), and past research has demonstrated that being a member of a sorority puts one more at risk for sexual assault and being a member of a fraternity makes one more likely to be a perpetrator of sexual assault. Because of the high rates of Greek participants that Bucknell has, it is difficult to expand the findings to schools with different demographics. Female facilitation was highly correlated with Greek status, and thus it could be more of a problem in the Greek community than among independent women. In a school where Independent women are the majority, female facilitation scores may be significantly lower – and thus similar research should be done at such an institution.

A third limitation to this study is that participants self-selected. This method of participation may over-represent college women who are willing to disclose information about their sexual experience and involvement in female facilitation. Thus, the magnitude of female facilitation rates could be inflated. However, victimization rates are similar to previous Bucknell studies which suggest that they are reliable. It is also possible that sexual assault victims are actually underrepresented because of the traumatic nature of the experience and victims tendency to avoid reminders of these experiences.

A fourth limitation of the study was that the survey method does not allow for the clarification of the meaning of language used in the items for respondents. There is a
potential for respondents to not have interpreted the questions in the way they were intended to be understood or to be unable to respond in a way they felt was most appropriate for the question, as there was no “other” option or space for elaboration. Thus, some data might not be consistent with participant’s true beliefs or experiences. However, the new SES version used in this study seems to constitute improvements over the old version because it makes explicit consent in the questions, and thus those who answer “yes” to any of the questions are confirming to a non-consensual sexual experience, which by definition is sexual assault.

A fifth and final limitation to this study is that it is all retrospective reports of sexual assault victimization and female facilitation, some of which could have happened up to three years ago. Participants are not immune to memory distortions that are a function between the time of event and time of memory recall. This may particularly be the case in this study, because sexual assault and female facilitation often occur when the victim is intoxicated. This is a problem for all survey based research on sexual assault and one that no investigator has been able to develop a better solution for.

Implications

The findings of this study have important implications for future research on sexual assault victimization. In the past, there has been significant research on individual factors that put one at risk of sexual assault and on profiles of the male perpetrators of sexual assault. However, by looking specifically about one’s primary female social group and how they encourage risky behaviors, a new construct was developed to focus on what leads to a risky sexual environment. The construct focused on female peers encouraging behaviors that had previously been shown to be risk factors for sexual assault – drinking, hooking up, doing drugs and attending parties where alcohol is present. This construct is not meant to blame
women for their own or their female peers’ victimization. However, there is preliminary
evidence that these behaviors are related to sexual assault victimization and other risk factors
such as alcohol consumption. By expanding these behaviors beyond the individual and to
their larger social group, it is possible to see a larger problem on campus.

The campus culture at Bucknell is a social scene that is dominated by men and
fraternities. It is a social scene where parties are constantly held at fraternity houses or men’s
downtown houses, and women have little if any say over the structure of the party due to
national Panhellenic rules that sororities may not serve alcohol. In speaking to many female
students it can be heard that at many registered events at fraternity houses it is not uncommon
for beer to be thrown by the men over the rest of the party, generally directed at the women,
and speaks to the differences in social power between men and women on campus.
Nonetheless, female peers encourage one another to attend these parties, drink before and at
them, and dress in accordance with the themes. Not only does this put their peers at risk for
sexual assault, but it also encourages the campus climate that allows for males to dominate
and females to be subordinate. While this may not be the case with all female students at
Bucknell, it occurs enough that the culture is able to exist the way it does. Walking into any
fraternity party would confirm that this is the case.

It is to be noted that steps are being taken to address this situation, such as the sorority
presidents addressing the Interfraternity Council in March of this year stating that they would
no longer support themes that are degrading to women. While this is a positive step, it is too
soon to evaluate the efficacy of the address.
Education Regarding Female Facilitation

Assuming that the female facilitation construct proves to be sufficiently reliable and valid, this research demonstrates that female-focused education on sexual assault prevention efforts should include the behavior of women as well as the behavior of men. Previous efforts to focus prevention efforts have been seen by some as victim blaming, and the intent of this is not to do that but rather to educate women on what behaviors they may be partaking in that are furthering their own and their peers’ risk and to better understand the social environment that produces an increased risk of sexual assault victimization. Women need a better understanding that their actions and encouragement are putting their friends and themselves at risk of sexual assault victimization. Since the majority of women in this study noted that they had been a facilitatee, it is important to teach them how to resist the pressure that their female peers are putting on them to engage in behaviors with which they may not be comfortable. As past research has demonstrated, there is pluralistic ignorance associated with hooking up (Lambert, Kahn & Apple, 2003). It is likely that this pluralistic ignorance also extends to the other behaviors we studied, and that women are not as comfortable dressing provocatively or drinking to dangerous levels as their behavior would demonstrate. It is important for sexual assault education to make it clear to women that their discomfort is not unique.

Facilitator behaviors are also important to look at for future education. While the average scores on the facilitator subscale were lower than scores on the facilitatee subscale, there was a clear demonstration that a number of women engage in these behaviors. One might hypothesize that they engage in these behaviors because they are the norm on
Bucknell’s campus and have a lack of understanding as to the potential negative consequences of their actions.

*Future Research*

Future research is needed to expand on the understanding of female facilitation of sexual assault. Since this measure was used for the first time in this study, the results need to be validated in at least one other study to ensure that it is indeed measuring what preliminary results are showing it is. In addition, more convergent measures should be looked at to determine other characteristics of the females that are engaging in these behaviors. While it appears that this measure is both reliable and valid, further research using this tool is needed to confirm this. This study found a correlational relationship between female facilitation and sexual assault victimization. In future research, a causal relationship should be further explored.

An important finding in this study was that there was a significant ordering effect for the facilitator measure. If a participant was prompted with the facilitatee behaviors she may have been less willing to admit to facilitator behaviors immediately afterwards. Future research should replicate the differences found in this study based on order of administration or only use the order in which the facilitator subscale is first in order to gain the most accurate results.

Future research should also examine this measure on a campus that has lower participation in Greek life in order to better see if this is strictly a Greek phenomenon or if it extends to all undergraduate women. Our research suggests that it occurs more often in Greek than Independent women, but since so many females on this campus are either Greek
or have a number of Greek friends, it is hard to extend these findings to come up with a concrete conclusion.
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Appendix A.

Social Behavior and Attitudes Among College Women

2011 Survey

Consent Form
Human Participants Research
Bucknell University

Project Title: Social Behavior and Attitudes among College Women

Purpose of the Research: I understand that the purpose of this study is to obtain a better understanding of the social behavior of college women and the attitudes they hold. I also understand that the study is concerned with understanding sexual assault, hooking up (defined as a sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse, with or without the potential for future commitment), alcohol consumption, hazing, and related behaviors in which some college women engage.

General Plan of the Research: I understand that if I consent to participate in this study, I will be asked to complete a survey, which will ask me a series of questions about my own sexual experiences and associated behaviors. My answers to all of the survey questions will be completely anonymous. I will not be asked to reveal any information that could be used to identify me as a participant in this study.

Estimated Duration of the Research: I understand that the survey should take me no longer than 40 minutes to complete.

Estimated Total Number of Participants: I understand that the experimenters expect to collect survey data from approximately 300 participants.

Questions? If I have questions or concerns, I understand that I may contact the Principal Investigator, Professor Bill Flack, wflack@bucknell.edu, 577-1131, Department of Psychology. For general questions about the rights of human participants in research, I may contact Abe Feuerstein, Chair, Institutional Review Board, Office of Institutional Research, afeuerstein@bucknell.edu, 577-3293. In addition, a debriefing will be included following completion of the survey regardless of whether I choose to submit my results or not.

Voluntary Participation: I understand that my participation in this research is completely voluntary. If I agree to participate, I may change my mind at any time and for any reason. I may refuse to answer any questions and/or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, and if I choose, my results will not be saved.

Benefits of Participation: I understand that I will have the option to enter into a drawing for a chance to win one of ten $50 prizes for participating in this research at the end of the survey. It is also possible that I will benefit from the opportunity to reflect on these questions, and I
may find the exercise useful. In addition, I may also benefit from learning about psychological research from participating in this study.

**Anonymity:** I understand that my answers to all of the survey questions will be completely anonymous, meaning there is no way that my answers will be able to be connected to my identity. I will not be asked to reveal any information that could be used to identify me as a participant in this study. All of the information that I provide will be stored in a secure datafile access to which is limited to the Principal Investigator, members of his student research team, and three professional staff members of ISR. The survey datafile will be stored separately from the file containing my email address, which will be randomized. This eliminates any possibility that I could be identified with my answers.

**Discomforts:** I understand that it is possible that considering some of the questions on the survey could cause me to become upset, ashamed, or embarrassed. However, I also understand that I can complete this survey on any computer that uses Microsoft Windows software and that is either directly or wirelessly connected to the university server (however, hardwired connections are encouraged to ensure the survey software runs properly).

**Risks:** I understand that, aside from the risk of discomfort as indicated above, there are no other known risks to me from participating in this research. I also understand that, in the event that I become uncomfortable or upset by any of the questions, and feel the need to speak with someone about my reactions, I may contact Psychological Services (577-1604).

I understand that I will be given additional information about this research in a debriefing after I have finished participating in this study, and before I leave this online session.

I have read the above description of the research.

By clicking the Next Page button, I agree to participate in this research, and I acknowledge that I am 18 years of age or older.
Demographic Questionnaire

1. Class Year (choose one)
   - Freshmen
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior

2. Age (choose one)
   - 17 and younger
   - 18
   - 19
   - 20
   - 21
   - 22 and older

3. Affiliation (choose all that apply)
   - Greek member
   - Independent
   - Varsity Athlete

4. Combined Parental Income (choose one)
   - 0-49,999
   - 50,000-99,999
   - 100,000-149,999
   - 150,000-199,999
   - 200,000-249,999
   - 250,000+

5. Race/Ethnicity
   - Caucasian
   - African American
   - Hispanic
   - Asian/Asian-American
   - Native American
   - Other

6. Sexual Orientation
   - Heterosexual
   - Homosexual
   - Bisexual
   - Other
7. Do you consider yourself to be religious?
   - Yes
   - No

8. The majority of people in your Primary Social Group are: (choose one)
   - Greek members
   - Independents
   - Varsity Athletes
Self Esteem (Rosenberg, 1965)

Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Select the choice that indicates your response.

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2. At times, I think I am no good at all.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6. I certainly feel useless at times.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

7. I feel that I’m a person of worth, at least an equal plane with others.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
• Disagree
• Strongly Disagree

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
• Strongly Agree
• Agree
• Disagree
• Strongly Disagree

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
• Strongly Agree
• Agree
• Disagree
• Strongly Disagree

10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
• Strongly Agree
• Agree
• Disagree
• Strongly Disagree
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Social Desirability (SDS-10; Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D., 1960)

Instructions: Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item, decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally, and then select either the “T” or the “F” to indicate your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2. I have never intensely disliked anyone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>4. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong doings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>5. I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>6. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>7. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>8. When I don’t know something I don’t at all mind admitting it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>9. I can remember “playing sick” to get out of something.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>10. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT; Babor et al., 2001)

1. How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?
   - Never
   - Monthly or less
   - 2 to 4 times a month
   - 2 to 3 times a week
   - 4 or more times a week

2. How many drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day when you are drinking?
   - 1 or 2
   - 3 or 4
   - 5 or 6
   - 7, 8, or 9
   - 10 or more

3. How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - Daily or almost daily

4. How often during the last year have you found that you were not able to stop drinking once you had started?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - Daily or almost daily

5. How often during the last year have you failed to do what was normally expected from you because of drinking?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - Daily or almost daily

6. How often during the last year have you needed a first drink in the morning to get yourself going after a heavy drinking session?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
7. How often during the last year have you had a feeling of guilt or remorse after drinking?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - Daily or almost daily

8. How often during the last year have you been unable to remember what happened the night before because you had been drinking?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - Daily or almost daily

9. Have you or someone else been injured as a result of your drinking?
   - No
   - Yes, but not in the last year
   - Yes, during the last year

10. Has a relative or friend or a doctor or another health worker been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down?
    - No
    - Yes, but not in the last year
    - Yes, during the last year
Hook-up Participation Questionnaire

*Hooking-up is defined as a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.*

1. How often have you hooked up with someone whom you had not met before?
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently

2. How often have you hooked up with a person whom you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend?
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently

3. How often have you had a one-time hook up with a friend?
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently

4. How often have you hooked up more than once with a friend?
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently

5. How often have you hooked up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship?
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently

6. How often have you hooked up with someone with the intention of future commitment?
   - Never
   - Rarely
   - Occasionally
   - Frequently
7. How often have you hooked up with someone whom you are not in a relationship with, when you were already in an exclusive relationship with another person?
   • Never
   • Rarely
   • Occasionally
   • Frequently

8. After ending an exclusive relationship, how often have you “rebounded,” meaning how often have you hooked up with someone when you have just ended an exclusive relationship in order to spite an ex or to feel good about yourself?
   • Never
   • Rarely
   • Occasionally
   • Frequently
Female Facilitation Questionnaire

Part A: Facilitator Questions

Hazing is: Any act committed against someone joining or maintaining membership in a group that is humiliating, intimidating or demeaning, or that endangers the health and safety of the person. Hazing includes active or passive participation in such acts and occurs regardless of the willingness to participate in the activities.

1. How often have you ever hazed a female peer?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

2. How often have you ever told female peers that hazing is normal/to be expected?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

3. How often have you ever hazed because hazing is normal/to be expected?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

4. How often have you ever hazed females within your primary social group?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

5. When socializing with fellow female students, how often have you ever encouraged a member of that group to become intoxicated?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
6. How often have you ever encouraged female peers to participate in “hook-up” bets or dares?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

7. How often have you ever encouraged female peers to “pre-game” (consume alcohol in preparation for a social event)?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

8. How often have you ever encouraged your female peers’ participation in drinking games?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

9. How often have you ever pressured a female peer in your primary social group to “go out” (attend a party, bar, etc. where alcohol is available for her use)?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

10. How often have you ever pressured a female peer in your primary social group to attend events where alcohol is not available for her use?
    - Never
    - Less than monthly
    - Monthly
    - Weekly
    - More than once a week
11. How often has your opinion of a certain male organization or group ever influenced your female peers’ likelihood to go to a hosted event at that group?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

12. How often has your opinion of a certain male organization or group ever influenced your female peers’ likelihood to “hook-up” with a member of that group? (“Hook-up” is defined as: sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.)
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

13. How often have you ever called your female peers a derogatory slur (e.g. “bitch”, “slut”, or “whore”) in a playful or joking manner?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

14. How often have you ever encouraged a female peer to kiss you or another female student in the presence of males?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

15. How often have you ever negatively judged a female peer when recalling an evening’s events in which she was intoxicated?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

16. How often have you ever minimized the gravity of events from a female peer’s previous night (by joking or laughing about it) despite her possible feelings of personal shame?
17. How often have you ever rewarded, tangibly or intangibly, a female peer for drinking to excess?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

18. How often have you ever rewarded, tangibly or intangibly, a female peer for “hooking-up” with male peers?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

19. How often have you ever encouraged female peers to wear more revealing outfits?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

20. How often have you ever encouraged female peers to participate in themed parties?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

21. How often have you ever escorted a female peer to a male’s room?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week
22. How often have you ever encouraged a female peer to drink alcohol in a male’s room?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

23. How often have you ever encouraged a female peer to use marijuana (e.g. smoke, bong, brownie, vaporizer)?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week
Part B: Facilitatee Questions

Hazing is: Any act committed against someone joining or maintaining membership in a group that is humiliating, intimidating or demeaning, or that endangers the health and safety of the person. Hazing includes active or passive participation in such acts and occurs regardless of the willingness to participate in the activities.

1. How often have you ever been hazed by a female peer?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

2. How often have you ever been told by female peers that hazing is normal/to be expected?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

3. How often have you ever been hazed because hazing is normal/to be expected?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

4. How often have you ever been hazed by females within your primary social group?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

5. When socializing with fellow female students, how often have you ever been encouraged by a member of that group to become intoxicated?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

6. How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to participate in “hook-up”
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bets or dares?
- Never
- Less than monthly
- Monthly
- Weekly
- More than once a week

7. How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to “pre-game” (consume alcohol in preparation for a social event)?
- Never
- Less than monthly
- Monthly
- Weekly
- More than once a week

8. How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to “pre-game” (consume alcohol in preparation for a social event)?
- Never
- Less than monthly
- Monthly
- Weekly
- More than once a week

9. How often have you ever been encouraged by your female peers’ to participate in drinking games?
- Never
- Less than monthly
- Monthly
- Weekly
- More than once a week

10. How often have you ever been pressured by female peers in your primary social group to “go out” (attend a party, bar, etc. where alcohol is available for your use)?
- Never
- Less than monthly
- Monthly
- Weekly
- More than once a week

11. How often have you ever been pressured by female peers in your primary social group to attend events where alcohol is not available for your use?
- Never
• Less than monthly
• Monthly
• Weekly
• More than once a week

12. How often have your female peers’ opinions of a certain male organization or group ever influenced your likelihood to go to a hosted event at that group?
• Never
• Less than monthly
• Monthly
• Weekly
• More than once a week

13. How often have your female peers’ opinion of a certain male organization or group ever influenced your likelihood to “hook-up” (a sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment) with a member of that group?
• Never
• Less than monthly
• Monthly
• Weekly
• More than once a week

14. How often have you ever been called a derogatory slur (such as “bitch”, “slut”, or “whore”) by your female peers in a playful or joking manner?
• Never
• Less than monthly
• Monthly
• Weekly
• More than once a week

15. How often have you ever been encouraged by a female peer to kiss her or another female student in the presence of males?
• Never
• Less than monthly
• Monthly
• Weekly
• More than once a week

16. How often have you ever been negatively judged by a female peer when recalling an evening’s events in which you were intoxicated?
• Never
• Less than monthly
17. How often has a female peer ever minimized the gravity of events from your previous night (by joking or laughing about it) despite your possible feelings of personal shame?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

18. How often have you ever been rewarded, tangibly or intangibly, by a female peer for drinking to excess?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

19. How often have you ever been rewarded, tangibly or intangibly, by a female peer for “hooking-up” with male peers? (“Hooking-up” is defined as: sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.)
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

20. How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to wear more revealing outfits?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

21. How often have you ever been encouraged by female peers to participate in themed parties?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
22. How often have you ever been told by your female peers about your behaviors while you were intoxicated that you could not remember?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

23. How often have you ever been escorted by a female peer to a male’s room?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

24. How often have you ever been encouraged by a female peer to drink alcohol in a male’s room?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

25. How often have you ever been encouraged by a female peer to use marijuana (eg smoke, bong, brownie, vaporizer) in a male’s room?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week

26. How often have you ever been pressured by a female peer to attend events where alcohol is not available for your use?
   - Never
   - Less than monthly
   - Monthly
   - Weekly
   - More than once a week
Sexual Experiences Survey (SES-SFV, Koss et al., 2007)

The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely confidential. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box showing the number of times each experience has happened to you. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion—for example, if one night someone told you some lies and had sex with you when you were drunk, you would check both boxes a and c.

Sexual Experiences

1. Someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of my body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of my clothes without my consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration) by:
   a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to. □□□□
   b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to. □□□□
   c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening. □□□□
   d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me. □□□□
   e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon. □□□□

If you answered 1 or more to any of the questions above, please answer the next two questions. If you answered zero for all the questions above, skip to the next page.

Did any of these unwanted sexual experiences occur in the context of a hook up? (Defined: a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment)
   • Yes
   • No

If you answered yes to the previous question, which of the following types of hooking up did the unwanted sexual experience occur?
   • A hook up with someone who you had not met before.
   • A hook up with a person that you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.
   • A one-time hook up with a friend.
   • A hook up with a friend that you have hooked up with more than once.
   • A hook up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship.
2. **Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent by:**

   a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.  
   b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.  
   c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.  
   d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.  
   e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

If you answered 1 or more to any of the questions above, please answer the next two questions. If you answered zero for all the questions above, skip to the next page.

Did any of these unwanted sexual experiences occur in the context of a hook up? *(Defined: a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment)*

- Yes
- No

If you answered yes to the previous question, which of the following types of hooking up did the unwanted sexual experience occur?

- A hook up with someone who you had not met before.
- A hook up with a person that you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.
- A one-time hook up with a friend.
- A hook up with a friend that you have hooked up with more than once.
- A hook up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship.
3. A man put his penis into my vagina, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:

a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.

b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.

c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.

d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.

e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

If you answered 1 or more to any of the questions above, please answer the next two questions. If you answered zero for all the questions above, skip to the next page.

Did any of these unwanted sexual experiences occur in the context of a hook up? (Defined: a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment)

- Yes
- No

If you answered yes to the previous question, which of the following types of hooking up did the unwanted sexual experience occur?

- A hook up with someone who you had not met before.
- A hook up with a person that you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.
- A one-time hook up with a friend.
- A hook up with a friend that you have hooked up with more than once.
- A hook up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship.
4. A man put his penis into my butt, or someone inserted fingers or objects without my consent by:
   a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.
   b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.
   c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
   d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.
   e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

How many times with a fellow Bucknell student?

0 1 2 3+

If you answered 1 or more to any of the questions above, please answer the next two questions. If you answered zero for all the questions above, skip to the next page.

Did any of these unwanted sexual experiences occur in the context of a hook up? (Defined: a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment)
   • Yes
   • No

If you answered yes to the previous question, which of the following types of hooking up did the unwanted sexual experience occur?
   • A hook up with someone who you had not met before.
   • A hook up with a person that you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.
   • A one-time hook up with a friend.
   • A hook up with a friend that you have hooked up with more than once.
   • A hook up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship.
5. Even though it didn’t happen, someone TRIED to have oral sex with me, or make me have oral sex with them without my consent by:

a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.  

b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.  

c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.  

d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.  

e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.  

If you answered 1 or more to any of the questions above, please answer the next two questions. If you answered zero for all the questions above, skip to the next page.

Did any of these unwanted sexual experiences occur in the context of a hook up? (Defined: a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment)

• Yes
• No

If you answered yes to the previous question, which of the following types of hooking up did the unwanted sexual experience occur?

• A hook up with someone who you had not met before.  
• A hook up with a person that you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.  
• A one-time hook up with a friend.  
• A hook up with a friend that you have hooked up with more than once.  
• A hook up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship.
6. Even though it didn’t happen, a man TRIED to put his penis into my vagina, or someone tried to stick in fingers or objects without my consent by:
   a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.  
   b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.  
   c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.  
   d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.  
   e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

If you answered 1 or more to any of the questions above, please answer the next two questions. If you answered zero for all the questions above, skip to the next page.

Did any of these unwanted sexual experiences occur in the context of a hook up? (Defined: a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment)
   • Yes
   • No

If you answered yes to the previous question, which of the following types of hooking up did the unwanted sexual experience occur?
   • A hook up with someone who you had not met before.
   • A hook up with a person that you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.
   • A one-time hook up with a friend.
   • A hook up with a friend that you have hooked up with more than once.
   • A hook up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship.
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7. Even though it didn’t happen, a man TRIED to put his penis into my butt, or someone tried to stick in fingers or objects without my consent by:
   a. Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn’t want to.
   b. Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn’t want to.
   c. Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.
   d. Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.
   e. Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

If you answered 1 or more to any of the questions above, please answer the next two questions. If you answered zero for all the questions above, skip to the next page.

Did any of these unwanted sexual experiences occur in the context of a hook up? (Defined: a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment)
   • Yes
   • No

If you answered yes to the previous question, which of the following types of hooking up did the unwanted sexual experience occur?
   • A hook up with someone who you had not met before.
   • A hook up with a person that you consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.
   • A one-time hook up with a friend.
   • A hook up with a friend that you have hooked up with more than once.
   • A hook up with someone with whom you were previously in a romantic relationship.
Perceptions of Consent (Bogle, 2007)

Imagine that you are a member of a campus judicial board, which has to decide cases where a classmate has made a complaint against a current student. You have to decide if a student is guilty of anything and if so what penalty the student will receive. Penalties include things like: a) being asked to write a reflection paper, b) going to mandatory counseling sessions, etc. The most severe penalties a judicial board can give are suspension or permanent dismissal from the university.

In some cases, judicial boards have to decide cases involving sex between students. The judicial board has to decide if the sex was consensual or non-consensual. For each of the following scenarios, indicate whether you think the information given would lead you to believe the sex was consensual or non-consensual.

1) The student filing the complaint had 4 or 5 beers prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

2) The student filing the complaint had 4 or 5 shots prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

3) The student filing the complaint had 4 or 5 glasses of wine prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

4) The student filing the complaint was “legally drunk” (i.e., too drunk to drive) prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

5) The student filing the complaint and his/her sex partner were similarly intoxicated by the alcohol they consumed prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

6) The student filing the complaint was having difficulty walking straight (due to drinking alcohol) prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
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a. Probably consensual
b. Probably non-consensual
c. Not enough information to judge

7) The student filing the complaint vomited (due to drinking alcohol) prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

8) The student filing the complaint was slurring his/her speech (due to drinking alcohol) prior to sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

9) The student filing the complaint was confused about the name of the sex partner (due to drinking alcohol) prior to the sexual intercourse taking place.
   a. Probably consensual
   b. Probably non-consensual
   c. Not enough information to judge

10) I believe a typical college female is too drunk to consent to sex after _________ number of alcoholic beverages.

11) I believe a typical college male is too drunk to consent to sex after _________ number of alcoholic beverages.

12) If a student was found to have had sex with another student when s/he was too drunk to consent, the most appropriate penalty would be:
    a. Write a reflection paper on why the behavior was wrong
    b. Go to mandatory counseling sessions
    c. Be placed on temporary suspension from the university
    d. Be permanently dismissed from the university

13) If a student was found to have had sex with another student when s/he was too drunk to consent, the matter should be turned over to the police for criminal prosecution.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Not sure
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree
Debriefing

You have now completed the survey. Click the Submit Survey button at the bottom of this page to record your responses. After submitting the survey, you will have the opportunity to enter your email address into a random lottery.

We encourage you to read the following information.

We want to express our sincere thanks for your help with this research. The kinds of questions asked in this type of research are not always easy to answer, and we appreciate that you were willing to do this. We also want to remind you that your answers to all of these questions will be held in strict anonymity. There is no way that you can be identified as the person who has given these answers. All reports of this research will include results based solely on group averages, never on information given by a single individual.

We also want to tell you that we are conducting this research to examine the hooking up and facilitative behaviors of women with respect to sexual assault. We are interested in what the results of this study will tell us, most importantly, because we think that the Bucknell community needs to be aware of the factors associated with the high rates of sexual assault. Eventually, we expect that this information will lead to improvements in the University’s efforts at prevention, and in the scientific understanding of sexual assault.

If you are interested in finding out more about this and related topics of research, we recommend the following:


If you find that answering any of these questions has led to undue stress or other significant concerns with which you are having difficulty, please consider contacting one of the counselors at our Psychological Services Center on campus (call 577-1604 to schedule an appointment). Needing to talk with a professional counselor is not uncommon. A surprisingly high percentage of college students seek counseling at there is supported evidence that talking with someone about these kinds of problems can help a great deal.

Again, thank you very much for the information you have provided, and for your help without research.
Do College Women Facilitate the Sexual Assault of their Female Peers? 80